

EXPONENTIAL SUMS TWISTED BY GENERAL ARITHMETIC FUNCTIONS

ANJI DONG, NICOLAS ROBLES, ALEXANDRU ZAHARESCU, AND DIRK ZEINDLER

ABSTRACT. We examine exponential sums of the form $\sum_{n \leq X} w(n) e(\alpha n^k)$, for $k = 1, 2$, where α satisfies a generalized Diophantine approximation and where w are different arithmetic functions that might be multiplicative, additive, or neither. A strategy is shown on how to bound these sums for a wide class of functions w belonging within the same ecosystem. Using this new technology we are able to improve current results on minor arcs that have recently appeared in the literature of the Hardy-Littlewood circle method. Lastly, we show how a bound on $\sum_{n \leq X} |\mu(n)| e(\alpha n)$ can be used to study partitions asymptotics over squarefree parts and explain their connection to the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation and results. Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. To put our results in context, we first set the following definition

$$(1.1) \quad S_r(\alpha, X) := \sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbb{P} \\ p_1 \cdots p_r \leq X}} e(\alpha p_1 \cdots p_r) \quad \text{where} \quad e(x) = \exp(2\pi i x),$$

and where \mathbb{P} denotes the set of primes. One of our central results is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that*

$$(1.2) \quad \left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}, \quad (a, q) = 1.$$

Then for any $X \geq 2$, $q \leq X$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(1.3) \quad S_r(\alpha, X) \ll_r \left(\frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{2r}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2r}}\} + X^{\frac{2+2r}{3+2r}} + X^{\frac{2r-1}{2r}} q^{\frac{1}{2r}} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

We shall prove more general versions of this theorem as well as several related results involving exponential sums twisted by different functions of primes in the forthcoming sections. These twisted exponential sums can be thought of as belonging within the same ecosystem and the techniques we present can be repurposed for other types of exponential sums.

Bounds on exponential sums have several useful applications in different areas of number theory. One such notable application of a classic inequality in additive number theory takes place when $\Upsilon = r = 1$ in Theorem 1.1 and it is as follows.

Theorem 1.2 (Vinogradov estimate). *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. Then for any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.4) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) \ll \left(\frac{X}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{X} \sqrt{q} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11L03, 11L07, 11L20. Secondary: 11P55, 11P82.

Keywords and phrases: exponential sums, arithmetic functions, weights associated to partitions, Hardy-Littlewood circle method, zeros of the Riemann zeta-function, explicit formulae, Weyl's bound.

This was established by Vinogradov [35] and the proof was later simplified considerably by Vaughan [32], see also [9, §25] and [20, §23]. In its original form it appeared as $\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) e(\alpha n)$ where Λ is the von Mangoldt function, a sum whose generalization we shall also cover in this paper. Vinogradov's bound is an essential step in bounding the minor arcs arising from the sums of three primes as well as in partitions into *primes* as shown by Vaughan in [34]. Specifically, using this bound, Vinogradov was able to show that every sufficiently large odd integer is the sum of three primes and also obtained an asymptotic formula for the number of such representations.

As of recently, a rich amount of literature on partitions involving the Hardy-Littlewood circle method has been published. Each case required its own specialized and associated exponential sum. For instance in [11, 13], the associated exponential sum needed to bound partitions into *powers and certain restricted polynomials* was Weyl's bound [33, §3] on $\sum_{n \leq x} e(\alpha n^k)$, the sum being taken over integers n , not primes p . Weyl's bound was also instrumental in [3] to study partitions in *arithmetic progressions*. In [14], an analogous result of Kawada-Wooley [19] was employed by Gafni to bound a sum over *prime powers*. In [2], an extension of a classic result of Motohashi [25] had to be derived to bound sums of the form $\sum_{n \leq X} \sigma_{k_1, k_2}(n) e(\alpha n)$, where σ_{k_1, k_2} is the *generalized divisor function*. Another instance is in [6], where Daniels bounded exponential sums for *signed partitions* employing Davenport's inequality for the Möbius function [8], see also [24].

For asymptotic partitions into *semiprimes* [7], a generalization of Theorem 1.2 was established.

Theorem 1.3 (Generalized Vinogradov estimate, [7, §5.1]). *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon \geq 1$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.5) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) \ll \Upsilon \left(\frac{X}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{X} \sqrt{q} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

This was the stepping stone to obtaining a bound for $S_2(\alpha, X)$ by the use of the so-called 'hyperbola method'. Indeed, employing Theorem 1.3, the following bound on S_2 was proved.

Theorem 1.4 ([7, Theorem 5.1]). *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.6) \quad S_2(\alpha, X) \ll \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{6}}} (\log X)^{\frac{7}{3}} + X^{\frac{16}{17}} (\log X)^{\frac{39}{17}} + X^{\frac{7}{8}} q^{\frac{1}{8}} (\log X)^{\frac{9}{4}}.$$

In this article, we go a good deal further and improve Theorem 1.3 by considerably simplifying the original argument in [7] (which was based on Davenport's [9, §25]) and obtaining a substantially stronger version, along with a much more elegant proof. The improvements of Theorem 1.1 over Theorem 1.3 are threefold:

- the range of validity of Υ is extended from $[1, \infty)$ to $(0, \infty)$,
- only the first term inside the brackets on the right-hand side of (1.3) is affected by Υ , rather than having Υ as global prefactor in (1.5),
- the exponent of Υ is now reduced from 1 to $\frac{1}{2}$.

In turn, these improvements lead to a stronger version of Theorem 1.4, which we now illustrate for $r = 2$ and $r = 3$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.7) \quad S_2(\alpha, X) \ll \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}} + X^{\frac{6}{7}} (\log X)^{\frac{19}{7}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}},$$

$$(1.8) \quad S_3(\alpha, X) \ll \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{6}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{6}}\} (\log X)^{\frac{7}{3}} + X^{\frac{8}{9}} (\log X)^{\frac{23}{9}} + X^{\frac{5}{6}} q^{\frac{1}{6}} (\log X)^{\frac{7}{3}}.$$

For example, let us take the case $r = 2$. The second and third exponents of X on the right-hand side of (1.6) and (1.7) are improved by

$$(1.9) \quad \frac{16}{17} - \frac{6}{7} = \frac{10}{119} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{7}{8} - \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{8},$$

respectively. These improvements are due to the fact that Υ appears with a $\frac{1}{2}$ exponent. However, the presence of Υ only in the first term of the right-hand of (1.3) also simplifies matters considerably, for otherwise using Theorem 1.3 with the hyperbola method would have yielded

$$(1.10) \quad S_3(\alpha, X) \ll \Upsilon X^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log X)^2 q^{\frac{1}{2}} + \Upsilon X q^{-\frac{1}{18}}(\log X)^{\frac{19}{9}} + \Upsilon X^{\frac{52}{53}}(\log X)^{\frac{111}{53}} + \Upsilon X^{\frac{25}{26}} q^{\frac{1}{26}}(\log X)^{\frac{27}{13}} \\ + \Upsilon(\log \log X) \left(X q^{-\frac{1}{6}}(\log X)^{\frac{7}{3}} + X^{\frac{7}{8}} q^{\frac{1}{8}}(\log X)^{\frac{9}{4}} \right),$$

which is not only weaker than (1.8), but substantially more complicated and cumbersome.

The reason Theorem 1.5 is presented as a theorem, rather than as corollary of Theorem 1.1, is because we have opted to present Theorem 1.1 in a compact notation where the exponents of the logarithms are a bit weaker. However, with some additional work, we can refine these exponents to those in Theorem 1.5 not only for $r \in \{2, 3\}$ but for any integer r . Although different applications might require specific precision in the exponents, in general, and certainly for our purposes, the exponents associated to the logarithms are not as critical as the exponents associated to X and q . Therefore, when warranted, we have chosen to provide simplified arguments for the sake of clarity.

The techniques employed to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.5 lend themselves well to study adjacent exponential sums twisted by other arithmetic functions. If we let Λ^{*r} denote the r -fold Dirichlet convolution of Λ with itself, then one such instance is

$$(1.11) \quad \tilde{S}_r(\alpha, X) := \sum_{n \leq X} \Lambda^{*r}(n) e(\alpha n) = \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_r \in \mathbb{N} \\ n_1 \cdots n_r \leq X}} e(\alpha n_1 \cdots n_r) \prod_{i=1}^r \Lambda(n_i).$$

Along the way, we shall present analogue bounds for (1.11). However, we do not stop here.

Definition 1.1. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an arithmetic function. For any real α and $X \geq 1$ we shall adopt the notation

$$(1.12) \quad S_f(\alpha, X) := \sum_{n \leq X} f(n) e(\alpha n).$$

The notation S_r is reserved exclusively for (1.1). For instance in [1], convolutions of Möbius functions were considered. In this direction, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\alpha = a/q + \beta$ for some $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\beta| < \Upsilon/q^2$ for some $\Upsilon > 0$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.13) \quad S_{\mu * \mu}(\alpha, X) \ll_{\varepsilon} \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}} + X^{\frac{6}{7} + \varepsilon} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}},$$

for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 1.6 improves the bound for $S_{\mu * \mu}$ that appeared in [1]. Theorem 1.6 will be further generalized for the r -fold convolution μ^{*r} in Section 4.1. If we let $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$ denote the characteristic function of primes, then Theorem 1.5 shows a bound for exponential sums twisted by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$, whereas in Theorem 1.6 we studied exponential sums twisted by $\mu * \mu$. Therefore, this begs the question of bounding an exponential sum twisted by

$$(1.14) \quad \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(n) := (\mu * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}})(n) = \sum_{\substack{hp=n \\ p \in \mathbb{P}}} \mu(h).$$

We illustrate the behavior of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ in Figure 1.1 where the color hue represents magnitude.




FIGURE 1.1. Values of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(x)$ on the left, and $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$ on the right, for $1 \leq x \leq 500$.

The result is as follows.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\alpha = a/q + \beta$ for some $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\beta| < \Upsilon/q^2$ for some $\Upsilon > 0$. Then for any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.15) \quad S_{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}}(\alpha, X) \ll_{\varepsilon} \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}} + X^{\frac{6}{7} + \varepsilon} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}},$$

for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lastly, a natural step is to consider the twist by $\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$, where $\mathbf{1}(n) = 1$ for all n , which is incidentally $\omega(n)$, the number of distinct prime divisors of n . This bound will be revisited in [15].

Theorem 1.8. *Let $\alpha = a/q + \beta$ for some $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\beta| < \Upsilon/q^2$ for some $\Upsilon > 0$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.16) \quad S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}}(\alpha, X) \ll \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}} + X^{\frac{6}{7}} (\log X)^{\frac{19}{7}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{2}}.$$

We now present a new bound for sums twisted by $|\mu|$.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\alpha = a/q + \beta$ for some $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\beta| < 1/q^2$. For $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$(1.17) \quad S_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X) \ll \frac{X}{q} \log X + X^{\frac{8}{13}} (\log X)^{\frac{37}{13}} + q \log X.$$

This sum had been studied in [4, 5]. The latest results were published in [30] where Schläge-Puchta showed that $S_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X) \ll (\frac{X}{q} + q)X^{\varepsilon}$ for $q \leq Q \leq \frac{1}{2}X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Theorem 1.9 extends the range of Q from $Q \leq \frac{1}{2}X^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to $Q \leq X$, after which it is trivial, although it still holds. Moreover, the ε term is removed and instead replaced by a power of $\log X$. As we shall see, this will allow us to bound the minor arcs arising from the partitions associated to $|\mu|$.

In all of our previous sums, the term $e(\cdot)$ was of the form $e(\alpha n)$. With the technique we present we can also study sums with $e(\alpha n^2)$ instead of $e(\alpha n)$ as the below result shows.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\alpha = a/q + \beta$ for some $(a, q) = 1$ and $|\beta| < 1/q^2$. For $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$\tilde{S}_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X) = \sum_{n \leq X} \mu^2(n) e(\alpha n^2) \ll \frac{X}{q^{1/4}} + X^{1/2} \log X (\log q)^{1/2} + X^{1/2} q^{1/4} (\log q)^{1/4}.$$

We now end with the above mentioned application to partitions. The generating function for partitions weighted by $|\mu|$ is

$$(1.18) \quad \Psi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) z^n = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - z^n)^{-|\mu(n)|}.$$

The number $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n)$ can be interpreted combinatorially as the number of partitions of n with only square free parts. An application of the Hardy-Littlewood circle method along with Theorem 1.9 will allow us to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.11. *We have as $n \rightarrow \infty$ that*

$$(1.19) \quad \log \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) = 2\sqrt{n} + O_\varepsilon(n^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}),$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Further, if there exists a real h with $\frac{1}{2} \leq h \leq 1$ such that the real part of all non-trivial zeros of ζ are less or equal to h then

$$(1.20) \quad \log \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) = 2\sqrt{n} + O_\varepsilon(n^{\frac{h}{4}+\varepsilon}),$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

This theorem elaborates on a result of Erdős, see [12] and [36], where an asymptotic for $\log \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n)$ was established. Moreover, we will state in Lemma 6.8 a more precise version of Theorem 1.11 using the corresponding saddle point solution.

1.2. Discussion on the technique. We have chosen to present the partitions with weights associated to $|\mu|$ for two main reasons.

First the function $|\mu|$ is obviously multiplicative and a tempting course of action would have been to use the results in [24], which are extremely general bounds for exponential sums associated to multiplicative functions with certain growth conditions. Our rationale is that there might be other situations where the exponential sum might be twisted, for example by a function β , say, that is either additive or neither multiplicative nor additive. In those instances, the strategy put forward is to examine the arithmetic properties of β to understand if it is the combination of other well understood arithmetic functions such as $\mu, \tau, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, |\mu|, \log$ etc. There are a handful of fundamental estimates, such as Vinogradov's inequality, from which bounds for exponential sums may be achieved by suitable combinations. In general the results of this strategy are more than good enough to treat a wide range of minor arcs, however more tailored approaches could yield tighter bounds. In addition, our results do not impose growth conditions nor multiplicativity on β . If one were interested in minor arcs associated to $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ (neither multiplicative nor additive) or ω (additive), then Theorems 1.7 and 1.8, respectively, would be the key results to use.

