

BOUNDS FOR KLOOSTERMAN SUMS ON $GL(n)$

VALENTIN BLOMER AND SIU HANG MAN

ABSTRACT. This paper establishes power-saving bounds for Kloosterman sums associated with the long Weyl element for $GL(n)$ for arbitrary $n \geq 2$, as well as for another type of Weyl element of order 2. These bounds are obtained by establishing an explicit representation as exponential sums. As an application we go beyond Sarnak's density conjecture for the principal congruence subgroup of prime level. We also bound all Kloosterman sums for $GL(4)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Classical Kloosterman sums. Kloosterman sums belong to the most universal exponential sums in number theory, algebra and automorphic forms. The classical Kloosterman sum for parameters $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a modulus $c \in \mathbb{N}$ is

$$(1.1) \quad S(m, m', c) = \sum_{d \pmod{c}}^* e\left(\frac{md + m'\bar{d}}{c}\right).$$

Kloosterman [Kl] introduced this type of exponential sum in his thesis as a crucial tool to study the representation of integers by positive quaternary quadratic forms. Since then they have been ubiquitous in number theory, for instance as the finite Fourier transform of exponential sums containing modular inverses, as Fourier coefficients of classical Poincaré series, in various instances of delta-symbol methods and perhaps most prominently in the relative trace formula of Petersson-Kuznetsov type (to which Poincaré series are a precursor). One of its key properties is the Weil bound [We] (complemented by Salié for powerful moduli [Sal])

$$|S(m, m', c)| \leq \tau(c)c^{1/2}(m, m', c)^{1/2}$$

where τ denotes the divisor function. This essentially exhibits square root cancellation relative to the trivial bound $|S(m, m', c)| \leq \phi(c)$ where ϕ is Euler's ϕ -function.

We proceed to describe the more general set-up of Kloosterman sums. Let G be a reductive group, T the maximal torus, and U the standard maximal unipotent subgroup. Let $N = N_G(T)$ be the normalizer of T in G , $W = N/T$ the Weyl group and $\omega : N \rightarrow W$ the quotient map. For $w \in W$, we define $U_w = U \cap w^{-1}U^\top w$ and $\bar{U}_w = U \cap w^{-1}Uw$. For $n \in N(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and a finite index subgroup $\Gamma \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ we define

$$C(n) = U(\mathbb{Q}_p)nU(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap \Gamma, \quad X(n) = U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash C(n) / U_{\omega(n)}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$$

and the projection maps

$$u : X(n) \rightarrow U(\mathbb{Q}_p) \backslash U(\mathbb{Z}_p), \quad u' : X(n) \rightarrow U_{\omega(n)}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \backslash U_{\omega(n)}(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11L05.

Key words and phrases. Kloosterman sums.

Let ψ, ψ' be two characters on $U(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ that are trivial on $U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. The (local) Kloosterman sum is then defined to be

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', n) = \sum_{x=u(x)nu'(x) \in X(n)} \psi(u(x))\psi'(u'(x)).$$

In this paper we will take $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, but we may think of Γ as a more general ‘‘congruence subgroup’’. Of course, by the Chinese remainder theorem it suffices to study local Kloosterman sums. There is some flexibility in the definition. For instance, some authors have $U_{\omega(n)}$ on the left and U on the right.

Example 1: For $G = \text{GL}(2)$, $n = \begin{pmatrix} & -1/c \\ c & \end{pmatrix}$ (so that $U_{\omega(n)} = U$) with $c = p^r$, say, $\psi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \psi_0(mx)$, $\psi'\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \psi_0(m'y)$ for the standard additive character ψ_0 on $\mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} n \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} cx & -1/c + cxy \\ c & cy \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$$

if and only if $x, y \in p^{-r}\mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p$, $xy - p^{-2r} \in p^{-r}\mathbb{Z}_p$, and we recover (1.1).

Example 2: For $G = \text{GL}(3)$ and $n = \begin{pmatrix} & & -1/c_1 \\ & c_1/c_2 & \\ c_2 & & \end{pmatrix}$ in the big Bruhat cell an explicit form of the corresponding Kloosterman sum becomes already much more complicated. Using Plücker coordinates, Bump, Friedberg and Goldfeld [BFG, Section 4] derived for two general characters ψ_{n_1, n_2} and ψ_{m_1, m_2} of 3-by-3 upper triangular unipotent matrices the explicit formula for the global Kloosterman sum

$$\sum_{\substack{B_1, C_1 \pmod{c_1} \\ B_2, C_2 \pmod{c_2} \\ (B_j, C_j, c_j)=1 \\ c_1 c_2 | c_1 C_2 + B_1 B_2 + C_1 c_2}} e\left(\frac{m_1 B_1 + n_1 (Y_1 c_2 - Z_1 B_2)}{c_1} + \frac{m_2 B_2 + n_2 (Y_2 c_1 - Z_2 B_1)}{c_2}\right)$$

where Y_1, Y_2, Z_1, Z_2 are chosen such that $Y_j B_j + Z_j C_j \equiv 1 \pmod{c_j}$ for $j = 1, 2$.

We see from these examples that Kloosterman sums, while defined rather naturally in terms of the Bruhat decomposition, turn out to be extremely complicated exponential sums. We are well equipped with deep technology from algebraic geometry and p -adic analysis to bound general exponential sums in a relatively sharp fashion, but it is unfortunately not clear a priori how to apply these to general Kloosterman sums given by (1.2). In fact, even determining the size of $X(n)$ and hence the ‘‘trivial’’ bound for (1.2) (ignoring cancellation in the characters) is a deep result of Dąbrowski and Reeder [DR].

One case is classical: for $G = \text{GL}(n)$ and the Weyl element $\begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ I_{n-1} & & & \end{pmatrix}$ (‘‘Voronoi element’’) the Kloosterman sum (1.2) becomes a hyper-Kloosterman sum [Fr, Theorem B] in the sense of Deligne and hence its size is well-understood. In addition we have good bounds for Kloosterman sums on $\text{GL}(3)$ [St, BFG, DF], $\text{Sp}(4)$ [Ma] and for the long Weyl element on $\text{GL}(4)$ [GSW, Appendix]. In all other cases, the best we know is the trivial bound of Dąbrowski-Reeder [DR]. A typical strategy, employed for instance in [BFG, GSW, Br], is to use Plücker coordinates to understand the Bruhat decomposition of $\text{GL}(n)$ in an explicit fashion. Unfortunately, for large n the Plücker relations become extremely complicated, and it seems that this path is not very promising in general.

In this paper, our focus is on Kloosterman sums for the general linear group $G = GL(n+1)$ for $n \geq 2$. The notation $n+1$ in place of n is slightly more convenient. We parametrize the unipotent upper triangular matrices U of dimension $n+1$ as

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_{11} & u_{12} & \cdots & u_{1n} \\ & 1 & u_{22} & \cdots & u_{2n} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & u_{nn} \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We consider two characters ψ, ψ' of $U(\mathbb{Q}_p)/U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, defined by

$$\psi(u) = e\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j u_{jj}\right), \quad \psi'_p(u) = e\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \psi'_j u_{jj}\right)$$

for $\psi_j, \psi'_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. The Weyl group of G consists of $(n+1)!$ permutation matrices, but only Weyl elements of the form

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & I_{d_1} \\ & & & & \\ & & & I_{d_2} & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ I_{d_r} & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

with identity matrices I_{d_j} of dimension d_j lead to well-defined objects (see [Fr, p. 175]), which reduces the number of relevant Weyl elements to 2^n . We consider two of them, namely the long Weyl element

$$w_l = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & \pm 1 \\ & & & & \\ & & & -1 & \ddots \\ & & 1 & & \\ -1 & & & & \\ 1 & & & & \end{pmatrix},$$

and with a particular application in mind (to be described in Subsection 1.4)

$$w_* = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & \pm 1 \\ & & & & \\ & & & -I_{n-1} & \\ & & & & \\ 1 & & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

The chosen representatives of the Weyl elements w_l and w_* here satisfy that the determinant of the $k \times k$ -minor formed by the bottom k rows and appropriate columns has positive determinant. The actual choice of the representatives is unimportant to the theory, but this particular choice makes the computations in later sections more convenient.

We write a typical modulus as $C = (p^{r_1}, \dots, p^{r_n})$ with $r_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ which we embed into the torus T as $C^* = \text{diag}(p^{-r_1}, p^{r_2-r_1}, \dots, p^{r_{n-1}-r_n}, p^{r_n})$. The first main achievement of this paper is an explicit and reasonably compact expression of the considered Kloosterman sum as an exponential sum which we are going to describe in the following two subsections. We try to present this in a user-friendly way, which may ease further investigations. In the appendix we consider all Weyl elements for the group $G = GL(4)$.

