

HYBRID BOUNDS FOR $GL(4) \times GL(1)$ TWISTED L -FUNCTIONS

FEI HOU

ABSTRACT. Let P, M be two primes such that $(P, M) = 1$. Let Π be a normalized Hecke-Maaß form on $GL(4)$ of level P , and χ a primitive Dirichlet character modulo M . In this paper, we study the hybrid subconvexity problem for $L(s, \Pi \otimes \chi)$ simultaneously in the level and conductor aspects. Among other things, we prove a hybrid subconvex bound, so long as $M^{1/5} < P < M^{2/5}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let P, M be two primes such that $(P, M) = 1$. Let χ be a primitive Dirichlet character modulo M . There is a very long history of understanding the central values of the L -functions. It might be traced back to the pioneering work of Burgess [3], who gave the well-known estimate

$$L(1/2, \chi) \ll M^{3/16+\varepsilon}$$

in the year of 1962. Here, the exponent $3/16$ is nowadays known as the *Burgess' quality*. In 1978, Heath-Brown [8], for the first time, showed the hybrid subconvex bound for $L(s, \chi)$ simultaneously in the s and conductor aspects. It is remarkable that, just recently Petrow and Young [17] proved a Lindelöf-on-average upper bound for the fourth moment of Dirichlet L -functions along cosets, whereby to obtain the Weyl-strength hybrid bounds for all Dirichlet L -functions; this, in turn, improves on the result of Heath-Brown after roughly four decades.

Let f be a Hecke newform on $GL(2)$. In 2008, Blomer and Harcos [1] firstly studied hybrid subconvexity problem for $GL(2) \times GL(1)$ L -function $L(s, f \otimes \chi)$ simultaneously in the level, conductor and s aspects. Assume that the form f is of level P . Let $\vartheta = \log P / \log M$, and denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{f, \chi} = PM^2$ the (analytic) conductor of $L(1/2, f \otimes \chi)$. Blomer and Harcos's result implies

$$L(1/2, f \otimes \chi) \ll \mathcal{Q}_{f, \chi}^{1/4+\varepsilon} \left(\mathcal{Q}_{f, \chi}^{-1/(16+8\vartheta)} + \mathcal{Q}_{f, \chi}^{-(1-\vartheta)/(8+4\vartheta)} \right)$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 11F67, 11F66, 11L05.

Key words and phrases. Subconvexity, Twisted L -functions.

for any $0 < \vartheta < 1$. More recently, by averaging the fourth moment of $L(1/2, f \otimes \chi)$ over a family of newforms f , Khan [12] deduced that

$$L(1/2, f \otimes \chi) \ll \mathcal{Q}_{f,\chi}^{1/4+\varepsilon} \left(\mathcal{Q}_{f,\chi}^{-1/(8+4\vartheta)} + \mathcal{Q}_{f,\chi}^{-(1-2\varpi)\vartheta/(16+8\vartheta)} \right),$$

where ϖ denotes current best exponent towards the GL(2) Ramanujan Conjecture. This, however, completely solved the hybrid subconvexity problem for GL(2) \times GL(1) in the prime level and conductor aspects after roughly thirteen years.

In another direction, regarding the L -function $L(1/2, f \otimes g \otimes \chi)$, Sun [20] proved a subconvex bound in the depth-aspect that

$$L(1/2, g \otimes h \otimes \chi) \ll M'^{1-1/16+\varepsilon},$$

where g, h are any fixed holomorphic newforms, and the primitive character χ is of modulus M' , $M' = P^r$ for any integer $r \geq 12$. If the modulus is a prime P , quite recently, Ghosh [6] attained

$$L(1/2, g \otimes h \otimes \chi) \ll P^{1-1/23+\varepsilon}.$$

In addition, Sharma and Sawin [19] were able to generalize to the higher rank case, by showing that, for any fixed GL(3) Hecke-Maaß form π and GL(2) newform g ,

$$L(1/2, \pi \otimes g \otimes \chi) \ll P^{3/2-1/16+\varepsilon},$$

where the primitive character χ is still of prime modulus P . It is noticeable essentially they were working on Hecke cuspidal forms on GL(2) of level P^2 with the nebentypus χ^2 . Just lately, Kumar, Munshi and Singh [13] investigated the hybrid subconvexity problem for the GL(3) \times GL(2) L -functions in the levels aspects. Assume that the normalized form π is of level P and g is of level M , respectively. They achieved that

$$L(1/2, \pi \otimes g) \ll \mathcal{Q}_{\pi,g}^{1/4+\varepsilon} \left(\mathcal{Q}_{\pi,g}^{-(3-2\nu)/(16+24\nu)} + \mathcal{Q}_{\pi,g}^{-(2\nu-1)/(16+24\nu)} \right)$$

for any $1/2 < \nu < 3/2$, where $\mathcal{Q}_{\pi,g} = P^2 M^3$ is the (analytic) conductor of $L(1/2, \pi \otimes g)$, and the exponent $\nu = \log P / \log M$. The level aspect subconvexity problem for any genuine GL(d) L -function with $d \geq 4$ still remains a very important but wide-open problem.

Let Π be a normalized Hecke-Maaß form on GL(4) of level P (see §2 for definition and backgrounds). In this paper, we shall consider subconvexity for the GL(4) \times GL(1) L -function $L(s, \Pi \otimes \chi)$ in the level and conductor aspects simultaneously. To be precise, we are able to establish the following results:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $P, M \geq 1$ be two primes such that $(P, M) = 1$. Let χ be a primitive Dirichlet character modulo M . Let $\theta = \log P / \log M$. Then, for any normalized Hecke-Maaß form Π of level P with trivial nebentypus, we have*

$$L(1/2, \Pi \otimes \chi) \ll \mathcal{Q}^{1/4+\varepsilon} \left(\mathcal{Q}^{-(2-5\theta)/(32+8\theta)} + \mathcal{Q}^{-\theta/(16+4\theta)} + \mathcal{Q}^{-(1-2\mu)\theta/(8+2\theta)} + \mathcal{Q}^{(1-(4+2\mu)\theta)/(16+4\theta)} \right) \quad (1.1)$$

for any $0 < \mu < 1/2$, where $\mathcal{Q} = PM^4$ denotes the (analytic) conductor of $L(1/2, \Pi \otimes \chi)$, and the implied \ll -constant depends only on ε and the Langlands parameters α_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, as shown in (2.1).

We thus obtain the hybrid subconvex bound in both parameters P, M with $1/(4+2\mu) < \theta < 2/5$ for any $0 < \mu < 1/2$. The main theorem above follows from an immediate application of an estimate upon the cancellations for the average of the coefficients of the Dirichlet series for $L(1/2, \Pi \otimes \chi)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let the notations be as in Theorem 1.1. Let V be a smooth function, compactly supported on $[1/2, 5/2]$ with bounded derivatives. Denote by $A_\Pi(n, 1, 1)$ the n -th coefficient of the Dirichlet series for $L(s, \Pi \otimes \chi)$. Then, for any $M^{1/(4+2\mu)} < P < M^{2/5}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2-\varepsilon} \leq X \leq \mathcal{Q}^{1/2+\varepsilon}$ with $0 < \mu < 1/2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ being arbitrary, we have*

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_\Pi(n, 1, 1) \chi(n)}{\sqrt{n}} V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right) \ll X^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{P^{5/8}}{M^{1/4}} + \frac{1}{P^{1/2-\mu}} + \frac{M^{1/4}}{P^{1+\mu/2}} + \frac{1}{P^{1/4}} \right), \quad (1.2)$$

where the implied \ll -constant depends only on ε and the Langlands parameters α_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