The idea introduced in this paper can be applied to other interesting exponential sums. For example, let Ω be the total number of prime factors of n , and let $P(s)$ be the prime zeta function. Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega(n)n^{-s} = \zeta(s) \sum_{k>1} P(ks)$, for $\text{Re}(s) > 1$, we can write $\Omega(n) = \sum_{k>1} (\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P} * k})(n)$. We may then apply the ideas from Theorem 1.8 to this decomposition to obtain a bound on $\sum_{n \leq X} \Omega(n) e(\alpha n)$, see also [15]. In this way, it is likely that the technique will allow bounding exponential sums associated with a wide range of additive functions.

Other more exotic examples involve the following functions [31, §1.2]. Let $f_k(n)$ denote the number of representations of n as a product of k factors, each greater than unity when $n > 1$, the order of the factors being essential. The Dirichlet series for f_k is $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} f_k(n)n^{-s} = (\zeta(s) - 1)^k$ for $\text{Re}(s) > 1$. Using the binomial expansion, we see that we can write f_k as a convolution of τ functions, and therefore we may bound the exponential sum twisted by f_k . The same can be said about $g(n)$, the number of representations of n as a product of factors greater than unity, representations with factors in a different order being considered as distinct. If we let $f(1) = 1$, then $f(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(n)$ and therefore the Dirichlet series is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)n^{-s} = (2 - \zeta(s))^{-1}$ for $\text{Re}(s) > \alpha_0$ where $\zeta(\alpha_0) = 2$. In this case, a fractional binomial expansion would also yield combinatorial sums involving μ , and hence, in principle, we could also bound the exponential sum associated to f .

Before discussing the second reason, we also mention that our technology also allows us to bound sums with $e(\alpha P(n))$ where P is a suitable polynomial. In particular, we could have chosen to study

the partitions $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|,2}$ associated to

$$(1.21) \quad \Psi_2(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|,2}(n) z^n = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - z^{n^2})^{-|\mu(n)|}.$$

The function $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|,2}(n)$ can be interpreted combinatorially as the number of partitions of n , where each part is a square of a square free integer, e.g. 4 is allowed but 16 is not. The critical element for the extraction of these partitions would then be Theorem 1.10.

The second reason is that unlike μ , the function $|\mu|$ only takes values 0 and 1. Therefore, $|\mu|$ does not exhibit the same oscillations as μ . As a result, in [1] the authors achieved $\log \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|} \ll \sqrt{n}(\log n)^{-B}$ for any fixed $B > 0$ and all $n \geq 2$. In our present case, we are now able to obtain partition asymptotics of $\log \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}$ with a main term as well as an error term as seen in Theorem 1.11.

1.3. Structure of the paper. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1. This will require some preliminary lemmas that we will establish along the way. The special cases $r = 2$ and $r = 3$ (Theorem 1.5) will be treated in Section 3. The bounds on exponential sums from Theorem 1.6, Theorem 1.7, Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9 will be studied in Section 4. Moreover, in Section 5 we will present the proof of Theorem 1.10 along with some additional results, such as Weyl's bound and an analogue of the Heath-Brown identity for $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$. These results could become useful in the context of bounding new exponential sums associated to arithmetic functions or improving existing ones. Lastly, Section 6 will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.11 as well as the connection to the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function. We conclude with some additional ideas for future work in Section 7; in particular we elaborate on how our results could be employed in the context of Goldbach-Vinogradov ternary problems.

1.4. Notation. Throughout the paper, the expressions $f(X) = O(g(X))$, $f(X) \ll g(X)$, and $g(X) \gg f(X)$ are equivalent to the statement that $|f(X)| \leq (\geq) C|g(X)|$ for all sufficiently large X , where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant. A subscript of the form \ll_{α} means the implied constant may depend on the parameter α . The notation $f = o(g)$ as $x \rightarrow a$ means that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x)/g(x) = 0$ and $f \sim g$ as $x \rightarrow a$ denotes $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x)/g(x) = 1$. Dyadic sums are represented by $\sum_{n \sim N} f(n) = \sum_{N < n \leq 2N} f(n)$. The divisor function is denoted by $\tau(n)$. The k -fold divisor function $\tau_k(n)$ is defined by the coefficients of the Dirichlet series $\zeta^k(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tau_k(n)}{n^s}$ for $\text{Re}(s) > 1$. The notation f^{*r} indicates that the arithmetic function f is convolved with itself r times. The digamma function is denoted by $\Psi(x) = \frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}(x)$. The Greek character ρ is reserved for the radius of the circle method, whereas the non-trivial zeros of zeta will be denoted by ϖ . The Latin character p will always denote a prime, whereas $\mathfrak{p}_A(n)$ denotes the number of partitions of n with respect to some weight A . Finally, throughout the paper, we shall use the convention that ε denotes an arbitrarily small positive quantity that may not be the same at each occurrence.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We begin by proving the $r = 1$ case separately in the following self-contained result.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. For any $X \geq 2$, one has*

$$S_1(\alpha, X) \ll \left(\frac{X \max\{1, \sqrt{2\Upsilon}\}}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{X}\sqrt{q} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

The same bound holds for $\tilde{S}_1(\alpha, X)$ with $(\log X)^3$ replaced by $(\log X)^4$.

Proof. We only give the proof for $S_1(\alpha, X)$ since the proof for $\tilde{S}_1(\alpha, X)$ is almost identical. Dirichlet's approximation theorem asserts that for any real α and for any $M \geq 1$, there exists a rational

number a_1/q_1 , where $1 \leq q_1 \leq M$, and $(a_1, q_1) = 1$, such that $|\alpha - a_1/q_1| \leq 1/(q_1 M) \leq 1/q_1^2$. Choosing $M = 2q$ implies there exists $1 \leq q_1 \leq 2q$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(a_1, q_1) = 1$ and

$$(2.1) \quad \left| \alpha - \frac{a_1}{q_1} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2qq_1} \leq \frac{1}{q_1^2}.$$

Inserting a_1/q_1 into Vinogradov's bound, i.e Theorem 1.2 (or Theorem 1.3 with $\Upsilon = 1$), yields

$$(2.2) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) = \left(\frac{X}{\sqrt{q_1}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{X}\sqrt{q_1} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

We now can have two cases, $a/q = a_1/q_1$ and $a/q \neq a_1/q_1$. If $a/q = a_1/q_1$, we conclude that $a_1 = a$ and $q_1 = q$ since both are in the reduced form. This implies that

$$(2.3) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) = \left(\frac{X}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + \sqrt{X}\sqrt{q} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

Otherwise, if $a/q \neq a_1/q_1$, then using (2.1), we have

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{1}{qq_1} \leq \left| \frac{a_1}{q_1} - \frac{a}{q} \right| \leq \left| \frac{a_1}{q_1} - \alpha \right| + \left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2qq_1} + \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}.$$

Subtract $1/(2qq_1)$ from both sides of (2.4), we have $1/(2qq_1) \leq \Upsilon/q^2$, which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_1}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2\Upsilon}}{\sqrt{q}}.$$

Inserting this into (2.2) implies

$$(2.5) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) \ll \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\Upsilon}X}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + X^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{2q} \right) (\log X)^4.$$

Therefore, combining (2.3) and (2.5), we get our desired result. \square

Before stating the bounds we wish to show on $S_r(\alpha, X)$ and $\tilde{S}_r(\alpha, X)$ we need to introduce two key auxiliary results that will be critical in the subsequent proofs.

Lemma 2.2 (Generalized bilinear estimate). *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. Further, let $(\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\eta_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two real sequences with $|\xi_m| \leq 1$ and $|\eta_m| \leq 1$. Then one has for all $M, N > 0$ that*

$$\sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ m > M, n > N}} \xi_m \eta_n e(\alpha mn) \ll \left(\frac{X \max\{1, \Upsilon\}}{q} + \frac{X}{M} + \frac{X}{N} + q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^2.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.2 for $\Upsilon = 1$ can be found in [18, Lemma 13.8] and the extension to $\Upsilon > 0$ follows from the same principles that appeared in the proof of Lemma 2.1.

Furthermore, we shall introduce in the proof of Theorem 1.1 some helpful parameters M and N . After deducing upper bounds for the occurring terms as a function of M and N , we have to choose these parameters in a suitable way to minimize the resulting upper bounds. To accomplish this optimization, we use the following useful lemma.

Lemma 2.3 ([7, Lemma 5.1]). *Let F, G_0, G_1 and G_2 be continuous, real valued functions on \mathbb{R}_+ such that F is strictly decreasing and all G_i are increasing. Further, suppose that for $i = 0, 1, 2$*

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} G_i(x) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} F(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} G_i(x) = \infty.$$

Set $G(x) := \max\{G_0(x), G_1(x), G_2(x)\}$ and $H(x) := \max\{F(x), G(x)\}$. We then have

$$(2.7) \quad \min_{x \in (0, \infty)} H(x) = F(\min\{U_0, U_1, U_2\}) = G(\min\{U_0, U_1, U_2\}),$$

where U_i is the solution of the equation $F(U_i) = G_i(U_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

The parameter x runs in (2.7) over all values in \mathbb{R}_+ . However, we have to impose in the proof of Theorem 1.1 that $x \leq X$. Equation (2.7) is also correct in this situation as long as $\min\{U_0, U_1, U_2\} \leq X$ because $G(\min\{U_0, U_1, U_2\}) \leq G(X)$.

Equipped with these tools, we may now prove Theorem 1.1. We do this in a slightly more general setting. For this, let f be an arithmetic function. Define for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(2.8) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) := \sum_{n \leq X} f^{*r}(n) e(n\alpha).$$

Assume there exists is an $\eta \geq 0$ such that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(2.9) \quad f^{*r}(X) \ll (\log X)^{r\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n \leq X} |f|^{*r}(n) \ll_r X (\log X)^{\eta r}$$

for $X \geq 2$. Abel summation immediately implies that we have for all $0 \leq y < 1$

$$(2.10) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} |f|^{*r}(n) n^{-y} \ll_r X^{1-y} (\log X)^{\eta r}.$$

Also assume that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|\alpha - a/q| \leq q^{-2}$ and $(a, q) = 1$, we have

$$(2.11) \quad S_{1,f}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+r\eta} (Xq^{-\frac{1}{2}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} + X^{\frac{1}{2}}q^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be as above. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that*

$$(2.12) \quad \left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}, \quad (a, q) = 1.$$

We then have for any $X \geq 2$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(2.13) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) \ll_r (\log X)^{3+r\eta} (Xq^{-\frac{1}{2r}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2r}}\} + X^{\frac{2+2r}{3+2r}} + X^{\frac{2r-1}{2r}} q^{\frac{1}{2r}}).$$

We now give a more compact formulation of (2.13). We define for $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_0(r) &= 1, & \beta_1(r) &= \frac{2+2r}{3+2r}, & \beta_2(r) &= \frac{2r-1}{2r}, \\ \gamma_0(r) &= \frac{1}{2r}, & \gamma_1(r) &= 0, & \gamma_2(r) &= 0, \\ \delta_0(r) &= -\frac{1}{2r}, & \delta_1(r) &= 0, & \delta_2(r) &= \frac{1}{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

With these, we can rewrite (2.13) for $\Upsilon \geq 1$ as

$$(2.15) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r)} \Upsilon^{\gamma_j(r)} q^{\delta_j(r)}.$$

The advantage of (2.15) over (2.13) is that it is easier to handle within complex calculations. In particular, one can often handle all three summands in (2.13) at once, rather than having to look at each one separately. This is the case, for example, in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Further, we will use in the proof that each $\beta_j(r)$ is an increasing function in r and that each $\beta_j(r)$ fulfils the recurrence relation

$$(2.16) \quad \beta_j(r+1) = \frac{2 + 2\gamma_j - \beta_j(r)}{3 + 2\gamma_j - 2\beta_j(r)}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For $q \geq X$, the bound in Theorem 2.1 is larger than the trivial bound we get from (2.9). Thus we can assume that $q \leq X$. We prove Theorem 2.1 by induction over r . The case $r = 1$ and $\Upsilon = 1$ is true by (2.11). The case $r = 1$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ follows with the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Thus, Theorem 2.1 holds for $r = 1$.

Thus we assume that Theorem 2.1 holds for all $s \leq r - 1$ for some $r \geq 2$. We now need to show that the theorem also holds for r . It is sufficient to consider the case $\Upsilon = 1$, since we can use the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 to derive the case $\Upsilon > 0$. Note that we require

within the proof that the theorem hold for $s \leq r - 1$ with $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ and we thus cannot drop the Υ term from the theorem.

Inserting the definition of the Dirichlet convolution, we see that

$$(2.17) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) = \sum_{u \leq X} f^{*r}(u) e(u\alpha) = \sum_{mn \leq X} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha).$$

We now split $S_{r,f}(\alpha, X)$ into four pieces and estimate them separately. For this, let $M, N \geq 1$ with $MN \leq X$ arbitrary. We will determine them below to optimize our estimate. We write

$$(2.18) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) = S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) + S_{r,2}(\alpha, X) + S_{r,3}(\alpha, X) - S_{r,4}(\alpha, X)$$

with the $S_{r,j}$ terms given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ m > M, n > N}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha), & S_{r,2}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ n \leq N}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha), \\ S_{r,3}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ m \leq M}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha), & S_{r,4}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ m \leq M, n \leq N}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

We begin by giving an upper bound for $S_{r,1}(\alpha, X)$ with Lemma 2.2. To apply Lemma 2.2, we define

$$(2.19) \quad \xi_m := f^{*(r-1)}(m) \mathbf{1}_{m \leq X} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_n := f(n) \mathbf{1}_{n \leq X},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{m \leq X}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{n \leq X}$ are indicator functions. Equation (2.9) now implies that

$$\xi_m \ll (\log X)^{\eta(r-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_n \ll (\log X)^\eta.$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) &\ll \left(\frac{X}{M} + \frac{X}{N} + \frac{X}{q} + q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^{2+\eta r} \\ (2.20) \quad &\ll X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} M^{-\frac{1}{2}} + X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} q^{-\frac{1}{2}} + X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^{2+\eta r} q^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The third summand in (2.20) is smaller than the first summand in (2.13). Note that $q \leq X$ implies $X^{\frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq X^u q^{1-u}$ for all $u \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus we get that the fourth summand in (2.20) is smaller than the third summand in (2.13). Hence those two terms have the required order. It remains to take care of the first two summands in (2.20). To do this, we combine them with $S_{r,2}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3}(\alpha, X)$. More precisely, we set

$$(2.21) \quad S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X) := S_{r,2}(\alpha, X) + X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2.22) \quad S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X) := S_{r,3}(\alpha, X) + X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} M^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Now $S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ does not depend on M and $S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X)$ does not depend on N . Thus we can optimize $S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X)$ separately with respect to N and M . The final step is to insert the chosen M, N into $S_{r,4}(\alpha, X)$ and to check that this sum has also the required order.