1.2. Kloosterman sums for $G = GL(n+1)$ for the long Weyl element. Our stratification starts with the following decomposition. Let a modulus C be given as above with an exponent vector $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{w_l}(r) := \left\{ \underline{m} = (m_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n(n+1)/2} \mid \sum_{i \leq k \leq j} m_{ij} = r_k, 1 \leq k \leq n \right\}.$$

For $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{w_l}(r)$ we define

$$\mathcal{C}_{w_l}(\underline{m}) := \left\{ \underline{c} = (c_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \mid c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z} / \left(\prod_{k=j}^n p^{m_{ik}} \right) \mathbb{Z}, (c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1 \right\}$$

as well as the partial Kloosterman sum $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l)$ as

$$(1.3) \quad \sum_{\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{w_l}(\underline{m})} e \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^j \psi_j c_{i(j-1)} \overline{c_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} p^{m_k(j-1)} \prod_{k=1}^i p^{-m_k j} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^i \psi'_i c_{(n+1-i)(n+1-j)} \overline{c_{(n+2-i)(n+1-j)}} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} p^{m_{(n+2-i)(n+1-k)}} \prod_{k=1}^j p^{-m_{(n+1-i)(n+1-k)}} \right).$$

Here we employ the convention that $c_{ij} = 1$ and $m_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j$. Moreover, we set $\overline{c_{ij}} = 0$ when $m_{ij} = 0$. It is not obvious from the definition, but will follow from the proof, that this expression is well-defined (i.e. independent of the system of representatives chosen for the c_{ij}).

As an example, the case $n = 3$ (i.e. $G = \text{GL}(4)$) is spelled out explicitly in the appendix, where all Weyl elements for $\text{GL}(4)$ are analyzed.

We are now ready to state our first main result.

Theorem 1. *For $C = (p^{r_1}, \dots, p^{r_n})$ we have with the above notation*

$$\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_l) = \sum_{\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{w_l}(r)} \text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l)$$

where $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l)$ is defined in (1.3).

Remarks: While still relatively complicated, the exact formula has a number of nice features. First of all, we see the “trivial bound” of Dąbrowski-Reeder with bare eyes by simply counting the number of terms in the summation:

$$\#\mathcal{C}_{w_l}(\underline{m}) \leq \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} p^{(j-i+1)m_{ij}} = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} p^{r_k}$$

for $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{w_l}(r)$. We are now in a position to exploit cancellation to obtain non-trivial bounds in Corollary 1 below. It is also structurally quite interesting because it consists of nested $\text{GL}(2)$ Kloosterman sums. This is reminiscent of the archimedean case where the (non-degenerate) $\text{GL}(n)$ -Whittaker function can be expressed as nested integrals of Bessel K -functions (i.e. $\text{GL}(2)$ Whittaker functions), see [St]. The exact formula can also be used for certain exact evaluations (see below), it can be generalized to congruence subgroups, and can perhaps ultimately be a means for deeper methodological machinery in analytic number theory such as Poisson summation etc.

Corollary 1. *With the notation as above, there exists a $\delta = \delta_n > 0$ such that*

$$\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_l) \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} p^{r_k} \right)^{1-\delta}.$$

Xinchen Miao kindly informed us that he obtained independently and by a slightly different method a similar bound in [Mi, Theorem 5.1].

We did not make any effort to optimize the value of δ (which is probably irrelevant in many applications). If one is really interested in sharp bounds, it is likely to become extremely involved, as can already be seen in the case $n = 2$ (cf. [DF]). It is an interesting question whether δ can be chosen independently of n . In this particular situation we do not know

the answer, but for general Weyl elements the answer is NO, as we will see in the next subsection.

1.3. Kloosterman sums for $G = GL(n+1)$ for w_* . We now establish similar results for the Weyl element w_* . For this Weyl element we have relatively severe restrictions on the moduli $C = (p^{r_1}, \dots, p^{r_n})$, see [Fr, Proposition 1.3]. For instance, if ψ, ψ' satisfy $p \nmid \psi_j \psi'_j$ and $n \geq 3$, then the exponents r_k need to form an arithmetic progression.

In the present situation we define

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{M}_{w_*}(r) := \left\{ \underline{m} = (m_{ij})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \\ i=1 \text{ or } j=n}} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{2n-1} \mid \sum_{i \leq k \leq j} m_{ij} = r_k, 1 \leq k \leq n \right\}.$$

For $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{w_*}(r)$ we define

$$\mathcal{C}_{w_*}(\underline{m}) = \left\{ \underline{c} = (c_{ij})_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \\ i=1 \text{ or } j=n}} \mid \begin{array}{l} c_{1j} \in \mathbb{Z}/\prod_{k=j}^n p^{m_{1k}} \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq j \leq n, \\ c_{in} \in \mathbb{Z}/\prod_{k=2}^i p^{m_{kn}} \mathbb{Z}, 2 \leq i \leq n, \end{array} (c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1 \right\}$$

as well as the partial Kloosterman sum $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*)$ as

$$(1.5) \quad \sum_{\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{w_*}(\underline{m})} e \left(\psi_1 \frac{\overline{c_{11}}}{p^{m_{11}}} + \sum_{j=2}^n \psi_j \left(\frac{c_{1(j-1)} \overline{c_{1j}}}{p^{m_{1j}}} + \frac{c_{(j+1)n} \overline{c_{jn}}}{p^{-m_{1(j-1)} + m_{1j} + m_{jn}}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \psi'_1 \frac{c_{2n}}{p^{m_{2n}}} + \psi'_n \left(\frac{c_{1n} \overline{c_{nn}}}{p^{m_{1n}}} + \frac{c_{1(n-1)}}{p^{-m_{nn} + m_{1(n-1)} + m_{1n}}} \right) \right).$$

Again we employ the convention that $c_{ij} = 1$ and $m_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j$. Moreover, we set $\overline{c_{ij}} = 0$ when $m_{ij} = 0$. For the case $n = 4$, we refer to the appendix.

Theorem 2. For $C = (p^{r_1}, \dots, p^{r_n})$ we have with the above notation

$$\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_*) = \sum_{\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{w_*}(r)} \text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*)$$

whenever the Kloosterman sum on the left hand side is well-defined.

Corollary 2. There exists a $\delta = \delta_n > 0$ such that

$$\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_*) \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2}, \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} p^{r_k} \right)^{1-\delta}.$$

Corollary 3. For $C = (p, \dots, p)$ and characters ψ, ψ' with $p \nmid \psi_j \psi'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$ we have $\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_*) = p^{n-1} + p^{n-2}$.

The last result shows that Kloosterman sums can be fairly large. In particular, the best we can hope in general in the situation of Corollary 2 is $\delta_n \asymp 1/n$. Corollary 3 is a variation of [Bl, Theorem 3], but proved by a completely different argument, since [Bl, Theorem 3] is special to the congruence subgroup $\Gamma_0(p)$. A similar, but more involved computation shows

$$\text{Kl}_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w_l) = (-1)^n (p+1)$$

for $C = (p, \dots, p)$ and characters ψ, ψ' with $p \nmid \psi_j \psi'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. This generalizes [BFG, Property 4.10] for $n = 2$.

1.4. An application. Kloosterman sums come up most prominently in the Kuznetsov formula. Up until now, in higher rank one could at best employ the trivial bound. With non-trivial bounds at hand, we can now refine the main result of [AB].

The Ramanujan conjecture for the group $\mathrm{GL}(n)$ states that cuspidal automorphic representations are tempered. This is way out of reach, but one may hope that it holds in reasonable families in the following quantitative average sense: automorphic forms that are “far away” from being tempered should occur “rarely”. With this in mind, let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma(q)}(M)$ be the finite family of cusp forms ϖ (eigenforms for the unramified Hecke algebra) for the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma(q) \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with bounded spectral parameter $\|\mu_{\varpi, \infty}\| \leq M$ (see [AB] for more details). For a place v of \mathbb{Q} and $\sigma \geq 0$ define

$$N_v(\sigma, \mathcal{F}) = \#\{\varpi \in \mathcal{F} \mid \sigma_{\varpi, v} \geq \sigma\}$$

where $\sigma_{\varpi, v} = \max_j |\Re \mu_{\varpi, v}(j)|$. The trivial bound is $N_v(\sigma, \mathcal{F}) \leq N_v(0, \mathcal{F}) = \#\mathcal{F}$. On the other hand, we have $\sigma_{\mathrm{triv}, v} = \frac{1}{2}(n-1)$. One might hope that a trace formula can interpolate linearly between these two bounds:

$$\mathcal{N}(\sigma, \mathcal{F}) \ll_{v, \varepsilon, n} M^{O(1)} [\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma(q)]^{1 - \frac{2\sigma}{n-1} + \varepsilon}$$

where $M^{O(1)}[\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma(q)]$ should be thought of as a proxy for $\#\mathcal{F}$. This is a version of Sarnak’s density conjecture [Sar] and was proved in [AB] for squarefree q . Of course, the trivial representation is not cuspidal, and so one may hope to do even better, but even for $n = 2$ this is a very hard problem when the Selberg trace formula is employed. On the other hand, the Kuznetsov formula is better suited in this situation, since the residual spectrum is a priori excluded. We use this observation to go *beyond* Sarnak’s density conjecture in the scenario described above for prime moduli.

