

MAJORATION DU NOMBRE DE VALEURS FRIABLES D'UN POLYNÔME

R. DE LA BRETÈCHE & S. DRAPPEAU

The following is a translation of section 8 of [dlBD17], which is concerned with the following bound.

Theorem 1. *Let $x, M, N \geq 1$, $MN \leq x^2$, and $(a_m), (b_n)$ be two sequences bounded in absolute values by 1. Let $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is not a perfect square, and $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a smooth function with compact support inside \mathbb{R}_+^* . Then*

$$(1) \quad \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M} \sum_{\substack{N \leq n \leq 2N \\ (n,m)=1}} a_m b_n \left(\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ mn|k^2-D}} V\left(\frac{k}{x}\right) - x \widehat{V}(0) \frac{\varrho(mn)}{mn} \right) \\ \ll_{D,V} x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} M^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{1+\varepsilon} N^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta} M^{-\frac{1}{4}+\theta/2},$$

where $\widehat{V}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} V(t) e(-t\xi) dt$.

Another side-result is the following version of the main theorem of [DI82], with explicit dependence on the best-known bound towards Selberg's eigenvalue conjecture. Define

$$P_D(x) = P^+ \left(\prod_{x < n \leq 2x} (n^2 - D) \right).$$

Corollary 2. *For $\theta \in [0, 1/4]$, let $\kappa(\theta) \in [1, 2]$ be the unique number satisfying*

$$\int_1^{\kappa(\theta)} \frac{t dt}{1 - 2\theta t} = \frac{1}{4(1 - 2\theta)}.$$

For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is not a perfect square, we have

$$P_D(x) \gg_{\varepsilon, D} x^{\kappa(\theta)-\varepsilon}$$

for all $\theta \geq 0$ which is admissible for Selberg's eigenvalue conjecture. In particular, $\theta = 7/64$ is admissible [Kim03]; therefore, for x large enough,

$$P_D(x) \geq x^{1,2182}.$$

Theorem 1 follows immediately from the following bound, using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality.

Proposition 3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $x, M, N \geq 1$, $MN \leq x^2$, $(b_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\|b\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is not a perfect square, and $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a smooth function compactly supported inside \mathbb{R}_+^* . Then*

$$(2) \quad \sum_{M < m \leq 2M} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ (n,m)=1}} b_n \left(\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ mn|k^2-D}} V\left(\frac{k}{x}\right) - x \widehat{V}(0) \frac{\rho(mn)}{mn} \right) \right|^2 \\ \ll_{\varepsilon, V, D} \left(1 + x \left(\frac{M}{N^2} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}+\theta} \right) x^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Remark. The left-hand side of (2) is trivially bounded by $M^{-1}x^{2+\varepsilon}$, which allows us to assume from the start that $M \geq N^2$, and justify the interest of seeking a value of θ as small as possible.

The previous proposition will be deduced from the following lemma, which is concerned with equidistribution of roots of quadratic congruences.

Lemma 4. *Let $(q, r, d) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ with $(q, 2Dr) = 1$ and $d|q$, $\lambda \pmod{d}$ an invertible class, and $\omega \pmod{d}$ a residue class such that $\omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{d}$. Let $M \gg qd$, f be a smooth function compactly supported in \mathbb{R}_+^* , satisfying*

$$(3) \quad \|f^{(j)}\|_\infty \ll_j 1,$$

Let $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < 1$ and

$$(4) \quad P_f(M; q, r, d, \lambda, \omega, \alpha, \beta) := \sum_{\substack{(m, \Omega) \in \mathcal{D} \\ \alpha \leq \frac{\Omega}{mq} < \beta}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right),$$

where \mathcal{D} is the set of pairs (m, Ω) such that

$$(m, qr) = 1, \quad m \equiv \lambda \pmod{d} \\ \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{mq}, \quad \Omega \equiv \omega \pmod{d}.$$

Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$(5) \quad P_f(M; q, r, d, \lambda, \omega, \alpha, \beta) = A_f(M; q, r, d, \alpha, \beta) + O_{\varepsilon, D, f}\left((qrM)^\varepsilon d^{\frac{3}{4}}(qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta}\right).$$

Here, the main term A_f is defined through

$$A_f(M; q, r, d, \alpha, \beta) = (\beta - \alpha)M\widehat{f}(0)C_D \frac{A(qr)\rho(q/(q, d^\infty))}{\varphi(d)},$$

where $A(qr) = \prod_{p|qr}(1 + 1/p)^{-1}$ and $C_D > 0$ is a constant depending only on D . The implicit constant depends at most on ε , D , and on the implicit constants in (3).

The previous estimate follows from the following exponential sums bound.

Lemma 5. *Under the notations and hypotheses of Lemma 4, The following bounds hold for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

(1) For $1 \leq |h| \leq qd^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$(6) \quad \sum_{(m, \Omega) \in \mathcal{D}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right) \ll_{\varepsilon, D, f} |h|(qr)^\varepsilon + (rM)^\varepsilon d^{\frac{3}{4}}(qd, h)^\theta (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta}.$$

(2) For $\frac{1}{2} \leq H \ll qM$,

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{H} \sum_{H < |h| \leq 2H} \left| \sum_{(m, \Omega) \in \mathcal{D}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right) \right| \ll_{\varepsilon, D, f} H(qr)^\varepsilon + (rM)^\varepsilon d^{\frac{3}{4}}(qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta}.$$

(3) Assume $d = 1$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq Q \ll M$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq H \ll QM$, that $t \in [0, 1]$, let $\mathcal{I} \subset [H, 2H]$ be an interval, and $(f_q)_{Q < q \leq 2Q}$ a sequence of functions satisfying (3) and $f_q(v) \neq 0 \Rightarrow v \asymp 1$ uniformly in q . Then

$$(8) \quad \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{\substack{Q < q \leq 2Q \\ (q, 2Dr)=1}} \left| \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h \in \mathcal{I}} e(th) \sum_{(m, \Omega) \in \mathcal{D}} f_q\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right) \right| \\ \ll_{\varepsilon, D, f} H(Qr)^\varepsilon + (rM)^\varepsilon \left\{ M^{\frac{1}{2}} + H^{-\frac{1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta} \right\}.$$

The implied constants depend at most on ε , D , and on the implicit constants in (3).

Remarks.

- When $d = 1$, using the Selberg bound $\theta \leq 1/4$ (cf. [DI83], theorem 4), we recover, up to the uniformity in h , a result of Duke, Friedlander and Iwaniec [DFI95, formula (25)] and Tóth [Tót00, formula (15)].
- The bounds (6) and (7) are valid for $M \ll qd$, but they are then less precise than the trivial bound $O_{\varepsilon,D,f}(q^\varepsilon M^{1+\varepsilon})$.

0.1. Proof of Lemma 5. We focus first on the bound (6). We assume that $h > 0$, taking complex conjugates if necessary.

0.1.1. *Coprimality.* Let $S'(M, q, \lambda)$ be the LHS of (6). A Möbius inversion yields

$$(9) \quad S'(M, q, \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\ell|qr \\ (\ell,d)=1}} \mu(\ell) S(M/\ell, q\ell, \lambda\bar{\ell})$$

where μ is the Möbius function and

$$S(M, q, \lambda) := \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{N} \\ m \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}}} \sum_{\substack{\Omega \in \mathbb{N} \\ \alpha m q \leq \Omega < \beta m q \\ \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{mq} \\ \Omega \equiv \omega \pmod{d}}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right).$$

It will suffice to show that $S(M, q, \lambda)$ is bounded by the RHS of (6).

0.1.2. *Gauss correspondance.* Let

$$\mathcal{Q}_D = \{Q(X, Y) = AX^2 + 2BXY + CY^2, (A, B, C) \in \mathbb{Z}^3, B^2 - AC = D\}.$$

For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_D$, we let $(A(Q), B(Q), C(Q))$ be the coefficients in the expression above. The group $\Gamma = PSL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ acts on \mathcal{Q}_D through

$$\sigma Q(x, y) = Q((x, y)\sigma) \quad (\sigma \in \Gamma)$$

where the product on the RHS is the matrix product. In particular,

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} B(\sigma Q) &= \alpha\gamma A + (\alpha\delta + \beta\gamma)B + \beta\delta C, \\ C(\sigma Q) &= \gamma^2 A + 2\gamma\delta B + \delta^2 C = Q(\gamma, \delta) \end{aligned}$$

if $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix}$. By a reasoning identical to [DFI95, p. 247] (see also [Kow04, section 6.1]), we obtain

$$(11) \quad S(M, q, \lambda) = \sum_{Q \in \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{Q}_D} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Gamma_\infty \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_Q \\ \mathcal{P}(\sigma)}} f\left(\frac{C(\sigma Q)}{qM}\right) e\left(\frac{hB(\sigma Q)}{C(\sigma Q)}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ is the property that

$$\mathcal{P}(\sigma) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} C(\sigma Q) \equiv \lambda q \pmod{qd}, \\ B(\sigma Q) \equiv \omega \pmod{d}, \end{cases}$$

and $\Gamma_Q \subset \Gamma$ is the stabilizer of Q .