As a direct application of Theorem 1.1 above, we obtain

Corollary 1.3. *With the notations being as before, there exists a family of Hecke-Maaß forms Π of level P , with $P \asymp M^{2/7+\varepsilon}$, such that*

$$L(1/2, \Pi \otimes \chi) \ll_{\Pi, \varepsilon} \mathcal{Q}^{1/4-1/60+\varepsilon}.$$

The basic manoeuvre in the paper follows a well-trodden but powerful path in studying L -functions involving levels aspects, namely the moment method plus the amplification. We shall employ a decomposition formula which was rooted in Munshi's work [16], and then explicitly revealed by Holowinsky and Nelson [9]. This makes it feasible to attack the hybrid subconvexity problem for the $\mathrm{GL}(4) \times \mathrm{GL}(1)$ L -function by using the decomposition formula twice; otherwise, it seems impossible to succeed. It is crucial that at the first stage we artificially introduce an amplifier and then we resort to this trick again before the second decomposition of the dualized L -values. To increase the degree of freedom of the L -structures, we gradually introduce the flexible parameters \mathcal{T} , \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{R}^* and \mathcal{S} relative to the fixed parameters P, M attached to the central value $L(1/2, \Pi \otimes \chi)$. It, on the other hand, is very challenging to devise them to draw down on each other, so as to extract an admissible bound to beat the convexity barrier.

To expose the method in this paper as clearly as possible, we have handled the degenerate term $\mathcal{S}_\Pi^{\mathrm{Deg}}$ in a relatively direct manner in §3.3; this enables us lose the coverage of subconvexity for $\varepsilon < \theta < 1/5$ (observing that morally the degenerate term $\mathcal{S}_\Pi^{\mathrm{Deg}}$ is always

dominated by the non-degenerate term $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}$). Indeed, if one proceeds by repeating the argument as in §3.1 in full details one can establish the range $\varepsilon < \theta < 2/5$, where the Voronoï summation formula in ramified case would be put into use instead. One might also wonder if the method implies a way out of the subconvexity problem for $\text{GL}(5)$. We are now working on this, and expect to report the progress in the future article.

Throughout the paper, ε always denotes an arbitrarily small positive constant which might not be the same at each occurrence.

2. PREREQUISITES

2.1. Automorphic L -functions and functional equations. In this part, we shall give a recap of the theory of automorphic L -functions. Let $N \geq 1$ be a square-free integer. We introduce the congruence subgroup

$$\Gamma_1(N) := \text{Stab}_{\text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z})}((0, 0, 0, 1)) \subset \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Let Π be a normalized Hecke-Maaß form of type $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \mathbb{C}$ for the congruent subgroup $\Gamma_1(N)$ with trivial nebentypus, which has a Fourier-Whittaker expansion with the Fourier coefficients $A_{\Pi}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$; see, e.g., [7, Chapter 9] for definition and backgrounds. The Fourier coefficients of Π and that of its contragredient $\tilde{\Pi}$ are related by $A_{\Pi}(m_1, m_2, m_3) = A_{\tilde{\Pi}}(m_3, m_2, m_1)$ for any $(m_1, m_2, m_3, N) = 1$, with $A_{\Pi}(1, 1, 1) = 1$. The Jacquet-Langland L -function is given by $L(s, \Pi) = \sum_{n \geq 1} A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)n^{-s}$ for $\text{Re}(s) > 1$. Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= 3/2 - v_1 - 2v_2 - 3v_3, & \alpha_2 &= -3/2 + 3v_1 + 2v_2 + v_3, \\ \alpha_3 &= -1/2 - v_1 + 2v_2 + v_3, & \alpha_4 &= 1/2 - v_1 - 2v_2 + v_3 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

be the Langlands parameters of Π . We define the completed L -function

$$\Lambda(s, \Pi) = \mathcal{Q}_{\Pi}^{s/2} \varepsilon(\Pi) L_{\infty}(s, \Pi) L(s, \Pi),$$

where

$$L_{\infty}(s, \Pi) = \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + \alpha_i),$$

the (analytic) conductor $\mathcal{Q}_{\Pi} \asymp N$, and $|\varepsilon(\Pi)| = 1$. Here, we have followed the notational convention that $\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s) = \pi^{-s/2} \Gamma(s/2)$. One thus has the following functional equation

$$\Lambda(s, \Pi) = \varepsilon(\Pi) \Lambda(1 - s, \tilde{\Pi}).$$

Next, let $M \geq 1$ be a square-free integer satisfying that $(N, M) = 1$ by a little of abuse of notation. For any primitive Dirichlet character modulo M , we turn to considering the

$\mathrm{GL}(4) \times \mathrm{GL}(1)$ twisted L -function $L(s, \Pi \otimes \chi)$, which is given by the Dirichlet series $\sum_{n \geq 1} A_\Pi(n, 1, 1) \chi(n) n^{-s}$ for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > 1$. Now, one defines the Gamma factor by

$$L_{\infty, \varrho}(s, \Pi \otimes \chi) = \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + \alpha_i + \varrho),$$

where $\varrho = 0$ or 1 according to whether χ is even or odd. The completed L -function defined by

$$\Lambda(s, \Pi \otimes \chi) = \mathcal{Q}^{s/2} L_{\infty, \varrho}(s, \Pi \otimes \chi) L(s, \Pi \otimes \chi)$$

with $\mathcal{Q} \asymp NM^4$ is thus an entire function with an analytic continuation to all $s \in \mathbb{C}$, and satisfies the function equation that

$$\Lambda(s, \Pi \otimes \chi) = \varepsilon(\Pi \otimes \chi) \Lambda(1 - s, \tilde{\Pi} \otimes \bar{\chi}).$$

2.2. Voronoï summation formula. Before stating the exact formula, we need define a hyper-Kloosterman sum of a special type which has appeared in the $\mathrm{GL}(4)$ Voronoï formula. Let $a, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let

$$\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2), \quad \mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2)$$

be 2-tuples of positive integers satisfying the divisibility conditions

$$d_1 | q_1 c, \quad d_2 | \frac{q_1 q_2 c}{d_1}.$$

The hyper-Kloosterman sum $\mathcal{KL}_2(n, m, c; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{KL}_2(n, m, c; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d}) = \sum_{x_1 \bmod \frac{q_1 c}{d_1}}^* \sum_{x_2 \bmod \frac{q_1 q_2 c}{d_1 d_2}}^* e\left(\frac{d_1 x_1 n}{c} + \frac{d_2 \overline{x_1 x_2}}{\frac{q_1 c}{d_1}} + \frac{x_2 m}{\frac{q_1 q_2 c}{d_1 d_2}}\right). \quad (2.2)$$

Let now ω be a smooth function compactly supported $[1/2, 5/2]$ with bounded derivatives, and $\tilde{\omega}$ its Mellin transform. For any given Maaß form Π of prime level P , let the Langlands parameters be as in (2.1). For all $s \in \mathbb{C}$, define

$$G_+(s) = \varepsilon(\Pi) \prod_{i=1}^4 \frac{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(1 - s - \alpha_i)}{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + \alpha_i)}, \quad G_-(s) = \varepsilon(\Pi) \prod_{i=1}^4 \frac{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(2 - s - \alpha_i)}{\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(s + \alpha_i + 1)},$$

and set

$$\mathfrak{U}_{\pm}(x; \omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\sigma} \tilde{\omega}(s) x^s G_{\pm}(s) ds$$

for $x > 0$ and some $\sigma > 0$. We then proceed by writing

$$\mathfrak{U}(x; \omega) = \mathfrak{U}_+(x; \omega) + \mathfrak{U}_-(x; \omega), \quad \mathfrak{U}(-x; \omega) = \mathfrak{U}_+(x; \omega) - \mathfrak{U}_-(x; \omega).$$

