

NEW VARIANTS OF ARITHMETIC QUANTUM ERGODICITY

PETER HUMPHRIES AND JESSE THORNER

ABSTRACT. We establish two new variants of arithmetic quantum ergodicity. The first is for self-dual GL_2 Hecke–Maaß newforms over \mathbb{Q} as the level and Laplace eigenvalue vary jointly. The second is a nonsplit analogue wherein almost all restrictions of Hilbert (respectively Bianchi) Hecke–Maaß cusp forms to the modular surface dissipate as their Laplace eigenvalues grow.

1. INTRODUCTION

Šnirel’man [38], Colin de Verdière [9], and Zelditch [42, 43] proved the quantum analogue of geodesic flow on a finite volume Riemannian manifold X being ergodic. To be more specific, let Δ denote the Laplace–Beltrami operator on X , and let $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of L^2 -integrable eigenfunctions of Δ . Let λ_k be the Laplace eigenvalue of φ_k , so that $\Delta\varphi_k = \lambda_k\varphi_k$; we may order $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ so that $(\lambda_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is monotonically nondecreasing. Consider the probability measures $d\mu_k := |\varphi_k|^2 d\mu$, where $d\mu$ is the volume form on X . If the geodesic flow on the unit cotangent bundle is ergodic (which happens, for instance, when X has negative curvature), then there exists a density one subsequence φ_{k_n} along which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{k_n}(A) = \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(X)}$$

when A is a continuity set. This has been termed *quantum ergodicity*. Rudnick and Sarnak [34] have conjectured that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k(A) = \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(X)}$$

when X has negative curvature, which would alleviate the need to pass to a density one subsequence. This has been termed *quantum unique ergodicity*.

Let $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. The orbifold $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ has attracted much attention because of its arithmetic structure. The volume form $d\mu(z)$ is the measure $y^{-2} dx dy$ (where $z = x + iy$), and $\mu(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}) = \frac{\pi}{3}$. Let $(\varphi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ denote an orthonormal basis of Maaß cusp forms satisfying $\Delta\varphi_k(z) = \lambda_\varphi\varphi_k(z)$, where $\Delta = -y^2(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2})$. We may diagonalize the space of Maaß cusp forms so that we may take each φ_k to be an eigenfunction of all Hecke operators and the involution $\varphi_k(z) \mapsto \varphi_k(-\bar{z})$. We call such an eigenfunction a Hecke–Maaß cusp form. We expect the cuspidal spectrum of $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ to be simple [37], so that every Maaß cusp form is a Hecke–Maaß cusp form.

The first author was supported by the National Science Foundation (grant DMS-2302079) and by the Simons Foundation (award 965056). The second author was supported by the Simons Foundation (award MP-TSM-00002484).

Let $\mathbf{1}_B$ be the indicator function of an injective geodesic ball B in $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, and for a probability measure ν on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, define the discrepancy

$$(1.1) \quad D(\nu) := \sup_{B \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \left| \nu(\mathbf{1}_B) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_B) \right|.$$

If $D(\mu_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, as predicted by the quantum unique ergodicity conjecture, then the measures $d\mu_k$ converge in the weak-* topology to $(3/\pi)d\mu$. The rate of decay of $D(\mu_k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ then quantifies the rate of convergence. Watson's thesis [40] shows that the generalized Lindelöf hypothesis (GLH) for certain families of $\mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ and $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ Rankin–Selberg L -functions is essentially equivalent to

$$(1.2) \quad \mu_k(\mathbf{1}_B) = \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_B) + O_{B,\varepsilon}(\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon})$$

for every fixed injective geodesic ball $B \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$. Young refines this by explicating the dependence on B in the error term in (1.2) under the assumption of GLH [41, Proposition 1.5]. In particular, Young conditionally proves small scale quantum unique ergodicity—the error term in (1.2) is smaller than the main term so long as $\mu(\mathbf{1}_B)$ is a little larger than $\lambda_k^{-1/6}$. Moreover, even if $\mu(\mathbf{1}_B)$ is smaller than $\lambda_k^{-1/6}$, Young obtains bounds for the error term in (1.2) uniform in B that are strong enough to imply the optimal bound $D(\mu_k) \ll_\varepsilon \lambda_k^{-1/4+\varepsilon}$, resolving a conjecture of Luo and Sarnak [29, p. 210] conditionally under GLH.

Unconditionally, there are no known individual bounds $D(\mu_k)$ other than the work of Lindenstrauss [28] and Soundararajan [35], which shows that

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} D(\mu_k) = 0$$

with an unspecified rate of convergence. On the other hand, unconditional bounds for $D(\mu_k)$ are quite strong *on average*. Luo and Sarnak [29, Theorem 1.5] proved a strong quantitative version of Zelditch's quantum ergodicity result, namely

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{1}{|\{\lambda_k \leq T\}|} \sum_{\lambda_k \leq T} D(\mu_k)^2 \ll_\varepsilon T^{-\frac{1}{21}+\varepsilon}.$$

Chebyshev's inequality then implies that for fixed positive real numbers α and β satisfying $2\alpha + \beta < \frac{1}{21}$, we have that

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{|\{\lambda_k \leq T : D(\mu_k) \geq \lambda_k^{-\alpha}\}|}{|\{\lambda_k \leq T\}|} \ll T^{-\beta}.$$

Following Kowalski, Michel, and Vanderkam [22], one can consider variants of quantum ergodicity or quantum unique ergodicity in which the surface on which the Hecke–Maaß forms are defined varies instead of the Laplace eigenvalue. Given an integer $q \geq 1$, let $\Gamma_0(q)$ be the level q Hecke congruence subgroup of Γ . Let φ be a Hecke–Maaß newform of level q_φ , trivial nebentypus, and Laplace eigenvalue $\lambda_\varphi > 0$, so that φ is defined on the orbifold $\Gamma_0(q) \backslash \mathbb{H}$. Since $\Gamma_0(q)$ is a finite-index subgroup of $\Gamma_0(1) = \Gamma$, it follows that for each fundamental domain \mathcal{F} of $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, there exists a fundamental domain of $\Gamma_0(q) \backslash \mathbb{H}$ containing \mathcal{F} .

Let $C_b(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$ be the set of bounded, continuous functions $H: \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. If $H \in C_b(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$, then the pushforward to $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ of the L^2 -mass of φ (weighted by H) is the finite measure on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ given by

$$(1.6) \quad \mu_\varphi(H) := \int_{\Gamma_0(q_\varphi) \backslash \mathbb{H}} |\varphi(z)|^2 H(z) d\mu(z).$$

For fixed $\lambda > 0$, the assertion that

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{q_\varphi = q \\ \lambda_\varphi \leq \lambda}} D(\mu_\varphi) = 0$$

is one possible “level-aspect” variation of (1.3), where the orbifold on which the Hecke–Maaß newforms are defined varies instead of the Laplace eigenvalues. A proof of (1.7) appears to be beyond the reach of current methods, although such a result along a subsequence of *powerful* moduli follows from the work of Nelson, Pitale, and Saha [32]. Going one step further, one might hope to combine (1.3) and (1.7) and prove a “hybrid-aspect” result such as

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi \leq Q} D(\mu_\varphi) = 0.$$

2. MAIN RESULTS

In this paper, we investigate generalizations of the arithmetic quantum ergodicity results (1.4) and (1.5). Our first result implies (1.8) along a density one subsequence of φ . Let \mathcal{F} be the set of GL_2 Hecke–Maaß newforms φ of weight zero and trivial nebentypus. Let $\mathrm{Ad} \varphi$ denote the adjoint lift of φ . Recall the definitions in (1.1) and (1.6). We prove the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $Q \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{F}(Q) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{F} : \lambda_\varphi q_\varphi \in (Q, 2Q]\}$. If $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$|\{\mathrm{Ad} \varphi : \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), D(\mu_\varphi) \geq (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{10^{12}}}\}| \ll_\varepsilon Q^\varepsilon.$$

The implied constant is ineffective.

Remark. The implied constant is ineffective because the contribution from the dihedral Hecke–Maaß newforms in $\mathcal{F}(Q)$ requires Siegel’s ineffective lower bound for Dirichlet L -functions at $s = 1$. If we restrict to the subfamily of nondihedral Hecke–Maaß newforms, then our proof shows that the implied constant is effective.

Theorem 2.1 shows that there are very few adjoint lifts of $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$ such that the discrepancy $D(\mu_\varphi)$ is large. This does not preclude the possibility that several $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$ have the same adjoint lift and $D(\varphi)$ is large. Nonetheless, we prove that strong bounds for $D(\mu_\varphi)^2$ hold on average over $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$.

Corollary 2.2. *If $Q \geq 1$, then*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}(Q)|} \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)} D(\mu_\varphi)^2 \ll Q^{-\frac{1}{10^{12}}}.$$

The implied constant is ineffective.

Our second result is a nonsplit analogue of arithmetic quantum ergodicity wherein almost all restrictions of Hilbert (respectively Bianchi) Hecke–Maaß cusp forms to the modular surface dissipate as their Laplace eigenvalues grow. This particular framework appears to be new to the literature. To begin, let $E = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ be a real quadratic field with narrow class number 1 and ring of integers \mathcal{O}_E , and let $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of Hilbert Maaß cusp forms on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)\backslash\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. We denote by $\lambda_{1,j} = \frac{1}{4} + t_{1,j}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,j} = \frac{1}{4} + t_{2,j}^2$ the two Laplace eigenvalues of ϕ_j , where $t_{1,j}, t_{2,j}$ are the associated spectral parameters. Let $\mathrm{As} \phi_j$ denote the Asai transfer of ϕ_j , as introduced in [1]. The archimedean part of the analytic conductor of $\mathrm{As} \phi_j$ is given by

$$(2.1) \quad C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j) := (3 + |t_{1,j} + t_{2,j}|)^2 (3 + |t_{1,j} - t_{2,j}|)^2.$$

Consider the signed measure $d\mu_j(z) := \phi_j(z, z) d\mu(z)$ on $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$ obtained by restricting the function $\phi_j(z_1, z_2)$ on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)\backslash\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ to the diagonal embedding of $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$. Given $H \in C_b(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H})$, we define

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{D}_j(H) := \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} H(z) d\mu_j(z) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu_j(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}) \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} H(z) d\mu(z).$$

We pose the following conjecture regarding the signed measures $d\mu_j$.

Conjecture 2.3. *For any fixed $H \in C_b(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H})$, we have that*

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j) \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_j(H) = 0.$$

This conjecture may be thought of as a nonsplit analogue of quantum unique ergodicity in configuration space for $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$, where the restriction of a Hilbert Maaß cusp form $\phi_j(z_1, z_2)$ on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)\backslash\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ to the diagonal embedding of $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$ replaces the restriction of $\varphi_k(z_1)\varphi_k(z_2)$ on $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H} \times \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$ to the diagonal embedding of $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$, where φ_k is a Maaß cusp form on $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$. As we show in Lemma 5.1, if ϕ_j is additionally an eigenfunction of all the Hecke operators, then $\mu_j(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}) = 0$ except on the rare occasion that ϕ_j is the base change of a Hecke–Maaß newform on $\Gamma_0(D)\backslash\mathbb{H}$ of level D and nebentypus χ_D , the primitive quadratic character modulo D . Thus, Conjecture 2.3 may be interpreted as stating that the restriction of a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß newform ϕ_j to $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$ dissipates, rather than equidistributes, as $C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j) \rightarrow \infty$ apart from when ϕ_j is a base change.

Conjecture 2.3 seems out of reach by current methods. When ϕ_j is the base change of a cuspidal *holomorphic* Hecke eigenform of even weight k and H is a fixed Hecke–Maaß cusp form, Nelson has shown that the analogue of (2.3) holds as $k \rightarrow \infty$ [31, Theorem B]. His method is also valid when ϕ_j is the base change of a Hecke–Maaß newform provided one additionally assumes the generalized Ramanujan conjecture, but no longer applies when ϕ_j is not a base change.

