

ON VU'S THEOREM IN WARING'S PROBLEM FOR THINNER SEQUENCES

JAVIER PLIEGO

ABSTRACT. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq k(\log k + 3.20032)$. Let \mathbb{N}_0^k be the set of k -th powers of nonnegative integers. Assume that ψ is an increasing function tending to infinity with $\psi(x) = o(\log x)$ and satisfying some regularity conditions. Then, there exists a subsequence $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which the number of representations $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k)$ of each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$n = x_1^k + \dots + x_s^k \quad x_i^k \in \mathfrak{X}_k$$

satisfies the asymptotic formula

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \sim \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n)$$

for almost all natural numbers n , with $\mathfrak{S}(n)$ being the singular series associated to Waring's problem. If moreover $s \geq k(\log k + 4.20032)$ the above conclusion holds for almost all $n \in [X, X + \log X]$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $T(k)$ be the least natural number for which it is known that all large integers are the sum of $T(k)$ k -th powers of natural numbers. We also show for $k \geq 14$ and every $s \geq T(k)$ the existence of a sequence $\mathfrak{X}'_k \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}'_k) \asymp \log n$$

for every sufficiently large n . The latter conclusion sharpens a result of Wooley and addresses a question of Vu.

1. INTRODUCTION

Problems about asymptotic basis of order s , which are defined as subsequences $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$ for which every sufficiently large natural number is the sum of s elements in \mathfrak{B} , constitute a central topic in additive number theory. Among these, finding the least number $G(k)$ with property that the set \mathbb{N}_0^k of k -th powers of nonnegative integers is an asymptotic basis of order $G(k)$ plays a prominent role, a recent article of Brudern-Wooley [1] delivering in its simplest formulation the bound

$$G(k) \leq \lceil k(\log k + 4.20032) \rceil. \tag{1.1}$$

It seems natural to enquire whether there is a subbasis $\mathfrak{X}_k \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ with the corresponding number of representations of each natural number being small. We then denote for given $\mathfrak{X}_k \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k)$ to the number of solutions of

$$n = x_1^k + \dots + x_s^k, \quad x_i^k \in \mathfrak{X}_k.$$

Answering a query of Nathanson [19] about the existence for some $s = s(k)$ of an asymptotic basis $\mathfrak{X}_k \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ of order s satisfying $|\mathfrak{X}_k \cap [1, X]| \ll X^{1/s+o(1)}$, Vu [29] in fact showed that there are indeed sequences as above satisfying the stronger proviso

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \asymp \log n. \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11B13, 11B34, 11P05, 11P55, 05D40;

Key words and phrases. Asymptotic basis, probabilistic method, Waring's problem, circle method.

The preceding result remedied the deficiency of literature for the instance $k \geq 3$ save those in [5, 19] (see [4, 9, 21, 30, 37] for the case $k = 2$) and matched what was already known for the analogous linear problem [12] with respect to the size of $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k)$.

In contrast, the conclusions pertaining to the number of variables were far beyond the bounds for $G(k)$ available, it being implicit in Vu's work that $s \gg k^4 8^k$. This matter was essentially resolved soon after by Wooley [34]. The arguments of that paper thus roughly speaking showed that whenever technology from the Hardy-Littlewood method permits to derive a bound of the shape $G(k) \leq T(k)$ for some function $T(k)$ then for every

$$s \geq T(k) + 2 \tag{1.3}$$

there would exist $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying (1.2).

Two central questions emerge if one were to go beyond the aforementioned work. Namely, whether the conclusion (1.2) may be refined by either an asymptotic formula or an analogous formula with $\log n$ being replaced by some function $\psi(n) = o(\log n)$, and whether the two extra variables underlying (1.3) could be eliminated. In order to address the second one we define for each natural number s the parameter $\Delta_{2s} = \Delta_{2s}(k)$ to be the unique solution of the equation

$$\Delta_{2s} e^{\Delta_{2s}/k} = k e^{1-2s/k}.$$

We further present for convenience

$$\tau(k) = \max_{w \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{k - 2\Delta_{2w}}{4w^2} \tag{1.4}$$

and the function

$$G_0(k) = \min_{\substack{v \geq 1 \\ v \in \mathbb{N}}} \left(2v + \frac{\Delta_{2v}}{\tau(k)} \right). \tag{1.5}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $k, s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \geq \max(\lfloor G_0(k) \rfloor + 1, 4k + 1)$. There exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which whenever n is a sufficiently large integer in terms of k and s then*

$$\log n \ll R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \ll \log n. \tag{1.6}$$

In particular, the cardinality of the truncated sequence satisfies

$$|\mathfrak{X}_k \cap [1, X]| \asymp (X \log X)^{1/s}. \tag{1.7}$$

We remark that despite having only considered even numbers $2v$ in the definition (1.5), as opposed to [1, (6.11)], the same quantitative conclusions as therein are deduced by following their ideas to provide an upper bound for $G_0(k)$ in the upcoming corollaries. The term $4k + 1$ may be improved with more work, such a refinement having no impact in the main results of the paper.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq k(\log k + 4.20032)$. Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying (1.6) for every sufficiently large integer n and (1.7).*

We observe in view of (1.1) that the above result is best possible with respect to the constraint in the number of variables, the approach in [34] leading to (1.3) combined with (1.1) having delivered an analogous conclusion but with $s \geq k(\log k + 4.20032) + 2$. In order to present another ensuing consequence we denote by ω to the unique real solution with $\omega \geq 1$ of the trascental equation

$$\omega - 2 - 1/\omega = \log \omega. \tag{1.8}$$

We then put

$$C_1 = 2 + \log(\omega^2 - 3 - 2/\omega), \quad C_2 = \frac{\omega^2 + 3\omega - 2}{\omega^2 - \omega - 2}, \quad (1.9)$$

and note that $C_1 = 4.200189\dots$ and $C_2 = 3.015478\dots$

Corollary 1.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq \lceil k(\log k + C_1) + C_2 \rceil - 1$. Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying (1.6) for every sufficiently large integer n and (1.7). Moreover, the same conclusion holds when $14 \leq k \leq 20$ and $s \geq H(k)$, where $H(k)$ is defined in the following table:*

k	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
$H(k)$	89	97	105	113	121	129	137

In view of the preceding corollaries and the conclusions derived in [1] we note that the restriction on s in the above results matches that in the literature pertaining to Waring's problem whenever $k \geq 14$. We thereby replace (1.3) by $s \geq T(k)$ for the smallest currently known $T(k)$ satisfying $G(k) \leq T(k)$ and thus eliminate the two extra variables required hitherto. We also announce our intention to return in a latter occasion to investigate the instance $k \leq 13$.

Despite asymptotic formulae of $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1)$ for the linear case being present in earlier work, no analogous evaluations had previously been obtained for higher powers. For such purposes we first say that a function $\psi(t)$ is of *uniform growth* when $\psi(t)$ is a positive function of a positive variable t , increasing monotonically to infinity. We also say that it is of *uniform growth with exponent ε* if moreover one has $\psi(t) = O(t^\varepsilon)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. We may further consider functions with the additional property that there exists another function φ of uniform growth such that

$$\psi(n/\varphi(n)) \sim \psi(n), \quad (1.10)$$

and write

$$\xi_x = 1 - \frac{\psi(x/\varphi(x))}{\psi(x)}, \quad \xi(x) = \max_{y \in [x, 2x]} \xi_y. \quad (1.11)$$

We also introduce for $k \geq 2$ and $s \geq \max(5, k + 2)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the singular series

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q \left(q^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^q e(ar^k/q) \right)^s e(-an/q). \quad (1.12)$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let k and s be as in either Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.1 or 1.2. Let ψ be a function of uniform growth with exponent ε satisfying (1.10) and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(n)/\log n = \infty$. Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ and a constant $v > 0$ such that whenever n is a sufficiently large integer one has*

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O\left(\psi(n)\left(\xi(n) + \varphi(n)^{-v} + (\log n)^{-v} + \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)^{1/2}\right)\right).$$

We recall that [23, Chapter 4] entails $\mathfrak{S}(n) \asymp 1$ whenever $s \geq 4k + 1$. Other authors have considered slightly different formulations of regularity conditions (see [7, 22]). In particular Erdős [7] had previously imposed $\psi'(t)$ to be continuous, no such strong assumption being

required here. Investigating the sharpest possible conclusions cognate to such matters though is not the purpose of this memoir.

We shift our attention to the discussion after (1.3) and note that in the linear case $k = 1$ it was conjectured by Erdős and Turán [13] that whenever \mathfrak{X}_1 is an asymptotic basis of order 2 then $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1)$ cannot be bounded. It is commonly believed that the analogous conclusion for $s > 2$ should also hold, the first author suggesting that even

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1)}{\log n} > 0 \quad (1.13)$$

might always occur (see [6, 8, 22]). The preceding discussion thereby lends credibility to the belief that $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k)$ when $k \geq 2$ should satisfy the same properties.

In view of Theorem 1.2 it also seems appropriate deliberating whether the estimate (1.2) could in turn be replaced by an asymptotic formula for some sequence \mathfrak{X}_k . We allude to [6, 7], wherein it is conjectured that the statement

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_2(n; \mathfrak{X}_1)}{\log n} = c$$

for any constant $c \neq 0$ is indeed false, it being reasonable to extend such a speculation to the instance $s > 2$. In virtue of the formula stemming from the aforementioned theorem and the preceding remark one would predict for any function $\psi(n)$ of uniform growth satisfying $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$ that

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \sim \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n)$$

cannot hold. We note that as far as the author is concerned, no previous work in the literature hitherto had given account of results concerning the above regime for neither the linear case nor the higher degree one.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq k(\log k + 3.20032)$. Let ψ be a function of uniform growth satisfying (1.10) and $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$. Let $\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ with*

$$\delta(x) \geq C_0(\xi(x) + \varphi(x)^{-v} + (\log x)^{-v} + \psi(x)^{-1/2}(\log \psi(x))^{1/2}) \quad (1.14)$$

for some sufficiently small fixed $v > 0$ and some large enough constant $C_0 > 0$ depending on k, s . Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O(\psi(n)\delta(n)) \quad (1.15)$$

holds for all but $O(Ne^{-\delta(N)^2\psi(N)})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$, and

$$|\mathfrak{X}_k \cap [1, X]| \asymp (X\psi(X))^{1/s}. \quad (1.16)$$

Moreover, if $\psi(n) = o(\log n)$ the bound

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \ll \frac{\log n}{\log \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} \right)} \quad (1.17)$$

holds for all but $O(N^{1-v_k})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$, where $v_k > 0$ is some constant satisfying $v_k^{-1} = k(\log k + O(1))$ for large k . The same conclusions hold for the values of k and s presented in the following table.

k	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
s	71	77	83	91	97	103	111

We illustrate the discussion by putting $\psi(n) = \sqrt{\log n}$ and applying the above theorem to deduce the following.

Corollary 1.3. *Let k, s be as in Theorem 1.3. Then, there exists some constant $v > 0$ and a subset $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which*

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\sqrt{\log n} + O((\log n)^{1/2-v})$$

holds for all but $O(Ne^{-(\log N)^{1/2-v}})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$, and

$$|\mathfrak{X}_k \cap [1, X]| \asymp X^{1/s}(\log X)^{1/2s}.$$

Moreover, the bound

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \ll \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$$

holds for all but $O(N^{1-v_k})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$.

We postpone the discussion concerning the conclusions depending on probabilistic arguments but anticipate that the presence of the exceptional set pertaining to (1.17) is only due to the limitations in the application of the circle method. Such a device becomes more transparent in the upcoming Theorems 1.4 and 1.7. We derive sharper results when s lies on the ranges comprised in Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2 and display the strongest conclusions available concerning the validity of the anticipated asymptotic formula when no number theoretic obstructions occur.

Theorem 1.4. *Let s and k be as in Corollaries 1.1 or 1.2. Let ψ be a function of uniform growth, satisfying (1.10) and $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$, and let $\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ with (1.14). Let $\kappa \geq 1$ be a constant, and ω be a function of uniform growth such that $\omega(N) \ll e^{\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}$. Then, for any collection of sets $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^{N^\kappa}$ with $\mathcal{M}_j(N) \subset [N, 2N]$ for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\frac{(\log N)\omega(N)}{\delta(N)^2\psi(N)} \ll |\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \ll (\log N)e^{\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}$$

there exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which for every sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O(\psi(n)\delta(n)) \tag{1.18}$$

for all but $O(|\mathcal{M}_j(N)|\omega(N)^{-1})$ integers $n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N)$. Moreover, the bound (1.17) occurs for every sufficiently large integer n .

We may derive from the previous theorem the following conclusion in the classical setting of short intervals.

Corollary 1.4. *Let s, k, δ, ψ be as in Theorem 1.4. Then there exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ for which the asymptotic formula (1.18) holds for all but $O(\log X)$ natural numbers $n \in [X, X + (\log X)e^{\delta(X)^2\psi(X)}]$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for every function $\omega(x)$ of uniform growth satisfying $\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} = o(\omega(n))$ there exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ such that*

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \sim \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) \tag{1.19}$$

holds for all but $o(\omega(X))$ integers $n \in [X, X + \omega(X)]$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

It stems from the preceding result that whenever $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$ is of uniform growth, satisfies (1.10), and k, s are as in Corollary 1.4 then in particular (1.19) holds for almost all $n \in [X, X + \log X]$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$. If moreover $\psi(n) \asymp \log n$ then (1.19) holds for any $\omega(x)$ of uniform growth and almost all $n \in [X, X + \omega(X)]$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

The starting point of our proof of the above theorems is largely inspired by that in the memoirs of Vu [29] with respect to the probabilistic ideas and of Wooley [34] with respect to the circle method input. We depart from the latter in the choice of smooth numbers latent in the analysis, the random sequences considered therein comprising k -th powers of integers lying in a subset of the smooth numbers presented via a suitable partition. Such an election alleviates in part the customary pruning process when considering suitably modified weighted smooth Weyl sums at the cost of having weaker pointwise estimates over the minor arcs at one's disposal. Moreover, deriving an asymptotic formula rather than upper and lower bounds of the right order of magnitude for the corresponding counting problem is impracticable. In contrast, the smoothness condition considered herein permits one after performing various manoeuvres and with the aid of new technology [1] to eventually deduce an asymptotic evaluation and enables one to derive pointwise estimates over minor arcs of the same strength than those available in the literature for conventional smooth Weyl sums.

A handful of additional difficulties arise in the context of Theorem 1.3 when examining the preceding problem as soon as the number of variables s distants from the thresholds presented in both Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Rather than merely showing that almost all natural numbers may be written as a sum of s positive k -th powers, one should moreover prove for almost every natural number n that for every $1 \leq d \leq s-1$ and fixed $(y_1, \dots, y_d) \in [1, n^{1/k}]^d$ the number of solutions of

$$n - y_1^k - \dots - y_d^k = x_{d+1}^k + \dots + x_s^k, \quad x_i \in \mathbb{N} \quad (1.20)$$

counted with weights $(x_{d+1} \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}$ with the variables satisfying some smoothing condition is $O(n^{-\tau})$ for some $\tau > 0$. The preceding proviso is required for the application of probabilistic concentration inequalities. Such a big collection of additional counting problems drastically impairs the ensuing conclusions with respect to the range of s , robust estimates for exceptional sets of natural numbers not represented as sums of positive k -th powers being particularly useful in order to bound the above quantities.

Several complications are encountered in the course of obtaining estimates for exceptional sets involving weighted smooth Weyl sums. First, as is done in [34], one is inevitably forced to make a dissection in order to consider sums running over smooth numbers of roughly the same size. When expressing (1.20) via orthogonality as an integral of a product of smooth Weyl sums and performing the above decompositions, one is left to analyse sums of integrals of the shape

$$\int_0^1 \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} g_s(\alpha, P_l, R) e(-\alpha m) d\alpha. \quad (1.21)$$

Here the parameters P_l satisfy $1 \leq P_l \leq P$ with $P = m^{1/k}$ and

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P/2, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k),$$

the set of smooth numbers $\mathcal{A}(P, R)$ being defined in (2.1). However, in order to apply Bessel's inequality effectively to the end of deriving the strongest bounds possible, it transpires that for each collection $(P_l)_{l \leq s-d}$ the choice of major and minor arcs should be uniform. This creates recalcitrant situations whenever the sizes of P_{l_1} and P_{l_2} for some $l_1 \neq l_2$ are significantly different since $g_s(\alpha, P_{l_2}, R)$ over the major arcs cognate to P_{l_1} may no longer exhibit suitable major arc behaviour and viceversa.

Moreover, whenever s is as in Theorems 1.3 or 1.5 it stems from the application of [1, Theorem 5.2] that, upon defining

$$f(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \quad (1.22)$$

then one has for small fixed $c > 0$ and k large enough on the set of extreme minor arcs $\mathfrak{N}(cP^{k/2}, P)$ defined in (2.6) the estimate

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(cP^{k/2}, P)} |f(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \ll P^{2s-k-\log k/10}. \quad (1.23)$$

However, if one were to save a factor of $P^{\log k/10}$ over the trivial bound for the corresponding exceptional set, estimates for the s -th moment over truncated minor arcs of the shape $P^{s-k-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$ should be obtained to such an end. This though may no longer be possible with the current knowledge available when the height Q associated to such minor arcs is of intermediate size. It is also worth noting in view of (1.21) that the parameters P_l may be considerably smaller than P , it thereby no longer being possible saving such a factor by means of the above procedure.

The difficulties outlined above are partially surmounted with the aid of the new technology introduced in [1], which permits one to enlarge the range of heights Q for which mean values restricted to major arcs of such heights may be appropriately estimated. We then make a careful division according to the sizes P_l of the variables and reduce the problem to that of estimating integrals of the shape (1.21) with $(P_l)_{l \leq s-d}$ being suitably close in size so that major arcs corresponding to some P_{l_0} are contained in a moderately enlarged set of major arcs cognate to P_l for each $l \leq s-d$. We also note that the strain underlying the discussion in (1.23) is negotiated in part by exploiting the extra factors appearing as a consequence of the presence of weights. Moreover, the range $200 \leq k \leq 100000$, say, presents additional difficulties which are overcome after tediously optimizing some parameters by a narrow margin.

In order to present an asymptotically sharper version of Theorem 1.3 we allude to (1.9) and derive the following.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large and $s \geq s_0(k)$ for some integer $s_0(k)$ satisfying*

$$s_0(k) = k \left(\log k + C_1 - 1 - \frac{1}{\log k} \right) + O(k(\log k)^{-2}).$$

Then, under the same conditions on ψ, δ as in Theorem 1.3 there exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying (1.15) for all but $O(Ne^{-\delta(N)^2\psi(N)})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$ and (1.16). The same conclusion concerning (1.17) holds for $\nu_k > 0$ with

$$\nu_k^{-1} = k(\log k)^3 + O((\log k)^6).$$

If moreover $s \geq k \left(\log k + C_1 - \frac{e^{C_1-2}}{\log k + C_1} \right)$ then (1.17) holds for all but $O(N^{1-\nu_k})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$, wherein

$$\nu_k = 1/k + O\left(\frac{1}{k \log k}\right). \quad (1.24)$$

It has been thought pertinent to discuss the range in the second part of the above theorem since, as opposed to what its nature suggests, the techniques of [1, 2] are crucially employed in order to estimate the contribution over major arcs of intermediate height arising due to the presence of variables having different sizes.

We recall (1.11) and deem it appropriate observing that if no regularity conditions of the shape (1.10) are assumed for ψ , one may obtain stronger estimates for the exceptional set at the cost of losing asymptotic preciseness.

Theorem 1.6. *Let k and s be as in either Theorem 1.3 or in the first sentence in Theorem 1.5. Let ψ be a function of uniform growth with $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$ and $|\xi_n - 1| \asymp 1$. Then there exists $\mathfrak{X}_k = \mathfrak{X}_k(s) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying (1.16) and*

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_k) \asymp \psi(n)$$

for all but $O(Ne^{-\psi(N)})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$. The same conclusion as in both Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 accordingly concerning (1.17) holds whenever $\psi(n) = o(\log n)$.

We note that one could obtain using the same ideas an analogous conclusion with the underlying function φ being replaced by any positive constant $C > 1$, such a refinement being omitted for the sake of concision. The argument that leads to the above conclusions is drastically alleviated in the linear case $k = 1$ to the extent that no constraints in the number of variables are required and some of the exceptional sets which arose after the application of the circle method are no longer present. No previous results in the regime underlying the last theorems having been given account of hitherto in the literature, it has thereby been thought pertinent to record these herein.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $s \geq 2$. Let ψ be of uniform growth with (1.10) and $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$. Let $\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\delta(x) \geq C_0(x^{-1/s} + \xi(x) + \varphi(x)^{-1/s} + \psi(x)^{-1/2}(\log \psi(x))^{1/2})$$

for some large enough constant $C_0 > 0$. Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_1 = \mathfrak{X}_1(s) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that for every sufficiently large N one has

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1) = \psi(n) + O(\psi(n)\delta(n)) \tag{1.25}$$

for all but $O(Ne^{-\delta(N)^2\psi(N)})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$, and $|\mathfrak{X} \cap [1, X]| \asymp (X\psi(X))^{1/s}$. Moreover, for ω and any collection of sets $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^k$ satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.4 there exists a sequence $\mathfrak{X}_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$ for which (1.25) holds for all but $O(|\mathcal{M}_j(N)|\omega(N)^{-1})$ integers $n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N)$, and analogous conclusions to the ones in Corollary 1.4 hold. In addition, one has for every sufficiently large n the bound

$$R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1) \ll \frac{\log n}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)}. \tag{1.26}$$

We deem it worth observing though that an astute modification of the arguments in [14, 18] would have delivered a similar conclusion concerning the bound $O(Ne^{-\delta(N)^2\psi(N)})$ but essentially no further sharpenings as the ones presented in Theorems 1.4, 1.7 and Corollary 1.4. It is also a noteworthy feature that (1.26), which in particular entails $R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1) = o(\log n)$, holds for sufficiently large n , the property failing in view of (1.13) being that of constituting an asymptotic basis. Moreover, almost all results in problems involving the circle method typically show evidence for the veracity of the corresponding statement, in contrast to what occurs in this setting.

We remark that no similar estimates concerning (1.26) had been obtained hitherto for $s \geq 3$ (see [11] for a result of a similar flavour in a slightly different context when $s = 2$). Previous approaches to obtain upper bounds for random variables of the same nature would typically have had their genesis inter alia on the Sunflower lemma introduced by Erdős and

Tetali [12] or on concentration inequalities of Vu [28] or Kim and Vu [17]. We employ instead that of Janson and Rucinski [16], the others delivering conclusions not sufficient for our purposes.

If on the other hand ψ does not satisfy (1.10), a similar conclusion to that stemming from Theorem 1.6 may be obtained.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $s \geq 2$. Let ψ be a function of uniform growth satisfying $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$ and $|\xi_n - 1| \asymp 1$. Then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{X}_1 = \mathfrak{X}_1(s) \subset \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (1.16) and*

$$\psi(n) \ll R_s(n; \mathfrak{X}_1) \ll \psi(n)$$

for all but $O(Ne^{-\psi(N)})$ integers $n \in [1, N]$. The same conclusion as in Theorem 1.7 concerning (1.26) holds when $\psi(n) = o(\log n)$.

The exposition is structured as follows. We start in Sections 2 and 3 by routinely adapting the new machinery introduced in [1] to the setting of weighted smooth Weyl sums over dyadic intervals. Sections 4 and 5 are primarily devoted to obtain major arc type estimates of sufficient power by either combining Abel summation with classical estimates or following similar ideas as in the original setting. By employing bounds from such sections we perform a pruning process in Section 6 which culminates in Section 7 with the obtention of an asymptotic formula for the number of solutions of

$$n = x_1^k + \dots + x_s^k, \quad x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, R)$$

counted with weights $(x_1 \dots x_s)^{-1+k/s}$, an analogous formula which holds for almost all numbers being derived in Section 8 in the context of Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6. Section 9 concludes the circle method part of the manuscript with an intricate analysis to derive estimates for exceptional sets cognate to (1.20). We provide a sequel of preliminary probabilistic lemmata in Section 10 and prepare the ground for the application of the probabilistic method in Section 11, the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 being completed in Section 12. Sections 13 and 14 contain the bulk of the probabilistic part of Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6, the latter being devoted to provide upper bounds for the representation function and the proofs of the theorems being delivered in Section 15. We conclude the paper in Section 16 with a brief sketch of the proof of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8. We use \ll and \gg to denote Vinogradov's notation, write $f = O(g)$ if $f \ll g$ and $f \asymp g$ whenever $f \ll g$ and $f \gg g$. We write $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ to denote vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$.

Acknowledgements: The author is partially funded by the Curiosity Driven grant "Value distribution of quantum modular forms" of the Università degli Studi di Genova.

2. MEAN VALUE ESTIMATES FOR WEIGHTED WEYL SUMS

We shall devote the present section to prepare the ground by adapting the machinery developed in [1] to the context of weighted smooth Weyl sums relevant to our current needs. To such an end we fix $k \geq 2$ and introduce for $R, P \geq 1$ the set of smooth numbers

$$\mathcal{A}(P, R) = \left\{ n \in [1, P] \cap \mathbb{Z} : p|n \implies p \leq R \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

and the subset $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P, R) = \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P/2, R)$. We recall (1.22), define

$$g(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \quad (2.2)$$

and for each real number $t > 0$ the mean value

$$U_t(P, R) = \int_0^1 |f(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha. \quad (2.3)$$

We say that $\Delta_t >$ is an admissible exponent if for $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ in terms of k, s, ε then whenever $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$ and P is sufficiently large one has

$$U_t(P, R) \ll P^{t-k+\Delta_t+\varepsilon},$$

the underlying implicit constant potentially depending on k, s, ε and η . We further consider for $s \geq 2$ the weighted exponential sums

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k), \quad f_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k). \quad (2.4)$$

For future purposes it may be convenient defining for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ the set

$$\mathcal{C}_q(P, R) = \left\{ n \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) : p|n \implies p|q \right\}$$

and denoting as above $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P, R) = \mathcal{C}_q(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{C}_q(P/2, R)$. It also seems worth introducing for $M \geq 1$ the sums

$$g_{s,q}^*(\alpha, P, M, R) = \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ v > M \\ (v, q) = 1}} v^{-1+k/s} \sum_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P/v, R)} u^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha (uv)^k)$$

and

$$g_{s,q}^\dagger(\alpha, P, M, R) = \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{A}(M, R) \\ (v, q) = 1}} v^{-1+k/s} \sum_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P/v, R)} u^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha (uv)^k).$$

In view of the preceding definitions, it then transpires that for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$ then

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) = g_{s,q}^*(\alpha, P, M, R) + g_{s,q}^\dagger(\alpha, P, M, R). \quad (2.5)$$

Equipped with the above formula we shall compute next mean values over a suitable set of major arcs, it being desirable introducing beforehand for any prime number π the sum

$$g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R) = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{A}(P/m, \pi) \\ (w, q) = 1}} w^{-1+k/s} \sum_{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P/mw, R)} u^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha (uw)^k).$$

Moreover, we also take for $M \geq 1$ the set

$$\mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R) = \left\{ v \in \mathcal{A}(M\pi, R) : v > M, \pi|v \text{ and } \pi'|v \implies \pi' \geq \pi \right\},$$

and make a Hardy-Littlewood dissection of the unit interval as follows. When $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $1 \leq q \leq Q$ we define $\mathfrak{M}_q(Q, P)$ to be the union of the sets

$$\mathfrak{M}_{a,q}(Q, P) = \left\{ \alpha \in [0, 1) : |q\alpha - a| \leq QP^{-k} \right\}$$

for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq a \leq q$ and $(a, q) = 1$, and write

$$\mathfrak{M}(Q, P) = \bigcup_{q=1}^Q \mathfrak{M}_q(Q, P).$$

It may be pertinent to consider for future use the dyadically truncated major arcs

$$\mathfrak{N}(Q, P) = \mathfrak{M}(Q, P) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q/2, P) \quad (2.6)$$

and for $q \leq Q$ the associated collection $\mathfrak{N}_q(Q, P) = \mathfrak{M}_q(Q, P) \setminus \mathfrak{M}_q(Q/2, P)$. We conclude the prelude to the previously announced computation by considering for \mathfrak{B} being either \mathfrak{M} or \mathfrak{N} and $t > 1$ the sum

$$I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R) \\ (m, q) = 1}} m^{-1+k/s} \int_{\mathfrak{B}_q(Q, P)} |g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha m^k, P, m, R)|^t d\alpha. \quad (2.7)$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let Q be a real number satisfying $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ and $s, t \geq 2$. Then, whenever $M \geq R$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq q \leq Q$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{B}_q(Q, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll (R^{1+k/s} M^{k/s})^{t-1} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{B}) + Q M^t P^{\varepsilon-k-t(1-k/s)}.$$

Proof. We draw the reader's attention to (2.5) and start by noting that whenever $q \leq Q$ then [31, Lemma 2.1] yields $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P, R)| \ll P^\varepsilon$, and hence one trivially has

$$g_{s,q}^\dagger(\alpha, P, M, R) \ll P^{-1+k/s} \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{A}(M, R) \\ (v, q) = 1}} |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P/v, R)| \ll P^{-1+k/s+\varepsilon} M.$$

It also seems worth observing that the argument of [1, Lemma 3.3] entails

$$g_{s,q}^*(\alpha, P, M, R) = \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R) \\ (m, q) = 1}} m^{-1+k/s} g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha m^k, P, m, R).$$

Consequently, an application of Holder's inequality would deliver the estimate

$$|g_{s,q}^*(\alpha, P, M, R)|^t \ll (R^{1+k/s} M^{k/s})^{t-1} \left(\sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R) \\ (m, q) = 1}} m^{-1+k/s} |g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha m^k, P, m, R)|^t \right).$$

Then by observing that $|\mathfrak{B}_q(Q, P)| \ll Q P^{-k}$ the lemma follows upon recalling (2.7) by combining the preceding equations with (2.5). \square

