

HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF THE LARGE VALUES OF WEYL SUMS

CHANGHAO CHEN AND IGOR E. SHPARLINSKI

ABSTRACT. The authors have recently obtained a lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension for the sets of vectors $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1)^d$ with large Weyl sums, namely of vectors for which

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \exp(2\pi i (x_1 n + \dots + x_d n^d)) \right| \geq N^\alpha$$

for infinitely many integers $N \geq 1$. Here we obtain an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of these exceptional sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Motivation and background.** For an integer $d \geq 2$, let $\mathbb{T}_d = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ be the d -dimensional unit torus.

For a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{T}_d$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the exponential sums

$$S_d(\mathbf{x}; N) = \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(x_1 n + \dots + x_d n^d),$$

which are commonly called *Weyl sums*, where throughout the paper we denote $\mathbf{e}(x) = \exp(2\pi i x)$.

The authors [2, Appendix A] have shown that for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d$ (with respect to Lebesgue measure) one has

$$(1.1) \quad |S_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \leq N^{1/2+o(1)} \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

see also [3, Theorem 2.1] for a different proof. It is very natural to conjecture that the exponent $1/2$ is the best possible value, and indeed for $d = 2$ the authors [4] proved that for almost all $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{T}_2$ we have

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} |S_2((x_1, x_2); N)| N^{-1/2} (\log \log N)^{-1/6} = \infty.$$

However there seems to be no results in this direction for $d \geq 3$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11L15, 28A78, 28A80.

Key words and phrases. Weyl sums, Hausdorff dimension.

For integer $d \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ our main object is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d : |S_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^\alpha \text{ for infinitely many } N \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We can restate the bound (1.1) in the following way: for any $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ the set $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ is of Lebesgue measure zero. Here we are mostly interested in the structure of the sets $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$, and for convenience we call the set $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ the exceptional set for any integer $d \geq 2$ and each $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The authors [2] show that in terms of the Baire categories and Hausdorff dimension the exceptional sets $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ are quite massive. By [2, Theorem 1.3], for each $0 < \alpha < 1$ and integer $d \geq 2$ the set $\mathbb{T}_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ is of the first *Baire category*. Alternatively, this is equivalent to the statement that the complement $\mathbb{T}_d \setminus \Xi_d$ to the set

$$(1.2) \quad \Xi_d = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d : \forall \varepsilon > 0, |S_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^{1-\varepsilon} \right. \\ \left. \text{for infinitely many } N \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is of first category, see [2] for more details and reference therein. For the Hausdorff dimension it is shown in [2, Theorem 1.5] that for any $d \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ one has

$$(1.3) \quad \dim \mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha} \geq \xi(d, \alpha) > 0$$

with some explicit constant $\xi(d, \alpha)$.

We remark that the authors [3, Corollary 1.9] have obtained a non-trivial upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ for some α , however the bounds there are not fully explicit and do not cover the whole range $1/2 < \alpha < 1$.

Here we obtain the nontrivial upper bound of $\dim \mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ for all $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ and $d \geq 2$.

On the other hand, we note that we do not have any plausible conjecture about the exact value of the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$.

1.2. Main results. For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the s -dimension *Hausdorff measure* of \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{A}) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\delta^s(\mathcal{A}),$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_\delta^s(\mathcal{A}) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam } \mathcal{U}_i)^s : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_i \text{ and } \text{diam } \mathcal{U}_i \leq \delta, i \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

The *Hausdorff dimension* of \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$\dim \mathcal{A} = \inf \{s > 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{A}) = 0\} \\ = \sup \{s > 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{A}) = \infty\}.$$

We refer to [5] for more details and properties of Hausdorff dimension.

For integer $d \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ denote

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{u}(d, \alpha) = \min_{k=0, \dots, d-1} \frac{(2d^2 + 4d)(1 - \alpha) + k(k + 1)}{4 - 2\alpha + 2k}.$$

Theorem 1.1. *For any integer $d \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ we have*

$$\dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} \leq \mathbf{u}(d, \alpha).$$

For $d \geq 2$ and any $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ an elementary calculation gives that $\mathbf{u}(d, \alpha) < d$. In fact by taking $k = d - 1$ in (1.4) we derive

$$\mathbf{u}(d, \alpha) \leq d - \frac{d(d + 1)(2\alpha - 1)}{2(d + 1 - \alpha)}.$$

Thus, we have

Corollary 1.2. *For any integer $d \geq 2$ and any $1/2 < \alpha < 1$ we have $\dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} < d$.*