A natural weakening of Conjecture 2.3 is the conjecture that there exists a density one subsequence ϕ_{j_n} for which (2.3) holds for all $H \in C_b(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H})$; this in turn may be thought of as a nonsplit analogue of quantum ergodicity. We prove the following result towards this, where we instead first fix a nice test function H and then show that, apart from a very small number of exceptional Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp forms ϕ_j , $|\mathcal{D}_j(H)|$ decays polynomially in $C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $H \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$. Let $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp forms. For $Q \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) := \{\phi_j : C(\text{As } \phi_j) \in (Q, 2Q]\}$. If $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$|\{\phi_j \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : |\mathcal{D}_j(H)| > C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{10^{12}}}\}| \ll_{D,H,\varepsilon} Q^\varepsilon.$$

As we point out in Lemma 5.7, Theorem 2.4 is nontrivial once $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. We emphasize that in Theorem 2.4, the density one sequence is dependent on the choice of test function $H \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$, in contrast with (1.4) or Theorem 2.1. One would like to overcome this via a diagonalization and approximation argument, as in [42, Section 6]. Unfortunately, there is a major hindrance in our setting: μ_j is a signed measure, rather than a probability measure. A diagonalization and approximation argument would require strong control over the total mass of the measure $|\mu_j|$, which we presently lack.

There is also an analogue of Conjecture 2.3 when $D < 0$, so that $E = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ is an imaginary quadratic field of class number 1 with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_E . In place of $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H} \cong (\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})) / (\text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(2))$, we work on hyperbolic three-space $\mathbb{H}^3 \cong \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) / \text{SU}(2)$, where we identify \mathbb{H}^3 with the subspace $\{P = z + jr : z \in \mathbb{H}, r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of the Hamiltonian quaternions. In place of an orthonormal basis of Hilbert Maaß cusp forms $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ on $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ with associated signed measures $d\mu_j(z) := \phi_j(z, z) d\mu(z)$ on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, we work with an orthonormal basis of Bianchi Maaß cusp forms $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ on $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$. We denote by $\lambda_j = 1 + 4t_j^2$ the Laplace eigenvalue of ϕ_j , where t_j is the associated spectral parameter. The archimedean part of the analytic conductor of ϕ_j is given by $C(\phi_j) := (3 + |t_j|)^4$. Consider the signed measures $d\mu_j(z) := \phi_j(z) d\mu(z)$ on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ obtained by restricting the function $\phi_j(P)$ on $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$ to $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$. With this alteration of $d\mu_j(z)$, we then define $\mathcal{D}_j(H)$ just as in (2.2). We pose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.5. *If $H \in C_b(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$ is fixed, then*

$$(2.4) \quad \lim_{C(\phi_j) \rightarrow \infty} C(\phi_j)^{\frac{1}{8}} \mathcal{D}_j(H) = 0.$$

Conjecture 2.5 is analogous to Conjecture 2.3, with two notable differences:

- (1) In the latter, we take the limit as $C(\phi_j)$ tends to infinity, rather than $C(\text{As } \phi_j)$; this is due to the fact that $C(\phi_j) \asymp C(\text{As } \phi_j)$ in this setting.
- (2) In the latter, we additionally insert a factor $C(\phi_j)^{1/8}$; this is due to the fact that the main term $\mu_j(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}) \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} H(z) d\mu(z)$ may be of size $C(\phi_j)^{-1/8}$ in this setting.

If ϕ_j is additionally an eigenfunction of all the Hecke operators, we show that $\mu_j(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}) = 0$ except on the rare occasion that ϕ_j is the base change of a Hecke–Maaß newform on $\Gamma_0(D) \backslash \mathbb{H}$ of weight 1, level $-D$, and nebentypus χ_D , the primitive quadratic character modulo $-D$. Thus, Conjecture 2.5 may be interpreted as stating that once normalized by a multiplicative factor $C(\phi_j)^{1/8}$, the restriction of a Bianchi Hecke–Maaß cusp form ϕ_j to $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ dissipates, rather than equidistributes, as $C(\phi_j) \rightarrow \infty$ unless ϕ_j is a base change.

We prove the following result towards a quantum ergodicity analogue of Conjecture 2.5.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $H \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$. Let $(\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of Bianchi Hecke–Maaß cusp forms. For $Q \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) := \{\phi_j : C(\phi_j) \in (Q, 2Q]\}$. If $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$|\{\phi_j \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : |\mathcal{D}_j(H)| > C(\phi_j)^{-\frac{1}{8} - \frac{\varepsilon}{10^{12}}}\}| \ll_{D,H,\varepsilon} Q^\varepsilon.$$

We have made no effort to optimize the factor of $\frac{1}{10^{12}}$ appearing in the exponents in Theorems 2.1, 2.4, and 2.6; it could be improved with more care. Nonetheless, the method of proof cannot obtain an exponent nearly as strong as the exponent $\frac{1}{21}$ appearing in Luo and Sarnak's estimate (1.4). This arises from a fundamental difference in the method of proof. In contrast to the work of Luo and Sarnak in [29], which relies heavily on Poincaré series, the proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.4, and 2.6 rely on spectral expansions and period integral identities (generalizing work of Ichino and Watson) that relate the inner products in these expansions to Rankin–Selberg L -functions on the critical line. The work of Soundararajan and the second author [36] relates bounds for L -functions on the critical line to the scarcity of zeros of L -functions near the line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1$. The desired scarcity follows from zero density estimates.

Acknowledgements. We thank Yao Cheng, Alexandre de Faveri, and Daniel Hu for helpful comments.

3. PROPERTIES OF L -FUNCTIONS

We recall some standard facts about L -functions arising from automorphic representations and their Rankin–Selberg convolutions. See [3, 11, 20, 30, 36].

3.1. Standard L -functions. Let \mathfrak{F}_n be the set of cuspidal automorphic representations $\pi = \pi_\infty \otimes \bigotimes'_p \pi_p$ of $\operatorname{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$, where the restricted tensor product runs over all primes and π is normalized so that its central character is trivial on the diagonally embedded copy of the positive reals. Given $\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n$, let $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ be the contragredient representation and q_π be the arithmetic conductor of π . The local L -function $L(s, \pi_p)$ is defined in terms of the Satake parameters $\alpha_{j,\pi}(p) \in \mathbb{C}$ by

$$(3.1) \quad L(s, \pi_p) = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 - \alpha_{j,\pi}(p)p^{-s})^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_\pi(p^k)}{p^{ks}}.$$

If $p \nmid q_\pi$, then $\alpha_{j,\pi}(p) \neq 0$ for all j . If $p \mid q_\pi$, then there might exist j such that $\alpha_{j,\pi}(p) = 0$. The standard L -function $L(s, \pi)$ associated to π is of the form

$$L(s, \pi) = \prod_p L(s, \pi_p) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_\pi(n)}{n^s}.$$

The Euler product and Dirichlet series converge absolutely when $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$.

At the archimedean place, there are n Langlands parameters $\mu_{j,\pi} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$L(s, \pi_\infty) = \prod_{j=1}^n \Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s + \mu_{j,\pi}), \quad \Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s) := \pi^{-\frac{s}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right).$$

Let r_π be the order of the pole of $L(s, \pi)$ at $s = 1$: this is 0 unless $n = 1$ and π is trivial, in which case $L(s, \pi)$ is the Riemann zeta function, which has a simple pole at $s = 1$. The completed L -function

$$\Lambda(s, \pi) = (s(s-1))^{r_\pi} q_\pi^{s/2} L(s, \pi) L(s, \pi_\infty)$$

is entire of order 1, and there exists a complex number $W(\pi)$ of modulus 1 such that if $s \in \mathbb{C}$, then

$$\Lambda(s, \pi) = W(\pi)\Lambda(1 - s, \tilde{\pi}).$$

The analytic conductor of π is given by

$$(3.2) \quad C(\pi, t) := q_\pi \prod_{j=1}^n (3 + |it + \mu_{j,\pi}|), \quad C(\pi) := C(\pi, 0).$$

3.2. Rankin–Selberg L -functions. Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ and $\pi' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n'}$. At each prime p , Jacquet, Piatetski-Shapiro, and Shalika [20] associate to π_p and π'_p a local Rankin–Selberg L -function

$$(3.3) \quad L(s, \pi_p \times \pi'_p) = \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{j'=1}^{n'} (1 - \alpha_{j,j',\pi \times \pi'}(p)p^{-s})^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{\pi \times \pi'}(p^k)}{p^{ks}}$$

and a local conductor $q_{\pi_p \times \pi'_p}$. If $p \nmid q_{\pi \times \pi'}$, then we have the equality of sets

$$(3.4) \quad \{\alpha_{j,j',\pi \times \pi'}(p)\} = \{\alpha_{j,\pi}(p)\alpha_{j',\pi'}(p)\}.$$

The Rankin–Selberg L -function $L(s, \pi \times \pi')$ associated to π and π' and its arithmetic conductor are

$$L(s, \pi \times \pi') = \prod_p L(s, \pi_p \times \pi'_p) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{\pi \times \pi'}(n)}{n^s}, \quad q_{\pi \times \pi'} = \prod_p q_{\pi_p \times \pi'_p}.$$

Jacquet, Piatetski-Shapiro, and Shalika associate $n'n$ complex Langlands parameters $\mu_{\pi \times \pi'}(j, j')$ to π_∞ and π'_∞ , from which one defines

$$L(s, \pi_\infty \times \pi'_\infty) = \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{j'=1}^{n'} \Gamma\left(\frac{s + \mu_{\pi \times \pi'}(j, j')}{2}\right).$$

Let $r_{\pi \times \pi'}$ be the order of the pole of $L(s, \pi \times \pi')$ at $s = 1$. By our normalization for the central characters of π and π' , we have that $r_{\pi \times \pi'} = 0$ unless $\pi = \tilde{\pi}'$, in which case $r_{\pi \times \tilde{\pi}} = 1$. The completed L -function

$$(3.5) \quad \Lambda(s, \pi \times \pi') = (s(s-1))^{r_{\pi \times \pi'}} q_{\pi \times \pi'}^{s/2} L(s, \pi \times \pi') L(s, \pi_\infty \times \pi'_\infty)$$

is entire of order 1, and there exists a complex number $W(\pi \times \pi')$ of modulus 1 such that

$$\Lambda(s, \pi \times \pi') = W(\pi \times \pi')\Lambda(1 - s, \tilde{\pi} \times \tilde{\pi}').$$

As with $L(s, \pi)$, the analytic conductor of $L(s, \pi \times \pi')$ is given by

$$(3.6) \quad C(\pi \times \pi', t) := q_{\pi \times \pi'} \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{j'=1}^{n'} (3 + |it + \mu_{\pi \times \pi'}(j, j')|), \quad C(\pi \times \pi') := C(\pi \times \pi', 0).$$

The combined work of Bushnell and Henniart [6] and Brumley [16, Appendix] yields

$$(3.7) \quad C(\pi \times \pi', t) \ll C(\pi \times \pi')(3 + |t|)^{n'n}, \quad C(\pi \times \pi') \ll C(\pi)^{n'} C(\pi')^n.$$

Li [27, Theorem 2] proved that there exists an absolute and effectively computable constant $c_1 > 0$, which we assume to be large for future convenience, such that

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow \sigma} (\sigma_0 - 1)^{r_{\pi \times \pi'}} |L(\sigma_0, \pi \times \pi')| \ll \exp\left(c_1 n' n \frac{\log C(\pi \times \pi')}{\log \log C(\pi \times \pi')}\right), \quad \sigma \in [1, 3].$$

We can change π' to $\pi' \otimes |\det|^{it}$; at the archimedean place, this has the effect of adding it to each Langlands parameter $\mu_{\pi \times \pi'}(j, j')$. We then apply the functional equation, the Phragmén–Lindelöf principle, and (3.7) to obtain for all $\sigma \geq 0$

$$(3.9) \quad \lim_{\sigma_0 \rightarrow \sigma} \left| \left(\frac{\sigma_0 + it - 1}{\sigma_0 + it + 1} \right)^{r_{\pi \times \pi'}} L(\sigma_0 + it, \pi \times \pi') \right| \ll_{n, n', \varepsilon} (C(\pi)^{n'} C(\pi')^n (3 + |t|)^{n'n})^{\frac{\max\{1-\sigma, 0\}}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{n'n}}.$$