Proposition 4. *Let $M, \varepsilon > 0$, $n \geq 5$. Let q be a large prime and let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma(q)}(M)$ be the set of cuspidal automorphic forms for $\Gamma(q) \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with archimedean spectral parameter $\|\mu\| \leq M$. Fix a place v of \mathbb{Q} . There exist constants K, δ depending only on n , such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(\sigma, \mathcal{F}) \ll_{v, \varepsilon, n} M^K [\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma(q)]^{1 - \frac{2\sigma}{n-1} - \delta}$$

for $\sigma \geq 0$.

2. THE STRATIFICATION OF DĄBROWSKI AND REEDER

Here we convert results in [DR] to conform with our convention. Although nothing in this section is new, it might be convenient for the reader to compile some results.

Let G be a simply connected Chevalley group over \mathbb{Q}_p , with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Let W be the Weyl group of G , and let Φ and Φ^+ denote the set of roots and the set of \mathfrak{g} respectively. We fix a set of simple roots Δ of \mathfrak{g} . For each positive root $\beta \in \Phi^+$, there is a natural homomorphism $\phi_\beta : \mathrm{SL}(2) \rightarrow G$. For $t \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ we write

$$x_\beta(t) = \phi_\beta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x_{-\beta}(t) = \phi_\beta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ t & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Through the canonical bijection $\beta \longleftrightarrow \check{\beta}$ between the set of roots Φ and the set of coroots $\check{\Phi}$, we have

$$\check{\beta}(c) = \phi_\beta \begin{pmatrix} c & \\ & c^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $c \in \mathbb{Q}_p^\times$. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $m\check{\beta}$ for $\check{\beta}(p^m)$. This induces a natural embedding

$$\check{X} := \text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, T) \hookrightarrow T$$

from the set of cocharacters of T into the maximal torus T . If $\lambda = -\sum_{\beta \in \Delta} r_\beta \check{\beta} \in \check{X}$ for $r_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define the height of λ to be

$$\text{ht}(\lambda) := \sum_{\beta \in \Delta} r_\beta.$$

For $w \in W$, we write

$$R(w) := \{\beta \in \Phi^+ \mid w\beta \in -\Phi^+\}.$$

Then, if $w = s_{\beta_1} \dots s_{\beta_l}$ is a reduced expression of w as a product of simple reflections, then

$$(2.1) \quad R(w^{-1}) = \{\gamma_j := s_{\beta_1} \dots s_{\beta_{j-1}} \beta_j \mid j = 1, \dots, l\}.$$

For $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ we set

$$\mu(a) := \max\{0, -v_p(a)\}, \quad a^* := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Z}_p, \\ p^{-2v_p(a)} a^{-1} & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Z}_p. \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $a \notin \mathbb{Z}_p$, say $a = cp^{-m}$, $m \geq 1$, $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, then we have $a^* = c^{-1}p^{-m}$. This means the map $a \mapsto a^*$ preserves μ . For $\beta \in \Delta$ we define

$$(2.2) \quad b_\beta(a) := x_\beta(a^*)(-\mu(a)\check{\beta})\overline{s_\beta}x_\beta(a),$$

where $\overline{s_\beta}$ is some fixed representative of the simple reflection s_β in $N = N_G(T)$. When no confusion can arise, we simply write s_β for $\overline{s_\beta}$. We observe that $b_\beta(a) \in G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. Indeed, we have

$$b_\beta(a) = \phi_\beta \begin{pmatrix} & -1 \\ 1 & a \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } a \in \mathbb{Z}_p, \quad b_\beta(a) = \phi_\beta \begin{pmatrix} c^{-1} & \\ p^m & c \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } a = cp^{-m} \in \mathbb{Z}_p.$$

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $w = s_{\beta_1} \dots s_{\beta_l}$ be a reduced representation of w as a product of simple reflections, and write $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$. For $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_l) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^l$, let $b(\underline{a}) := b_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{a})$ denote the image of $b_{\beta_1}(a_1) \dots b_{\beta_l}(a_l)$ in $U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. From [DR, Proposition 2.1], the map $b_{\underline{\beta}} : \mathbb{Q}_p^l \rightarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is injective, and its image is contained in $U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash (BwU \cap G(\mathbb{Z}_p))$, where $B = TU$ is the standard Borel subgroup of G .

We remark that the map $b_{\underline{\beta}}$ really depends on the choice of the reduced representation of w . Moreover, $b_{\underline{\beta}}$ also depends on the choice of the representative $\overline{s_\beta}$ of s_β . If we fix a representative of w in $G(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, then by convention we choose the representatives such that the toral part of the Bruhat decomposition of $b_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{a})$ has positive entries.

For $\underline{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_l) \in \mathbb{N}_0^l$, we set

$$Y_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{m}) = \left\{ \underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_l) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^l \mid \mu(a_i) = m_i, i = 1, \dots, l \right\}.$$

Let $\beta \in \Delta$, and

$$u = \prod_{\beta \in \Phi^+} x_\beta(a_\beta) \in U(\mathbb{Q}_p).$$

The β -coordinate function f_β is defined by $f_\beta(u) := a_\beta$. Note that this does not depend on the order of the product. For $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ and $u \in U(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, we define

$$R_\beta^a(u) := b_\beta(a)ub_\beta(a + f_\beta(u))^{-1}.$$

Then $R_{\beta}^a(U(\mathbb{Z}_p)) \subseteq U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. For a sequence $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ of simple roots, we can construct a right action $* = *_{\underline{\beta}} : \mathbb{Q}_p^l \times U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p^l$, $\underline{a} \mapsto \underline{a} * u =: \underline{a}'$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & a'_l a_l + f_{\beta_l}(u), \\ & a'_j = a_j + f_{\beta_j} \left(R_{\beta_{j+1}}^{a_{j+1}} R_{\beta_{j+2}}^{a_{j+2}} \dots R_{\beta_l}^{a_l}(u) \right), \quad 1 \leq j \leq l-1. \end{aligned}$$

Then $b_{\underline{\beta}} : \mathbb{Q}_p^l \rightarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is right $U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ -equivariant with respect to $*_{\underline{\beta}}$, that is, we have $b_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{a} *_{\underline{\beta}} u) = b_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{a})u$ for $u \in U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and $\underline{a} \in \mathbb{Q}_p^l$. It follows that $b_{\underline{\beta}}$ induces a map

$$\underline{b}_{\underline{\beta}} : \mathbb{Q}_p^l / U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \backslash (BwB \cap G(\mathbb{Z}_p)) / U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p),$$

where $\mathbb{Q}_p^l / U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ denotes the set of $U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ -orbits with respect to the right action $*_{\underline{\beta}}$.

For any cocharacter $\lambda \in \check{X}$, we define

$$(2.3) \quad Y_{\lambda} = \coprod \left\{ Y_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{m}) \mid \underline{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^l, \lambda = - \sum_{j=1}^l m_j \check{\gamma}_j \right\},$$

where γ_j is defined in (2.1). Now we are able to state the main result in this section.

Lemma 1 ([DR, Proposition 3.3]). *Let $\lambda \in \check{X}$, $n = \lambda w \in N(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and let $w = s_{\beta_1} \dots s_{\beta_l}$ be a reduced representation of w as a product of simple reflections. Write $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$. Then $\underline{b}_{\underline{\beta}}$ gives a bijection between $Y_{\lambda} / U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and the Kloosterman set $X(\bar{n})$.*

The following proposition gives the trivial bound for Kloosterman sums.