In what follows we shall prepare the ground to obtain a mean value estimate of the strenght of [1, Theorem 4.2]. To such an end we fix Q satisfying $1 \leq Q \leq \frac{1}{2} P^{k/2} R^{-k}$ and $m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)$, and set

$$M = P(2Q)^{-2/k} R^{-1}. \quad (2.8)$$

The preceding assumptions assure that $R \leq M$ and that whenever $\pi \leq R$ and $m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)$ then $m \leq M\pi \leq P(2Q)^{-2/k}$, and thus $Q \leq \frac{1}{2}(P/m)^{k/2}$, which entails that the arcs $\mathfrak{M}_{a,q}(Q, P/m)$ are disjoint. We recall equation (2.7) and note that then one may apply [1, Lemma 2.3] to obtain

$$I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R) \\ (m, q) = 1}} m^{-k-1+k/s} \int_{\mathfrak{B}_q(Q, P/m)} |g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R)|^t d\alpha. \quad (2.9)$$

In order to make further progress we find it pertinent to introduce for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and a prime number $\pi \leq R$ the subset of smooth numbers

$$\mathcal{C}_{q,\pi}(P, R) = \left\{ n \in \mathcal{C}_q(P, R) : p|n \implies p > \pi \right\}$$

and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{q,\pi}(P, R) = \mathcal{C}_{q,\pi}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{C}_{q,\pi}(P/2, R)$, and observe that the same argument employed in [1, Lemma 4.1] permits one to deduce

$$g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R) = \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{q,\pi}(P/m, R)} z^{-1+k/s} \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P/mz, \pi)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha(xz)^k).$$

In what follows it will be useful making the dyadic dissection

$$g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log(P/m)}{\log 2} \rfloor} g_{s,q,\pi,j}^*(\alpha, P, m, R),$$

where

$$g_{s,q,\pi,j}^*(\alpha, P, m, R) = \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{q,\pi}(2^{-j}P/m, R)} z^{-1+k/s} \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P/mz, \pi)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha(xz)^k).$$

Having been furnished with the previous identity we note that whenever $t \geq 2$ then the bound $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_q(P, R)| \ll P^\varepsilon$ combined with Holder's inequality delivers

$$|g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R)|^t \ll P^\varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log(P/m)}{\log 2} \rfloor} (P2^{-j}/m)^{(-1+k/s)t} \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{q,\pi}(2^{-j}P/m, R)} |g_s(\alpha z^k, P/mz, \pi)|^t.$$

Then, upon denoting

$$V_t(\pi, m, z, \mathfrak{B}) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}(Q, P/m)} |g_s(\alpha z^k, P/mz, \pi)|^t d\alpha \quad (2.10)$$

we deduce via the previous equation in conjunction with (2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{B}) &\leq \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)} m^{-k-1+k/s} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} \int_{\mathfrak{B}_q(Q, P/m)} |g_{s,q,\pi}^*(\alpha, P, m, R)|^t d\alpha \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon \max_{P_0 \leq P} \left(P_0^{(-1+k/s)t} \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)} m^{-k-1+k/s} \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P_0, R)} V_t(\pi, m, z, \mathfrak{B}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where we used the fact that the arcs $\mathfrak{M}_q(Q, P/m)$ are disjoint as observed right before (2.9). In order to estimate the inner sum in the preceding equation it is desirable to introduce for $Y \leq P$ the mean value

$$V_{t,s}(Y, R) = \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, Y, R)|^t d\alpha.$$

It then seems worth furnishing ourselves with the following lemma that will be employed throughout the entire memoir.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $t = 2w$ for some $w \in \mathbb{N}$ and let Δ_t be an admissible exponent. Then, there is some η depending on ε, k, s with the property that whenever P is sufficiently large and $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$ then, uniformly in $Y \leq P$ one has*

$$V_{t,s}(Y, R) \ll P^\varepsilon Y^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t}.$$

Proof. We note that by orthogonality $V_{t,s}(Y, R)$ equals the number of solutions of

$$x_1^k + \dots + x_w^k = x_{w+1}^k + \dots + x_{2w}^k$$

counted with weights

$$(x_1 \dots x_{2w})^{-1+k/s} \asymp Y^{tk/s-t}.$$

It then transpires upon recalling (2.3) that $V_{t,s}(Y, R) \ll Y^{tk/s-t} U_t(Y, R)$. The proposition follows by combining the preceding equation with [1, Lemma 2.1]. \square

We are now prepared to present the following key proposition. To such an end we henceforth establish the convention that unless mentioned otherwise whenever a statement involves the letter R , then it is asserted that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a number $\eta > 0$ such that the statement holds uniformly for $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $t = 2w$ for some $w \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\omega \geq 1$. Let Δ_t be an admissible exponent. Then whenever $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ one has the bound*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(Q, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{2\Delta_t/k}.$$

Proof. Whenever $\frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}R^{-k} \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ then the previous lemma yields

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(Q, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll V_{t,s}(P, R) \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t+\varepsilon} \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{2\Delta_t/k},$$

as desired. If instead $Q < \frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}R^{-k}$ we then observe that by (2.11) and a change of variables one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{M}) &\ll P^\varepsilon \max_{P_0 \leq P} \left(P_0^{(-1+k/s)t} \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)} m^{-k-1+k/s} \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P_0, R)} V_{t,s}(P/mz, R) \right) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon \max_{P_0 \leq P} \left(P_0^{(-1+k/s)t} \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)} m^{-k-1+k/s} \sum_{z \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P_0, R)} (P/mz)^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t} \right) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon \max_{P_0 \leq P} \left(P_0^{(-1+k/s)t+1} \sum_{\pi \leq R} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)} m^{-k-1+k/s} (P/mP_0)^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we employed Lemma 2.2. We then observe that $\Delta_t \geq k - t/2$, the latter being a consequence of the presence of diagonal solutions in the equation underlying (2.3), and combine it with the fact that $t \geq 2$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{M}) &\ll \max_{P_0 \leq P} \left(P_0^{k-t+1-\Delta_t} P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t+\varepsilon} M^{-\Delta_t-(t-1)k/s} \right) \\ &\ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} M^{-(t-1)k/s} (P/M)^{\Delta_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma 2.1 in conjunction with (2.8) and the preceding equation delivers

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(Q, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} \int_{\mathfrak{M}_q(Q, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{\frac{tk}{s}-k+\varepsilon} Q^{\frac{2\Delta_t}{k}} + P^{\frac{tk}{s}-k+\varepsilon} Q^{2-\frac{2t}{k}}.$$

The lemma follows by employing the aforementioned inequality pertaining Δ_t . \square

3. MEAN VALUES RESTRICTED TO MINOR ARCS

We shall first obtain a pointwise bound for the weighted smooth exponential sum at hand which shall be more effective on extreme sets of minor arcs.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $l = 2w$ with $w \in \mathbb{N}$, let Δ_l be an admissible exponent and $s \geq 2k$. Then, whenever $b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(b, r) = 1$ one has that*

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll \Theta^\varepsilon P^{k/s+\varepsilon} (P^{\Delta_l}(\Theta^{-1} + P^{-k/2} + \Theta P^{-k}))^{2/l^2} + (P\Theta)^\varepsilon,$$

where we wrote $\Theta = r + P^k|r\alpha - b|$.

Proof. We take $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and such that $|\alpha - a/q| \leq 1/q^2$. We first employ Abel's summation formula to obtain

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{-1+k/s} \left| \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(P, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \right| + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-2+k/s} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(y, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P/2, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \right| dy.$$

It then transpires that an application of [33, Lemma 3.1] in the same vein as in [1, Lemma 5.1] delivers

$$\begin{aligned} g_s(\alpha, P, R) &\ll q^\varepsilon P^{k/s+\varepsilon} (P^{\Delta_l}(q^{-1} + P^{-k/2} + qP^{-k}))^{2/l^2} + P^{-1/2+k/s+\varepsilon} \\ &\quad + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-2+k/s} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(y, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P/2, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \right| dy. \end{aligned}$$

In order to examine the last integral, which we denote by I_P , we apply the aforementioned lemma to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_P &\ll q^\varepsilon \int_{P/2}^P y^{-1+k/s+\varepsilon} (y^{\Delta_l}(q^{-1} + y^{-k/2} + qy^{-k}))^{2/l^2} dy + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-3/2+k/s+\varepsilon} dy \\ &\ll q^\varepsilon P^{k/s+\varepsilon} (P^{\Delta_l}(q^{-1} + P^{-k/2} + qP^{-k}))^{2/l^2} + q^\varepsilon P^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the preceding equations one gets

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^\varepsilon P^{k/s+\varepsilon} (P^{\Delta_l}(q^{-1} + P^{-k/2} + qP^{-k}))^{2/l^2} + (qP)^\varepsilon.$$

The statement of the lemma thereby follows replacing q in the preceding equation by $\Theta = r + P^k|r\alpha - b|$ via the transference principle (see [36, Lemma 14.1]). \square

We shall next explore the potential of the preceding analysis and suppose that $(\Delta_{2w})_{w \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of admissible exponents. In view of the preceding discussion it seems pertinent to recall (1.4) and observe by the equation before (5.1) of [1] that

$$\tau(k) \leq 1/4k. \quad (3.1)$$

We also define for any real number $t \geq 2$ the parameter

$$\Delta_t^* = \min_{\substack{1 \leq v \leq t/2 \\ v \in \mathbb{N}}} \left(\max \left(\Delta_{2v} - (t-2v)\tau(k), \Delta_{2v} - (t-2v)k/s \right) \right) \quad (3.2)$$

and say that Δ_t^* is an *admissible exponent for minor arcs*. We may omit henceforth writing $v \in \mathbb{N}$ for the sake of concision. The reader may observe that the preceding definition differs midly from that in [1, (5.3)], though in practice the results involving it shall ultimately deliver consequences of the same strength.

Proposition 3.1. *Whenever $t \geq 2$ with $s \geq 2k$ and $1 \leq Q \leq \frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}R^{-k}$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(Q,P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{2\Delta_t^*/k}.$$

Proof. We recall (2.8) to the reader and observe that by the discussion after equation (5.5) of [1] then whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(Q, P/m)$ for some $m \in \mathcal{B}(M, \pi, R)$ there exist $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(b, r) = 1$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}Qz^{-k} < r + \left(\frac{P}{mz}\right)^k |r(\alpha z^k) - b| \leq 2Q.$$

Equipped with this remark we deduce from Lemma 3.1 that for $\pi \leq R$ prime then

$$g_s(\alpha z^k, P/mz, \pi) \ll P^\varepsilon \left(\frac{P}{mz}\right)^{k/s} \left(\left(\frac{P}{mz}\right)^{\Delta_l} \left(z^k/Q + \left(\frac{mz}{P}\right)^{k/2} + \left(\frac{mz}{P}\right)^k Q\right)\right)^{2/l^2} + P^\varepsilon.$$

We next take $l = 2w$ corresponding to the maximum in (1.4) and observe upon recalling (2.8) that whenever $M \leq m \leq MR$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(Q, P/m)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} g_s(\alpha z^k, P/mz, \pi) &\ll P^\varepsilon \left(\frac{P}{m}\right)^{k/s+(\Delta_l-k/2)\frac{2}{l^2}} z^{-k/s-2\Delta_l/l^2+2k/l^2} + P^\varepsilon \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon \left(\frac{P}{m}\right)^{k/s-\tau(k)} z^{-k/s+2(k-\Delta_l)/l^2} + P^\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

We next consider $v \in \mathbb{N}$ minimising the right side of (3.2) and write $t = t_0 + 2v$. Then upon recalling equation (2.10) it transpires that

$$V_t(\pi, m, z, \mathfrak{N}) \ll P^\varepsilon \left(\left(\frac{P}{m}\right)^{t_0(k/s-\tau(k))} z^{-kt_0/s+2t_0(k-\Delta_l)/l^2} + 1\right) \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha z^k, P/mz, \pi)|^{2v} d\alpha.$$

Therefore, a routinary application of orthogonality in conjunction with Lemma 2.2 delivers

$$\begin{aligned} V_t(\pi, m, z, \mathfrak{N}) &\ll P^\varepsilon \left(\left(\frac{P}{m}\right)^{t_0(k/s-\tau(k))} z^{-kt_0/s+2t_0(k-\Delta_l)/l^2} + 1\right) V_{2v,s}(P/mz, \pi) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon \left(\frac{P}{m}\right)^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*} z^{-tk/s+2t_0(k-\Delta_l)/l^2+k-\Delta_{2v}} + P^\varepsilon (P/mz)^{2vk/s-k+\Delta_{2v}}. \end{aligned}$$

We draw the reader's attention back to (2.11) and apply the preceding bound to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{N}) &\ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*+\varepsilon} M^{-(t-1)k/s-\Delta_t^*} \max_{P_0 \leq P} P_0^{-t+k+1+2t_0(k-\Delta_l)/l^2-\Delta_{2v}} \\ &\quad + P^{2vk/s-k+\Delta_{2v}+\varepsilon} M^{(1-2v)k/s-\Delta_{2v}} \max_{P_0 \leq P} P_0^{(t-2v)k/s+k-\Delta_{2v}+1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe first that as a consequence of the condition $t \geq 2$ and the inequalities $\Delta_l \geq k - l/2$ and $\Delta_{2v} \geq k - v$, as was observed in Proposition 2.1, one gets

$$-t + k + 1 + 2t_0(k - \Delta_l)/l^2 - \Delta_{2v} \leq -t + 1 + \frac{t_0}{l} + v \leq 1 - t/2 \leq 0.$$

Moreover, in view of the proviso $s \geq 2k$ and the same inequality it is apparent that

$$(t - 2v)k/s + k - \Delta_{2v} + 1 - t \leq (t - 2v)k/s + v + 1 - t \leq 1 - t/2 \leq 0,$$

from where it follows that

$$\sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{N}) \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*+\varepsilon} M^{-(t-1)k/s-\Delta_t^*}.$$

We may conclude the proof by observing that Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(Q,P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^\varepsilon M^{(t-1)k/s} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq Q} I_{q,t}(M, \mathfrak{N}) + Q^2 M^t P^{\varepsilon-k-t(1-k/s)},$$

whence combining the previous bounds and recalling the definition of M one has

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(Q,P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} \left(Q^{2\Delta_t^*/k} + Q^{2-2t/k} \right) \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{2\Delta_t^*/k},$$

where in the last step we used (3.1), the customary inequality on Δ_{2v} and $s \geq 2k$ to deduce

$$\Delta_t^* \geq \max \left(k - v - (t - 2v)k/s, k - v - \frac{(t - 2v)}{4k} \right) \geq k - t/2 \geq k - t.$$

□

In view of the above discussion it is apparent that we have prepared the ground to obtain certain mean value estimates over minor arc, these being defined whenever $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ by means of $\mathfrak{m}(Q) = [0, 1) \setminus \mathfrak{N}(Q, P)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $t \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2k$. Let $\theta > 0$ be a real number satisfying $\theta \leq k/2$. Then, when $P^\theta \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ and $\Delta_t^* < 0$ one has the estimate*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll_\theta P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{-2|\Delta_t^*|/k}.$$

If on the contrary $\Delta_t^* \geq 0$ one gets

$$\int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*+\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We begin by writing

$$J_Q = \left\lceil \frac{\log(P^{k/2}/Q)}{\log 2} \right\rceil, \quad J_0 = \left\lceil \frac{\log(2R^k)}{\log 2} \right\rceil.$$

It is a consequence of Dirichlet's approximation theorem (see the argument before equations (2.1) and (5.9) of [1]) that

$$[0, 1) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{J_1} \mathfrak{N}(2^{-j} P^{k/2}, P), \quad \mathfrak{m}(Q) \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{J_Q} \mathfrak{N}(2^{-j} P^{k/2}, P). \quad (3.4)$$

We next observe that if $0 \leq j \leq J_0$ then by the argument in [1, Theorem 5.3] it follows that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(2^{-j} P^{k/2}, P)$ there exist $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(b, r) = 1$ satisfying $P^{k/2} R^{-k} \ll r + P^k |r\alpha - b| \ll P^{k/2}$. Therefore, Lemma 3.1 combined with (1.4) gives

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{k/s-\tau(k)+\varepsilon} + P^\varepsilon,$$

and hence upon writing $t = t_0 + 2v$ as in the discussion after equation (3.3) and $P_j = 2^{-j} P^{k/2}$ it transpires by Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{N}(P_j, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha &\ll \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(P_j, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)| \right)^{t_0} \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2v} d\alpha \\ &\ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_{2v}-t_0\tau(k)+\varepsilon} + P^{2vk/s-k+\Delta_{2v}+\varepsilon} \ll P^{tk/s-k-|\Delta_t^*|+\varepsilon} \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{-2|\Delta_t^*|/k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

wherein it may be useful recalling (3.2). Therefore, by the preceding discussion in conjunction with the application of Proposition 3.1 for the range $J_0 < j \leq J_Q$ one obtains

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll \sum_{j=0}^{J_Q} \int_{\mathfrak{N}(2^{-j}P^{k/2}, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} Q^{-2|\Delta_t^*|/k}.$$

If on the contrary $\Delta_t^* \geq 0$ then whenever $j > J_0$ Proposition 3.1 yields

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(P_j, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\varepsilon} (2^{-j}P^{k/2})^{2\Delta_t^*/k} \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*+\varepsilon}.$$

If instead $j \leq J_0$, equation (3.5) permits one to deduce that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}(P_j, P)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_{2v-t_0}\tau(k)+\varepsilon} + P^{2vk/s-k+\Delta_{2v}+\varepsilon} \ll P^{tk/s-k+\Delta_t^*+\varepsilon}.$$

The combination of the preceding lines with (3.4) concludes the proof. \square

4. PRELIMINARY MAJOR ARC MANOEUVRES

We shall begin by stating some routinary estimates for the weighted version of auxiliary exponential sums and integrals over the major arcs, it being worth introducing beforehand the parameters

$$\tilde{i}_s = \left\lceil \frac{\log 2s}{k \log 2} \right\rceil \quad P_- = 2^{-\tilde{i}_s-1}P, \quad (4.1)$$

and whenever $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ the exponential sums

$$w_s(\beta) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{1 \leq x \leq P^k} x^{-1+1/s} e(\beta x), \quad \tilde{w}_s(\beta) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{P_-^k < x \leq P^k} x^{-1+1/s} e(\beta x). \quad (4.2)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Whenever $|\beta| \leq 1/2$ one has*

$$w_s(\beta) \ll \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)^{1/s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}_s(\beta) \ll \frac{P^{k/s}}{1 + P^k|\beta|}.$$

Proof. The first bound follows by [23, Lemma 2.8], and the second one by [23, Lemma 6.2]. \square

The next lemma shall deliver similar bounds for integral analogues of the preceding sums.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\theta_0, \theta_1 \geq 0$ real numbers and let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\beta| \leq 1/2$. If $c > 0$ is some fixed constant then*

$$\int_{cP}^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1 + y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \frac{P^{\theta_0}}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}}.$$

If moreover $\theta_0 < k\theta_1$ it follows that

$$\int_1^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1 + y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \frac{P^{\theta_0}}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)^{\theta_0/k}}.$$

Proof. In order to examine the second integral we begin by assuming that $|\beta|^{-1} < P^k$ and make the customary division to obtain

$$\int_1^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \int_1^{|\beta|^{-1/k}} \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy + \int_{|\beta|^{-1/k}}^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy.$$

We estimate the first one trivially and get

$$\int_1^{|\beta|^{-1/k}} \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \int_1^{|\beta|^{-1/k}} y^{\theta_0-1} dy \ll |\beta|^{-\theta_0/k} \ll \frac{P^{\theta_0}}{(1+P^k|\beta|)^{\theta_0/k}}.$$

For the second one we use the restriction on the exponents and note that

$$\int_{|\beta|^{-1/k}}^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \int_{|\beta|^{-1/k}}^P y^{-1-k\theta_1+\theta_0} |\beta|^{-\theta_1} dy \ll |\beta|^{-\theta_0/k}.$$

Combining the previous equations with a trivial estimate for the instance $|\beta|^{-1} \geq P^k$ we deduce the second estimate in the statement of the lemma. For the first one we assume first that $|\beta|^{-1} < P^k$ and obtain

$$\int_{cP}^P \frac{y^{\theta_0-1}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)^{\theta_1}} dy \ll \int_{cP}^P y^{-1-k\theta_1+\theta_0} |\beta|^{-\theta_1} dy \ll P^{-k\theta_1+\theta_0} |\beta|^{-\theta_1},$$

as required. The desired bound follows when $|\beta|^{-1} \geq P^k$ trivially. \square

We shall present one last lemma concerning the customary approximation of the weighted smooth exponential sum on the major arcs by employing classical work. For such purposes we introduce for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ the complete exponential sum

$$S(q, a) = \sum_{r=1}^q e(ar^k/q). \quad (4.3)$$

We further recall (2.4), (4.1) and consider

$$\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ x > P_-}} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k). \quad (4.4)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q \leq (\log P)^{1/8}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(a, q) = 1$ and for which $|\alpha - a/q| \leq (\log P)^{1/8} P^{-k}$. Then, whenever $P^\eta \exp(-\frac{k}{\eta} (\log P)^{1/2}) \leq R \leq P^\eta$ with $0 < \eta < 1/2$ one has*

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) - \rho(1/\eta) q^{-1} S(q, a) w_s(\alpha - a/q) \ll P^{k/s} (\log P)^{-1/2}, \quad (4.5)$$

where ρ is the Dickman's function described, for instance, in [24, Section 5]. Similarly,

$$\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) - \rho(1/\eta) q^{-1} S(q, a) \tilde{w}_s(\alpha - a/q) \ll P^{k/s} (\log P)^{-1/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. We set $\beta = \alpha - a/q$ and define for convenience when $y \leq P$ the auxiliary sum

$$S_y = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(y, R) \\ x > R}} \left(e(\alpha x^k) - q^{-1} S(q, a) e(\beta x^k) \right).$$

A routinary application of summation by parts delivers

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ x > R}} \left(e(\alpha x^k) - q^{-1} S(q, a) e(\beta x^k) \right) x^{-1+k/s} \ll P^{-1+k/s} |S_P| + \int_R^P x^{-2+k/s} |S_x| dx.$$

We may now apply equation (5.18) in [24, Lemma 5.4] to bound $|S_x|$ and $|S_P|$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(P,R) \\ x > R}} (e(\alpha x^k) - q^{-1}S(q, a)e(\beta x^k))x^{-1+k/s} &\ll \frac{q}{\log P} \int_R^P x^{-1+k/s}(1 + x^k|\beta|)dx \\ &+ \frac{qP^{k/s}}{\log P}(1 + P^k|\beta|), \end{aligned}$$

whence by the restriction on β and q it follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(P,R) \\ x > R}} (e(\alpha x^k) - q^{-1}S(q, a)e(\beta x^k))x^{-1+k/s} \ll P^{k/s}(\log P)^{-1/2}. \quad (4.7)$$

In order to proceed it seems desirable to introduce for $y \leq P$ the auxiliary sums

$$B(y) = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(y,R) \\ x > R}} e(\beta x^k).$$

It then follows by the equation before (5.19) in [24, Lemma 5.4] that

$$B(y) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{R^k \leq m \leq y^k} m^{1/k-1} \rho\left(\frac{\log m}{k \log R}\right) e(\beta m) + O\left(\frac{P}{\log P}(1 + P^k|\beta|)\right).$$

Therefore, it transpires by the continuity of $\rho'(u)$ whenever $u > 1$ (see for instance [24, Section 5]) in conjunction with the mean value theorem and the range of R described at the statement of the lemma that whenever $P^k(\log P)^{-k} \leq m \leq P^k$ then

$$\rho\left(\frac{\log m}{k \log R}\right) = \rho(1/\eta) + O((\log P)^{-1/2}),$$

whence for $y > P(\log P)^{-1}$ one has that

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{R^k \leq m \leq y^k} m^{1/k-1} \rho\left(\frac{\log m}{k \log R}\right) e(\beta m) = \frac{\rho(1/\eta)}{k} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq y^k} m^{1/k-1} e(\beta m) + O(P(\log P)^{-1/2}).$$

Equipped with the above utensils we may now employ Abel's summation to derive

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P,R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\beta x^k) = P^{-1+k/s} B(P) + O(R^{k/s}) + (1 - k/s) \int_R^P x^{-2+k/s} B(x) dx.$$

Consequently, using the equations preceding the previous one and recalling (4.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right)} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P,R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\beta x^k) &= \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{s}\right) \sum_{m \leq P^k} m^{1/k-1} e(\beta m) \int_{m^{1/k}}^P x^{-2+k/s} dx \\ &+ P^{-1+k/s} w_k(\beta) + O\left(\frac{P^{k/s}}{\log P}((\log P)^{1/2} + P^k|\beta|)\right), \end{aligned}$$

whence integrating and rearranging terms one gets

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P,R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\beta x^k) = \rho\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right) w_s(\beta) + O\left(\frac{P^{k/s}}{\log P}((\log P)^{1/2} + P^k|\beta|)\right).$$

Combining the above expression with (4.7) and the restriction $|\beta| \leq (\log P)^{1/8} P^{-k}$ described in the statement of the lemma we get (4.5). In order to obtain (4.6) we merely observe that

$$\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) = f_s(\alpha, P, R) - f_s(\alpha, P_-, R)$$

and apply (4.5) to both of the summands in the above equation. \square

5. MAJOR ARC ESTIMATES

We shall employ the results derived in [2] to obtain suitable bounds via partial summation included in two lemmata which shall be applicable on different regimes.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. Suppose that $s \geq 4k$ and $k \geq 2$ and that $2 \leq R \leq P$. Then one has the bound*

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll (\log P)^4 q^\varepsilon \left(\frac{q^{-1/2k} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/s}} + P^{-1/4+5k/4s-(k/s)^2} R^{1/2} q^{1/8} \right) \\ + (\log P)^3 q^\varepsilon P^{-1/4+k/s+k/8} R^{1/2} |q\alpha - a|^{1/8} + P^{k/s-(k/s)^2}. \quad (5.1)$$

If instead $k+1 \leq s < 4k$, an analogous estimate holds with the above factor $P^{-1/4+5k/4s-(k/s)^2}$ being replaced by $P^{-1/4+k/4s}$. Moreover, whenever $s \geq 2$ then

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll (\log P)^3 q^\varepsilon \left(\frac{q^{-1/2k} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/2}} + P^{-1/4+k/s} R^{1/2} (q + P^k |q\alpha - a|)^{1/8} \right). \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. We begin the proof by noting that upon recalling (1.22) then [2, Theorem 1.1] yields

$$f(\alpha, P, R) \ll (\log P)^3 q^\varepsilon \left(\frac{q^{-1/2k} P}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/k}} + P^{3/4} R^{1/2} (q + P^k |q\alpha - a|)^{1/8} \right). \quad (5.3)$$

Truncating the sum appropriately and employing summation by parts in conjunction with the trivial bound delivers

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{-1+k/s} |f(\alpha, P, R)| + O(P^{k/s-(k/s)^2}) + \int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy. \quad (5.4)$$

We next write $\beta = \alpha - a/q$ and insert (5.3) into the previous integral to obtain

$$\int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy \ll (\log P)^3 q^{\varepsilon-1/2k} \int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P \frac{y^{-1+k/s}}{(1 + y^k |\beta|)^{1/k}} dy \\ + (\log P)^3 q^{\varepsilon-1/2k} \int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P y^{-5/4+k/s} R^{1/2} (q + y^k |q\alpha - a|)^{1/8} dy.$$

We integrate the second term, assume $s \geq 4k$ and employ the fact that $k \geq 2$ to obtain

$$\int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P y^{-5/4+k/s} R^{1/2} (q + y^k |q\alpha - a|)^{1/8} dy \ll P^{-1/4+k/s+k/8} R^{1/2} |q\alpha - a|^{1/8} \\ + (\log P) P^{-1/4+5k/4s-(k/s)^2} R^{1/2} q^{1/8},$$

the latter term being $P^{-1/4+k/s} R^{1/2} q^{1/8}$ when $s < 4k$. We also employ Lemma 4.2 to obtain

$$\int_{P^{1-k/s}}^P \frac{y^{-1+k/s}}{(1 + y^k |\beta|)^{1/k}} dy \ll \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\beta|)^{1/s}}.$$

Consequently, the estimate (5.1) follows combining the above bounds with (5.3) and (5.4).

In order to show (5.2) we observe via partial summation that

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{-1+k/s} |g(\alpha, P, R)| + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-2+k/s} |g(\alpha, y, R)| dy,$$

employ the corresponding bound cognate to $g(\alpha, P, R)$ embodied in [2, Theorem 1.1] and follow an analogous analysis as above. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let R and P be real numbers with $2 \leq R \leq P^\eta$ for some $0 < \eta < 1/2$. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and such that $q \leq (\log P)^A$ for any fixed constant $A > 0$. Assume that $s \geq k + 1$. Then, upon denoting $\beta = \alpha - a/q$ one has*

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\beta|)^{1/s}} + P^{k/s} (1 + P^k |\beta|) \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}),$$

where the constant $c > 0$ may depend on A and η . Moreover,

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\beta|)} + P^{k/s} (1 + P^k |\beta|) \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}).$$

Proof. We begin by observing that an application of summation by parts delivers

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{-1+k/s} |f(\alpha, P, R)| + 1 + \int_2^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy. \quad (5.5)$$

In order to apply [2, Theorem 1.2] it seems required to assume that $y \geq P^{\eta'}$ for any $2\eta < \eta' < 1$. More precisely, one trivially has

$$\int_2^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy = \int_{P^{\eta'}}^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy + O(P^{k\eta'/s}),$$

and by the preceding proviso it transpires that for any $y \geq P^{\eta'}$ then

$$\log(R)/\log y \leq \eta/\eta' < 1/2.$$

Consequently, the application of [2, Theorem 1.2] yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{P^{\eta'}}^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy &\ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \int_{P^{\eta'}}^P \frac{y^{-1+k/s} dy}{(1 + y^k |\beta|)^{1/k}} \\ &+ \int_{P^{\eta'}}^P y^{-1+k/s} \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}) (1 + P^k |\beta|) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant depending on η . We then apply as is customary Lemma 4.2 to the first integral in the above equation and deduce that

$$\int_{P^{\eta'}}^P y^{-2+k/s} |f(\alpha, y, R)| dy \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\beta|)^{1/s}} + P^{k/s} \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}) (1 + P^k |\beta|).$$

We conclude the first part of the statement by applying [2, Theorem 1.2] to the first term in the right side of (5.5).