3.3. Zeros of L -functions. For $Q \geq 1$, we denote by $\mathfrak{F}_n(Q)$ the set of cuspidal automorphic representations π of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ with analytic conductor $C(\pi)$ at most Q . We shall show that for any fixed cuspidal automorphic representation π' , a subconvex bound for $L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')$ holds for *most* $\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n(Q)$ in the large Q limit. The proof relies on a zero density estimate, which, for $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $T \geq 1$, concerns the count (with multiplicity)

$$N_{\pi \times \pi'}(\sigma, T) := |\{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : L(\rho, \pi \times \pi') = 0, \beta \geq \sigma, |\gamma| \leq T\}|.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n, n' \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. If $Q \geq 1$, $\pi' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n'}(Q^{1/11})$, and $1 \leq T \leq Q^{1/11} + 6$, then*

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n(Q)} N_{\pi \times \pi'}\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{150}, T\right) \ll_{\varepsilon} Q^{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Let $n, n' \geq 1$ be arbitrary. We invoke [17, Theorem 1.1] with $\mathcal{S} = \mathfrak{F}_n(Q)$, which, after rescaling ε , states that for $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $T \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n(Q)} N_{\pi \times \pi'}(\sigma, T) \ll_{n, n', \varepsilon} (|\mathfrak{F}_n(Q)|^4 (C(\pi')QT)^{6.15 \max\{n^2, n'n\}})^{1-\sigma + \frac{\varepsilon}{10^6}}.$$

The desired result now follows from our bounds on T and $C(\pi')$, the bound $|\mathfrak{F}_n(Q)| \ll_{\varepsilon} Q^{2n+1/4}$ that follows from [5, Appendix], and the restriction to $n, n' \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. \square

We will apply Lemma 3.1 to study moments of L -function using the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $n, n' \geq 1$. Let $(\pi, \pi') \in \mathfrak{F}_n \times \mathfrak{F}_{n'}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. For all $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$, there exists an effectively computable constant $c_2 = c_2(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \log |L(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{9\alpha}{10^{10}}\right) \log(C(\pi)^{n'} C(\pi')^n (3 + |t|)^{n'n}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{10^7} N_{\pi \times \pi'}(1 - \alpha, |t| + 6) + c_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We mimic the proof of [36, Theorem 1.1], replacing π' with $\pi' \otimes |\det|^{it}$. This has the effect of adding it to each Langlands parameter $\mu_{\pi \times \pi'}(j, j')$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \log |L(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\alpha}{10^9}\right) \log C(\pi \times \pi', t) + 2 \log |L(\tfrac{3}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{10^7} |\{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : \beta \geq 1 - \alpha, |\gamma - t| \leq 6\}| + O_{n, n'}(1) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\alpha}{10^9}\right) \log C(\pi \times \pi', t) + 2 \log |L(\tfrac{3}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{10^7} N_{\pi \times \pi'}(1 - \alpha, |t| + 6) + O_{n, n'}(1) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\alpha}{10^9}\right) \log(C(\pi)^{n'} C(\pi')^n (3 + |t|)^{n'n}) + 2 \log |L(\tfrac{3}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{10^7} N_{\pi \times \pi'}(1 - \alpha, |t| + 6) + O_{n, n'}(1). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma now follows from (3.8) and (3.9). \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let $n, n' \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\pi' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n'}(Q^{1/11})$. If $\varepsilon > 0$, then with $O_\varepsilon(Q^\varepsilon)$ exceptions, each $\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_n(Q)$ satisfies*

$$|L(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \pi \times \pi')| \leq (C(\pi)^{n'} C(\pi')^n (3 + |t|)^{n'n})^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{6\varepsilon}{10^{12}}} \quad \text{for all } t \in [-Q^{\frac{1}{11}}, Q^{\frac{1}{11}}].$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmata 3.1 and 3.2 with $\alpha = \varepsilon/150$. \square

4. HYBRID-ASPECT QUANTUM ERGODICITY FOR GL_2 HECKE–MAASS NEWFORMS

Let φ be a Hecke–Maaß newform on $\Gamma_0(q_\varphi) \backslash \mathbb{H}$ with trivial nebentypus and Laplace eigenvalue $\lambda_\varphi = \frac{1}{4} + t_\varphi^2 > 0$. Then φ is an eigenfunction of the hyperbolic Laplacian Δ , all of the Hecke operators, and the involution T_{-1} sending $\varphi(z)$ to $\varphi(-\bar{z})$. The eigenvalue W_φ of φ for T_{-1} is either 1 or -1 , leading to the respective Fourier expansions

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(x + iy) &= \rho(\varphi) \sqrt{y} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_\varphi(m) K_{it_\varphi}(2\pi my) \cos(2\pi mx), \\ \varphi(x + iy) &= \rho(\varphi) \sqrt{y} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_\varphi(m) K_{it_\varphi}(2\pi my) \sin(2\pi nx), \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho(\varphi)$ is a positive normalizing constant. We consider the family

$$\mathcal{F}(Q) := \{\varphi : \lambda_\varphi q_\varphi \in (Q, 2Q]\}.$$

The estimate

$$(4.2) \quad |\mathcal{F}(Q)| \asymp Q^2$$

follows from the work of Brumley and Milićević in [4].

Let $(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be the sequence of Hecke–Maaß cusp forms on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ normalized to have Petersson norm 1, and let $E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it)$ denote a real-analytic Eisenstein series. With $z = x + iy$, let

$$\langle f, g \rangle_q := \int_{\Gamma_0(q) \backslash \mathbb{H}} f(z) \overline{g(z)} d\mu(z)$$

be the level q Petersson inner product. For $H \in C_b(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$ and a Hecke–Maaß newform φ on $\Gamma_0(q_\varphi) \backslash \mathbb{H}$, we define

$$\mu_\varphi(H) = \int_{\Gamma_0(q_\varphi) \backslash \mathbb{H}} |\varphi(z)|^2 H(z) d\mu(z) = \langle H, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}.$$

We always consider φ to be normalized so that μ_φ is a probability measure. Subject to this normalization, we take the positive constant $\rho(\varphi)$ in (4.1) to be such that $\lambda_\varphi(1) = 1$.

4.1. Preliminaries. Let $B(w, r)$ be an injective geodesic ball on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ of radius r centered at $w \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, and let $\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}$ be its indicator function. We will study the discrepancy

$$D(\mu_\varphi) = \sup_{\substack{B(w,r) \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H} \\ r > 0, w \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}}} \left| \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) \right|.$$

Choose $T \geq e$ and define

$$D^T(\mu_\varphi) := \sup_{\substack{B(w,r) \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H} \\ w \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}, \operatorname{Im}(w) \geq T}} \left| \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_B) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_B) \right|,$$

$$D_T(\mu_\varphi) := \sup_{\substack{B(w,r) \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H} \\ w \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}, \operatorname{Im}(w) < T}} \left| \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_B) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_B) \right|.$$

Note that $D(\mu_\varphi) = \max\{D_T(\mu_\varphi), D^T(\mu_\varphi)\}$. We first bound $D^T(\mu_\varphi)$ using the work of Soundararajan [35].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$. If $T \geq e$, then $D^T(\mu_\varphi) \ll (\log T)/\sqrt{T}$.*

Proof. Consider an injective geodesic ball $B(w, r)$ with $\operatorname{Im}(w) \geq T$. Observe that

$$\left| \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) \right| \leq \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) + \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) \leq \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) + O(T^{-2})$$

and

$$\mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w,r)}) \ll \int_{\substack{|x| \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ y \geq T}} |\varphi(x + iy)|^2 \frac{dx dy}{y^2}.$$

We expand φ according to (4.1) and apply Parseval's identity to obtain

$$\int_{\substack{|x| \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ y \geq T}} |\varphi(x + iy)|^2 \frac{dx dy}{y^2} = \frac{\rho(\varphi)^2}{2} \int_1^\infty |K_{ir}(2\pi t)|^2 \sum_{m \leq t/T} |\lambda_\varphi(m)|^2 \frac{dt}{t}.$$

Since φ is has trivial nebentypus, the Hecke relations [13, (0.3)] give us

$$\lambda_\varphi(m_1) \lambda_\varphi(m_2) = \sum_{\substack{d | \gcd(m_1, m_2) \\ \gcd(d, q) = 1}} \lambda_\varphi\left(\frac{m_1 m_2}{d^2}\right).$$

Consequently, for integers $m, m_1, m_2 \geq 1$ and a prime p , we have the bounds

$$|\lambda_\varphi(p)|^2 \leq 3 + |\lambda_\varphi(p^2)|, \quad |\lambda_\varphi(mp^2)| \leq |\lambda_\varphi(p^2) \lambda_\varphi(m)| + |\lambda_\varphi(m)| + \left| \lambda_\varphi\left(\frac{m}{p^2}\right) \right|,$$

$$|\lambda_\varphi(m_1) \lambda_\varphi(m_2)| \leq \sum_{d | \gcd(m_1, m_2)} \left| \lambda_\varphi\left(\frac{m_1 m_2}{d^2}\right) \right|, \quad |\lambda_\varphi(mp)| \leq |\lambda_\varphi(m) \lambda_\varphi(p)| + \left| \lambda_\varphi\left(\frac{m}{p}\right) \right|.$$

With these inequalities along with the multiplicative structure of the Hecke eigenvalues $\lambda_\varphi(m)$, we can mimic the proof of [35, Theorem 3] and conclude that

$$\sum_{m \leq x/y} |\lambda_\varphi(m)|^2 \ll \frac{\log(ey)}{\sqrt{y}} \sum_{m \leq x} |\lambda_\varphi(m)|^2, \quad 1 \leq y \leq x,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho(\varphi)^2}{2} \int_1^\infty |K_{ir}(2\pi t)|^2 \sum_{m \leq t/T} |\lambda_\varphi(m)|^2 \frac{dt}{t} &\ll \frac{\log T}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{\rho(\varphi)^2}{2} \int_1^\infty |K_{ir}(2\pi t)|^2 \sum_{m \leq t} |\lambda_\varphi(m)|^2 \frac{dt}{t} \\ &= \frac{\log T}{\sqrt{T}} \int_{\substack{|x| \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ y \geq 1}} |\varphi(x + iy)|^2 \frac{dx dy}{y^2} \\ &= \frac{\log T}{\sqrt{T}} \mu_\varphi(\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re}(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \operatorname{Im}(z) \geq 1\}). \end{aligned}$$

Since φ is normalized so that μ_φ is a probability measure and there exists a fundamental domain of $\Gamma_0(q) \backslash \mathbb{H}$ containing the set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Re}(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \operatorname{Im}(z) \geq 1\}$, the preceding display is $\ll (\log T)/\sqrt{T}$. The result follows. \square

We next bound $D_T(\mu_\varphi)$. Our first step in this regard is to bound this in terms of a spectral expansion on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ in terms of Hecke–Maaß cusp forms φ_k on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ with spectral parameter t_k and Eisenstein series $E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$. If $M, T \geq e$, then*

$$D_T(\mu_\varphi)^2 \ll M^{-2} + (1 + M^{-3}T) \left(\sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 + \int_{|t| \leq M} |\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 dt \right)$$

with an absolute implied constant.