The $\mathrm{GL}(4)$ Voronoï summation formula is thus given by

Lemma 2.1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $(c, aP) = 1$. With notations as above, we have*

$$\sum_{n \neq 0} A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1) e\left(\frac{an}{c}\right) \omega\left(\frac{n}{X}\right) = c\sqrt{P} \sum_{\pm} \sum_{d_1|c} \sum_{d_2|\frac{c}{d_1}} \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{A_{\Pi}(m, d_2, d_1)}{|m|d_2d_1} \mathcal{KL}_2(-\bar{a}, m, c; (1, 1), (d_1, d_2)) \mathfrak{U}\left(\frac{mXd_2^2d_1^3}{c^4P}; \omega\right).$$

The assertion for Hecke-Maaß forms with trivial levels has already given in many works such as [14, 4]. The version involving the level aspect can be referred to Zhou [21] who formulated the analog of the Voronoï summation formula in the $\mathrm{GL}(3)$ -case by appealing to the construction of a double Dirichlet series and the functional equations of L -functions twisted by Dirichlet characters. Indeed, Corbett's formula [5, Theorem 1.1] can cover this, which proceeds in the framework of the adelic interpretations.

We might proceed by writing $\mathcal{KL}_2(\bar{a}, m, c; (1, 1), (d_1, d_2))$ asymptotically as

$$\frac{1}{d_1^2d_2} \sum_{\substack{x, y, z \pmod{c} \\ xyz \equiv 1 \pmod{c}}}^* e\left(\frac{d_1x\bar{a} + d_1d_2my + d_1d_2z}{c}\right).$$

With this, one has seen the relation that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} e\left(\frac{an}{c}\right) \omega\left(\frac{n}{X}\right) \\ & \implies \sum_{d_1|c} \sum_{d_2|\frac{c}{d_1}} \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{A_{\Pi}(m, d_2, d_1)}{\sqrt{md_2^2d_1^3}} \frac{\mathrm{Kl}_3(-\bar{a}, m; d_1, d_2, c)}{c} \mathfrak{U}\left(\frac{|m|Xd_2^2d_1^3}{c^4P}; \omega\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where the sum

$$\mathrm{Kl}_3(m, n; d_1, d_2, c) = \sum_{\substack{x, y, z \pmod{c} \\ xyz \equiv 1 \pmod{c}}}^* e\left(\frac{d_1mx + d_1d_2ny + d_1d_2z}{c}\right) \quad (2.4)$$

for any integers $m, n, c \geq 1$.

We have a good control of the asymptotic behavior of Ω_{\pm} , upon expressing it in term of the oscillatory integral; see, e.g., [4, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma 2.2. *For any fixed integer $\mathcal{K} \geq 1$ and $x \gg 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}_+(x; \omega) &= x \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \omega(y) \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{(xy)^{j/4+1/8}} \left\{ c_j e\left(4(xy)^{1/4}\right) \mathcal{W}_j^+\left(8\pi(xy)^{1/4}\right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + d_j e\left(-4(xy)^{1/4}\right) \mathcal{W}_j^-\left(8\pi(xy)^{1/4}\right) \right\} dy + O\left(x^{(3-\mathcal{K})/4-1/8}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{W}_j^\pm are certain smooth weight functions satisfying that $x^i \mathcal{W}_j^{\pm(i)}(x) \ll 1$ for any $i \geq 1$, and c_j, d_j are suitable constants depending on the four parameters α_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, above. Furthermore, $\mathcal{U}_-(x; \omega)$ has the same expression except values of constants.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we are dedicated to proving Theorem 1.2. The point of departure, however, is the assembly with the amplification method. For any fixed $T \geq 1$, we introduce a set of moduli \mathfrak{t} :

$$\mathfrak{t} = \{T \leq t \leq 2T \text{ is prime, } (t, MP) = 1\}.$$

We will choose the sequence $\{\gamma_t\}_t \in \mathbb{C}$ of moduli at most one, supported on the set \mathfrak{t} , such that

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \bar{\chi}(t) = 1.$$

Here, \mathcal{T} stands for the cardinalities of the set \mathfrak{t} , which satisfies that $\mathcal{T} \asymp T/\log T$. Notice that the sequence γ_t is well-defined. For example, one can take $\gamma_t = \chi(t)$, whenever $t \in \mathfrak{t}$, and zero otherwise. Now, if one defines

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1) \chi(n)}{\sqrt{n}} V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right) \quad (3.1)$$

with V being a smooth function supported on $[1/2, 5/2]$ of bounded derivatives, we thus transform $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P)$ into

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1) \chi(\bar{t}n)}{\sqrt{n}} V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right).$$

For any given primitive Dirichlet character $\chi \pmod{M}$, let us recall that Holowinsky and Nelson [9] has formulated a decomposition for χ

$$\chi(n) = \frac{M}{\mathcal{R}\tau(\bar{\chi})} \sum_{r \geq 1} \chi(r) e\left(\frac{n\bar{r}}{M}\right) U\left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right) - \frac{1}{\tau(\bar{\chi})} \sum_{r \geq 1} \text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(r, n; M) \widehat{U}\left(\frac{r}{M/\mathcal{R}}\right), \quad (3.2)$$

where $0 < \mathcal{R} \leq M$ is a freely chosen parameter. Here, the twisted Kloosterman sum

$$\text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(m, n; q) = \sum_{\substack{x, y \pmod{q} \\ xy \equiv 1 \pmod{q}}}^* \chi(x) e\left(\frac{mx + ny}{q}\right)$$

for any integers $m, n, q \geq 1$, and \widehat{U} is the Fourier transform of the smooth weight function U , i.e., $\widehat{U}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} U(y) e(xy) dy$, which is supported on $[1/2, 5/2]$ and normalized such

that $\widehat{U}(0) = 1$. Recall that typical transformation formula for χ should be

$$\chi(n) = \frac{1}{\tau(\overline{\chi})} \sum_{r \bmod M}^* \chi(r) e\left(\frac{n\overline{r}}{M}\right).$$

One might recognize the first term on the right-hand side of (3.2) as a truncated approximation for χ by an exponential sum of the length less than the conductor; while, the second term should be thought of as its dual form. Now, an application of (3.2) splits $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P)$ into three parts:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P) = \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}(X, M, P) - \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Dua.}}(X, M, P) + \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}(X, M, P), \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}(X, M, P) &= \frac{M}{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R}\tau(\overline{\chi})} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \\ (r, P) = 1}} \chi(r) U\left(\frac{r}{R}\right) \\ &\quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} e\left(\frac{n\overline{str}}{M}\right) V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Dua.}}(X, M, P) &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}\tau(\overline{\chi})} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{r \geq 1} \widehat{U}\left(\frac{r}{M/R}\right) \\ &\quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} \text{Kl}_{2, \chi}(r, \overline{tn}; M) V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}(X, M, P) = \frac{M}{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R}\tau(\overline{\chi})} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ P|r}} \chi(r) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} e\left(\frac{n\overline{tr}}{M}\right) U\left(\frac{r}{R}\right) V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right), \quad (3.6)$$

respectively. Observe that $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}$ survives, if and only if $\mathcal{R} > P$. We will assume henceforth that the parameters \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} satisfy that

$$\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{T} < M. \quad (3.7)$$

3.1. Treatment of $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}$. This subsection is devoted to estimating $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}$. Recall (3.4). By the reciprocity law, one writes

$$e\left(\frac{n\overline{tr}}{M}\right) = e\left(-\frac{n\overline{M}}{tr}\right) e\left(\frac{n}{trM}\right).$$