Lemma 2 ([DR, Proposition 3.4]). *Assume the settings above. For $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^l$ we have*

$$\# \left(Y_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{m}) / U_w(\mathbb{Z}_p) \right) = p^{\text{ht}(\lambda)} (1 - p^{-1})^{\kappa(\underline{m})},$$

where $\kappa(\underline{m})$ is the number of nonzero entries in \underline{m} .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We apply the results from Section 2 to our case. Let $G = \text{GL}(n+1)$. A set of simple roots of G is given by $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, where $\alpha_i := e_i - e_{i+1}$. Using this root basis, the set of positive roots of G is given by

$$\Phi^+ = \{\alpha_{ij} := \alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} + \dots + \alpha_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Throughout this section, we use the following reduced representation of w_* :

$$(3.1) \quad w_l = (s_{\alpha_1} \dots s_{\alpha_n})(s_{\alpha_1} \dots s_{\alpha_{(n-1)}}) \dots (s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2}) s_{\alpha_1}.$$

Recall the definition of γ_j in (2.1). For the reduced representation (3.1) of w_* , we have

$$\underline{\gamma} = (\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \dots, \alpha_{1n}, \alpha_{22}, \alpha_{2n}, \dots, \alpha_{nn}).$$

Now we give a characterisation for $b(\underline{a})$, for $\underline{a} = (a_{11}, \dots, a_{1n}, a_{22}, \dots, a_{nn}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}$. Note that every $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ can be written uniquely as a product $a_{ij} = c_{ij} p^{-m_{ij}}$, with $m_{ij} \geq 0$, $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$.

Lemma 3. Let $\underline{a} = (a_{11}, \dots, a_{nn}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}$. Write $a_{ij} = c_{ij}p^{-m_{ij}}$, with $m_{ij} \geq 0$, $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$. Then $b(\underline{a})$ has a Bruhat decomposition $b(\underline{a}) = LNR$, where

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & L_{12} & L_{13} & \cdots & L_{1(n+1)} \\ & 1 & L_{23} & \cdots & L_{2(n+1)} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & L_{n(n+1)} \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & N_{1(n+1)} \\ & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & N_{(n+1)1} & & & \\ & & & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & R_{12} & R_{13} & \cdots & R_{1(n+1)} \\ & 1 & R_{23} & \cdots & R_{2(n+1)} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & R_{n(n+1)} \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$N_{i(n+2-i)} = (-1)^{(n+1-i)} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{i-1} p^{m_{k(i-1)}}}{\prod_{k=1}^n p^{m_{ik}}}, \quad (1 \leq i \leq n+1),$$

$$L_{ij} = \sum_{1 \leq \delta_1 < \dots < \delta_{j-i} \leq j-1} L_{ij}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{j-i}), \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq n+1),$$

$$L_{ij}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{j-i}) := \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{\delta_k(i-2+k)} \prod_{k=1}^{j-i} \prod_{t=\delta_{k-1}+1}^{\delta_k-1} p^{m_{t(i-2+k)}}}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{\delta_k(i-1+k)} \prod_{k=1}^{\delta_{j-i}} p^{m_{k(j-1)}}},$$

$$R_{ij} = \sum_{n+1-i \leq \partial_1 \leq \dots \leq \partial_{j-i} \leq n} R_{ij}(\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{j-i}), \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq n+1),$$

$$R_{ij}(\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{j-i}) := \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{(n+2-i-k)\delta_k} \prod_{k=\delta_1+1}^n p^{m_{(n+2-i)k}}}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{(n+3-i-k)\delta_k} \prod_{k=1}^{j-i} \prod_{t=\delta_k}^{\delta_{k+1}} p^{m_{(n+2-i-k)t}}}.$$

To interpret the formula above, we set $c_{ij} := 1$ and $m_{ij} := 0$ if the condition $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ is not satisfied, and $\delta_0 := 0$, $\partial_{j-i+1} := n$. As a convention, when $m_{ij} = 0$, we define $c_{ij}^{-1} := 0$ as a formal symbol.

Remark: The hard part is to find explicit formulae for the Bruhat decomposition. Once the formulae are given, the proof is a straightforward inductive verification by simply matching terms on both sides of the matrix equation.

Proof. First we justify the definition $c_{ij}^{-1} := 0$ as a formal symbol when $m_{ij} = 0$. We recall the definition of $b_\beta(a)$ for $\beta \in \Phi^+$, $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. We write a as a product $a = cp^{-m}$, with $m \geq 0$, $c \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $(c, p^m) = 1$. When $m \geq 1$, we have

$$(3.2) \quad b_\beta(cp^{-m}) = \phi_\beta \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & c^{-1}p^{-m} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} & -p^m \\ p^m & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & cp^{-m} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Meanwhile, when $m = 0$ we have

$$b_\beta(c) = \phi_\beta \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} & -1 \\ 1 & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Hence (3.2) also works for $m = 0$ if we treat $c^{-1} := 0$ as a formal symbol. As $b_\beta(\alpha)$ is a product of such matrices, our convention is justified.

Now we prove the actual formula by induction. For easier manipulation, we assume $m_{ij} \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$; when some $m_{ij} = 0$ we use the convention $c_{ij}^{-1} := 0$ to the result. When $n = 1$, the formula reads

$$b_{\alpha_1}(a_{11}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c_{11}^{-1}p^{-m_{11}} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} & p^{-m_{11}} \\ p^{m_{11}} & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c_{11}p^{-m_{11}} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$L'_{ij}(\delta) = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{(\delta_k+1)(i-1+k)} \prod_{k=1}^{j-i} \prod_{t=\delta_{k-1}+1}^{\delta_k-1} p^{m_{(t+1)(i-1+k)}}}{\prod_{k=1}^{j-i} c_{(\delta_k+1)(i+k)} \prod_{k=1}^{\delta_j-i} p^{m_{(k+1)j}}}, \quad R'_{ij}(\partial) = R_{ij}(\partial).$$

It is then straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ik}(1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{k-i}) N_{k(n+2-k)} R_{(n+2-k)j}(\partial) \\ = \frac{c_{1(i-1)}}{c_{1i}} L'_{i(k-1)}(\delta_2 - 1, \dots, \delta_{k-i} - 1) N_{(k-1)(n+2-k)} R'_{(n+2-k)j}(\partial), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ik}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-i}) N_{k(n+2-k)} R_{(n+2-k)j}(\partial) \\ = p^{m_{1(i-1)}} L'_{(i-1)(k-1)}(\delta_1 - 1, \dots, \delta_{k-i} - 1) N_{(k-1)(n+2-k)} R'_{(n+2-k)j}(\partial) \end{aligned}$$

if $\delta_1 \geq 2$. Matching the terms with (3.4) yields $(LNR)_{ij} = (\Upsilon L'N'R')_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Now consider the case where $1 \leq i \leq n$, $j = n+1$. From (3.5), we deduce that

$$(\Upsilon L'N'R')_{i(n+1)} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

It remains to show that $(LNR)_{i(n+1)} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. By straightforward computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ik}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-i}) N_{k(n+2-k)} R_{(n+2-k)j}(\partial_1, \dots, \partial_{k-1}) \\ = -L_{ik}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-i+1}) N_{(k+1)(n+1-k)} R_{(n+1-k)j}(\partial'_1, \dots, \partial'_k), \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial'_1 = k$, $\partial'_\ell = \max\{k, \partial_{\ell-1}\}$ for $2 \leq \ell \leq k$, and $\delta_{k-i+1} = k + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \partial_\ell - \sum_{\ell=2}^k \partial'_\ell$. Putting this back into (3.4) yields $(LNR)_{i(n+1)} = 0$ as desired.

Now consider the case where $i = n+1$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then (3.4) and (3.5) say

$$\begin{aligned} (\Upsilon L'N'R')_{(n+1)j} &= p^{m_{1n}} \sum_{k=1}^n L'_{nk} N'_{k(n+1-k)} R'_{(n+1-k)j} = p^{m_{1(i-1)}} N'_{n1} R'_{1j}. \\ (LNR)_{(n+1)j} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} L_{(n+1)k} N_{k(n+2-k)} R_{(n+2-k)j} = N_{(n+1)1} R_{1j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_{1j}(\partial) = r'_{1j}(\partial)$, and $N_{(n+1)1} = p^{m_{1n}} N'_{n1}$, it follows that $(\Upsilon L'N'R')_{(n+1)j} = (LNR)_{(n+1)j}$.