Proof. We follow the strategy in [29, Section 5], which we include for completeness. Let $B(w, r) \subseteq \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ be an injective geodesic ball centered at $w \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ satisfying $\operatorname{Im}(w) < T$. Define

$$k_r(z, w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d(z, w) < r, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad K_r(z, w) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} k_r(\gamma z, w).$$

Here

$$d(z, w) := \log \frac{|z - \bar{w}| + |z - w|}{|z - \bar{w}| - |z - w|}$$

is the hyperbolic distance between two points z and w in \mathbb{H} . It follows from these definitions that $K_r(z, w) = \mathbf{1}_{B(w, r)}(z)$. We spectrally expand $K_r(z, w)$ using [19, Theorem 15.7]. If $h_r(t)$ is the Selberg–Harish-Chandra transform of $k_r(z, w)$ (see [19, Lemma 15.6]), then

$$(4.3) \quad K_r(z, w) = \frac{3}{\pi} h_r\left(\frac{i}{2}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_r(t_k) \varphi_k(z) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_r(t) E(z, \frac{1}{2} + it) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} dt.$$

We smooth the sum and the integral in (4.3) as follows. Let $\psi_\varepsilon(z, w)$ be a nonnegative mollifier supported inside of a ball of radius ε with the property that $\int_{\mathbb{H}} \psi_\varepsilon(z, w) d\mu(z) = 1$. We can and will choose $\psi_\varepsilon(z, w)$ so that $\psi_\varepsilon(z, w) \ll \varepsilon^{-2}$ and its Selberg–Harish-Chandra transform $h^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies $|h^{(\varepsilon)}(t)| \ll 1$ for $|t| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$ and is rapidly decreasing for $|t| > \varepsilon^{-1}$.

Given $B(w, r)$ as above, we consider $B(\zeta, r - 2\varepsilon)$ and $B(\zeta, r + 2\varepsilon)$, subject to the convention that if $r \leq 2\varepsilon$, then $\mathbf{1}_{B(\zeta, r - 2\varepsilon)}$ is identically zero. For a function $F(z)$ on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$, we define

$$\bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(z, w) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \psi_\varepsilon(\gamma z, w), \quad (F * \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon)(z) := \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} F(w) \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(w, z) d\mu(w).$$

It follows by construction that $k_{r-2\varepsilon} * \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(z) \leq \mathbf{1}_{B(w, r)}(z) \leq k_{r+2\varepsilon} * \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(z)$. These two convolutions have the following expansions per [29, Equation 48]:

$$\begin{aligned} k_{r \pm 2\varepsilon} * \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(z) &= \frac{3}{\pi} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon} \left(\frac{i}{2} \right) h^{(\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{i}{2} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \varphi_k(z) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t) E(z, \frac{1}{2} + it) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

For any $H \in L^2(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$, we by [19, Theorem 15.5] and the definition of μ_φ that

$$\mu_\varphi(H) = \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(H) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle H, \varphi_k \rangle_1 \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle H, E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it) \rangle_1 \langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} dt.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\varphi(k_{r \pm 2\varepsilon} * \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon) &= \frac{3}{\pi} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon} \left(\frac{i}{2} \right) h^{(\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{i}{2} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} \langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} dt. \end{aligned}$$

The inversion formula for the Selberg–Harish-Chandra transform implies that $h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(\frac{i}{2})$ equals $\int_{\mathbb{H}} \psi_\varepsilon(z, w) d\mu(z) = 1$ while $h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(\frac{i}{2}) = \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w, r \pm 2\varepsilon)}) = \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w, r)}) + O(\varepsilon)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mu_\varphi(\mathbf{1}_{B(w, r)}) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu(\mathbf{1}_{B(w, r)}) \right| &\ll \varepsilon + \sum_{\pm} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} \langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} dt \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} D_T(\mu_\varphi)^2 &\ll \varepsilon^2 + \sum_{\pm} \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} \langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} dt \right|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We first handle the contribution from the cuspidal spectrum. Note that by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and our aforementioned decay properties for $h^{(\varepsilon)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) \varphi_k(w)|^2 |h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k)| \right) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 |h^\varepsilon(t_k)| \\ & \ll \left(\sum_{|t_k| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) \varphi_k(w)|^2 \right) \sum_{|t_k| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 + \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.3) that if $\text{Im}(w) \leq T$, then

$$\sum_{|t_k| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) \varphi_k(w)|^2 \ll \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} |K_{r+2\varepsilon}(z, w)|^2 d\mu(z) \ll 1 + \varepsilon^3 T,$$

hence

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t_k) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t_k) \overline{\varphi_k(w)} \langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} \right|^2 \ll (1 + \varepsilon^3 T) \sum_{|t_k| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2.$$

A verbatim argument for the contribution from the continuous spectrum shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h_{r \pm 2\varepsilon}(t) h^{(\varepsilon)}(t) \overline{E(w, \frac{1}{2} + it)} \langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi} dt \right|^2 \\ & \ll (1 + \varepsilon^3 T) \int_{|t| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 dt + \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma now follows by replacing ε with $1/M$. \square

4.2. Relating inner products to L -functions. We now relate the inner products $|\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2$ and $|\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2$ in Lemma 4.2 to values of L -functions on the critical line. Let $q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}$ be the arithmetic conductor of the adjoint lift $\text{Ad } \varphi$. The positive integer $q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}$ is a perfect square satisfying $\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}} \mid q_\varphi$. Moreover, we have $\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}} = q_\varphi$ if and only if q_φ is squarefree [32, Proposition 2.5].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\varepsilon' > 0$, and let $W_k = W(\varphi_k) \in \{-1, 1\}$ be the root number of φ_k . We have*

$$|\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 \ll_{\varepsilon'} (q_\varphi(3 + |t_\varphi|))^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}} (3 + |t_k|)^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}} \frac{(1 + W_k) q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}}}{q_\varphi} \right)^{1-2\vartheta} L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k)}{(3 + |t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi - t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi + t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

where $\vartheta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ is the best known exponent towards the generalized Ramanujan conjecture.

Remark. The value $\vartheta = \frac{7}{64}$ is admissible by work of Kim and Sarnak [21, Appendix 2], so that if φ is any Hecke–Maaß newform and p is any prime, then $|\lambda_\varphi(p)| \leq p^{7/64} + p^{-7/64}$. We also point out that $L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k)$ is nonnegative via work of Lapid [26].

Proof. Nelson, Pitale, and Saha [32, Corollary 2.8, Theorem 3.1, and Proposition 3.3] proved that

$$|\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 \leq (1 + W_k) \frac{10^{5\omega(q_\varphi/\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad}}\varphi})} \Lambda(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) \Lambda(\frac{1}{2}, \varphi_k)}{8q_\varphi \Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \varphi)^2 \Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)} \tau\left(\frac{q_\varphi}{\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad}}\varphi}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{q_\varphi}{\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad}}\varphi}}\right)^{2\theta},$$

where $\omega(n)$ is the number of prime divisors of n and $\tau(n)$ is the number of divisors of n . While they state their results in the case where φ is in fact a holomorphic cuspidal newform of weight k , level q , and trivial nebentypus, their calculations are purely local. Therefore, their result carries over to Hecke–Maaß newforms having trivial nebentypus without any changes. This uses [40, Theorem 2] to show that the archimedean normalized local integral I_∞^* in [32, Theorem 3.1] equals 1 if φ_k is even and 0 if φ_k is odd.

In [13], it is shown that for all $\varepsilon' > 0$, we have

$$(4.4) \quad L(1, \text{Ad } \varphi)^{-1} \ll_{\varepsilon'} (q_\varphi(3 + |t_\varphi|))^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}}, \quad L(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)^{-1} \ll_{\varepsilon'} (3 + |t_k|)^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}}.$$

If φ is dihedral, then the upper bound on $L(1, \text{Ad } \varphi)^{-1}$ is ineffective because it relies on Siegel’s ineffective upper bound on $L(1, \chi)^{-1}$, where χ is a primitive quadratic Dirichlet character. The lemma now follows from the definition of $q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}$, Stirling’s formula (see [7] for a similar computation), and the convexity bound for $L(\frac{1}{2}, \varphi_k)$. \square

Lemma 4.4. *If $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$, then*

$$|\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 \ll_{\varepsilon'} (q_\varphi(3 + |t_\varphi|))^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}} (3 + |t|)^{\frac{\varepsilon'}{2}} \frac{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad}}\varphi}}{q_\varphi}\right)^{1-2\theta} |L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \text{Ad } \varphi)|^2}{(3 + |t|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi - t|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi + t|)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. This is proved using the local calculations of Nelson, Pitale, and Saha in [32, Corollary 2.8] the unfolding method, the convexity bound for the Riemann zeta function, Stirling’s formula, and (4.4). \square

In order to bound the desired averages of the inner products in Lemmata 4.3 and 4.4, we require an understanding of the central values of the pertinent L -functions on average. We obtain such an understanding using Proposition 3.3. In doing so, we shall identify a Hecke–Maaß newform φ with its corresponding cuspidal automorphic representation $\pi_\varphi \in \mathfrak{F}_2$. Abusing notation, we use φ and π_φ interchangeably. The analytic conductors of φ and φ_k satisfy $C(\varphi) \asymp (3 + |t_\varphi|)^2$ and $C(\varphi_k) \asymp (3 + |t_k|)^2$, respectively.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $1 \leq M \leq Q^{1/22}$. The set*

$$\mathcal{E}_1(Q, M) := \{\text{Ad } \varphi : \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), \text{ there exists } t \in [-M, M] \text{ such that} \\ |L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \text{Ad } \varphi)| \geq (q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}(3 + |t_\varphi|)^2(3 + |t|)^3)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12}\varepsilon}\}$$

has cardinality $O_\varepsilon(Q^{2\varepsilon})$. Additionally, the set

$$\mathcal{E}_2(Q, M) := \{\text{Ad } \varphi : \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), \text{ there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that} \\ L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) \geq (q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2(3 + |t_\varphi|)^4(3 + |t_k|)^6)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12}\varepsilon}\}$$

has cardinality $O_\varepsilon(M^2 Q^{2\varepsilon})$.

Proof. We give the details for the second part only; the details for the first part are simpler. We will separately estimate the cardinalities of the nondihedral subfamily

$\{\text{Ad } \varphi: \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), \varphi \text{ nondihedral, there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that}$

$$L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) \geq (q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4 (3 + |t_k|)^6)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}$$

and the dihedral subfamily

$\{\text{Ad } \varphi: \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), \varphi \text{ dihedral, there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that}$

$$L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) \geq (q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4 (3 + |t_k|)^6)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}.$$

If $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$ is nondihedral, then it follows from work of Gelbart and Jacquet [10] that $\text{Ad } \pi_\varphi \in \mathfrak{F}_3$, and $C(\text{Ad } \varphi) \leq 4C(\varphi)^2$. Therefore, by the above discussion, Proposition 3.3 implies that the cardinality of the nondihedral subfamily is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_3(16Q^2): |L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \pi \times \pi_{\varphi_k})| \geq (C(\pi)^2 C(\pi_{\varphi_k})^3)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}| \\ &\ll_\varepsilon Q^{2\varepsilon} |\{\varphi_k: |t_k| \leq M\}|. \end{aligned}$$

This is $O_\varepsilon(M^2 Q^{2\varepsilon})$ by the Weyl law [18, Chapter 11]

$$(4.5) \quad |\{t_k: |t_k| \leq M\}| = \frac{1}{12} M^2 + O(M \log M).$$

If $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ is dihedral, then there exists a real quadratic extension E/\mathbb{Q} of discriminant $D > 1$ and a Hecke character χ of E with arithmetic conductor \mathfrak{q} such that φ is the automorphic induction of χ ; in particular, φ has arithmetic conductor $q_\varphi = DN_{E/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{q})$ with $N_{E/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{q}) \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ [15, Lemma 4.2]¹. The adjoint lift of φ has the isobaric decomposition $\text{Ad } \varphi = \chi_D \boxplus \varphi' \otimes \chi_D$, where φ' is the automorphic induction of χ^2 and χ_D denotes the primitive Dirichlet character modulo D corresponding to E/\mathbb{Q} . This gives us the factorization

$$L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) = L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \varphi_k \otimes \chi_D) L(\tfrac{1}{2}, (\varphi' \otimes \chi_D) \times \varphi_k),$$

and both central L -values on the right-hand side are nonnegative [39]. It follows that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$ is dihedral, the discriminant of the associated real quadratic field E satisfies $D \leq \sqrt{2Q}$, while the analytic conductor of $C(\varphi_k \otimes \chi_D)$ is $D^2 C(\varphi_k)$, and

$$C((\varphi' \otimes \chi_D) \times \varphi_k) = q_{\varphi' \otimes \chi_D}^2 (3 + |2t_\varphi + t_k|)^2 (3 + |2t_\varphi - t_k|)^2,$$

where $Dq_{\varphi' \otimes \chi_D}$ is a perfect square for which $\sqrt{Dq_{\varphi' \otimes \chi_D}} \mid q_\varphi$, so that $q_{\varphi' \otimes \chi_D} \leq 4Q^2$. So the cardinality of the dihedral subfamily is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\{D \leq \sqrt{2Q}: L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \varphi_k \otimes \chi_D) \geq (D^2 C(\varphi_k))^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_2(4Q^2): |L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \pi \otimes \pi_{\varphi_k})| \geq (C(\pi)^2 C(\varphi_k)^2)^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}|. \end{aligned}$$

¹It is erroneously stated in [15, Lemma 4.2] that $N_{E/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{q}) = D$. Daniel Hu alerted the first author that in fact only the weaker statement $N_{E/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{q}) \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ is true.

