# ON EXPONENTIAL SUMS OVER PRIMES IN ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS 

By<br>Hiroshi Mikawa

## 1. Introduction

I. M. Vinogradov's proof of the ternary Goldbach problem is based upon bounds for the exponential sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) e(\alpha n) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with a wide uniformity in real $\alpha$, where $\Lambda$ is the von Mangoldt function and, for real $\theta, e(\theta)=\exp (2 \pi i \theta)$. By using a combinatrial identity, R. C. Vaughan presented an elegant simple argument on it, see [2], for instance.
J.-r. Chen's theorem on the binary Goldbach problem is built upon the linear sieve and the mean prime number theorem, vide [5]. According to H. Iwaniec [6], the Rosser's weight of the linear sieve has the well-factorable property. An arithmetic function $\lambda$ is called "well-factorable of level $D$ ", if for any $D_{1}, D_{2} \geq 1$, $D=D_{1} D_{2}$, there exist two functions $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$ supporting in $\left(0, D_{1}\right]$ and $\left(0, D_{2}\right]$ respectively such that $\left|\lambda_{1}\right| \leq 1,\left|\lambda_{2}\right| \leq 1$ and $\lambda=\lambda_{1} * \lambda_{2}$. Also the mean prime number theorem has been surprisingly developed by E. Fouvry and H. Iwaniec [4], E. Fouvry [3] and E. Bombieri, J.-B. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec [1]. In [1] they established a non-trivial bound of the averaging sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{(d . c)=1} \lambda(d)\left(\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv c(\bmod d)}} \Lambda(n)-\frac{x}{\varphi(d)}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any fixed integer $c \neq 0$ and for any well-factorable function $\lambda$ of level $D=x^{4 / 7-\varepsilon}, \varepsilon>0$.

Recently D. I. Tolev mixed the ternary problem with the binary problem, and was led to a blend of (1) and (2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{d \leq D \\(d, c)=1}} \gamma(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv c(\bmod d)}} \Lambda(n) e(\alpha n) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [8] he successfully estimated (3) with a wide uniformity in $\alpha$, providing that $\gamma \ll 1$ and $D=x^{1 / 3}(\log x)^{-B}$ where $B>0$ is some constant. As the sequence $\gamma$ is regarded as sieving weights, it is of some interest to extend the level of distribution $D$ in (3). Thus the purpose of this paper is to show that, if $\gamma$ is wellfactorable, then the above exponent $1 / 3$ may be replaced by $4 / 9$.

Theorem. Suppose that $|\alpha-a / q| \leq q^{-2}$ with $(a, q)=1$. Let $c \neq 0$ be an integer. Let $B>0$ be given. Then, for any well-factorable function $\lambda$ of level $D=x^{4 / 9}(\log x)^{-B}$, we have that

$$
\sum_{(d . c)=1} \lambda(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv c(\bmod d)}} \Lambda(n) e(\alpha n) \ll x^{7 / 8}\left(x q^{-1}+x(\log x)^{-4 B}+q\right)^{1 / 8}(\log x)^{13}
$$

where the implied constant depends only on $B$.
This assertion would be applicable to the problems of $[7,8,9]$ and capable to make a modest improvement upon these results. As well as [8], our argument is elementary.

The notation of this paper is standard in Number Theory. Although the symbol $\|\cdot\|$ is used in two different meanings, there would be no confusion. For real $\theta,\|\theta\|$ is the distance from $\theta$ to the nearest integer. For sequence $a=(a(n))$, $\|a\|$ stands for the $l^{2}$-norm. $n \sim N$ means that $N<n \leq c N$ with some constant $0<c \leq 2$. We use the abbreviation $L=\log x$.
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## 2. Proof of Theorem