In order to show the second one we recall (2.2) and observe that [2, Theorem 1.2] yields

$$g(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P}{(1 + P^k |\beta|)} + P(1 + P^k |\beta|) \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}).$$

Equipped with this bound we note that then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{P/2}^P y^{-2+k/s} |g(\alpha, y, R)| dy &\ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \int_{P/2}^P \frac{y^{-1+k/s}}{(1+y^k|\beta|)} dy \\ &\quad + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-1+k/s} \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2})(1+P^k|\beta|) dy \\ &\ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{1+P^k|\beta|} + P^{k/s} \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2})(1+P^k|\beta|), \end{aligned}$$

where we implicitly estimated the first integral by employing Lemma 4.2. Combining the preceding formula with an analogue of (5.5) delivers the desired result. \square

6. FURTHER PRUNING

We shall combine the work of last sections to estimate the contribution of major arcs of intermediate height. To such an end we begin by defining for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}_{a,q}(\frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}, P)$ with $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $(a, q) = 1$ and $0 \leq a \leq q \leq \frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}$ the function

$$\Upsilon(\alpha) = q^{-2}(1+P^k|\alpha - a/q|)^{-1}. \quad (6.1)$$

If on the contrary $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{M}_{a,q}(\frac{1}{2}P^{k/2}, P)$ for all a, q as above we set $\Upsilon(\alpha) = 0$. Observe that in view of the fact that the preceding intervals are disjoint this defines a function in $[0, 1)$. We shall in what follows write $\mathfrak{M}(Q)$ to denote $\mathfrak{M}(Q, P)$ for simplicity.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $r > 1$. For real numbers $Q_0, Q_1 > 0$ satisfying $1 \leq Q_0 < Q_1 \leq P^{k/2}$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(Q_1) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q_0)} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^r d\alpha \ll P^{-k} Q_0^{1-r}.$$

Proof. It seems worth noting first that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}(Q_1) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q_0)$ there are $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $(a, q) = 1$ and $0 \leq a \leq q \leq Q_1$ with $|\alpha - a/q| \leq Q_1/qP^k$ such that either $|\alpha - a/q| > \frac{Q_0}{qP^k}$ or $q > Q_0$. Consequently, the integral at hand may be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(Q_1) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q_0)} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^r d\alpha &\ll \sum_{q \leq Q_1} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q q^{-2r} \int_{|\beta| > Q_0/qP^k} \frac{d\beta}{(1+P^k|\beta|)^r} \\ &\quad + \sum_{q > Q_0} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q q^{-2r} \int_{|\beta| \leq Q_1/qP^k} \frac{d\beta}{(1+P^k|\beta|)^r}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows in a routinary manner that

$$\sum_{q \leq Q_1} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q q^{-2r} \int_{|\beta| > Q_0/qP^k} \frac{d\beta}{(1+P^k|\beta|)^r} \ll P^{-k} Q_0^{1-r} \sum_{q \leq Q_1} q^{-r} \ll P^{-k} Q_0^{1-r}$$

and that

$$\sum_{q > Q_0} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q q^{-2r} \int_{|\beta| \leq Q_1/qP^k} \frac{d\beta}{(1+P^k|\beta|)^r} \ll P^{-k} \sum_{q > Q_0} q^{1-2r} \ll P^{-k} Q_0^{2-2r},$$

as desired. \square

Equipped with the above lemma we shall present promptly a minor arc estimate valid for all Q , it being pertinent delivering beforehand yet another major arc type estimate.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $s \geq k + 1$ and $t \geq 4k + 1$. Let $0 < \theta < \min(\frac{2t-2}{t+16}, 1)$ and assume that $1 \leq Q \leq P^\theta$. Then one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k} Q^{-1/53k}. \quad (6.2)$$

Proof. We prepare the ground by applying Lemma 5.1 whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta)$ to derive

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^\varepsilon (\log P)^3 (P^{k/s} \Upsilon(\alpha)^{1/4k} + P^{k/s-1/4+\theta/8+\varepsilon}).$$

Combining the preceding estimate with the conclusion of Lemma 6.1 and the fact that $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta)) \leq P^{2\theta-k}$ permits one to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha &\ll (\log P)^{3t} P^{tk/s} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^{t/4k-\varepsilon} d\alpha \\ &+ P^{tk/s-k+\theta(2+t/8)-t/4+\varepsilon} \ll (\log P)^{3t} P^{tk/s-k} Q^{\varepsilon-1/4k} + P^{tk/s-k-1/4}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where we implicitly utilised the restriction on θ . Consequently, equation (6.2) would follow provided that $Q \geq (\log P)^{13tk}$. If instead $Q < (\log P)^{13tk}$ one may apply Lemma 5.2 to get whenever $q \leq (\log P)^A$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}_{a,q}((\log P)^{13tk})$ that

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{k/s} \Upsilon(\alpha)^{-\varepsilon+1/2k} + P^{k/s} (1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|) \exp(-c(\log P)^{1/2}).$$

It seems worth noting that when $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{13tk}) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)$ then

$$\Upsilon(\alpha)^{\varepsilon-1/2k} (1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|) \ll \exp(c(\log P)^{1/2}),$$

whence

$$g_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll P^{k/s} \Upsilon(\alpha)^{-\varepsilon+1/2k}. \quad (6.4)$$

We write $\mathfrak{M}_1 = \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{13tk})$ and $\mathfrak{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{13kt}) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)$ for simplicity and combine (6.3) with the above estimate to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha &\ll \int_{\mathfrak{M}_1} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha + \int_{\mathfrak{M}_2} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \\ &\ll P^{tk/s-k} (\log P)^{\varepsilon-t/4} + P^{tk/s} \int_{\mathfrak{M}_2} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^{t/2k-\varepsilon} d\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and hence another application of Lemma 6.1 delivers

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k} (\log P)^{\varepsilon-t/4} + P^{tk/s-k} Q^{\varepsilon-1-1/2k},$$

which yields the desired result. \square

Having been furnished with the preceding bounds we derive the following.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $s \geq 2k$ and $t \geq 4k + 1$. Let $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ and assume that Δ_t^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_t^* < 0$. Then for every positive parameter $\tilde{\nu} < \min(2|\Delta_t^*|/k, 1/53k)$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k} Q^{-\tilde{\nu}}. \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover,

$$\int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{tk/s-k}. \quad (6.6)$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 3.2, it suffices to show the first estimate whenever $1 \leq Q \leq P^\theta$ for sufficiently small θ . We thus assume that $\theta < \min(\frac{2t-2}{t+16}, 1)$. In the latter instance, an application of the aforementioned proposition combined with Lemma 6.2 delivers

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha &\ll \int_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha + \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \\ &\ll P^{tk/s-k-\theta\bar{v}} + P^{tk/s-k} Q^{-1/53k}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. In order to obtain (6.6) we note that setting $Q = 1$ in (6.5) permits one to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha &\ll \int_{\mathfrak{m}(1)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha + \int_{\mathfrak{M}(1)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha \\ &\ll P^{tk/s-k} + \int_{\mathfrak{M}(1)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)|^t d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The observation that $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(1)) \leq P^{-k}$ in conjunction with the trivial bound for $g_s(\alpha, P, R)$ enables one to derive (6.6). \square

We should indicate that one could have obtained the above proposition for smaller t , such a refinement not having any impact in the main results of the memoir.

7. AN ASYMPTOTIC EVALUATION

We shall complete the major arc analysis in the context of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 by deriving the relevant asymptotic formula. We thus consider for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ the parameter

$$P = (2N)^{1/k} \quad (7.1)$$

and define for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and $0 \leq a \leq q \leq (\log P)^{1/8}$ the arcs

$$\mathfrak{K}(a, q) = \left\{ \alpha \in [0, 1) : |\alpha - a/q| \leq (\log P)^{1/8} P^{-k} \right\}, \quad (7.2)$$

denote \mathfrak{K} to the union of such sets and $\mathfrak{k} = [0, 1) \setminus \mathfrak{K}$. We further introduce for $0 \leq j \leq s$ and whenever $N \leq n \leq 2N$ the integral

$$r_j(n, R) = \int_0^1 \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j} e(-\alpha n) d\alpha, \quad (7.3)$$

which by orthogonality and upon recalling (4.4) satisfies

$$r_j(n, R) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ x_l > P_-^k, \quad l \leq j}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}, \quad (7.4)$$

and write for clarity $r_{s,k}(n, R) = r_0(n, R)$. In view of the preceding definitions it then transpires that

$$r_j(n, R) = \int_{\mathfrak{K}} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j} e(-\alpha n) d\alpha + O\left(\int_{\mathfrak{k}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j} d\alpha \right). \quad (7.5)$$

We shall bound the contribution of the minor arcs with the aid of a more general estimate that shall be employed on multiple contexts in the memoir, it being pertinent presenting to such an end the constant

$$\nu = \min(|\Delta_s^*|/2sk, 1/107sk). \quad (7.6)$$

We also introduce for a measurable set $\mathfrak{B} \subset [0, 1)$, a fixed real number $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, any parameter $1 \leq P_0 \leq P$ and integers $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $0 \leq l \leq s - j$ the integral

$$I_{\mathfrak{B}, \gamma}^{j, l}(P, P_0) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\gamma\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j-l} |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)|^l d\alpha, \quad (7.7)$$

and, for each $P_1, P_2, P_3 \leq P$, its counterpart

$$I_{\mathfrak{B}, \gamma}^{j, l}(P_1, P_2, P_3) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}} |g_s(\alpha, P_1, R)|^j |g_s(\gamma\alpha, P_2, R)|^{s-j-l} |g_s(\alpha, P_3, R)|^l d\alpha.$$

Lemma 7.1. *Let $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $0 \leq l \leq s - j$. Let $1 \leq P_0 \leq P$ and $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ and assume that $s \geq 4k + 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then whenever $\Delta_s^* < 0$ and $l \leq 1$ one has*

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), \gamma}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \ll Q^{-\nu}, \quad (7.8)$$

and if $2 \leq l \leq s - j$ but $P_0 = 1$ the same estimate holds. If on the contrary $\Delta_s^* \geq 0$ with $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$ and $l \geq 1$ then upon denoting $\delta_{s-1}^* = \max(\Delta_{s-1}^*, 0)$ one has

$$I_{[0, 1), \gamma}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \ll P_0^{k/s} P^{\varepsilon - \frac{1}{s-1}(k/s - \delta_{s-1}^*)}. \quad (7.9)$$

Proof. We make for convenience and upon recalling (4.1) the dyadic dissections

$$\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{i}_s} g_s(\alpha, 2^{-i}P, R), \quad f_s(\alpha, P, R) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \rfloor} g_s(\alpha, 2^{-i}P, R). \quad (7.10)$$

We note first that an application of Holder's inequality and a change of variable deliver

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), \gamma}^{j, l}(P, P_0) &\ll (\log P)^{s-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \rfloor} \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \rfloor} \max_{\bar{P} \asymp P} I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), \gamma}^{j, l}(\bar{P}, 2^{-i}P, 2^{-r}P) \\ &\ll (\log P)^s \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \rfloor} \max_{\bar{P} \asymp P} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, \bar{P}, R)|^s d\alpha \right)^{1/s} \left(\int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, 2^{-i}P, R)|^s d\alpha \right)^{1-1/s}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to prepare the ground for the application of Proposition 6.1 it seems required observing beforehand that if $\bar{P} \asymp P$ then $\mathfrak{M}(\bar{c}Q, \bar{P}) \subset \mathfrak{M}(Q, P)$ whenever $\bar{c} > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant. Therefore, by the aforementioned proposition we deduce that

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), \gamma}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \ll (\log P)^{s+1} \max_{\bar{P} \asymp P} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}(Q)} |g_s(\alpha, \bar{P}, R)|^s d\alpha \right)^{1/s} \ll (\log P)^{s+1} Q^{-2\nu}, \quad (7.11)$$

where $\nu > 0$ satisfies the inequality described at the statement of the lemma. Upon denoting $L_\nu(P) = (\log P)^{(s+1)/\nu}$, equation (7.8) would then follow unless $Q \leq L_\nu(P)$. In the former case one may apply Lemma 5.2 combined with the argument that leads to (6.4) to obtain

$$f_s(\gamma\alpha, P, R) \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)^{1/s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^{\varepsilon-1/k} \frac{P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)},$$

the last estimate stemming from (7.10). In view of the above equations it transpires that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(Q)$ then $\max(f_s(\alpha, P, R), f_s(\gamma\alpha, P, R)) \ll P^{k/s}Q^{-1/s}$. Assuming first that $l \leq 1$, using the preceding estimates and recalling that $s \geq 4k + 1$, one gets

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(L_\nu(P)) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) \ll P^k Q^{-1/s} \sum_{q \leq L_\nu(P)} q^{1 - \frac{(s-2)}{k}} \int_{|\beta| \leq \frac{L_\nu(P)}{qP^k}} \frac{d\beta}{(1 + P^k|\beta|)^{2 - \frac{3}{s}}} \ll Q^{-1/s}.$$

If instead $l \geq 2$ and $P_0 = 1$ then using the fact that $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(L_\nu(P))) \ll P^{\varepsilon-k}$ in conjunction with the trivial bounds for the preceding exponential sums delivers

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(L_\nu(P)) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), \gamma}^{j,l}(P, 1) \ll P^{-lk/s + \varepsilon}.$$

Consequently, the preceding estimates in both cases in conjunction with (7.11) for the choice $Q = L_\nu(P)$ deliver

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) = I_{\mathfrak{m}(L_\nu(P)), \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) + I_{\mathfrak{M}(L_\nu(P)) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) \ll (\log P)^{-(s+1)} + Q^{-\frac{1}{s}} \ll Q^{-\nu},$$

as desired.

In order to show (7.9) we instead apply the trivial bound $f_s(\alpha, P_0, R) \ll P_0^{k/s}$ and obtain via Holder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P_0^{-k/s} I_{[0,1], \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) &\ll \int_0^1 |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\gamma\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j-l} |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)|^{l-1} d\alpha \\ &\ll \left(\int_0^1 |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-1} d\alpha \right)^{\frac{j}{s-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |f_s(\gamma\alpha, P, R)|^{s-1} d\alpha \right)^{\frac{s-j-l}{s-1}} \left(\int_0^1 |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)|^{s-1} d\alpha \right)^{\frac{l-1}{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We then introduce for $Y > 1$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ the integral

$$I_\xi(Y) = \int_0^1 |g_s(\xi\alpha, Y, R)|^{s-1} d\alpha,$$

and employ (7.10) as above to get

$$I_{[0,1], \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) \ll P^\varepsilon P_0^{k/s} \max_{\substack{\bar{P} \sim P \\ P_i, P_r \leq P}} I_1(\bar{P})^{j/(s-1)} I_\gamma(P_i)^{(s-j-l)/(s-1)} I_1(P_r)^{(l-1)/(s-1)},$$

whence either Propositions 3.2 or 6.1 depending on the positivity of Δ_{s-1}^* combined with a change of variables then delivers

$$I_{[0,1], \gamma}^{j,l}(P, P_0) \ll P_0^{k/s} P^{\varepsilon - \frac{j}{s-1}(k/s - \delta_{s-1}^*)} \max_{1 \leq P_i \leq P} P_i^{-\left(\frac{s-j-l}{s-1}\right)(k/s - \delta_{s-1}^*)} \ll P_0^{k/s} P^{\varepsilon - \frac{1}{s-1}(k/s - \delta_{s-1}^*)}.$$

□

Equipped with the above lemma we have reached a position from which to estimate in a straightforward manner the minor arc contribution in (7.5).

Corollary 7.1. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ satisfying $\Delta_s^* < 0$. Then, whenever $1 \leq j \leq s$ one has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{k}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j} d\alpha \ll (\log P)^{-\nu/15}.$$

Proof. By taking $Q = (\log P)^{1/15}$ we observe that $\mathfrak{M}(Q) \subset \mathfrak{A}$, and hence $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{m}(Q)$. We thus apply Lemma 7.1 for the choices $l = 0$ and $\gamma = 1$ and the previous remark to obtain

$$\int_{\mathfrak{k}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j} d\alpha \ll I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q), 1}^{j,0}(P, P) \ll (\log P)^{-\nu/15},$$

as desired. \square

We shall next shift the reader's attention to (7.5) for the purpose of computing the major arc contribution. We recall beforehand the singular series defined in (1.12) and introduce

$$c_{k,s}(\eta) = \frac{1}{k^s} \rho(1/\eta)^s \Gamma(1/s)^s. \quad (7.12)$$

Proposition 7.1. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$. Then one has whenever $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \leq n \leq 2N$ that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j} e(-\alpha n) d\alpha = c_{k,s}(\eta) \mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-1/16}). \quad (7.13)$$

Consequently, if Δ_s^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_s^* < 0$ and the inequality $P^n \exp(-\frac{\nu}{k}(\log P)^{1/2}) \leq R \leq P^n$ holds one has

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) = c_{k,s}(\eta) \mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu/15}). \quad (7.14)$$

Proof. We fix $Q = (\log P)^{1/8}$, recall (4.2), (4.3) and consider when $1 \leq j \leq s$ for convenience

$$\tilde{J}_j(n, Q) = \int_{-QP^{-k}}^{QP^{-k}} \tilde{w}_s(\beta)^j w_s(\beta)^{s-j} e(-\beta n) d\beta$$

and

$$\mathfrak{S}(n, Q) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,q)=1}}^q (q^{-1} S(q, a))^s e(-an/q).$$

Then, upon recalling (7.2) and observing that $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{R}) \ll Q^3 P^{-k}$ it transpires that an application of Lemma 4.3 delivers

$$\int_{\mathfrak{R}} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j} e(-\alpha n) d\alpha = \rho(1/\eta)^s \mathfrak{S}(n, Q) \tilde{J}_j(n, Q) + O((\log n)^{-1/8}). \quad (7.15)$$

It further seems worth denoting

$$\tilde{J}_j(n) = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \tilde{w}_s(\beta)^j w_s(\beta)^{s-j} e(-\beta n) d\beta,$$

and observing that the application of Lemma 4.1 permits one to deduce that

$$\tilde{J}_j(n) - \tilde{J}_j(n, Q) \ll \int_{QP^{-k}}^1 |\tilde{w}_s(\beta)|^j |w_s(\beta)|^{s-j} d\beta \ll P^k \int_{QP^{-k}}^1 (1 + P^k |\beta|)^{-2 + \frac{1}{s}} d\beta \ll Q^{-1 + \frac{1}{s}}.$$

In order to compute $\tilde{J}_j(n)$ we merely utilise orthogonality to observe that

$$\tilde{J}_j(n) = k^{-s} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_s \leq n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_s = n \\ m_1, \dots, m_j > P_-^k}} (m_1 \cdots m_s)^{1/s-1},$$

and note that an inclusion-exclusion argument combined with the previous equation yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} \tilde{J}_j(n) = k^{-s} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_s \leq n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_s = n \\ \max_{i \leq s} (m_i) > P_-^k}} (m_1 \cdots m_s)^{1/s-1} = \tilde{J}(n),$$

where we wrote

$$\tilde{J}(n) = k^{-s} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_s \leq n \\ m_1 + \dots + m_s = n}} (m_1 \cdots m_s)^{1/s-1}$$

and used the fact that the condition on $\max_{i \leq s} (m_i)$ is redundant. We draw the reader's attention to [23, Theorem 2.3] and observe that using the notation therein and setting k to be s on that context one has $(s/k)^s J(n) = \tilde{J}(n)$, whence the application of such a theorem would yield

$$\tilde{J}(n) = \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^s \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{s}\right)^s + O(n^{-1/s}) = k^{-s} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^s + O(n^{-1/s}). \quad (7.16)$$

The singular series is handled routinely by invoking the estimate $S(q, a) \ll q^{1-1/k+\varepsilon}$ in [23, Theorem 4.2] to get whenever $s \geq 4k + 1$ the bound $\mathfrak{S}(n) \ll 1$ and the approximation

$$\mathfrak{S}(n, Q) = \mathfrak{S}(n) + O(Q^{-2-1/k}). \quad (7.17)$$

Then combining (7.15), (7.16) and (7.17) and the previous observations one derives (7.13). In order to prove the second statement of the proposition we recall (7.4) and observe that

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P,R)}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s} = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P,R) \\ \max_{i \leq s} (x_i) > P_-}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}, \quad (7.18)$$

whence by an inclusion-exclusion argument it follows that

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) = \sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} r_j(n, R). \quad (7.19)$$

One then gets by (7.3), (7.5) and the preceding equation that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{s,k}(n, R) &= \sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} \int_{\mathfrak{R}} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j} e(-\alpha n) d\alpha \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{j=1}^s \int_{\mathfrak{t}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-j} d\alpha\right). \end{aligned}$$

whence (7.13) in conjunction with Corollary 7.1 delivers (7.14), as desired. \square

We shall conclude our analysis in this section by showing that the analogous counting function with one of the underlying variables being significantly smaller is negligible. To such an end it seems convenient defining for any function $\varphi(x)$ of uniform growth

$$r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P,R) \\ \min_{i \leq s} (x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{1/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}. \quad (7.20)$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and assume that Δ_s^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_s^* < 0$ and φ as above. Suppose that $P^\eta \exp(-\frac{\eta}{k}(\log P)^{1/2}) \leq R \leq P^\eta$. Then for every natural number $N \leq n \leq 2N$ one has*

$$r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R) = c_{k,s}(\eta) \mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu/15} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu/4s}).$$

Proof. We begin by observing upon recalling (7.18) that

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) \leq (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{1/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}. \quad (7.21)$$

Then by setting $P_0 = n^{1/k}\varphi(n)^{-1/k}$ it transpires by orthogonality that

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R) \leq s^2 \int_0^1 \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R) e(-\alpha n) d\alpha. \quad (7.22)$$

We distinguish as is customary into major and minor arc contribution for the preceding integral and note that the latter one is amenable to the methods of Lemma 7.1. Consequently, the right side of the above equation equals

$$\begin{aligned} & s^2 \int_{\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R) e(-\alpha n) d\alpha \\ & + O\left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)| |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-2} |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)| d\alpha \right) \\ & = s^2 \int_{\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R) e(-\alpha n) d\alpha + O(I_{\mathfrak{m}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s}), 1}^{1,1}(P, P_0)), \end{aligned}$$

whence the application of the aforementioned lemma yields the bound

$$|r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R)| \ll \int_{\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)| d\alpha + \varphi(n)^{-\frac{\nu}{4s}}. \quad (7.23)$$

We next note that $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})) \ll \varphi(n)^{1/2s} P^{-k}$, whence by the trivial bounds

$$f_s(\alpha, P_0, R) \ll P_0^{k/s} \ll P^{k/s} \varphi(n)^{-1/s}, \quad \max(\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R), f_s(\alpha, P, R)) \ll P^{k/s}$$

it follows that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)| d\alpha \ll \varphi(n)^{1/2s} \varphi(n)^{-1/s} = \varphi(n)^{-1/2s}. \quad (7.24)$$

Combining the previous estimate with (7.23) delivers

$$|r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R)| \ll \varphi(n)^{-\nu/4s}, \quad (7.25)$$

which in conjunction with Proposition 7.1 yields the desired result. \square

We have then prepared the ground to obtain an asymptotic evaluation of a suitable version of the preceding counting functions that shall play a crucial role, namely

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta) \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{1/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}. \quad (7.26)$$

Corollary 7.2. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and assume that Δ_s^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_s^* < 0$. Let φ be a function of uniform growth satisfying $2\varphi(x) \leq \exp((\log x)^{1/2})$. Then for sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ and each natural number $N \leq n \leq 2N$ one has*

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu/15} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu/4s}).$$

Proof. We first observe that one trivially has

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) \leq \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, P^\eta)}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s} = r_{s,k}(n, P^\eta),$$

where we employed the fact that $x_i \leq n^{1/k} \leq P$ for each $i \leq s$, whence Proposition 7.1 enables one to deduce

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) - c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) \leq C_1(\log n)^{-\nu/15} \quad (7.27)$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. On the other hand, upon recalling (7.20) and the restriction on φ it transpires that

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) \geq \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{\eta/k}) \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{1/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s} \geq r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, P^\eta \exp(-\frac{\eta}{k}(\log P)^{1/2})).$$

Therefore, the application of Proposition 7.2 permits one to get

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) - c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) \geq -C_2((\log n)^{-\nu/15} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu/4s}) \quad (7.28)$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. The corollary follows by combining both (7.27) and (7.28). \square

8. UNREPRESENTATION EVALUATIONS

We shall explore in the present section the validity of the preceding asymptotic formulae if the condition $\Delta_s^* < 0$ no longer holds and provide promptly a pointwise minor arc bound, it being worth writing for each $1 \leq Q \leq P^{k/2}$ to such an end $\mathfrak{m}(Q, P) = [0, 1) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q, P)$.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $k \geq 6$ and $s > k$, and define the positive number $\sigma(k)$ by*

$$\sigma(k)^{-1} = k(\log k + 8.02113).$$

Then, there is some $\eta = \eta(k) > 0$ with the property that uniformly in $2 \leq R \leq P^\eta$ one has

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(P, P/2)} |g_s(\alpha, P, R)| \ll P^{k/s - \sigma(k) + \varepsilon}$$

and for which for every $\sigma_0 < \sigma(k)$ with $s < k\sigma_0^{-1}$ then

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(P^{1+\sigma_0 s}, P)} |f_s(\alpha, P, R)| \ll P^{k/s - \sigma_0}.$$

Proof. We recall (1.22) and employ [3, Theorem 1.1] to deduce the estimate

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(P, P)} |f(\alpha, P, R)| \ll P^{1 - \sigma(k) + \varepsilon}. \quad (8.1)$$

Having been furnished with the above bound we apply summation by parts in the same manner as in Section 5 in conjunction with the latter to get for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}(P, P/2)$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} g_s(\alpha, P, R) &\ll P^{k/s-\sigma(k)+\varepsilon} + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-2+k/s} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(y, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P/2, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \right| dy \\ &\ll P^{k/s-\sigma(k)+\varepsilon} + \int_{P/2}^P y^{-1+k/s-\sigma(k)+\varepsilon} dy \ll P^{k/s-\sigma(k)+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

The reader may note that whenever $P/2 \leq y \leq P$ then $\mathfrak{m}(P, P/2) \subset \mathfrak{m}(y, y)$, the application of (8.1) being thereby legitimate.

In order to obtain the second estimate we instead split the corresponding sum, namely

$$\begin{aligned} f_s(\alpha, P, R) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k) + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k) \\ &\ll P^{k/s-\sigma_0} + \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

the first summand having been bounded trivially. In order to treat the second one we observe that whenever $P^{1-s\sigma_0/k} \leq y \leq P$ one has $\mathfrak{M}(y, y) \subset \mathfrak{M}(P^{s\sigma_0+1}, P)$, and hence

$$\mathfrak{m}(P^{s\sigma_0+1}, P) \subset \mathfrak{m}(y, y). \quad (8.4)$$

Integration by parts then yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k) \ll P^{-1+k/s} (|f(\alpha, P, R)| + |f(\alpha, P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)|) \\ &+ \int_{P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}}^P y^{-2+k/s} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(y, R)} e(\alpha x^k) \right| dy + P^{1-s\sigma_0/k} \int_{P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}}^P y^{-2+k/s} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, inserting (8.1) in the preceding estimate and employing the remark leading to (8.4) entails

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \setminus \mathcal{A}(P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}, R)} x^{-1+k/s} e(\alpha x^k) \ll P^{k/s-\sigma_0} + \int_{P^{1-s\sigma_0/k}}^P y^{-1+k/s-\sigma_0} dy \ll P^{k/s-\sigma_0},$$

such a conclusion in conjunction with (8.3) thereby delivering the desired result. \square

Equipped with the preceding bounds we shall proceed to provide a crude approach for delivering a power saving over the trivial bound of the exceptional set appertaining to (7.3). To such an end we introduce as is customary for a set $\mathfrak{B} \subset [0, 1]$, integers $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $0 \leq l \leq s-j$, some large parameter $N > 0$, a natural number $n \in [N, 2N]$ and $1 \leq P_0 \leq P$ the auxiliary Fourier coefficient

$$I_{\mathfrak{B}, P_0}^{j, l}(n) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)^j f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-j-l} f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)^l e(-\alpha n) d\alpha, \quad (8.5)$$

wherein it seems worth recalling (7.1) and (7.6).