By Proposition 3.3 and (4.5), this is $O_\varepsilon(M^2Q^{2\varepsilon})$. The proposition follows by combining the dihedral and nondihedral subfamilies. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$. Let $1 \leq M \leq Q^{1/22}$. If $\text{Ad } \varphi \notin \mathcal{E}_1(Q, M)$, then*

$$\int_{|t| \leq M} |\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 dt \ll_{\varepsilon'} (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{\varepsilon' - 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon} M^{\frac{7}{2}}.$$

Also, if $\text{Ad } \varphi \notin \mathcal{E}_2(Q, M)$, then

$$\sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 \ll_{\varepsilon'} (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{\varepsilon' - 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon} M^{\frac{7}{2}}.$$

Proof. We give the details for the second part only; the details for the first part are simpler. Note that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$, then $\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi \asymp Q$. By Lemma 4.3, we have that

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 \ll_{\varepsilon'} Q^{\varepsilon'} \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} \frac{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}}/q_\varphi)^{1-2\vartheta} L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k)}{(3 + |t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi - t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi + t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proposition 4.5 and [36, Example 3] ensure that for all k such that $|t_k| \leq M$, we have the bound

$$L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{Ad } \varphi \times \varphi_k) \ll \begin{cases} [q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4 (3 + |t_k|)^6]^{\frac{1}{4}} & \text{if } \text{Ad } \varphi \in \mathcal{E}_1(Q, M), \\ [q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4 (3 + |t_k|)^6]^{\frac{1}{4} - 6 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon} & \text{if } \text{Ad } \varphi \notin \mathcal{E}_1(Q, M). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, if $\text{Ad } \varphi \notin \mathcal{E}_2(Q, M)$, then (4.6) is

$$(4.7) \quad \ll_{\varepsilon'} Q^{\varepsilon'} \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} \frac{(\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}}/q_\varphi)^{1-2\vartheta} (3 + |t_k|)(3 + |t_\varphi|)}{(q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4)^{6\varepsilon/10^{12}} (3 + |2t_\varphi - t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi + t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Since $\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}} \mid q_\varphi$ (with equality if and only if q_φ is squarefree) and $\vartheta = \frac{7}{64}$, we have

$$(\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}}/q_\varphi)^{1-2\vartheta} \leq 1, \quad \frac{(\sqrt{q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}}/q_\varphi)^{1-2\vartheta}}{(q_{\text{Ad } \varphi}^2 (3 + |t_\varphi|)^4)^{6\varepsilon/10^{12}}} \ll Q^{-1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon}.$$

The bound

$$\frac{(3 + |t_k|)(3 + |t_\varphi|)}{(3 + |2t_\varphi - t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}} (3 + |2t_\varphi + t_k|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \ll 1 + |t_k|^{\frac{3}{2}} \ll M^{\frac{3}{2}}$$

holds since the supremum of the left-hand side as t_φ varies is achieved when $2t_\varphi = \pm t_k$. Therefore, by the above discussion and (4.5), (4.7) is

$$\ll_{\varepsilon'} Q^{\varepsilon' - 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon} M^{\frac{7}{2}} \asymp_{\varepsilon'} (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{\varepsilon' - 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon} M^{\frac{7}{2}}. \quad \square$$

4.3. Proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let

$$T \geq e, \quad 1 \leq M \leq Q^{\frac{1}{22}}, \quad \varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0.$$

By Lemmata 4.1 and 4.2, we find that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$, then $D(\mu_\varphi)^2$ is

$$\ll \frac{(\log T)^2}{T} + \frac{1}{M^2} + \left(1 + \frac{T}{M^3}\right) \left(\sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\langle \varphi_k, |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 + \int_{|t| \leq M} |\langle E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it), |\varphi|^2 \rangle_{q_\varphi}|^2 dt \right).$$

Recall $\mathcal{E}_1(Q, M)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(Q, M)$ from Proposition 4.5. If $\text{Ad } \varphi \notin \mathcal{E}_1(Q, M) \cup \mathcal{E}_2(Q, M)$, then by Corollary 4.6, we have the bound

$$D(\mu_\varphi)^2 \ll_{\varepsilon'} \frac{(\log T)^2}{T} + \frac{1}{M^2} + \left(1 + \frac{T}{M^3}\right) (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{\varepsilon' - 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \varepsilon} M^{\frac{7}{2}}.$$

We choose Q to be large with respect to ε , and we choose

$$A = \frac{6875 \cdot 10^8}{3}, \quad T = Q^{\frac{\varepsilon}{A}}, \quad M = Q^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2A}}, \quad \varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{10^{20}}.$$

Noting that $|\mathcal{E}_1(Q, M)| + |\mathcal{E}_2(Q, M)| \ll_\varepsilon M^2 Q^{2\varepsilon}$ by Proposition 4.5, we find that

$$|\{\text{Ad } \varphi: \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), D(\mu_\varphi) \geq (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{-2.18 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}| \ll_\varepsilon Q^{(2 + \frac{1}{A})\varepsilon}.$$

Rescaling ε to $\varepsilon/(2 + 1/A)$, we conclude that

$$|\{\text{Ad } \varphi: \varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q), D(\mu_\varphi) \geq (\lambda_\varphi q_\varphi)^{-1.08 \times 10^{-12} \varepsilon}\}| \ll_\varepsilon Q^\varepsilon,$$

which is stronger than what Theorem 2.1 asserts. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Given $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$, define $m(\varphi, Q) := \{\varphi' \in \mathcal{F}(Q): \text{Ad } \varphi = \text{Ad } \varphi'\}$. By [33, Theorem 4.1.2], if q_φ is squarefree, then $m(\varphi, Q) = 1$. Otherwise, for all $\delta > 0$, we have the bound $m(\varphi, Q) \ll_\delta Q^{1/2 + \delta}$. In light of the bound (4.2) and the fact that the convexity bound for L -functions yields $|D(\mu_\varphi)| \ll 1$, Corollary 2.2 follows immediately from Theorem 2.1. \square

5. NONSPLIT QUANTUM ERGODICITY

Let $E = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ be a real quadratic field with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_E , where $D > 0$ is a fundamental discriminant; we assume for simplicity that E has narrow class number 1. Let σ be the nontrivial Galois automorphism of E . Given

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E),$$

define

$$\gamma z := \frac{az + b}{cz + d}, \quad \sigma(\gamma)z := \frac{\sigma(a)z + \sigma(b)}{\sigma(c)z + \sigma(d)}.$$

A Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form of level \mathcal{O}_E is an L^2 -normalized smooth function $\phi: \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which

- ϕ is a joint eigenfunction of the weight 0 Laplacians

$$\Delta_1 := -y_1^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_1^2} \right), \quad \Delta_2 := -y_2^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_2^2} \right)$$

for $(z_1, z_2) = (x_1 + iy_1, x_2 + iy_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, so that there exist $t_{1,\phi}, t_{2,\phi} \in \mathbb{R} \cup i[-\frac{7}{64}, \frac{7}{64}]$ such that if $\lambda_{1,\phi} = \frac{1}{4} + t_{1,\phi}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,\phi} = \frac{1}{4} + t_{2,\phi}^2$, then

$$\Delta_1 \phi(z_1, z_2) = \lambda_{1,\phi} \phi(z_1, z_2), \quad \Delta_2 \phi(z_1, z_2) = \lambda_{2,\phi} \phi(z_1, z_2),$$

- ϕ is automorphic, so that if $\gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)$, then $\phi(\gamma z_1, \sigma(\gamma) z_2) = \phi(z_1, z_2)$,
- ϕ is of moderate growth,
- ϕ is cuspidal, and
- ϕ is a joint eigenfunction of every Hecke operator.

There is a diagonal embedding $\mathbb{H} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ given by the map $z \mapsto (z, z)$. A Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form ϕ is Γ -invariant when restricted to the diagonal embedding of \mathbb{H} ; thus $\phi(z, z)$ may be viewed as the restriction of a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form to the modular surface $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$.

5.1. Period integrals involving Hilbert Maaß cusp forms. We consider $\phi(z, z)$ integrated over $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ against a Laplacian eigenfunction H . By assumption, ϕ is L^2 -normalized, so that

$$\int_{\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}} |\phi(z_1, z_2)|^2 d\mu(z_1, z_2) = 1, \quad d\mu(z_1, z_2) := \frac{dx_1 dx_2 dy_1 dy_2}{y_1^2 y_2^2}.$$

We have that $\mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}) = 2\sqrt{D}\xi_E(2)$, where $\xi_E(s) := D^{s/2}\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s)^2\zeta_E(s)$ denotes the completed Dedekind zeta function. There are three cases of interest:

- (1) H is a constant,
- (2) H is an Eisenstein series,
- (3) H is a Hecke–Maaß cusp form.

In each case, the corresponding period integral $\int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z)H(z) d\mu(z)$ may be associated to certain L -functions, as we now elucidate; we postpone the proofs of these identities to Section 5.2.

5.1.1. Nonsplit quantum limits. We first consider the case of $H = 1$. We completely classify the possible values of $\int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) d\mu(z)$; we may think of these possible values as quantum limits in this nonsplit setting.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix a real quadratic number field $E = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ with narrow class number 1, and denote by χ_D the quadratic Dirichlet character modulo D associated to E . Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form with positive first Fourier coefficient. Then*

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) d\mu(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{D^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad} \varphi \otimes \chi_D)}{\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad} \varphi)}} & \text{if } \phi \text{ is the base change of a nondihedral Hecke–Maaß} \\ & \text{newform } \varphi \text{ of weight 0, level } D, \text{ nebentypus } \chi_D, \text{ and} \\ & \text{Laplacian eigenvalue } \lambda_\varphi = \lambda_{1, \phi} = \lambda_{2, \phi}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark. From this, one can readily show that there exist absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that if ϕ is indeed the base change of φ , then

$$(5.2) \quad \exp(-c_1 \sqrt{\log C(\mathrm{As} \phi)}) \ll_D \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) d\mu(z) \ll_D \exp(c_2 \sqrt{\log C(\mathrm{As} \phi)}).$$

These are consequences of [2, 13, 27].

5.1.2. Restrictions of Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp forms and Eisenstein series. Next, we take H to be an Eisenstein series $E(z, \frac{1}{2} + it)$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 5.2 (Cf. [8, Lemma 4.3]). *Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form with positive first Fourier coefficient, and suppose that $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$(5.3) \quad \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) E(z, \tfrac{1}{2} + it) d\mu(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} D^{\frac{1}{4}}} \frac{\Lambda(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \text{As } \phi)}{\sqrt{\Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \phi)} \xi(1 + 2it)}.$$

Here $\text{As } \phi$ denotes the Asai transfer of ϕ , as introduced in [1], while $\xi(s) := \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s) \zeta(s)$ denotes the completed Riemann zeta function.