0.1.3. *Localization of variables.* Let $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix}$ be a generic element in index of the sum in the RHS of (11). We introduce, following Tóth [Tót00, lemme 4.2], a function $\Psi : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which allows us to encode the quotient by Γ_Q . This function satisfying $\sum_{\tau \in \Gamma_Q} \Psi(\sigma\tau) = 1$ for all $\sigma \in \Gamma$. When $D < 0$, the function Ψ is constant, and in the opposite case $\Psi(\sigma)$ is a \mathcal{C}^∞ function of the ratio δ/γ . We also let $w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth function satisfying

$$\mathbf{1}_{|t| \leq \frac{1}{2}} \leq w(t) \leq \mathbf{1}_{|t| \leq 2}, \quad w(t) + w(1/t) = 1$$

for $t \neq 0$. We insert the weight $w(\gamma/\delta) + w(\delta/\gamma)$ in the RHS of (11). In the contribution of the term $w(\gamma/\delta)$, we apply to the sums over σ and Q the involutions changing $Q(X, Y)$ to $\tilde{Q} = Q(Y, X)$, and σ to $\tilde{\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} -\beta & -\alpha \\ \delta & \gamma \end{pmatrix}$. We then have

$$B(\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{Q}) = -B(\sigma Q), \quad C(\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{Q}) = C(\sigma Q).$$

We obtain

$$(12) \quad S(M, q, \lambda) = S(h, \Psi_1) + S(-h, \Psi_2),$$

with

$$(13) \quad (\Psi_1(\sigma), \Psi_2(\sigma)) = (w(t)\Psi(t), w(t)\Psi(1/t)) \quad (\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_\infty \setminus \Gamma, \quad t = \gamma/\delta),$$

$$(14) \quad F_{\Psi, Q}(\sigma) = \Psi(\sigma) f\left(\frac{C(\sigma Q)}{qM}\right),$$

and

$$(15) \quad S(h, \Psi) = \sum_{Q \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{Q}_D} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Gamma_\infty \setminus \Gamma / \Gamma_Q \\ \mathcal{P}(\sigma)}} F_{\Psi, Q}(\sigma) e\left(\frac{hB(\sigma Q)}{C(\sigma Q)}\right).$$

In what follows, we let $\Psi \in \{\Psi_1, \Psi_2\}$ be fixed, noting that this function (and so the associated function $F_{\Psi, Q}$) vanishes whenever $|t| \geq 2$ (with the notation (13)).

0.1.4. *Simplification of the phase.* We write the definition (15) as $S(h, \Psi) = \sum_{Q \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{Q}_D} S_Q(h, \Psi)$. The sum over Q is finite and its number of terms depends at most on D . It will therefore suffice to bound $S_Q(h, \Psi)$ separately for each Q . For $\sigma \in \Gamma$, we define

$$\phi_\sigma = \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \quad (\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & * \\ \gamma & * \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma \neq 0).$$

The identity, due to Hooley [Hoo63, formula (27)],

$$(16) \quad e\left(\frac{hB(\sigma Q)}{C(\sigma Q)}\right) = e(h\phi_\sigma) + O(h(qM)^{-1})$$

is then established similarly to lemma 4.3 of Toth [Tót00]. Inserting this in $S_Q(h, \Psi)$, we obtain

$$(17) \quad S_Q(h, \Psi) = T_Q(h, F_{\Psi, Q}) + O(h),$$

with

$$T_Q(h, F) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Gamma_\infty \setminus \Gamma / \Gamma_Q \\ \mathcal{P}(\sigma)}} F(\sigma) e(h\phi_\sigma).$$

0.1.5. *Congruence conditions.* We decompose by the Hecke congruence subgroup $\Gamma_0(qd)$ to obtain

$$T_Q(h, \Psi) = \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \Gamma_\infty \backslash \Gamma_0(qd) \\ \sigma \in \Gamma_0(qd) \backslash \Gamma \\ \mathcal{P}(\tau\sigma)}} F(\tau\sigma)e(h\phi_{\tau\sigma}).$$

If $\tau = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(qd)$, then the relations (10) as well as $qd|\gamma$ show that

$$\mathcal{P}(\tau\sigma) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} q \mid C(\sigma Q), \\ \delta^2 q^{-1} C(\sigma Q) \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}, \\ B(\sigma Q) \equiv \omega \pmod{d}. \end{cases}$$

Since $(\lambda, d) = 1$, the second condition is detected by Dirichlet character, which yields

$$(18) \quad T_Q(h, \Psi) = \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{d}} \overline{\chi(\lambda)} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Gamma_0(qd) \backslash \Gamma \\ \mathcal{P}^*(\sigma)}} \chi(q^{-1} C(\sigma Q)) U_{Q,\sigma}(h, \Psi),$$

with

$$U(h, \Psi) = U_{Q,\sigma}(h, \Psi) = \sum_{\tau \in \Gamma_\infty \backslash \Gamma_0(qd)} \overline{\vartheta(\tau)} F(\tau\sigma)e(h\phi_{\tau\sigma}),$$

where $\mathcal{P}^*(\sigma)$ now denotes the conditions

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{P}^*(\sigma) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} q \mid C(\sigma Q) \\ B(\sigma Q) \equiv \omega \pmod{d} \end{cases}$$

and ϑ denotes the central character defined by

$$\vartheta(\tau) = \overline{\chi}^2(\delta) \quad (\tau = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ * & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(qd)).$$

0.1.6. *Reminders on generalized Kloosterman sums.* In this section, we recall some facts on Kloosterman sums. We refer to chapters 2 and 4 of [Iwa97] for definitions. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R})$ be two cusps for $\Gamma_0(qd)$, of stabilizers $\Gamma_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathbf{b}}$ and scaling matrices $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{b}} \in PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$, meaning that

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{a}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \Gamma_\infty \sigma_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1}, \quad \Gamma_{\mathbf{b}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{b}} \Gamma_\infty \sigma_{\mathbf{b}}^{-1}.$$

A cusp is equivalent under the action of $\Gamma_0(qd)$ to a unique cusp $\mathbf{a}' = u/v$, with

$$v \geq 1, \quad v|qd, \quad (u, v) = 1, \quad 1 \leq u \leq (v, qd/v).$$

We may then define the *width* of the cusp \mathbf{a} to be the number

$$(20) \quad w_{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{q}{(q, v^2)}.$$

We associate to (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) the set of moduli

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := \left\{ c \in \mathbb{R}_+^* : \exists \alpha, \beta, \delta \in \mathbb{R}, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1} \Gamma \sigma_{\mathbf{b}} \right\}.$$

For all $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ et $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we define the Kloosterman sums

$$(21) \quad S_{\mathbf{ab}}(m, n; \gamma) = \sum_{\substack{\delta \in [0, \gamma) : \\ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & * \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1} \Gamma_0(qd) \sigma_{\mathbf{b}}}} \overline{\vartheta}(\sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & * \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \sigma_{\mathbf{b}}^{-1}) e\left(\frac{\alpha m + \delta n}{\gamma}\right).$$

We refer to section 4.1.1 of [Dra17] for more details, notably on the dependence of $S_{\mathbf{ab}}(m, n; c)$ with respect to the scaling matrices $(\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{b}})$. In this work, we will use the following facts.