Lemma 8.1. *Let $s \geq 2k + 1$ with the property that $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ is an admissible exponent for minor arcs. Let $0 < \theta \leq k/2$ and j as above. Then, for all but $O(N^{1-\nu\theta/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P), P_0}^{j, l}(n) \ll N^{-\nu\theta/6sk}.$$

Proof. A routinary application of Bessel's inequality in conjunction with Holder's inequality permits one to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in [N, 2N]} |I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P), P_0}^{j, l}(n)|^2 &\ll \int_{\mathfrak{m}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2j} |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2(s-j-l)} |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)|^{2l} d\alpha \\ &\ll \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{j/s} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{1-(j+l)/s} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{l/s}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

wherein we wrote $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P)$ for the sake of concision. We insert the decompositions (7.10) in the previous estimate and apply Holder's inequality to deduce that the right side of the above equation is bounded above by a constant times

$$(\log P)^{2s-2} \max_{P_1 \leq P} \left(\int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P_1, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{1-j/s} \max_{P_2 \asymp P} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |g_s(\alpha, P_2, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{j/s}.$$

Consequently, in virtue of the negativity of Δ_{2s}^* one may employ Proposition 6.1 to bound both integrals in the preceding line and thus derive

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in [N, 2N]} |I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P), P_0}^{j, l}(n)|^2 &\ll (\log P)^{2s-2} P^{k(s-j)/s} \max_{P_2 \asymp P} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |g_s(\alpha, P_2, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{j/s} \\ &\ll P^{k-\theta\nu/s+\varepsilon} \ll N^{1-\theta\nu/sk+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma then follows by a simple pidgeonhole argument. \square

We shall next refine the above analysis for large enough k to the end of obtaining a sharper estimate for the exceptional set.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough, let $s \geq 2k + 1$ and any $\sigma_0(k)$ with $\sigma_0(k) < \sigma(k)$ and $\sigma_0(k)^{-1} = k(\log k + O(1))$ with the property that there exists some s_0 for which $\Delta_{s_0}^* < 0$ is an admissible exponent for minor arcs and $2s - s_0 \geq r_0(k)$ with $r_0(k) = k(\log k + O(1))$. Let $1 \leq j \leq s$ and $0 \leq l \leq \min(s - j, 1)$. Then, there is some ν_k such that*

$$\nu_k = 1/k + O\left(\frac{1}{k \log k}\right) \quad (8.7)$$

for which for all but $O(N^{1-\nu_k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ and $1 \leq P_0 \leq P$ one has

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^{1+s\sigma_0(k)}, P), P_0}^{j, l}(n) \ll N^{-\delta_k}$$

for some constant $\delta_k > 0$.

Proof. The starting point of our discussion shall be the application of Bessel's and Holder's inequality to obtain an analogous estimate to that in (8.6) for the choice $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}(P^{1+s\sigma_0(k)}, P)$. We employ the decomposition (7.10) for $f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)$ and insert the last bound in Proposition 6.1 on the corresponding integral pertaining the latter upon noting $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ to derive

$$\sum_{n \in [N, 2N]} |I_{\mathfrak{m}, P_0}^{j, l}(n)|^2 \ll P^{lk/s+\varepsilon} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{1-(j+l)/s} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \right)^{j/s}.$$

We deem it appropriate to analyse the integral in the right side and note that employing the decomposition (7.10) for $\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)$ then Propositions 6.1 and 8.1 yield

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |h_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{2s} d\alpha \ll \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}} |h_s(\alpha, P, R)| \right)^{2s-s_0} \int_{\mathfrak{m}} |h_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s_0} d\alpha \ll P^{k-(2s-s_0)\sigma_0(k)+\varepsilon},$$

where $h = f, \tilde{f}$, the combination of the previous equations enabling one to derive that

$$\sum_{n \in [N, 2N]} |I_{m, P_0}^{j, l}(n)|^2 \ll P^{k - (2s - s_0)\sigma_0(k)(1 - l/s) + \varepsilon}.$$

The bounds appertaining to s_0 and $\sigma_0(k)$ in the statement of the lemma entail the bound

$$(2s - s_0)\sigma_0(k)(1 - 1/s) \geq \nu'_k, \quad \text{with } \nu'_k = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log k}\right)$$

for sufficiently large k . The lemma then follows by a routinary pigeonhole argument. \square

In order to proceed in the proof it seems desirable to recall (7.7) to the end of delivering some major arc estimates for intermediate ranges.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $s \geq 4k + 2$, let $0 < \theta \leq \min(k^2/(3s), \frac{2s^2 + 8k^2 - 2ks}{s(s+24)})$ and let l, j be as in Lemma 8.2. Then, whenever $1 \leq Q < P^\theta$ and $1 \leq P_0 \leq P$ one has*

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), 1}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \ll Q^{-1/8s}. \quad (8.8)$$

Proof. We allude to Lemma 5.1 and (7.10) and note that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta)$ then there exist $a \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and $q \leq P^\theta$ for which $|q\alpha - a| \leq P^{\theta - k}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) &\ll q^\varepsilon (\log P)^3 \left(\frac{q^{-1/2k} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/2}} + P^{k/s - 1/4 + \theta/8 + \varepsilon} \right) \\ &\ll q^\varepsilon (\log P)^3 \left(\frac{q^{-(2+1/k)/s} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{3/s}} + P^{k/s - 1/4 + \theta/8 + \varepsilon} \right), \end{aligned}$$

wherein we employed the fact that $s \geq 4k + 2$, and

$$f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll q^\varepsilon (\log P)^4 \left(\frac{q^{-1/2k} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/s}} + P^{5k/4s - 1/4 + \theta/8 - (k/s)^2 + \varepsilon} \right) + P^{k/s - (k/s)^2}.$$

The conditions on α stated above in conjunction with the restrictions on s and θ permit one to observe that

$$q^{(2+1/k)/s} (1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{3/s} \ll P^{3\theta/s} \leq P^{1/4 - \theta/8 - k/(4s) + (k/s)^2} \leq P^{1/4 - \theta/8},$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(2+1/k)/s} (1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/s} &\ll q^{(1+1/k)/s} P^{\theta/s} \ll P^{\theta(2+1/k)/s} \leq P^{3\theta/s} \\ &\leq \min(P^{(k/s)^2}, P^{1/4 - \theta/8 - k/(4s) + (k/s)^2}), \end{aligned}$$

the last step being a consequence of the previous estimate. The preceding remarks entail

$$\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll (\log P)^3 \frac{q^{\varepsilon - (2+1/k)/s} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{3/s}}, \quad f_s(\alpha, P, R) \ll (\log P)^4 \frac{q^{\varepsilon - (2+1/k)/s} P^{k/s}}{(1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{1/s}},$$

from where it follows upon recalling (6.1), the fact that $j \geq 1$ and $0 \leq l \leq 1$ and the restriction $s \geq 4k + 2$ that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta)$ then

$$|\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-l-j} \ll (\log P)^{4s-4l} P^{k-lk/s} \Upsilon(\alpha)^{1+1/s-\varepsilon}.$$

Combining the preceding estimate with the conclusion of Lemma 6.1 and the trivial bound on $f_s(\alpha, P_0, R)$ permits one to deduce

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), 1}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \ll (\log P)^{4s-4l} P^k \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^{1+1/s-\varepsilon} d\alpha \ll (\log P)^{4s-4l} Q^{\varepsilon-1/s}. \quad (8.9)$$

By the above discussion it transpires that (8.8) would follow provided that $Q \geq (\log P)^{5s^2}$. If on the contrary $Q < (\log P)^{5s^2}$ we note that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{5s^2}) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)$ then

$$q^{1/k}(1 + P^k|\beta|) \ll \exp(c(\log P)^{1/2}),$$

a consequence of such an estimate combined with the application of Lemma 5.2 and the proviso $0 \leq l \leq 1$ being whenever $q \leq (\log P)^{5s^2}$ that

$$|\tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R)|^j |f_s(\alpha, P, R)|^{s-l-j} \ll P^{k-kl/s} \Upsilon(\alpha)^{2-2/s-\varepsilon}.$$

We write $\mathfrak{M}_1 = \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{5s^2})$ and $\mathfrak{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}((\log P)^{5s^2}) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q)$ for simplicity and combine (8.9) with the above estimate and Lemma 6.1 to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), 1}^{j, l}(P, P_0) &\ll I_{\mathfrak{M}_1, 1}^{j, l}(P, P_0) + I_{\mathfrak{M}_2, 1}^{j, l}(P, P_0) \\ &\ll (\log P)^{\varepsilon-s} + P^k \int_{\mathfrak{M}_2} |\Upsilon(\alpha)|^{2-2/s-\varepsilon} d\alpha \ll Q^{\varepsilon-1/5s}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result. \square

Having been furnished with the preceding estimates we employ upon recalling (7.6) some of the major arc analysis in Section 7 to derive for almost all integers an asymptotic evaluation of the weighted counting function $r_{s,k}(n, R)$ defined in (7.3).

Proposition 8.2. *Let $s \geq 4k+2$ with $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ being an admissible exponent for minor arcs and let $0 < \theta \leq \min(k^2/(3s), \frac{2s^2+8k^2-2ks}{s(s+24)})$. Suppose that $P^\eta \exp(-\frac{\eta}{k}(\log P)^{1/2}) \leq R \leq P^\eta$. Then, for all but $O(N^{1-\theta\nu/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$r_{s,k}(n, R) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu}). \quad (8.10)$$

If moreover k, s satisfy the conditions in Lemma 8.2 and $s = k(\log k + O(1))$ then (8.10) holds for all but $O(N^{1-\nu_k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$, where ν_k satisfies (8.7).

Proof. We begin by setting $P_0 = P$, recalling the definitions (7.2), (7.3) and (8.5) and noting that for each $1 \leq j \leq s$ then

$$r_j(n, R) = I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P), P}^{j, 0}(n) + I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta, P) \setminus \mathfrak{R}, P}^{j, 0}(n) + I_{\mathfrak{R}, P}^{j, 0}(n). \quad (8.11)$$

We shall first focus our attention on the second summand, it being pertinent noting that whenever $Q = (\log P)^{1/8}$ then $\mathfrak{M}(Q) \subset \mathfrak{R}$, and hence

$$\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta, P) \setminus \mathfrak{R} \subset \mathfrak{M}(P^\theta, P) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q).$$

It stems from the above inclusion, the triangle inequality and Lemma 8.3 that

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta, P) \setminus \mathfrak{R}, P}^{j, 0}(n) \ll I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), 1}^{j, 0}(P, P) \ll (\log n)^{-1/64s}. \quad (8.12)$$

We next observe that equation (7.13) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} I_{\mathfrak{R}, P}^{j, 0}(n) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-1/16}). \quad (8.13)$$

We complete the proof by estimating $I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta, P), P}^{j, 0}(n)$ via Lemma 8.1 in the first instance described at the statement of the proposition and combine such a conclusion with the preceding lines and (8.11) to get for all but $O(N^{1-\theta\nu/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} r_j(n, R) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu}).$$

The desired result follows by the above line in conjunction with the computation leading to (7.19).

If instead k is sufficiently large and k, s satisfy the conditions described in the second part of the statement then we take $\sigma_0(k)^{-1} = k(\log k + C_0)$ for a sufficiently large constant C_0 , note that $\sigma_0(k) < \sigma(k)$ and hence there is some sufficiently large $C'_0 > 0$ for which

$$1 + \sigma_0(k)s = 2 - \frac{C'_0}{\log k} \leq \min\left(k^2/(3s), \frac{2s + 8k^2/s - 2k}{s + 24}\right).$$

We thus set $\theta = 1 + \sigma_0(k)s$ and observe that by the preceding line we may apply Lemma 8.3 to obtain (8.12) for the above choice of θ . Consequently, combining the preceding conclusion and Lemma 8.2 one may obtain by (8.11) and (8.12) the equation

$$r_j(n, R) = I_{\mathfrak{R}, P}^{j, 0}(n) + O((\log n)^{-1/64s})$$

for all but $O(N^{1-\nu k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$, which in conjunction with (7.19) and (8.13) enables one to deduce mutatis mutandis (8.10) under the aforementioned conditions. \square

We shall next deduce upon recalling (7.20) the analogue of Proposition 7.2.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $s \geq 4k + 2$, assume that Δ_{2s}^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$, φ is a function of uniform growth and θ is as in Proposition 8.2. Let $P^\eta \exp(-\frac{\eta}{k}(\log P)^{1/2}) \leq R \leq P^\eta$. Then, for all but $O(N^{1-\theta\nu/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu} + \varphi(n)^{-1/32s^2}). \quad (8.14)$$

If moreover k, s satisfy the conditions in the second part of Proposition 8.2 then (8.14) holds for all but $O(N^{1-\nu k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$.

Proof. We begin by recalling (7.22) and noting that the integral therein in this context is expressible as a sum of integrals that are tractable by the previous lemmata, namely,

$$|r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R)| \ll |I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta), P_0}^{1,1}(n) + I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), P_0}^{1,1}(n) + I_{\mathfrak{M}(Q), P_0}^{1,1}(n)|, \quad (8.15)$$

where we set $Q = \varphi(n)^{1/4s}$ and $P_0 = P\varphi(n)^{-1/k}$. We first observe that

$$\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(\varphi(n)^{1/4s})) \leq \varphi(n)^{1/2s} P^{-k},$$

whence the arguments that lead to (7.24) entail $I_{\mathfrak{M}(Q), P_0}^{1,1}(n) = O(\varphi(n)^{-1/2s})$. Moreover, the triangle inequality in conjunction with Lemma 8.3 permits one to deduce that

$$I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), P_0}^{1,1}(n) \ll I_{\mathfrak{M}(P^\theta) \setminus \mathfrak{M}(Q), 1}^{1,1}(P, P_0) \ll \varphi(n)^{-1/32s^2}.$$

We complete the discussion by employing Lemma 8.1 whenever $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ to get

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta), P_0}^{1,1}(n) \ll N^{-\nu\theta/6sk}$$

for all but $O(N^{1-\nu\theta/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$. If moreover k, s satisfy the conditions in the second part of Proposition 8.2 then upon setting $\theta = 1 + \sigma_0(k)s$, Lemma 8.2 yields

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(P^\theta), P_0}^{1,1}(n) \ll N^{-\delta k}$$

for all but $O(N^{1-\nu k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$. Consequently, the preceding discussion combined with equation (8.15) permits one to deduce that under both circumstances

$$|r_{s,k}(n, R) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, R)| \ll \varphi(n)^{-1/32s^2}$$

holds for all but $O(N^{1-\nu\theta/2sk})$ and all but $O(N^{1-\nu k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ respectively, such an estimate in conjunction with Proposition 8.2 delivering the desired result. \square

Corollary 8.1. *Let k, s, φ, θ be as in Proposition 8.3 with φ satisfying $2\varphi(x) \leq \exp((\log x)^{1/2})$. Then, for all but $O(N^{1-\theta\nu/2sk})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) = c_{k,s}(\eta)\mathfrak{S}(n) + O((\log n)^{-\nu/15} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu/4s}). \quad (8.16)$$

If moreover k, s satisfy the conditions in the second part of Proposition 8.2 then (8.16) holds for all but $O(N^{1-\nu k})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$.

Proof. The desired result follows by employing the argument of Corollary 7.2 replacing the use of Propositions 7.1 and 7.2 therein by their counterparts Propositions 8.2 and 8.3. \square

9. ALMOST ALL ESTIMATES FOR FAMILIES OF WEIGHTED REPRESENTATION FUNCTIONS

As foreshadow in the introduction, it is the analysis which we shall perform in the upcoming section which ultimately impairs the restriction on the number of variables in Theorems 1.3 and 1.5. It is then opportune to introduce for fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$, fixed vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{s-d}) \in [1, s]^{s-d}$ and every natural number $m \in [N, 2N]$ the Fourier coefficient

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) = \int_0^1 \tilde{f}_s(a_1\alpha, P, R) \prod_{j=2}^{s-d} f_s(a_j\alpha, P, R) e(-\alpha m) d\alpha, \quad (9.1)$$

wherein we take P as in (7.1). It is convenient to recall (1.4) and fix any positive real number $D = D(k) \geq 1$ which shall be determined later satisfying the bound

$$\tau(k) \geq (Dk)^{-1}, \quad (9.2)$$

such a number being permitted to depend on k . We also introduce for $s \geq 2$, any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and some fixed constant $c > 0$ which shall be determined in due course the parameter

$$T_d(k) = \frac{s^3 d}{2ck^3}, \quad (9.3)$$

and for every positive integer $T_0 \leq T_d(k)$ the constants

$$s_{T_0} = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{s-d-T_0}{2} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad c_k = \frac{39d}{40} \left(1 - \frac{(d+1)s}{k^2} - \frac{d}{k} \right) \frac{s}{\frac{2s}{D} + dk}. \quad (9.4)$$

Proposition 9.1. *Let $k \geq 100$ and $\max(15/2, \sqrt{D}/2)k \leq s \leq Dk^2$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}$. Assume that there is some natural number $s_0 > s$ with the property that there is an admissible exponent for minor arcs $\Delta_{s_0}^* < 0$, that $T_d(k) \leq 3k/4$ for the choice $c = c_k$, that $2(s-d-k) > s_0$ with $s_0 - 1 - k \leq s < s_0$ and that $D \leq 4c_k$. Suppose that for every $T_0 \leq T_d(k)$ then $\Delta_{s_{T_0}}$ is an admissible exponent satisfying*

$$0 \leq \Delta_{s_{T_0}} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + \frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} + \left(\frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} \right)^2 \right). \quad (9.5)$$

Then for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d/240s})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ one has

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll m^{-k/4s^3} \quad (9.6)$$

and, whenever in addition $s \asymp k \log k$ and $c = k^7/s^8$ the same conclusion holds for sufficiently large k for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d\zeta_k})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ with

$$\zeta_k = \frac{1}{s} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log k} \right) \right). \quad (9.7)$$

If instead for sufficiently large k one has $s_0 - k(1 + k/s) \leq s \asymp k \log k$ and $d \leq \frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{D k^7 (s-k)}$ with $2(s - d - k) > s_0$ and s_0 as above and

$$0 \leq \Delta_{sT_0} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + \frac{k}{s} + \frac{2k^2}{3s^2} \right) \quad (9.8)$$

for the choice $c = k^7/s^8$ then for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d\gamma_k})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ one has

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll m^{-d/k^2}, \quad (9.9)$$

wherein

$$\gamma_k = \frac{1}{s} \left(\left(\frac{k}{s} \right)^2 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k} \right) \right). \quad (9.10)$$

Proof. In order to derive the best possible estimates for the exceptional set it is appropriate to consider the dyadic dissection underlying (7.10), making a distinction between the corresponding sizes of the underlying variables being a desideratum to the end of applying the pertinent approach accordingly. To put it more succinctly, we recall (7.1), denote for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the parameter $P_j = 2^{-j}P$ and introduce for each integer $0 \leq T_0 \leq s - d$ the sets

$$\mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P) = \left\{ \mathbf{j} \in \left[0, \left\lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \right\rfloor \right]^{s-d} : P_{j_l} \geq P^{1-c(\frac{k}{s})^2}, l > T_0; P_{j_l} \leq P^{1-c(\frac{k}{s})^2}, 0 \leq l \leq T_0 \right\},$$

where c is the aforementioned constant and we wrote $P_{j_0} = 1$. We then consider for each $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)$ and each subset $\mathfrak{B} \subset [0, 1)$ the Fourier coefficient

$$I_{\mathbf{j}}(m, \mathfrak{B}) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}} \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R) e(-\alpha m) d\alpha,$$

wherein we dropped the dependence on \mathbf{a} for brevity, employ the dissection (7.10) and decompose the integral at hand into

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll B(m) + C(m), \quad (9.11)$$

wherein we wrote

$$B(m) = \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} |I_{\mathbf{j}}(m, [0, 1))|, \quad C(m) = \sum_{T_0 > T_d(k)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} |I_{\mathbf{j}}(m, [0, 1))|. \quad (9.12)$$

We shall examine first $B(m)$, it being desirable making a distinction between major and minor arcs suitably chosen, namely

$$B(m) = B_1(m) + B_2(m),$$

where

$$B_1(m) = \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} |I_{\mathbf{j}}(m, \mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-V(T_0)k/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}))|$$

and

$$B_2(m) = \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} |I_{\mathbf{j}}(m, \mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-V(T_0)k/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}))|$$

and $V(T_0)$ is some parameter satisfying

$$V(T_0) < \frac{s}{k} \quad (9.13)$$

which shall be made explicit later on. We shall assume that $c < (s/k)^2$, such an inequality being shown later in the argument, focus our attention on the minor arc contribution first

and write for the sake of brevity V in lieu of $V(T_0)$. A routinary application of Bessel's and Holder's inequality permits one to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |B_1(m)|^2 &\ll (\log P)^{s-d} \sum_{\substack{T_0 \leq T_d(k) \\ j \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)}} \sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |I_j(m, \mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}))|^2 \\ &\ll (\log P)^{s-d} \sum_{\substack{T_0 \leq T_d(k) \\ j \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)}} \int_{\mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2})} \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^2 d\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (9.14)$$

We then insert the trivial bound

$$g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R) \ll P_{j_l}^{k/s} \quad (9.15)$$

on the factors in the above line with $l \leq T_0$ for the purpose of estimating the integral therein by a constant times

$$\sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} \sum_{\substack{j_{T_0+1}, \dots, j_{s-d} \leq \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \\ P_{j_l} \geq P^{1-\frac{ck^2}{s^2}}}} (P^{1-\frac{ck^2}{s^2}})^{\frac{2kT_0}{s}} \int_{\mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)}, P^{1-\frac{ck^2}{s^2}})} \prod_{l=T_0+1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^2 d\alpha. \quad (9.16)$$

We pause the exposition and find it desirable to note as in previous occasions that in view of the inequality $P^{1-c(k/s)^2} \leq P_{j_l} \leq P$ for each $l > T_0$ then

$$\mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-k/s)}, P_{j_l}) \subset \mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-k/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}),$$

and hence

$$\mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-k/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}) \subset \mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-k/s)}, P_{j_l}). \quad (9.17)$$

It may also be opportune to assume first for each T_0 that

$$d < \frac{s^2 - ck^2}{Dk(s - Vk)} \quad (9.18)$$

and emphasize that whenever $l \geq T_0$ then in light of the above restriction it transpires that

$$P_{j_l}^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)} \leq P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)} \leq P_{j_l}^{\frac{k^2 D d(s-Vk)}{2(s^2-ck^2)}} \leq P_{j_l}^{k/2}. \quad (9.19)$$

We further note for prompt convenience that by hypothesis one has

$$2(s - d - T_0) \geq 2(s - d - T_d(k)) \geq 2(s - d - k) > s_0 > s. \quad (9.20)$$

We also draw the reader's attention back to (3.2) to note in view of the provisos $s \leq Dk^2$ and (9.2) and the preceding conclusion that then

$$\Delta_{2(s-d-T_0)}^* \leq \Delta_{s_0}^* - (2(s-d-T_0) - s_0)\tau(k) < -(2(s-d-T_0) - s_0)\tau(k). \quad (9.21)$$

In view of equations (9.17), (9.19) and (9.21) we have reached a position from which to apply Proposition 3.2 to the integral in (9.16). We thus denote $\mathfrak{m}_0 = \mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})}, P^{1-c(\frac{k}{s})^2})$

for simplicity and get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{m_0} \prod_{l=T_0+1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^2 d\alpha &\ll \max_{l \geq T_0} \int_{\mathfrak{m}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-\frac{V k}{s})}, P_{j_l})} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^{2(s-d-T_0)} d\alpha \\ &\ll \max_{l \geq T_0} P_{j_l}^{2(s-d-T_0)k/s-k} P^{-\frac{d D k}{s}(1-\frac{V k}{s})\tau(k)(2(s-d-T_0)-s_0)+\varepsilon} \\ &\ll P^{2(s-d-T_0)k/s-k-\frac{d D k}{s}(1-\frac{V k}{s})\tau(k)(2(s-d-T_0)-s_0)+\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

the last step being a consequence of (9.20). We employ (9.2) and insert the preceding estimate in (9.14) and (9.16) to deduce that

$$\sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |B_1(m)|^2 \ll \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} P^{k-2kd/s+\varepsilon-\frac{d}{s}(1-Vk/s)(2(s-d)-s_0)+T_0\left(\frac{2d}{s}(1-Vk/s)-2ck^3/s^3\right)}. \quad (9.22)$$

We next examine the exponent $\alpha(T_0)$ in the above equation, the assumption $s_0 - k - 1 \leq s$ permitting one to observe upon denoting

$$\alpha(T_0) = k - 2kd/s - \frac{d}{s}(1 - Vk/s)(2(s-d) - s_0) + T_0 \left(\frac{2d}{s}(1 - Vk/s) - 2ck^3/s^3 \right) \quad (9.23)$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(T_0) &\leq k - 2kd/s - d(1 - Vk/s)(1 - 2d/s - k/s - 1/s) + T_0 \left(\frac{2d}{s}(1 - Vk/s) - 2ck^3/s^3 \right) \\ &\leq k - d + \frac{k\beta_k(T_0)}{s}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.24)$$

wherein

$$\beta_k(T_0) = -d + dV \left(1 - \frac{k}{s} \right) + \frac{d(2d+1)}{k} + \frac{2T_0 d}{k} - \frac{2ck^2 T_0}{s^2}.$$

We first assume the conditions described in the first part of the statement and introduce in the context underlying these and for each $T_0 \leq T_d(k)$ the parameter

$$V(T_0) = \frac{(d+1+T_0)s}{k^2} + c \left(\frac{2}{Dd} + \frac{k}{s} \right). \quad (9.25)$$

We also allude to (9.4) and set $c = c_k$, it being worth noting in view of the trivial bound

$$c_k < \frac{1}{\frac{2}{Dd} + \frac{k}{s}} < Dd/2 \quad (9.26)$$

and the restrictions on d and s that

$$c_k < \frac{s}{2k} + \frac{Dk}{8s} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{s}{k} \right)^2 + \frac{D}{8} \leq \left(\frac{s}{k} \right)^2.$$

As a prelude to the discussion we verify first the condition (9.13) by employing beforehand the constraint $T_d(k) \leq 3k/4$ in conjunction with (9.26) to the end of deducing the relation

$$s^3 d \leq \frac{3}{2} k^4 c \leq \frac{3Ddk^4}{4}, \quad (9.27)$$

from where it follows by the bound $s \geq 15k/2$ that

$$\frac{s^2}{Dk} \leq \frac{3k^3}{4s} \leq \frac{k^2}{10}. \quad (9.28)$$

We then utilise the aforementioned collection of ingredients in conjunction with the bound $k \geq 100$ and $s \geq 15k/2$ to derive the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (d+1+T_0)s + ck^2 \left(\frac{2}{dD} + \frac{k}{s} \right) &\leq \frac{s^2}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4} + \frac{304sk}{400} + k^2 \leq \frac{s^2}{Dk} + \frac{304sk}{400} + \frac{401k^2}{400} \\ &\leq \frac{441k^2}{400} + \frac{304sk}{400} \leq \left(\frac{147}{1000} + \frac{304}{400} \right) sk < sk, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first step we used the bound $T_0 \leq 3k/4$, that pertaining to d in the statement and the first estimate in (9.26), and on the third step we employed (9.28). The condition (9.13) then follows upon recalling (9.25), as desired.

In order to proceed in the proof we insert (9.25) into the line defining $\beta_k(T_0)$ to obtain

$$\beta_k(T_0) \leq T_0 \left(\frac{ds}{k^2} - \frac{2k^2c}{s^2} + \frac{d}{k} \right) + \frac{d(d+1)s}{k^2} + \frac{d^2}{k} - d + \frac{2c}{D} + \frac{cdk}{s}.$$

It is then worth noting that the aforementioned choice for c delivers the identity

$$\frac{d(d+1)s}{k^2} + \frac{d^2}{k} - d + \frac{2c}{D} + \frac{cdk}{s} = -\frac{d}{40} \left(1 - \frac{(d+1)s}{k^2} - \frac{d}{k} \right).$$

We also remark that (9.27) in conjunction with the condition $s \geq 15k/2$ delivers

$$\frac{s^2d}{2k^3} \left(\frac{s}{k} + 1 \right) \leq \frac{2s^3d}{3k^4} \leq c.$$

The above inequality then implies

$$\frac{ds}{k^2} - \frac{2k^2c}{s^2} + \frac{d}{k} \leq 0.$$

Therefore, by inserting the preceding estimates into (9.24), and noting that the condition $D \leq 4c_k$ entails

$$\frac{1}{39} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{Ddk}{4s} \right) \leq \frac{d}{40} \left(1 - \frac{(d+1)s}{k^2} - \frac{d}{k} \right)$$

we obtain

$$\alpha(T_0) \leq k - d - k/78s - \frac{Ddk^2}{156s^2}.$$

We thereby combine the above lines with (9.22) to get

$$\sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |B_1(m)|^2 \ll P^{k-d-k/78s}. \quad (9.29)$$

We conclude the analysis pertaining to the first instance described at the statement of the proposition by recalling that the above discussion is correct subject to the validity of (9.18), deducing that the upper bound therein is superior to that in the statement of the proposition being a desideratum. Indeed, by noting in view of the fact that $s \geq \sqrt{D}k/2$ and the restriction on d , these in turn entailing $d \leq \frac{s}{kD} + \frac{k}{4s} \leq \frac{2s}{kD}$, that the choice in (9.25) combined with the above bound yields $V \geq \frac{2ck}{s}$, one gets when applying the latter in conjunction with the assumption $D \leq 4c_k$ that

$$\frac{s^2 - ck^2}{Dk(s - Vk)} = \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{sV - ck}{D(s - Vk)} \geq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{ck}{Ds} \geq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}. \quad (9.30)$$

When k is sufficiently large and satisfies $s_0 - (k + k^2/s) \leq s \asymp k \log k$ then by making recourse to (9.23) one would have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(T_0) &\leq k - 2kd/s - d(1 - Vk/s)(1 - 2d/s - k/s - k^2/s^2) + T_0 \left(\frac{2d}{s}(1 - Vk/s) - 2ck^3/s^3 \right) \\ &\leq k - d + \frac{k}{s} \left(-d + dV \left(1 - \frac{k}{s} - \frac{k^2}{s^2} \right) + \frac{dk}{s} + \frac{2d^2}{k} + \frac{2T_0d}{k} - \frac{2ck^2T_0}{s^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9.31)$$

Consequently, taking instead $V = Dk/2s$ and $c = s^7/k^8$ one would have $T_0 \leq T_d(k) = O(k(\log k)^{-3})$ and hence

$$\alpha(T_0) \leq k - d - \frac{dk}{s} \left(1 + E(d, k) \right)$$

with $E(d, k)$ being a function satisfying $E(d, k) = O((\log k)^{-1})$. In addition, a similar argument as in (9.30) in conjunction with the proviso $c = O(k^{-1}(\log k)^7)$ would entail

$$\frac{s^2 - ck^2}{Dk(s - Vk)} = \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{sV}{D(s - Vk)} + O(k^{-1}(\log k)^6) = \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{2(s - Vk)} + O(k^{-1}(\log k)^6),$$

from where it follows for k sufficiently large that

$$\frac{s^2 - ck^2}{Dk(s - Vk)} \geq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}.$$

Therefore, by the preceding discussion and (9.7) one gets

$$\sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |B_1(m)|^2 \ll P^{k-d-dk\zeta_k+\varepsilon}. \quad (9.32)$$

In order to obtain the conclusion involving (9.10) we take $V = 1$ and $c = s^7/k^8$. One then would have whenever k is sufficiently large that

$$\frac{s^2k^6 - s^7}{Dk^7(s - k)} = O(\log k)$$

and hence $d/k = O(k^{-1}(\log k))$ and $ck^2/s^2 \gg k^{-1}(\log k)^5$, an ensuing consequence being

$$\frac{2T_0d}{k} - \frac{2ck^2T_0}{s^2} = 2T_0 \left(\frac{d}{k} - \frac{ck^2}{s^2} \right) < 0.$$

By combining the above with (9.31) then

$$\alpha(T_0) \leq k - d - \frac{dk}{s} \left(\left(\frac{k}{s} \right)^2 + E_1(k, d) \right),$$

where $E_1(k, d) = O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)$, whence inserting the above in (9.22) yields

$$\sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |B_1(m)|^2 \ll P^{k-d-dk\gamma_k+\varepsilon}. \quad (9.33)$$

It is opportune to remark that (9.18) for the above choices of V and c is equivalent to that in the statement of the proposition.