5.1.3. *Restrictions of Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp forms and Hecke–Maaß cusp forms.* Finally, we take H to be a Hecke–Maaß cusp form φ_j .

Lemma 5.3 (Cf. [8, Theorem 5.6]). *Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form and let φ_k be a Hecke–Maaß cusp form on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$ of parity $W_k \in \{1, -1\}$. Then*

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) \varphi_k(z) d\mu(z) \right|^2 = \frac{1 + W_k}{8\sqrt{D}} \frac{\Lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k)}{\Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \phi) \Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)}.$$

Remark. The central L -value $L(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k)$ is nonnegative [26].

5.1.4. *Conditional bounds.* For the sake of posterity, we record bounds towards these period integrals under the assumption of the generalized Lindelöf hypothesis.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume the generalized Lindelöf hypothesis. Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form and let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$\int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) E(z, \tfrac{1}{2} + it) d\mu(z) \ll_{D, t, \varepsilon} C(\text{As } \phi)^{-\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, let φ_k be a Hecke–Maaß cusp form on $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$. Then

$$\int_{\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) \varphi_k(z) d\mu(z) \ll_{D, t_k, \varepsilon} C(\text{As } \phi)^{-\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We prove the latter; the former follows similarly. Via Lemma 5.3, it suffices to show that

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{\Lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k)}{\Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \phi) \Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)} \ll_{D, t_k, \varepsilon} C(\text{As } \phi)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon},$$

and we may assume without loss of generality that $W_k = 1$. The generalized Lindelöf hypothesis bounds the L -functions present on the left-hand side of (5.4) by $O_{D, t_k, \varepsilon}(C(\text{As } \phi)^\varepsilon)$. The gamma factors present on the left-hand side of (5.4) are equal to

$$\frac{\prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2, \pm_3} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(\tfrac{1}{2} \pm_1 it_{1, \phi} \pm_2 it_{2, \phi} \pm_3 it_k)}{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1)^2 \prod_{\pm} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \pm 2it_{1, \phi}) \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \pm 2it_{2, \phi}) \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \pm 2it_k)}.$$

By Stirling’s formula, this is asymptotic to

$$8\pi^{-\pi \Omega(t_k, t_{1, \phi}, t_{2, \phi})} \prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} (3 + |t_{1, \phi} \pm_1 t_{2, \phi} \pm_2 t_k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$(5.5) \quad \Omega(t, t_{1,\phi}, t_{2,\phi}) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |t_{1,\phi}| \geq |t_{2,\phi}| \text{ and } |t_{1,\phi}| - |t_{2,\phi}| \leq |t| \leq |t_{1,\phi}| + |t_{2,\phi}| \\ & \text{or } |t_{2,\phi}| \geq |t_{1,\phi}| \text{ and } |t_{2,\phi}| - |t_{1,\phi}| \leq |t| \leq |t_{1,\phi}| + |t_{2,\phi}|, \\ |t_{1,\phi}| - |t_{2,\phi}| - |t| & \text{if } |t_{1,\phi}| \geq |t_{2,\phi}| \text{ and } |t| \leq |t_{1,\phi}| - |t_{2,\phi}|, \\ |t_{2,\phi}| - |t_{1,\phi}| - |t| & \text{if } |t_{2,\phi}| \geq |t_{1,\phi}| \text{ and } |t| \leq |t_{2,\phi}| - |t_{1,\phi}|, \\ |t| - |t_{1,\phi}| - |t_{2,\phi}| & \text{if } |t| \geq |t_{1,\phi}| + |t_{2,\phi}|. \end{cases}$$

The result then follows. \square

5.1.5. *Unconditional bounds.* As an application of Proposition 3.3, we are able to unconditionally prove subconvex bounds towards these period integrals provided one excises a sparse subfamily of Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp forms. In order to show this, we first require some auxiliary results on fibers of the Asai transfer.

Lemma 5.5. *Let E be a real quadratic extension of \mathbb{Q} with narrow class number 1, and let Π and Π' be cuspidal automorphic representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$ of arithmetic conductor \mathcal{O}_E . The Asai transfers $\mathrm{As}\Pi$ and $\mathrm{As}\Pi'$ are equal if and only if $\Pi' \in \{\Pi, \Pi^\sigma\}$, where σ generates $\mathrm{Gal}(E/\mathbb{Q})$.*

Proof. From [23, Theorem 7.1], if Π and Π' are cuspidal automorphic representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$ for which $\mathrm{As}\Pi = \mathrm{As}\Pi'$, then there exists a Hecke character ω of $E^\times \backslash \mathbb{A}_E^\times$ such that either $\Pi = \Pi' \otimes \omega$ or $\Pi^\sigma = \Pi' \otimes \omega$. Since Π and Π' are of arithmetic conductor \mathcal{O}_E , and hence are unramified at every nonarchimedean place, ω must also be unramified at every nonarchimedean place. The number of such characters is the narrow class number of E . Since the narrow class number equals 1 by hypothesis, ω must be the trivial character. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let E be a real quadratic extension of \mathbb{Q} with narrow class number 1, and let Π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$ of arithmetic conductor \mathcal{O}_E . If $\mathrm{As}\Pi$ is noncuspidal, then Π is the base change of a nondihedral cuspidal automorphic representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$ of arithmetic conductor D , and central character $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$, the quadratic Hecke character of $\mathbb{Q}^\times \backslash \mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q}^\times$ corresponding to the quadratic extension E/\mathbb{Q} . We have the isobaric decomposition $\mathrm{As}\Pi = (\mathrm{Ad}\pi \otimes \omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}) \boxplus \mathbb{1}$, and π is unique up to a twist by $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$. Finally, if Π and Π' are the base changes of π and π' respectively, then $\mathrm{Ad}\pi = \mathrm{Ad}\pi'$ if and only if $\Pi = \Pi'$.*

Proof. Necessarily, Π must be nondihedral, since it is unramified at every nonarchimedean place, so [24, Theorem B (a)] implies that $\mathrm{As}\Pi$ is noncuspidal if and only if $\Pi = \Pi^\sigma$. From the work of Langlands [25], the condition $\Pi = \Pi^\sigma$ can only be met if Π is the base change of a cuspidal automorphic representation π of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$. In this case, the automorphic induction of Π to an automorphic representation $\mathcal{AI}_{E/\mathbb{Q}}\Pi$ of $\mathrm{GL}_4(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$ is noncuspidal and has the isobaric decomposition $\pi \boxplus (\pi \otimes \omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}})$. By comparing these representations, we see that the central character of π must be $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$ and the arithmetic conductor of π must be D .

The cuspidal automorphic representation π must be unique up to a twist by $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$, since it is shown in [25] that two cuspidal automorphic representations π and π' of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$ have identical base change if and only if $\pi' = \pi \otimes \omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$. Furthermore, Krishnamurthy [24, Theorem B (c)] has established the isobaric decomposition $\mathrm{As}\Pi = (\mathrm{Ad}\pi \otimes \omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}) \boxplus \mathbb{1}$.

Next, we observe that π must be nondihedral, for otherwise there would exist some Hecke character χ of $E^\times \backslash \mathbb{A}_E^\times$ such that π is the automorphic induction $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{I}_{E/\mathbb{Q}}\chi$ of χ , but then Π would have the isobaric decomposition $\chi \boxplus \chi$, and in particular would not be cuspidal.

Finally, we note that if $\text{Ad } \pi = \text{Ad } \pi'$, then from [33, Theorem 4.1.2], there must exist a Hecke character ω of $\mathbb{Q}^\times \backslash \mathbb{A}_E^\times$ such that $\pi = \pi' \otimes \omega$. Since π and π' both have arithmetic conductor D and central character $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$, necessarily ω is either trivial or equal to $\omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$; in either case, the base change of π' must be equal to that of π . \square

We may use Lemma 5.6 to give a lower bound for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) := \{\phi : Q < C(\text{As } \phi) \leq 2Q\}$.

Lemma 5.7. *If $Q \geq 1$, then $|\mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)| \gg_D \sqrt{Q}$.*

Proof. By positivity, it suffices to bound from below the number of $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)$ that are a base change, as in Lemma 5.6. This is precisely the number of nondihedral Hecke–Maaß newforms φ of weight 0, level D , nebentypus χ_D , and spectral parameter $t_\varphi \in (\frac{\sqrt{Q}}{3} - 3, \frac{\sqrt{2Q}}{3} - 3]$, which is $\gg_D \sqrt{Q}$ by (4.5). \square

We now apply Proposition 3.3 to prove subconvex bounds for almost all period integrals.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $1 \leq M \leq Q^{1/22}$. The set*

$$\mathcal{D}_1(Q, M) := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : \text{there exists } t \in [-M, M] \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. L\left(\frac{1}{2} + it, \text{As } \phi\right) \geq C(\text{As } \phi)^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon}{18 \cdot 10^{11}}} (1 + |t|) \right\}$$

has cardinality $O_{D,\varepsilon}(Q^\varepsilon)$. Additionally, the set

$$\mathcal{D}_2(Q, M) := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : \text{there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. L\left(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k\right) \geq C(\text{As } \phi)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}}} C(\varphi_k) \right\}$$

has cardinality $O_{D,\varepsilon}(M^2 Q^\varepsilon)$.

Proof. We give the details for the second part only; the details for the first part are simpler. Given a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)$ with archimedean spectral parameters $t_{1,\phi}$ and $t_{2,\phi}$, let Π denote the underlying cuspidal automorphic representation of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$. This has arithmetic conductor \mathcal{O}_E , and its two archimedean components are principal series representations with spectral parameters $t_{1,\phi}$ and $t_{2,\phi}$. The Asai transfer $\text{As } \Pi$ of Π is an automorphic representation of $\text{GL}_4(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$ of analytic conductor $C(\text{As } \phi)D$. If Π is the base change of π , as in Lemma 5.6, then as π is nondihedral, $\text{Ad } \pi \otimes \omega_{E/\mathbb{Q}}$ is a cuspidal automorphic representation of $\text{GL}_3(\mathbb{A}_\mathbb{Q})$ and also has analytic conductor $C(\text{As } \phi)D$.

We now bound the cardinality of $\mathcal{D}_2(Q, M)$ by separately estimating the cardinalities of the cuspidal Asai transfer subfamily

$$\left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : \text{As } \phi \text{ cuspidal, there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. L\left(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k\right) \geq C(\text{As } \phi)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}}} C(\varphi_k) \right\}$$

and the noncuspidal Asai transfer subfamily

$$\left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q) : \text{As } \phi \text{ noncuspidal, there exists } \varphi_k \text{ with } |t_k| \leq M \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. L\left(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k\right) \geq C(\text{As } \phi)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}}} C(\varphi_k) \right\}$$

The cardinality of the cuspidal Asai transfer subfamily is

$$\ll \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_4(2DQ) : |L(\frac{1}{2}, \pi \times \pi_{\varphi_k})| \geq C(\pi)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}}} C(\pi_{\varphi_k})\}|.$$

By Proposition 3.3 and the Weyl law (4.5), this is $O_{D,\varepsilon}(M^2 Q^\varepsilon)$.

Next, if $\text{As } \phi$ is noncuspidal, Lemma 5.5 shows that there exists a Hecke–Maaß newform φ of arithmetic conductor D and nebentypus χ_D such that $L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi \times \varphi_k) = L(\frac{1}{2}, (\text{Ad } \varphi \otimes \chi_D) \times \varphi_k) L(\frac{1}{2}, \varphi_k)$, and this map from ϕ to $\text{Ad } \varphi \otimes \chi_D$ is injective. Upon invoking the convexity bound for $L(\frac{1}{2}, \pi_{\varphi_k})$, we deduce that the cardinality of the noncuspidal transfer family is

$$\ll \sum_{|t_k| \leq M} |\{\pi \in \mathfrak{F}_3(2DQ) : |L(\frac{1}{2}, \pi \times \pi_{\varphi_k})| \geq C(\pi)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}}} C(\pi_{\varphi_k})^{\frac{1}{2}}\}|.$$

Again by Proposition 3.3 and the Weyl law (4.5), this is $O_{D,\varepsilon}(M^2 Q^\varepsilon)$. \square

5.2. Proofs of Lemmata 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3. The Fourier expansion of a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form ϕ is

$$(5.6) \quad \phi(z_1, z_2) = \rho(\phi) \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_E \\ \alpha \neq 0}} \lambda_\phi(\alpha) \sqrt{y_1} K_{it_1, \phi} \left(\frac{2\pi|\alpha|y_1}{\sqrt{D}} \right) \sqrt{y_2} K_{it_2, \phi} \left(\frac{2\pi|\sigma(\alpha)|y_2}{\sqrt{D}} \right) e \left(\frac{\alpha x_1 - \sigma(\alpha)x_2}{\sqrt{D}} \right).$$

The positive constant $\rho(\phi)$ ensures that ϕ is L^2 -normalized with respect to the measure $d\mu$ on $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. An exact formula for $\rho(\phi)$ is given below.