Lemma 6. *Let $\sigma \in \Gamma_0(qd) \setminus \Gamma$ satisfy the conditions $\mathcal{P}^*(\sigma)$ defined in (19).*

(1) *The number of such σ is $O(d\tau(q))$.*

(2) *Suppose that the cusp $\mathfrak{a} = \sigma\infty$ is equivalent to u/v , with $v|q$, $1 \leq u < v$ and $(u, v) = 1$. Then $v|Q(0, 1)^2$, in particular $v = O_Q(1)$, and*

$$(22) \quad w_{\mathfrak{a}} = \frac{qd}{(qd, v^2)} \asymp_Q qd.$$

(3) *The set of moduli $\mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})$ is*

$$\mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a}) = \left\{ w_{\mathfrak{a}}^{\frac{1}{2}} vm, m \in \mathbb{Z} : (m, qd/v) = 1 \right\}.$$

(4) *When $\gamma = w_{\mathfrak{a}}^{\frac{1}{2}} vm \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})$, the Kloosterman sum $S_{\infty\mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma)$ is given by*

$$S_{\infty\mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{vm} \\ \delta \pmod{u[v, v']m} \\ \delta \equiv m \pmod{uv'} \\ (\delta - m, um) = u \\ \alpha\delta \equiv u \pmod{vm}}} \bar{\vartheta} \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ * & \delta \end{pmatrix} e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{vm} + \frac{n\delta}{u[v, v']m}\right),$$

where we have put $v' = qd/v$. Here, the scaling matrices are

$$\sigma_{\infty} = \text{Id}, \quad \sigma_{\mathfrak{a}} = \begin{pmatrix} u\sqrt{w_{\mathfrak{a}}} & 0 \\ v\sqrt{w} & (u\sqrt{w})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(5) *We have the trivial bound*

$$(23) \quad |S_{\infty\mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma)| \leq \frac{v}{(v, v')} (m, u) m \ll_Q m,$$

(6) *When $n = 0$, we have*

$$(24) \quad |S_{\infty\mathfrak{a}}(h, 0; \gamma)| \leq \tau(2m)^{O_{\mathfrak{a}, Q}(1)}(dh, m).$$

The proof of this lemma, which is independant from the rest of the proof of Lemma 5, will be given below in section 0.5.

0.1.7. *Completion of sums.* In the sum $U(h, \Psi)$, we change τ to $\tau\sigma^{-1}$, so that

$$U(h, \Psi) = \sum_{\tau \in \Gamma_{\infty} \setminus \Gamma_0(qd)\sigma} \vartheta(\tau\sigma^{-1}) F(\tau) e(h\phi_{\tau}).$$

The cusp $\mathfrak{a} = \sigma\infty$ is equivalent to u/v for some $v|qd$ and $(u, v) = 1$, and this expression is unique if we impose $1 \leq u \leq (v, qd/v)$. We temporarily write

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{a}} = \begin{pmatrix} w_{\mathfrak{a}}^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & w_{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_{\mathfrak{a}} = \sigma\tau_{\mathfrak{a}}$$

so that the stabilize $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}} \subset \Gamma_0(qd)$ of \mathfrak{a} satisfies $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}} = \sigma_{\mathfrak{a}}\Gamma_{\infty}\sigma_{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1}$. In the sum on the RHS of (25), we replace again τ by $\tau\tau_{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1}$ noting that this leaves the quantity ϕ_{τ} unchanged. We obtain

$$(25) \quad U(h, \Psi) = \sum_{\tau \in \Gamma_{\infty} \setminus \Gamma_0(qd)\sigma_{\mathfrak{a}}} \vartheta(\tau\sigma_{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1}) F(\tau\tau_{\mathfrak{a}}^{-1}) e(h\phi_{\tau}).$$

At this point, we remark that $(v, qd/v)|q$. In particular, the cusp \mathfrak{a} is singular for ϑ , meaning that

$$\vartheta(\tau) = 1 \quad (\tau \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}).$$

We separate the sum over τ in the RHS of (25) according to right classes modulo Γ_∞ . Note that for $\omega \in \Gamma_\infty$, we have $\phi_{\tau\omega} \equiv \phi_\tau \pmod{1}$, as well as

$$\vartheta(\tau\omega\sigma_a^{-1}) = \vartheta(\tau\sigma_a^{-1})\vartheta(\sigma_a\omega\sigma_a^{-1}) = \vartheta(\tau\sigma_a^{-1}).$$

We obtain

$$U(h, \Psi) = \sum_{\tau \in \Gamma_\infty \backslash \Gamma_0(qd)\sigma_a/\Gamma_\infty} \vartheta(\tau\sigma_a^{-1})e(h\phi_\tau) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} F\left(\tau \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tau_a^{-1}\right).$$

Given the relations (13) and (14), the function

$$t \mapsto F\left(\tau \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tau_a^{-1}\right)$$

is smooth, with compact support, and only depends on the lower entries of τ . If $\tau = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix}$, then

$$F\left(\tau \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tau_a^{-1}\right) = F\left(\begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ \gamma w_a^{-1/2} & \gamma(t + \delta/\gamma)w_a^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

The Poisson summation formula yields

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} F\left(\tau \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tau_a^{-1}\right) = e\left(\frac{n\delta}{\gamma}\right) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G(\gamma, n),$$

where

$$G(\gamma, n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} F\left(\begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ \gamma w_a^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \gamma t w_a^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}\right) e(-nt) dt.$$

Using the definition (21), we finally obtain

$$(26) \quad U(h, \Psi) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma) G(\gamma, n).$$

0.1.8. *Localization and preparation of variables.* We recall that $w_a \asymp_Q qd$. By definition of $F = F_{\Psi, Q}$, we have

$$G(\gamma, n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Psi(tw_a) f\left(\frac{Q(\gamma, \gamma tw_a)}{qw_a M}\right) e(-nt) dt.$$

Whenever the integrand is non-zero, we have $|t| \leq 2w_a^{-1}$ and $\gamma \asymp_{Q, f} q(dM)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Integrating by parts (*cf.* lemma 5.1 of [Tót00]), we obtain

$$(27) \quad G(\gamma, n) \ll_j (qd)^{j-1} n^{-j} \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

The implied constants here also depend on the implied constants in (3); this dependency will not be explicitated to clarify the notations.

Let $N_1 := qd(Mq)^\eta$. In the RHS of (26), we isolate the contribution of U_0 (resp. U_1) coming from $n = 0$ (resp. $|n| > N_1$). The bounds (23), (24) and (27) yields

$$(28) \quad |U_0(h, \Psi)| \ll_{\varepsilon, D} (qd)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a}) \\ \gamma \asymp q(dM)^{1/2}}} |S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, 0; \gamma)| \ll (Mqh)^\varepsilon d^{-1} q^{-\frac{1}{2}} M^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$|U_1(h, \Psi)| \ll_{j, D} (qM)^{3/2} \left(\frac{qd}{N}\right)^{j-1} \ll_{\eta, D} (qM)^{-10}$$

choosing $j = j(\eta)$ sufficiently large. Both error terms here are bounded by the RHS of (6).

On another hand, Faà di Bruno's formula shows that the function G satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^{k+\ell}}{\partial x^{\ell_1} \partial y^{\ell_2}} G(x, y) \Big|_{\substack{x=\gamma \\ y=n}} \ll_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \gamma^{-\ell_1} (qd)^{-\ell_2-1}.$$

Similarly to (27), this bound also depends on the implicit constants in (3).

We introduce a partition of unity for the variable n ,

$$G(\gamma, n) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} G_{2^k}(\gamma, n),$$

where $K \leq 2 + \log(N_1)/\log 2$, and for $1 \leq N \leq N_1$, the function $G_N(\gamma, n)$ is smooth with respect to both variables, vanishes outside $n \in [N/2, 2N]$ and satisfies

$$(29) \quad \frac{\partial^{k+\ell}}{\partial x^k \partial y^\ell} G_N(x, y) \Big|_{\substack{x=\gamma \\ y=n}} \ll (qd)^{-1} \gamma^{-k} (\min\{qd, N\})^{-\ell} \ll (qM)^{O(n\ell)} (qd)^{-1} \gamma^{-k} N^{-\ell}.$$

In accordance with this decomposition, we have

$$(30) \quad \sum_{0 < |n| \leq N_1} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma) G(\gamma, n) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} V_{2^k},$$

$$(31) \quad V_N = \sum_{N/2 \leq |n| \leq 2N} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma) G_N(\gamma, n).$$

We then let

$$F(x, \xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} G_N\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{h|y|}}{x}, y\right) e(y\xi) dy, \quad G_N(\gamma, n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} F\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{h|n|}}{\gamma}, \xi\right) e(-n\xi) d\xi.$$

The integral defining F is supported on $y \asymp N$, and when $F(x, \xi) \neq 0$, we necessarily have $x \asymp X := (hN/q^2 dM)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Faà di Bruno's formula again implies

$$\partial_{k0} F(x, \xi) \ll_k (qM)^{O(n)} X^{-k} \frac{(qd)^{-1} N}{1 + (N\xi)^2}.$$

Here the implied constant in $O(n)$ is independent of k . We finally let

$$\phi_\xi(x) = X(1 + (N\xi)^2) qd(xN)^{-1} (qM)^{-\varpi} F(x, \xi)$$

for some positive number $\varpi = O(n)$, so that $x \mapsto \phi_u(x)$ is smooth, compactly supported on $x \asymp X$ and satisfies

$$(32) \quad \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \|\phi_\xi^{(j)}\| \ll_j X^{-j}.$$

Here again the implied constants depend on the implied constants in (3). We then have

$$(33) \quad V_N = 4\pi(qM)^\varpi d^{-\frac{1}{2}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{N}{1 + (N\xi)^2} W_N(\xi) d\xi,$$

where we have let

$$(34) \quad W_N(\xi) := \sum_{N/2 \leq |n| \leq 2N} a_n \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} \frac{S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}^{(\xi)}(h, n; \gamma)}{\gamma} \phi_\xi\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{h|n|}}{\gamma}\right),$$

as well as $a_n = \sqrt{|n|/N}$, and where we have incorporated the factor $e(-n\xi)$ in the scaling matrix of ∞ (which is indicated by the notation $S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}^{(\xi)}$).