Now, if one chooses

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{X}{M\mathcal{T}}, \quad (3.8)$$

the harmonic $e(n/(trM))$ is automatically flat. We thus turn to the following

$$\frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{TR}} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P)=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} e\left(-\frac{n\bar{M}}{tr}\right) U\left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right) V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right) \quad (3.9)$$

in estimating the non-degenerate term $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}$. Our strategy next is to apply the GL(4)-Voronoi formula to the n -sum above, followed by the delicate analysis of the resulting structures reformulations. This (essentially) produces a transformation for the display in (3.9) as follows

$$\frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{TR})^2} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P)=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{d_1 | tr} \sum_{d_2 | tr/d_1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{\overline{A_{\Pi}(m, d_2, d_1)}}{\sqrt{m d_2^2 d_1^3}} \text{Kl}_3(\bar{P}M, n; d_1, d_2, tr) \mathscr{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{m d_2^2 d_1^3}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right). \quad (3.10)$$

Here, for any $r, \iota \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the smooth weight \mathscr{W}_{\pm} is defined as $\mathscr{W}_{\pm}(\iota, r) = \mathfrak{U}_{\pm}(\iota; V)U(r)$, and $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{TR})^4 P/X^{1-\varepsilon}$. Upon combining with Lemma 2.2, one sees that the resulting integral transform $\mathfrak{U}_{\pm}(x; V)$ asymptotically equals

$$x^{5/8} \sum_{\pm} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \frac{V(y)}{y^{3/8}} e\left(\pm 4(xy)^{1/4}\right) \mathcal{W}_1^{\pm}\left(8\pi(xy)^{1/4}\right) dy \quad (3.11)$$

plus an acceptable error term, with the weights \mathcal{W}_1^{\pm} satisfying that $x^j \mathcal{W}_1^{\pm(j)}(x) \ll X^{\varepsilon}$ for any $j \geq 1$. Recall the definition of $\text{Kl}_3(m, n; d_1, d_2, tr)$ as shown in (2.4). It suffices to take care of the salient case where $d_2 = 1$ in the following, the portion with d_2 being large contributes less significantly (as one expects) by a similar analysis. Note that $(t, r) = 1$ by the pre-condition (3.7); this implies that there are three options for d_1 , that is, $d_1 = 1$, $d_1 = t$ and $d_1 | r, d_1 > 1$ ($d_1 = tr$ cannot occur, in view of that $\mathcal{N} < (\mathcal{TR})^3 X^{-\varepsilon}$). For clarity of presentation, it suffices to deal with the case of $d_1 = 1$ (this will be responsible for the dominated contribution of $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.}}$); the same argument works for other situations which brings relatively small contributions. In this sense, the task is essentially boiled down to

$$\frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{TR})^2} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P)=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\overline{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}}{\sqrt{m}} \text{Kl}_3(\bar{P}M, n; tr) \mathscr{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right), \quad (3.12)$$

where the classic hyper-Kloosterman sum Kl_3 is defined as

$$\text{Kl}_3(m, n; q) = \sum_{\substack{x, y, z \pmod{q} \\ xyz \equiv 1 \pmod{q}}}^* e\left(\frac{mx + ny + z}{q}\right)$$

for any integers $m, n, q \geq 1$. Observe that $(M, r) = 1$, on account of the assumption that $\mathcal{R} < M$. Let $n = n_0 n_1$ with $n_0 | (tr)^\infty$ and $(n_1, tr) = 1$. By a standard computation (see, e.g., [18, Section 2]), one might write

$$\text{Kl}_3(\overline{P}M, n; tr) = \frac{1}{\varphi(tr)} \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \tau^*(\overline{\psi}, n_0) \tau^2(\overline{\psi}) \psi(\overline{P}M) \psi(n),$$

with

$$\tau^*(\overline{\psi}, n_0) = \sum_{t \bmod tr}^* e\left(\frac{n_0 t}{tr}\right) \overline{\psi}(n_0 t).$$

With the help of this, the expression (3.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R})^2} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P) = 1}} \chi(r) \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \frac{\tau^2(\overline{\psi}) \psi(\overline{P}M)}{\varphi(tr)} \\ \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ n = n_0 n_1 \\ n_0 | (tr)^\infty \\ (n_1, tr) = 1}} \tau^*(\overline{\psi}, n_0) \frac{\overline{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)} \psi(n)}{\sqrt{n}} \mathscr{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Now, we proceed by introducing a new amplifier β_s . For any $S \geq 1$, we define another set of moduli \mathfrak{s} by

$$\mathfrak{s} = \{S \leq s \leq 2S \text{ is prime, } (s, MP) = 1, \text{ and } (s, t) = 1 \text{ for any } t \in \mathfrak{t}\},$$

with $\#\mathfrak{s} = \mathcal{S} \asymp S/\log S$ to be chosen optimally in the sequel. Here, as before the sequence $\{\beta_s\}_s$ is of moduli at most one, supported on the set \mathfrak{s} and satisfies that

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}} \beta_s \chi(s) = 1.$$

By an assembly with this new amplifier, the multiple sum (3.13) is transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R})^2} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P) = 1}} \chi(r) \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \frac{\tau^2(\overline{\psi}) \psi(\overline{P}M)}{\varphi(tr)} \\ \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ n = n_0 n_1 \\ n_0 | (tr)^\infty \\ (n_1, tr) = 1}} \tau^*(\overline{\psi}, n_0) \frac{\overline{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)} \psi(n\overline{s})}{\sqrt{n}} \mathscr{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

The manoeuvre for the next stage is to resort to the formula (3.2) twice. Let $1 \leq \mathcal{R}^* \leq \mathcal{T}\mathcal{R}$ be a parameter which will be explicitly determined later. The display above thus turns

into

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{TR})^2} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, \bar{P})=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \frac{\tau^2(\bar{\psi}) \psi(\bar{P}M)}{\varphi(tr)} \\ & \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ n = n_0 n_1 \\ n_0 | (tr)^\infty \\ (n_1, tr) = 1}} \tau^*(\bar{\psi}, n_0) \frac{\overline{A_\Pi(n, 1, 1)}}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \frac{tr}{\mathcal{R}^* \tau(\bar{\psi})} \sum_{r^* \geq 1} \psi(r^*) e\left(\frac{n s r^*}{tr}\right) \mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{\tau(\bar{\psi})} \sum_{\nu \geq 1} \text{Kl}_{2, \psi}(\nu, n \bar{s}; tr) \check{\mathcal{V}}\left(\frac{\nu \mathcal{R}^*}{\mathcal{TR}}\right) \right\} \mathcal{W}_\pm\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{V} is a Schwarz function, which behaves like U , and $\check{\mathcal{V}}$ denotes its Fourier transform given by $\check{\mathcal{V}}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \mathcal{V}(y) e(xy) dy$ such that $\check{\mathcal{V}}(0) = 1$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varphi(tr)} \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \tau^*(\bar{\psi}, n_0) \tau(\bar{\psi}) \psi(r^* \bar{P}M) \\ & = \frac{1}{\varphi(tr)} \sum_{x, y \bmod tr}^* e\left(\frac{n_0 x + y}{tr}\right) \sum_{\psi \bmod tr} \bar{\psi}(n_0 xy) \psi(r^* \bar{P}M) \\ & = \text{Kl}_2(r^* \bar{P}M, 1; tr). \end{aligned}$$

We are thus led to the following two terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_\Pi^{\text{Non-de.}, 1}(X, M, P) & = \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{R}^*} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, \bar{P})=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{r^* \geq 1} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\overline{A_\Pi(n, 1, 1)}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ & \quad e\left(\frac{n s r^*}{tr}\right) \text{Kl}_2(\bar{P}M r^*, 1; tr) \mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \mathcal{W}_\pm\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_\Pi^{\text{Non-de.}, 2}(X, M, P) & = \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{TR})^2} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, \bar{P})=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{\nu \geq 1} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\overline{A_\Pi(n, 1, 1)}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ & \quad \mathfrak{C}(s, \nu, n; tr) \check{\mathcal{V}}\left(\frac{\nu \mathcal{R}^*}{\mathcal{TR}}\right) \mathcal{W}_\pm\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

with

$$\mathfrak{C}(s, m, n; q) = \sum_{\gamma \bmod q}^* e\left(\frac{m\gamma + n\bar{s}\gamma}{q}\right) \text{Kl}_2(\bar{P}M\gamma, 1; q) \quad (3.15)$$

for any integers $s, m, n, q \geq 1$ with $(s, q) = 1$.