We may assume that $q \leq x$, for otherwise our assertion is trivial. We choose the parameters of the well-factorable property as $D_{1}=x^{1 / 3} L^{-B}$ and $D_{2}=x^{1 / 9}$, so that $D=D_{1} D_{2}=x^{4 / 9} L^{-B}$. By a dyadic decomposition of summation ranges, it is sufficient to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P:=\sum_{\substack{m \sim M \\(m . c)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \sim N \\ n . c)=1}} f(m) g(n) \sum_{\substack{k \leq x \\ k \equiv c(\bmod m n)}} \Lambda(k) e(\alpha k) \ll x^{7 / 8}\left(x q^{-1}+x L^{-4 B}+q\right)^{1 / 8} L^{11} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly for

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \ll M \ll x^{1 / 3} L^{-B}, \quad 1 \ll N \ll x^{1 / 9} ; \quad f \ll 1, g \ll 1 . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We next decompose $\Lambda$ by means of the combinatrial identity of R.C. Vaughan. We take the parameters in $[2, \S 24]$ as $U=V=x^{1 / 3}$. Then $\Lambda$ is written as the sum of $\Lambda_{0}$ and $\Lambda_{i j}$ 's, $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$, where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Lambda_{0}(k)= \begin{cases}\Lambda(k) & k \leq x^{1 / 3} \\
0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
\Lambda_{\mathrm{l} j}(k)=\sum_{\substack{t h=k \\
t \leq x^{1 / 3}}} a_{j}(t) l_{j}(h) ; \quad \Lambda_{2 j}(k)=\sum_{\substack{t h=k \\
x^{1 / 3}<t, h \leq x^{2 / 3}}} b_{j}(t) d_{j}(h)
\end{gathered}
$$

with $a_{1}(n)=b_{1}(n) \ll \log n, a_{2}(n) \ll 1, l_{1}(n)=d_{1}(n)=1, l_{2}(n)=\log n, b_{2}(n) \ll \Lambda(n)$ and $d_{2}(n) \ll \tau(n)$.

The contribution of $\Lambda_{0}$ to $P$ is at most

$$
\sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{n \sim N} L\left(\frac{x^{1 / 3}}{m n}+1\right) \ll\left(x^{1 / 3}+M N\right) L \ll x^{1 / 2}
$$

Let $Q_{i j}$ be the partial sum of $P$ corresponding to $\Lambda_{i j}, 1 \leq i, j \leq 2$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
P \ll x^{1 / 2}+\sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{j=1,2}\left|Q_{i j}\right| \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We first consider the "type I" sum $Q_{1 j}, j=1,2$. Since $l_{1}(h)=1$, we see that

$$
Q_{11} \ll \sum_{\substack{m \sim M \\(m, c)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \sim N \\(n, c)=1}} \sum_{t \leq x^{1 / 3}}\left|a_{1}(t)\right|\left|\sum_{\substack{t h \leq x \\ t h \equiv c(\bmod m n)}} e(\alpha t h)\right| .
$$

The above congruence is soluble if and only if $(t, m n)=1$, and equivalent to $h \equiv r(\bmod m n)$ with some $r$. Writing $h=r+m n k$, we change the variable $h$ for $k$. Then $k$ runs through some interval of length $\leq x(t m n)^{-1}$. Here we note that $t m n \ll x^{1 / 3} M N \ll x$ or $x(t m n)^{-1} \gg 1$. Hence we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{11} & \ll L \sum_{m} \sum_{n} \sum_{t}\left|\sum_{k} e(\alpha t m n k)\right|  \tag{7}\\
& \ll L \sum_{\substack{m \sim M \\
(m . c t)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \sim N \\
(n . c t)=1}} \sum_{1 \leq x^{1 / 3}} \min \left(\frac{x}{t m n}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha t m n\|}\right) \\
& \ll \sum_{k<M N x^{1 / 3}} \tau_{3}(k) \min \left(\frac{x}{k}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha k\|}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ll L\left(\sum_{k} \tau_{3}(k)^{2} \frac{x}{k}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{k} \min \left(\frac{x}{k}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha k\|}\right)\right)^{1 / 2} . \\
& \ll L\left(x L^{9}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\left(x q^{-1}+M N x^{1 / 3}+q\right) L\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \ll x^{1 / 2}\left(x q^{-1}+M N x^{1 / 3}+q\right)^{1 / 2} L^{6}
\end{aligned}
$$