Furthermore taking, for example, $k = 0$ in (1.4) we obtain

$$\dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} \leq \mathbf{u}(d, \alpha) \leq \frac{(2d^2 + 4d)(1 - \alpha)}{4 - 2\alpha}.$$

We note that although the lower bound (1.3) and the upper bound of Theorem 1.1 are of very different magnitude with respect to d , however for $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ they give the same rate of convergency to zero which of order $1 - \alpha$. More precisely, the explicit formula for $\xi(d, \alpha)$ from [2] and the formula (1.4) yield

$$c_1(d) \leq \liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} \leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} \leq c_2(d)$$

for two positive constants $c_1(d), c_2(d)$ depending only on d . In fact for $d = 2$ we have

$$c_1(2) = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(2) = 8,$$

while for $d \geq 3$ we have

$$c_1(d) = \max_{\nu=1, \dots, d} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\nu}, \frac{2}{2d - \nu} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(d) = d^2 + 2d.$$

In particular, we have

Corollary 1.3. *For any integer $d \geq 2$, if $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ then $\dim \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha} \rightarrow 0$.*

From the definition of Ξ_d , see (1.2), we have $\Xi_d \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{d, \alpha}$ for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. Therefore

Corollary 1.4. *For any integer $d \geq 2$, we have $\dim \Xi_d = 0$.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and conventions. Throughout the paper, the notation $U = O(V)$, $U \ll V$ and $V \gg U$ are equivalent to $|U| \leq c|V|$ for some positive constant c , which throughout the paper may depend on the degree d and occasionally on the small real positive parameters ε and δ .

For any quantity $V > 1$ we write $U = V^{o(1)}$ (as $V \rightarrow \infty$) to indicate a function of V which satisfies $|U| \leq V^\varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, provided V that is large enough.

We use $\#\mathcal{X}$ to denote the cardinality of set \mathcal{X} .

We always identify \mathbb{T}_d with half-open unit cube $[0, 1)^d$, in particular we naturally associate Euclidean norm $\|x\|$ with points $x \in \mathbb{T}_d$. Moreover we always assume that $d \geq 2$.

We say that some property holds for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d$ if it holds for a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{T}_d$ of Lebesgue measure $\lambda(\mathcal{X}) = 1$.

We always keep the subscript d in notations for our main objects of interest such as $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$, $S_d(\mathbf{x}; N)$ and \mathbb{T}_d , but sometimes suppress it in auxiliary quantities.

2.2. Mean value theorems. The *Vinogradov mean value theorem* in the currently known form, due to Bourgain, Demeter and Guth [1] for $d \geq 4$ and Wooley [7] for $d = 3$, asserts that,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_d} |S_d(\mathbf{x}; N)|^{2s(d)} d\mathbf{x} \leq N^{s(d)+o(1)},$$

where $s(d) = d(d+1)/2$. We will use the following result due to Wooley [9, Theorem 1.1], which extends the bound to the Weyl sums with weights.

Lemma 2.1. *For any sequence of complex weights $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, and any integer $N \geq 1$, we have the upper bound*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_d} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \mathbf{e}(x_1 n + \dots + x_d n^d) \right|^{2s(d)} d\mathbf{x} \leq N^{o(1)} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |a_n|^2 \right)^{s(d)}.$$

2.3. Completion method. The following bound is special case of [3, Lemma 3.2], and for completeness we give a proof here.

Lemma 2.2. *For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d$ and $1 \leq M \leq N$ we have*

$$S_d(\mathbf{x}; M) \ll W_d(\mathbf{x}; N),$$

where

$$W_d(\mathbf{x}; N) = \sum_{h=1}^N \frac{1}{h} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(hn/N) \mathbf{e}(x_1n + \dots + x_d n^d) \right|.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote

$$f(n) = x_1n + \dots + x_d n^d.$$

Observe that by the orthogonality

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbf{e}(h(n-k)/N) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 1, \dots, M, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We also note that for $1 \leq h, M \leq N$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^M \mathbf{e}(hk/N) \ll \frac{N}{\min\{h, N+1-h\}},$$

see [6, Equation (8.6)]. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S_d(\mathbf{x}; M) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(f(n)) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbf{e}(h(n-k)/N) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^M \mathbf{e}(-hk/N) \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(f(n)) \mathbf{e}(hn/N) \\ &\ll \sum_{h=1}^N \frac{1}{\min\{h, N+1-h\}} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(hn/N) \mathbf{e}(f(n)) \right| \\ &\ll \sum_{h=1}^N \frac{1}{h} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(hn/N) \mathbf{e}(f(n)) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Observe that for any N there exists a sequence $b_N(n), n = 1, \dots, N$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad b_N(n) \ll \log N, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$

and $W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)$ can be written as

$$(2.2) \quad W_d(\mathbf{x}; N) = \sum_{n=1}^N b_N(n) \mathbf{e}(x_1n + \dots + x_d n^d).$$