In the rest of the paper, we will continue to assume that

$$\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{S}, \quad \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T} < \mathcal{R}^* < \mathcal{TR}. \quad (3.16)$$

3.1.1. *Bounding $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.},1}$.* Let us now begin with estimating the term $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.},1}$. By applying the GL(4)-Voronoi formula, together with Lemma 2.2, this term turns out to be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{TR})^2 \mathcal{R}^*} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, \bar{P})=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{r^* \geq 1} \sum_{d_1 | tr} \sum_{d_2 | tr/d_1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(m, d_2, d_1)}{\sqrt{m d_2^2 d_1^3}} \\ & \text{Kl}_3(-sr^* \bar{P}, m; d_1, d_2, tr) \text{Kl}_2(\bar{P} M r^*, 1; tr) \mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}\left(\frac{nd_2^2 d_1^3}{X}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}(x, r) = U(r) \int_1^{10X^{100\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \frac{V(y)}{(yt)^{3/8}} e(4(ty)^{1/4} \pm 4(tx)^{1/4}) \\ \mathcal{W}_1(8\pi(ty)^{1/4}) \mathcal{W}_1^{\pm}(8\pi(tx)^{1/4}) dy dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $x, r \in \mathbb{R}^+$. One might identify $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}$ as a Schwarz function, which behaves like one with the partial derivatives $x^i r^j \frac{\partial^i}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial r^j} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}(x, r) \ll X^{\varepsilon}$ for any $i, j \geq 0$. As hinted before, for the purpose of gaining an effective control over the magnitude of the sum (3.17) the main focus is enough to be on the focal situation where $d_1 = d_2 = 1$. The expression in (3.17) is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{TR})^2 \mathcal{R}^*} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_s \gamma_t \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, \bar{P})=1}} \chi(r) \sum_{r^* \geq 1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(m, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{m}} \text{Kl}_3(-sr^* \bar{P}, m; tr) \\ & \text{Kl}_2(\bar{P} M r^*, 1; tr) \mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}\left(\frac{m}{X}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce a smooth weight by letting $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{C}_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+)$ be a function supported on $[X^{-\varepsilon}/2, 5X^{\varepsilon}/2]$, identical to one for $x \in [X^{-\varepsilon}, 2X^{\varepsilon}]$, with the bounded derivatives. Via interchanging the order of sums and then applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get rid of Fourier coefficients $A_{\Pi}(m, 1, 1)$ with the help of the bound of ‘‘Ramanujan on average’’ $\sum_{m \leq X} |A_{\Pi}(m, b, c)|^2 \ll P^{\varepsilon} (bcX)^{1+\varepsilon}$ (see, e.g., [4, Section 3]), we arrive at

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.},1}(X, M, P) \ll \frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{TR})^{2-\varepsilon} \mathcal{SR}^*} \mathcal{A}^{1/2}(X, P, M), \quad (3.18)$$

where $\mathcal{A}(X, P, M)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq 1} \phi\left(\frac{m}{XL}\right) \sum_{\substack{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s} \\ t_1, t_2 \in \mathfrak{t}}} \beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_{t_1} \overline{\gamma_{t_2}} \sum_{\substack{r_1, r_2 \geq 1 \\ (r_1, r_2, P)=1}} \chi(r_1) \overline{\chi(r_2)} \\ & \sum_{r_1^*, r_2^* \geq 1} \text{Kl}_3(-s_1 r_1^* \overline{P}, m; t_1 r_1) \text{Kl}_2(\overline{P} M r_1^*, 1; t_1 r_1) \overline{\text{Kl}_3(-s_2 r_2^* \overline{P}, m; t_2 r_2)} \\ & \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{P} M r_2^*, 1; t_2 r_2)} \mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r_1^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}\left(\frac{m}{X}, \frac{r_1}{\mathcal{R}}\right) \overline{\mathcal{V}\left(\frac{r_2^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}\right) \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\pm}\left(\frac{m}{X}, \frac{r_2}{\mathcal{R}}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $L \geq 1$ is a parameter to be chosen after a while. This is reminiscent of the ‘Maass transfer trick’ given by Munshi [15] and the trick of Blomer and Leung [2, Section 5]. We are in a position to exploit Poisson summation with the modulus $t_1 t_2 r_1 r_2$ to the sum over n . Note that $\mathcal{R} \ll \mathcal{T}$; this implies that $(t_1 t_2, r_1 r_2) = 1$. The m -sum is essentially converted into

$$\frac{X^{1+\varepsilon} L}{t_1 t_2 r_1 r_2} \sum_{|h| \ll (t_1 t_2 r_1 r_2)^{1+\varepsilon} / XL} \sum_{\gamma \bmod t_1 t_2 r_1 r_2} \text{Kl}_3(-\overline{P} s_1 r_1^*, \gamma; t_1 r_1) \overline{\text{Kl}_3(-\overline{P} s_2 r_2^*, \gamma; t_2 r_2)} e\left(-\frac{\gamma h}{t_1 t_2 r_1 r_2}\right)$$

We will choose $L = P^{1/2+100\varepsilon}$, so that the non-zero frequencies do not exist, upon recalling (3.8) which shows that $M^{1-\varepsilon} \sqrt{P} \ll \mathcal{T} \mathcal{R} \ll M^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}$. With this, we find that $t_1 = t_2$, and, moreover, $(r_1, r_2) = 1$ which implies $r_1 = r_2$; otherwise, the sum is (negligibly) small, on account of the fact that $\sum_{t \bmod q} \text{Kl}_3(\ell t, 1; q)$ essentially ‘vanishes’ for any integers $\ell, q \geq 1$. Assume that $t_1 = t_2 = t$ and $r_1 = r_2 = r$, say. By Poisson summation with the modulus tr , it thus follows that the quantity we are faced with actually is the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}}{\mathcal{T} \mathcal{R}} \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathfrak{t} \\ s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}}} |\beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P)=1}} \sum_{r_1^*, r_2^* \geq 1} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{P} M r_1^*, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{P} M r_2^*, 1; tr)} \\ & \sum_{j \bmod tr} \text{Kl}_3(-\overline{P} s_1 r_1^*, j; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_3(-\overline{P} s_2 r_2^*, j; tr)} \mathcal{V}^b\left(\frac{r_1^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}, \frac{r_2^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

with $\mathcal{V}^b(x, y, z) = \mathcal{V}(x) \mathcal{V}(y) U(z)$ for any $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