We can do the computations for $S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X)$ in one sweep. For this, let $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$, $U \leq X$ and set

$$(2.23) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) := \sum_{\substack{uv \leq X \\ u \leq U}} f^{*s}(u) f^{*(r-s)}(v) e(uv\alpha),$$

$$(2.24) \quad \Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X) := X (\log X)^{2+\eta r} U^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X).$$

Using the definition of $S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X)$, we see that

$$(2.25) \quad \Sigma_{r,1,N}(\alpha, X) = S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{r,r-1,M}(\alpha, X) = S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X).$$

Then we get

$$(2.26) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) \leq \sum_{u \leq U} |f^{*s}(u)| \left| \sum_{v \leq X/u} f^{*(r-s)}(v) e(uv\alpha) \right|.$$

Since $r - s \leq r - 1$, we can apply the induction hypothesis to the inner sum with $\alpha' = u\alpha$. To do this, we have to find suitable a', q' and Υ as in (2.12) such that $|\alpha - a'/q'| \leq \Upsilon/(q')^2$. Multiplying (2.12) by u leads to

$$(2.27) \quad \left| \alpha' - \frac{ua}{q} \right| \leq \frac{u}{q^2}.$$

By assumption, we have $(a, q) = 1$, however q and u do not need to be coprime. In order to apply the induction hypothesis, we set

$$(2.28) \quad \alpha' = u\alpha, \quad a' = \frac{ua}{(u, q)}, \quad q' = \frac{q}{(u, q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon = \frac{u}{(u, q)^2},$$

Inserting these expressions into (2.27) leads to

$$(2.29) \quad \left| \alpha' - \frac{a'}{q'} \right| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{(q')^2}.$$

Now $(a', q') = 1$ and the required assumptions are fulfilled. Inserting the induction hypothesis for $r - s$ in the form of (2.15) and using that $\log(X/u) \leq \log X$ gives

$$(2.30) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+\eta(r-s)} \sum_{u \leq U} |f^{*s}(u)| \sum_{j=0}^2 (X/u)^{\beta_j(r-s)} \Upsilon^{\gamma_j(r-s)} (q')^{\delta_j(r-s)}.$$

Observe that $\delta_j(r-s) + \gamma_j(r-s) \geq 0$. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^2 \left(\frac{X}{u} \right)^{\beta_j(r-s)} \Upsilon^{\gamma_j(r-s)} (q')^{\delta_j(r-s)} &= \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} u^{\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} ((u, q))^{-\delta_j(r-s) - 2\gamma_j(r-s)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} u^{\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)}, \end{aligned}$$

where, we recall, $(u, q) = \gcd(u, q)$. Therefore we arrive at

$$(2.31) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+(r-s)\eta} \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} \sum_{u \leq U} |f^{*s}(u)| u^{\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)}.$$

Further, we have $-1 < \gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s) \leq 0$. Thus, we get with (2.10) that

$$(2.32) \quad \sum_{m \leq U} |f(u)|^{*s} u^{\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} \ll U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} (\log X)^{\eta s}.$$

Inserting this computation into (2.31) and using that $U \leq X$ yields

$$(2.33) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \left(\sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} \right).$$

Inserting this into (2.24) leads us to

$$(2.34) \quad \Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \left(\frac{XU^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\log X} + \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} \right).$$

We now chose U so that it minimizes this bound of $\Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X)$. Since $1 + \gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s) \geq 0$ for all j , we can use Lemma 2.3 with

$$(2.35) \quad F(U) := \frac{XU^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\log X} \quad \text{and} \quad G_j(U) := X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s)-\beta_j(r-s)}.$$

We thus have to find solutions U_0, U_1 and U_2 of the equation

$$(2.36) \quad \frac{XU_j^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\log X} = X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} U_j^{1+\gamma_j(r-s)-\beta_j(r-s)}.$$

We immediately get with the recurrence relation of $\beta_j(r)$ in (2.16) that

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} U_j &= X^{\frac{2-2\beta_j(r-s)}{3+2\gamma_j(r-s)-2\beta_j(r-s)}} q^{-\frac{2\delta_j(r-s)}{3+2\gamma_j(r-s)-2\beta_j(r-s)}} (\log X)^{\frac{-2}{3+2\gamma_j(r-s)-2\beta_j(r-s)}} \\ &= X^{2-2\beta_j(r-s+1)} q^{-\frac{2\delta_j(r-s)}{3+2\gamma_j(r-s)-2\beta_j(r-s)}} (\log X)^{\frac{-2}{3+2\gamma_j(r-s)-2\beta_j(r-s)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the values of $\beta_j(r-s)$, $\gamma_j(r-s)$ and $\delta_j(r-s)$ and using in U_2 that $\delta_2(r-s) = 1 - \beta_2(r-s)$ and the definition of $\beta_2(r-s+1)$ produces

$$(2.38) \quad U_0 = \frac{q^{\frac{1}{r-s+1}}}{(\log X)^{\varepsilon_0}}, \quad U_1 = \frac{X^{2-2\beta_1(r-s+1)}}{(\log X)^{\varepsilon_1}}, \quad U_2 = \frac{X^{2-2\beta_2(r-s+1)} q^{-2(1-\beta_2(r-s+1))}}{(\log X)^{\varepsilon_2}},$$

where $0 \leq \varepsilon_j < 1$, and therefore $U = \min\{U_0, U_1, U_2\}$. In particular, we get $U \leq X$ as required since

$$\beta_1(r) = \frac{2+2r}{3+2r} = 1 - \frac{1}{3+2r}$$

and thus $U_1 \leq X^{1-\frac{1}{3+2r}}$.

Now Lemma 2.3 and the fact that $0 \leq \beta_2(r-s+1) \leq 1$ imply

$$(2.39) \quad \begin{aligned} \Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X) &\ll (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \left(\frac{X}{U^{\frac{1}{2}} \log X} \right) \\ &\leq (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \left(\frac{X}{U_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \log X} + \frac{X}{U_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \log X} + \frac{X}{U_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \log X} \right) \\ &= (\log X)^{3+r\eta} \left(X q^{-\frac{1}{2(r-s+1)}} + X^{\beta_1(r-s+1)} + X^{\beta_2(r-s+1)} q^{1-\beta_2(r-s+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting $s = 1$ and $s = r - 1$ then immediately gives the upper bounds for $S_{r,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3,M}(\alpha, X)$. Since $\beta_j(r)$ is increasing in r and $q \leq X$, these bounds have the form (2.13).

Thus it remains to show that $S_{r,4}(\alpha, X)$ is of lower order. We have

$$(2.40) \quad M = \min\{M_0, M_1, M_2\} \leq M_1 \quad \text{and} \quad N = \min\{N_0, N_1, N_2\} \leq N_1.$$

Inserting $s = 1$ and $s = r - 1$ into (2.38) and using that $\beta_1(r) = \frac{2+2r}{3+2r}$ gives

$$M_1 = X^{2-2\beta_1(2)} = X^{\frac{2}{7}} \quad \text{and} \quad N_1 = X^{2-2\beta_1(r)} = X^{\frac{2}{3+2r}}.$$

Thus, we have $MN \leq X$. We get with (2.9) that

$$(2.41) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{r,4}(\alpha, X) &\ll \left| \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ n \leq M, n \leq N}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha) \right| \ll \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ n \leq M, n \leq N}} |f^{*(r-1)}(m)| |f(n)| \\ &\ll \left(\sum_{m \leq M} |f|^{*(r-1)}(m) \right) \left(\sum_{n \leq N} |f(n)| \right) \ll MN (\log X)^{r\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting M_1 and N_1 gives

$$(2.42) \quad S_{r,4}(\alpha, X) \ll X^{\frac{4}{7(3+2r)}} (\log X)^{r\eta} \ll X^{\frac{4}{14}} (\log X)^{r\eta} \ll X^{\frac{4}{5}} (\log X)^{r\eta} \ll X^{\beta_1(r)} (\log X)^{r\eta}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

We give in this section the proof of Theorem 1.5 which needs to be handled separately from the other theorems in order to show how to obtain tighter exponents.

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.5. In other words, we determine the powers of $\log X$ more precisely than in Theorem 1.1 for $r = 2$ and $r = 3$. The proof however follows a similar blueprint as the proof of Theorem 1.1. Thus we give only the most relevant steps of $S_2(\alpha, X)$, and then highlight the adjustments needed for the other cases.

Let $S_{2,j}(\alpha, X)$ be as in (2.18) with $f = \mu$ and $r = 2$. We then have

$$(3.1) \quad S_2(\alpha, X) = S_{2,1}(\alpha, X) + S_{2,2}(\alpha, X) + S_{2,3}(\alpha, X) - S_{2,4}(\alpha, X)$$

We get with Lemma 2.2

$$(3.2) \quad S_{2,1}(\alpha, X) \ll X(\log X)^2(M^{-\frac{1}{2}} + N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + X^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log X)^2q^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Further, using Lemma 2.1 with

$$(3.3) \quad \alpha' = \alpha p_2, \quad a' = \frac{\alpha p_2}{(p_2, q)}, \quad q' = \frac{q}{(p_2, q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon = \frac{p_2}{(p_2, q)^2},$$

we obtain the following bounds

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{2,2}(\alpha, X) &\leq \sum_{p_2 \leq N} \left| \sum_{p_1 \leq X/p_2} e(\alpha p_1 p_2) \right| \leq \sum_{p_2 \leq N} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\Upsilon} X}{\sqrt{q'} p_2} + \left(\frac{X}{p_2} \right)^{\frac{4}{5}} + \left(\frac{X q'}{p_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (\log(X/p_2))^3 \\ &\leq (\log X)^3 \sum_{p_2 \leq N} \left(\frac{X}{\sqrt{q p_2}} + \left(\frac{X}{p_2} \right)^{\frac{4}{5}} + \left(\frac{X q}{p_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq (\log X)^3 \left(\frac{X N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} N^{\frac{1}{5}} + (X q N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$(3.5) \quad S_{2,2,N}(\alpha, X) \ll X(\log X)^2 N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (\log X)^3 \left(\frac{X N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}} N^{\frac{1}{5}} + (X q N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

To minimize $S_{2,2,N}(\alpha, X)$, we use Lemma 2.3. Solving the corresponding equations gives

$$N_0 = q^{\frac{1}{2}} \log^{-1} X, \quad N_1 = X^{\frac{2}{7}} \log^{-\frac{10}{7}} X, \quad N_2 = \frac{\sqrt{X}}{\sqrt{q}(\log X)}$$

and $N = \min\{N_0, N_1, N_2\}$. Thus

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{2,2,N}(\alpha, X) &\ll X(\log X)^2 \left(\frac{1}{N_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{N_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{N_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &\ll X q^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X + X^{\frac{6}{7}} \log^{\frac{19}{7}} X + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X. \end{aligned}$$

The computations for $S_{2,3,M}(\alpha, X)$ are identical and give the same bound. Also, $S_{2,4}(\alpha, X)$ is lower order. This completes the proof of (1.7).

We now look at the case $r = 3$. We have

$$(3.7) \quad S_3(\alpha, X) = S_{3,1}(\alpha, X) + S_{3,2}(\alpha, X) + S_{3,3}(\alpha, X) - S_{3,4}(\alpha, X)$$

with $S_{r,j}(\alpha, X)$ as in (2.18) with $f = \mu$ but now $r = 3$. We get with Lemma 2.2

$$(3.8) \quad S_{3,1}(\alpha, X) \ll X(\log X)^2(M^{-\frac{1}{2}} + N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + X^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log X)^2 q^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using the same technique as in the bound for S_2 , equation (1.7), with

$$(3.9) \quad \alpha' = \alpha p_3, \quad a' = \frac{ap_3}{(p_3, q)}, \quad q' = \frac{q}{(p_3, q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon = \frac{p_3}{(p_3, q)^2},$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{3,2}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 p_3 \leq X \\ p_3 \leq N}} e(\alpha p_1 p_2 p_3) \leq \sum_{p_3 \leq N} \left| \sum_{p_1 p_2 \leq X/p_3} e(\alpha p_1 p_2 p_3) \right| \\ &\ll \sum_{p_3 \leq N} \left(\left(\frac{X}{p_3} \right) q^{-\frac{1}{4}} \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X + \left(\frac{X}{p_3} \right)^{\frac{6}{7}} \log^{\frac{19}{7}} X + \left(\frac{X}{p_3} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X \right) \\ &\ll X q^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X \sum_{p_3 \leq N} p_3^{-\frac{3}{4}} + X^{\frac{6}{7}} \log^{\frac{19}{7}} X \sum_{p_3 \leq N} p_3^{-\frac{6}{7}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X \sum_{p_3 \leq N} p_3^{-\frac{3}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus arrive at

$$S_{3,2,N}(\alpha, X) \ll X(\log X)^2 N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + X q^{-\frac{1}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X + X^{\frac{6}{7}} N^{\frac{1}{7}} \log^{\frac{19}{7}} X + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X.$$

To minimize $S_{3,2,N}(\alpha, X)$, we use Lemma 2.3. Solving the corresponding equations gives

$$N_0 = \frac{q^{\frac{1}{3}}}{(\log X)^{\frac{2}{3}}}, \quad N_1 = \frac{X^{\frac{2}{9}}}{(\log X)^{\frac{10}{9}}}, \quad N_2 = \frac{X^{\frac{1}{3}}}{q^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log X)^{\frac{2}{3}}}.$$

and $N = \min\{N_0, N_1, N_2\}$. Thus

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{3,2,N}(\alpha, X) &\ll X(\log X)^2 \left(\frac{1}{N_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{N_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{N_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \\ &\ll X q^{-\frac{1}{6}} \log^{\frac{7}{3}} X + X^{\frac{8}{9}} \log^{\frac{23}{9}} X + X^{\frac{5}{6}} q^{\frac{1}{6}} \log^{\frac{7}{3}} X. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2.13) in Theorem 2.1 shows that $S_{3,3,M}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{3,4}(\alpha, X)$ are smaller than $S_{3,2,N}(\alpha, X)$ and thus this completes the proof.