by Cauchy's inequality and $[2, \S 25,(3)]$. The estimation of $Q_{12}$ is similar.
We proceed to the "type II" sum $Q_{2 j}, j=1,2$. Put

$$
\begin{aligned}
R & =R(M, N, U, V ; f, g, r, s) \\
& =\sum_{\substack{m \sim M \\
(m, c)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \sim N \\
(n, c)=1}} f(m) g(n) \sum_{\substack{u \sim U}} \sum_{\substack{v \sim V \\
u v \leq x \\
u v \equiv c(\bmod m n)}} r(u) s(v) e(\alpha u v) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By a dyadic decomposition of summation ranges, we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|Q_{21}\right|+\left|Q_{22}\right| \ll L^{2} \sup |R| \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the supremum is taken over all parameters $M, N, U, V$ and all sequences $f, g, r, s$ satisfying (5) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{1 / 3} \ll U, \quad V \ll x^{2 / 3} ; \quad r(k) \ll \log k, \quad s(k) \ll \tau(k) . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the next section we shall show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|R|^{2} \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x L^{-4 B}+q\right)^{1 / 4} L^{13} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

uniformly. We here note that, by symmetry, we may assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \ll U . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, since $\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} \ll x L^{5}$, (4) follows from (6), (7), (8) and (10). Our proof of Theorem is thus reduced to the estimation (10) for $R$ under the conditions (5), (9) and (11).

## 3. Type III Sum

In order to show (10), we first arrange $R$ in the following three ways:

$$
\sum_{u}\left|\sum_{m} \sum_{n} \sum_{v}\right| ; \quad \sum_{u} \sum_{m}\left|\sum_{n} \sum_{v}\right| ; \quad \sum_{u} \sum_{m} \sum_{n}\left|\sum_{v}\right| .
$$

We then examine each of these, and compare the three resulting bounds for $R$.

We begin by taking the second way. It follows from Cauchy's inequality that

$$
\begin{align*}
|R|^{2} & \leq\|r\|^{2} M \sum_{u \sim U} \sum_{\substack{m \sim M}}\left|\sum_{\substack{n \sim N \\
(m, c)=1}} g(n) \sum_{\substack{v, c)=1 \\
u v \leq x \\
u v \equiv c(\bmod m n)}} s(v) e(\alpha u v)\right|^{2}  \tag{12}\\
& =\|r\|^{2} M S, \text { say. }
\end{align*}
$$

We expand the square is $S$ and bring the sum over $u$ inside to obtain

The above simultaneous congruences are soluble if and only if $\left(v_{1}, m n_{1}\right)=$ $\left(v_{2}, m n_{2}\right)=1$ and $v_{1} \equiv v_{2}\left(\bmod m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right)\right)$, and reduce to the single equation $u \equiv b\left(\bmod m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right]\right)$ with some $b$. Writing $v_{1}=v_{2}+m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k$ and $u=b+$ $m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right] l$, we change the variables $\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, u\right)$ for $(k, v, l)$. Then we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k\right|=\left|v_{1}-v_{2}\right| \leq V \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that $l$ runs through some interval of length $\leq U\left(m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right]\right)^{-1}$. Also

$$
\begin{aligned}
u\left(v_{1}-v_{2}\right) & =\left(b+m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right] l\right) m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k \\
& =b m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k+m^{2} n_{1} n_{2} k l .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we have that

$$
S \ll \sum_{m} \sum_{n_{1}} \sum_{n_{2}} \sum_{k} \sum_{v}\left|s\left(v+m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k\right)\right||s(v)|\left|\sum_{l} e\left(\alpha m^{2} n_{1} n_{2} k l\right)\right| .
$$