— When $s_1 = s_2$ and $r_1^* = r_2^*$. Note that $r_1^* s_1 \equiv r_2^* s_2 \pmod{tr}$. If $r_1 = r_2$, then $s_1 = s_2$, upon recalling the pre-condition (3.16). In this case, the sum $\mathcal{A}(X, P, M)$ is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \ll \frac{X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}}{\mathcal{T} \mathcal{R}} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_s \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \sum_{r^* \sim \mathcal{R}^*} |\text{Kl}_2(\overline{P} M r^*, 1; tr)|^2 \sum_{j \bmod tr} |\text{Kl}_3(-\overline{P} s r^*, j; tr)|^2 \\ & \ll X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{R}^* (\mathcal{T} \mathcal{R})^4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

— When $s_1 \neq s_2$ and $r_1^* \neq r_2^*$. Next, we consider $r_1^* \neq r_2^*$; this implies $s_1 \neq s_2$. The display (3.19) is controlled by

$$\ll X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}(\mathcal{TR})^2 \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{r \geq 1} \sum_{r_1^*, r_2^* \geq 1} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}r_1^*, 1; tr) \\ \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}r_2^*, 1; tr)} \mathbf{1}_{r_1^* \equiv r_2^* s_2 \overline{s_1} \pmod{tr}} \mathcal{V}^b \left(\frac{r_1^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}, \frac{r_2^*}{\mathcal{R}^*}, \frac{r}{\mathcal{R}} \right).$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{r_2^* \geq 1} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}r_2^* s_2 \overline{s_1}, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}r_2^*, 1; tr)} \sum_{\substack{r_1^* \geq 1 \\ r_1^* \equiv r_2^* s_2 \overline{s_1} \pmod{tr}}} \mathcal{V} \left(\frac{r_1^*}{\mathcal{R}^*} \right) \mathcal{V} \left(\frac{r_2^*}{\mathcal{R}^*} \right) \\ \ll \frac{\mathcal{R}^*}{(tr)^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{|\ell| \ll \mathcal{TR}/\mathcal{R}^{*1-\varepsilon}} \left| \sum_{h \pmod{tr}} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}h s_2 \overline{s_1}, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}h, 1; tr)} e \left(\frac{\ell h}{tr} \right) \right|$$

by invoking Poisson summation with the modulus tr to the r_2^* -sum. Now, if $\ell = 0$, this shows that $s_1 \equiv s_2 \pmod{tr}$ and thence $s_1 = s_2$. We thus return to the former situation. We will be devoted to the non-zero frequencies in what follows. By the estimate for the triple sum

$$\sum_{\gamma \pmod{q}} \text{Kl}_2(m\gamma, 1; tr) \text{Kl}_2(n\gamma, 1; q) e \left(\frac{h\gamma}{q} \right) \ll (m, n, q)^{1/2} (m - n, h, q)^{1/2} q^{3/2+\varepsilon} \quad (3.21)$$

for any integers $m, n, h, q \geq 1$ (see, e.g., [11, Section 4]), the contribution from this case is bounded at most by a quantity

$$\ll X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}(\mathcal{TR})^2 \sup_{\ell \ll \mathcal{TR}/\mathcal{R}^{*1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{\substack{r \geq 1 \\ (r, P)=1}} (tr)^{3/2+\varepsilon} (\ell, tr)^{1/2} \\ \ll X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P}(\mathcal{TR})^{9/2+\varepsilon} \mathcal{S}^2.$$

Combining with (3.20) and (3.18) shows that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.},1}(X, M, P) \ll \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{TR})^2 \mathcal{R}^*} \left(X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{R}^* (\mathcal{TR})^4 + X^{1+\varepsilon} \sqrt{P} (\mathcal{TR})^{9/2+\varepsilon} \mathcal{S}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \ll X^{1/2+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\sqrt{MP}^{1/4}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{S} \mathcal{R}^*}} + \frac{\sqrt{M} (\mathcal{TR} P)^{1/4}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \right). \quad (3.22)$$

3.1.2. *Bounding $\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.},2}$.* In this part, we shall turn to handling the term $\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.},2}$, the exact expression of which has been given as in (3.14). By interchanging the order of sums

and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one finds

$$\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Non-de.},2}(X, M, P) \ll \frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{TR})^{2-\varepsilon}\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{B}^{1/2}(X, P, M), \quad (3.23)$$

where the multiple sum $\mathcal{B}(X, P, M)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(X, P, M) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}\right) \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}, t_1, t_2 \in \mathfrak{t}} \beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_{t_1} \overline{\gamma_{t_2}} \sum_{\substack{r_1, r_2 \geq 1 \\ (r_1, r_2, P) = 1}} \chi(r_1) \overline{\chi(r_2)} \\ &\quad \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \geq 1} \mathfrak{C}(s_1, \nu_1, n; t_1 r_1) \overline{\mathfrak{C}(s_2, \nu_2, n; t_2 r_2)} \check{\mathcal{Y}}\left(\frac{\nu_1 \mathcal{R}^*}{\mathcal{TR}}\right) \\ &\quad \mathcal{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r_1}{\mathcal{R}}\right) \overline{\check{\mathcal{Y}}\left(\frac{\nu_2 \mathcal{R}^*}{\mathcal{TR}}\right)} \mathcal{W}_{\pm}\left(\frac{n}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{r_2}{\mathcal{R}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Recall that the co-primality relation $(t_1 t_2, r_1 r_2) = 1$ holds. We find that there is only one scenario, namely $t_1 = t_2$ and $r_1 = r_2$, need to be taken into account (as far as the dominated contribution is concerned), upon recalling the explicit expression of \mathfrak{C} presented in (3.15), and employing the philosophy that $\sum_{\gamma \bmod q} \text{Kl}_2(a\gamma, 1; q)$ ‘vanishes’ essentially for any integers $a, q \geq 1$. Now, if one puts $t_1 = t_2 = t$ and $r_1 = r_2 = r$, say, by applying Poisson summation with the modulus tr , the n -sum is essentially simplified into a form of the following

$$\ll \frac{\mathcal{N}}{(tr)^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{j \bmod tr} \mathfrak{C}(s_1, \nu_1, j; tr) \overline{\mathfrak{C}(s_2, \nu_2, j; tr)},$$

upon noticing that the non-zero frequencies do not exist anymore. Upon resorting to the expression (3.15), the inner-sum over j turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\xi, \rho \bmod tr} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}\xi, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}\rho, 1; tr)} e\left(\frac{\nu_1 \xi - \nu_2 \rho}{tr}\right) \sum_{j \bmod tr} e\left(\frac{j(\overline{s_1} \xi - \overline{s_2} \rho)}{tr}\right) \\ &= tr \sum_{\xi \bmod tr} \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}\xi, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}s_2 \overline{s_1} \xi, 1; tr)} e\left(\frac{(\nu_1 - \nu_2 s_2 \overline{s_1}) \xi}{tr}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will proceed the argument by distinguishing two different situations.