4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 AND 1.9

We start with $S_{\mu*\mu}$ in (1.13). For this, we have to replace Lemma 2.1 by

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. Then, for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \mu(n) e(n\alpha) \ll_{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{X \max\{1, \sqrt{\Upsilon}\}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}+\varepsilon} + X^{\frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (\log X)^3.$$

This was shown for $\Upsilon = 1$ in [1, Theorem 1.4] and [20, §23] and the extension to $\Upsilon > 0$ follows from the blueprints presented in this paper. Inserting this into the above computation, (3.5) is replaced by

$$(4.2) \quad S_{\mu*\mu,2,N}(\alpha, X) \ll X(\log X)^2 N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (\log X)^3 \left(\frac{X N^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{q}} + X^{\frac{4}{5}+\varepsilon} N^{\frac{1}{5}+\varepsilon} + (XqN)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

The solutions N_0 and N_2 are the same and

$$(4.3) \quad N_1 = X^{\frac{2-10\varepsilon}{7+10\varepsilon}} (\log X)^{-\frac{10}{7}-\varepsilon}.$$

Inserting (4.3) into $X(\log X)^2 N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ leads to the corresponding term in (1.13).

4.1. An aside for a weaker generalization of Theorem 1.6. The bound (1.13) can also be generalized for r -fold convolutions of μ , or r -fold convolutions of arithmetic functions that satisfy certain growth conditions. Let f be a bounded arithmetic function and let $S_{r,f}(\alpha, X)$ be as in (2.8). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and define $\tau_r(n) := \mathbf{1}^{*r}(n)$ where, we recall, the Dirichlet convolution of the constant function 1 is performed r times. Observe that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f^{*r}(X) \ll \tau_r(X)$ for $X \geq 1$. Also assume that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|\alpha - a/q| \leq q^{-2}$ and $(a, q) = 1$, we have

$$(4.4) \quad S_{1,f}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^3 (Xq^{-1/2} + X^{4/5+\varepsilon} + X^{1/2}q^{1/2}).$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let f be as above. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. We then have for any $X \geq 2$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$(4.5) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) \ll_r (Xq^{-\frac{1}{2r}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2r}}\} + X^{\frac{2+2r}{3+2r}+\varepsilon} + X^{\frac{2r-1}{2r}} q^{\frac{1}{2r}}) (\log X)^{\max\{r^2, 3\}}.$$

If we take $f = \mu$, then the generalization follows albeit with a slightly weaker power of $\log X$. We will first need some auxiliary results. The first of which is a result of interest in its own right that can be repurposed for future work.

Lemma 4.2 (Generalized Type II estimate). *Let g and h be two arithmetic functions supported on $[1, y]$ and $[1, z]$, respectively and $X \geq 2$. Further, let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. We then have as $X \rightarrow \infty$*

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} (g * h)(n) e(\alpha n) \ll \left(\frac{yz}{q} \max\{1, \Upsilon\} + y + z + q \right)^{1/2} (\log 2q)^{1/2} \|g\|_2 \|h\|_2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the L^2 -norm on \mathbb{N} .

Proof. The proof for $\Upsilon = 1$ can be found in [20, Theorem 23.5], and the extension to $\Upsilon > 0$ follows the same principles as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. \square

Next, we need to make use of a divisor sum estimate. In this context, Norton [26] established the following useful result.

Lemma 4.3. *We have for $r \geq 1$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$*

$$(4.7) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} (\tau_r(n))^2 \ll X(\log X)^{r^2-1}.$$

Further, we have for $s < 1$ that

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \tau_r(n) n^{-s} \ll X^{1-s} (\log X)^{r-1}.$$

Proof. We first look at (4.7). The case $r = 1$ is trivial since $\tau_1 = 1$. The case $r \geq 2$ can be found in [20, Theorem 23.6]. Further, (4.8) follows by a simple induction. \square

With these two results, we may now proceed.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof is an enhancement of the proof of Theorem 2.1. Thus we only state the differences between them with the relevant details.

The case $\Upsilon \neq 1$ can be deduced immediately from the case $\Upsilon = 1$ with the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Also, if $q \geq X$ then the bound in (4.5) is larger than what we get with the trivial bound combined with (4.8). Thus, we can assume that $q \leq X$ and $\Upsilon = 1$.

Equation (4.4) implies that the theorem holds for $r = 1$. Thus we can assume that the theorem holds for all $s \leq r - 1$ for some $r \geq 2$. Our task is to show that it also holds for $s = r$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we write

$$(4.9) \quad S_{r,f}(\alpha, X) = S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) + S_{r,2}(\alpha, X) + S_{r,3}(\alpha, X) - S_{r,4}(\alpha, X)$$

with $S_{r,j}(\alpha, X)$ as in (2.18). The main difference to the proof of Theorem 2.1 is that we have to use a different bound for $S_{r,1}(\alpha, X)$. More precisely, we replace Lemma 2.2 with Lemma 4.2. Recall that for $S_{r,1}$ we have

$$(4.10) \quad S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) = \sum_{\substack{mn \leq X \\ m > M, n > N}} f^{*(r-1)}(m) f(n) e(nm\alpha).$$

We cannot apply Lemma 4.2 directly with $g = f^{*(r-1)}$ and $h = f$ since the obtained bound is too large. To obtain a better bound, we use a dyadic decomposition. Observe that $m \in [M, X/N]$. We now split this interval into dyadic intervals $(2^{j-1}, 2^j]$ with $2^j \in [M, X/N]$. Also, if $m \in (2^{j-1}, 2^j]$ then $n \leq \frac{X}{2^{j-1}}$. With this in mind, we can write

$$(4.11) \quad S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) = \sum_{M < 2^j < X/N} \sum_{u \leq X} (g_j * h_j)(u) e(u\alpha),$$

where the functions g_j and h_j are given by

$$(4.12) \quad g_j(m) = f^{*(r-1)}(m) \mathbf{1}_{2^{j-1} < m \leq 2^j} \quad \text{and} \quad h_j(n) = f(n) \mathbf{1}_{N < n \leq \frac{X}{2^{j-1}}}.$$

Observe that using Lemma 4.3 leads to

$$(4.13) \quad \|g_j\|_2^2 = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} g_j^2(m) \ll \sum_{m=2^{j-1}}^{2^j} (\tau_{r-1}(m))^2 \ll 2^j (\log X)^{(r-1)^2-1}.$$

Similarly, we get $\|h_j\|_2^2 \ll \frac{X}{2^{j-1}}$. Applying Lemma 4.2 with $y = 2^j$, $z = \frac{X}{2^{j-1}}$, we obtain

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{r,1}(\alpha, X) &= \sum_{M < 2^j < X/N} \sum_{u \leq X} (g_j * h_j)(u) \ll \sum_{M < 2^j < X/N} \left(\frac{2X}{q} + 2^j + \frac{X}{2^{j-1}} + q \right)^{1/2} X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^{(r-1)^2-1} \\ &\ll \left(\frac{X}{q} + \frac{X}{N} + \frac{X}{M} + q \right)^{1/2} X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^{(r-1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the bound for $S_{r,1}(\alpha, X)$ is analogous to the bound of $S_{r,1}(\alpha, X)$ that appears the proof of Theorem 2.1, except that we have a different power of $\log X$.

Likewise, the computations for $S_{r,2}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{r,3}(\alpha, X)$ follow similar guidelines, except that the powers of $\log X$ change and one has to replace $\beta_1(r) = \frac{2+2r}{3+2r}$ by $\beta_1(r) = \frac{2+2r}{3+2r} + \varepsilon$. For instance, (2.30) has to be replaced with

$$(4.15) \quad \Sigma_{r,s}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{\max\{(r-s)^2, 3\}} \sum_{u \leq U} |f^{*s}(u)| \sum_{j=0}^2 (X/u)^{\beta_j(r-s)} \Upsilon^{\gamma_j(r-s)} (q')^{\delta_j(r-s)}$$

because of the different log power in the induction hypothesis. Also, (2.32) has to be replaced by

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_{m \leq U} |f(u)|^{*s} u^{\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} \ll U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} (\log X)^{s-1}$$

because we have to use (4.8). Combining both bounds shows that we have to replace (2.34) by

$$(4.17) \quad \Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X) \ll (\log X)^{\max\{r^2, 3\}} \left(\frac{XU^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\log X} + \sum_{j=0}^2 X^{\beta_j(r-s)} q^{\delta_j(r-s)} U^{1+\gamma_j(r-s) - \beta_j(r-s)} \right).$$

This expression is very close to (2.34) and we can use exactly the same computation as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 to minimise $\Sigma_{r,s,U}(\alpha, X)$ with respect to U . Since these computations are akin, we may omit them. \square

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.8. The computation for (1.15) is concomitant and a combination of (3.5) and (4.2). It remains to show (1.16). For this we use

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \leq M} \mu(m) \sum_{n \leq X/m} \mu(n) e(mn\alpha) &\ll \sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{n \leq X/m} |e(mn\alpha)| \\ &\ll \sum_{m \leq M} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{m}, \frac{1}{\|m\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \left(M + \frac{X}{q} + q \right) \log X. \end{aligned}$$

As above, we need to minimize

$$S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, 2, M}(\alpha, X) := \frac{X}{M^{\frac{1}{2}}} (\log X)^2 + \left(\frac{X}{q} + M + q \right) \log X$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 and solving the resulting equations gives $M = X^{\frac{2}{3}} (\log X)^{\frac{2}{3}}$. Therefore,

$$S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, 2, M}(\alpha, X) \ll \left(\frac{X}{q} + q \right) \log X + X^{\frac{2}{3}} (\log X)^{\frac{5}{3}}.$$

Similarly, we get as in the previous cases

$$S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, 3, M}(\alpha, X) \ll X q^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X + X^{\frac{6}{7}} \log^{\frac{19}{7}} X + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \log^{\frac{5}{2}} X.$$

Combing $S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, 2, M}(\alpha, X)$ and $S_{\mathbf{1} * \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}, 3, M}(\alpha, X)$ and using that $q \leq X$ gives (1.16). Using that $|\mu| \leq 1$, the proof for both theorems is identical and the bounds are the same (in fact, it follows for any arithmetic bounded function).

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.9. Before proceeding to the proof, it is worth noting that the techniques that we have employed so far (Υ -enhanced bounds combined with the hyperbola method) could also have been used to obtain a bound for $S_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X)$. Indeed, from [1] we have

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \tilde{\mu}_2(n) e(n\alpha) \ll \left(\frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\} + X^{\frac{23}{28}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (\log X)^{10},$$

for $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{\Upsilon}{q^2}$ with $\Upsilon > 0$ and $(a, q) = 1$. Here $\tilde{\mu}_2$ is generated by the Dirichlet series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_2(n)}{n^s} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2s)}$ for $\text{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$. Combining this with the well-known result

$$(4.19) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} e(n\alpha) \ll \min \left\{ X, \frac{1}{\|\alpha\|} \right\}$$

yields $S_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X) = S_1(\alpha, X) + S_2(\alpha, X) + S_3(\alpha, X) - S_4(\alpha, X)$ with $S_j(\alpha, X)$ similar as in (2.18) with $f = |\mu|$ and $r = 2$. Applying Lemma 2.2 yields

$$(4.20) \quad S_1(\alpha, X) \ll X (\log X)^{10} (M^{-\frac{1}{2}} + N^{-\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + X^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log X)^{10} q^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

since $(\log X)^2 \ll (\log X)^{10}$. Next, we set

$$(4.21) \quad \alpha' = \alpha m, \quad a' = \frac{am}{(m, q)}, \quad q' = \frac{q}{(m, q)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon = \frac{m}{(m, q)^2}.$$

Moving on S_2 we see that

$$\sum_{m \leq M} \left| \sum_{n \leq X/m} \tilde{\mu}_2(m) e(nm\alpha) \right| \ll \sum_{n \leq N} \left(\frac{X}{n} (q')^{-\frac{1}{4}} \Upsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} + \left(\frac{X}{n} \right)^{\frac{23}{28}} + \left(\frac{X}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} (q')^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (\log X)^{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \sum_{n \leq N} \left(\frac{X}{q^4} n^{-\frac{3}{4}} + X^{\frac{23}{28}} n^{-\frac{23}{28}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} n^{-\frac{3}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (\log X)^{10} \\ &\ll \left(\frac{XN^{\frac{1}{4}}}{q^{\frac{1}{4}}} + X^{\frac{23}{28}} N^{\frac{5}{28}} + X^{\frac{3}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (\log X)^{10}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to select the optimal values we need to solve the equations $XN^{-\frac{1}{2}} = XN^{\frac{1}{4}}q^{-\frac{1}{4}}$, $XN^{-\frac{1}{2}} = X^{\frac{23}{28}}N^{\frac{5}{28}}$ and $XN^{-\frac{1}{2}} = X^{\frac{3}{4}}N^{\frac{1}{4}}q^{\frac{1}{4}}$. The solutions are $N_0 = q^{\frac{1}{3}}$, $N_1 = X^{\frac{5}{19}}$ and $N_2 = X^{\frac{1}{3}}q^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, respectively. Inserting these, we obtain $Xq^{-\frac{1}{6}} + X^{\frac{33}{38}} + X^{\frac{5}{6}}q^{\frac{1}{6}}$. Next we study S_3 . We write

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{m \leq M} \tilde{\mu}_2(m) \sum_{m \leq X/n} e(nm\alpha) &\ll \sum_{m \leq M} |\tilde{\mu}_2(m)| \left| \sum_{m \leq X/n} e(nm\alpha) \right| \\ &\ll \sum_{m \leq M} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{n}, \frac{1}{\|n\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \left(M + q + \frac{X}{q} \right) \log X. \end{aligned}$$

We have to solve the equations $XM^{-\frac{1}{2}} = M$, $XM^{-\frac{1}{2}} = Xq^{-1}$ and $XM^{-\frac{1}{2}} = q$. The solutions are $M_0 = X^{\frac{2}{3}}$, $M_1 = q^2$ and $M_2 = X^2q^{-2}$, respectively. Inserting these, we get $X^{\frac{2}{3}} + Xq^{-1} + q$. Combining all these results, we finally arrive at

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq X} |\mu(n)| e(\alpha n) &\ll \left(\frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{6}}} + X^{\frac{33}{38}} + X^{\frac{5}{6}}q^{\frac{1}{6}} + X^{\frac{2}{3}} + \frac{X}{q} + q + \frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}} + X^{\frac{1}{2}}q^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) (\log X)^{10} \\ &\ll \left(\frac{X}{q^{\frac{1}{6}}} + X^{\frac{33}{38}} + X^{\frac{5}{6}}q^{\frac{1}{6}} \right) (\log X)^{10}. \end{aligned}$$

While this is certainly a useful bound that could be used to deal with the minor arcs arising from partitions weighted by $|\mu|$ as we shall in Section 6, we can actually substantially improve this bound to (1.17), i.e. the one shown in the statement of Theorem 1.9. To accomplish this improvement we shall first to state and prove need an auxiliary result which is both a generalization as well as an improvement of a lemma of Mikawa [22].