In order to proceed in the proof we shall provide an estimate for $B_2(m)$ of sufficient robustness for our purposes. We thus start by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_2(m)| &\ll \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2})} \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)| d\alpha \\
&\ll \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} (P^{1-c(k/s)^2})^{\frac{kT_0}{s}} \sum_{\substack{j_{T_0+1}, \dots, j_{s-d} \\ P_{j_l} \geq P^{1-c(k/s)^2}}} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2})} \prod_{l=T_0+1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)| d\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{9.34}$$

where in the last step we inserted the trivial bound (9.15) on the factors with $l \leq T_0$. We then observe as is customary that whenever $P^{1-c(k/s)^2} \leq P_{j_l} \leq P$ then one has

$$\mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)}, P^{1-c(k/s)^2}) \subset \mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)+ck^3/s^2}, P_{j_l}).$$

Equipped with the above relation it seems worth denoting $\mathfrak{M}_0 = \mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)}, P^{1-c(\frac{k}{s})^2})$, recalling (9.4) and alluding to both Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 in order to derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathfrak{M}_0} \prod_{l=T_0+1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)| d\alpha &\ll \max_{l \geq T_0} \int_{\mathfrak{M}(P^{\frac{k^2 D d}{2s}(1-Vk/s)+ck^3/s^2}, P_{j_l})} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^{s-d-T_0} d\alpha \\
&\ll \max_{l \geq T_0} P_{j_l}^{(s-d-T_0)k/s-k} P^{\frac{dDk}{s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})\Delta_{sT_0}+2c\Delta_{sT_0}k^2/s^2+\varepsilon} \\
&\ll P^{(d+T_0)(\frac{ck^3}{s^3}-k/s)+\frac{dDk}{s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})\Delta_{sT_0}+2c\Delta_{sT_0}k^2/s^2+\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

the latter being employed in view of the inequality $\Delta_{sT_0} \geq 0$ when the corresponding height of the major arcs exceeds $P_{j_l}^{k/2}$. The reader may find it useful noting that in the second estimate of the above lines we applied either Proposition 2.1 or Lemma 2.2 accordingly for the choice $t = s_{T_0}$ and bounded the potential remaining copy of $|g_s(\alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|$ via (9.15). In the last step we employed the fact that $P^{1-c(k/s)^2} \leq P_{j_l}$ for every $l \geq T_0$. Inserting the preceding estimate into (9.34) permits one to derive for every $m \in [N, 2N]$ the bound

$$|B_2(m)| \ll \sum_{T_0 \leq T_d(k)} P^{-dk/s+ck^3d/s^3+\frac{dDk}{s}(1-\frac{Vk}{s})\Delta_{sT_0}+2c\Delta_{sT_0}k^2/s^2+\varepsilon}. \tag{9.35}$$

The assumption (9.5) stated above yields the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&-dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 + \frac{dDk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{Vk}{s}\right) \Delta_{sT_0} + 2c\Delta_{sT_0} k^2/s^2 \leq -dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{dk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{Vk}{s}\right) + \frac{2ck^2}{Ds^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} + \left(\frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k}\right)^2\right) \\
&\leq \frac{ck^3d}{s^3} + \frac{k^2}{s^2} \left(\frac{2c}{D} - dV\right) \left(1 + \frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} + \left(\frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k}\right)^2\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{dT_0}{s} + \frac{d(d+1)}{s} + \frac{d(T_0 + d + 1)^2}{ks}.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus assume first the conditions in the first part of the statement and recall the choices (9.25) and $c = c_k$ to deduce that under such provisos then

$$-dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 + \frac{dDk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{Vk}{s}\right) \Delta_{sT_0} + 2c\Delta_{sT_0} k^2/s^2 \leq -\frac{k^2 d^2 c}{s^3},$$

which combined with (9.35) enables one to deduce that

$$|B_2(m)| \ll P^{-\frac{k^2 d^2 c}{s^3} + \varepsilon}, \quad (9.36)$$

as desired. If moreover $s \asymp k \log k$ then by taking $V = Dk/2s$ and $c = s^7/k^8$ as above one would have $c \asymp (\log k)^7/k$ and $T_0 + d \ll k/(\log k)^3$, whence

$$-dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 + \frac{dDk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{Vk}{s}\right) \Delta_{sT_0} + 2c\Delta_{sT_0} k^2/s^2 \leq -\frac{k^3 dD}{2s^3} \left(1 + E_0(k, s)\right)$$

with $E_0(k, s) \ll 1/(\log k)$, the preceding estimate thereby delivering for sufficiently large k the conclusion $|B_2(m)| \ll P^{-\frac{k^3 dD}{3s^3}}$.

If one is instead in the situation described at the second part of the statement of the proposition then upon recalling the choices $V = 1$ and $c = s^7/k^8$ one has by (9.8) and for sufficiently large k the bound

$$\begin{aligned} -dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 + \frac{dDk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{Vk}{s}\right) \Delta_{sT_0} + 2c\Delta_{sT_0} k^2/s^2 &\leq -dk/s + cdk^3/s^3 \\ + \frac{dk}{s} \left(1 - \frac{k}{s}\right) \left(1 + \frac{k}{s} + \frac{2k^2}{3s^2}\right) + 4ck^2/s^2 &\leq -(1/3 - c) \frac{dk^3}{s^3} + 4ck^2/s^2 < -\frac{dk^3}{4s^3}, \end{aligned}$$

where we employed the fact that both $\frac{dk^3}{s^3} \gg (\log k)^{-3}$ with $c = O((\log k)^7 k^{-1})$ and $ck^2/s^2 \ll k^{-1}(\log k)^5$, which in conjunction with (9.35) permits one to derive

$$|B_2(m)| \ll P^{-\frac{dk^3}{4s^3}}. \quad (9.37)$$

We conclude the proof by analysing the contribution flowing from $C(m)$, it in turn having been defined in (9.12). We first apply in a routinary manner as above Bessel's and Holder's inequalities subsequently to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |C(m)|^2 &\ll (\log P)^{s-d} \sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} \sum_{T_0 > T_d(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} |I_j(m, [0, 1])|^2 \\ &\ll (\log P)^{s-d} \sum_{T_0 > T_d(k)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T_0}(P)} \int_0^1 \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^2 d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We utilise (9.15) to estimate trivially the factors in the above line with $l \leq T_d(k)$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |C(m)|^2 &\ll P^\varepsilon \sum_{T_0 > T_d(k)} \sum_{\substack{j_{T_0+1}, \dots, j_{s-d} \\ P_{j_l} \geq P^{1-c(k/s)^2}}} (P^{1-c(k/s)^2})^{\frac{2kT_d(k)}{s}} \int_0^1 \prod_{l=T_d(k)+1}^{s-d} |g_s(a_l \alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^2 d\alpha \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^{1-c(k/s)^2})^{\frac{2kT_d(k)}{s}} \max_{P_{j_l} \leq P} \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P_{j_l}, R)|^{2(s-T_d(k)-d)} d\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (9.38)$$

wherein the last step we employed orthogonality to eliminate the coefficient a_l . Equipped with the inequalities in (9.20) and the trivial bound (9.15) one may estimate the integral

in the preceding equation via Proposition 6.1, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P_{j_i}, R)|^{2(s-T_d(k)-d)} d\alpha &\ll (P_{j_i}^{k/s})^{2(s-T_d(k)-d)-s_0} \int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, P_{j_i}, R)|^{s_0} d\alpha \\ &\ll P_{j_i}^{2(s-T_d(k)-d)\frac{k}{s}-k} \ll P^{2(s-T_d(k)-d)\frac{k}{s}-k}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we utilised the restriction $P_{j_i} \leq P$ in conjunction with the fact that the corresponding exponents in the last line are positive, it in turn being a direct consequence of (9.20). We then recall (9.3) and insert the above estimate in (9.38) to derive

$$\sum_{m \in [N, 2N]} |C(m)|^2 \ll P^{k-d-2dk/s+\varepsilon}.$$

We thereby combine the preceding expression with the equations (9.11), (9.29) and (9.36) to deduce that whenever $m \in [N, 2N]$ then

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll |B_1(m)| + |C(m)| + N^{-\frac{kd^2c}{s^3}+\varepsilon}, \quad (9.39)$$

wherein by a routine pidgeonhole argument one has for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-1/240s})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ the bound $|B_1(m)| \ll N^{-1/240s}$ and for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d/s})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ the estimate

$$|C(m)| \ll N^{-d/3s}.$$

The proposition in the first instance then follows by the preceding discussion. If instead $s_0 - (k + k^2/s) \leq s \asymp k \log k$ then one has by (9.37) that (9.39) holds with $N^{-dk^2/4s^3}$ replacing the summand $N^{-\frac{kd^2c}{s^3}+\varepsilon}$. It moreover transpires by (9.32) whenever $s \asymp k \log k$ and for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d\zeta_k})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ that

$$|B_1(m)| \ll N^{-dk/s^2}$$

since $k/s^2 = O(k^{-1}(\log k)^{-2})$ and hence it can be absorbed by the error term cognate to ζ_k , the bound $|B_1(m)| \ll N^{-d/k^2}$ holding by (9.33) for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d\gamma_k})$ integers $m \in [N, 2N]$ by a similar argument when $s_0 - k(1 + k/s) \leq s \asymp k \log k$. \square

The upcoming lemma shall instead encompass the instance in which d exceeds the threshold presented in the above proposition. For such purposes we assume for some integer $1 \leq d_0 \leq s - 2$ that $\Delta_2 \lfloor \frac{s-d_0}{2} \rfloor$ is an admissible exponent and denote

$$\delta_{d_0} = \Delta_2 \lfloor \frac{s-d_0}{2} \rfloor, \quad \tau_{d_0} = \frac{|\delta_{d_0} - d_0 k/s|}{2(s-d_0)k}.$$

Lemma 9.1. *Let $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \geq d_0 + 2$ with the property that δ_{d_0} satisfies $s\delta_{d_0} < d_0 k$, suppose that $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d_0 \leq d \leq s - 1$ and let $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}$. Then for sufficiently large N and every integer $m \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll m^{-\tau_{d_0}}.$$

Proof. We begin as is customary by alluding to the dyadic dissections (7.10) and observe that inserting those in (9.1) in conjunction with an application of Holder's inequality and

a change of variables delivers

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \ll \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{i} \in [0, \lfloor \frac{\log P}{\log 2} \rfloor]^{s-d} \\ i_1 \leq i_s}} \prod_{l=1}^{s-d} \left(\int_0^1 |g_s(\alpha, 2^{-i_l} P, R)|^{s-d_0} d\alpha \right)^{1/(s-d_0)},$$

it being worth recalling (4.1) and (7.1) and remarking that $d \geq d_0$. We conclude the proof by noting that $2^{-i_1} P \asymp P$ and invoking Lemma 2.2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^{\delta_{d_0} - d_0 k/s})^{1/(s-d_0)} \max_{P_1 \leq P} (P_1^{\delta_{d_0} - d_0 k/s})^{(s-d-1)/(s-d_0)} \\ &\ll (m^{\delta_{d_0} - d_0 k/s + \varepsilon})^{1/k(s-d_0)} \ll m^{-\tau_{d_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

wherein we employed the condition $s\delta_{d_0} < d_0 k$, as desired. \square

We note for further convenience that the above lemma yields for $d_0 \leq d \leq s-1$ the existence of a constant $K_3 > 0$ for which for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ then

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \leq K_3 m^{-\tau_{d_0}}, \quad (9.40)$$

denote by K_1 and K_2 respectively to the implicit constants underlying (9.6) and (9.9), and write $\tilde{K} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 4} K_i$, the constant K_4 being defined later on in (11.14). In order to make further progress in the section we deem it appropriate to introduce beforehand for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, tuples $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [1, n^{1/k}]^d$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d) \in [1, s]^d$ the function

$$Y_{\mathbf{b}}(n, \mathbf{x}) = n - b_1 x_1^k - \dots - b_d x_d^k.$$

We also recall (7.6) and the definition of δ_{s-1}^* in Lemma 7.1, and introduce

$$\nu_0 = \frac{2\tau_0}{s}, \quad \tau_0 = \min \left(\nu/16, \frac{1}{3(s-1)} \left| 1 - \frac{s}{k} \delta_{s-1}^* \right|, s \min_{1 \leq d_0 \leq s-1} \tau_{d_0}/2, k/8s^2 \right), \quad (9.41)$$

and, whenever $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}$ with $1 \leq d \leq s-1$ the sets

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d,\mathbf{a}}(N) = \left\{ n \in [1, 2N] : F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(n) > \tilde{K} n^{-\nu_0} \right\}. \quad (9.42)$$

For each $l \leq s-1$ we further consider $\mathcal{B}_l(n) = [1, s]^{s-l} \times [1, s]^d \times [1, n^{1/k}]^d \cap \mathbb{N}^{s+2d-l}$ and

$$\mathcal{Z}_d(N) = \bigcup_{l=d}^{s-1} \left\{ n \in [1, 2N] : \exists (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_d(n) : Y_{\mathbf{b}}(n, \mathbf{x}) = m > 0, \quad F_{l,\mathbf{a}}(m) > \tilde{K} m^{-\nu_0} \right\}. \quad (9.43)$$

Likewise, we recall (7.6), (7.12) and (7.26), set $v_0 = \min(\nu/30, \nu/8s)$ and define

$$\mathcal{Z}_0(N) = \bigcup_{r \in \{r_{s,k}, r_{s,k}^\varphi\}} \left\{ n \in [1, 2N] : |r(n, R) - c_{k,s}(\eta) \mathfrak{S}(n)| \geq (\log n)^{-v_0} + \varphi(n)^{-v_0} \right\}, \quad (9.44)$$

where in the above line we are taking integers n for which the preceding inequality holds for $r(n, R)$ being either $r_{s,k}(n, R)$ or $r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n, R)$. In what follows we shall write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(N) = \bigcup_{d=1}^{s-1} \bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}} \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d,\mathbf{a}}(N), \quad (9.45)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}(N) = \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}(N) \cup \bigcup_{d=0}^{s-1} \mathcal{Z}_d(N). \quad (9.46)$$

It then transpires whenever $n \in [1, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ that for every $1 \leq d \leq l \leq s-1$, each $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in [1, s]^{s-l} \times [1, s]^d$, every tuple of natural numbers $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [1, n^{1/k}]^d$ and

$$m = n - b_1 x_1^k - \dots - b_d x_d^k$$

with $m > 0$ one gets $F_{l, \mathbf{a}}(m) \leq \tilde{K} m^{-\nu_0}$. Moreover, in view of (9.40) and (9.41) one has for $d_0 \leq d \leq s-1$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}$ that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d, \mathbf{a}}(N) = \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{Z}_d(N) = \emptyset. \quad (9.47)$$

We deduce as a corollary of the analysis performed in the present section estimates for the cardinality of the preceding set.

Corollary 9.1. *Under the assumptions in both Corollary 8.1 and Proposition 9.1 concerning the first situation described therein and the existence of some $d_0 \leq \lceil \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \rceil$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma 9.1, one has for every sufficiently large N the estimate*

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll N^{1-\zeta_k}$$

for some $\zeta_k > 0$ which, when in addition k is sufficiently large and s is as in the second part of the statement in Corollary 8.1 satisfies (9.7). If instead k, s fulfil the conditions concerning the second situation described in both the aforementioned proposition and Corollary 8.1, and there is some $d_0 \leq \lceil \frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{Dk^7(s-k)} \rceil$ for which the constraints in Lemma 9.1 hold then

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll N^{1-\gamma_k},$$

the parameter $\gamma_k > 0$ satisfying (9.10).

Proof. We first note for fixed $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^{s-d}$ with $1 \leq d \leq d_0 - 1$ and under the assumptions right above (9.6) that as a consequence of Proposition 9.1 one has for all but $O(N^{1-d/k-d/240s})$ integers $n \in [N, 2N]$ that then

$$F_{d, \mathbf{a}}(n) \leq K_1 n^{-k/4s^3}.$$

In view of the definition (9.42) this implies in particular

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d, \mathbf{a}}(N)| \ll N^{1-d/k-d/240s} \ll N^{1-d/240s}, \quad (9.48)$$

an analogous argument delivering when $s \asymp k \log k$ and for k sufficiently large the estimate

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d, \mathbf{a}}(N)| \ll N^{1-d/k-d\zeta_k} \ll N^{1-\zeta_k}$$

with $\zeta_k > 0$ as in (9.7). If instead $s_0 - k(1 + k/s) \leq s \asymp k \log k$ and the assumptions right above (9.8) hold then one has

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{d, \mathbf{a}}(N)| \ll N^{1-d/k-d\gamma_k} \ll N^{1-\gamma_k}.$$

On the other hand, it is apparent from Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1 that whenever $s \geq 4k + 2$ with Δ_{2s}^* being an admissible exponent for minor arcs satisfying $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ then

$$|\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| \ll N^{1-\theta\nu/2sk},$$

for each $0 < \theta \leq \min(k^2/(3s), \frac{2s^2+8k^2-2ks}{s(s+24)})$, and if k is large enough and k, s fulfil the conditions in the second part of Proposition 8.2 one has $|\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| \ll N^{1-\nu_k}$, the parameter

ν_k satisfying (8.7). We conclude the proof by noting in view of (9.47) for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq d \leq s - 1$ that

$$\mathcal{Z}_d(N) \subset \bigcup_{l=d}^{s-1} \bigcup_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in [1,s]^d \\ \mathbf{a} \in [1,s]^{s-l}}} \left\{ n \in [1, 2N] : n = m + b_1 x_1^k + \dots + b_d x_d^k, \quad m \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{l,\mathbf{a}}(N), \quad x_i \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

It thereby follows by the conclusion after (9.47) and the first estimate in (9.48) that $\mathcal{Z}_d(N) = \emptyset$ if $d_0 \leq d \leq s - 1$ and otherwise

$$|\mathcal{Z}_d(N)| \ll N^{d/k} \sum_{l=d}^{d_0-1} |\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{l,\mathbf{a}}(N)| \ll N^{d/k} \sum_{l=d}^{d_0-1} N^{1-l/k-l/240s} \ll N^{1-d/240s},$$

as desired, the preceding upper bound being replaced via an analogous procedure by both $N^{1-\zeta_k}$ and $N^{1-\gamma_k}$ under the second and the third situations respectively described previously. The corollary then follows by combining the above equations. \square

10. PRELIMINARY PROBABILISTIC LEMMATA

We begin by introducing some required infrastructure, it being convenient to present first the following lemma that establishes the existence of the probability space on which to base our manoeuvres. We write Ω to refer to the set of sequences of the natural numbers.

Lemma 10.1. *Let $(\theta_n)_n$ be a sequence of real numbers having the property that*

$$0 \leq \theta_n \leq 1 \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then there exists a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ satisfying:

- (i) *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the event $\mathcal{B}^{(n)} = \{\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N} : n \in \mathfrak{X}\}$ is measurable and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^{(n)}) = \theta_n$.*
- (ii) *The events $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(2)}, \dots$ are independent.*

Proof. See Halberstam-Roth [15, Theorem 13, §3]. \square

The majority of the results obtained herein which shall eventually lead to establishing a particular conclusion in a set of measure 1 and for a sufficiently large integer shall have its reliance on the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

Lemma 10.2 (Borel-Cantelli). *Let $\{E_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of measurable events having the property that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(E_n) < \infty.$$

Then with probability 1 at most a finite number of them occur.

Proof. See Halberstam-Roth [15, Theorem 7, §3]. \square

In order to state the main concentration inequality employed throughout the memoir it seems worth introducing beforehand some notation. Let t_1, \dots, t_m be independent Bernoulli random variables and let $Y(\mathbf{t}) = Y(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ be a *positive simplified normal* polynomial of degree d , i.e. a polynomial of degree d with positive coefficients of size at most 1 with each of the factors t_i in the monomials appearing at most once. We shall write for $A \subset [1, n]$ the

symbol $\partial_A(F)$ to denote the partial derivatives of Y with respect to the variables given by the indexes in A , and abbreviate by $\mathbb{E}_A(Y)$ the expected value $\mathbb{E}(\partial_A(Y(\mathbf{t})))$.

We next introduce for any $0 \leq j \leq s-1$ for the sake of preciseness the auxiliary expectation $\mathbb{E}_j(Y) = \max_{A \subset [1, n], |A| \leq s-1} \mathbb{E}_A(Y)$. We further set for a given constant $K \geq 1$ the function $f(K) = \max \left\{ 1, \lceil (K/s!)^{1/s} \rceil - 1 \right\}$ and the sum $b(s, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \binom{n}{j}$, and consider for a parameter $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq 1$ the expression

$$r(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0) = \frac{2b(s, n)\varepsilon_0^{f(K/2)/2}}{f(K/2)!} + \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0^{1/8}}{K}\right)^{\lfloor (1/8s) \log(1/\varepsilon_0) \rfloor}. \quad (10.1)$$

We also define recursively $h(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0)$ by means of the formula

$$h(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0) = h(s-1, K, n + \lceil \mathbb{E}(Y) \rceil, \varepsilon_0) + nr(s-1, K, n, \varepsilon_0)$$

with $h(1, K, n, \varepsilon_0) = 0$. We find it opportune to observe that if $\mathbb{E}(Y) \leq n/Q$ for sufficiently large Q then it would follow that $h(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0) \leq 2snr(s-1, K, 2n, \varepsilon_0)$. Equipped with this notation we may now introduce the main technical probabilistic proposition of the paper.

Proposition 10.1. *Let Y be a positive simplified normal polynomial of degree at most s . Then, for any positive numbers ε_0, λ and K satisfying $K \geq 2s$ with $\mathbb{E}_1(Y) \leq \varepsilon_0 \leq 1$ and such that $4sK\lambda \leq \mathbb{E}(Y)$, it follows that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y - \mathbb{E}(Y)| \geq (4sK\lambda\mathbb{E}(Y))^{1/2}) \leq 2se^{-\lambda/4} + h(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0).$$

Proof. See [28, Theorem 1.3]. □

11. THE PROBABILISTIC METHOD

We shall make use of Lemma 10.1 in order to construct for a function ψ of uniform growth with exponent ε and upon recalling (7.12) the probabilistic space $\mathcal{S}_\psi(k, s, \eta)$ of sequences $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}$ stemming from such a lemma by defining

$$\mathbb{P}(y \in \mathfrak{X}) = \begin{cases} x^{-1+k/s} c_{k,s}(\eta)^{-1/s} \psi(x^k)^{1/s} & \text{if } y = x^k \text{ for some } x \in \mathcal{A}(x, x^\eta) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11.1)$$

We shall denote for simplicity

$$\psi_1(y) = c_{k,s}(\eta)^{-1} \psi(y). \quad (11.2)$$

It then seems desirable to consider for each $x \in \mathcal{A}(x, x^\eta)$ the random variable t_x defined by $t_x = 1$ if $x^k \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $t_x = 0$ else, these in turn being independent. In view of the above definitions it then transpires that

$$\mathbb{P}(t_x = 1) = x^{-1+k/s} \psi_1(x^k)^{1/s}, \quad \mathbb{P}(t_x = 0) = 1 - x^{-1+k/s} \psi_1(x^k)^{1/s}.$$

Equipped with the preceding considerations we define for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the random variable

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta)}} \prod_{j=1}^s t_{x_j}. \quad (11.3)$$

We shall split the above sum for convenience and write

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\neq}(n) + R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\equiv}(n), \quad (11.4)$$

where the term $R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\neq}(n)$ is defined in an analogous manner as $R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n)$ but with the underlying variables having the property that $x_i \neq x_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq s$. Likewise, the random variable $R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\equiv}(n)$ is defined in a similar fashion but comprising instead tuples for which $x_i = x_j$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq s$. Moreover, we further decompose

$$R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\neq}(n) = R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n) + R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n), \quad (11.5)$$

where $R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n)$ is defined by imposing to the underlying tuples the condition $x_i > n^{\tau_0/k}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq s$, and where $R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)$ instead comprises tuples satisfying $x_j \leq n^{\tau_0/k}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s$, where τ_0 was defined in (9.41).

We shall next apply the procedure utilised in [29], it being desirable computing some auxiliary expectations with the aid of the arithmetic results obtained in previous sections.

Lemma 11.1. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\Delta_s^*, \Delta_{s-1}^*$ be admissible exponents for minor arcs satisfying either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$. Then, whenever $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) \ll n^{-\tau_0/s}.$$

Proof. By recalling the definitions in the previous page and (7.1) it transpires that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^{\tau_0}) \\ x_i \neq x_j \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) \leq n^{\tau_0/k}}} \mathbb{P}(x_1^k, \dots, x_s^k \in \mathfrak{X}) \ll P^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, P^\eta) \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) \leq n^{\tau_0/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s}.$$

We then note upon setting $\varphi(n) = n^{1-\tau_0}$ that (7.21) yields

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) \ll P^\varepsilon |r_{s,k}(n, P^\eta) - r_{s,k}^\varphi(n, P^\eta)|,$$

whence when $\Delta_s^* < 0$ it is apparent by equation (7.25) and (9.41) that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) \ll n^{\varepsilon - (1-\tau_0)\nu/4s} \ll n^{-\tau_0/s}.$$

If on the contrary $\Delta_s^* \geq 0$ but $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$ then a customary application of orthogonality as therein delivers

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) \ll P^\varepsilon \left| \int_0^1 \tilde{f}_s(\alpha, P, R) f_s(\alpha, P, R)^{s-2} f_s(\alpha, P^{\tau_0}, R) e(-\alpha n) d\alpha \right|,$$

whence by recalling (7.7) for convenience it follows by an application of the triangle inequality and Lemma 7.1 that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) \ll P^\varepsilon I_{[0,1],1}^{1,1}(P, P^{\tau_0}) \ll P^{\varepsilon + k\tau_0/s - \frac{1}{s-1}(k/s - \delta_{s-1}^*)} \ll P^{-k\tau_0/s},$$

where we employed (9.41), as desired. \square

We shall make further progress by presenting an analogous lemma within the same circle of ideas required in the concentration inequality proposition utilised herein. To such an end it seems pertinent recalling (7.7) and (9.41) and introducing first an auxiliary lemma employed on multiple occasions throughout the section.

Lemma 11.2. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\Delta_s^*, \Delta_{s-1}^*$ be admissible exponents for minor arcs satisfying either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be a fixed constant. Then, for every $1 \leq l \leq s - 1$ and every sufficiently large integer m one has*

$$I_{[0,1],\gamma}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1) \ll m^{-2\tau_0/s}. \quad (11.6)$$

Proof. We assume first that $\Delta_s^* < 0$ for convenience and apply Lemma 7.1 for the choice $Q = m^{1/4s}$ and $P = m^{1/k}$ to deduce that

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q),\gamma}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1) \ll m^{-\nu/4s},$$

where ν was defined in (7.6). On the other hand, the customary remark $\text{meas}(\mathfrak{M}(Q)) \leq m^{1/2s-1}$ in conjunction with the trivial bounds permits one to obtain

$$I_{\mathfrak{m}(Q),\gamma}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1) \ll m^{l/s+1/2s-1} \ll m^{-1/2s}.$$

The combination of the preceding estimates delivers

$$I_{[0,1],\gamma}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1) \ll m^{-\nu/4s}$$

and hence the bound (11.6) under the first assumption in the statement.

If instead one has $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$ then another application of Lemma 7.1 yields

$$I_{[0,1],\gamma}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1) \ll m^{\varepsilon - \frac{1}{s-1}(1/s - \delta_{s-1}^*/k)} \ll m^{-2\tau_0/s}.$$

□

Lemma 11.3. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\Delta_s^*, \Delta_{s-1}^*$ be admissible exponents for minor arcs satisfying either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$. Then, for every $1 \leq l \leq s - 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^\neq(m)) \ll m^{-\tau_0/s}.$$

Proof. By definition and a similar argument as in Lemma 11.1 it is apparent that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^\neq(m)) \ll m^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{m=x_1^k+\dots+x_l^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta)}} (x_1 \cdots x_l)^{-1+k/s} \ll m^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{m=x_1^k+\dots+x_l^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(m^{1/k}, m^{\eta/k})}} (x_1 \cdots x_l)^{-1+k/s}.$$

Then, upon recalling (7.5) one has that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^\neq(m)) \ll m^\varepsilon I_{[0,1],1}^{1,s-l}(m^{1/k}, 1), \quad (11.7)$$

whence the above estimate in conjunction with Lemma 11.2 delivers the desired result. □

We further recall (9.41), introduce for convenience the set

$$\mathcal{R}^+(n) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^s : n = x_1^k + \dots + x_s^k, \quad x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta) : x_i > n^{\tau_0/k}, \quad x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j \right\}, \quad (11.8)$$

and write for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and henceforth $\text{Set}(\mathbf{x}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$.