Finally, for $i = j = n+1$, we have

$$(LNR)_{(n+1)(n+1)} = N_{(n+1)1} R_{1(n+1)} = c_{1n} = (\Upsilon L'N'R')_{(n+1)(n+1)}.$$

So (3.3) holds, finishing the proof. \square

Lemma 4. *Assume the settings above. For $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n(n+1)/2}$, a complete system of coset representatives for $Y_{\underline{\beta}}(\underline{m})/U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is given by*

$$\left\{ (c_{ij} p^{-m_{ij}})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \left| c_{ij} \left(\text{mod } \prod_{k=j}^n p^{m_{ik}} \right), (c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1 \right. \right\}.$$

Remark: The shape of the system is not completely obvious (to us), but once it is given, the verification is somewhat lengthy, but straightforward.

Proof. From Lemma 2 we already know the number of coset representatives needed. So it remains to show that all these coset representatives are inequivalent under right action by $U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. Again we argue inductively. The case $n = 1$ is straightforward to verify. Indeed, suppose we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & c'_{11}p^{-m_{11}} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c_{11}p^{-m_{11}} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_{11} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $u_{11} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $0 \leq c_{11}, c'_{11} < p^{m_{11}}$. This actually says

$$c'_{11}p^{m_{11}} = c_{11}p^{m_{11}} + u_{11},$$

which implies $u_{11} = 0$, and $c'_{11} = c_{11}$ as desired.

Now we consider the general case. For $n = r$, we set

$$R := b_{\underline{\beta}}(c_{11}p^{-m_{11}}, \dots, c_{rr}p^{-m_{rr}}), \quad R' := b_{\underline{\beta}}(c'_{11}p^{-m_{11}}, \dots, c'_{rr}p^{-m_{rr}}),$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_{11} & \cdots & u_{1r} \\ & 1 & \cdots & u_{2r} \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

such that

$$(3.7) \quad R' = Ru.$$

Removing the final column and the final row of the matrices yields the problem for $n = r - 1$ (with a renaming of variables $c_{ij} \mapsto c_{(i-1)(j-1)}$, $c'_{ij} \mapsto c'_{(i-1)(j-1)}$). By induction, we deduce that the first r rows and columns of R and R' are identical, and $u_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq r - 1$. Using Lemma 3, we deduce that $c_{ij} = c'_{ij}$ for $2 \leq i \leq j \leq r$.

It remains to consider the final columns of the matrices. The $(1, r + 1)$ -th entry of (3.7) reads

$$(3.8) \quad c'_{1r} \prod_{j=1}^r p^{-m_{jr}} = c_{1r} \prod_{j=1}^r p^{-m_{jr}} + \sum_{j=2}^{r+1} u_{(r+2-j)r} c_{jr} \prod_{k=j}^r p^{-m_{kr}},$$

where again we set $c_{(r+1)r} := 1$. Recall that we have $0 \leq c_{1r}, c'_{1r} < p^{1r}$. From (3.8), we deduce that $c'_{1r} = c_{1r}$. It then follows that

$$(3.9) \quad u_{rr} = -R_{1r}^{-1} (u_{(r-1)r} R_{1(r-1)} + \dots + u_{2r} R_{12} + u_{1r}) = - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} u_{jr} \frac{c_{(r+2-j)r}}{c_{2r}} \prod_{k=2}^{r+1-j} p^{m_{kr}}.$$

Now we turn to the $(2, r + 1)$ -th entry of (3.7). It reads

$$(3.10) \quad R'_{2(r+1)} = R_{2(r+1)} + \sum_{j=2}^r u_{jn} R_{2j}.$$

From Lemma 3, we see that there is exactly one term in $R_{2(r+1)}$ and $R'_{2(r+1)}$ that depends on c_{1j} for some $j \leq r - 1$. Since $c_{ij} = c'_{ij}$ for $2 \leq i \leq j \leq r$, we can remove all the other terms within $R_{2(r+1)}$ and $R'_{2(r+1)}$, and obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{c'_{1(r-1)} p^{m_{rr} - m_{1(r-1)} - m_{1r}}}{\prod_{k=2}^{r-1} p^{m_{k(r-1)}}} = \frac{c_{1(r-1)} p^{m_{rr} - m_{1(r-1)} - m_{1r}}}{\prod_{k=2}^{r-1} p^{m_{k(r-1)}}} + \sum_{j=2}^r u_{jr} R_{2j}.$$

To show that $c'_{1(r-1)} = c_{1(r-1)}$, it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{j=2}^r u_{jr} R_{2j} \in p^{m_{rr}} \prod_{k=2}^{r-1} p^{-m_k(r-1)} \mathbb{Z}_p.$$

Using (3.9), we rewrite

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{j=2}^r u_{jr} R_{2j} = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} u_{jr} \left(R_{2j} - \frac{R_{1j} R_{2r}}{R_{1r}} \right).$$

We expand

$$R_{2j} = \sum_{n-1 \leq \delta_1 \leq \dots \leq \delta_{j-2} \leq n} R_{2j}(\delta),$$

where

$$R_{2j}(\delta) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_{(r-1)\delta_1} \dots c_{(r+2-j)\delta_{j-2}}}{c_r \delta_1 \dots c_{r+3-j} \delta_{j-2}} \frac{p^{m_{rr}}}{p^{m_{(r-1)\delta_1} + \dots + m_{(r+2-j)\delta_{j-2}} + \dots + m_{(r+2-j)r}}}, & \text{if } \delta_1 \neq r, \\ \frac{c_{(r-1)\delta_1} \dots c_{(r+2-j)\delta_{j-2}}}{c_r \delta_1 \dots c_{r+3-j} \delta_{j-2}} \frac{1}{p^{m_{(r-1)\delta_1} + \dots + m_{(r+2-j)\delta_{j-2}} + \dots + m_{(r+2-j)r}}}, & \text{if } \delta_1 = r. \end{cases}$$

For $0 \leq l \leq j-2$, we write $\delta_{[j]}(l) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{j-2})$, with $\delta_k = r-1$ if $k \leq l$, and $\delta_k = r$ otherwise. From (3.9), it is easy to check that

$$\frac{R_{1j} R_{2r}(\delta_{[r]}(k))}{R_{1r}} \in p^{m_{rr}} \prod_{k=2}^{r-1} p^{-m_k(r-1)} \mathbb{Z}_p.$$

for $k \geq j-1$. On the other hand, we verify that

$$R_{2j}(\delta_{[j]}(k)) = \frac{R_{1j} R_{2r}(\delta_{[r]}(k))}{R_{1r}}$$

for $0 \leq j \leq k-2$. So we conclude that

$$R_{2j} - \frac{R_{1j} R_{2r}}{R_{1r}} \in p^{m_{rr}} \prod_{k=2}^{r-1} p^{-m_k(r-1)} \mathbb{Z}_p$$

for $1 \leq j \leq r-1$. The claim then follows from (3.12).

By similar arguments, we proceed inductively and show that

$$\sum_{j=i}^r u_{jr} R_{ij} \in \prod_{k=r+2-i}^n p^{m_{(r+2-i)k}} \prod_{k=2}^{r+1-i} p^{-m_k(r+1-i)} \mathbb{Z}_p$$

for $3 \leq i \leq r$, and thus $c'_{1j} = c_{1j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r-2$. This finishes the proof of the statement. \square

Combining the previous computations, we complete the proof of Theorem 1, noting that $\lambda = -\sum_{j=1}^n r_j \check{\alpha}_j \in \check{X}$, $r_j \geq 0$ corresponds to the components of $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The proof of Theorem 2 is similar. We omit the analogous straightforward verification and just write down the relevant formulae. We fix a reduced representation of w_* as follows

$$(4.1) \quad w_* = s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_{n-1}} s_{\alpha_n} s_{\alpha_{n-1}} \cdots s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_1}.$$

Recall the definition of γ_j in (2.1). For the reduced representation (3.1) of w_* , we have

$$\underline{\gamma} = (\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \dots, \alpha_{1n}, \alpha_{nn}, \dots, \alpha_{2n}).$$

Now we give a characterisation for $b(\underline{a})$, for $\underline{a} = (a_{11}, \dots, a_{1n}, a_{nn}, \dots, a_{2n}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{2n-1}$. Again, every $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ can be written uniquely as a product $a_{ij} = c_{ij} p^{-m_{ij}}$, with $m_{ij} \geq 0$, $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\underline{a} = (a_{11}, \dots, a_{1n}, a_{nn}, \dots, a_{2n}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{2n-1}$. Write $a_{ij} = c_{ij} p^{-m_{ij}}$, with $m_{ij} \geq 0$, $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, and $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$. Then $b(\underline{a})$ has a Bruhat decomposition $b(\underline{a}) = LNR$, where*