Lemma 4.4. *For $2 \leq M, J \leq x$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have that*

$$G := M \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_k(j) \min \left\{ \frac{x}{m^2 j}, \frac{1}{\|\alpha m^2 j\|} \right\} \ll M^2 J (\log x)^k + x^{3/4} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/4} (\log x)^{k+3}.$$

Proof. Denote $\log x$ by L . For $H > 2$, we have the Fourier expansion

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

where $w_h = w_h(H) \ll \min(\log H, \frac{H}{|h|}, \frac{H^2}{h^2})$. Put $H = x(M^2 J)^{-1}$. By (4.8), we have

$$\sum_{j \sim J} \tau_k(j) \ll J (\log J)^{k-1} \ll JL^{k-1}.$$

Therefore, if $H \leq 2$, we trivially have that

$$G \ll M \sum_{m \sim M} \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_k(j) \ll M^2 JL^{k-1}.$$

Now for $H > 2$, we may use the above expansion to obtain

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

Substituting this into G , we see that

$$(4.24) \quad G \ll M^2 J L^k + M \sum_{0 < |h| < H^2} |w_h| \sum_{j \sim J} \tau_k(j) |e(\alpha m^2 j h)| = m^2 J L^k + F.$$

By [22, §4] we can write the bound

$$|e(\alpha m^2 j h)|^2 \ll M + \sum_{g \leq 2M} \min \left\{ M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g j h\|} \right\},$$

this implies that

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} F^2 &\ll M^2 \sum_{k \leq H^2} |w_k| \sum_{l \sim J} \tau_k(l)^2 \sum_{h \leq H^2} |w_h| \sum_{j \sim J} |e(\alpha m^2 j h)|^2 \\ &\ll M^2 H L \sum_{l \sim J} \tau_{2k-1}(l) \sum_{h \leq H^2} |w_h| \sum_{j \sim J} |e(\alpha m^2 j h)|^2 \\ &\ll M^2 H J L^{2k-1} \left\{ H J M L + \sum_{h \leq H^2} \min \left(\log H, \frac{H}{h} \right) \sum_{j \sim J} \sum_{g \leq 2M} \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g j h\|} \right) \right\} \\ &= x L^{2k-1} \left\{ \frac{x}{M} L + E \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the E term we have

$$E \ll L \max_{1 \leq T \ll H} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{h \leq 2HT} \sum_{j \sim J} \sum_{g \leq 2M} \min \left(M, \frac{1}{\|\alpha g j h\|} \right).$$

Using again [22, §4], $E \ll x^{1/2} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/2} L^6$. Therefore, combining this with (4.25), we get

$$F^2 \ll x L^{2k-1} \left\{ \frac{x}{M} L + x^{1/2} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/2} L^6 \right\} \ll \frac{x^2 L^{2k}}{M} + x^{3/2} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/2} L^{2k+5}.$$

Thus, combining this with (4.24), we see that

$$G \ll m^2 J L^k + \frac{x L^k}{M^{1/2}} + x^{3/4} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/4} L^{k+3} \ll m^2 J L^k + x^{3/4} \left(\frac{x}{q} + \frac{x}{M} + q \right)^{1/4} L^{k+3},$$

which was the last ingredient of the proof. \square

We shall also make use of the following well-known result [18, §13].

Lemma 4.5. *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in Z$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$, then*

$$\sum_{m \leq M} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{m}, \frac{1}{\|m\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \left(M + \frac{X}{q} + q \right) \log(2qMX).$$

We are now ready to proceed with the proof of the improved bound of the exponential sum twisted by $|\mu|$.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Noticing that $\mu^2(x) = \sum_{ab^2=x} \mu(b)$ we write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq X} \mu^2(n) e(n\alpha) &= \sum_{n \leq X} \sum_{ab^2=n} \mu(b) e(n\alpha) = \sum_{b^2 \leq X} \sum_{a \leq X/b^2} \mu(b) e(ab^2\alpha) \\ &= \sum_{b \leq X^{1/2}} \mu(b) \sum_{a \leq X/b^2} e(ab^2\alpha) \ll \sum_{b \leq X^{1/2}} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We break the range of b into two parts: for large b 's, we will use the bound from Lemma 4.4, whereas for small b 's, we will use Lemma 4.5. This means that

$$(4.26) \quad \sum_{b \leq X^{1/2}} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\} = \left(\sum_{b \leq B} + \sum_{B < b \leq X^{1/2}} \right) \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\}.$$

Applying Lemma 4.5, we get

$$(4.27) \quad \sum_{b \leq B} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \sum_{m \leq B^2} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{m}, \frac{1}{\|m\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \left(B^2 + \frac{X}{q} + q \right) (\log X).$$

Next, by Lemma 4.4 dyadically with $k = 1$, we have

$$(4.28) \quad \sum_{B < b \leq X^{1/2}} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \sum_{B < b \leq X^{1/2}} \sum_{m \leq 2} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2 m}, \frac{1}{\|b^2 m \alpha\|} \right\}$$

$$(4.29) \quad \ll \left(X^{1/2} + \frac{X}{q^{1/4} B} + \frac{X}{B^{5/4}} + \frac{X^{3/4} q^{1/4}}{B} \right) (\log X)^4.$$

Using Lemma 2.3, combining (4.27) and (4.29), we choose

$$F(B) = \frac{B^2}{(\log X)^3}, \quad G_1(B) = \frac{X}{q^{1/4} B}, \quad G_2(B) = \frac{X}{B^{5/4}} \quad \text{and} \quad G_3(B) = \frac{X^{3/4} q^{1/4}}{B},$$

then we get the bound

$$(4.30) \quad \frac{B^2}{(\log X)^3} \ll \frac{X^{2/3}}{q^{1/6} \log X} + \frac{X^{8/13}}{(\log X)^{15/13}} + \frac{X^{1/2} q^{1/6}}{\log X},$$

and thus we finally arrive at

$$\sum_{n \leq X} |\mu(n)| e(n\alpha) \ll \frac{X \log X}{q} + q \log X + X^{1/2} (\log X)^4 + \left(\frac{X^{2/3}}{q^{1/6} \log X} + \frac{X^{8/13}}{(\log X)^{15/13}} + \frac{X^{1/2} q^{1/6}}{\log X} \right) (\log X)^4$$

$$= \left(\frac{X}{q} + q \right) \log X + X^{1/2} (\log X)^4 + \frac{X^{2/3}}{q^{1/6}} (\log X)^3 + X^{8/13} (\log X)^{37/13} + X^{1/2} q^{1/6} (\log X)^3$$

$$(4.31) \quad \ll \frac{X}{q} \log X + X^{8/13} (\log X)^{37/13} + q \log X,$$

as it was to be shown. \square

Remark 4.1. In the statement of Lemma 1.9, the bound will be worse than the trivial bound if $q \geq X$. Note that in (4.31) if $q \in (0, X^{5/13})$, then X/q dominates; if $q \in (X^{5/13}, X^{8/13})$, then $X^{8/13} (\log X)^{37/13}$ dominates; and if $q \in (X^{8/13}, X)$, then $q \log X$ dominates. In (4.27), if we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we see that

$$\sum_{b \leq B} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{b^2}, \frac{1}{\|b^2\alpha\|} \right\} \ll \sum_{m \leq B^2} \min \left\{ \frac{X}{m}, \frac{1}{\|m\alpha\|} \right\}$$

$$\ll \left(X \sum_{m \leq B^2} \frac{1}{m} \right)^{1/2} \left(\left(B^2 + \frac{X}{q} + q \right) (\log X) \right)^{1/2}$$

$$(4.32) \quad \ll X^{1/2} \left(B + \frac{X^{1/2}}{q^{1/2}} + q^{1/2} \right) (\log X)^2 = \left(X^{1/2} B + \frac{X}{q^{1/2}} + X^{1/2} q^{1/2} \right) (\log X)^2.$$

Then again using Lemma 2.3, we will have

$$(4.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq X} |\mu(n)| e(n\alpha) &\ll \left(\frac{X^{3/4}}{q^{1/8}} + X^{13/18} + X^{5/8} q^{1/8} + \frac{X}{q^{1/2}} + X^{1/2} q^{1/2} \right) (\log X)^4 \\ &\ll \left(\frac{X}{q^{1/2}} + X^{1/2} q^{1/2} \right) (\log X)^4. \end{aligned}$$

Now, in (4.33) when $q \in (0, X^{1/2})$ the term $\frac{X}{q^{1/2}} (\log X)^4$ dominates, and when $q \in (X^{1/2}, X)$ the term $X^{1/2} q^{1/2}$ dominates. Therefore, comparing (4.31) and (4.33), we can see that (4.31) is always better when $q \leq X$.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.10 AND ADDITIONAL RESULTS

As we saw in Section 2, two critically important results were Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 with the additional refinement of being able to take $\Upsilon > 0$ into account. There exist other instances where being able to accommodate the parameter Υ will be very helpful, especially if Υ is not constrained to be greater than or equal to 1. One such instance takes place when bounding exponential sums associated to the Liouville $\lambda(n)$ function or the Jordan totient function $J_k(n)$. To that end, we present the following generalization to Weyl's bound, see [18, 35].

Lemma 5.1 (Generalized Weyl bound). *Let M, N, a, q be integers such that $(a, q) = 1$ and $q > 0$. If f is a real polynomial of degree $k \geq 1$ with leading coefficient α such that $|\alpha - a/q| \leq \Upsilon q^{-2}$ for some $\Upsilon > 0$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{x=M+1}^{M+N} e(f(x)) \ll N^{1+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\max\{1, \Upsilon\}}{q} + \frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{N^{k-1}} + \frac{q}{N^k} \right)^{2^{1-k}}.$$

Proof. Weyl's inequality implies the case $\Upsilon = 1$ and the extension to $\Upsilon > 0$ follows the same principles as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. \square

Similarly, we may show the following stronger result which is only valid for $k = 2$.

Lemma 5.2 (Generalized quadratic Weyl bound). *Let M, N, a, q be integers such that $(a, q) = 1$ and $q > 0$. If $f(x) = \alpha x^2 + \beta x + \gamma$ such that $|\alpha - a/q| \leq \Upsilon q^{-2}$ for some $\Upsilon > 0$, then we have*

$$\sum_{x=1}^N e(f(x)) \ll \frac{N}{\sqrt{q}} \max\{1, \Upsilon^{1/2}\} + \sqrt{N \log q} + \sqrt{q \log q}.$$

Proof. The $\Upsilon = 1$ case can be found in [23, §3, Theorem 1]. The extension to $\Upsilon > 0$ follows the same guidelines as Lemma 2.1. \square

We can use these results to prove a bound for exponential sums twisted by $|\mu|$ but with a polynomial in $P(n)$ instead of n in $e(\cdot)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Note that

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \mu^2(n) e(n^2 \alpha) = \sum_{b \leq X^2} f(b) e(b\alpha) \quad \text{where} \quad f(a) = \begin{cases} 1, & m = (p_1 \cdots p_r)^2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This can be seen by considering the Euler product of f as

$$F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p^{2s}} \right) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p^{2s}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p^{2s}} \right)^{-1}$$

$$(5.2) \quad = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{4s}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}}\right)^{-1} = \frac{\zeta(2s)}{\zeta(4s)},$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, we may write $f = g * h$, where

$$g(m) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m \text{ is a square} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad h(\ell) = \begin{cases} \mu(\ell^{1/4}), & \text{if } \ell \text{ is a fourth power} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then (5.1) is equivalent to

$$(5.3) \quad \sum_{\substack{m\ell \leq X^2 \\ m, \ell \geq 1}} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha).$$

For generality, replace X^2 by Y . Then, our goal is to bound the exponential sum

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{\substack{m\ell \leq Y \\ m \geq 1, \ell \geq 1}} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha),$$

where α, q satisfy the minor arc condition $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq q^{-2}$ and $(a, q) = 1$. Since we are summing over the hyperbolic region $\Sigma := \{m, \ell : m\ell \leq Y\}$, for arbitrary $L \geq 1$, let $M = Y/L$ and define the following sets:

$$\Sigma_1 = \{m, \ell : m \leq M, \ell \leq Y/m\}, \quad \Sigma_2 = \{m, \ell : \ell \leq L, m \leq Y/\ell\}, \quad \Sigma_3 = \{m, \ell : m \leq M, \ell \leq L\}.$$

Then, $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 - \Sigma_3$. The sum over Σ_1 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \leq M} \sum_{\ell \leq Y/m} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) &\ll \sum_{m \leq M} g(m) \sum_{u \leq (Y/m)^{1/4}} \mu(u) e(mu^4\alpha) \\ &\ll Y^{1/4} \sum_{v \leq \sqrt{M}} \frac{1}{v^{1/2}} \ll Y^{1/4} M^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

The sum over Σ_2 is bounded by

$$\sum_{\ell \leq L} \sum_{m \leq Y/\ell} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) \ll \sum_{\ell \leq L} h(\ell) \sum_{u \leq \sqrt{Y/\ell}} e(u^2\ell\alpha).$$

Take $\Upsilon = \frac{\ell}{(\ell, q)^2}$ in Lemma 5.2, the above is then bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \leq L} h(\ell) \left(\frac{\sqrt{Y}}{\sqrt{q}} + \frac{Y^{1/4}}{\ell^{1/4}} \sqrt{\log q} + \sqrt{q \log q} \right) &\ll \sum_{v \leq L^{1/4}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{Y}}{\sqrt{q}} + \frac{Y^{1/4}}{v} \sqrt{\log q} + \sqrt{q \log q} \right) \\ &\ll \frac{\sqrt{Y} L^{1/4}}{\sqrt{q}} + Y^{1/4} \log Y \sqrt{\log q} + L^{1/4} \sqrt{q \log q}. \end{aligned}$$

The third sum over Σ_3 can be bounded by

$$\sum_{\ell \leq L} \sum_{m \leq M} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) \ll \sum_{\ell \leq L} h(\ell) \sum_{u \leq M^{1/2}} e(u^2\ell\alpha) \ll \sum_{v \leq L^{1/4}} M^{1/2} = M^{1/2} L^{1/4}.$$