Lemma 11.4. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\Delta_s^*, \Delta_{s-1}^*$ be admissible exponents for minor arcs satisfying either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$. Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ be a set of indexes $A = \{a_1^k, \dots, a_l^k\}$ where $|A| = l$ with $a_j \in \mathcal{A}(a_j, a_j^\eta)$ and $1 \leq l \leq s - 1$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \ll n^{-\tau_0^2/s}.$$

If moreover $n \in [1, N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ one gets

$$\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \ll n^{-\nu_0\tau_0/2}.$$

Proof. We write for convenience

$$m = n - \sum_{y^k \in A} y^k \quad \text{and} \quad l = s - |A|.$$

One then has that

$$\partial_A(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(n)) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^+(n) \\ A \subset \text{Set}(\mathbf{x})}} \prod_{x_j \in \text{Set}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus A} t_{x_j}.$$

We observe that by relabelling if necessary, each $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_l, \dots, x_s)$ in the preceding sum satisfies

$$m = x_1^k + \dots + x_l^k,$$

whence upon employing the definition (11.8) it transpires that $m \geq x_1^k > n^{\tau_0}$. We apply expected values on both sides of the above equation to deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(\partial_A(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(n))) \ll \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},l}^\neq(m)).$$

We assume next the first hypothesis in the lemma and observe that the application of Lemma 11.3 enables one to derive the bound

$$\mathbb{E}(\partial_A(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(n))) \ll m^{-\tau_0/s} \ll n^{-\tau_0^2/s}$$

under both of the provisos described in the first statement of the lemma, as desired.

If instead the second hypothesis holds then since $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ one has upon recalling (9.46) that $n \notin \mathcal{Z}_{|A|}(N)$, it in turn entailing $F_{|A|,1}(m) \ll m^{-\nu_0}$. Consequently, the same argument in Lemma 11.3 and orthogonality permits one to deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(\partial_A(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(n))) \ll m^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{m=x_1^k+\dots+x_l^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(m^{1/k}, m^{\eta/k})}} (x_1 \cdots x_l)^{-1+k/s} \ll m^\varepsilon F_{|A|,1}(m) \ll m^{-\nu_0/2} \ll n^{-\nu_0\tau_0/2},$$

wherein we employed the same device as above. \square

We shall next include the upcoming lemma analysing the contribution of tuples with two of the components being equal. To such an end we introduce when $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ for tuples $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_l) \in [1, s]^l$ the set

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a},l}(n) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^l : \quad n = a_1 x_1^k + \dots + a_l x_l^k, \quad x_i \neq x_j \text{ for } i \neq j, \quad x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta) \right\}, \quad (11.9)$$

and consider the random variable

$$R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a},l}(n)} \prod_{x_j \in \text{Set}(\mathbf{x})} t_{x_j}. \quad (11.10)$$

Lemma 11.5. *Let $s \geq 4k+1$ and let $\Delta_s^*, \Delta_{s-1}^*$ be admissible exponents for minor arcs satisfying either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$. Let $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^l$ with $a_1 + \dots + a_l \leq s$. Then, one has for every sufficiently large integer n the bounds*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^{-\tau_0/s}, \quad \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^-(n)) \ll n^{-\tau_0/s}.$$

Proof. By definition and upon writing $P = n^{1/k}$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a},l}(n)} \mathbb{P}(x_1^k, \dots, x_l^k \in \mathfrak{X}) \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{n=a_1 x_1^k + \dots + a_l x_l^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, P^\eta)}} \prod_{i=1}^l x_i^{-1+k/s}. \quad (11.11)$$

Then it transpires by (9.1) and orthogonality that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon |F_{s-l,\mathbf{a}}(n)|,$$

where we employed the fact, by relabelling if necessary, that $x_1 > P_-$, the latter parameter being defined right after (4.1). We recall (7.7) and note that Holder's inequality in conjunction with a change of variables thereby entails

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{v=2}^l \int_0^1 |\tilde{f}_s(a_1\alpha, P, R)| |f_s(a_v\alpha, P, R)|^{l-1} d\alpha \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{v=2}^l I_{[0,1), a_v/a_1}^{1,s-l}(P, 1).$$

We apply Lemma 11.2 to each of the terms on the inner sum in the above equation to get

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^{\varepsilon-2\tau_0/s} \ll n^{-\tau_0/s}, \quad (11.12)$$

as desired. The second estimate follows by observing that

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^-(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} \sum_{\substack{a_1+\dots+a_l=s \\ \mathbf{a} \in [1,s]^l}} R_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n), \quad (11.13)$$

averaging on both sides and applying (11.12). \square

We deem it convenient noting for future use that the argument leading to (11.12) implies in particular upon recalling (9.1) that in the instances for which either $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$ then for any $1 \leq d \leq s-1$, any $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{s-d}) \in [1, s]^{s-d}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$F_{d,\mathbf{a}}(m) \leq K_4 m^{-2\tau_0/s}, \quad (11.14)$$

for some constant $K_4 > 0$, the definition (9.46) in particular entailing

$$\mathcal{Z}(N) = \mathcal{Z}_0(N). \quad (11.15)$$

We also record for future purposes upon writing

$$R_s^-(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} \sum_{\substack{a_1+\dots+a_l=s \\ \mathbf{a} \in [1,s]^l}} \sum_{\substack{n=a_1x_1^k+\dots+a_lx_l^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, P^\eta)}} \prod_{i=1}^l x_i^{-1+k/s} \quad (11.16)$$

that the above procedure yields

$$R_s^-(n) \ll n^{-2\tau_0/s}. \quad (11.17)$$

We have therefore prepared the ground for estimating appropriately the auxiliary random variables $R_{\mathbf{x},s}^-(n)$ and $R_{\mathbf{x},s}^0(n)$ in a set of positive probability. Indeed, we may employ the argument in the last paragraph of [29, page 128] with Lemmata 11.3 and 11.1 in the present memoir replacing respectively their counterparts Lemmata 3.4 and 3.6 of the aforementioned paper to show that there exists some constant $C_1 = C_1(s, k, \eta) > 0$ such that with probability at least $4/5$ one has for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the bound

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^0(n) \leq C_1. \quad (11.18)$$

Likewise, one might utilise the aforementioned argument in [29, page 128] with Lemma 11.5 herein (see also Lemma 13.4) replacing both Lemmata 3.4 and 3.6 therein to show for some $C_2 = C_2(s, k, \eta) > 0$ that with probability at least $4/5$ one has for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the bound

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^-(n) \leq C_2. \quad (11.19)$$

After the above sequel of results it remains to compute the mean of $R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)$. For such purposes we take a function $\varphi(x)$ of uniform growth, recall (1.11) and the definition of the parameter v_0 in (9.44) and note that one may assume henceforth in view of the statements of Theorems 1.2 et alia that $2\varphi(x) \leq \exp((\log x)^{1/2})$.

Proposition 11.1. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and assume that ψ, φ are functions of uniform growth with $|\xi_n - 1| \asymp 1$ and $2\varphi(x) \leq \exp((\log x)^{1/2})$. Whenever Δ_s^* is an admissible exponent for minor arcs with $\Delta_s^* < 0$ one has for sufficiently large N and every integer $n \in [N, 2N]$ that*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \asymp_{k,s} \psi(n). \quad (11.20)$$

If moreover $\xi(n) = o(1)$ then for sufficiently large N and every integer $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O(\psi(n)((\log n)^{-v_0} + \varphi(n)^{-v_0} + \xi_n)). \quad (11.21)$$

If there is no assumption on Δ_s^* then both equation (11.20) and (11.21) hold for every $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$.

Proof. We begin by recalling (7.1), (7.3) and the definition of $R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)$ right after (11.3) for the purpose of noting that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) = \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta) \\ x_i \neq x_j \\ x_i > n^{\tau_0/k}}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+k/s} \psi_1(x_i^k)^{1/s} \leq r_{k,s}(n, P^\eta) \psi_1(n), \quad (11.22)$$

wherein we applied the monotonicity of $\psi_1(x)$ and (7.4). We remind the reader of the formula for ψ_1 in (11.2) and note under the hypothesis $\Delta_s^* < 0$ that then the application of Proposition 7.1 delivers the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \leq \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + E(n), \quad (11.23)$$

where $E(n)$ is some arithmetic function satisfying $E(n) = O(\psi(n)(\log n)^{-v_0})$. If no condition on Δ_s^* is assumed and $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ the same holds by the definition (9.44) with the function $E(n)$ satisfying

$$E(n) = O(\psi(n)((\log n)^{-v_0} + \varphi(n)^{-v_0})).$$

In order to derive the corresponding lower bound we draw the attention back to (7.26) and (11.22) and note by the monotonicity of ψ_1 that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_i^\eta) \\ x_i \neq x_j \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})^{1/k}}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+k/s} \psi_1(x_i^k)^{1/s} \geq \psi_1(n/\varphi(n))r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) - \psi_1(n)R_s^-(n),$$

wherein it may be pertinent to recall (11.16). Then, by (11.17) we observe that there exists some constant $C_s > 0$ for which

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \psi_1(n/\varphi(n))r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) - C_s\psi(n)n^{-2\tau_0/s}.$$

Therefore, Corollary 7.2 in conjunction with (11.2) permits one to deduce the existence of a constant $C_{s,1} > 0$ for which

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n/\varphi(n)) - C_{s,1}\psi(n)((\log n)^{-v_0} + \varphi(n)^{-v_0}). \quad (11.24)$$

We deem it appropriate to observe by alluding to (9.1) that

$$R_s^-(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} \sum_{\substack{a_1+\dots+a_l=s \\ \mathbf{a} \in [1,s]^l}} F_{s-l,\mathbf{a}}(n)$$

for the choice $R = P^n$, whence if $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ then by (9.42) and (9.45) in conjunction with the monotonicity of ψ_1 we note that there is some constant $C_{s,2} > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \psi_1(n/\varphi(n))r_{s,k,\eta}^\varphi(n) - C_{s,2}n^{-\nu_0}.$$

Therefore, in view of the fact that $n \notin \mathcal{Z}_0(N)$ there exists $C_{s,1} > 0$ for which

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n/\varphi(n)) - C_{s,1}\psi(n)((\log n)^{-\nu_0} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu_0}).$$

We shall allude now to the classical theory of Waring's problem to note that under the assumptions on s described above it follows by [23, Theorems 4.3 and 4.6] that

$$\mathfrak{S}(n) \asymp_{k,s} 1. \quad (11.25)$$

Equipped with the above bound we observe then that under the first assumption on ξ in the statement one has

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \gg \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) \gg \psi(n),$$

wherein the implicit constants depend on k and s . Combining the previous bound with (11.23) and (11.25) delivers (11.20).

If moreover $\xi(n) = o(1)$ one would instead have by using (11.24) and (11.25) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) &\geq \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) \frac{\psi(n/\varphi(n))}{\psi(n)} - C_{s,1}\psi(n)((\log n)^{-\nu_0} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu_0}) \\ &= \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n)(1 - \xi_n) - C_{s,1}\psi(n)((\log n)^{-\nu_0} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu_0}) \\ &\geq \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) - \tilde{C}_s\psi(n)((\log n)^{-\nu_0} + \varphi(n)^{-\nu_0} + \xi_n), \end{aligned}$$

wherein $\tilde{C}_s = \tilde{C}_s(k, s, \eta) > 0$ is a constant. The preceding lower bound in conjunction with (11.23) yields the desired result. \square

12. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.2

We have now reached a point from which to conclude the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2 by employing the analysis performed in the previous sections. To such an end we first note that whenever $v \geq k^2 + k - 2$ then [35, Corollary 10.2] combined with orthogonality permits one to derive that

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha, P, R)|^{2v} d\alpha \ll \int_0^1 \left| \sum_{x=1}^P e(\alpha x^k) \right|^{2v} d\alpha \ll P^{2v-k+\varepsilon},$$

an ensuing conclusion being that $\Delta_{2v} = 0$ is an admissible exponent. It therefore transpires that upon recalling (3.2) then whenever $s \geq 2k^2 + 2k$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s^* &\leq \left(\max \left(\Delta_{2k^2+2k-4} - (s - 2k^2 - 2k + 4)\tau(k), \Delta_{2k^2+2k-4} - (s - 2k^2 - 2k + 4)k/s \right) \right) \\ &\leq -(s - 2k^2 - 2k + 4)(\min(\tau(k), k/s)) < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12.1)$$

If instead $s < 2k^2 + 2k$ then in particular $s \leq 4k^2$, and by (3.1) it is apparent that

$$\tau(k) \leq \frac{1}{4k} \leq \frac{k}{s},$$

from where it flows under the above assumption that

$$\Delta_s^* = \min_{\substack{1 \leq v \leq s/2 \\ v \in \mathbb{N}}} \left(\Delta_{2v} - (s - 2v)\tau(k) \right) = \tau(k) \min_{\substack{1 \leq v \leq s/2 \\ v \in \mathbb{N}}} \left(2v + \frac{\Delta_{2v}}{\tau(k)} \right) - s\tau(k). \quad (12.2)$$

We next recall the definition of $G_0(k)$ in (1.5) and observe that if $s \geq \max(\lfloor G_0(k) \rfloor + 1, 4k + 1)$ then in particular $s > G_0(k)$, and whence the underlying $v \geq 1$ therein attaining the minimum in the corresponding definition would in turn satisfy $s > 2v$, such a remark in conjunction with the preceding line entailing

$$\Delta_s^* = \tau(k)(G_0(k) - s) < 0. \quad (12.3)$$

We conclude the prelude of the proof by combining (12.1) with the above line to deduce that under the assumption of Theorem 1.1 then

$$s \geq 4k + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_s^* < 0. \quad (12.4)$$

We next invoke Proposition 10.1, note as a consequence of the above analysis that the requirements in Lemma 11.4 are met and observe that using the notation underlying the discussion thereof it is apparent in view of such a lemma that $\mathbb{E}_1(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \ll n^{-\tau_0^2/s}$. Then, upon setting $\varepsilon_0 = n^{-\tau_0^2/s}$ one has for every $\beta > 1$ by taking a sufficiently large constant $K = K(k, s, \eta, \beta)$ that

$$r(l, K, n, \varepsilon_0) \ll n^{-\beta-1}$$

for every $l \leq s$. It further seems desirable to note that $\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon$, such a conclusion stemming from Proposition 11.1, it in turn being applicable in view of (12.4), in conjunction with the proviso $\psi(n) \ll n^\varepsilon$. The remark preceding Proposition 10.1 then yields

$$h(s, K, n, \varepsilon_0) \ll nr(s-1, K, 2n, \varepsilon_0) \ll n^{-\beta},$$

wherein we employed the above estimate.

We next consider a function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ which will be made explicit shortly and take $\lambda = \delta(n)^2 \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) / 4sK$ in the setting underlying Proposition 10.1 for the purpose of applying the latter to derive

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) - \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))| \geq \delta(n) \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))) \ll e^{-\delta(n)^2 \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) / 16sK} + n^{-\beta}. \quad (12.5)$$

We then assume $\psi(n) = C_{k,s,\eta} \log n$ for a large constant $C_{k,s,\eta} > 0$ and note that under the conditions of the first instance described in Proposition 11.1 which we may apply as a consequence of (12.4), it transpires upon taking $\delta(n) = 1/2$ that then

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) - \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))| \geq (1/2) \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))) \ll n^{-1-v}$$

for some $v > 0$. Therefore, the application of Lemma 10.2 (Borel-Cantelli) combined with the aforementioned proposition enables one to deduce for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the relation

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \asymp_{k,s} \log n \quad (12.6)$$

with probability 1.

If moreover $\psi(n)$ satisfies the requisites cognate to Theorem 1.2 we then take $\delta(n) = \tilde{C}_{k,s,K} (\log n / \psi(n))^{1/2}$ for some large enough constant $\tilde{C}_{k,s,K}$ depending on k, s and K .

Under the preceding circumstances it seems instructive to gather the estimates (11.20) stemming from Proposition 11.1 with (12.5) to get

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n) - \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n))| \geq \delta(n)\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n))) \ll n^{-1-v}$$

for some $v > 0$. Consequently, a customary application of Lemma 10.2 combined with the latter proposition and (11.25) permits one to obtain for sufficiently large n the formula

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n) &= \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n))(1 + O(\delta(n))) \\ &= \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O(\psi(n)(\delta(n) + \xi(n) + \varphi(n)^{-v_0} + (\log n)^{-v_0})) \end{aligned} \quad (12.7)$$

with probability 1.

We complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 by appealing to equations (11.4) and (11.5) and noting that the conclusions (11.18) and (11.19) combined with (12.6) permit one to deduce that with probability at least $3/5$ then one has for sufficiently large n the estimate

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) \asymp_{k,s} \log n. \quad (12.8)$$

In the context underlying Theorem 1.2 then (12.7) in conjunction with the above entails the asymptotic relation

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = \mathfrak{S}(n)\psi(n) + O\left(\psi(n)\left(\xi(n) + \varphi(n)^{-v_0} + (\log n)^{-v_0} + \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)^{1/2}\right)\right). \quad (12.9)$$

The existence of a basis $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying either (12.8) or (12.9) accordingly then follows from the above discussion.

In order to deduce the corollaries it just suffices to provide upper bounds for $G_0(k)$, the one cognate to Corollary 1.1 stemming from the discussion right after [1, (7.8)] whenever $k > 20$, and the ones pertaining to Corollary 1.2 flowing from the analysis in the proof of [1, Theorem 1.2], the corresponding s thereby satisfying (12.4). It seems appropriate remarking that the underlying v taken therein to bound the function $G_0(k)$ introduced on that memoir right after equation (7.6) is an even number, the estimate resulting ultimately from this choice thereby delivering a legitimate bound for the function $G_0(k)$ introduced herein.

If $14 \leq k \leq 20$ we employ instead [1, Section 8] to deduce bounds for $G_0(k)$ included in Table 2 therein to the end of deriving the result in Corollary 1.2 pertaining to this range, the conclusion concerning the restriction on the number of variables involving the function $H(k)$ being stronger than those stated at the beginning of Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2.

For $3 \leq k \leq 13$ we merely allude to [34, Theorem 5.1] and note that the function $\mathfrak{H}(k)$ presented in the aforementioned theorem has the property that whenever $s \geq \mathfrak{H}(k)$ then (1.6) holds, and satisfies

$$\mathfrak{H}(k) \leq \min\left(k(\log k + 4.20032), k(\log k + C_1) + C_2 - 1\right).$$

In the context underlying Theorem 1.2 it further seems necessary observing as is done in [34, Theorem 5.1] that $\Delta_{\mathfrak{H}(k)-1} = 0$ is an admissible exponent, and hence $\Delta_{\mathfrak{H}(k)}^* < 0$. The preceding remarks then yield both of the corollaries and the theorem for such a range. If $k = 2$ then $\Delta_8 = 0$ is an admissible exponent, and hence $\Delta_9^* = 0$, such an observation being sufficient for our purposes. We then conclude the proofs by making recourse to [12] for the case $k = 1$ of Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2, that pertaining to Theorem 1.2 following mutatis mutandis (see also Section 16).

13. THINNER SEQUENCES

We shall prepare the ground for the application of probabilistic lemmata presented in previous sections to deliver the existence of thinner sequences satisfying suitable properties. It is pertinent to introduce for a function $\delta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ satisfying (1.14), a function ψ of uniform growth with $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$, a sufficiently large integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and fixed constants $c, C > 0$ with $\psi(n) \leq C \log n$ for every sufficiently large n the parameters

$$L_C(N) = \left\lfloor \frac{C \log N}{\psi(N)\delta(N)^2} \right\rfloor, \quad M_c(N) = (\log N)e^{c\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}, \quad (13.1)$$

and write $L = L_C(N)$ for the sake of concision. We then recall (11.1) and (11.3) and introduce for a set $\mathcal{N}_L = \{n_1, \dots, n_L\}$ the random variables

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) = \sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(n_i) \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) = \sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n_i). \quad (13.2)$$

Before making further progress it is worth presenting the counterpart of Proposition 11.1 in this setting. For such purposes we recall (1.11) first.

Proposition 13.1. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\mathcal{N}_L \subset [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ be a subset satisfying $|\mathcal{N}_L| = L$. Then when ψ, φ are as in Proposition 11.1 with $|\xi_n - 1| \asymp 1$ it follows that*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \asymp_{k,s} \psi(N)L. \quad (13.3)$$

If moreover $\xi(n) = o(1)$ then one has

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) = \psi(N) \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{S}(n_i) + O\left(\psi(N)L(\xi(N) + \varphi(N)^{-v_0} + (\log N)^{-v_0})\right). \quad (13.4)$$

Proof. We begin taking expected values in (13.2) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) = \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n_i)), \quad (13.5)$$

it being appropriate examining beforehand each of the summands in the right side of the preceding equation with the aid of Proposition 11.1. Indeed, if the first condition on ξ holds then whenever N is sufficiently large and $n \in [N, 2N]$ one has $\psi(n) \asymp \psi\left(\frac{n}{\varphi(n)}\right)$, which implies by the fact that both ψ and φ are of uniform growth that

$$\psi(n) \asymp \psi(N). \quad (13.6)$$

Therefore, inserting (11.20) into (13.5) one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \asymp \sum_{i=1}^L \psi(n_i),$$

whence (13.3) follows by combining the preceding relation with (13.6).

In order to get (13.4) we note by the increasing property of ψ in conjunction with (1.11) that whenever $n \in [N, 2N]$ then

$$0 \leq \psi(n) - \psi(N) \leq \psi\left(\frac{n}{\varphi(n)}\right) + \xi(N)\psi(n) - \psi(N),$$

whence since whenever N is sufficiently large it transpires that $\frac{n}{\varphi(n)} < N$ and ψ is increasing then one has $0 \leq \psi(n) - \psi(N) \leq \xi(N)\psi(n)$. The preceding inequality in conjunction with (13.6) thereby entails

$$\psi(n) = \psi(N) + O(\xi(N)\psi(N)). \quad (13.7)$$

We then insert (11.21) into (13.5) and thus get

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) = \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{S}(n_i)\psi(n_i) + O\left(\sum_{i=1}^L \psi(n_i)(\varphi(n_i)^{-\nu_0} + (\log n_i)^{-\nu_0} + \xi_{n_i})\right),$$

whence the combination of both the above equation, (11.25) and (13.7) for the choice $n = n_i$ yields the desired result. \square

In what follows we prepare the ground for the application of Proposition 10.1, it being appropriate to such an end presenting beforehand the customary auxiliary lemmata required.

Lemma 13.1. *Let $s \geq 2$ and let $A = \{a_1^k, \dots, a_d^k\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ be a set of different indexes with $a_j \in \mathcal{A}(a_j, a_j^\eta)$ and $1 \leq j \leq d \leq s-1$. Let $\mathcal{N}_L \subset [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ be a subset satisfying $|\mathcal{N}_L| = L$. Then one has the bound*

$$\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \ll N^{-\nu_0\tau_0/2}.$$

Proof. We write as is customary $\mathcal{N}_L = \{n_1, \dots, n_L\}$ and

$$m_i = n_i - \sum_{y^k \in A} y^k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq L, \quad l = s - |A|.$$

We deem it appropriate drawing the reader's attention back to the description in the paragraph right before (10.1) and observe upon recalling (11.8) that then

$$\partial_A R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) = \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^+(n_i) \\ A \subset \text{Set}(\mathbf{x})}} \prod_{x_j \in \text{Set}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus A} t_{x_j}.$$

We allude to the proof of Lemma 11.4 and note in view of the fact that each m_i is expressible as a sum of k -th powers of some numbers in $\text{Set}(\mathbf{x})$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^+(n_i)$ that then $m_i \gg N^{\tau_0}$. Averaging on both sides of the preceding equation thereby delivers

$$\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \ll \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^+(m_i)) \ll N^\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^L F_{s-l,1}(m_i), \quad (13.8)$$

it being convenient recalling (9.1). In view of the fact that $n_i \notin \mathcal{Z}_{s-l}(N)$ it transpires that $F_{s-l,1}(m_i) \ll m_i^{-\nu_0}$, the discussion in the above paragraph entailing $F_{s-l,1}(m_i) \ll N^{-\nu_0\tau_0}$. Consequently, inserting the latter bound and the estimate $L \ll (\log N)^2$ in (13.8), it in turn stemming from both (1.14) and (13.1), yields the desired result. \square

We make further progress in the proof by presenting the counterparts of Lemmata 11.1, 11.2 and 11.5, it being desirable recalling (9.42), (9.43) and (11.10).

Lemma 13.2. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $n \in [1, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}_1(N)$. Then one has*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^0(n)) \ll n^{-\nu_0/4}.$$

Moreover, if $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^l$ with either $n \in [1, 2N] \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l, \mathbf{a}}(N)$ or $n \in [1, 2N] \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l, \mathbf{1}}(N)$ one gets the estimates

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, \mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^{-\nu_0/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, l}^\neq(n)) \ll n^{-\nu_0/2}$$

respectively.

Proof. We begin by drawing the reader's attention to the proof of Lemma 11.1, recall (7.1) and observe as therein that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, s}^0(n)) \ll P^\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{n=x_1^k+\dots+x_s^k \\ x_i \in \mathcal{A}(P, P^n) \\ x_1 \leq n^{\tau_0/k}}} (x_1 \cdots x_s)^{-1+k/s} \ll P^\varepsilon \sum_{x \leq n^{\tau_0/k}} x^{-1+k/s} F_{1, \mathbf{1}}(n-x^k),$$

wherein $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in [1, s]^{s-1}$, whence upon noting that $n \notin \mathcal{Z}_1(N)$ one gets

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, s}^0(n)) \ll n^{\varepsilon-\nu_0} \sum_{x \leq n^{\tau_0/k}} x^{-1+k/s} \ll n^{\varepsilon+\tau_0/s-\nu_0}.$$

The first statement then would follow by recalling (9.41). For the second one we note that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, \mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a}, l}(n)} (x_1 \cdots x_l)^{-1+k/s} \ll n^\varepsilon F_{s-l, \mathbf{a}}(n),$$

wherein it may be useful recalling (11.9). Consequently, since $n \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l, \mathbf{a}}(N)$ then the right side of the above equation is $O(n^{-\nu_0/2})$. The last claim follows by setting $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{1}$. \square

Having prepared the ground for the analysis of the preceding auxiliary random variables, we now proceed to estimate these with high probability. To such an end we introduce for a sequence $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ and $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and upon recalling (11.9) the set

$$Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(n) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{1, l}(n) : x_j^k \in \mathfrak{X}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq l \right\}.$$

We also denote by $\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(n))$ to the maximum h such that $Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(n)$ contains h pairwise disjoint tuples. Likewise, we further write for convenience

$$S_{\mathfrak{X}, s}^0(n) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) : x_i \leq n^{\tau_0/k} \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq s \right\}.$$

Lemma 13.3. *Let $s \geq 2$. Then there is some constant $K > 0$ such that with probability at least 0.8 and $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ then*

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}, s}^0(n) \leq K. \quad (13.9)$$

Proof. We essentially follow the proof of [29, Lemma 1.4]. We note that for fixed $K'_1 > 0$ then whenever $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and $m \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l, \mathbf{1}}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(m)) \geq K'_1) \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(m)} \prod_{x_i \in \text{Set}(\mathbf{x})} t_{x_i} \right) \right)^{K'_1} \leq \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X}, l}^\neq(m))^{K'_1} \ll m^{-\nu_0 K'_1/2},$$

where we employed Lemma 13.2. Then, by taking $K'_1 > 3/\nu_0$ sufficiently large it would follow with probability at least 0.9 that then

$$\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{X}}^l(m)) < K'_1 \quad \text{for all } m \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l, \mathbf{1}}(N) \text{ for any } N \geq 1. \quad (13.10)$$

In order to proceed further in the proof we return to Lemma 13.2 for the purpose of noting that $\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(n)) = O(n^{-\nu_0/4})$, whence an analogous argument to the one exhibited above assures with probability at least 0.9 that whenever K'_2 is sufficiently large one has

$$\text{Disj}(S_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(m)) \leq K'_2 \quad \text{for all } m \notin \mathcal{Z}_1(N) \text{ for any } N \geq 1. \quad (13.11)$$

We next take $K = (K'_3 - 1)^s s!$ and $K'_3 = \max(K'_2, K'_1) + 1$ and note that by the Erdős-Rado's sunflower lemma [10] (see [29, Lemma 1.4] for further details) one may deduce that whenever $R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(n) > K$ then either $\text{Disj}(S_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(n)) \geq K'_3$ or $\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{x}}^l(m')) \geq K'_3$ for some $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and some

$$m' = n - \sum_{j=1}^{s-l} y_j^k, \quad y_j \in \mathbb{N}$$

according to whether the corresponding tuples \mathbf{x}_i stemming from such an application satisfy $\cap_{i=1}^{K'_3} \text{Set}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \emptyset$ or not. In view of the assumption $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ it transpires that $n \notin \mathcal{Z}_{s-l}(N)$, such a condition in turn implying $F_{s-l,1}(m') \leq \tilde{K}(m')^{-\nu_0}$ and hence $m' \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l,1}(N)$. Consequently, by (13.10) and (13.11) the union of the preceding events occurs with probability at most 0.2, whence (13.9) happens with probability at least 0.8. \square

The perusal of $R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^-(n)$ shall be analogous to that of $R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(n)$, whence concision shall be adopted at times. We thus recall (11.9) and (11.13) and introduce for each $1 \leq l \leq s-1$, each $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^l$ and $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ the set

$$Q_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{a},l}(n) : \quad x_j^k \in \mathfrak{X}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq l \right\}.$$

Lemma 13.4. *Let $s \geq 2$. Then there is some constant $C^= > 0$ such that with probability at least 0.9 and $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ then*

$$R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^-(n) \leq C^=.$$

Proof. We allude to Lemma 13.2 for the purpose of observing that $\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^j(n)) = O(n^{-\nu_0/4})$ for each $1 \leq j \leq s-1$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^j$. The argument in Lemma 13.3 permits one to deduce with probability at least $1 - 0.1s^{-s}$ that for some sufficiently large constant C_1 one has

$$\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^j(m)) < C_1, \quad m \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-j,\mathbf{a}}(N) \text{ for any } N \geq 1.$$

We then note upon setting $C_2 = (C_1 - 1)^s s! + 1$ that by a routinary application of the sunflower lemma it is apparent for $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^l$ that if $R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n) > C_2$ for some $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ then $\text{Disj}(Q_{\mathfrak{x},\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}^{l'}(n')) \geq C_1$ with $1 \leq l' \leq l$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{a}} = (a_{i_{l-l'+1}}, \dots, a_{i_l})$, and

$$n' = n - \sum_{j=1}^{l-l'} a_{i_j} y_{i_j}^k, \quad y_{i_j} \in \mathbb{N},$$

wherein since $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ then $n' \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{s-l',\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}(N)$, which by the above argument happens with probability at most $0.1s^{-s}$. The preceding discussion permits one to deduce for $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for any $N \geq 1$ and with probability at least $1 - 0.1s^{-s}$ that $R_{\mathfrak{x},\mathbf{a}}^l(n) \leq C_2$, such a bound in conjunction with (11.13) entailing $R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^-(n) \leq s^s C_2$ with probability at least 0.9. The lemma follows by setting $C^= = s^s C_2$. \square

It not being appropriate to dilate further on the preparatives, we present via the upcoming proposition the aforementioned concentration inequality denoting beforehand $\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L} = \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L))$.