Lemma 5.9 ([8, Lemma 3.2]). *Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form. Then*

$$(5.7) \quad \rho(\phi)^2 = \frac{8}{\sqrt{D}} \frac{1}{\Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \phi)}.$$

Proof. This is essentially proven in [8, Lemma 3.2], albeit with some minor errata; we sketch the main ideas. First, we let Φ denote the adèlic lift of ϕ . Then by [39, Proposition 6] and [8, (3.16)], we have that

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\text{Z}(\mathbb{A}_E)\text{GL}_2(E) \backslash \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)} |\Phi(g)|^2 dg = \frac{1}{8} \rho(\phi)^2 \frac{\Lambda(1, \text{Ad } \phi)}{\xi_E(2)}.$$

Here dg denotes the Tamagawa measure, so that $\text{Z}(\mathbb{A}_E)\text{GL}_2(E) \backslash \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$ has volume 2, and we have taken $q = 1$ in [8, (3.16)] and corrected the erroneous factor $2^{-2\delta_D}$ to instead be $1/16$. Our result differs additionally from that in [8, (3.16)] since our definition (3.5) of the completed L -function includes the arithmetic conductor and the discriminant. It remains to note that

$$\int_{\text{Z}(\mathbb{A}_E)\text{GL}_2(E) \backslash \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)} |\Phi(g)|^2 dg = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}\xi_E(2)} \int_{\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \backslash \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}} |\phi(z_1, z_2)|^2 d\mu(z_1, z_2),$$

where the normalising factor comes from comparing the volume of $Z(\mathbb{A}_E)\mathrm{GL}_2(E)\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)$ with respect to the Tamagawa measure to that of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)\backslash\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}$ with respect to $d\mu$. \square

Lemma 5.10 (Cf. [8, Lemma 4.3]). *Let ϕ be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form, and suppose that $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$. Then*

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z)E(z, s) d\mu(z) = \frac{1}{4}\rho(\phi)\frac{\Lambda(s, \mathrm{As}\phi)}{\xi(2s)}.$$

Proof. Consider the integral

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z)E(z, s) d\mu(z).$$

By unfolding via the automorphy of $\phi(z, z)$ and then inserting the expansion (5.6), this equals

$$\rho(\phi) \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_E \\ \alpha \neq 0}} \lambda_\phi(\alpha) \int_0^\infty K_{it_{1,\phi}}\left(\frac{2\pi|\alpha|y}{\sqrt{D}}\right) K_{it_{2,\phi}}\left(\frac{2\pi|\sigma(\alpha)|y}{\sqrt{D}}\right) y^{s-1} dy \int_0^1 e\left(\frac{(\alpha - \sigma(\alpha))x}{\sqrt{D}}\right) dx.$$

The integral over x vanishes unless $\alpha = \sigma(\alpha)$, so that $\alpha = m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, in which case it is equal to 1. The remaining integral over y is equal to

$$\frac{D^{s/2} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + it_{1,\phi} + it_{2,\phi})\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + it_{1,\phi} - it_{2,\phi})\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s - it_{1,\phi} + it_{2,\phi})\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s - it_{1,\phi} - it_{2,\phi})}{8|m|^s \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(2s)}$$

by [12, 6.576.4], while just as in [1, Theorem 2], we have that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}} \frac{\lambda_\phi(m)}{|m|^s} = \frac{2L(s, \mathrm{As}\phi)}{\zeta(2s)}.$$

The desired identity thereby follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Taking the residue of both sides of (5.9) at $s = 1$, we see that

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) d\mu(z) = \frac{1}{2}\rho(\phi) \mathrm{Res}_{s=1} \Lambda(s, \mathrm{As}\phi).$$

From Lemma 5.6, $\Lambda(s, \mathrm{As}\phi)$ has a pole at $s = 1$ if and only if ϕ is the base change of a nondihedral Hecke–Maaß cuspidal newform φ of weight 0, level D , and nebentypus χ_D . If this is the case, then $\Lambda(s, \mathrm{As}\phi) = \Lambda(s, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi \otimes \chi_D)\xi(s)$, and consequently

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z) d\mu(z) = \frac{1}{2}\rho(\phi)\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi \otimes \chi_D).$$

Finally, we note that $\Lambda(s, \mathrm{Ad}\phi) = \Lambda(s, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi)\Lambda(s, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi \otimes \chi_D)$, and so from (5.7), we have that $\rho(\phi) = 2\sqrt{2}D^{-1/4}(\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi)\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad}\varphi \otimes \chi_D))^{-1/2}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.2. This follows from (5.9) via analytic continuation. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. If $W_k = -1$, then the result follows upon making the change of variables $z \mapsto -\bar{z}$. Otherwise, we apply [8, Theorem 5.6], which states that

$$\left| \int_{Z(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})} \Phi(h, h)\Psi_k(h) dh \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\xi_E(2)}{\xi(2)} \frac{\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{As} \phi \times \varphi_k)}{\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad} \phi)\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad} \varphi_k)} \\ \times \int_{Z(\mathbb{A}_E)\mathrm{GL}_2(E)\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_E)} |\Phi(g)|^2 dg \int_{Z(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})} |\Psi_k(h)|^2 dh.$$

Here all measures involved are the Tamagawa measures, Φ denotes the adèlic lift of ϕ , Ψ_k denotes the adèlic lift of φ_k , and we have used [8, Proposition 6.14] to determine the local constants arising from the archimedean place. The left-hand side is equal to

$$\frac{6}{\pi} \left| \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} \phi(z, z)\varphi_k(z) d\mu(z) \right|^2,$$

where the normalising factor comes from comparing the volume of $Z(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ with respect to the Tamagawa measure to that of $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}$ with respect to $d\mu$, while via (5.8), the right-hand side is equal to

$$\frac{3}{16\pi} \rho(\phi)^2 \frac{\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{As} \phi \times \varphi_k)}{\Lambda(1, \mathrm{Ad} \varphi_k)},$$

since

$$\int_{Z(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})\backslash\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}})} |\Psi_k(h)|^2 dh = \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} |\varphi_k(z)|^2 d\mu(z) = \frac{6}{\pi}$$

as φ_k is L^2 -normalized. It remains to insert the identity (5.7). \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2.4. Given $H \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H})$, we consider

$$(5.10) \quad \mathcal{D}_j(H) := \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} H(z) d\mu_j(z) - \frac{3}{\pi} \mu_j(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}) \int_{\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}} H(z) d\mu(z).$$

Lemma 5.11. *Let ϕ_j be a Hilbert Hecke–Maaß cusp form. If $H \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H})$, then for any $0 < \varepsilon' < \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$(5.11) \quad |\mathcal{D}_j(H)|^2 \ll_{H,D,\varepsilon'} C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon'} \sum_{|t_k| \leq C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}} L(\frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{As} \phi_j \times \varphi_k) \\ + C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon'} \int_{-C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}}^{C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}} |L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \mathrm{As} \phi_j)|^2 dt + C(\mathrm{As} \phi_j)^{-100}.$$

Proof. By the spectral decomposition of H , Lemmata 5.2 and 5.3, and Stirling's formula, $|\mathcal{D}_j(H)|$ is

$$\ll_D \sum_{\varphi_k} |\langle H, \varphi_k \rangle| \left(\frac{L(\frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{As} \phi_j \times \varphi_k)}{L(1, \mathrm{Ad} \phi_j)L(1, \mathrm{Ad} \varphi_k)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\Omega(t_k, t_{1,j}, t_{2,j})} \prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} (3 + |t_{1,j} \pm_1 t_{2,j} \pm_2 t_k|)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \\ + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle H, E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it) \rangle| \frac{|L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \mathrm{As} \phi_j)|}{L(1, \mathrm{Ad} \phi_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\zeta(1 + 2it)|} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\Omega(t, t_{1,j}, t_{2,j})} \prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} (3 + |t_{1,j} \pm_1 t_{2,j} \pm_2 t|)^{-\frac{1}{4}} dt,$$

where $\Omega(t, t_{1,j}, t_{2,j})$ is as in (5.5). Since H is smooth and the Laplacian is self-adjoint, we have that $\langle H, \varphi_k \rangle = \lambda_k^{-N} \langle \Delta^N H, \varphi_k \rangle$ and $\langle H, E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it) \rangle = (\frac{1}{4} + t^2)^{-N} \langle \Delta^N H, E(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it) \rangle$ for any nonnegative integer N . By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Bessel’s inequality, we deduce that for any nonnegative integer N ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}_j(H)|^2 &\ll_{D,N} \|\Delta^N H\|_2^2 \sum_{\varphi_k} \frac{L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi_j \times \varphi_k)}{L(1, \text{Ad } \phi_j) L(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)} (3 + |t_k|)^{-4N} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\pi\Omega(t_k, t_{1,j}, t_{2,j})} \prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} (3 + |t_{1,j} \pm_1 t_{2,j} \pm_2 t_k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ \|\Delta^N H\|_2^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \text{As } \phi_j)|^2}{L(1, \text{Ad } \phi_j) |\zeta(1 + 2it)|^2} (3 + |t|)^{-4N} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\pi\Omega(t, t_{1,j}, t_{2,j})} \prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} (3 + |t_{1,j} \pm_1 t_{2,j} \pm_2 t|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Taking N sufficiently large, we see that we may truncate the sum over φ_k to $|t_k| \leq C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}$ and the integral over t to $|t| \leq C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}$ at the cost of an error term of size $O_{H,D}(C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-100})$. The desired bound (5.11) for $|\mathcal{D}_j(H)|^2$ then follows from the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} L(1, \text{Ad } \phi_j)^{-1} &\ll_{D, \varepsilon'} C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}, \quad L(1, \text{Ad } \varphi_k)^{-1} \ll_{\varepsilon'} C(\varphi_k)^{\varepsilon'}, \\ |\zeta(1 + 2it)|^{-2} &\ll_{\varepsilon'} (3 + |t|)^{\varepsilon'}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $\mathcal{D}_1(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})$ and $\mathcal{D}_2(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})$ be as in Proposition 5.8. Let ϕ_j be an element of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)$. If $\phi_j \notin \mathcal{D}_1(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})$, we have via Proposition 5.8 that

$$C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon'} \int_{-C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}}^{C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}} |L(\frac{1}{2} + it, \text{As } \phi_j)|^2 dt \ll_{\varepsilon'} C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}} + 4\varepsilon'}.$$

Similarly, if $\phi_j \notin \mathcal{D}_2(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})$, we have via Proposition 5.8 and the Weyl law (4.5) that

$$C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon'} \sum_{|t_k| \leq C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{\varepsilon'}} L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi_j \times \varphi_k) \ll_{\varepsilon'} C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}} + 5\varepsilon'}.$$

By (5.11), we deduce that if $\phi_j \notin \mathcal{D}_1(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'}) \cup \mathcal{D}_2(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})$, then

$$\mathcal{D}_j(H) \ll_{H,D,\varepsilon'} C(\text{As } \phi_j)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{9 \cdot 10^{11}} + 5\varepsilon'}.$$