0.1.9. *Using Kuznetsov's formula.* We bound W_N separately for each ξ . We omit the quantity ξ from the notation, and we will use from (a_n) and ϕ only the bounds $|a_n| \leq 1$, the bounds (32) and the fact that $\phi(x) \neq 0$ implies $x \asymp X$, where we recall that $X \asymp (hN/q^2 dM)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

For each $n \in [N/2, 2N]$, we apply Kuznetsov's formula (lemma 4.5 of [Dra17], with $\kappa = 0$). We obtain

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} \frac{S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma)}{\gamma} \phi\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{hn}}{\gamma}\right) = \mathcal{H}_{h,n}^+ + \mathcal{E}_{h,n}^+ + \mathcal{M}_{h,n}^+, \quad (n > 0)$$

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathfrak{a})} \frac{S_{\infty \mathfrak{a}}(h, n; \gamma)}{\gamma} \phi\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{h|n|}}{\gamma}\right) = \mathcal{E}_{h,n}^- + \mathcal{M}_{h,n}^-, \quad (n < 0)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{h,n}^+ = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi)} \frac{\tilde{\phi}(t_f)}{\cosh(\pi t_f)} (hn)^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\rho_{f\infty}(h)} \rho_{f\mathfrak{a}}(n),$$

and $\mathcal{M}_{h,n}^-$, $\mathcal{E}_{h,n}^\pm$, $\mathcal{H}_{h,n}^+$ are given by similar expression. Here, the set $\mathcal{B}(q, \chi)$ denotes an orthonormal basis of Maass cusp forms f , each being an eigenfunction of the hyperbolic Laplacian, with associated eigenvalue $\lambda_f = \frac{1}{4} + t_f^2$ and Fourier coefficients $\rho_{f\mathfrak{a}}(n)$. We refer to section 4.1.2 of [Dra17] for the associated definitions and normalisation. We have $t_f \in \mathbb{R} \cup [-i\theta, i\theta]$, where we recall that $\theta \leq 7/64$ by Kim and Sarnak [Kim03], and that the Selberg-Ramanujan conjecture predicts that $\theta = 0$. The transform $\tilde{\phi}$ in the expression above is given by

$$\tilde{\phi}(t) = \frac{2\pi i}{\sinh(\pi t)} \int_0^\infty (J_{2it}(x) - J_{-2it}(x)) \phi(x) \frac{dx}{x}$$

where $J_\nu(x)$ is the J -Bessel function. The transform $\tilde{\phi}$ satisfies the bounds in lemma 4.4 of [Dra17] (see lemma 2.4 of [Top15] for stronger bounds). In the present case, we have $X \ll (qM)^{\eta/2}$, so that

$$|\tilde{\phi}(t)| \ll \begin{cases} (qM)^{2\eta}(1+|t|)^{-3}, & t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (Mq)^{\eta/2}(q^2 dM/hN)^{|t|}, & t \in [-i/4, i/4]. \end{cases}$$

The quantity $\mathcal{E}_{h,n}^\pm$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_{h,n}^+$) corresponds to the contribution of non-holomorphic Eisenstein series (resp. to the contribution of holomorphic cusp forms of weight ≥ 2). We study in detail \mathcal{M}^+ , the other terms being analyzed in a similar manner.

Our treatment differs depending on whether we average over h or not.

0.1.10. *The case (h, q) fixed.* We separate in $\mathcal{M}_{h,n}^+$ the contribution of functions $f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi)$ with $t_f \in \mathbb{R}$, from those with $t_f \in i\mathbb{R}$. According to this decomposition we write

$$(35) \quad W_N = \sum_{N/2 \leq n \leq 2N} a_n \mathcal{M}_{h,n}^+ = \mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{reg}} + \mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{exc}},$$

where the notation corresponds to ‘‘regular’’ and ‘‘exceptional’’. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$(36) \quad |\mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{reg}}| \leq (\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{reg}} \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{reg}})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{reg}} &:= \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi) \\ t_f \in \mathbb{R}}} \frac{|\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|}{\cosh(\pi t_f)} h |\rho_{f\infty}(h)|^2, \\ \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{reg}} &:= \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi) \\ t_f \in \mathbb{R}}} \frac{|\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|}{\cosh(\pi t_f)} \left| \sum_{N/2 \leq n \leq 2N} a_n n^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{f\mathfrak{a}}(n) \right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

To bound $\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{reg}}$, we use lemma 2.7 of [Top15], so that

$$\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{reg}} \ll_{\varepsilon} (qhM)^{\varepsilon} \left\{ 1 + (qd, h)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{qd^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\}.$$

To bound $\mathcal{M}_N^{\text{reg}}$, we use the large sieve inequality (in our case, proposition 4.7 of [Dra17])

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{reg}} \ll_{\varepsilon} (qM)^{\varepsilon} N \left\{ 1 + \frac{N}{qd^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\}.$$

Our hypotheses $h \ll q$ and $N \leq N_1$ then imply

$$(38) \quad \mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{reg}} \ll_{\eta} (qM)^{O(\eta)} q^{\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

For each h , we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$(39) \quad |\mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{exc}}| \ll (\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{exc}} \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{exc}})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(40) \quad \mathcal{M}_h^{\text{exc}} := \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi) \\ t_f \in i\mathbb{R}}} |\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|^2 h |\rho_{f\infty}(h)|^2, \quad \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{exc}} := \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \chi) \\ t_f \in i\mathbb{R}}} \left| \sum_{N/2 \leq n \leq 2N} a_n n^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{f\mathfrak{a}}(n) \right|^2.$$

The large sieve again yields

$$(41) \quad \mathcal{M}_N^{\text{exc}} \ll_{\varepsilon} (qM)^{\varepsilon} N \left\{ 1 + \frac{N}{qd^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\}.$$

For $\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{exc}}$, we use lemma 2.9 of [Top15],

$$\mathcal{M}_h^{\text{exc}} \ll_{\eta} (qhM)^{O(\eta)} \{(qd, h)MN^{-1}\}^{2\theta}.$$

Our hypothesis $N \leq N_1$ then implies

$$\mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{exc}} \ll_{\eta} (qhM)^{O(\eta)} d^{\frac{1}{4}} (qd, h)^{\theta} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.$$

The right-hand side here is larger than that obtain in (38). Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{N/2 \leq n \leq 2N} a_n \mathcal{M}_{h,n}^+ \ll_{\eta} (qhM)^{O(\eta)} d^{\frac{1}{4}} (qd, h)^{\theta} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.$$

The same bounds holds for $\mathcal{M}_{h,n}^-$, whereas the other terms \mathcal{E}^{\pm} and \mathcal{H}^+ , are of the order of the RHS of (38). We therefore have

$$W_N \ll_{\eta} (qM)^{O(\eta)} d^{\frac{1}{4}} (qd, h)^{\theta} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.$$

We insert this in (33) then (30), which yields, with the bounds (28) and choosing $\eta > 0$ arbitrarily small,

$$U(h, \Psi) \ll_{\varepsilon} (qM)^{\varepsilon} d^{-\frac{1}{4}} (qd, h)^{\theta} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.$$

We insert this again in (18), using point (i) of Lemma 6 to bound the sum over σ . We get

$$T_Q(h, \Psi) \ll_{\varepsilon} (qM)^{\varepsilon} d^{\frac{3}{4}} (qd, h)^{\theta} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta},$$

which gives the bound (6) by using (17), (12) and (9) successively.

0.1.11. *Bound on average over h .* In this section we justify the bound (7). When $H \leq qd^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we may simply take the average over h of the bound (6) established in the previous sections. We henceforth assume that $H > qd^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Let $(c_h) \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $|c_h| \leq 1$ be a sequence with

$$\left| \sum_{(m,\Omega) \in \mathcal{D}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right) \right| = c_h \sum_{(m,\Omega) \in \mathcal{D}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) e\left(\frac{h\Omega}{mq}\right).$$

The coefficients (c_h) depend at most on $(h, q, d, \lambda, \omega, M, f)$.