Proposition 13.2. *Let $s \geq 4k + 1$ and let $\mathcal{N}_L \subset [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ be a subset satisfying $|\mathcal{N}_L| = L$. Then for every $\beta > 1$ there is a constant $K = K(k, s, \eta, \beta)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) - \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}| \geq \delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}) \ll e^{-\delta(N)^2\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}/16sK} + N^{-\beta}. \quad (13.12)$$

Consequently, there exists $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0(k, s, \eta, \beta) > 0$ with $\kappa_0 \leq 1$ for which

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) - \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}| \geq \delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}) \ll N^{-\kappa_0 C} + N^{-\beta}.$$

Proof. We invoke Proposition 10.1 as is customary and note employing the notation underlying the discussion thereof that it transpires in view of Lemma 13.1 that whenever $\mathcal{N}_L \subset [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ one has $\mathbb{E}_1(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \ll N^{-\nu_0\tau_0/2}$. Then, upon setting $\varepsilon_0 = N^{-\nu_0\tau_0/2}$ one gets for every $\beta > 1$ by taking a sufficiently large constant $K = K(k, s, \eta, \beta)$ that

$$r(s, K, 2N, \varepsilon_0) \ll N^{-\beta-1}.$$

It further seems appropriate to observe that $\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L} \ll N^\varepsilon$, such a conclusion stemming from Proposition 13.1 in conjunction with the proviso $\psi(N)L \ll N^\varepsilon$. The remark preceding Proposition 10.1 then permits one to deduce that

$$h(s, K, 2N, \varepsilon_0) \ll Nr(s-1, K, 2N, \varepsilon_0) \ll N^{-\beta},$$

wherein we employed the above estimate. We conclude by taking $\lambda = \delta(N)^2\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}/4sK$ in the setting underlying the aforementioned proposition to obtain via the latter

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) - \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}| \geq \delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}) \ll e^{-\lambda/4} + N^{-\beta},$$

as claimed. The second statement follows by recalling (13.1) and observing that by Proposition 13.1 then there is some constant $\kappa'(s, k) > 0$ for which

$$\delta(N)^2\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}/16sK \geq \kappa'(s, k)\delta(N)^2L\psi(N)/K \geq C\kappa'(s, k)(\log N)/2K,$$

whence inserting the previous bound in (13.12) delivers the desired result. \square

In order to make further progress we consider as in Theorem 1.4 and for every fixed constant $\kappa \geq 1$ a collection of sets $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^{N^\kappa}$ with $\mathcal{M}_j(N) \subset [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ and $|\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \leq M_c(N)$, the latter being defined in (13.1), for sufficiently large N . We shall present promptly the main proposition of this section, it being appropriate indicating beforehand that we shall henceforth make in (13.1) the choices

$$c = \kappa_0/2, \quad C = 1 + \frac{6\kappa}{\kappa_0}, \quad \beta = 7\kappa + 2, \quad (13.13)$$

the parameter $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0(k, s, \eta, \beta) \leq 1$ stemming from the application of Proposition 13.2.

Theorem 13.1. *Let ψ be a function of uniform growth with the property for every sufficiently large integer n that $\psi(n) = O(\log n)$ and $|\xi_n - 1| \asymp 1$. Then for all sufficiently large N , each collection $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^{N^\kappa}$ as above and all $\mathcal{N}_L \subset \mathcal{M}_j(N)$ with $|\mathcal{N}_L| = L$ for $1 \leq j \leq N^\kappa$, the expression*

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) \asymp_{k,s} \psi(N)L$$

holds with probability at least 0.7. If moreover $\xi(n) = o(1)$ and

$$\xi(N) + \varphi(N)^{-\nu_0} + (\log N)^{-\nu_0} \ll \delta(N) < 1 \quad (13.14)$$

with

$$\delta(N) \geq \left(\frac{C \log(\psi(N))}{c\psi(N)} \right)^{1/2} \quad (13.15)$$

for sufficiently large N then with probability at least 0.7 one has

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) = \psi(N) \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{S}(n_i) + O(\psi(N)L\delta(N)). \quad (13.16)$$

Proof. We write $M = \lfloor M_c(N) \rfloor$ and examine firstly the associated binomial coefficient underlying the preceding statement, thereby obtaining by Stirling's formula

$$\binom{M}{L} \sim \frac{\left(\frac{M}{e}\right)^M \sqrt{2\pi M}}{\left(\frac{L}{e}\right)^L \sqrt{2\pi L} \left(\frac{M-L}{e}\right)^{M-L} \sqrt{2\pi(M-L)}} \ll \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{L}{M}\right)^{M-L}} \left(\frac{M}{L}\right)^L.$$

Then, upon recalling (13.1) we note that then

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{M}{L} &\ll e^{3(M-L)L/2M} (C^{-1} e^{c\delta(N)^2\psi(N)} \psi(N))^{\frac{C(\log N)}{\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}} \\ &\ll e^{cC \log N + C(\log N)(3/2 + \log(\psi(N)) - \log C)\delta(N)^{-2}\psi(N)^{-1}} \ll e^{cC \log N + \frac{C(\log N)\log(\psi(N))}{\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}} \\ &\ll e^{c(C+1)\log N}, \end{aligned} \quad (13.17)$$

wherein we employed the proviso (13.15) and the fact that $3/2 < \log C$.

Equipped with the preceding bound we sum over the corresponding sets the probabilities examined in Proposition 13.2, it being pertinent to denote beforehand

$$\Pi(k, s, \eta, \kappa) = \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N^\kappa} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}_L \subset \mathcal{M}_j(N) \\ |\mathcal{N}_L|=L}} \mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) - \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}| \geq \delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}),$$

and apply the latter proposition for the choice $\beta = 7\kappa + 2$ to derive

$$\Pi(k, s, \eta, \kappa) \ll \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N^\kappa} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}_L \subset \mathcal{M}_j(N) \\ |\mathcal{N}_L|=L}} (N^{-\kappa_0 C} + N^{-7\kappa-2}) \ll \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N^\kappa} \binom{M}{L} N^{-\kappa_0 C},$$

it being appropriate to remark in view of (13.13) and the fact that $\kappa_0 \leq 1$ that

$$\kappa_0 C = 6\kappa + \kappa_0 \leq 7\kappa + 2$$

and to clarify that the parameter L depends on the variable N over which one is summing. We insert (13.17) in the above line and deduce

$$\Pi(k, s, \eta, \kappa) \ll \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N^\kappa} N^{c(C+1) - \kappa_0 C} \ll \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} N^{\kappa + c(C+1) - \kappa_0 C}.$$

We note upon recalling (13.13) that

$$\kappa + c(C+1) - \kappa_0 C = \kappa + \kappa_0(1-C)/2 = -2\kappa,$$

from where it follows that $\Pi(k, s, \eta, \kappa) < \infty$. One thus may apply Borel-Cantelli to deduce with probability 1 that for sufficiently large N then every $\mathcal{N}_L \subset \mathcal{M}_j(N)$ with $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j \leq N^\kappa}$ constituting the above collection of sets in $[N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ satisfies

$$R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) = \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L} + O(\delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}). \quad (13.18)$$

We momentarily pause the discussion and note that as a consequence of Lemmata 13.3 and 13.4 there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that for all $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for each $N \geq 1$ and with probability at least 0.7 one has

$$R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^0(n) + R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^-(n) \leq C'. \quad (13.19)$$

We then insert (13.19) into (11.4) and (11.5) and obtain upon recalling (13.2) that

$$R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) = \sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(n_i) + O(L) = R_{\mathfrak{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) + O(L).$$

The proposition then follows by combining the above equation with (13.14), (13.18) and Proposition 13.1. \square

14. UPPER BOUNDS BEYOND THE LOGARITHMIC BARRIER

We shall devote this section to derive upper bounds for the representation function, it being required to such an end preparing the ground for the application of the concentration inequality by introducing some notation. We consider a finite set Γ and the family $[\Gamma]^{\leq s}$ of subsets $I \subset \Gamma$ with the property that $|I| \leq s$. We then take $\mathcal{H} \subset [\Gamma]^{\leq s}$ and consider a family of non-negative random variables Y_I for each $I \in [\Gamma]^{\leq s}$ with the property that Y_I and Y_J are independent whenever $I \cap J = \emptyset$. We further assume that there is another family ξ_α , $\alpha \in \Gamma$ of independent random variables such that each Y_I is a function of the collection $\{\xi_\alpha : \alpha \in I\}$. We introduce for convenience

$$X = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{H}} Y_I$$

and denote $\mu = \mathbb{E}(X)$. It also seems worth considering for each $I \in \mathcal{H}$ the random variable

$$X_I = \sum_{J \subset I} Y_J$$

and examine the conditional expectations $\mathbb{E}(X_I | \xi_\alpha, \alpha \in I)$, which are functions of $\xi_\alpha, \alpha \in I$. We also denote $\mu_I = \sup \mathbb{E}(X_I | \xi_\alpha, \alpha \in I)$ and for every $1 \leq l \leq s$, the value $\mu_l = \max_{|I|=l} \mu_I$.

Proposition 14.1. *In the above setting, we write $|\Gamma| = n$. Then, for every $t > 0$ and every r_1, \dots, r_s such that*

$$r_1 \dots r_l \cdot \mu_l \leq t, \quad l = 1, \dots, s, \quad (14.1)$$

one has the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mu + t) \leq \left(1 + \frac{t}{\mu}\right)^{-r_1/8s} + \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} n^l \left(1 + \frac{t}{r_1 \dots r_l \mu_l}\right)^{-r_{l+1}/8s}.$$

Proof. See [16, Theorem 3.10]. \square

Equipped with the preceding utensil we are prepared to deduce the desired upper bound for the representation function at hand by combining the previous proposition with the analysis in the above sections.

Corollary 14.1. *Let $\psi(t)$ be a function of uniform growth with the property that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(n)}{\log n} = 0. \quad (14.2)$$

Then, whenever N is sufficiently large and $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ one gets with probability 1 the bound

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \ll \frac{\log n}{\log \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} \right)} \quad (14.3)$$

and, with probability at least 0.6 the estimate

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(n) \ll \frac{\log n}{\log \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} \right)}. \quad (14.4)$$

Moreover, if $s \geq 4k + 1$ and Δ_s^ is an admissible exponent for minor arcs satisfying $\Delta_s^* < 0$ then one has for sufficiently large integer n the upper bounds (14.3) and (14.4).*

Proof. In order to prepare the ground for the application of the above proposition it seems desirable to recall (11.8), introduce first

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \left\{ B \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k : B = \text{Set}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^+(n) \right\}$$

and use the above result by setting $X = R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)$, the base set being $\Gamma = [1, n]$ and

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ I \subset B_n, B_n \in \mathcal{R}_n \right\}.$$

We shall next draw the reader's attention back to the discussion above Proposition 10.1 to note that with the notation presented therein it transpires for every $I \in \mathcal{H}$ that $\mu_I = \mathbb{E}_I(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))$. We thereby deduce for $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ and by means of Lemma 11.4 that whenever $I \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfies $1 \leq |I| \leq s - 1$ then $\mu_I \ll n^{-2\beta_k}$, where $\beta_k = \min(\nu_0\tau_0/4, \tau_0^2/(2s))$. If moreover k, s are in the second situation described above then the same lemma yields a similar conclusion for every sufficiently large $n \in [1, N]$. The preceding conclusion then permits one to derive for $1 \leq l \leq s - 1$ the estimate

$$\mu_l \ll n^{-2\beta_k} \quad (14.5)$$

in both situations. We shall next set for convenience

$$r_1(n) = \frac{32s \log n}{\log \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} \right)}, \quad r_l = 32s(l+1)\beta_k^{-1} \quad \text{when } 2 \leq l \leq s$$

and consider

$$t_n = \frac{(32s)^s (s+1)! \beta_k^{-s+1} \log n}{2 \log \left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)} \right)}.$$

Then one has with the above definitions $r_1(n) \cdot r_2 \dots r_s = t_n$ and for every $1 \leq l \leq s - 1$ the estimate

$$r_1(n) \cdot r_2 \dots r_l \cdot \mu_l \ll n^{-\beta_k} \leq t_n,$$

the last inequality holding for sufficiently large n , and where we implicitly employed the provisos (14.2) and (14.5). Moreover, by an analogous argument it transpires that

$$\frac{t_n}{r_1(n) \cdot r_2 \dots r_l \cdot \mu_l} \gg n^{\beta_k}. \quad (14.6)$$

We then write $\mu(n) = \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))$ and note in view of the previous discussion in conjunction with the fact that $\mu_s = 1$ that the conditions (14.1) hold, whence the application of Proposition 14.1 yields

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \geq \mu(n) + t_n) \leq \left(1 + \frac{t_n}{\mu(n)}\right)^{-r_1(n)/8s} + \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} n^l \left(1 + \frac{t_n}{r_1(n) \cdot r_2 \dots r_l \cdot \mu_l}\right)^{-r_{l+1}/8s}. \quad (14.7)$$

We shall first examine the second summand and note that (14.6) delivers

$$\sum_{l=1}^{s-1} n^l \left(1 + \frac{t_n}{r_1(n) \cdot r_2 \dots r_l \cdot \mu_l}\right)^{-r_{l+1}/8s} \ll \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} n^{l-r_{l+1}\beta_k/8s} \ll \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} n^{-3l-8} \ll n^{-11}. \quad (14.8)$$

In order to examine the first one it is desirable to recall Proposition 11.1 both for the instance $\Delta_s^* < 0$ and the situation in which $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ for the purpose of remarking that then there exists some constant $C_{s,k}$ for which

$$\mu(n) \leq C_{s,k} \psi(n). \quad (14.9)$$

Therefore, upon denoting $c_{s,k} = \frac{1}{2}(32s)^s (s+1)! \beta_k^{-s+1} C_{s,k}^{-1}$ it transpires that

$$\left(1 + \frac{t_n}{\mu(n)}\right)^{-r_1(n)/8s} \ll \left(1 + \frac{c_{s,k} \log n}{\psi(n) \log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)}\right)^{-\frac{4 \log n}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)}} \ll e^{-4 \log n + \frac{4(\log n) \log\left(c_{s,k}^{-1} \log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)\right)}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)}}.$$

Then in view of the condition (14.2) it is apparent that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log\left(c_{s,k}^{-1} \log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)\right)}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)} = 0,$$

whence it follows whenever n is sufficiently large that

$$\left(1 + \frac{t_n}{\mu(n)}\right)^{-r_1(n)/8s} \ll n^{-3}.$$

We combine the above equation with both (14.7) and (14.8) to deduce the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \geq \mu(n) + t_n) \ll n^{-3}.$$

The relation (14.9) combined with the aforementioned proviso (14.2) entails

$$\mu(n) \leq C_{s,k} \psi(n) \leq \frac{c_{s,k} C_{s,k} \log n}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)} = t_n$$

for sufficiently large n . By the preceding discussion,

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \geq 2t_n) \leq \mathbb{P}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) \geq \mu(n) + t_n) \ll n^{-3},$$

a consequence of the above line being by a customary application of Borel-Cantelli that with probability 1 one has for sufficiently large N and $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ the estimate

$$R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n) < 2t_n \ll \frac{\log n}{\log\left(\frac{\log n}{\psi(n)}\right)}, \quad (14.10)$$

the same bound holding for every sufficiently large n if $\Delta_s^* < 0$. We conclude the proof by drawing the attention back to (11.4) and (11.5) for the purpose of noting that the

conclusions in (11.18) and (11.19) whenever $\Delta_s^* < 0$ and Lemmata 13.3 and 13.4 in the instance $n \notin \mathcal{Z}(N)$ permit one to deduce with probability at least 0.6 that

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n) + O(1),$$

the above equation in conjunction with (14.10) delivering the desired upper bound. \square

15. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 AND 1.6

Equipped with the preceding propositions we have reached a position from which to conclude our analysis concerning the aforementioned theorems.

Proof of Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. We begin by writing $\Xi_{s,k}, \Xi_2, \Xi_1 > 0$ to refer to the implicit constants latent in the error terms in (11.25), (13.7) and (13.16) respectively. Let $\Xi = \max(\Xi_{s,k} \cdot \Xi_2, \Xi_1)$ and consider for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq j \leq N^\kappa$ the collection of sets $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^{N^\kappa}$ described right above (13.13). It seems worth noting that in the context of Theorem 1.4 one may assume that $|\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \leq M_c(N)$ since one can write $\delta'(N) = \sqrt{c}\delta(N)$, the factor \sqrt{c} being absorbed by the error term in (1.15). Whenever $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ we introduce the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^0 = \left\{ n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N) : R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) \leq \mathfrak{G}(n)\psi(n) - 3\Xi\delta(N)\psi(N) \right\}.$$

Then the conclusion in Theorem 13.1 entails the existence of a sequence $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying the bound $|\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^0| \leq L - 1$ for every $1 \leq j \leq N^\kappa$ and sufficiently large N , since if otherwise $|\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^0| \geq L$ and $\{n_1, \dots, n_L\} \subset \mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^0$ with $n_i \neq n_l$ for $i \neq l$ then it would follow that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n_i) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{G}(n_i)\psi(n_i) - 3\Xi\delta(N)L\psi(N) \\ &\leq \psi(N) \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{G}(n_i) + \Xi_{s,k}\Xi_2\psi(N)\xi(N)L - 3\Xi\delta(N)L\psi(N), \end{aligned}$$

where we employed (11.25) and (13.7) in the last step. Consequently, (1.14) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n_i) &\leq \psi(N) \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{G}(n_i) + \Xi L\psi(N)(\xi(N) - 3\delta(N)) \\ &\leq \psi(N) \sum_{i=1}^L \mathfrak{G}(n_i) - 2\Xi L\psi(N)\delta(N), \end{aligned}$$

which in turn could only occur with probability at most 0.3 by Theorem 13.1. A similar argument would apply whenever $1 \leq j \leq N^\kappa$ for the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^1 = \left\{ n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N) : R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) \geq \mathfrak{G}(n)\psi(n) + 3\Xi\delta(N)\psi(N) \right\},$$

and consequently, upon defining $\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}} = \mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^0 \cup \mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}^1$, one has that $|\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{X}}| \leq 2L - 2$.

We observe that in the context underlying Theorem 1.4 then (12.4) holds, and whence the conclusion (11.15) in conjunction with Proposition 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 entails the bound $|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll 1$. By the preceding discussion it then transpires that

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = \mathfrak{G}(n)\psi(n) + O(\delta(N)\psi(N))$$

whenever $n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}$ with $\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}$ satisfying

$$|\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}| \ll L = |\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \frac{L}{|\mathcal{M}_j(N)|} \ll |\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \omega(N)^{-1},$$

where ω is a positive function of uniform growth such that $\omega(N) \ll e^{\delta(N)^2 \psi(N)}$, and where we employed both (13.1) and the fact that $|\mathcal{M}_j(N)| \gg \frac{(\log N) \omega(N)}{\delta(N)^2 \psi(N)}$ embodied in the statement of the aforementioned theorem, which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

In order to make progress in the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 we introduce

$$\mathcal{S}_{N,\mathfrak{x}}^\delta = \left\{ n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N) : |R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) - \mathfrak{G}(n)\psi(n)| \geq 3\Xi\delta(N)\psi(N) \right\}.$$

We also partition $[N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N)$ into $\mathcal{F}_M(N)$ sets by means of

$$[N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\mathcal{F}_M(N)} \mathcal{M}_l(N)$$

with $|\mathcal{M}_l(N)| = M$ when $1 \leq l \leq \mathcal{F}_M(N) - 1$ and $|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}_M(N)}| \leq M$ and satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}_l(N) \cap \mathcal{M}_j(N) = \emptyset \quad \text{whenever } l \neq j.$$

Then upon observing that $\mathcal{F}_M(N) \ll N/M$ and the fact that $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j=1}^{\mathcal{F}_M(N)}$ is a partition of $[N, 2N]$ one has

$$|\mathcal{S}_{N,\mathfrak{x}}^\delta| = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{F}_M(N)} |\mathcal{S}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}| \leq 2(L-1)\mathcal{F}_M(N) \ll NL/M \ll \frac{Ne^{-c\delta(N)^2\psi(N)}}{\psi(N)\delta(N)^2},$$

where in the last steps we employed (13.1) and the trivial bound on $\mathcal{F}_M(N)$. The preceding discussion permits one to deduce that

$$R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) = \mathfrak{G}(n)\psi(N) + O(\delta(N)\psi(N)) \quad (15.1)$$

whenever $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus (\mathcal{Z}(N) \cup \mathcal{S}_{N,\mathfrak{x}}^\delta)$ with $|\mathcal{S}_{N,\mathfrak{x}}^\delta|$ satisfying the above bound. The reader may observe that the constant c in the previous estimate for the exceptional set may be deleted upon writing $\delta'(N) = \sqrt{c}\delta(N)$ as above.

We shift our attention to Theorem 1.6 and deduce via Theorem 13.1 the existence of constants $c_{s,k,\eta}, C_{s,k,\eta} > 0$ with the property that for sufficiently large N then

$$c_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)L \leq R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) \leq C_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)L \quad (15.2)$$

with probability at least 0.7. Then, taking some $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^k$ satisfying the preceding estimates and considering as above and for every $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{F}_M(N)$ the sets

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^0 = \left\{ n \in \mathcal{M}_j(N) : R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) \leq c_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)/2 \right\}$$

it transpires that $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^0| \leq L - 1$ since if otherwise $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^0| \geq L$ and $\{n_1, \dots, n_L\} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^0$ then

$$\sum_{i=1}^L R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n_i) \leq c_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)L/2,$$

which would in turn contradict (15.2). Consequently, by an analogous argument pertaining the set $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^1$ comprising integers satisfying $R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) \geq 2C_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)$, defining

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathfrak{x}} = \left\{ n \in [N, 2N] \setminus \mathcal{Z}(N) : R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) \leq c_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)/2 \text{ or } R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) \geq 2C_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N) \right\}$$

and setting $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^0 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}^1$ it would follow in a similar manner that $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}| \leq 2(L-1)$. By employing the same argument as above and taking $\delta(N) = 1/2$ one would then have

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathfrak{x}}| = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{F}_M(N)} |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{j,\mathfrak{x}}| \leq 2(L-1)\mathcal{F}_M(N) \ll NL/M \ll Ne^{-c\psi(N)/4}.$$

Consequently, it transpires that

$$c_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N)/2 \leq R_{\mathfrak{x}}^s(n) \leq 2C_{s,k,\eta}\psi(N) \quad (15.3)$$

whenever $n \in [N, 2N] \setminus (\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathfrak{x}} \cup \mathcal{Z}(N))$ with N being sufficiently large, as claimed, the constant in the exponent of the exceptional set being deleted by taking $\psi'(N) = c\psi(N)/4$.

In view of equations (15.1) and (15.3) and Corollary 14.1 it therefore remains to show that under the conditions concerning k and s described in Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6 then either the constraints underlying Propositions 8.2 and 9.1 and Lemma 9.1 are satisfied or else $\Delta_s^* < 0$ or $k > s\Delta_{s-1}^*$ and $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$ hold, the claims concerning the size $|\mathfrak{X}_k \cap [1, X]|$ following via a routinary probabilistic argument involving Chernoff's inequality (see [20, (10.2)]). As a prelude to the discussion we make recourse to [1, Lemma 7.1] and (9.2), assume that $k > 20$ and note that one may take

$$D = 9.027901. \quad (15.4)$$

We then allude to the analysis leading to (12.3) for the purpose of observing that every $s_0 \geq \max(\lfloor G_0(k) \rfloor + 1, 4k + 1)$ has the property that $\Delta_{s_0}^* < 0$, such a remark in conjunction with the choice for D , equation [1, (7.8)] and (1.5) thereby leading to conclude that

$$s_0 = \lfloor k(\log k + 2 + \log D) \rfloor + 1 \quad (15.5)$$

satisfies the above. We first note that if $s \geq s_0$ then $\Delta_s^* < 0$, and hence $|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll 1$ as a consequence of Proposition 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 combined with the conclusion leading to (11.15), as desired.

We next observe in view of (15.5) that it follows by the argument right after [1, (7.8)] that for any s in the interval $k(\log k + 3.20032) \leq s < s_0$ then

$$k(\log k + 1 + \log D) \leq s \leq k(\log k + 2 + \log D) \quad (15.6)$$

and hence $s_0 - k - 1 \leq s < s_0$, as required in Proposition 9.1. We also note that

$$2k(\log kD + 1) \left(1 - \frac{1}{Dk}\right) - 2k - \frac{1}{2} > k(\log kD + 2) + 1$$

is equivalent to

$$2k + \frac{2}{D} < \left(k - \frac{2}{D}\right) \log kD - \frac{3}{2},$$

the latter holding for the aforementioned choice of D and $k \geq 100$, an ensuing consequence of which being under the same conditions on k, s as above and $d \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}$ that

$$s_0 \leq k(\log kD + 2) + 1 < 2k(\log kD + 1) \left(1 - \frac{1}{Dk}\right) - 2k - \frac{1}{2} \leq 2(s - d - k),$$

as desired. We continue the verification of the constraints in Proposition 9.1 noting first that whenever $k \geq 100$ then

$$\log k + 2 + \log D \leq \frac{D}{4}(k - 5),$$

it in turn entailing for s in the range (15.6) that

$$\frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \leq \frac{k}{4} - 1. \quad (15.7)$$

Having been furnished with the above we proceed by recalling (9.4) and remarking that

$$s_{T_0} = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{s - d - T_0}{2} \right\rfloor \geq s - d - T_0 - 1,$$

whence by alluding to [32, Theorem 2.1] we observe that when s is in the range (15.6) then there is some admissible exponent $\Delta_{s_{T_0}}$ satisfying

$$0 \leq \Delta_{s_{T_0}} \leq ke^{1-s_{T_0}/k} \leq \frac{e^{(T_0+d+1)/k}}{D}.$$

Consequently, whenever $T_0 \leq T_d(k) \leq 3k/4$ and $d+1 \leq k/4$, the last inequality holding in view of (15.7), then

$$\Delta_{s_{T_0}} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + \frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} + \left(\frac{T_0 + d + 1}{k} \right)^2 \right), \quad (15.8)$$

as desired.

We next fix any s satisfying (15.6), take for convenience

$$v = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2}k(1 + \log(Dk)) - \frac{1}{2D} \right\rfloor$$

and make recourse to (12.2) to note that whenever $2v \leq s$ then (9.2) and (15.4) yields

$$\Delta_s^* \leq \left(\Delta_{2v} - (s - 2v)\tau(k) \right) \leq \frac{1}{Dk} \left(Dk\Delta_{2v} - (s - 2v) \right) = \frac{1}{Dk} \left(Dk\Delta_{2v} + 2v \right) - \frac{s}{Dk}.$$

We have deem it pertinent noting that the bound right above [1, (7.8)] appertaining to $2v + \Delta_{2v}/\tau(k)$ constitutes in view of equation (7.6) of that same memoir an upper bound for $2v + Dk\Delta_{2v}$ (the reader may observe that the letter v on that paper corresponds to $2v$ herein). By the preceding discussion then

$$\Delta_s^* \leq \frac{\log(kD) + 2}{D} - \frac{s}{Dk}. \quad (15.9)$$

Equipped with the above bound we may assume at this point first that $s < Dk$, and observe that whenever $s \geq k(\log(kD) + 1) + 1$ then

$$\Delta_{s-1}^* - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{\log(kD) + 2}{D} - \frac{(s-1)}{Dk} - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{D} - \frac{k}{s} < 0, \quad (15.10)$$

a similar argument yielding for $k(\log(kD) + 1) \leq s < k(\log(kD) + 1) + 1$ and $s < \frac{Dk}{1+\frac{1}{k}}$ that

$$\Delta_{s-1}^* - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{\log(kD) + 2}{D} - \frac{(s-1)}{Dk} - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) - \frac{k}{s} < 0, \quad (15.11)$$

where we employed the aforementioned constraint on s . By recalling (15.4) we observe that the preceding assumption on s occurs whenever

$$k(\log(kD) + 1) + 1 < \frac{Dk}{1 + \frac{1}{k}},$$

such an inequality being valid for $1 \leq k \leq 300$. We conclude the cornucopia of instances for which an inequality of the flavour of (15.10) holds by considering s in the range (15.6)

satisfying the additional condition $1 \leq \frac{s}{Dk} < 2$. In such circumstances, whenever $s \geq k(\log(kD) + 3/2) + 1$ then by (15.9) one has

$$\Delta_{s-1}^* - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{2D} - \frac{k}{s} < 0.$$

Under any of the assumptions earlier described then it flows from both (15.10), (15.11), the last inequality and the remark leading to (11.15) that $\mathcal{Z}(N) = \mathcal{Z}_0(N)$. In view of (15.9) one has when s is in (15.6) that

$$\Delta_{2s}^* \leq \frac{\log(kD) + 2}{D} - \frac{2(\log kD + 1)}{D} < 0, \quad (15.12)$$

the application of Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1 in conjunction with the preceding observations entailing

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| = |\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| \ll N^{1-\delta_k} \quad (15.13)$$

for some constant $\delta_k > 0$, as desired.