— *When $s_1 = s_2$ and $\nu_1 = \nu_2$.* In this case, recalling (3.24) one finds the multiple sum $\mathcal{B}(X, P, M)$ is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll (TR)^{1+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_s \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{\substack{r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \\ (r, P) = 1}} \sum_{\nu \sim TR/\mathcal{R}^*} \sum_{\xi \bmod tr} |\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM}\xi, 1; tr)|^2 \\ &\ll (TR)^{4+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{R}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

— When $s_1 \neq s_2$ and $\nu_1 \neq \nu_2$. Next, let us take care of the case where $s_1 \neq s_2, \nu_1 \neq \nu_2$; this case will provide another significant contribution to $\mathcal{B}(X, P, M)$. By appealing to the estimate (3.21), one infers that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(X, P, M) &\ll (TR)^{1+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \sim TR/\mathcal{R}^*} \sum_{\xi \bmod tr} \\ &\quad \text{Kl}_2(\overline{PM\xi}, 1; tr) \overline{\text{Kl}_2(\overline{PMs_2\overline{s_1}\xi}, 1; tr)} e\left(\frac{(\nu_1 - \nu_2 s_2 \overline{s_1})\xi}{tr}\right) \\ &\ll (TR)^{1+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathfrak{s}, t \in \mathfrak{t}} |\beta_{s_1} \overline{\beta_{s_2}} \gamma_t|^2 \sum_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \sim TR/\mathcal{R}^*} (tr)^{3/2+\varepsilon} (s_1 \nu_1 - s_2 \nu_2, tr)^{1/2} \\ &\ll (TR)^{9/2+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{S}^2 / \mathcal{R}^{*2}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, here, $s_1 \nu_1 \neq s_2 \nu_2$; otherwise, $s_1 | \nu_2$ and $s_2 | \nu_1$ which cannot occur provided that $TR/\mathcal{R}^* < \mathcal{S}$. This is already guaranteed by the final choice of \mathcal{R}^* in (3.33) below. Together with (3.25), we are thus allowed to find

$$\mathcal{B}(X, P, M) \ll (TR)^{4+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{S} / \mathcal{R}^* + (TR)^{9/2+\varepsilon} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{S}^2 / \mathcal{R}^{*2}.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.},2}(X, M, P) &\ll \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\mathcal{S}(TR)^2} \left(\frac{(TR)^4 \sqrt{\mathcal{S}P}}{\sqrt{X\mathcal{R}^*}} + \frac{\mathcal{S}(TR)^{17/4}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \sqrt{\frac{P}{X}} \right) \\ &\ll X^{1/2+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{P\sqrt{M}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}^*}} + \frac{P^{9/8} M^{3/4}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

upon combining with (3.23), (3.25) and (3.8). It is clear that this estimate is larger than that for $\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.},1}(X, M, P)$ as shown in (3.22). In summary, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Non-de.}}(X, M, P) \ll X^{1/2+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{P\sqrt{M}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}^*}} + \frac{P^{9/8} M^{3/4}}{\mathcal{R}^*} \right). \quad (3.27)$$

3.2. Treatment of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Dua.}}$. In this subsection, we will attempt to seek a sharp estimate for $\mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Dua.}}$. Recall (3.5). It is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{S}_{\text{II}}^{\text{Dua.}}(X, M, P) \right|^2 &\ll \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}^2 M^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{r_1, r_2 \geq 1} \widehat{U}\left(\frac{r_1}{M/\mathcal{R}}\right) \widehat{U}\left(\frac{r_2}{M/\mathcal{R}}\right) \sum_{t_1, t_2 \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_{t_1} \overline{\gamma_{t_2}} \\ &\quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(r_1, \overline{t_1 n}; M) \overline{\text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(r_2, \overline{t_2 n}; M)} V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

By appealing to Poisson summation with the modulus M , the last line above is

$$\ll \frac{\widehat{V}(0)X}{M} \sum_{\delta \bmod M} \text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(r_1, \overline{t_1 \delta}; M) \overline{\text{Kl}_{2,\chi}(r_2, \overline{t_2 \delta}; M)},$$

where \widehat{V} is the Fourier transform of V given by $\widehat{V}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} V(x)e(xyX/M)dx$, and it is noticeable that the zero-frequency only survives, since the resulting length of the dual sum after Poisson is roughly $\ll_{\varepsilon} M^{1+\varepsilon}/X < 1$. As of now, let us take a quick glance at the exact form of the δ -sum. Via opening the Kloosterman sums and executing the δ -sum, the δ -sum above asymptotically equals

$$\chi(\bar{t}_2)\bar{\chi}(\bar{t}_1)M \prod_{i \geq 0} \prod_{p_i^{\alpha_i} \parallel M} \sum_{\beta \bmod p_i^{\alpha_i}}^* e\left(\frac{(\bar{t}_1 r_1 - \bar{t}_2 r_2)\beta}{p_i^{\alpha_i}}\right) \ll M^{1+\varepsilon} |(t_2 r_1 - t_1 r_2, M)|.$$

Therefore, we infer that the multiple sum on the right-hand side of (3.28) is controlled by

$$\ll X^{1+\varepsilon} \sum_{0 < r_1, r_2 \ll M/\mathcal{R}} \sum_{\substack{t_1, t_2 \in \mathfrak{t} \\ t_2 r_1 \geq t_1 r_2}} (t_2 r_1 - t_1 r_2, M).$$

One verifies that the non-generic terms $t_1 = t_2, r_1 = r_2$ such that $t_2 r_1 = t_1 r_2$ provide a quantity by $\ll_{\varepsilon} X^{1+\varepsilon} M^2 \mathcal{T} \mathcal{R}^{-1}$; whilst, the generic terms (namely, the terms such that $t_2 r_1 \neq t_1 r_2$), however, contribute an amount $\ll X^{1+\varepsilon} (\mathcal{T} M \mathcal{R}^{-1})^2$. This reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Dua.}}(X, M, P) &\ll X^{\varepsilon} \sqrt{MX} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R}}} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}} \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{X} \left(\frac{1}{p^{1/4-\varepsilon}} + \frac{\mathcal{T}^{1+\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{MP}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

upon recalling (3.8).

3.3. Treatment of $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}$. In this part, we are left with handling the term $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}$ in (3.6). Write $r \rightarrow rP^{\iota}$ with $\iota \geq 1$. One can recast (3.6) as

$$\frac{\sqrt{M}}{(\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R})^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{\iota=1}^{\lfloor \log \mathcal{R}/\log P \rfloor} \sum_{r \geq 1} \chi(rP^{\iota}) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(n, 1, 1)}{\sqrt{n}} e\left(\frac{ntrP^{\iota}}{M}\right) U\left(\frac{r}{\mathcal{R}/P^{\iota}}\right) V\left(\frac{n}{X}\right).$$

Here, the focal point is to analyze the situation where $\iota = 1$; an entirely analogous analysis will, however, produce a much relatively smaller magnitude for the case of $\iota \geq 2$. We shall proceed by an argument which bears some resemblances to that for $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Dua.}}$ in the preceding paragraphs. In the light of this, we briefly outline the proof. Indeed, whenever $\iota = 1$, one invokes the Voronoï formula, Theorem 2.1, to the n -sum above. This quickly yields (essentially)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\chi(P)}{\sqrt{M}(TR)^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{t \in \mathfrak{t}} \gamma_t \sum_{r \geq 1} \chi(r) \sum_{d_1 | M} \sum_{d_2 | M/d_1} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{A_{\Pi}(m, d_2, d_1)}{\sqrt{md_2^2 d_1^3}} \\ \text{Kl}_3(-tr, n; d_1, d_2, M) \mathscr{W}_{\pm} \left(\frac{md_2^2 d_1^3}{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{rP}{\mathcal{R}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with the parameter $\widehat{\mathcal{N}} = M^4P/X^{1-\varepsilon}$. Notice that $d_1 = 1$, in view of that $\widehat{\mathcal{N}} < M^3X^{-\varepsilon}$. We will concentrate on the salient scenario where $d_2 = 1$, from which the dominated contribution of $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}$ thus can be captured. Now, interchanging the order of sums, followed by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that the multiple sum above is bounded by the square-root of