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & L_{12} & L_{13} & \cdots & L_{1(n+1)} \\ & 1 & L_{23} & \cdots & L_{2(n+1)} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & L_{n(n+1)} \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & N_{1(n+1)} \\ & N_{22} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & N_{nn} & \\ N_{(n+1)1} & & & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & R_{12} & R_{13} & \cdots & R_{1(n+1)} \\ & 1 & R_{23} & \cdots & R_{2(n+1)} \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & R_{n(n+1)} \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$N_{1(n+1)} = (-1)^n \prod_{j=1}^n p^{-m_{1j}}, \quad N_{ii} = -p^{m_{1(i-1)} - m_{in}}, \quad (2 \leq i \leq n), \quad N_{(n+1)1} = \prod_{j=1}^n p^{m_{jn}},$$

$$L_{1j} = (-1)^j c_{1(j-1)}^{-1} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} p^{-m_{1k}}, \quad (2 \leq j \leq n), \quad L_{1(n+1)} = c_{11}^{-1} c_{2n}^{-1} \prod_{k=1}^n p^{-m_{kn}},$$

$$L_{ij} = (-1)^{j-i+1} \left(\frac{c_{1(i-1)}}{c_{1(j-1)}} \prod_{k=i}^{j-1} p^{-m_{1k}} + \frac{c_{1i} c_{(i+1)n}}{c_{1(j-1)} c_{in}} p^{m_{1(i-1)} - in} \prod_{k=i}^{j-1} p^{-m_{1k}} \right) \quad (2 \leq i < j \leq n),$$

$$L_{i(n+1)} = \frac{c_{1(i-1)}}{c_{1i} c_{(i+1)n}} p^{-m_{1n}} \prod_{k=i+1}^n p^{-m_{kn}} + c_{in}^{-1} p^{m_{1(i-1)} - m_{1n}} \prod_{k=i}^n p^{-m_{in}} \quad (2 \leq i \leq n),$$

$$R_{1j} = c_{jn} \prod_{k=2}^j p^{-m_{kn}} \quad (2 \leq j \leq n), \quad R_{1(n+1)} = c_{1n} \prod_{k=1}^n p^{-m_{kn}},$$

$$R_{i(n+1)} = (-1)^{n-i} \left(\frac{c_{1i} c_{(i+1)n}}{c_{in}} \prod_{k=i}^n p^{-m_{1k}} + c_{1(i-1)} p^{m_{in}} \prod_{k=i-1}^n p^{-m_{1k}} \right), \quad (2 \leq i \leq n).$$

To interpret the formula above, we set $c_{ij} := 1$ and $m_{ij} := 0$ if the condition $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ is not satisfied. As a convention, when $m_{ij} = 0$, we define $c_{ij}^{-1} := 0$ as a formal symbol.

Proof. Similar as the proof of Lemma 3. \square

Lemma 6. *Assume the settings above. For $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{2n-1}$, a complete system of coset representatives for $Y_{\beta}(\underline{m})/U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is given by*

$$\left\{ (c_{ij} p^{-m_{ij}})_{\substack{i=1, 1 \leq j \leq n \\ 2 \leq i \leq n, j=n}} \mid \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq c_{1j} < \prod_{k=j}^n p^{m_{1k}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \\ 0 \leq c_{in} < \prod_{k=2}^i p^{m_{kn}}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n, \end{array} c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}, (c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. Similar as the proof of Lemma 4. \square

Combining the above results, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.

5. NON-TRIVIAL BOUNDS FOR KLOOSTERMAN SUMS

In this section we prove Corollaries 1 and 2. As mentioned before, with a view towards possible generalizations we employ a rather soft argument. The idea is that the partial Kloosterman sum $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l)$ defined in (1.3) with

$$\sum_{i \leq k \leq j} m_{ij} = r_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

is a nested sum of classical $GL(2)$ Kloosterman sums, and we choose (carefully!) only one summation variable c_{ij} in which we apply Weil's bound. Due to complicated nature of the indices we need some additional structure, and we define an ordering on the set of indices (i, j) , $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ as follows

$$(1, n) < (1, n-1) < \dots < (1, 1) < (2, n) < \dots < (2, 2) < \dots < (n, n).$$

Now we return to (1.3) and the c_{ij} -sum modulo $C = p^{m_{ij} + \dots + m_{in}}$ where all other variables are fixed. It is an exponential sum with argument

$$c_{ij}A + \overline{c_{ij}}B$$

where

$$A = \psi_{j+1} \overline{c_{i,j+1}} p^{m_{1j} + \dots + m_{(i-1)j} - m_{1(j+1)} - \dots - m_{i(j+1)}} + \psi'_{n+1-i} \overline{c_{(i+1)j}} p^{m_{(i+1)n} + \dots + m_{(i+1)(j+1)} - m_{in} - \dots - m_{ij}},$$

$$B = \psi_j c_{i(j-1)} p^{m_{1(j-1)} + \dots + m_{(i-1)(j-1)} - m_{1j} - \dots - m_{ij}} + \psi'_{n+2-i} c_{(i-1)j} p^{m_{in} + \dots + m_{i(j+1)} - m_{(i-1)n} - \dots - m_{(i-1)j}}.$$

Here we put $c_{ij} = 0$ and $m_{ij} = 0$ for $i < 0$ or $j > n$. In order to avoid problems with well-definedness, we extend the range of the c_{ij} -summation and write the c_{ij} -sum as $p^{-M} S(p^M CA, p^M CB, p^M C)$ with

$$M = m_{1(j+1)} + \dots + m_{(i-1)(j+1)} + m_{1j} + \dots + m_{(i-1)j} + m_{(i-1)n} + \dots + m_{(i-1)(j+2)}.$$

These are the negative exponents in A and B that do not occur in C . By Weil's bound, we have

$$p^{-M} S(p^M CA, p^M CB, p^M C) \ll C^{1/2} p^{-M/2} (p^M CB, p^M C)^{1/2}.$$

Let

$$\mu_{ij} = \max_{(\alpha, \beta) < (i, j)} m_{\alpha\beta}.$$

Then we have

$$p^M C = p^{m_{ij} + O(\mu_{ij})}.$$

We also have

$$p^M CB = \psi_j c_{i(j-1)} p^{O(\mu_{ij})} + \psi'_{n+2-i} c_{(i-1)j} p^{M_3 + O(\mu_{ij})},$$

hence

$$p^{-M} S(p^M CA, p^M CB, p^M C) \ll C p^{-m_{ij}/2 + O(\mu_{ij})} (\psi_j c_{i(j-1)}, p^{m_{ij}})^{1/2}.$$

Recall our convention $c_{ij} = 1$ for $j < i$, which is relevant in the previous display for $i = j$. We also recall that $(c_{i(j-1)}, p) = 1$ unless $m_{i(j-1)} = 0$. Now we easily see that

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{c_{\nu\mu} \\ (\nu, \mu) \neq (i, j)}} \left| \sum_{c_{ij}} (\dots) \right| \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2} \right) p^{r_1 + \dots + r_n - m_{ij}/2 + O(\mu_{ij})}.$$

Choosing the index pair (i, j) suitably, we conclude

$$\mathrm{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l) \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2} \right) p^{r_1 + \dots + r_n - \delta_0 \max_{i,j} m_{ij}}$$

for some $\delta_0 > 0$ (depending on n), from which we easily complete the proof of Corollary 1, observing that the number of \underline{m} for a given vector r is $O(p^{\varepsilon(r_1 + \dots + r_n)})$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

The proof of Corollary 2 is similar. Here we use the ordering

$$(1n) < (1, n-1) < \dots < (11) < (2, n) < (3, n) < \dots < (n, n).$$

Analyzing (1.5), we see that the c_{1n} -sum equals

$$S(\psi'_n \overline{c_{nn}}, \psi_n c_{1(n-1)}, p^{m_{1n}}),$$

the $c_{1(n-1)}$ -sum equals

$$S(\psi'_n p^{m_{nn}} + \psi_n \overline{c_{1n}} p^{m_{1(n-1)}}, \psi_{n-1} c_{1(n-2)} p^{m_{1n}}, p^{m_{1(n-1)} + m_{1n}})$$

the c_{1j} -sum for $1 \leq j \leq n-2$ equals

$$S(\psi_{j+1} \overline{c_{1(j+1)}} p^{m_{1j} + m_{1(j+2)} + \dots + m_{1n}}, \psi_j c_{1(j-1)} p^{m_{1(j+1)} + \dots + m_{1n}}, p^{m_{1j} + \dots + m_{1n}}),$$

the c_{2n} -sum equals

$$p^{-m_{11}} S(\psi'_1 p^{m_{11}}, \psi_2 c_{3n} p^{m_{12}}, p^{m_{2n} + m_{11}}),$$

the c_{in} -sum for $3 \leq i \leq n-1$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} p^{-m_{1(i-1)} - m_{(i-1)n} - m_{1i}} S(\psi_{i-1} \overline{c_{(i-1)n}} p^{m_{1i} + m_{1(i-2)} + m_{in} + \dots + m_{nn}}, \\ \psi_i c_{(i+1)n} p^{2m_{1(i-1)} + m_{(i-1)n} + m_{(i+1)n} + \dots + m_{nn}}, \\ p^{m_{1i} + m_{1(i-1)} + m_{(i-1)n} + m_{in} + \dots + m_{nn}}) \end{aligned}$$

and the c_{nn} -sum equals

$$\begin{aligned} p^{-m_{1(n-1)} - m_{1n}} S(\psi_{n-1} \overline{c_{(n-1)n}} p^{m_{1n} + m_{1(n-2)} + m_{nn} + m_{(n-2)n} + \dots + m_{2n}}, \\ \psi'_n c_{1n} p^{m_{2n} + \dots + m_{nn} + m_{1(n-1)}} + \psi_n p^{2m_{1(n-1)} + m_{2n} + \dots + m_{(n-1)n}}, \\ p^{m_{2n} + \dots + m_{nn} + m_{1(n-1)} + m_{1n}}). \end{aligned}$$