Now setting $M = Y/L$, we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{m\ell \leq Y \\ m, \ell \geq 1}} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) \ll \frac{Y^{1/2}}{L^{1/4}} + \frac{\sqrt{Y} L^{1/4}}{\sqrt{q}} + Y^{1/4} \log Y \sqrt{\log q} + L^{1/4} \sqrt{q \log q}.$$

Using Lemma 2.3, the final bound is

$$\sum_{\substack{m\ell \leq Y \\ m, \ell \geq 1}} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) \ll \frac{Y^{1/2}}{q^{1/4}} + Y^{1/4} \log Y (\log q)^{1/2} + Y^{1/4} q^{1/4} (\log q)^{1/4}.$$

Substituting $Y = X^2$, we finally conclude that

$$\sum_{n \leq X} \mu^2(n) e(n^2\alpha) \ll \frac{X}{q^{1/4}} + X^{1/2} \log X (\log q)^{1/2} + X^{1/2} q^{1/4} (\log q)^{1/4},$$

as we wanted to show. This ends the proof. \square

It is worth remarking that other approaches could be undertaken in order to achieve a bound for $\tilde{S}_{|\mu|}$. In [1, Theorem 1.6] it was shown that

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} (\mu * g_2)(n) e(\alpha n) \ll \left(\frac{X}{q^{1/2}} + X^{5/6} + X^{1/2} q^{1/2} \right) (\log X)^{5/2}$$

where g_2 is the indicator function of squarefull numbers. The Dirichlet series for $\mu * g_2$ corresponds to $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mu * g_2)(n) n^{-s} = \frac{\zeta(2s)\zeta(3s)}{\zeta(s)\zeta(6s)}$. One such approach would be to consider $(\mu * q_1)(n)$ or $(|\mu| * q_2)(n)$ where $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q_1(n) n^{-s} = \frac{\zeta(2s)}{\zeta(s)\zeta(4s)}$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q_2(n) n^{-s} = \frac{\zeta(2s)^2}{\zeta(s)\zeta(4s)}$. This would involve using the Vaughan identity associated to q_1 and q_2 . Alternatively, one could try to get a bound for $\sum_{n \leq X} \tilde{\mu}_4(n) e(\alpha n)$ where $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mu}_4(n) n^{-s} = (\zeta(4s))^{-1}$ for $\text{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{4}$, much like in (4.18). This would also likely involve the use of the Vaughan identity. Moreover, one would also need a bound for $\sum_{n \leq X} j_2(n) e(\alpha n)$ where $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} j_2(n) n^{-s} = \zeta(2s)$ for $\text{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$. Then, by the use of the hyperbola/Y method, one convolves both bounds to get the desired final bound. These approaches will be the subject of future research.

By using Lemma 5.1 bound we may extend Theorem 1.10, although the bound will not be as precise since Weyl's inequality is weaker when dealing with a polynomial P of degree $k > 2$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\alpha - \frac{a}{q}| \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ with $(a, q) = 1$. Let $X \geq 2, k > 2$, and define*

$$R(P_k, \alpha, X) := \sum_{n \leq X} |\mu(n)| e(P(n)\alpha),$$

where $P_k(n) = c_k n^k + c_{k-1} n^{k-1} + \dots + c_0$ over \mathbb{R} . Then, we have

$$R(P_k, \alpha, X) \ll \frac{X^{1/2+2^{2-k}+\varepsilon}}{q^{2^{1-k}}} + q^{2^{1-k}} X^{1/2+\varepsilon},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, for $k = 3$, we have a slightly sharper bound, which is

$$R(P_3, \alpha, X) \ll X^{1/2+\varepsilon} q^{1/6} + \frac{X^{1+\varepsilon}}{q^{1/4}},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.10 except that we use Lemma 5.1 instead of Lemma 5.2 to bound the sum over Σ_2 . We then see that the sum over Σ_2 is bounded by

$$L^{2^{1-k}-1/4} q^{-2^{1-k}} Y^{1/2+\varepsilon} + L^{2^{-k}-1/4} Y^{-2^{-k}+1/2+\varepsilon} + L^{k2^{-k}-1/4} q^{2^{1-k}} Y^{-k2^{-k}+1/2+\varepsilon},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Combining all bounds, we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{m\ell \leq Y \\ m, \ell \geq 1}} g(m)h(\ell) e(m\ell\alpha) \ll \frac{Y^{1/2}}{L^{1/4}} + L^{2^{1-k}-1/4} q^{-2^{1-k}} Y^{1/2+\varepsilon} + L^{2^{-k}-1/4} Y^{-2^{-k}+1/2+\varepsilon}$$

$$(5.6) \quad + L^{k2^{-k}-1/4} q^{2^{1-k}} Y^{-k2^{-k}+1/2+\varepsilon}.$$

Using Lemma 2.3 when $k = 3$ implies that (5.6) is bounded by $Y^{1/4+\varepsilon} q^{1/6} + Y^{1/2+\varepsilon} q^{-1/4}$. When $k \geq 4$, (5.6) is bounded by

$$Y^{1/4} + q^{-2^{1-k}} Y^{1/4+2^{1-k}+\varepsilon} + Y^{1/4+\varepsilon} + q^{2^{1-k}} Y^{1/4+\varepsilon} \ll q^{-2^{1-k}} Y^{1/4+2^{1-k}+\varepsilon} + q^{2^{1-k}} Y^{1/4+\varepsilon},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Substituting $Y = X^2$, we get our desired result. \square

As illustrated in Section 4, it is likely that the bounds we have presented, while useful for most applications where demanding to very demanding savings are required, could further be improved by decreasing the exponents associated to $X, \log X$ and q using specifically tailored arguments for the problem at hand. A useful tool in this direction will likely involve the Heath-Brown formula for decomposing μ and Λ as well as the Selberg identity for Λ_2 , see [16] and [18, §13], both of which are advanced combinatorial decompositions of arithmetic functions. Indeed the Heath-Brown decomposition of Λ and μ played a key role in the enlarging the size of the mollifier of the second moment of the Riemann zeta-function in [27, 28]. In turn, these enlargements increased the proportion of non-trivial zeros of ζ on the critical line. Here we present an analogue for $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$ that will become useful in future research.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq 1$ and $V \geq x^{1/k}$. For $n \leq x$, we have*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}(n) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j-1} \binom{k}{j} \mu_{\leq V}^{*j} * \mathbf{1}^{*(j-1)} * \omega.$$

Proof. Write $\mu = \mu_{\leq V} + \mu_{>V}$, then clearly the convolution $\mu_{>V}^{*k} * \mathbf{1}^{*k-1} * \omega$ vanishes on $\mathbb{N}_{\leq x}$. Expanding out $\mu_{>V} = \mu - \mu_{\leq V}$ and using the binomial formula, we get

$$(5.7) \quad 0 = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu^{*(k-j)} * \mu_{\leq V}^{*j} * \mathbf{1}^{*(k-1)} * \omega.$$

Using the identities $\mu * \omega = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\mu * 1 = \delta$, where δ is the multiplicative identity of Dirichlet convolution, the $j = 0$ term of (5.7) becomes $\mu^k * \mathbf{1}^{*(k-1)} * \omega = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$. For all other terms of (5.7), we use again the identity $\mu * 1 = \delta$ and write

$$\mu^{*(k-j)} * \mu_{\leq V}^{*j} * \mathbf{1}^{*(k-1)} * \omega = \mu_{\leq V}^{*j} * \mathbf{1}^{*(j-1)} * \omega.$$

Combining all, (5.7) can be rewritten as in the statement of the lemma. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.11

Results regarding weighted or signed partitions can be found in recent literature [1, 2, 6, 10]. The strategy consists in employing the Hardy-Littlewood circle method to extract the asymptotics of \mathfrak{p} . Generally, although not always, this process results in examining a contour integral over three distinct arcs. For brevity we shall provide the hardest ingredient for each arc and the reader is referred to the above mentioned literature for the remaining details.

Equation (1.18) can be rewritten as

$$\Psi(z) = \exp(\Phi(z)) \quad \text{where} \quad \Phi(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{j} z^{jn}.$$

We may now use Cauchy's integral formula to extract $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}$ as

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) = \rho^{-n} \int_0^1 \Psi(\rho e(\alpha)) e(-n\alpha) d\alpha = \rho^{-n} \int_0^1 \exp[\Phi(\rho e(\alpha)) - 2\pi i n \alpha] d\alpha,$$

for any $0 < \rho < 1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be large. We choose the radius ρ to be $\rho = \rho(x)$ so that $x = \rho\Phi'(\rho)$. Furthermore, we can see that

$$(6.2) \quad \rho\Phi'(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n|\mu(n)|\rho^{jn}.$$

Therefore, $\rho\Phi'(\rho)$ is a strictly monotonically increasing function on the interval $[0, 1)$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \Phi'(\rho) = \infty$. Thus the relationship between x and ρ is well-defined and injective.

6.1. Set up of the arcs. We now define the major arcs \mathfrak{M} and minor arcs \mathfrak{m} as follows. For real $A > 0$ we set

$$(6.3) \quad \delta_q = q^{-1}X^{-1}(\log X)^A \quad \text{and} \quad Q = (\log X)^A.$$

Moreover, for $1 \leq a \leq q \leq Q$ with $(a, q) = 1$ we define $\mathfrak{M}(q, a)$ to be the open interval

$$(6.4) \quad \mathfrak{M}(q, a) := \left(\frac{a}{q} - \delta_q, \frac{a}{q} + \delta_q \right).$$

The major arcs \mathfrak{M} and minor arcs \mathfrak{m} are then defined by

$$(6.5) \quad \mathfrak{M} = \bigcup_{1 \leq q \leq Q} \bigcup_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \mathfrak{M}(q, a) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{m} = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \setminus \mathfrak{M}.$$

We use the canonical splitting of (6.1) as

$$(6.6) \quad \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) = \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{\mathfrak{M}(1,0)} + \int_{\mathfrak{M} \setminus \mathfrak{M}(1,0)} + \int_{\mathfrak{m}} \right) \exp[\Phi(\rho e(\alpha)) - 2\pi i n \alpha] d\alpha.$$

For the first integral, we shall use contour integration and the saddle point method, for the second one we will use an adapted Siegel-Walfisz lemma associated to $|\mu|$, and for the third term we will exploit the bounds on exponential sums established earlier.

6.2. The explicit formula. In order to prove the explicit formula of this section, we will require a contour integration involving the term $1/\zeta(2s)$. To prove our formula unconditionally, we shall use the following result due to the works of Ramachandra and Sankaranarayanan [29, Theorem 2] (see also [17, Lemma 1] and [21, Theorem 1.5]). This result provides unconditional upper bounds for $1/\zeta(s)$ inside the critical strip along a specific vertical line segment.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $T > 0$ be a sufficiently large positive number and $H = T^{1/3}$. Then one has*

$$\min_{T \leq t \leq T+H} \max_{\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 2} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^{-1} \leq \exp(C(\log \log T)^2)$$

with an absolute constant $C > 0$. In particular, there exists a real $T_* \in [T, T + T^{1/3}]$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(\sigma + iT_*)} \leq T_*^\varepsilon \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 2,$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

We shall define a parameter $X = (\log \frac{1}{\rho})^{-1}$ so that $\rho = e^{-1/X}$ as well as $\Delta := (1 + 4\pi^2 X^2 \theta^2)^{-1/2}$.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X \geq 1$. If $X\Delta^3 \geq 1$, then there exists a sequence T_ν with $\nu \leq T_\nu \leq 2\nu$ such that*

$$(6.7) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} + \log \frac{X}{2\pi(1 - 2\pi i X \theta)} + \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\text{Im}(\varpi)| < T_\nu} f(X, \theta, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(X, \theta, n),$$

where the functions f and g are given by

$$f(X, \theta, \varpi) = \frac{1}{2\zeta'(\varpi)} \left(\frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} \right)^{\varpi/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(1 + \frac{\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{\varpi}{2}\right),$$

$$g(X, \theta, n) = \left(\mathfrak{c}_1(n) \log \frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} + \mathfrak{c}_2(n) \right) \left(\frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} \right)^{-n}.$$

The coefficients \mathfrak{c}_1 and \mathfrak{c}_2 are computable constants defined in (6.15). The sum is taken over the non-trivial zeros ϖ of $\zeta(s)$ under the assumption, for notational ease, of simplicity.

Remark 6.1. Unlike assuming the Riemann hypothesis, the assumption of the simplicity of the zeros does not represent a technical difficulty and it can be relaxed at the expense of cluttering the expression for $f(X, \theta, \varpi)$ to the point of becoming unreadable, see [31, §14.27] ‘obvious modifications are required if the zeros are not simple’.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Recall that

$$(6.8) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{j} \exp\left(-jn\left(\frac{1}{X} - 2\pi i \theta\right)\right),$$

where $\rho = e^{-1/X}$. Applying the inverse Mellin transform of the exponential function we obtain

$$(6.9) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(c)} \Gamma(s) j^{-s} n^{-s} \left(\frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} \right)^s ds,$$

for $c > 0$. The interchange of summation and integration is legal for any $c > 1$ and it leads to

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(c)} \Gamma(s) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^{s+1}} \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{n^s} \right) \left(\frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} \right)^s ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(c)} \Gamma(s) \zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} \left(\frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta} \right)^s ds. \end{aligned}$$

We temporarily set $y = \frac{X}{1 - 2\pi i X \theta}$ and proceed with a singularity analysis. The path of integration in (6.10) is the vertical line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = c > 1$. The technique is to now push the part $|t| \leq T$ of this path to the left using a rectangular contour whose vertices are $c \pm iT$ and $-u \pm iT$ where $u = N + \frac{1}{2}$, for some large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ in order to avoid the trivial zeros. The new contour of integration is therefore $\gamma = \cup_{i=1}^5 \gamma_i$, where $\gamma_1 = (c - i\infty, c - iT]$, $\gamma_2 = [c - iT, -u - iT]$, $\gamma_3 = [-u - iT, -u + iT]$, $\gamma_4 = [-u + iT, c + iT]$ and $\gamma_5 = [c + iT, c + i\infty]$. Using the Cauchy residue theorem leads to

$$(6.11) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = R + \sum_{k=1}^5 \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k} \Gamma(s) \zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s ds = R + \sum_{k=1}^5 I_k,$$

where R is equal to the contribution of the residues at the singularities of the integrand in the region enclosed by the two paths of integration. We must now look at each integral separately and bound it and find the value of R .