From Lemma 2.2 we immediately obtain:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $N_i = 2^i, i \in \mathbb{N}$. Using above notation for any $\eta > 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha+\eta} \subseteq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d : |W_d(\mathbf{x}; N_i)| \geq N_i^\alpha \text{ for infinitely many } i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Thus for the purpose of estimate the set $\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha}$ it is sufficient to know the size of the set

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d : |W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^\alpha\},$$

which we investigate in Section 2.4 below.

2.4. Distribution of large values of exponential sums. We first remark that the results in this subsection are special forms of [3], see also [8, Lemma 2.1]. For completeness we give proofs for these special cases.

For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d)$ with $\zeta_j > 0, j = 1, \dots, d$, we define the d -dimensional rectangle (or box) with the centre \mathbf{u} and the side lengths $2\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) = [u_1 - \zeta_1, u_1 + \zeta_1] \times \dots \times [u_d - \zeta_d, u_d + \zeta_d].$$

In analogue of [8, Lemma 2.1] and [3, Lemma 3.5] we obtain:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small. If $|W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^\alpha$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_d$, then*

$$|W_d(\mathbf{y}; N)| \geq N^\alpha/2$$

holds for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ provided that N is large enough and

$$0 < \zeta_j \leq N^{\alpha-j-1-\varepsilon}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Proof. For any $h = 1, \dots, N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(hn/N) \left(\mathbf{e}(x_1n + \dots + x_d n^d) - \mathbf{e}(y_1n + \dots + y_d n^d) \right) \\ \ll \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^d \zeta_j n^j \leq N^{\alpha-\varepsilon/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last estimate holds for all large enough N . By Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$|W_d(\mathbf{x}; N) - W_d(\mathbf{y}; N)| \ll N^{\alpha-\varepsilon/2} \log N \leq N^\alpha/2,$$

which holds for all large enough N and gives the result. \square

In analogue of [3, Lemma 3.7] from Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4 we obtain:

Lemma 2.5. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small parameter. For each $j = 1, \dots, d$ let*

$$\zeta_j = 1 / \lceil N^{j+1+\varepsilon-\alpha} \rceil.$$

We divide \mathbb{T}_d into

$$U = \prod_{j=1}^d \zeta_j^{-1}$$

boxes of the type

$$[n_1 \zeta_1, (n_1 + 1) \zeta_1) \times \dots \times [n_d \zeta_d, (n_d + 1) \zeta_d),$$

where $n_j = 0, \dots, 1/\zeta_j - 1$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Let \mathfrak{R} be the collection of these boxes, and

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{R}} = \{\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R} : \exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R} \text{ with } |W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^\alpha\}.$$

Then one has

$$\#\tilde{\mathfrak{R}} \leq U N^{s(d)(1-2\alpha)+o(1)}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R}$. By Lemma 2.4 if $|W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)| \geq N^\alpha$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}$, then for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $|W_d(\mathbf{y}; N)| \geq N^\alpha/2$. Combining with Lemma 2.1 and (2.1), (2.2) we derive

$$N^{2s(d)\alpha} \#\tilde{\mathfrak{R}} \prod_{j=1}^d \zeta_j \ll \int_{\mathbb{T}_d} |W_d(\mathbf{x}; N)|^{2s(d)} d\mathbf{x} \leq N^{s(d)+o(1)},$$

which yields the desired bound. □

Note that the above bound of $\#\tilde{\mathfrak{R}}$ is nontrivial when $1/2 < \alpha < 1$.

From Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.5 we formulate the following Corollary 2.6 for the convenience of our applications.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $N_i = 2^i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $\eta > 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha+\eta} \subseteq \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i=k}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R}(i)} \mathcal{R},$$

where each \mathcal{R} of $\mathfrak{R}(i)$ has the side length $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d)$ such that

$$\zeta_j = 1 / \lceil N_i^{j+1+\varepsilon-\alpha} \rceil, \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

and furthermore

$$\#\mathfrak{R}(i) \leq N_i^{s(d)-2\alpha s(d)} \prod_{j=1}^d \zeta_j^{-1} \leq N_i^{2s(d)(1-\alpha)+d(1-\alpha)+d\varepsilon+o(1)}.$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We start from some auxiliary results. First, we adapt the definition of the *singular value function* from [5, Chapter 9] to the following.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a rectangle with side lengths

$$r_1 \geq \dots \geq r_d.$$

For $0 < t \leq d$ we set

$$\varphi_{0,t}(\mathcal{R}) = r_1^t,$$

and for $k = 1, \dots, d-1$ we define

$$\varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R}) = r_1 \dots r_k r_{k+1}^{t-k}.$$