We recall the general convention $c_{ij} = 1$, $m_{ij} = 0$ for $j < i$. We now argue as before to obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{c_{\nu\mu} \\ (\nu, \mu) \neq (i, j)}} \left| \sum_{c_{ij}} (\dots) \right| \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2} \right) p^{r_1 + \dots + r_n - m_{ij}/2 + O(\mu_{ij})}$$

and conclude the proof as for w_l .

6. AN EXACT EVALUATION

Here we prove Corollary 3. For the vector $r = (1, \dots, 1)$, the relevant \underline{m} are

- $m_{1n} = 1$, $m_{ij} = 0$ otherwise;
- $m_{1k} = m_{k+1, n} = 1$, $m_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, for some $1 \leq k \leq n-1$.

In the first case we obtain

$$\mathrm{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*) = \sum_{c_{11}, \dots, c_{1(n-2)} \pmod{p}} \sum_{c_{1(n-1)} \pmod{p}} \sum_{c_{1n} \pmod{p}}^* e\left(\frac{\psi_n c_{1(n-1)} \overline{c_{1n}}}{p} + \frac{\psi'_n c_{1(n-1)}}{p}\right).$$

The two innermost sums equal p , and so we obtain $\mathrm{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*) = p^{n-1}$.

In the second case we consider first the case $2 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*)$ contains the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{c_{1(k-1)}, c_{1k} \pmod{p} \\ (c_{1k}, p)=1}} e\left(\frac{\psi_k c_{1(k-1)} \overline{c_{1k}}}{p}\right) = 0$$

Finally, if $k=1$, we obtain

$$\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*) = \sum_{c_{3n}, \dots, c_{nn} \pmod{p}} \sum_{c_{11}, c_{2n} \pmod{p}}^* e\left(\frac{\psi_1 \overline{c_{11}}}{p} + \frac{\psi'_1 c_{2n}}{p}\right).$$

The two inner sums equal 1, and so $\text{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*) = p^{n-2}$. This completes the proof.

7. BEYOND SARNAK'S DENSITY CONJECTURE

We finally prove Proposition 4. This requires some minor modifications in Sections 4 and 5 of [AB] that we now describe. We use the notation from [AB]. Since q is prime, the argument simplifies a bit, and we need [AB, Lemma 4.2] for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ and $(1, 0)$. For $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ we use it as is, for $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ we make a small improvement. We recall that we need to count x'_{ij}, y'_{ij} satisfying the size conditions [AB, (4.15)] and the congruences [AB, (4.17), (4.18)], where in the case $\beta = 0$ the congruence (4.18) can be written more simply as (4.19). The count for (4.15) is given in (4.16). In order to count the saving imposed by the congruences (4.17), (4.19), we proceed as described after (4.18), but obtain an extra saving for y'_{1n} from (4.19) of size p^{n-3} . Thus we see that

$$C_{1,0} \leq \frac{p^{\frac{1}{6}(n^3+3n^2+2n-12)+n(n-1)}}{p^{2(n-2)} \cdot p^{\frac{1}{2}(n-2)(n-3)} \cdot p^{n-2+\frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-2)} \cdot p^{n-3}} = \mathcal{N}_q q^{(n-1)^2} q^{n+2} \leq \mathcal{N}_q q^{(n-1)^2} q^{\frac{7}{4}(n-1)}$$

for $n \geq 5$. (It is important to have exponent strictly less than 2.) Together with the improved bound of Corollary 2, we now obtain the following variation of [AB, Theorem 4.3] under the additional assumptions that $n \geq 5$, q is prime and $c = (c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) = (q^n \gamma_1, \dots, q^n \gamma_{n-1})$ satisfies $\gamma_j < q^2$ (which implies that only the cases $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ and $(1, 0)$ are relevant in the proof):

$$(7.1) \quad S_{q, w_*}^v(M, N, c) \ll q^\varepsilon \frac{\mathcal{N}_q}{q^{n-1}} \frac{c_1 \cdots c_{n-1}}{(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})^\delta} (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}, q^\infty)^{3/4+\delta}$$

with δ as in our Corollary 2. We can and will assume without loss of generality that $\delta < 1/10$.

With this in hand, we move to the discussion after [AB, Lemma 5.1]. The key point is that we can now slightly relax [AB, (5.3)] to

$$mZ \leq K^{-1}(1 + 1/r + R)^{-K} q^{n+1+\delta_0}$$

for some sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$ to be chosen in a moment (cf. also [AB, (1.4)]). If $n \geq 4$ and $\delta_0 < 1/10$, then by Remarks 2 after [AB, Lemma 4.1] we can still conclude that only the trivial Weyl element and w_* give a non-zero contribution. The contribution of the trivial Weyl element is given in (5.4) for the contribution of the w_* we invoke (7.1) getting

$$\ll q^\varepsilon \frac{\mathcal{N}_q}{q^{n-1}} Z^{2\eta_1} \sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1} \ll q^{1+\delta_0}} \frac{(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}, q^\infty)}{(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})^\delta} \ll \mathcal{N}_q Z^{2\eta_1}$$

if $(1 + \delta_0)(1 - \delta) < 1$. In this way we obtain an improved version of [AB, Proposition 5.2] where (under the current assumptions q prime, $n \geq 5$) we only need the relaxed condition

$T \leq M^{-K} q^{n+1+\delta_0}$. This can be directly inserted into [AB, Corollary 6.11] and completes the proof of Proposition 4.

8. APPENDIX: THE CASE $G = \mathrm{GL}(4)$

It might be useful for applications to use the method of proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 to obtain explicit formulae and non-trivial bounds for *all* Weyl elements in the case $G = \mathrm{GL}(4)$.

There are 8 Weyl elements. We do not need to talk about the trivial Weyl element and the Voronoi element $\begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$, which is covered in [Fr] (with non-trivial bounds following from Deligne's estimates). The element $\begin{pmatrix} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$ is analogous.

For the long Weyl element $w_l = \begin{pmatrix} & & & -1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$ we obtain by (1.3) that $\mathrm{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_l)$ is given by

$$\sum_{\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{w_l}(\underline{m})} e \left(\frac{\psi_1 \overline{c_{11}}}{p^{m_{11}}} + \psi_2 \left(\frac{c_{11} \overline{c_{12}}}{p^{m_{12}}} + \frac{\overline{c_{22}}}{p^{-m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{22}}} \right) + \psi_3 \left(\frac{c_{12} \overline{c_{13}}}{p^{m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{22} \overline{c_{23}}}{p^{-m_{12}+m_{13}+m_{23}}} + \frac{\overline{c_{33}}}{p^{-m_{12}-m_{22}+m_{13}+m_{23}+m_{33}}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\psi'_1 c_{33}}{p^{m_{33}}} + \psi'_2 \left(\frac{c_{23} \overline{c_{33}}}{p^{m_{23}}} + \frac{c_{22}}{p^{-m_{33}+m_{23}+m_{22}}} \right) + \psi'_3 \left(\frac{c_{13} \overline{c_{23}}}{p^{m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{12} \overline{c_{22}}}{p^{-m_{23}+m_{13}+m_{12}}} + \frac{c_{11}}{p^{-m_{23}-m_{22}+m_{13}+m_{12}+m_{11}}} \right) \right)$$

where the sum runs over

$$c_{11} \pmod{p^{m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{13}}}, \quad c_{12} \pmod{p^{m_{12}+m_{13}}}, \quad c_{13} \pmod{p^{m_{13}}}, \\ c_{22} \pmod{p^{m_{22}+m_{23}}}, \quad c_{23} \pmod{p^{m_{23}}}, \quad c_{33} \pmod{p^{m_{33}}}$$

subject to $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$.