Recalling the definition (35), it will suffice to prove that

$$(42) \quad \mathcal{M}_{H,N}^{\text{reg}} := \frac{1}{H} \sum_{H < h \leq 2H} c_h \mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{reg}} \ll_{\eta} (qHM)^{O(\eta)} d^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(43) \quad \mathcal{M}_{H,N}^{\text{exc}} := \frac{1}{H} \sum_{H < h \leq 2H} c_h \mathcal{M}_{h,N}^{\text{exc}} \ll_{\eta} (qHM)^{O(\eta)} d^{\frac{1}{4}} M^{\theta} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta}.$$

The bounds (37) and (41) are valid on average over h , since they do not depend on h .

In the case of (42), a reasoning similar to (36) reduces the problem to the estimation of

$$\mathcal{M}_H^{\text{reg}} := H^{-2} \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q,\chi) \\ t_f \in \mathbb{R}}} \frac{|\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|}{\cosh(\pi t_f)} \left| \sum_{H < h \leq 2H} c_h \sqrt{h} \rho_{f\infty}(h) \right|^2.$$

The large sieve inequality yields

$$\mathcal{M}_H^{\text{reg}} \ll_{\varepsilon} (qHM)^{\varepsilon} H^{-1} \left\{ 1 + \frac{H}{qd^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\} \ll_{\varepsilon} (qHM)^{\varepsilon},$$

whence we deduce the bound (42).

As concerns (43), by reasoning similarly to (41), the problem is reduced to considering

$$\mathcal{M}_H^{\text{exc}} := H^{-2} \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q,\chi) \\ t_f \in i\mathbb{R}}} |\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|^2 \left| \sum_{H < h \leq 2H} c_h \sqrt{h} \rho_{f\infty}(h) \right|^2.$$

We use the large sieve inequality for the exceptional spectrum, in our case lemma 4.8 of [Dra17], using the bound of Kim-Sarnak (see the remark preceding section 4.3 of [Dra17]). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_H^{\text{exc}} &\ll_{\eta} H^{-1} (qM)^{O(\eta)} \left(1 + \left(\frac{qM}{N} \right)^{2\theta} \right) \left(1 + d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{H}{qd} \right)^{1-2\theta} \right) \\ &\ll_{\eta} (qM)^{O(\eta)} (q^2 d)^{2\theta - \frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{M}{N} \right)^{2\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

This plainly suffices to prove (43). Formula (7) is deduced in a way similar to the case of fixed h .

0.1.12. *Bound on average over h and q .* Suppose now that $d = 1$, and $c_h = e(th)\mathbf{1}_{h \in \mathcal{I}}$ for some interval $\mathcal{I} \subset [H, 2H]$. We follow the arguments from the previous sections, encoding the factor $e(th)$ in the scaling matrix of ∞ , which brings us to the estimation of

$$\mathcal{M}_H^{\text{exc}}(q) = H^{-2} \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{B}(q, \mathbf{1}) \\ t_f \in i\mathbb{R}}} |\tilde{\phi}(t_f)|^2 \left| \sum_{h \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{h} \rho_{f\infty}(h) \right|^2.$$

We sum this over $q \in [Q, 2Q]$, and use the weighted large sieve inequality of Deshouillers-Iwaniec, Theorem 7 of [DI83]. We obtain

$$\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{Q < q \leq 2Q} \mathcal{M}_H^{\text{exc}}(q) \ll_{\varepsilon, \eta} M^{O(\eta)} H^{-1+\varepsilon} \left\{ 1 + \frac{H}{Q} + \left(\frac{M}{N} \right)^{2\theta} \right\}.$$

With 2θ replaced with $\frac{1}{2}$, this follows directly from Theorem 7 of [DI83]. The previous bound is easily justified by noting that at the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 7, page 278 of [DI83], the quantity $\sqrt{Y/Y_1}$ may be replaced by $(Y/Y_1)^{2\theta}$. The conclusion of the proof follows in a way identical to the case of fixed h .

Remarks.

- When H is large, the error term we obtain is slightly better than that announced in (7). This has no bearing on the application we consider here.
- The factors h and H in the first terms of the RHS of (6)-(8) may be improved by using integration by parts instead of the trivial approximation (16).

0.2. **Proof of Lemma 4.** From Lemma 5, we deduce by a standard Fourier analytic technique the estimate

$$(44) \quad \begin{aligned} P_f(M; q, r, d, \lambda, \omega, \alpha, \beta) \\ = (\beta - \alpha) P_f(M; q, r, d, \lambda, \omega, 0, 1) + O_{\varepsilon, D, f}((qM)^\varepsilon d^{\frac{3}{4}} (qd)^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

We omit the details, which are similar to pages 179 and 180 of [Iwa78]. The only difference with our treatment lies in the additional terms h and H in the RHS of (6) and (7), which forces the choice $\Delta = (q + M^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}$ in the argument of Iwaniec. This induces an additional error term

$$\ll \Delta^{-1} + M\Delta \ll q + M^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll q^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta},$$

which is acceptable.

We therefore focus on the treatment of the main term. We require the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x \geq 1$, $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is not a perfect square, $(q, d) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $q \geq 1$, $(q, 2D) = 1$, $d|q$ and $\lambda \pmod{d}$ with $(\lambda, d) = 1$. Let $\chi_D = \left(\frac{D}{\cdot}\right)$ be the Kronecker symbol, and $\varkappa_D(n) := (1 * \chi_D)(n)$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n, q) = 1 \\ n \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}}} \varkappa_D(n) = \frac{x}{\varphi(d)} \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{\chi_D(p)}{p} \right) L(1, \chi_D) + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^{\frac{1}{2}} q^\varepsilon).$$

Proof. This follows easily from the Dirichlet hyperbola method. □

Recall that for $p \nmid 2D$, we have $\rho(p) = 1 + \left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = \varkappa_D(p)$. We write $\rho = \varkappa_D * h_D$, in such a way that the function h_D satisfies $\sum_{\ell} |h_D(\ell)| \ell^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} \ll_{\varepsilon, D} 1$. When $M \geq 1$ and $(\lambda, d) = 1$, using Lemma 7 and integration by parts, we deduce

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{(m,q)=1 \\ m \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \rho(m) &= \sum_{\substack{(\ell,q)=1 \\ \ell \ll M}} h_D(\ell) \sum_{\substack{(n,q)=1 \\ n \equiv \lambda \ell \pmod{d}}} f\left(\frac{n\ell}{M}\right) \varkappa_D(n) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} L(1, \chi_D) M \widehat{f}(0) \sum_{(\ell,q)=1} \frac{h_D(\ell)}{\ell} + O_{\varepsilon, D, f}(q^{\varepsilon} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$C_D := L(1, \chi_D) \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{h_D(\ell)}{\ell} = \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{(\rho * \mu)(\ell)}{\ell}.$$

We obtain

$$(46) \quad L(1, \chi_D) \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \sum_{(\ell,q)=1} \frac{h_D(\ell)}{\ell} = C_D \prod_{p|q} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}.$$

We return now to the estimation of the main term in the RHS of (44). The Chinese remainder theorem and the relations (45) and (46) with q replaced by qr yield

$$\begin{aligned} P_f(M; q, r, d, \lambda, \omega, 0, 1) &= \sum_{\substack{(m,qr)=1 \\ m \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{\Omega \pmod{qm} \\ \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{qm} \\ \Omega \equiv \omega \pmod{d}}} 1 \\ &= \rho_{\omega, d}(q) \sum_{\substack{(m,qr)=1 \\ m \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}}} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \rho(m) \\ &= C_D \prod_{p|qr} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \frac{\rho_{\omega, d}(q)}{\varphi(d)} M \widehat{f}(0) + O_{\varepsilon, D, f}(M^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} q^{\varepsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have let, for all $\omega \pmod{d}$ with $\omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{d}$,

$$\rho_{\omega, d}(q) = \sum_{\substack{\Omega \pmod{q} \\ \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{q} \\ \Omega \equiv \omega \pmod{d}}} 1.$$

It is easy to see that $\rho_{\omega, d}(q) = \rho(q)$ if $d = 1$, and for all $p \nmid 2D$, $1 \leq \delta \leq \nu$, $\rho_{\omega, p^{\delta}}(p^{\nu}) = 1$ by Hensel's lemma. We deduce that $\rho_{\omega, d}(q) = \rho(q/(q, d^{\infty}))$ independently of ω . This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.