The terms with $k=0$ contribute

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{m} \sum_{n_{1}} \sum_{n_{2}}\|s\|^{2} \sum_{l} 1 \ll\|s\|^{2} \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{n_{1} \sim N} \sum_{n_{2} \sim N}\left(\frac{U}{m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right]}+1\right)  \tag{14}\\
\ll\|s\|^{2}\left(U L^{3}+M N^{2}\right) .
\end{gather*}
$$

As for the terms with $k \neq 0$, we may assume $k>0$. Put $n_{1} n_{2} k=j$. Then, by (13), the condition on $j$ becomes

$$
0<m j=m n_{1} n_{2} k=\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right] m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k \ll N^{2} V .
$$

Also the trivial bound for the sum over $l$ is

$$
\ll \frac{U}{m\left[n_{1}, n_{2}\right]}+1=\frac{U m\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) k}{m^{2} n_{1} n_{2} k}+1 \ll \frac{U V}{m^{2} j}+1 \ll \frac{x}{m^{2} j}+1 .
$$

Moreover the sum over $v$ is $O\left(\|s\|^{2}\right)$ because of $a b \ll a^{2}+b^{2}$. Hence the sum under consideration is bounded by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{m} \sum_{j} \tau_{3}(j)\|s\|^{2}\left|\sum_{l} e\left(\alpha m^{2} j l\right)\right|  \tag{15}\\
\ll & \|s\|^{2} \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{m j \ll N^{2} V} \tau_{3}(j) \min \left(\frac{x}{m^{2} j}+1, \frac{1}{\left\|\alpha m^{2} j\right\|}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Here we note that $\min (a+1, b) \leq \min (a, b)+1$. Thus, substituting (14) and (15) into (12), we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
& |R|^{2} \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2}  \tag{16}\\
& \left\{M \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{m j \ll N^{2} V} \tau_{3}(j) \min \left(\frac{x}{m^{2} j}, \frac{1}{\left\|\alpha m^{2} j\right\|}\right)+M U L^{3}+M^{2} N^{2}+M N^{2} V L^{3}\right\} .
\end{align*}
$$

Now, in the above double sum, we split up the summation range for $j$. We then appeal to

Lemma. For $0<M, J \leq x$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
G & :=M \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_{3}(j) \min \left(\frac{x}{m^{2} j}, \frac{1}{\left\|\alpha m^{2} j\right\|}\right) \\
& \ll M^{2} J L^{3}+x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x M^{-1}+q\right)^{1 / 4} L^{8} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We put our proof of this lemma off until the next section. Therefore, through the second way, we reach the following estimation.

$$
\begin{align*}
|R|^{2} & \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{9}\left\{x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x M^{-1}+q\right)^{1 / 4}+M U+M^{2} N^{2}+M N^{2} V\right\}  \tag{17}\\
& =\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{9} Y, \text { say } .
\end{align*}
$$

Next, turning back to the begining, we take the third way. In place of the form $\sum_{u} \sum_{m}\left|\sum_{n} \sum_{v}\right|$, our starting point is now $\sum_{u} \sum_{m} \sum_{n}\left|\sum_{v}\right|$. Then, by the similar argument as above, we get the similar bound to (16), in which the pair of parameters $(M, N)$ is replaced by $(M N, 1)$. We thus have that

$$
\begin{align*}
|R|^{2} & \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{3}\left\{M N \sum_{d \sim M N} \sum_{d j<V} \min \left(\frac{x}{d^{2} j}, \frac{1}{\left\|\alpha d^{2} j\right\|}\right)+M N U+M^{2} N^{2}+M N V\right\}  \tag{18}\\
& \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{12}\left\{x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x(M N)^{-1}+q\right)^{1 / 4}+M N U+M^{2} N^{2}+M N V\right\} \\
& =\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{12} Z, \text { say }
\end{align*}
$$

by Lemma again.
Finally we take the first way. Restarting from $\sum_{u}\left|\sum_{m} \sum_{n} \sum_{v}\right|$, we argue as before. We then have the similar estimation to (16), replacing $(M, N)$ by $(1, M N)$. Hence we see that

$$
|R|^{2} \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2}\left\{\sum_{h \ll M^{2} N^{2} V} \tau_{5}(h) \min \left(\frac{x}{h}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha h\|}\right)+U L^{8}+M^{2} N^{2}+M^{2} N^{2} V\right\} .
$$