We start with R . At $s = 1$ we have a simple pole coming from $\zeta(s)$ for which we have

$$(6.12) \quad \operatorname{res}_{s=1} \Gamma(s) \zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s = y,$$

which will serve as leading term. At the non-trivial zeros $s = \varpi/2$ we have poles which we assume to be simple for which

$$(6.13) \quad \operatorname{res}_{s=\varpi/2} \Gamma(s) \zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s = \frac{y^{\varpi/2}}{2\zeta'(\varpi)} \Gamma\left(\frac{\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(1 + \frac{\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{\varpi}{2}\right).$$

There is also a double pole from $\Gamma(s)\zeta(s+1)$ at $s=0$ which yields

$$(6.14) \quad \operatorname{res}_{s=0} \Gamma(s)\zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s = \log \frac{y}{2\pi}.$$

For the non-trivial zeros at $s=-n$ for $n=1, 2, 3, \dots$ we also have double poles for which

$$(6.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{res}_{s=-n} \Gamma(s)\zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s &= \frac{(-1)^n \zeta(1-n)\zeta(-n)}{2n! \zeta'(-2n)} \\ &\quad \times \left(\log y - \frac{\zeta''}{\zeta'}(-2n) + \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(1-n) + \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(-n) + \psi(n+1) \right) y^{-n} \\ &=: (\mathfrak{c}_1(n) \log y + \mathfrak{c}_2(n)) y^{-n}, \end{aligned}$$

where, we recall, $\psi(x) = \frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}(x)$ denotes the digamma function. We now have R .

Except for one part of the horizontal integral over γ_4 , the rest of the analysis is straightforward. We shall make sure of $|y|^s \leq (X\Delta)^{-u} e^{-|t|(\Delta-\pi/2)}$ from [13]. For instance, to bound the vertical segments γ_1 and γ_5 , we employ $\Gamma(s) \ll e^{-\pi T/2}$, $\zeta(s+1) \ll 1$, $\zeta(2s)^{-1} \ll 1$ and $|y|^s \ll (X\Delta)^\sigma e^{-T(\Delta-\pi/2)}$. These imply that $I_1 \ll e^{-T\Delta/2}$, with a similar bound holding for I_5 . For the bound the vertical integral over the segment γ_3 , we use Stirling's formula $\Gamma(s)\zeta(s+1)\zeta(s) \ll (2\pi)^{2\sigma} |s|^{-\sigma-1/2} e^{-\pi|t|/2}$ as well as the functional equation of $\zeta(2s)$. These lead to $I_3 \ll X^{-u} \Delta^{-2u} (u^{-2u-3/2} \Delta^{-1/2})$. The difficulty resides in the horizontal integrals over the paths γ_2 and γ_4 . Let us consider I_4 since the treatment for I_2 is nearly identical. One first splits the path into

$$I_4 = \left(\int_{-u+iT}^{-3/2+iT} + \int_{-3/2+iT}^{-1+iT} + \int_{-1+iT}^{c+iT} \right) \Gamma(s)\zeta(s+1) \frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(2s)} y^s ds = I_{4,1} + I_{4,2} + I_{4,3},$$

say. The integral $I_{4,1}$ is actually not difficult and it follows by analytic techniques, i.e. using the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$ as well as $(\Gamma(s-1))^{-1} \ll e^{1-\sigma-(\frac{1}{2}-\sigma)\log(1-\sigma)+\frac{1}{2}\pi T}$ yields $I_{4,1} \ll e^{-T\Delta/2}$. The bound for $I_{4,2}$ is also $I_{4,2} \ll e^{-T\Delta/2}$ as can be seen by the functional equation. However, to deal with $I_{4,3}$ we employ Lemma 6.1: for $-1 \leq \operatorname{Re}(s) = \sigma \leq 2$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, for sufficiently large $V > 0$, there exists some $V \leq T_* \leq 2V$ such that

$$(6.16) \quad \frac{1}{\zeta(2(\sigma + iT_*))} \ll T_*^\varepsilon.$$

The above bound along with $\Gamma(s) \ll T^{\sigma-1/2} e^{-\pi T/2}$ and $\zeta(s+1) \ll T^\eta$ for some fixed constant $\eta > 0$ yields $I_{4,3} \ll e^{-T\Delta/2}$, which was the last piece.

The final step is to combine all these estimates and let $N \rightarrow \infty$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) &= \frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} + \log \frac{X}{2\pi(1-2\pi i X \theta)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{|\operatorname{Im}(\varpi)| < T_\nu} f(X, \theta, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(X, \theta, n) + O(e^{-T_\nu \Delta/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu \leq T_\nu \leq 2\nu$ with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. Letting $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ and choosing our sequence of T_ν appropriately such that (6.16) is satisfied we are led to

$$\Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} + \log \frac{X}{2\pi(1-2\pi i X \theta)} + \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\operatorname{Im}(\varpi)| < T_\nu} f(X, \theta, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(X, \theta, n),$$

which was the last step we needed to show. \square

Lemma 6.2 can be generalized a little more and we may show without much effort that

$$\left(\rho \frac{d}{d\rho} \right)^m \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \left(\frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} \right)^{1+m} + W(X, \theta, m)$$

$$(6.17) \quad + \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\operatorname{Im}(\varpi)| < T_\nu} f_m(X, \theta, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_m(X, \theta, n),$$

for $m \geq 0$. Here W is given by the cases

$$W(X, \theta, m) = \begin{cases} \log \frac{X}{2\pi(1-2\pi i X \theta)}, & \text{if } m = 0, \\ \Gamma(m) \left(\frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} \right)^m, & \text{if } m \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

and f_m is given by

$$f_m(X, \theta, \varpi) = \frac{1}{2\zeta'(\varpi)} \left(\frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} \right)^{m+\varpi/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{2m+\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(1+\frac{\varpi}{2}\right) \zeta\left(\frac{\varpi}{2}\right).$$

If $m = 0$ then $g_0(X, \theta, n) = g(X, \theta, n)$ and otherwise

$$(6.18) \quad g_m(X, \theta, n) = \frac{(-1)^n y^{-n} \zeta(-m-n) \zeta(1-m-n)}{n! \zeta(-2(m+n))} \quad \text{for } m \geq 1.$$

We can now use (6.17) to determine the asymptotic behaviour of ρ . Using that $\rho = e^{-1/X}$ and inserting $m = 1$ gives $\rho\Phi'(\rho) = X^2 + O(X^{3/2+\varepsilon})$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary. This expansion does not assume the Riemann hypothesis or the simplicity of zeros. By the definition of $\rho(x)$, we have to solve the equation $x = \rho\Phi'(\rho)$. Using the above asymptotics, we get

$$(6.19) \quad X = x^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(x^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon})$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary. On the other hand, additional assumptions on the zeros of ζ give a lower error term in (6.19). More precisely, if $\operatorname{Re}(\varpi) \leq h$ for some $\frac{1}{2} \leq h \leq 1$ and for all zeros ϖ of ζ then $\rho\Phi'(\rho) = X^2 + O(X^{1+\frac{h}{2}+\varepsilon})$ and hence

$$(6.20) \quad X = x^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(x^{\frac{h}{4}+\varepsilon}).$$

In particular if the Riemann hypothesis is true, then $h = \frac{1}{2}$ and thus $X = x^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(x^{\frac{1}{8}+\varepsilon})$.

6.3. Numerical tests on the zeros of ζ . Let us consider the truncated arithmetic double sum

$$(6.21) \quad \Phi_1(X, \theta, J, N) = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{|\mu(n)|}{j} \exp\left(-jn\left(\frac{1}{X} - 2\pi i \theta\right)\right)$$

as well as its ‘analytic’ counterpart

$$(6.22) \quad \Phi_2(X, \theta, T, N) = \Phi_{2,0}(X, \Theta) + \sum_{|\operatorname{Im}(\varpi)| < T} f(X, \theta, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^N g(X, \theta, n),$$

where the leading term $\Phi_{2,0}(X, \theta)$ is defined by

$$(6.23) \quad \Phi_{2,0}(X, \theta) = \frac{X}{1-2\pi i X \theta} + \log \frac{X}{2\pi(1-2\pi i X \theta)}.$$

Here we have set $\theta = \theta(X)$ to be

$$(6.24) \quad \theta(X) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1}{X^{4/3}} - \frac{1}{X^2}},$$

so that the condition $X\Delta^3 = 1$ is satisfied. We can now numerically illustrate the effects of the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function on Φ in the plots below. In Figure 6.1, we can appreciate the difference (in the real and imaginary parts) between the ‘full’ explicit formula (6.22) and just the leading term (6.23) without the presence of the zeros of the zeta function. The contributions from the zeros of the zeta function are subtle but nevertheless present. Figures 6.2 and 6.3 show the

difference (in real and imaginary parts, respectively) between the arithmetical component in (6.21) as well as the analytic one in (6.22).




FIGURE 6.1. Plot of $\operatorname{Re} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi_{2,0}(X, \theta)$ on the left-hand side and $\operatorname{Im} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1) - \operatorname{Im} \Phi_{2,0}(X, \theta)$ on the right-hand side for $1 \leq x \leq 500$.




FIGURE 6.2. Left: plot of $\operatorname{Re} \Phi_1(X, \theta, 1500, 1500)$ in blue and $\operatorname{Re} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1)$ in pink. Right: plot of $\operatorname{Re} \Phi_1(X, \theta, 1500, 1500) - \operatorname{Re} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1)$ for $1 \leq X \leq 500$.




FIGURE 6.3. Left: plot of $\operatorname{Im} \Phi_1(X, \theta, 1500, 1500)$ in blue and $\operatorname{Im} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1)$ in pink. Right: plot of $\operatorname{Im} \Phi_1(X, \theta, 1500, 1500) - \operatorname{Im} \Phi_2(X, \theta, 25, 1)$ for $1 \leq X \leq 500$.

6.4. The non-principal major arcs. Our next result involves $|\mu|$ in arithmetic progressions and it as follows.

Lemma 6.3. *As $X \rightarrow \infty$ assume that $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q \leq (\log X)^A$ for some $A > 0$ and $(q, \ell) = 1$. Then there exists a constant $C_A > 0$ only depending A such that*

$$(6.25) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv \ell \pmod{q}}} |\mu(n)| = \frac{X}{\zeta(2)\varphi(q) \prod_{p|q} (1+p^{-1})} + O(X \exp(-C_A \sqrt{\log X}))$$

as $X \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the implicit constant in $O(\cdot)$ can be chosen independently of q and ℓ .

Proof. We denote by χ a Dirichlet character modulo q . Using properties of characters, we can write

$$(6.26) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} |\mu(n)| = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\chi} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{n \leq X} \chi(n) |\mu(n)|,$$

where the outer sum is over all Dirichlet characters χ modulo q . Thus it is sufficient to show that for the principal character χ_0 we have

$$(6.27) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \chi_0(n) |\mu(n)| = \frac{X}{\zeta(2) \prod_{p|q} (1+p^{-1})} + O(X \exp(-C_A \sqrt{\log X})),$$

and for all characters $\chi \neq \chi_0$

$$(6.28) \quad \sum_{n \leq X} \chi(n) |\mu(n)| \ll X \exp(-C_A \sqrt{\log X}),$$

It is straight forward to see that for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$ one has

$$(6.29) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(n) |\mu(n)|}{n^s} = \frac{L(s, \chi)}{L(2s, \chi^2)},$$

where $L(s, \chi)$ is the Dirichlet L -function for the character χ . Thus Perron's formula implies

$$(6.30) \quad \sum'_{n \leq X} \chi(n) |\mu(n)| = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(c)} \frac{L(s, \chi)}{L(2s, \chi^2)} \frac{X^s}{s} ds$$

with $c > 1$ and where the prime indicates that the last term of the sum must be multiplied by $\frac{1}{2}$ when X is an integer. Observe that $L(2s, \chi^2)$ has no zeros for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ and the integrand has thus at most a pole at $s = 1$ for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Using the same argument as in the ordinary Siegel-Walfisz theorem to evaluate this integral, see for instance [24, Chapter 11.3], we obtain

$$(6.31) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(c)} \frac{L(s, \chi)}{L(2s, \chi^2)} \frac{X^s}{s} ds = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma(1)} \frac{L(s, \chi_0)}{L(2s, \chi_0^2)} \frac{X^s}{s} ds + O(X \exp(-C_A \sqrt{\log X})),$$

where $\gamma(1)$ is a small circle centered at $s = 1$. If χ is a non-principal character then $L(s, \chi)$ is entire and thus the residue at $s = 1$ is 0. On the other hand, $L(s, \chi_0)$ has for the principal character a pole at $s = 1$ with residue $\frac{\varphi(q)}{q}$ and $L(s, \chi_0) = \zeta(s) \prod_{p|q} (1 - p^{-s})$. Thus the residue at $s = 1$ is

$$(6.32) \quad \operatorname{res}_{s=1} \frac{L(s, \chi_0)}{L(2s, \chi_0^2)} \frac{X^s}{s} = \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \frac{X}{\zeta(2) \prod_{p|q} (1 - p^{-2})} = \frac{X}{\zeta(2) \prod_{p|q} (1 + p^{-1})}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In [10] and [14], it is shown that the above type of result is the main tool needed to bound the integral over the non-principal major arcs $\mathfrak{M} \setminus \mathfrak{M}(1, 0)$. Once Lemma 6.3 is established the rest of the argument is very direct. The first step is to establish the following lemma.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$ with $\gamma_1 > 0$ and $\gamma_2 \ll \gamma_1(\log(1/\gamma_1))^A$ for some $A > 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Moreover let $q, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q \ll (\log(1/\gamma_1))^A$ and $(\ell, q) = 1$. Define*

$$(6.33) \quad U(\gamma, \ell, q) := \sum_{n \equiv \ell \pmod{q}} |\mu(n)| \exp(-n\gamma).$$

Then one has that

$$U(\gamma, \ell, q) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)\varphi(q) \prod_{p|q} (1+p^{-1})} \frac{1}{\gamma} + O\left(\frac{1}{\varphi(q)\gamma_1(\log(1/\gamma_1))^C}\right).$$

where $\varphi(q)$ is the Euler totient function and $C \geq 1$ can be chosen arbitrarily.