0.3. Proof of Proposition 3.

0.3.1. *First reduction.* We remark first that the trivial bound $x^{2+\varepsilon}/M$ for the LHS of (2) allows us to assume without loss that $x \geq M$.

To simplify the proof of Proposition 3, we first justify that we may assume the sequence (b_n) to be supported on odd integers coprime to D . Suppose first, then, that the estimate (2) holds for such sequences. Letting

$$(47) \quad r_D(x; q) := \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ q|k^2-D}} V\left(\frac{k}{x}\right) - x \widehat{V}(0) \frac{\rho(q)}{q},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{M < m \leq 2M} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ (n, m) = 1}} b_n r_D(x; mn) \right| &= \sum_{M < m \leq 2M} \left| \sum_{\substack{1 \leq v \leq 2N \\ v | (2D)^\infty}} \sum_{\substack{N/v < n \leq 2N/v \\ (n, 2Dm) = 1}} b_{vn} r_D(x; vmn) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{v \leq 2N \\ v | (2D)^\infty}} \sum_{vM < m \leq 2vM} \left| \sum_{\substack{N/v < n \leq 2N/v \\ (n, 2Dm) = 1}} b_{vn} r_D(x; mn) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The bound (2) applied for each c in the RHS yields the desired bound.

We therefore assume in what follows that (b_n) is supported on integers n such that $(n, 2D) = 1$.

0.3.2. Interpreting a congruence condition. We follow the arguments in pages 180-183 of [Iwa78]. To do this, we modify the construction of the class $c \pmod{[n_1, n_2]}$, page 183 of [Iwa78], to deal with the fact that in our case, the sequence (b_n) is not assumed to be supported on squarefree integers.

Lemma 8. *Let $m, n_1, n_2, \ell_1, \ell_2 \geq 1$ be given, with $(2mD, n_1 n_2) = 1$. Let*

$$d = (n_1, n_2) / (n_1, n_2, \ell_1 - \ell_2),$$

and suppose that

$$(48) \quad (m(\ell_1 - \ell_2))^2 \equiv 4D \pmod{d}.$$

Then there exists $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $0 \leq c < [n_1, n_2]$, such that the sets

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, m) : \begin{array}{l} v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m} \\ (m\ell_j + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_j} \quad (j \in \{1, 2\}) \end{array} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \left\{ \Omega \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [cm, (c+1)m) : \begin{array}{l} \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{m[n_1, n_2]} \\ \Omega \equiv m(c - \frac{1}{2}(\ell_1 + \ell_2)) \pmod{d} \end{array} \right\}$$

are in bijection.

Remark. The sets \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are empty if the condition (48) is not satisfied.

Proof. Let

$$n_j = \prod_p p^{\nu_j(p)} \quad (j \in \{1, 2\}),$$

We define $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq c < [n_1, n_2]$ as the unique integers satisfying, for all p ,

$$c \equiv \begin{cases} \ell_1 \pmod{p^{\nu_1(p)}}, & \text{si } \nu_1(p) \geq \nu_2(p), \\ \ell_2 \pmod{p^{\nu_2(p)}} & \text{sinon.} \end{cases}$$

To each $v \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, m)$, we associate $\Omega(v) = cm + v \in [cm, (m+1)c)$. This map is bijective, and it will suffice to show that $\Omega(\mathcal{D}_1) = \mathcal{D}_2$. Suppose $v \in \mathcal{D}_1$, and let $\Omega = \Omega(v)$. Since $(m, [n_1, n_2]) = 1$, it suffices to prove the congruence $\Omega^2 \equiv D$ modulo m and $[n_1, n_2]$, separately. We have $\Omega \equiv v \pmod{m}$, which yields $\Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}$. For all p , we have

$$\Omega \equiv \ell_j m + v \pmod{p^{\nu_j(p)}},$$

with $j = 1$ if $\nu_1(p) \geq \nu_2(p)$, and $j = 2$ otherwise. In both cases, we obtain $\Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{p^{\nu_j(p)}}$, therefore $\Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{[n_1, n_2]}$. The condition $\Omega \equiv m(c - \frac{1}{2}(\ell_1 + \ell_2)) \pmod{d}$ easily follows from the fact that

$$(m\ell_1 + v)^2 \equiv (m\ell_2 + v)^2 \pmod{(n_1, n_2)}.$$

Suppose conversely that $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_2$ is given, and let $v = \Omega - mc$. The congruence $v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}$ is then immediate. Next, let p be fixed, let $\nu_j = \nu_j(p)$ and suppose $\nu_1 \geq \nu_2$ (the complementary case is treated in an identical way). We therefore have

$$c \equiv \ell_1 \pmod{p^{\nu_1}}, \quad \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{p^{\nu_1}},$$

which yields directly the congruence $(m\ell_1 + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{p^{\nu_1}}$. On another hand, we have

$$(m\ell_2 + v)^2 \equiv \Omega^2 - 2m(\ell_1 - \ell_2)\Omega + (m(\ell_1 - \ell_2))^2 \pmod{p^{\nu_2}}.$$

By hypothesis, we have $\Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{p^{\nu_2}}$. Then,

$$\Omega \equiv m(c - \frac{1}{2}(\ell_1 + \ell_2)) \equiv \frac{1}{2}m(\ell_1 - \ell_2) \pmod{\frac{p^{\nu_2}}{(p^{\nu_2}, \ell_1 - \ell_2)}},$$

which yields

$$2m(\ell_1 - \ell_2)\Omega \equiv (m(\ell_1 - \ell_2))^2 \pmod{p^{\nu_2}}.$$

We deduce $(m\ell_2 + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{p^{\nu_2}}$. We have therefore obtained $v \in \mathcal{D}_1$. \square

0.3.3. *Using the dispersion method.* We expand the square in the LHS of (2). In agreement with [Iwa78], we let

$$Y(m) := \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ (n, m) = 1}} b_n \frac{\rho(n)}{n}.$$

Let also the smooth function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given and such that $\mathbf{1}_{1 \leq t \leq 2} \leq f(t) \leq \mathbf{1}_{1/2 \leq t \leq 3}$. Finally, we recall the notation (47). The LHS of (2) is bounded above by

$$(49) \quad \sum_m f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ (n, m) = 1}} b_n r_D(x; mn) \right|^2 = S_1 - 2x \overline{\widehat{V}(0)} \operatorname{Re} S_2 + |x \widehat{V}(0)|^2 S_3,$$

with

$$S_j = \sum_m f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v < m \\ v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}}} T_j(m),$$

and

$$T_1(m) = \sum_{\substack{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N \\ (n_1 n_2, m) = 1}} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N} \\ k_j \equiv v \pmod{m} \\ k_j^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_j}}} V\left(\frac{k_1}{x}\right) \overline{V\left(\frac{k_2}{x}\right)},$$

$$T_2(m) = \frac{\overline{Y(m)}}{m} \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ (n, m) = 1}} b_n \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ k \equiv v \pmod{m} \\ k^2 \equiv D \pmod{n}}} V\left(\frac{k}{x}\right), \quad T_3(m) = \left(\frac{Y(m)}{m}\right)^2.$$

0.3.4. *Estimation of S_3 .* We have

$$S_3 = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_1)\rho(n_2)}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2) = 1} \frac{M^2}{m^2} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \rho(m).$$

With $g_1(t) = t^{-2} f(t)$, the m -sum in the RHS equals

$$P_{g_1}(M; 1, n_1 n_2, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1).$$

We therefore obtain

$$(50) \quad S_3 = P_3 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^\varepsilon M^{-\frac{3}{2} + \theta}),$$

with

$$P_3 = C_D M^{-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} t^{-2} f(t) dt \right) \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} A(n_1 n_2) \frac{\rho(n_1) \rho(n_2)}{n_1 n_2}.$$

0.3.5. *Estimation of S_2 .* We have

$$S_2 = \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_2)}{n_2} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2)=1} \frac{1}{m} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v < m \\ v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}}} \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ k \equiv v \pmod{m} \\ k^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_1}}} V\left(\frac{k}{x}\right).$$

We write $k = m\ell + v$ with $\ell \geq 0$ and $\ell \ll x/m$. We therefore have

$$V\left(\frac{m\ell + v}{x}\right) = V\left(\frac{m\ell}{x}\right) + O\left(\frac{m}{x}\right),$$

which yields, similarly to [Iwa78, formula (11)], the approximation $S_2 = S'_2 + O(x^\varepsilon)$ with

$$S'_2 = \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_2)}{n_2} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2)=1} \frac{1}{m} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{\ell \geq 0 \\ 0 \leq v < m \\ v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m} \\ (m\ell + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_1}}} V\left(\frac{m\ell}{x}\right).$$