Note that for a rectangle $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ with the side length $r_1 \geq r_2$ we have

$$\varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R}) = \begin{cases} r_1^t & \text{for } k = 0, \\ r_1 r_2^{t-1} & \text{for } k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.2. The notation $\varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R})$ roughly means that we can cover the rectangle \mathcal{R} by about (up to a constant factor)

$$\frac{r_1}{r_{k+1}} \dots \frac{r_k}{r_{k+1}}$$

balls of radius r_{k+1} , and hence this leads to the term

$$\varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{r_1}{r_{k+1}} \dots \frac{r_k}{r_{k+1}} r_{k+1}^t$$

in the expression for the Hausdorff measure with the parameter t (again up to a constant factor which does not affect our results).

From the definition of the Hausdorff dimension, using the above notation, we have the following inequality

$$(3.1) \quad \dim \mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha+\varepsilon} \leq \inf\{t > 0 : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R}(i)} \varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R}) < \infty, \\ \text{for some } k = 0, \dots, d-1\}.$$

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1. For $k = 1, \dots, d-1$ and $0 < t \leq d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R}(i)} \varphi_{k,t}(\mathcal{R}) &= \#\mathfrak{R}(i) \zeta_{k+1}^{t-k} \prod_{j=1}^k \zeta_j \\
 &\leq N_i^{2s(d)(1-\alpha)+d(1-\alpha)+d\varepsilon+o(1)} \\
 &\quad \times \left(N_i^{\alpha-1-\varepsilon-(k+1)} \right)^{t-k} \prod_{j=1}^k N_i^{\alpha-j-1-\varepsilon} \\
 &\leq N_i^{2s(d)(1-\alpha)+d(1-\alpha)+d\varepsilon+(t-k)(\alpha-k-2-\varepsilon)+k(\alpha-1-\varepsilon)-s(k)+o(1)}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.2}$$

Here and in the following we denote

$$s(k) = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}.$$

We remark that (3.2) also holds for the case $k = 0$, in which we have $s(k) = 0$. To be precise for $k = 0$ we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{R}(i)} \varphi_{0,t}(\mathcal{R}) \leq N_i^{2s(d)(1-\alpha)+d(1-\alpha)+d\varepsilon+t(\alpha-2-\varepsilon)+o(1)}.$$

Applying (3.1) we conclude that

$$\dim \mathcal{E}_{d,\alpha+\eta} \leq t$$

provided that the parameters α, ρ, k, t satisfy the following further condition

$$2s(d)(1-\alpha) + d(1-\alpha) + (t-k)(\alpha-k-2) + k(\alpha-1) - s(k) < 0,$$

which becomes

$$t > \frac{2s(d)(1-\alpha) + d(1-\alpha) + s(k)}{k+2-\alpha}.$$

By the arbitrary choice of η we finish the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by ARC Grant DP170100786.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain, C. Demeter and L. Guth, ‘Proof of the main conjecture in Vinogradov’s mean value theorem for degrees higher than three’, *Ann. Math.*, **184** (2016), 633–682. 4
- [2] C. Chen and I. E. Shparlinski, ‘On large values of Weyl sums’, *Preprint*, 2019, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.01551>. 1, 2, 3
- [3] C. Chen and I. E. Shparlinski, ‘New bounds of Weyl sums’, *Preprint*, 2019, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.07330>. 1, 2, 4, 6

- [4] C. Chen and I. E. Shparlinski, ‘Large and small values of quadratic Weyl sums’, *Preprin*, 2019, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.03101>. 1
- [5] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal geometry: Mathematical foundations and applications*, John Wiley, 2nd Ed., 2003. 2, 8
- [6] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004. 5
- [7] T. D. Wooley, ‘The cubic case of the main conjecture in Vinogradov’s mean value theorem’, *Adv. in Math.*, **294** (2016), 532–561. 4
- [8] T. D. Wooley, ‘Perturbations of Weyl sums’, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, **2016** (2016), 2632–2646. 6
- [9] T. D. Wooley, ‘Nested efficient congruencing and relatives of Vinogradov’s mean value theorem’, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, (to appear). 4

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES,
SYDNEY, NSW 2052, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: changhao.chen@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES,
SYDNEY, NSW 2052, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: igor.shparlinski@unsw.edu.au