The main step in this proof is to use Abel's summation formula and to employ Lemma 6.3. Since this calculation is not difficult, we will omit the details. However, the reader can find for example in [7, Lemma 6.2] the complete proof of an analogous result. Next, observe that for all $\beta > 0$ we have the elementary but helpful formula

$$e^{-\beta j/X} = \int_{\beta}^{\infty} jX^{-1} e^{-yj/X} dy.$$

Using this identity, we can write

$$(6.34) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\alpha)) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mu(n)| (\rho e(\alpha))^{jn} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} \int_1^{\infty} jX^{-1} e^{-yj/X} \sum_{n \leq y} |\mu(n)| e(jn\alpha) dy.$$

The last step is to combine (6.34) with Lemma 6.4.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A > 0$ be given. Further, let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with*

$$(a, q) = 1, \quad q \leq (\log X)^A \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| \leq q^{-1} X^{-1} (\log X)^A.$$

Then there exists $X_0(A)$ such that we have for all $X > X_0(A)$

$$(6.35) \quad |\Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\alpha))| \leq \frac{X}{q} (1 + o(1)).$$

The proof of this lemma is again standard and the interested reader can find, for example, in [7, Lemma 6.3] the complete proof of an analogous result. Lemma 6.5 immediately implies

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\theta \in \mathfrak{M} \setminus \mathfrak{M}(1, 0)$. Then we have*

$$(6.36) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) \ll_A \frac{3}{4} \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho)$$

where $A > 0$ is any fixed real number.

6.5. The minor arcs. In [10] and [14], it is explained that the forthcoming argument is the main step needed to bound the integral over the minor arcs \mathfrak{m} . We shall give the broad details. Recall that $\rho = e^{-1/X}$. Truncating the J -sum of (6.34) shows that

$$(6.37) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{j} \int_1^{\infty} jX^{-1} e^{-jt/X} S_{|\mu|}(t, j\theta) dt + O\left(\frac{X}{J}\right),$$

where $J = (\log X)^2$. For each $j \leq J$, Dirichlet's theorem can be used to choose $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(a, q) = 1$ such that $|j\theta - \frac{a}{q}| \leq q^{-1} X^{-1} (\log X)^A$ and $q < X(\log X)^{-A}$. Next, we set $a_j := a/(a, j)$ and $q_j = jq/(a, j)$. The definition of δ_q from Section 6.1 implies that $|\alpha - \frac{a_j}{q_j}| \leq \delta_{q_j}$. Since $\theta \in \mathfrak{m}$, it then follows that $q_j > Q$ where $Q = (\log X)^A$. Once either bound (1.17) or (4.23) is established, the rest of the argument follows in a straightforward manner.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\theta \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then we have*

$$(6.38) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho e(\theta)) \ll_A X(\log X)^{10-A/4}$$

where $A > 0$ is any fixed real number.

For the sake of illustration of the weaker method, the bounds on Lemma 6.7 correspond to those from (4.23). Lemma 6.7 can be strengthened by using Theorem 1.9 instead but it is immaterial to the rest of the argument.

6.6. The principal major arcs. Next, we present a common result in partition asymptotics that follows from an application of the saddle point method.

Lemma 6.8. *Set $\rho = \rho(n)$. One has*

$$(6.39) \quad \mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|}(n) = \frac{\rho^{-n}\Psi(\rho)}{(2\pi\Phi_{(2)}(\rho))^{1/2}}(1 + O(n^{-1/5})).$$

where $\Phi_{(m)}(\rho) = (\rho \frac{d}{d\rho})^m \Phi(\rho)$ as given by (6.7)

In order to get the asymptotics we compute the terms in the numerator and denominator. First

$$(6.40) \quad \rho^{-n}\Psi(\rho) = \exp\left(n \log \frac{1}{\rho(n)} + \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho(n))\right).$$

We again distinguish two situations. One where no assumption is made on the non-trivial zeros, and then one where their real part is upper bounded by a fixed constant $h < 1$. We begin with the unconditional case. Setting $\theta = m = 0$ in Lemma 6.2 and inserting (6.19), we get

$$(6.41) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho(n)) = X + \log \frac{X}{2\pi} + \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\operatorname{Im}(\varpi)| < T_\nu} f(X, 0, \varpi) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(X, 0, n) = n^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(n^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}).$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$(6.42) \quad n \log(1/\rho(n)) = nX^{-1} = n^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(n^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{(2)}(\rho(n)))^{1/2} = n^{\frac{3}{2}} + O(n^{\frac{5}{4}+\varepsilon}).$$

On the other hand, if $\operatorname{Re}(\varpi) \leq h$ for all zeros of ζ then

$$(6.43) \quad \Phi_{|\mu|}(\rho(n)) = X + O(X^{\frac{h}{2}+\varepsilon}) = n^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(n^{\frac{h}{4}+\varepsilon}),$$

$$(6.44) \quad n \log(1/\rho(n)) = n^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(n^{\frac{h}{4}+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{(2)}(\rho(n)))^{1/2} = n^{\frac{3}{2}} + O(n^{1+\frac{h}{4}+\varepsilon}).$$

Inserting these expressions into (6.39) completes the structure of Theorem 1.11. Further, we thus see that the non-trivial zeros of ζ are visible in (6.39) if one is working with the exact, but implicit saddle point solution. On the other hand, if one is trying to determine this solution explicitly and enter it in the above expression then the zeros are absorbed by the error term.

6.7. Final step. Combining Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7 for the error terms along with Lemmas 6.2 and 6.8 for the main terms yields the proof of Theorem 1.11.

7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

An attractive application of Theorem 1.1 follows a parallelism with Vinogradov's original goal. We will show in [10], which is a follow up to this paper, that we can obtain results on partitions into three integers with prescribed arithmetic conditions. For instance let N be an integer and consider the number $r(r_1, r_2, r_3, N)$ defined by

$$r(r_1, r_2, r_3, N) = \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=N} \Lambda^{*r_1}(n_1)\Lambda^{*r_2}(n_2)\Lambda^{*r_3}(n_3).$$

Retaining the definition and set up of the major and minor arcs from Section 6.1, we shall see that Theorem 1.1 will allow us to show that

$$I_r := \int_{\mathfrak{m}} \tilde{S}_r(\alpha, X)^3 e(-\alpha X) d\alpha \ll \frac{X^{2r-1}}{(\log X)^{A/2-(4+r)}}$$

for any $A > 0$ and where the implied constant depends only on A . This is an important step in obtaining an asymptotic expression for $r(r_1, r_2, r_3, N)$. Note that if $r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = 1$, then this reduces to

$$r(1, 1, 1, N) = r(N) = \sum_{p_1+p_2+p_3=N} \log p_1 \log p_2 \log p_3,$$

the counting function for the number of representations of an odd integer N as the sum of three primes p_1, p_2 and p_3 . Likewise, one could consider the quantity

$$t(N) = \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=N} |\mu(n_1)| |\mu(n_2)| |\mu(n_3)|,$$

the number of representations of an integer N as the sum of three numbers with prescribed $|\mu|$ conditions. Bounding

$$I_{|\mu|} := \int_{\mathfrak{m}} \tilde{S}_{|\mu|}(\alpha, X)^3 e(-\alpha X) d\alpha$$

by the use of Theorem 1.9 will be a key aspect in determining $t(N)$.

In [10] we will also study on these exponential sums can be used in the Hardy-Littlewood method to bound the minor arcs arising from partitions associated to functions of primes or squarefree numbers. For example, let $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial such that $P(\mathbb{N}) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. We then define $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|, P}(n)$ to be the number of partitions of n whose parts lie in the set $Q_P = \{P(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n \text{ squarefree}\}$. If $\gcd(Q_P) = 1$ to avoid undesirable congruence obstructions, then we may extract the value of $\mathfrak{p}_{|\mu|, P}(n)$ by employing Theorem 5.1 on the associated minor arcs, see also [11]. Another example takes place when we define the generating function

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{P}_r}(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{P}_r}(n) z^n = \prod_{p_1, \dots, p_r \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{1 - z^{p_1 \cdots p_r}} = \exp(\Phi_{\mathbb{P}_r}(z)),$$

to study partitions into r -full primes. Using Theorem 1.1 we will also be able to prove that

$$\Phi_{\mathbb{P}_r}(\rho e(\alpha)) \ll X(\log X)^{3-\frac{A}{2r}}$$

for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $A > 0$. This will be the key step in bounding the minor arcs which is usually the hardest ingredient of the Hardy-Littlewood method. An adapted Siegel-Walfisz result will handle the non-principal major arcs $\mathfrak{M} \setminus \mathfrak{M}(1, 0)$. The main terms of $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{P}_r}(n)$ will be produced with difficulty employing integration over a Hankel contour to avoid the essential singularities produced by the non-trivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$. This application is lengthy and it is considerably more involved than the treatment in [7], so we will not include it in the present paper.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NR wishes to acknowledge support from Vikram Kilambi and from Christopher Pernin and also wishes to thank Kunjakanan Nath and Debmalya Basak for fruitful discussions. DZ was supported by the Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2021-129.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Basak, N. Robles, and N. Zaharescu. Exponential sums over Möbius convolutions with applications to partitions. *To appear in Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, [arXiv:2312.17435](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.17435), 2023.
- [2] B. Berndt, N. Robles, A. Zaharescu, and D. Zeindler. Partitions with multiplicities associated with divisor functions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 533, 2024.
- [3] B. C. Berndt, A. Malik, and A. Zaharescu. Partitions into k th powers of terms in an arithmetic progression. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 290, 2018.
- [4] J. Brüden, A. Granville, A. Perelli, R. C. Vaughan, and T. D. Wooley. On the exponential sum over k -free numbers. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 356, 1998.
- [5] J. Brüden and A. Perelli. Exponential Sums and Additive Problems Involving Square-free Numbers. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, XXVIII, 1999.
- [6] T. Daniels. Bounds on the Möbius-signed partition numbers. *The Ramanujan Journal*, 65, 2024.
- [7] M. Das, N. Robles, A. Zaharescu, and D. Zeindler. Partitions into semiprimes. *Submitted, preprint arXiv:2212.12489*, 2022.
- [8] H. Davenport. On some infinite series involving arithmetical functions. II. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 8, 1937.
- [9] H. Davenport. *Multiplicative number theory*, volume 74 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2000. Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery.
- [10] A. Dong, N. Robles, A. Zaharescu, and D. Zeindler. Partitions into prime functions: asymptotics and quasi differentiable functions. *In progress*, 2024.
- [11] A. Dunn and N. Robles. Polynomial partition asymptotics. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 459, 2018.
- [12] P. Erdős. On an elementary proof of some asymptotic formulas in the theory of partitions. *Ann. of Math.*, 43(2), 1942.
- [13] A. Gafni. Power partitions. *Journal of Number Theory*, 163, 2016.
- [14] A. Gafni. Partitions into prime powers. *Mathematika*, 67, 2021.
- [15] A. Gafni and N. Robles. Exponential sums with generalized omega functions and Goldbach-Vinogradov ternary problems. *In progress*, 2024.
- [16] D. R. Heath-Brown. Prime numbers in short intervals and a generalized Vaughan identity. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 34, 1982.
- [17] S. Inoue. Relations among some conjectures on the Möbius function and the Riemann zeta-function. *Acta Arith.*, 191, 2019.
- [18] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. *Analytic Number Theory*, volume 53 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [19] K. Kawada and T. D. Wooley. On the Waring–Goldbach problem for fourth and fifth powers. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 83, 2001.
- [20] D. Koukoulopoulos. *The distribution of prime numbers*, volume 203 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2019] ©2019.
- [21] P. Kühn and N. Robles. Explicit formulas of a generalized ramanujan sum. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 12, 2016.
- [22] H. Mikawa. On exponential sums over primes in arithmetic progressions. *Tsukuba Journal of Mathematics*, 24, 2000.
- [23] H. L. Montgomery. *Ten Lectures on the Interface Between Analytic Number Theory and Harmonic Analysis*. American Mathematical Society, Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Number 84, 1994.
- [24] H. L. Montgomery and R. C. Vaughan. Exponential Sums with Multiplicative Coefficients. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 43, 1977.
- [25] Y. Motohashi. On the distribution of the divisor function in arithmetic progressions. *Acta Arithmetica*, 22, 1973.
- [26] K. K. Norton. Upper Bounds for Sums of Powers of Divisor Functions. *Journal of Number Theory*, 40, 1992.
- [27] K. Pratt and N. Robles. Perturbed moments and a longer mollifier for critical zeros of ζ . *Research in Number Theory*, 4(9), 2018.
- [28] K. Pratt, N. Robles, A. Zaharescu, and D. Zeindler. More than five-twelfths of the zeros of ζ are on the critical line. *Research in the Mathematical Sciences*, 7(2), 2020.
- [29] K. Ramachandra and A. Sankaranarayanan. Notes on the Riemann zeta-function. *J. Indian Math. Soc.*, 57, 1991.
- [30] J.-C. Schlage-Puchta. The exponential sum over squarefree integers. *Acta Arithmetica*, 115.3, 2004.
- [31] E. C. Titchmarsh. *The theory of the Riemann zeta-function, revised by D. R. Heath-Brown*. Oxford University Press, 1986.

- [32] R.-C. Vaughan. Sommes trigonométriques sur les nombres premiers. *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences. Séries A et B*, 285(16):A981–A983, 1977.
- [33] R. C. Vaughan. *The Hardy-Littlewood method*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [34] R. C. Vaughan. On the number of partitions into primes. *Ramanujan Journal*, 15:109–121, 2008.
- [35] I. M. Vinogradoff. Improvement of some theorems in the theory of primes. *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.)*, 37:115–117, 1942.
- [36] A. Zaharescu. On the parity of the number of partitions in square free parts. *The Ramanujan Journal*, 7, 2003.

ANJI DONG: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, ALTGELD HALL, 1409 W. GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL, 61801, USA
Email address: `anjid2@illinois.edu`

NICOLAS ROBLES: RAND CORPORATION, ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES, 1200 S HAYES ST, ARLINGTON, VA, 22202, USA
Email address: `nrobles@rand.org`

ALEXANDRU ZAHARESCU: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, ALTGELD HALL, 1409 W. GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL, 61801, USA AND SIMION STOILOW INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P. O. BOX 1-764, RO-014700 BUCHAREST, ROMANIA
Email address: `zaharesc@illinois.edu`

DIRK ZEINDLER: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, LANCASTER UNIVERSITY, FYLDE COLLEGE, BAILRIGG, LANCASTER LA1 4YF, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: `d.zeindler@lancaster.ac.uk`