The condition on the supports of f and V imply that the integers ℓ giving a non-trivial contribution to S'_2 come from an interval of integers I such that $\ell \asymp x/M$ for each $\ell \in I$. For all n_2 with $\rho(n_2) \neq 0$, we let $n'_2 = n_2/(n_2, n_1^\infty)$. Let $c \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, n_1)$ be the unique integer satisfying $c \equiv \ell \pmod{n_1}$. We have a bijection

$$\left\{ v \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, m) : \begin{array}{l} v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m} \\ (m\ell + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_1} \end{array} \right\} \\ \longrightarrow \left\{ \Omega \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, mn_1) : \begin{array}{l} \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{mn_1} \\ cm \leq \Omega < (c+1)m \end{array} \right\}$$

given by $v \mapsto mc + v$. Therefore,

$$S'_2 = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_2)}{n_2 \rho(n_2/(n_2, n_1^\infty))} \sum_{\ell \in I} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2)=1} g_{2,\ell}\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{\Omega \in \mathbb{N} \\ \Omega^2 \equiv D \pmod{mn_1} \\ cm \leq \Omega < (c+1)m}} 1.$$

where $g_{2,\ell}(t) = t^{-1} f(t) V(t\ell M/x)$, which satisfies the hypothesis (3). The sum over (m, Ω) is exactly $P_{g_{2,\ell}}(M; n_1, n'_2, 1, 1, 1, \frac{c}{n_1}, \frac{c+1}{n_1})$, Lemma 4 therefore yields

$$S'_2 = P_2 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^\varepsilon N^{-\frac{3}{2}-\theta} M^{-\frac{1}{2}+\theta}),$$

with

$$P_2 = C_D \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_1) \rho(n_2)}{n_1 n_2} A(n_1 n_2) \int t^{-1} f(t) \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} V\left(\frac{\ell t M}{x}\right) dt.$$

Uniformly for $t \in \text{supp } f$, we use

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} V\left(\frac{\ell t M}{x}\right) = \frac{x}{Mt} \widehat{V}(0) + O(1),$$

which yields $P_2 = x \widehat{V}(0) P_3 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^\varepsilon)$, and finally

$$(51) \quad S_2 = x \widehat{V}(0) P_3 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^\varepsilon \{1 + N^{-\frac{3}{2}-\theta} M^{-\frac{1}{2}+\theta}\}).$$

0.3.6. *Estimation of S_1 and conclusion.* In the sum S_1 , we let $k_j = m\ell_j + v$ be given with $\ell_j \geq 0$, so that

$$S_1 = \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \sum_{\ell_1, \ell_2 \geq 0} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2) = 1} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v < m \\ v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m} \\ (m\ell_j + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_j}}} V\left(\frac{m\ell_1 + v}{x}\right) \overline{V\left(\frac{m\ell_2 + v}{x}\right)}.$$

We replace the product $V(\dots)\overline{V(\dots)}$ by $V(m\ell_1/x)\overline{V(m\ell_2/x)}$. The error induced in S_1 by this replacement is $O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^{1+\varepsilon})$, so that $S_1 = S'_1 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(x^{1+\varepsilon})$, with

$$(52) \quad S'_1 = \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \sum_{\ell_1, \ell_2 \geq 0} \sum_{(m, n_1 n_2) = 1} f\left(\frac{m}{M}\right) \times \\ \times V\left(\frac{m\ell_1}{x}\right) \overline{V\left(\frac{m\ell_2}{x}\right)} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v < m \\ v^2 \equiv D \pmod{m} \\ (m\ell_j + v)^2 \equiv D \pmod{n_j}}} 1$$

For each $(n_1, n_2, \ell_1, \ell_2)$, the sum over v is expressed by means of Lemma 8. We let $q = [n_1, n_2]$, $d = (n_1, n_2)/(n_1, n_2, \ell_1 - \ell_2)$, and

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\lambda \pmod{d} : (\lambda(\ell_1 - \ell_2))^2 \equiv 4D \pmod{d}\}.$$

Since $(d, 2D) = 1$, we have $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ si $(\ell_1 - \ell_2, d) > 1$, and $|\mathcal{L}| = \rho(d)$ otherwise. The sum over (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) is therefore restricted to $(\ell_1 - \ell_2, d) = 1$. The sum over (m, v) in the RHS of (52) equals

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} P_{g_3} \left(M; q, d, \lambda, \omega_\lambda, \frac{c}{q}, \frac{c+1}{q} \right) \quad (\omega_\lambda = \lambda(c - \frac{1}{2}(\ell_1 + \ell_2))),$$

with $g_3(t) = f(t)V(t\ell_1 M/x)\overline{V(t\ell_2 M/x)}$. Since $|\mathcal{L}| = \rho(d)$ and $\rho(d)\rho(q/(q, d^\infty)) = \rho(q)$, Lemma 4 yields

$$S'_1 = P_1 + O_{\varepsilon, D} \left(x^{1+\varepsilon} + x^{2+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{N^2}{M} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta} \right),$$

with

$$(53) \quad P_1 = C_D M \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_1, \ell_2 \geq 0 \\ (\ell_1 - \ell_2, d) = 1}} \frac{\rho(q)}{q} \frac{A(q)}{\varphi(d)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t) V\left(\frac{t\ell_1 M}{x}\right) \overline{V\left(\frac{t\ell_2 M}{x}\right)} dt.$$

We denote temporarily $n_0 = (n_1, n_2)$. Recall that $d = n_0/(n_0, \ell_1 - \ell_2)$. For $X \gg 1$, we have

$$(54) \quad \sum_{\substack{\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathbb{N} \\ (\ell_1 - \ell_2, n_0) = n_0/d \\ (\ell_1 - \ell_2, d) = 1}} V\left(\frac{\ell_1}{X}\right) \overline{V\left(\frac{\ell_2}{X}\right)} = \mathbf{1}_{(d, n_0/d) = 1} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} V\left(\frac{\ell}{X}\right) \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ (k, d) = 1}} \overline{V\left(\frac{\ell + kn_0/d}{X}\right)} \\ = \mathbf{1}_{(d, n_0/d) = 1} \left\{ \frac{\varphi(d)}{n_0} |X\widehat{V}(0)|^2 + O_{\varepsilon, D}(d^\varepsilon X) \right\}.$$

Note that the property $\rho(p^\nu) = \rho(p) \in \{0, 2\}$ (for $p \nmid 2D$, $\nu \geq 1$) implies

$$(55) \quad \rho([n_1, n_2]) \sum_{\substack{d|(n_1, n_2) \\ (d, (n_1, n_2)/d) = 1}} 1 = \rho([n_1, n_2]) 2^{\omega((n_1, n_2))} = \rho(n_1)\rho(n_2).$$

We insert the estimate (54) with $X = x/(Mt)$ in the RHS of (53) (recall that the additional hypothesis $M \leq x$ was justified at section 0.3.1). The factors $\varphi(d)$ compensate, and the relation (55) allows us to deduce $P_1 = P'_1 + O(x^{1+\varepsilon})$, with

$$P'_1 = \frac{|x\widehat{V}(0)|^2}{M} C_D \sum_{N < n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} b_{n_1} \overline{b_{n_2}} \frac{\rho(n_1)\rho(n_2)}{n_1 n_2} A(n_1 n_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^{-2} f(t) dt.$$

We then have $P'_1 = |x\widehat{V}(0)|^2 P_3$, and finally

$$(56) \quad S_1 = |x\widehat{V}(0)|^2 P_3 + O_{\varepsilon, D} \left(x^{1+\varepsilon} + x^{2+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{N^2}{M} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}-\theta} \right).$$

Inserting the estimates (50), (51), and (56) in (49), we obtain the desired bound (2). This concludes the proof of Proposition 3

0.4. Proof of Corollary 2. In this section, we deduce Corollary 2 from the bound (8). We follow the arguments and notations of sections 4 and 5 de [DI82]. We consider

$$R_H(x, P, D) = \sum_{D < d \leq 2D} \lambda_d \sum_{0 < |h| \leq H} \sum_{m \equiv 0 \pmod{d}} \frac{C(m) \log m}{m} \sum_{\nu^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}} \widehat{b} \left(\frac{h}{m} \right) e \left(-\frac{h\nu}{m} \right),$$

where $D \leq x^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $P \in [x, x^2]$, $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, $H = Px^{-1+\eta}$, b is a smooth function compactly supported in $[x, 2x]$, such that $\|b^{(j)}\|_{\infty} \ll_j x^{-j}$, C is a smooth function compactly supported in $[P, 4P]$, such that $\|C^{(j)}\|_{\infty} \ll P^{-j}$, and (λ_d) is a sequence of coefficients with $|\lambda_d| \leq 1$. We insert the definition

$$\frac{1}{m} \widehat{b} \left(\frac{h}{m} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e(-ht) b(mt) dt.$$