The square of the above sum over $h$ is at most

$$
\sum_{k \ll M^{2} N^{2} V} \tau_{5}(k)^{2} \frac{x}{k} \sum_{h \ll M^{2} N^{2} V} \min \left(\frac{x}{h}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha h\|}\right) \ll x\left(x q^{-1}+M^{2} N^{2} V+q\right) L^{26},
$$

by Cauchy's inequality and $[2, \S 25,(3)]$. Hence, going through the first way, we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
|R|^{2} & \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{13}\left\{x^{1 / 2}\left(x q^{-1}+M^{2} N^{2} V+q\right)^{1 / 2}+U+M^{2} N^{2}+M^{2} N^{2} V\right\}  \tag{19}\\
& =\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{13} X, \text { say. }
\end{align*}
$$

In conjunction with (17), (18) and (19), we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|R|^{2} \ll\|r\|^{2}\|s\|^{2} L^{13} \min (X, Y, Z) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we recall the conditions (5), (9) and (11). It follows from (17) and (18) that

$$
\min (Y, Z) \ll x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x M^{-1}+q\right)^{1 / 4}+M^{2} N^{2}+\min \left(M U+M N^{2} V, M N U\right)
$$

since $\min (a+b, a+c)=a+\min (b, c), N \gg 1$ and $V \ll U$. The above last term is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq M U+\min \left(M N^{2} V, M N U\right) \\
& \leq M U+\left(M N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 2}(M N U)^{1 / 2} \\
& <M x^{2 / 3}+M N^{3 / 2} x^{1 / 2} \\
& \ll x L^{-B} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we used the inequality that $\min (a, b) \leq a^{s} b^{t}, s+t=1, s, t \geq 0$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min (Y, Z) & \ll x^{3 / 4}\left(x q^{-1}+x L^{-4 B}+q\right)^{1 / 4}+x M^{-1 / 4} \\
& =W+x M^{-1 / 4}, \text { say } .
\end{aligned}
$$

Also, from (19), we see that

$$
X \ll W+x^{1 / 2}\left(M^{2} N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 2}+M^{2} N^{2} V
$$

because of $1 \leq q \leq x$. In consequence, it turns out that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min (X, Y, Z) & =\min (X, \min (Y, Z)) \\
& \ll W+\min \left(x^{1 / 2}\left(M^{2} N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 2}+M^{2} N^{2} V, x M^{-1 / 4}\right) \\
& \ll W+\left(x^{1 / 2}\left(M^{2} N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 2}\right)^{1 / 5}\left(x M^{-1 / 4}\right)^{4 / 5}+\left(M^{2} N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 9}\left(x M^{-1 / 4}\right)^{8 / 9} \\
& \ll W+x^{9 / 10}\left(N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 10}+x^{8 / 9}\left(N^{2} V\right)^{1 / 9} \\
& \ll W
\end{aligned}
$$

since $N^{2} V \ll x^{8 / 9}$.
Substituting this into (20), we get the required bound (5) for $R$. Therefore we have Theorem, except for the verification of Lemma.