We consider next s as in (15.6) with $1 \leq \frac{s}{Dk} < 2 - \frac{k}{4s}$ and satisfying the additional hypothesis that $s \leq k(\log(kD) + 3/2) + 1$, the combination of both inequalities entailing in particular that $k \geq 200$. In what follows we shall verify the conditions required in Proposition 9.1, it being worth noting first that in this range

$$\frac{1}{k} + \frac{2s}{k^2} \leq \frac{1}{100} + \frac{2(\log(kD) + 3/2)}{k} + \frac{1}{20000} \leq \frac{1}{100} + \frac{9}{100} = \frac{1}{10} \quad (15.14)$$

and

$$\max(15/2, \sqrt{D}/2)k \leq s \leq Dk^2. \quad (15.15)$$

We also indicate upon recalling the choice of D in (15.4) that

$$1600(\log(kD) + 3/2 + 1/k)^2(\log(kD) + 3/2 + D/2 + 1/k) \leq 1053Dk$$

holds whenever $k \geq 200$. Equipped with the above provisos it then follows that

$$1600s^2(s + Dk/2) \leq 1053Dk^4 \leq 1170k^4D \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} - \frac{2s}{k^2}\right)$$

when $k \geq 200$, such an inequality implying that $T_1(k) \leq 3k/4$ in the above range for s . Likewise, we remind the reader of (9.4) and note by (15.14) that whenever $d = 1$ then

$$4c_k \geq \frac{39 \cdot 9}{200} \frac{D}{1 + \frac{Dk}{2s}} \geq \frac{117D}{100} > D, \quad (15.16)$$

wherein we employed the assumption $Dk \leq s$, as desired. In order to conclude the analysis of this instance we observe that whenever $k \geq 200$ and $k(\log(kD) + 1) \leq s < k(\log(kD) + 1) + 1$ with $\frac{Dk}{1+k} \leq s \leq Dk$, it being the remaining instance not being examined in the discussion leading to (15.13), then in particular $s \leq k(k+1)/4$ and hence

$$1 \leq \frac{k}{k+1} + \frac{k}{4s} \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \leq 5/4 < 2,$$

whence the same bounds as above hold for this range, (15.16) being replaced by $4c \geq \frac{11D}{10}$.

In order to proceed in the proof we assume instead that $2 \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}$ with s in (15.6), such a proviso in particular entailing the inequality

$$2D(\log(kD) + 7/8) \leq (\log(kD) + 2)^2, \quad (15.17)$$

from where it follows that $k \geq 100000$. Whenever the aforementioned circumstances occur then (15.15) holds, and hence for $d \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{k} + \frac{(d+1)s}{k^2} &\leq \frac{s}{Dk^2} + \frac{1}{4s} + \frac{s}{k^2} + \frac{s^2}{Dk^3} + \frac{5}{4k} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{k} + \frac{(\log(kD) + 2)^2}{Dk} + \frac{(D+1)(\log(kD) + 2)}{Dk} \leq \frac{1}{500}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, under the same assumptions on k it is apparent that

$$(\log(kD) + 2)^2 \left(\frac{3}{2}(\log(kD) + 2) + D/8 \right) \leq \frac{58383Dk}{80000},$$

the combination of the preceding estimates and the restriction on d delivering

$$\begin{aligned} s^2(s + dDk/2) &\leq k^3(\log(kD) + 2)^2 \left(\frac{3}{2}(\log(kD) + 2) + D/8 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{58383Dk^4}{80000} \leq \frac{117}{160} Dk^4 \left(1 - \frac{d}{k} - \frac{(d+1)s}{k^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

it in turn entailing $T_d(k) \leq 3k/4$. We may further derive in an analogous manner as above the inequality

$$4c_k \geq \frac{39 \cdot 499}{10000} \frac{D}{1 + \frac{dDk}{2s}} \geq \frac{39 \cdot 499}{10000} \left(\frac{D}{\frac{3}{2} + \frac{Dk^2}{8s^2}} \right) \geq \frac{39 \cdot 499D}{100 \cdot 151} > D,$$

where we implicitly employed the fact that $\frac{Dk^2}{8s^2} \leq \frac{1}{100}$ in the range for k, s described above, as desired. Consequently, by the preceding discussion it transpires that the assumptions in Proposition 9.1 hold for both the situations in which $\frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} < 2$ and $\frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \geq 2$.

We continue our verification by drawing the reader's attention to the statement of Lemma 9.1 and assume first that $1 \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} < 2$ and that $s \geq k(\log kD + 1) + 3$. We allude as is customary to [32, Theorem 2.1] to deduce that

$$\Delta_{2 \lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor} - \frac{2k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{D} - \frac{2k}{s} < \frac{1}{D} - \frac{1}{D(1 - k/8s)} < 0.$$

If instead $k(\log kD + 1) \leq s < k(\log kD + 1) + 3$ then combining both constraints would entail

$$D \left(1 - \frac{1}{4(\log kD + 1)} \right) \leq \frac{s}{k} \leq \log(kD) + 1 + \frac{3}{k},$$

from where it would in particular follow that $k \geq 250$. Moreover, the aforementioned theorem would yield whenever $k \geq 250$ the inequality

$$\Delta_{2 \lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor} - \frac{2k}{s} \leq \frac{e^{3/k}}{D} - \frac{2k}{s} < \frac{243}{80Dk} - \frac{k}{8Ds(1 - k/8s)} \leq \frac{243}{80Dk} - \frac{2k}{(16D - 1)s},$$

wherein we employed the fact that $s \leq 2Dk$. Consequently, one has whenever $k \geq 250$ in the above range that

$$\frac{k^2}{s} \geq \frac{k}{\log(kD) + 1 + 3/k} \geq \frac{250}{9} \geq 27,$$

the combination of the preceding bounds delivering

$$\Delta_{2 \lfloor \frac{s-2}{2} \rfloor} - \frac{2k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{243}{80D} - \frac{54}{(16D - 1)} \right) \leq -\frac{27}{80Dk}.$$

If on the contrary $2 < \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s}$ then by the conclusion stemming from (15.17) it transpires that $k \geq 100000$. We then set $d_0 = \lceil \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \rceil$ and note first that whenever s is as in (15.6) and k satisfies the above lower bound then

$$d_0 + 1 \leq \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} + 2 \leq \frac{\log(kD) + 2}{D} + \frac{9}{4} \leq \frac{k}{4},$$

as required right above (15.8). In view of the preceding conclusion then [32, Theorem 2.1] permits one to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2 \left[\frac{s-d_0}{2} \right] - \frac{d_0 k}{s} &\leq \frac{e^{(d_0+1)/k}}{D} - \frac{1}{D} - \frac{k^2}{4s^2} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{d_0+1}{k} + \left(\frac{d_0+1}{k} \right)^2 \right) - \frac{k^2}{4s^2} \\ &\leq \frac{5(d_0+1)}{4Dk} - \frac{k^2}{4s^2} \leq \frac{5s}{4D^2k^2} + \frac{4}{Dk} - \frac{k^2}{4s^2} \leq \frac{8s}{Dk^2} - \frac{k^2}{4s^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the inequality $64(\log(kD) + 2)^3 \leq Dk$, valid whenever $k \geq 100000$, in conjunction with the above bound yields

$$\Delta_2 \left[\frac{s-d_0}{2} \right] - \frac{d_0 k}{s} \leq -\frac{k^2}{8s^2},$$

as desired. The preceding discussion enables one to deduce in both of the instances that the required assumptions in Lemma 9.1 hold for the choice $d_0 = \lceil \frac{s}{Dk} + \frac{k}{4s} \rceil$. In view of (15.12), Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1, the latter conclusion and that entailing the verification of the conditions for Proposition 9.1 it transpires that Corollary 9.1 is applicable, thereby leading to the estimate

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll N^{1-\zeta_k},$$

where $\zeta_k > 0$ satisfies (9.7) for large k , as desired, and concludes when applied in conjunction with Corollary 14.1 the part of Theorem 1.3 pertaining to the range $k > 20$.

If $7 \leq k \leq 20$ then we instead allude to the tables in [27] for the purpose of deducing that the values $\Delta_{v-1}, \Delta_{w-1}$ included in the upcoming tables are indeed admissible exponents.

k	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
v	71	77	83	91	97	103	111
w	75	81	87	95	101	109	117
u	92	100	110	118	126	134	142
Δ_{v-1}	0.1756866	0.1812515	0.1868812	0.1697840	0.1762412	0.1826716	0.1701423
Δ_{w-1}	0.1281620	0.1355287	0.1426626	0.1318848	0.1390360	0.1306147	0.1238487

k	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
w	31	35	41	47	55	61	67
u	34	42	50	60	68	76	84
Δ_{w-1}	0.0528848	0.1294925	0.1420569	0.1509648	0.1274069	0.1357634	0.1431803

We also record that $\Delta_{18} = 0$ and $\Delta_{24} = 0$ are admissible exponents for both $k = 5$ and $k = 6$ respectively, such a conclusion stemming from the tables of [26], and write $(u, w) = (18, 23)$ and $(u, w) = (24, 27)$ accordingly for both $k = 5$ and $k = 6$. It is also informative to mention that by [24, Lemma 5.2] then $\Delta_{12} = 0$ for $k = 4$ is an admissible exponent, the analogous assertion $\Delta_8 = 0$ when $k = 3$ following from [25, Theorem 2], and

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha, P, R)|^u d\alpha \ll P^{u-k} \quad (15.18)$$

for the pairs $(k, u) = (4, 12)$ and $(3, 8)$, the estimate when $(k, u) = (2, 6)$ being classical. We then write $w = 17$ for $k = 4$ and $w = u + 1$ when $2 \leq k \leq 3$.

Employing the above tables and remarks, the reader may then observe that whenever $2 \leq k \leq 20$ and $w \leq s \leq k(\log k + 4.20032)$ for the above values of w then $\Delta_{w-1} - \frac{k}{s} < 0$, and $\Delta_{v-1} - \frac{k}{v} < 0$ whenever $14 \leq k \leq 20$, from where it trivially follows that $\Delta_{2\lfloor \frac{s-1}{2} \rfloor} < k/s$, the restriction described in Lemma 9.1 thereby holding for the choice $d_0 = 1$. We further note that by the tables in [27] for the range $7 \leq k \leq 20$ and by those in [26] for the range $5 \leq k \leq 6$ then $\Delta_u = 0$, it therefore transpires that $\Delta_{u+1}^* < 0$ and, since $s \geq w$ and hence $2s \geq u + 1$ for each $5 \leq k \leq 20$ then $\Delta_{2s}^* < 0$. We also observe whenever $5 \leq k \leq 20$ that $w \geq 4k + 2$ and recall (9.46) and (9.47) to deduce that the application of the aforementioned lemma in conjunction with Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1 entails

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| = |\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| \ll N^{1-\nu_k}$$

for some $\nu_k > 0$, as desired. The remaining part of Theorem 1.3 pertaining to $5 \leq k \leq 20$ then holds upon observing that $w \leq k(\log k + 3.20032)$.

For the cases $2 \leq k \leq 4$ one would combine when $s \geq w$ the bound (15.18) and Lemmata 5.1 and 5.2 to obtain similar results to those in Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 7.1 without the restriction $s \geq 4k + 1$ to derive the analogues of Proposition 7.1 and Corollary 7.2, and deduce $|\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| = O(1)$. The proof would follow by using Lemma 9.1 for the choice $d_0 = 1$ to obtain as in Corollary 9.1 that $|\mathcal{Z}(N)| = O(1)$ upon observing that $w \leq k(\log k + 3.20032)$, and alluding to [23, Theorem 4.6] for the bounds $\mathfrak{S}(n) \asymp 1$ when $2 \leq k \leq 3$.

We next shift our attention to the range pertaining Theorem 1.5 and note that one may make in view of [1, Lemma 7.1] the choice

$$D = \frac{(\omega - 1 - 2/\omega + 2/k)^2}{1 - 2/\omega}, \quad (15.19)$$

where ω is the unique real solution, with $\omega \geq 1$, of the equation (1.8), from where it follows as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 therein that

$$2 + \log D = C_1 + O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right), \quad (15.20)$$

the constant C_1 having been defined in (1.9). In view of the discussion in (15.5) it transpires that one may restrict the analysis to the instance $s < s_0$ for the above choice of D , and observe in light of the statement in Theorem 1.5 that one may assume

$$k(\log(kD) + 1) + 1 - \frac{k^2}{s} \leq s \quad (15.21)$$

for sufficiently large k , whence in particular $s_0 - k(1 + k/s) \leq s < s_0$ and, upon recalling the definition of s_0 in (15.5) then

$$k(\log(kD) + 1) - \frac{k}{\log(kD)} \leq s \leq k(\log(kD) + 2).$$

Equipped with the above bounds it is worth observing whenever k is sufficiently large that

$$\frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{D k^7 (s - k)} \ll \log k,$$

the choice $c = s^7/k^8$ thereby entailing for every $d \leq \frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{D k^7 (s - k)}$ the estimate

$$T_d(k) \ll \frac{k}{(\log k)^3}, \quad (15.22)$$

the parameter $T_d(k)$ having been defined in (9.3). Moreover, by the preceding discussion it is apparent for every d and s as above that

$$2(s - d - k) = 2k \log k + O(k),$$

from where it follows that $2(s - d - k) \geq s_0$, as desired. It therefore remains to show the property pertaining to the bound for $\Delta_{s_{T_0}}$ with $T_0 \leq T_d(k)$, a routinary recourse to [32, Theorem 2.1] in conjunction with (15.21), (15.22) and the preceding estimates permitting one to obtain for some constant $C_0 > 0$ and sufficiently large k the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{s_{T_0}} &\leq k e^{1-(s-d-T_0-1)/k} \leq \frac{1}{D} e^{k/s+C_0(k/s)^3} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + k/s + C_0(k/s)^3 + \frac{3}{5} (k/s + C_0(k/s)^3)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + k/s + \frac{2k^2}{3s^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude our discussion by setting $d_0 = \left\lceil \frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{D k^7 (s-k)} \right\rceil$ in the context underlying Lemma 9.1 and note that then [32, Theorem 2.1] in conjunction with the same circle of ideas as above yields for sufficiently large k the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2 \left\lfloor \frac{s-d_0}{2} \right\rfloor - \frac{d_0 k}{s} &\leq \frac{e^{k/s+(1+d_0)/k}}{D} - \frac{s^2 k^6 - s^7}{D k^7 (s-k)} \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{1}{D} \left(1 + \frac{k}{s} + \frac{2k^2}{3s^2} - \frac{s k^6 - s^6}{k^6 (s-k)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{k}{s} + \frac{2k^2}{3s^2} - \frac{k^7 - s^6}{k^6 (s-k)} \right) = \frac{1}{D} \left(\frac{2k^2}{3s^2} - \frac{k^2}{s(s-k)} + \frac{s^6}{k^6 (s-k)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, upon observing that $\frac{s^6}{k^6 (s-k)} = O((\log k)^5 k^{-1})$ it would then transpire for sufficiently large k that

$$\Delta_2 \left\lfloor \frac{s-d_0}{2} \right\rfloor - \frac{d_0 k}{s} \leq -\frac{k^2}{4s^2},$$

as desired. By the preceding discussion, it is then apparent that the conditions appertaining to Proposition 9.1, Lemma 9.1, Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1 hold for the range of k and s cognate to Theorem 1.5, Corollary 9.1 thereby being applicable and leading to the estimate $|\mathcal{Z}(N)| \ll N^{1-\gamma_k}$ with γ_k satisfying (9.10), as desired. The first conclusion pertaining to Theorem 1.5 then holds in view of the above analysis in conjunction with the choice (15.19).

If moreover $s \geq k \left(\log k + C_1 - \frac{e^{C_1-2}}{\log k + C_1} \right)$ then in view of (15.20) one has in particular

$$s \geq k(\log(kD) + 2) - \frac{Dk}{\log(kD) + 2} + E(k),$$

wherein $E(k) = O(1)$, and upon writing $s = k \left(\log k + C_1 - \frac{\theta e^{C_1-2}}{\log k + C_1} \right)$ for some $\frac{\log k}{k} \ll \theta \leq 1$ and making use of (15.9) then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{s-1}^* - \frac{k}{s} &\leq \frac{\theta}{\log(kD) + 2} - \frac{1}{\log(kD) + 2 - \frac{\theta D}{\log(kD) + 2}} + \frac{C_0}{k} \\ &\leq \frac{(\log(kD) + 2)^2 (\theta - 1) - \theta^2 D}{(\log(kD) + 2) ((\log(kD) + 2)^2 - D\theta)} + \frac{C_0}{k}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 > 0$ is some constant, which entails whenever k is sufficiently large that

$$\Delta_{s-1}^* - \frac{k}{s} \leq \frac{-D}{2(\log(kD) + 2) ((\log(kD) + 2)^2 - D\theta)}.$$

The preceding bound thereby delivers the restriction required in the remark leading to (11.15), whence upon recalling (9.46) it transpires that the previous observation in conjunction with Proposition 8.2 and Corollary 8.1 entails

$$|\mathcal{Z}(N)| = |\mathcal{Z}_0(N)| \ll N^{1-\nu_k}$$

with ν_k being a constant satisfying (1.24), as desired. The above remarks conclude the proof of Theorem 1.5.

16. THE LINEAR CASE

We shall briefly sketch the proof of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 by merely indicating the instances in the proof for higher powers where the argument would be alleviated in the linear case. We consider the same space but with probabilities $\mathbb{P}(y \in \mathfrak{X}) = y^{-1+1/s}\psi_1(y)^{1/s}$, where $\psi_1(y) = \Gamma(1/s)^{-s}\psi(y)$. We then define $R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n)$ as in (11.3) for $k = 1$ but without the smoothing condition, and write

$$R_{\mathfrak{X}}^s(n) = R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\neq}(n) + R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\bar{}}(n), \quad R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\neq}(n) = R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(n) + R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)$$

as in (11.4) and (11.5) respectively for the choice $\tau_0 = 1/2$. A routinary computation then yields whenever $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},l}^{\neq}(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{n=x_1+\dots+x_l} (x_1 \cdots x_l)^{-1+1/s} \ll n^{-1+l/s+\varepsilon} \ll n^{-1/s+\varepsilon}, \quad (16.1)$$

where in the second step we employed [23, Theorem 2.3]. In a similar manner one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n)) &\ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{x \leq n^{1/2}} x^{-1+1/s} \sum_{n-x=x_1+\dots+x_{s-1}} (x_1 \cdots x_{s-1})^{-1+1/s} \\ &\ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{x \leq n^{1/2}} x^{-1+1/s} (n-x)^{-1/s} \ll n^{\varepsilon-1/2s}. \end{aligned} \quad (16.2)$$

Likewise, whenever $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and $\mathbf{a} \in [1, s]^l$ we define $R_{\mathfrak{X},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)$ as in (11.10) and deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathfrak{X},\mathbf{a}}^l(n)) \ll n^\varepsilon \sum_{n=a_1x_1+\dots+a_lx_l} \prod_{i=1}^l x_i^{-1+1/s} \ll n^{\varepsilon-1/s}, \quad (16.3)$$

where we employed a modification of the argument in [23, Theorem 2.3].

Equipped with the preceding estimates we then may employ as in Section 11 the argument in the last paragraph of [29, page 128] to show that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(s) > 0$ such that with probability at least 0.6 one has for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the bounds

$$\max(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^0(n), R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^{\bar{}}(n)) \leq C_1. \quad (16.4)$$

We shall next define for $\mathcal{N}_L = \{n_1, \dots, n_L\} \subset [N, 2N]$ the random variable $R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)$ in the same manner as in (13.2), and consider for a subset of natural numbers $A \subset [1, 2N]$ with $|A| = d$ and $1 \leq d \leq s-1$ the expectation $\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathfrak{X},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L))$ defined in the paragraph before (10.1). Then, upon denoting

$$m_i = n_i - \sum_{y \in A} y, \quad 1 \leq i \leq L$$

and $l = s - |A|$, it transpires as in Lemma 13.1 and by (16.1) that

$$\mathbb{E}_A(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L)) \ll \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^+(m_i)) \ll \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},l}^\neq(m_i)) \ll N^\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^L m_i^{-1/s} \ll N^{\varepsilon-1/2s}. \quad (16.5)$$

It shall further be pertinent to compute $\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n))$. To such an end we proceed as in Proposition 11.1 by noting that the monotonicity of $\psi(x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) &= \sum_{\substack{n=x_1+\dots+x_s \\ x_i \neq x_j \\ x_i > n^{1/2}}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+1/s} \psi_1(x_i)^{1/s} \leq \psi_1(n) \sum_{\substack{n=x_1+\dots+x_s \\ x_i \geq 1}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+1/s} \\ &= \psi_1(n) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^s + O(\psi(n)n^{-1/s}) = \psi(n) + O(\psi(n)n^{-1/s}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we employed [23, Theorem 2.3] to evaluate the corresponding sum. Likewise, assuming as we may $\varphi(n) = o(n^{1/2})$ then for every sufficiently large n one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) &\geq \sum_{\substack{n=x_1+\dots+x_s \\ x_i \neq x_j \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+1/s} \psi_1(x_i)^{1/s} \\ &\geq \left(\psi_1(n/\varphi(n)) \sum_{\substack{n=x_1+\dots+x_s \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) > (n\varphi(n)^{-1})}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+1/s} \right) - \psi_1(n) R_s^-(n) \\ &= \psi_1(n/\varphi(n)) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^s + O(\psi(n)n^{-1/s}) + O\left(\psi(n) \sum_{\substack{n=x_1+\dots+x_s \\ \min_{i \leq s}(x_i) \leq (n\varphi(n)^{-1})}} \prod_{i=1}^s x_i^{-1+1/s}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we utilised [23, Theorem 2.3] to derive the first summand and the computation in (16.3) to estimate $R_s^-(n)$, it in turn denoting the analogue of (11.16). We thus recall (1.11) and use the argument in (16.2) to deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(n)) \geq \psi(n) + O(\psi(n)(n^{-1/s} + \xi(n) + \varphi(n)^{-1/s})).$$

Having been furnished with the preceding estimates we have reached a position from which to complete mutatis mutandis the proof of the analogue of Theorem 13.1.

Theorem 16.1. *Let ψ, ξ be as in Theorem 13.1. Then one has for sufficiently large N , each collection $(\mathcal{M}_j(N))_{j \leq N^\kappa}$ of subsets $\mathcal{M}_j(N) \subset [N, 2N]$ as therein and all $\mathcal{N}_L \subset \mathcal{M}_j(N)$ with $|\mathcal{N}_L| = L$ for $1 \leq j \leq N^\kappa$, the expression*

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) \asymp_{k,s} \psi(n)L$$

with probability at least 0.7. If moreover $\xi(n) = o(1)$ and δ is as in the statement of Theorem 1.7 then

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}^s(\mathcal{N}_L) = L\psi(N) + O(\psi(N)L\delta(N))$$

with probability at least 0.7.

Proof. We first observe upon denoting $\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L} = \mathbb{E}(R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L))$ that one may obtain for some constant $\kappa = \kappa(s, \beta) > 0$ the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_{\mathbf{x},s}^+(\mathcal{N}_L) - \mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}| \geq \delta(N)\mu_{\mathcal{N}_L}) \ll N^{-\kappa C} + N^{-\beta}$$

by following the proof of Proposition 13.2 and employing (16.5) in lieu of Lemma 13.1. Equipped with the above estimate, then the theorem flows by following the proof of Theorem 13.1, utilising when required the conclusion of (16.4) instead of (13.19). \square

We finally complete the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.8 by following the discussion in Section 15 and using Theorem 16.1 instead of Theorem 13.1. The second part of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 on the other hand follows by employing the same ideas as in Corollary 14.1 but utilising (16.5) in lieu of Lemma 11.4 to derive (14.5).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bruedern, T. D. Wooley, *On Waring's problem for larger powers*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 805 (2023), 115–142.
- [2] J. Bruedern, T. D. Wooley, *Estimates for smooth Weyl sums on major arcs*, arXiv:2405.18608.
- [3] J. Bruedern, T. D. Wooley, *Estimates for smooth Weyl sums on minor arcs*, arXiv:2408.06441.
- [4] S. L. G. Choi, P. Erdős, M. B. Nathanson, *Lagrange's theorem with $N^{1/3}$ squares*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 79 (1980), 203–205.
- [5] P. Ding and A. R. Freedman, *Small sets of k th powers*, Canad. Math. Bull. 37 (1994), 168–173.
- [6] P. Erdős, *Problems and results in additive number theory*, Colloque sur la Theorie des Nombres (CBRM) (Bruxelles), 1956, 127–137.
- [7] P. Erdős, *Problems and results on additive properties of general sequences. II*, Acta Math. Hung. 48 (1–2) (1986), 201–211.
- [8] P. Erdős, *Some of my favourite problems in number theory, combinatorics, and geometry*. Combinatorics Week (Portuguese) (São Paulo, 1994). Resenhas 2 (1995), no. 2, 165–186.
- [9] P. Erdős, M. B. Nathanson, *Lagrange's theorem and thin subsequences of squares* in *Contributions to Probability: A Collection of Papers Dedicated to Eugene Lukacs*, ed. J. Gani and V. K. Rohatgi, Academic Press, New York, 1981, 3–9.
- [10] P. Erdős, R. Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of sets*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 35 (1960), 85–90.
- [11] P. Erdős, A. Renyi, *Additive properties of random sequences of positive integers*, Acta Arith. 6 (1960).
- [12] P. Erdős, P. Tetali, *Representations of integers as the sum of k terms*, Random Structures Algorithms 1 (1990), No. 3, 245–261.
- [13] P. Erdős, P. Turán, *On a problem of Sidon in additive number theory, and on some related problems*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 16 (1941), 212–215.
- [14] J. H. Goguel, *Über Summen von zufälligen Folgen natürlicher Zahlen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 278/279 (1975), 63–77.
- [15] H. Halberstam, K. F. Roth, *Sequences*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [16] S. Janson, A. Rucinski, *The deletion method for upper tail estimates*, Combinatorica 24 (2004), No. 4, 615–640.
- [17] J. H. Kim, V. H. Vu, *Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications*, Combinatorica 20 (2000), 417–434.
- [18] B. Landreau, *Étude probabiliste des sommes des puissances s -ièmes*, Compositio Math. 99 (1995), No. 1, 1–31.
- [19] M. B. Nathanson, *Waring's problem for sets of density zero*. *Analytic number theory (Philadelphia, Pa., 1980)*, 301–310, Lecture Notes in Math., 899, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.
- [20] J. Pliego, *On the Erdős-Turán Conjecture and the growth of $B_2[g]$ sequences*, arxiv: arXiv:2405.04154.
- [21] J. Spencer, *Four squares with few squares* in *Number Theory (New York, 1991–1995)*, ed. D. V. Chudnovsky, G. V. Chudnovsky, and M. B. Nathanson. Springer, New York, 1996, 295 – 297.
- [22] C. Tafula, *Representation functions with prescribed rates of growth*, arXiv:2405.01530v1.
- [23] R. C. Vaughan, *The Hardy-Littlewood method*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [24] R. C. Vaughan, *A new iterative method in Waring's problem*, Acta Math. 162 (1989), no. 1-2, 1–71.

- [25] R. C. Vaughan, *On Waring's problem for cubes*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 365 (1986), 122–170.
- [26] R. C. Vaughan and T. D. Wooley, *Further improvements in Waring's problem*, Acta Math. 174 (1995), no. 2, 147–240.
- [27] R. C. Vaughan and T. D. Wooley, *Further improvements in Waring's Problem, IV: higher powers*, Acta Arith. 94 (2000), no. 3, 203–285.
- [28] V. H. Vu, *On the concentration of multivariate polynomials with small expectation*, Random Structures and Algorithms 16 (2000), 344–363.
- [29] V. H. Vu, *On a refinement of Waring's problem*, Duke Math. J. 105 (2000), 107–134.
- [30] E. Wirsing, *Thin subbases*, Analysis 6 (1986), 285–308.
- [31] T. D. Wooley, *Large improvements in Waring's problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) 135 (1992), no. 1, 131–164.
- [32] T. D. Wooley, *The application of a new mean value theorem to the fractional parts of polynomials*, Acta Arith., LXV. 2 (1993), 163–179.
- [33] T. D. Wooley, *New estimates for smooth Weyl sums*, J. London Math. Soc. 51 (1995), 1–13.
- [34] T. D. Wooley, *On Vu's thin basis theorem in Waring's problem*, Duke Math. J. 120 (2003), no. 1, 1–34.
- [35] T. D. Wooley, *Vinogradov's mean value theorem via efficient congruencing*, Ann. of Math. (2) 175 (2012), no. 3, 1575–1627.
- [36] T. D. Wooley, *Rational solutions of pairs of diagonal equations, one cubic and one quadratic*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 110 (2015), no. 2, 325–356.
- [37] J. Zölner, *Über eine Vermutung von Choi, Erdős und Nathanson*, Acta Arith. 45 (1985), 211–213.

UNIVERSITÀ DI GENOVA, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA. VIA DODECANESO 35, 16146 GENOVA, ITALY
Email address: `Javier.Pliego.Garcia@edu.unige.it`