By Proposition 5.8, we have that $|\mathcal{D}_1(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})| + |\mathcal{D}_2(Q, Q^{\varepsilon'})| \ll_{D,\varepsilon'} Q^{\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon'}$. We finish by taking $\varepsilon' = \frac{1}{5} \cdot 10^{-13} \varepsilon$ and rescaling ε . \square

5.4. Nonsplit quantum ergodicity for imaginary quadratic fields. Finally, we consider the analogous problem in the setting of imaginary quadratic fields instead of real quadratic fields. Let $E = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ be an imaginary quadratic field with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_E , where $D < 0$ is a fundamental discriminant; we assume for simplicity that E has class number 1. In place of $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H} \cong (\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})) / (\text{SO}(2) \times \text{SO}(2))$, we work on hyperbolic three-space $\mathbb{H}^3 \cong \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) / \text{SU}(2)$, where we identify \mathbb{H}^3 with the subspace $\{P = x + iy + jr : x, r \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0\}$ of the Hamiltonian quaternions. A Bianchi Hecke–Maaß cusp form of level \mathcal{O}_E is an L^2 -normalized smooth function $\phi : \mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which

- ϕ is an eigenfunction of the weight 0 Laplacian

$$\Delta := -y^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} \right) + y \frac{\partial}{\partial y},$$

so that $\Delta\phi(P) = \lambda_\phi\phi(P)$ for some $\lambda_\phi = 1 + 4t_\phi^2$ (and necessarily $t_\phi \in \mathbb{R} \cup -i[-\frac{7}{64}, \frac{7}{64}]$),

- ϕ is automorphic, so that $\phi(\gamma P) = \phi(P)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E)$, where

$$\gamma P := (aP + b)(cP + d)^{-1}, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

with the inverse and multiplication performed in the quaternion division algebra,

- ϕ is of moderate growth,
- ϕ is cuspidal, and
- ϕ is a joint eigenfunction of every Hecke operator.

There is an embedding $\mathbb{H} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{H}^3$ given by the map $x + iy \mapsto x + iy$; we write z for both the element $x + iy \in \mathbb{H}^2$ and for $x + iy \in \mathbb{H}^3$. A Bianchi Hecke–Maaß cusp form ϕ is $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ -invariant when restricted to this embedding; thus $\phi(z)$ may be viewed as the restriction of a Bianchi Hecke–Maaß cusp form to the modular surface $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}$.

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is by the same methods as that of Theorem 2.4; we therefore do not give details but rather highlight what alterations must be made. There are two major differences between the proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.6. The first difference is that although the analogues of Lemmata 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 are valid in this setting, the bounds (5.2) for $\mu_j(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H})$ instead become

$$C(\phi_j)^{-1/8} \exp(-c_1 \sqrt{\log C(\phi_j)}) \ll_D \mu_j(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}) \ll_D C(\phi_j)^{-1/8} \exp(c_2 \sqrt{\log C(\phi_j)})$$

(cf. [14, p. 2]). This polynomial decay in $C(\phi) := (3 + |t_\phi|)^4$ is why we must include the additional factor $C(\phi_j)^{1/8}$ in (2.4). This polynomial decay stems from the fact that in this setting, the square root of the gamma factors occurring in the completed L -functions on the right-hand side of (5.1) are

$$\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(2) \prod_{\pm} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(2 \pm 2it_\phi)}{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1) \prod_{\pm} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \pm 2it_\phi)}},$$

and by Stirling’s formula, this is asymptotic to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}(3 + |t_\phi|)^{-1/2} \asymp C(\phi)^{-1/8}$. The second difference is that the gamma factors present on the left-hand side of (5.4) are instead

$$\frac{\prod_{\pm_1, \pm_2} \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{1}{2} \pm_1 2it_\phi \pm_2 it_k) \prod_{\pm} \Gamma_{\mathbb{C}}(\frac{1}{2} \pm it_k)}{\Gamma_{\mathbb{C}}(1) \prod_{\pm} \Gamma_{\mathbb{C}}(1 \pm 2it_\phi) \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \pm 2it_k)},$$

where $\Gamma_{\mathbb{C}}(s) := 2(2\pi)^{-s}\Gamma(s)$. By Stirling’s approximation, this is asymptotic to

$$4\pi^2 e^{-\pi\Omega(t_k, t_\phi)} (3 + |t_\phi|)^{-1} \prod_{\pm} (3 + |2t_\phi \pm t_k|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \Omega(t, t_\phi) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |t| \leq 2|t_\phi|, \\ |t| - 2|t_\phi| & \text{if } |t| \geq 2|t_\phi|, \end{cases}$$

while

$$C(\mathrm{As}\phi \times \varphi_k) = (3 + |t_k|)^4 (3 + |2t_\phi + t_k|)^2 (3 + |2t_\phi - t_k|)^2.$$

For this reason, showing that $|\mathcal{D}_j(H)| < C(\phi_j)^{-1/8-\delta}$ for almost all $\phi_j \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)$ essentially reduces to showing that $L(\frac{1}{2}, \text{As } \phi_j \times \phi_k) < Q^{1/4-2\delta}$ for almost all $\phi_j \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{As}}(Q)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Asai. On certain Dirichlet series associated with Hilbert modular forms and Rankin's method. *Math. Ann.*, 226(1):81–94, 1977.
- [2] W. D. Banks. Twisted symmetric-square L -functions and the nonexistence of Siegel zeros on $\text{GL}(3)$. *Duke Math. J.*, 87(2):343–353, 1997.
- [3] F. Brumley. Effective multiplicity one on GL_N and narrow zero-free regions for Rankin-Selberg L -functions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 128(6):1455–1474, 2006.
- [4] F. Brumley and D. Milićević. Counting cusp forms by analytic conductor. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*. Accepted for publication.
- [5] F. Brumley, J. Thorner, and A. Zaman. Zeros of Rankin-Selberg L -functions at the edge of the critical strip. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(5):1471–1541, 2022. With an appendix by Colin J. Bushnell and Guy Henniart.
- [6] C. J. Bushnell and G. Henniart. An upper bound on conductors for pairs. *J. Number Theory*, 65(2):183–196, 1997.
- [7] J. Buttcane and R. Khan. On the fourth moment of Hecke–Maass forms and the random wave conjecture. *Compos. Math.*, 153(7):1479–1511, 2017.
- [8] Y. Cheng. Special value formula for the twisted triple product L -function and an application to the restricted L^2 -norm problem. *Forum Math.*, 33(1):59–108, 2021.
- [9] Y. Colin de Verdière. Ergodicité et fonctions propres du laplacien. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 102(3):497–502, 1985.
- [10] S. Gelbart and H. Jacquet. A relation between automorphic representations of $\text{GL}(2)$ and $\text{GL}(3)$. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 11(4):471–542, 1978.
- [11] R. Godement and H. Jacquet. *Zeta functions of simple algebras*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 260. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1972.
- [12] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik. *Table of integrals, series, and products*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, eighth edition, 2015. Translated from the Russian. Translation edited and with a preface by Daniel Zwillinger and Victor Moll.
- [13] J. Hoffstein and P. Lockhart. Coefficients of Maass forms and the Siegel zero. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 140(1):161–181, 1994. With an appendix by Dorian Goldfeld, Jeffrey Hoffstein and Daniel Lieman.
- [14] J. Hou. Bounds for the periods of eigenfunctions on arithmetic hyperbolic 3-manifolds over surfaces. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2304.04863, Apr. 2023.
- [15] P. Humphries. Spectral multiplicity for Maaß newforms of non-squarefree level. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2019(18):5703–5743, 2019.
- [16] P. Humphries. Standard zero-free regions for Rankin-Selberg L -functions via sieve theory. *Math. Z.*, 292(3–4):1105–1122, 2019. With an appendix by Farrell Brumley.
- [17] P. Humphries and J. Thorner. Zeros of Rankin-Selberg L -functions in families. *Compos. Math.* Accepted for publication.
- [18] H. Iwaniec. *Spectral methods of automorphic forms*, volume 53 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Revista Matemática Iberoamericana, Madrid, second edition, 2002.
- [19] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. *Analytic number theory*, volume 53 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [20] H. Jacquet, I. I. Piatetskii-Shapiro, and J. A. Shalika. Rankin-Selberg convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 105(2):367–464, 1983.
- [21] H. H. Kim. Functoriality for the exterior square of GL_4 and the symmetric fourth of GL_2 . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(1):139–183, 2003. With appendix 1 by Dinakar Ramakrishnan and appendix 2 by Henry H. Kim and Peter Sarnak.
- [22] E. Kowalski, P. Michel, and J. VanderKam. Rankin-Selberg L -functions in the level aspect. *Duke Math. J.*, 114(1):123–191, 2002.

- [23] M. Krishnamurthy. The Asai transfer to GL_4 via the Langlands-Shahidi method. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2003(41):2221–2254, 2003.
- [24] M. Krishnamurthy. Determination of cusp forms on $GL(2)$ by coefficients restricted to quadratic subfields (with an appendix by Dipendra Prasad and Dinakar Ramakrishnan). *J. Number Theory*, 132(6):1359–1384, 2012.
- [25] R. P. Langlands. *Base change for $GL(2)$* , volume 96 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1980.
- [26] E. M. Lapid. On the nonnegativity of Rankin-Selberg L -functions at the center of symmetry. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2003(2):65–75, 2003.
- [27] X. Li. Upper bounds on L -functions at the edge of the critical strip. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2010(4):727–755, 2010.
- [28] E. Lindenstrauss. Invariant measures and arithmetic quantum unique ergodicity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 163(1):165–219, 2006.
- [29] W. Z. Luo and P. Sarnak. Quantum ergodicity of eigenfunctions on $PSL_2(\mathbf{Z})\backslash\mathbf{H}^2$. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 81:207–237, 1995.
- [30] C. Mœglin and J.-L. Waldspurger. Le spectre résiduel de $GL(n)$. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 22(4):605–674, 1989.
- [31] P. D. Nelson. Quadratic Hecke Sums and Mass Equidistribution. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 05 2021. rnab093.
- [32] P. D. Nelson, A. Pitale, and A. Saha. Bounds for Rankin–Selberg integrals and quantum unique ergodicity for powerful levels. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 27(1):147–191, 2014.
- [33] D. Ramakrishnan. Modularity of the Rankin-Selberg L -series, and multiplicity one for $SL(2)$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 152(1):45–111, 2000.
- [34] Z. Rudnick and P. Sarnak. The behaviour of eigenstates of arithmetic hyperbolic manifolds. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 161(1):195–213, 1994.
- [35] K. Soundararajan. Quantum unique ergodicity for $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})\backslash\mathbb{H}$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 172(2):1529–1538, 2010.
- [36] K. Soundararajan and J. Thorner. Weak subconvexity without a Ramanujan hypothesis. *Duke Math. J.*, 168:1231–1268, 2019. With an appendix by Farrell Brumley.
- [37] G. Steil. Eigenvalues of the Laplacian and of the Hecke operators for $PSL(2, \mathbf{Z})$. Technical Report DESY 94-028, Hamburg, 1994.
- [38] A. I. Šnirel'man. Ergodic properties of eigenfunctions. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 29(6(180)):181–182, 1974.
- [39] J.-L. Waldspurger. Sur les valeurs de certaines fonctions L automorphes en leur centre de symétrie. *Compositio Math.*, 54(2):173–242, 1985.
- [40] T. C. Watson. *Rankin triple products and quantum chaos*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2002. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Princeton University.
- [41] M. P. Young. The quantum unique ergodicity conjecture for thin sets. *Adv. Math.*, 286:958–1016, 2016.
- [42] S. Zelditch. Uniform distribution of eigenfunctions on compact hyperbolic surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 55(4):919–941, 1987.
- [43] S. Zelditch. Selberg trace formulae and equidistribution theorems for closed geodesics and Laplace eigenfunctions: finite area surfaces. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 96(465):vi+102, 1992.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22904, USA
Email address: pchlumphries@gmail.com
URL: <https://sites.google.com/view/peterhumphries/>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, IL 61801, USA
Email address: jesse.thorner@gmail.com