$$X^\varepsilon \sum_{r_1, r_2 \geq 1} \chi(r_1) \overline{\chi(r_1)} \sum_{t_1, t_2 \in t} \gamma_{t_1} \overline{\gamma_{t_2}} \sum_{n \geq 1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{\widehat{\mathcal{N}}}\right) \text{Kl}_3(-t_1 r_1, n; M) \overline{\text{Kl}_3(-t_2 r_2, n; M)} \mathscr{W}_\pm\left(\frac{n}{\widehat{\mathcal{N}}}, \frac{r_1 P}{\mathcal{R}}\right) \overline{\mathscr{W}_\pm\left(\frac{n}{\widehat{\mathcal{N}}}, \frac{r_2 P}{\mathcal{R}}\right)}, \quad (3.30)$$

where the weight function ϕ is as before. Observe that $M < \widehat{\mathcal{N}}X^{-\varepsilon}$. Equipping with the Poisson shows that the zero-frequency only exists; this implies that $t_1 r_1 \equiv t_2 r_2 \pmod{M}$. If $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{M}$, it follows that the contribution to $\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}^{\text{Deg.}}(X, P, M)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}(\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R})^{1-\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{N}}}{M^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{r \ll \mathcal{R}/P} \sum_{t \in t} |\gamma_t|^2 \sum_{\gamma \pmod{M}} |\text{Kl}_3(-tr, \gamma; M)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\ll \sqrt{X} P^{-3/4+\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

upon recalling that $(t_1 r_1 t_2 r_2, M) = 1$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T} \ll M$ by (3.7). On the other hand, when $r_1 \not\equiv r_2 \pmod{M}$, the contribution is majorized by

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}(\mathcal{T}\mathcal{R})^{1-\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{N}}}{M^{1-\varepsilon}} \sum_{r_1, r_2 \ll \mathcal{R}/P} \sum_{\substack{t_1, t_2 \in t \\ t_1 \equiv t_2 r_2 \overline{r_1} \pmod{M}}} |\gamma_{t_1} \overline{\gamma_{t_2}}| \sum_{\gamma \pmod{M}} |\text{Kl}_3(-t_1 r_1, \gamma; M)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\ll \frac{\sqrt{X\mathcal{R}}}{P^{5/4-\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

3.4. The endgame. At the end of this paper, we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2. By combining with (3.3) and the estimates in (3.27), (3.29) and (3.31), one infers that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\Pi}(X, M, P)}{X^{1/2+\varepsilon}} &\ll \frac{P\sqrt{M}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}^*}} + \frac{P^{9/8}M^{3/4}}{\mathcal{R}^*} + \frac{\mathcal{T}^{1+\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{MP}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p^{1/4-\varepsilon}} + \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{R}}}{P^{5/4}} \mathbf{1}_{P < \mathcal{R}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

provided that $\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T} < \mathcal{R}^* < \mathcal{T}\mathcal{R}$, and $\mathcal{R} + \mathcal{T} < M$ with $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{T} = X/M$. A brute-force computation shows that, for the sake of securing the widest ranges of the parameters P, M to ensure subconvexity, it is necessary that

$$\frac{MP^2}{\mathcal{S}} + \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{T} + P^{9/8}M^{3/4} < \mathcal{R}^* < M\sqrt{P}, \quad (3.33)$$

with $\sqrt{M}P^{1/4+10\epsilon} + \sqrt{P} < \mathcal{T} < \sqrt{MP}$, $\sqrt{M} < \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{T} + P^{5/2}$ and $\sqrt{M} + P^{3/2} < \mathcal{S} < \sqrt{PM}$. This implies that the choices of the parameters $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}^*, \mathcal{S}$ and \mathcal{T} should be

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{X}{M^{3/2}P^\mu}, \quad \mathcal{R}^* = M^{1-\epsilon}\sqrt{P}, \quad \mathcal{S} = M^{1-100\epsilon}\sqrt{P}, \quad \mathcal{T} = \sqrt{M}P^\mu \quad (3.34)$$

for any $0 < \mu < 1/2$, whereby the right-hand side of (3.32) turns out to be

$$\ll X^\epsilon \left(\sqrt{\frac{P}{M}} + \frac{P^{5/8}}{M^{1/4}} + \frac{1}{P^{1/4}} + \frac{1}{P^{1/2-\mu}} + \frac{M^{1/4}}{P^{1+\mu/2}} \right). \quad (3.35)$$

This estimate above is trivial unless $M^{1/(4+2\mu)} < P < M^{2/5}$ for any $\mu < 1/2$, as elaborated in Theorem 1.2.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Blomer and G. Harcos, *Hybrid bounds for twisted L-functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **621** (2008), 53-79.
- [2] V. Blomer and W. H. Leung, *A GL(3) converse theorem via a “beyond endoscopy” approach*, 2024, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04037.
- [3] D. A. Burgess, *On character sums and L-series, I*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **12** (1962), 193-206.
- [4] V. Chandee and X. Li, *The second moment of GL(4) × GL(2) L-functions at special points*, Adv. Math. **365** (2020), 107060.
- [5] A. Corbett, *Voronoi summation for GL_n: collusion between level and modulus*, Amer. J. Math. **143** (2021), no. 5, 1361-1395.
- [6] A. Ghosh, *Subconvexity for GL(1) twists of Rankin-Selberg L-functions*, 2023, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09646.
- [7] D. Goldfeld, *Automorphic forms and L-functions for the group GL(n, ℝ)*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 99 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, With an appendix by K. Broughan).
- [8] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet L-functions*, Invent. Math. **47** (1978), no. 2, 149-170.
- [9] R. Holowinsky and P. Nelson, *Subconvex bounds on GL(3) via degeneration to frequency zero*, Math. Ann. **372** (2018), 299-319.
- [10] F. Hou and G. Lü, *An explicit Voronoi formula for SL₃(ℝ) newforms underlying the symmetric lifts in the level aspect*, Int. J. Number Theory **20** (2024), no. 3, 797-809.
- [11] B. Kerr, I. E. Shparlinski, X. Wu and P. Xi, *Bounds on bilinear forms with Kloosterman sums*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **108** (2023), no. 2, 578-621 (available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2204.05038>).
- [12] R. Khan, *Subconvexity bounds for twisted L-functions, II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (2022), no. 10, 6769-6796.
- [13] S. Kumar, R. Munshi and S. K. Singh, *Subconvexity bound for GL(3) × GL(2) L-functions: Hybrid level aspect*, Algebra & Number Theory **18** (2024), no. 3, 477-497.
- [14] S. D. Miller and W. Schmid, *A general Voronoi summation formula for GL(n, ℤ)*, In Geometry and Analysis, Adv. Lect. Math. vol. 18 (Intern. Press, Somerville, 2011), pp. 173-224.
- [15] R. Munshi, *A note on Burgess bound*, Geometry, Algebra, Number Theory, and Their Information Technology Applications, GANITA, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, 2016.

- [16] R. Munshi, *Twists of $GL(3)$ L -functions*, In: Müller, W., Shin, S.W., Templier, N. (eds) *Relative Trace Formulas*, Simons Symposia, Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68506-5_11.
- [17] I. Petrow and M. P. Young, *The fourth moment of Dirichlet L -functions along a coset and the Weyl bound*, *Duke Math.* **172** (2023), no. 10, 1879-1960.
- [18] R. A. Smith *On n -dimensional Kloosterman sums*, *J. Number Theory* **11** (1979), 324-343.
- [19] P. Sharma and W. Sawin *Subconvexity for $GL(3) \times GL(2)$ twists*, *Adv. Math.* **404**, Part B, 6 August 2022, 108420.
- [20] Q. Sun, *Bounds for $GL_2 \times GL_2$ L -functions in depth aspect*, *manuscripta math.* **174** (2024), 429-451.
- [21] F. Zhou, *The Voronoi formula on $GL(3)$ with ramification*, 2018, arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.10786.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCES, XI'AN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, XI'AN 710054, CHINA

Email address: fhou@xaut.edu.cn