Let $M = P/D$ and $f_{d,t}(v) = C(Mvd) \log(Mvd) b(Mvdt)$. We obtain

$$|R_H(x, P, D)| \ll xP^{-1} \sup_{|t| \in [x/(4P), 2x/P]} \sum_{D < d \leq 2D} \left| \sum_{0 < |h| \leq H} e(th) \sum_m f_{d,t} \left(\frac{m}{M} \right) \sum_{\nu^2 \equiv D \pmod{m}} e \left(-\frac{h\nu}{md} \right) \right|.$$

We have $\|f_{d,t}^{(j)}\|_{\infty} \ll_j 1$, $D \ll M$ and $H \ll MD$. We may therefore apply the bound (8) to each dyadic subsum $H_1 < h \leq 2H_1$, for $\frac{1}{2} \leq H_1 \leq H$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_H(x, P, D) &\ll x^{1+\varepsilon+O(\eta)} P^{-1} D \sup_{\frac{1}{2} \leq H_1 \leq H} H_1 \left\{ H_1 + M^{\frac{1}{2}} + H_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta} M^{\frac{1}{2}+\theta} \right\} \\ &\ll x^{\varepsilon+O(\eta)} \left\{ x^{-1} DP + (DP)^{\frac{1}{2}} + x^{\frac{1}{2}} P^{\theta} D^{1-2\theta} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This is $O(x^{1-\eta})$ if $D \leq x^{-K\eta} \min\{x^2 P^{-1}, x^{1/(2-4\theta)} P^{-\theta/(1-2\theta)}\}$ and K is a sufficiently large absolute constant. This bound on D , in conjunction with the arguments of section 8 of [DI82], yields the announced result.

0.5. Proof of Lemma 6.

Proof. Write $\sigma \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u & * \\ v & r \end{pmatrix}$ with $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. The classes $\Gamma_0(qd) \backslash \Gamma$ are in bijection with $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Z}/qd\mathbb{Z})$, the correspondence being given by $\sigma \mapsto [v : r]$. The condition $q|C(\sigma Q)$ then corresponds to $q|Q(v, r)$.

The relation $q|C(\sigma Q) = Q(v, r)$ implies $v|Q(v, r)^2$. However, we have the congruence $Q(v, r) \equiv Q(0, 1)r^2 \pmod{v}$ and $(r, v) = 1$, so that finally $v|Q(0, 1)^2$.

The explicit expression of $\mathcal{C}(\infty, \mathbf{a})$ and of $S_{\infty \mathbf{a}}(h, n; \gamma)$ is an elementary computation similar to section 2.2 of Deshouillers-Iwaniec [DI83]. We omit the details. The bound (23) is deduced using the triangle inequality, and noting that the condition $\alpha \delta \equiv u \pmod{vm}$ determines $\alpha \pmod{vm/(u, m)}$.

For the proof of (24), we use the Chinese remainder theorem. Let p be a prime number, and let

$$p^\mu \parallel m, \quad p^\lambda \parallel u, \quad p^\nu \parallel v, \quad p^{\nu'} \parallel v', \quad p^\Delta \parallel d.$$

Our hypotheses $(v, u) = (v', m) = 1$ then imply

$$\mu > 0 \Rightarrow \nu' = 0, \quad \lambda > 0 \Rightarrow \nu = 0, \quad \Delta \leq \max\{\nu, \nu'\}.$$

The Chinese remainder theorem shows that it suffices to prove the bounds

$$(57) \quad S_p(h) := \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}} \\ \delta \pmod{p^{\lambda+\mu+\max\{\nu, \nu'\}}} \\ \delta \equiv m \pmod{p^{\lambda+\nu'}} \\ (\delta - m, p^{\lambda+\mu}) = p^\lambda \\ \alpha \delta \equiv u \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}}}} \chi_p(\delta) e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{p^{\nu+\mu}}\right) \ll_Q (p^\Delta h, p^\mu),$$

where χ_p is a character modulo p^Δ . The change of variables $\delta \leftarrow m + \delta p^{\lambda+\nu'}$ transforms the LHS into

$$S_p(h) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}} \\ \delta \pmod{p^{\mu+\max\{\nu-\nu', 0\}}} \\ (\delta, p^\mu) = 1 \\ \alpha(m + \delta p^{\lambda+\nu'}) \equiv u \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}}}} \chi_p(m + \delta p^{\lambda+\nu'}) e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{p^{\nu+\mu}}\right).$$

We first deal with the case $\mu \leq \max\{\lambda, \nu\}$, taking the trivial bound

$$S_p(h) \ll_Q 1,$$

which follows from the fact that $u, v \ll_Q 1$.

Suppose then that $\mu > \max\{\lambda, \nu\} \geq 0$, in particular, $\nu' = 0$. Consider first the case $\nu = 0$, which implies $\Delta = 0$, so that the character is trivial and the sum simplifies to

$$S_p(h) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{p^\mu} \\ (\alpha, p) = 1}} e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{p^\mu}\right) \sum_{\substack{\delta \pmod{p^\mu} \\ \alpha \delta \equiv u/p^\lambda \pmod{p^{\mu-\lambda}}}} 1 = p^\lambda c_{p^\mu}(h),$$

where $c_r(h) = \sum_{b \pmod{r}, (b, r) = 1} e(hb/r)$ is the Ramanujan sum. We obtain

$$|S_p(h)| \leq p^\lambda (h, p^\mu).$$

Consider then the case $\nu > 0$. This implies $\lambda = 0$ and $\Delta \leq \nu$, and so

$$S_p(h) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}} \\ \delta \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}} \\ (\delta, p) = 1 \\ \alpha(m + \delta) \equiv u \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}}}} \chi(m + \delta) e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{p^{\nu+\mu}}\right) = \chi(u) \sum_{\substack{\alpha \pmod{p^{\nu+\mu}} \\ (\alpha, p) = 1}} \chi(\bar{\alpha}) e\left(\frac{h\alpha}{p^{\nu+\mu}}\right)$$

which is a Gauss sum (*c.f.* [IK04, lemme 3.2]). We therefore have

$$|S_p(h)| \leq 2(p^\Delta h, p^{\nu+\mu}).$$

We obtain in any case the bound (57), which concludes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [DFI95] W. Duke, J. B. Friedlander, and H. Iwaniec, *Equidistribution of roots of a quadratic congruence to prime moduli*, Ann. of Math. (2) **141** (1995), no. 2, 423–441.
- [DI82] J.-M. Deshouillers and H. Iwaniec, *On the greatest prime factor of $n^2 + 1$* , Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **32** (1982), no. 4, 1–11.
- [DI83] ———, *Kloosterman sums and Fourier coefficients of cusp forms*, Invent. Math. **70** (1982/83), no. 2, 219–288.
- [dlBD17] R. de la Bretèche and S. Drappeau, *Majoration du nombre de valeurs friables d'un polynôme*, pré-publication (2017), arXiv, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.03197>.
- [Dra17] S. Drappeau, *Sums of Kloosterman sums in arithmetic progressions, and the error term in the dispersion method*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2017), à paraître.
- [Hoo63] C. Hooley, *On the number of divisors of a quadratic polynomial*, Acta Math. **110** (1963), 97–114.
- [IK04] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [Iwa78] H. Iwaniec, *Almost-primes represented by quadratic polynomials*, Invent. Math. **47** (1978), no. 2, 171–188.
- [Iwa97] ———, *Topics in classical automorphic forms*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 17, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [Kim03] H. H. Kim, *Functoriality for the exterior square of GL_4 and the symmetric fourth of GL_2* , J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 1, 139–183, With appendix 1 by D. Ramakrishnan and appendix 2 by K. and P. Sarnak.
- [Kow04] E. Kowalski, *Un cours de théorie analytique des nombres*, Cours spécialisés, collection SMF, 2004.
- [Top15] B. Topalogullari, *On a certain additive divisor problem*, pré-publication (2015), arXiv, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.05770>.
- [Tót00] Á. Tóth, *Roots of quadratic congruences*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), no. 14, 719–739.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU-PARIS RIVE GAUCHE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS DIDEROT, SORBONNE PARIS CITÉ, UMR 7586, CASE POSTALE 7012, F-75251 PARIS CEDEX 13, FRANCE
E-mail address: `regis.delabreteche@imj-prg.fr`

AIX MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, CENTRALE MARSEILLE, I2M UMR 7373, 13453 MARSEILLE, FRANCE
E-mail address: `sary-aurelien.drappeau@univ-amu.fr`