## 4. Proof of Lemma

It remains to estimate $G$. To this end, we employ a well-known Fourier series: For $H>2$,

$$
\min \left(H,\|\theta\|^{-1}\right)=\sum_{h \in Z} w_{h} e(\theta h)
$$

where

$$
w_{h}=w_{h}(H) \ll \min \left(\log H, \frac{H}{|h|}, \frac{H^{2}}{h^{2}}\right) .
$$

Put $H=x\left(M^{2} J\right)^{-1}$. Unless $H>2$, we trivially have that

$$
G \ll M \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_{3}(j) \ll M^{2} J L^{2} .
$$

So we may use the above expansion to obtain

$$
\min \left(H, \frac{1}{\left\|\alpha m^{2} j\right\|}\right)=O(L)+\sum_{0<|h| \leq H^{2}} w_{h} e\left(\alpha m^{2} j h\right) .
$$

Substituting this into $G$, we see that

$$
\begin{align*}
G & <M^{2} J L^{3}+M \sum_{0<|h| \leq H^{2}}\left|w_{h}\right| \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_{3}(j)\left|\sum_{m \sim M} e\left(\alpha m^{2} j h\right)\right|  \tag{21}\\
& =M^{2} J L^{3}+F, \text { say. }
\end{align*}
$$

Here we consider

$$
\left|\sum_{m \sim M} e\left(\alpha m^{2} j h\right)\right|^{2}=\sum_{m_{1} \sim M} \sum_{m_{2} \sim M} e\left(\alpha\left(m_{1}^{2}-m_{2}^{2}\right) j h\right) .
$$

We write $m_{1}-m_{2}=g$, so that $|g| \leq M$ and $m_{1}^{2}-m_{2}^{2}=2 m_{2} g+g^{2}$. The above sum is then bounded by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \ll \sum_{m \sim M} 1+\sum_{g \leq M}\left|\sum_{m \sim M} e(\alpha 2 m g j h)\right|  \tag{22}\\
& \ll M+\sum_{g \leq 2 M} \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g j h\|}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Hence it follows from (21), Cauchy's inequality and (22) that

$$
\begin{align*}
F^{2} & \ll M^{2} \sum_{k \leq H^{2}}\left|w_{k}\right| \sum_{l \sim J} \tau_{3}(l)^{2} \sum_{h \leq H^{2}}\left|w_{h}\right| \sum_{j \sim J}\left|\sum_{m \sim M} e\left(\alpha m^{2} j h\right)\right|^{2}  \tag{23}\\
& \ll M^{2} H J L^{9}\left\{H J M L+\sum_{h \leq H^{2}} \min \left(\log H, \frac{H}{h}\right) \sum_{j \sim J} \sum_{g \leq 2 M} \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g h\|}\right)\right\} \\
& =x L^{9}\left\{\frac{x}{M} L+E\right\}, \text { say. }
\end{align*}
$$

We proceed to $E$. Dividing the interval $\left(0, H^{2}\right]$ into the subintervals $(0, H]$ and $\left(H 2^{k-1}, H 2^{k}\right], 1 \leq k \ll L$, we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E \ll L \max _{1 \leq T \ll H} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{h \leq 2 H T} \sum_{j \sim J} \sum_{g \leq 2 M} \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g j h\|}\right) . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Put $l=g j$. Then $l \ll M J H T \ll(x / M) T$ or $M \ll x T / l$. Hence, by Cauchy's
inequality and $[2, \S 25,(3)]$, the triple sum in $(24)$ is at most

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l \ll(x / M) T} \tau_{3}(l) \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha l\|}\right) \\
& \ll\left(\sum_{l \ll(x / M) T} \tau_{3}(l)^{2} M\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\sum_{l \ll(x / M) T} \min \left(\frac{x T}{l}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha l\|}\right)\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& \ll T x^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{x}{q}+\frac{x}{M}+\frac{q}{T}\right)^{1 / 2} L^{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

We therefore have that

$$
E \ll x^{1 / 2}\left(\frac{x}{q}+\frac{x}{M}+q\right)^{1 / 2} L^{6}
$$

Combining this with (23) and (21), we get the required bound for $G$.
This completes our proof of Theorem.
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