For the Weyl element $w_* = \begin{pmatrix} & & & -1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$ we obtain by (1.5) that $\mathrm{Kl}_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w_*)$ is given by

$$\sum_{\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{w_*}(\underline{m})} e \left(\frac{\psi_1 \overline{c_{11}}}{p^{m_{11}}} + \psi_2 \left(\frac{c_{11} \overline{c_{12}}}{p^{m_{12}}} + \frac{c_{33} \overline{c_{23}}}{p^{-m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{22}}} \right) + \psi_3 \left(\frac{c_{12} \overline{c_{13}}}{p^{m_{13}}} + \frac{\overline{c_{33}}}{p^{-m_{12}+m_{13}+m_{33}}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\psi'_1 c_{23}}{p^{m_{23}}} + \psi'_3 \left(\frac{c_{13} \overline{c_{33}}}{p^{m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{12}}{p^{-m_{33}+m_{13}+m_{12}}} \right) \right)$$

where the sum runs over

$$c_{11} \pmod{p^{m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{13}}}, \quad c_{12} \pmod{p^{m_{12}+m_{13}}}, \quad c_{13} \pmod{p^{m_{13}}}, \\ c_{23} \pmod{p^{m_{33}}}, \quad c_{33} \pmod{p^{m_{23}+m_{33}}}$$

subject to $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$. These two cases are illustrative examples for the general results presented in the body of the paper and Theorems 1 and 2 establish non-trivial bounds.

We are left with three remaining Weyl elements. We first consider $w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Here we choose the representative $w = s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_2}$, so that

$$\underline{\gamma} = (\alpha_{22}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{23}, \alpha_{13}).$$

We then obtain for $Kl_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w)$ by similar computations the formula

$$\sum_{\substack{c_{22} \pmod{p^{m_{12}+m_{22}+m_{23}}} \\ c_{12} \pmod{p^{m_{12}+m_{13}}} \\ c_{23} \pmod{p^{m_{13}+m_{23}}} \\ c_{13} \pmod{p^{m_{13}}}}^*} e\left(\psi_1\left(\frac{c_{22}\overline{c_{12}}}{p^{m_{12}}} + \frac{c_{23}\overline{c_{13}}}{p^{-m_{22}+m_{12}+m_{13}}}\right) + \frac{\psi_2\overline{c_{22}}}{p^{m_{22}}} + \psi_3\left(\frac{c_{22}\overline{c_{23}}}{p^{m_{23}}} + \frac{c_{12}\overline{c_{13}}}{p^{-m_{22}+m_{13}+m_{23}}}\right) + \frac{\psi'_2 c_{13}}{p^{m_{13}}}\right)$$

where \sum^* indicates the usual coprimality condition $(c_{ij}, p^{m_{ij}}) = 1$.

Here we obtain a saving relative to the trivial bound as follows: the c_{13} -sum and the c_{22} -sum save $O(|\psi'_2|_p^{-1/2} p^{-m_{13}/2})$ and $O(|\psi_2|_p^{-1/2} p^{-m_{22}/2})$ respectively. If $p \nmid c_{22}$, an analogous argument works for the indices (12), (23), and if $m_{22} = 0$ (which is the only situation in which we can have $p \mid c_{22}$), we obtain the saving from considering $\sum_{c_{22}} \left| \sum_{c_{12}, c_{23}} \right|$ as in (5.1).

Finally we treat the Weyl element $w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & -1 \\ & & 1 & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$, the Weyl element $\begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & 1 & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$ being analogous. Here we choose a representative $w = s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} s_{\alpha_3} s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2}$, so that

$$\underline{\gamma} = (\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{13}, \alpha_{22}, \alpha_{23}).$$

We then obtain for $Kl_p(\underline{m}, \psi, \psi', w)$ the formula

$$\sum_{\substack{c_{11} \pmod{p^{m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{13}}} \\ c_{12} \pmod{p^{m_{12}+m_{13}}} \\ c_{13} \pmod{p^{m_{13}}} \\ c_{22} \pmod{p^{m_{22}+m_{23}}} \\ c_{23} \pmod{p^{m_{23}}}}^*} e\left(\frac{\psi_1\overline{c_{11}}}{p^{m_{11}}} + \psi_2\left(\frac{c_{11}\overline{c_{12}}}{p^{m_{12}}} + \frac{\overline{c_{22}}}{p^{-m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{22}}}\right) + \psi_3\left(\frac{c_{12}\overline{c_{13}}}{p^{m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{22}\overline{c_{23}}}{p^{-m_{12}+m_{13}+m_{23}}}\right) + \frac{\psi'_2 c_{23}}{p^{m_{23}}} + \psi'_3\left(\frac{c_{11}}{p^{-m_{22}-m_{23}+m_{11}+m_{12}+m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{12}\overline{c_{22}}}{p^{-m_{23}+m_{12}+m_{13}}} + \frac{c_{13}\overline{c_{23}}}{p^{m_{13}}}\right)\right).$$

Arguing as in Section 5 with the ordering

$$(13) < (12) < (11) < (23) < (22)$$

we obtain a saving of $O_{\psi, \psi'}(p^{-\delta \max m_{ij}})$ for some $\delta > 0$. We conclude

Corollary 5. *Let w be a non-trivial Weyl element for $G = GL(4)$ and $C = (p^{r_1}, p^{r_2}, p^{r_3})$. Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$Kl_p(\psi, \psi', C^* w) \ll \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\psi_j|_p^{-1/2}, |\psi'_j|_p^{-1/2} \right) (p^{r_1+r_2+r_3})^{1-\delta}.$$

REFERENCES

- [AB] E. Assing, V. Blomer, *The density conjecture for principal congruence subgroups*, [arXiv:2204.08868](#)
- [Bl] V. Blomer, *Density theorems for $GL(n)$* , [arXiv:1906.07459](#)
- [Br] K. Broughan, *An algorithm for the explicit evaluation of $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ Kloosterman sums*, *ACM Commun. Comput. Algebra* **43** (2009), 1-10.
- [BFG] D. Bump, S. Friedberg, D. Goldfeld, *Poincaré series and Kloosterman sums for $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$* , *Acta Arith.* **50** (1988), 31-89
- [DF] R. Dąbrowski, B. Fisher, *A stationary phase formula for exponential sums over $\mathbb{Z}/p^m\mathbb{Z}$ and applications to $GL(3)$ -Kloosterman sums*, *Acta Arith.* **80** (1997), 1-48
- [DR] R. Dąbrowski, M. Reeder, *Kloosterman sets in reductive groups*, *J. Number Theory* **73** (1998), 228-255
- [Fr] S. Friedberg, *Poincaré series for $GL(n)$: Fourier expansion, Kloosterman sums, and algebro-geometric estimates*, *Math. Z.* **196** (1987), 165-188

- [GSW] D. Goldfeld, E. Stade, M. Woodbury, *An orthogonality relation for $GL(4, \mathbb{R})$* (with an appendix by Bingrong Huang). Forum Math. Sigma **9** (2021), Paper No. e47, 83 pp.
- [Kl] H. D. Kloosterman, *On the representation of numbers in the form $ax^2 + by^2 + cz^2 + dt^2$* , Acta Math. **49** (1927), 407-464.
- [Ma] S. H. Man, *Symplectic Kloosterman sums and Poincaré series*, Ramanujan J. **57** (2022), 707-753
- [Mi] X. Miao, *Bessel functions and Kloosterman integrals on $GL(n)$* , preprint
- [Sal] H. Salié, *Über die Kloostermanschen Summen $S(u, v; q)$* , Math. Z. **34** (1931) 91-109.
- [Sar] P. Sarnak, *Diophantine Problems and Linear Groups*, Proceedings of the ICM Kyoto (1990), 459-471
- [St] G. Stevens, *Poincaré series on $GL(r)$ and Kloostermann sums*, Math. Ann. **277** (1987), 25-51
- [We] A. Weil, *On some exponential sums*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **34** (1948), 204-207

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY

Email address: `blomer@math.uni-bonn.de`

DEPARTMENT MATHEMATIK/INFORMATIK, ABTEILUNG MATHEMATIK, WEYERTAL 86-90, 50931 KÖLN, GERMANY

Email address: `sman1@math.uni-koeln.de`