

## ADDENDUM TO “HYBRID BOUNDS FOR TWISTED $L$ -FUNCTIONS”

VALENTIN BLOMER AND GERGELY HARCOS

The aim of this *addendum* to our paper [BH] is two-fold. Firstly we show that the same method yields a more general version of Theorems 1 and 2 in [BH]. Secondly we correct an error in the proof of Proposition 3 in [BH].

Starting with the former, we observe that Theorems 1 and 2 in [BH] hold almost verbatim without the assumption that  $f$  has trivial nebentypus.

**Theorem 1’.** *Let  $f$  be a primitive (holomorphic or Maaß) cusp form of archimedean parameter  $\mu$  as in [BH, (1.2)], level  $N$  and arbitrary nebentypus, and let  $\chi$  be a primitive character modulo  $q$ . Then for  $\Re s = 1/2$  and for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  the twisted  $L$ -function  $L(f \otimes \chi, s)$  satisfies*

$$L(f \otimes \chi, s) \ll_{\mu, \varepsilon} (N|s|q)^\varepsilon N^{\frac{4}{5}} (|s|q)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{40}},$$

where the implied constant depends only on  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mu$ .

**Theorem 2’.** *Let  $f$  be a primitive (holomorphic or Maaß) cusp form of archimedean parameter  $\mu$ , level  $N$  and arbitrary nebentypus, and let  $\chi$  be a primitive character modulo  $q$ . Then for  $\Re s = 1/2$  and for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  the twisted  $L$ -function satisfies*

$$L(f \otimes \chi, s) \ll_\varepsilon \left( |s|^{\frac{1}{4}} |\mu|^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{8}} q^{\frac{3}{8}} + |s|^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mu| N^{\frac{1}{2}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (|s| |\mu| N q)^\varepsilon$$

if  $f$  is holomorphic, and

$$L(f \otimes \chi, s) \ll_\varepsilon \left( |s|^{\frac{1}{4}} (1 + |\mu|)^3 N^{\frac{1}{4}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{8}} q^{\frac{3}{8}} + |s|^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + |\mu|)^{\frac{7}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{4}} q^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) (|s| (1 + |\mu|) N q)^\varepsilon$$

otherwise.

**Remark 1.** The factor  $(N, q)^{\frac{1}{8}}$  can be improved to  $(N, q)^{\frac{1}{8}} / (\frac{N}{N_\psi}, q)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ , where  $N_\psi \mid N$  is the conductor of the nebentypus. In particular, this factor can be omitted as long as  $N_\psi^2 \mid N$ , and this recovers [BH, Theorem 2] when  $N_\psi = 1$ .

**Remark 2.** Together with the convexity bound, we obtain

$$L(f \otimes \chi, s) \ll_\varepsilon (|s|(1 + |\mu|)Nq)^\varepsilon |s|^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + |\mu|)^3 N^{\frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{3}{8}}.$$

Recently there has been a lot of interest in such bounds. In [FKM, Section 1.4], Theorem 2’ (with an unspecified dependence on  $f$  and  $s$  and in the case of trivial nebentypus) has been derived from a general result on exponential sums in Hecke eigenvalues of modular forms. Hoffstein [Ho] has devised an alternative method based on double Dirichlet series to derive Theorem 2’ for holomorphic  $f$  and with an unspecified dependence on  $f$  and  $s$ . Finally, Munshi [Mu] and Wu [Wu] have improved the exponent in Theorem 1’.

We indicate the minor modifications to prove Theorem 2’. Then Theorem 1’ follows as in [BH, Section 8]; we only remark that there is a small typo in [BH, (8.8)]:  $N_0$  should be  $N$ .

Let  $f$  be a newform of level  $N$  and nebentypus character  $\psi$  of conductor  $N_\psi \mid N$ . The case  $N_\psi = 1$  corresponds to the situation in [BH]. In [BH, (3.1)] we define

$$(1) \quad D := 3[N, N_\psi q].$$

---

Valentin Blomer was supported by the Volkswagen Foundation and ERC Starting Grant 258713. Gergely Harcos was supported by OTKA grants K 101855 and K 72731 and ERC Advanced Grant 228005.

We claim that in [BH, (3.9)] we can prove the slightly stronger bound

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{Q}_k^{\text{holo}}(\ell) \ll_{\varepsilon} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell}} + \left( \frac{\ell^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \frac{N}{N_{\psi}}, q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\ell^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{N}{N_{\psi}}, q \right) (N, q)^{1/2}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}} N} \right) \left( \frac{1 + |\tau|}{k} + 1 \right) \right) ((1 + |\tau|) D \ell)^{\varepsilon}$$

and similarly for  $\mathcal{Q}(\ell)$ . Then we can proceed with the analysis on [BH, pp. 65–66], with the only change that we use the new value of  $D$  in (1) and in the definition of  $L$  we replace  $(N, q)^{\frac{3}{4}}$  by  $\left( \frac{N}{N_{\psi}}, q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (N, q)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ . Hence it remains to show (2).

For  $(\ell, D) = 1$  we define the twisted divisor sum

$$\alpha_{1/2+i\tau}^{(\chi, \psi)}(\ell) = \sum_{\ell_1 \ell_2 = \ell} \psi(\ell_1) \chi(\ell_1) \overline{\chi(\ell_2)} \left( \frac{\ell_2}{\ell_1} \right)^{i\tau}$$

and the twisted Kloosterman-type sum

$$S_{\psi}(m_1, m_2, -\ell; c) := \sum_{\substack{a_1, a_2(c) \\ a_1 a_2 \equiv \ell(c)}} \psi(a_2) e \left( \frac{m_1 a_1 + m_2 a_2}{c} \right).$$

If  $\psi$  is trivial, this coincides with the definition on [BH, p. 68]. Now [BH, (4.8)] holds in our more general setting if we replace  $\alpha_{1/2+i\tau}^{(\chi)}(\ell)$  by  $\alpha_{1/2+i\tau}^{(\chi, \psi)}(\ell)$  in the diagonal term and  $S(m_1, m_2, -\ell; c)$  by  $S_{\psi}(m_1, m_2, -\ell; c)$  in the off-diagonal term. This follows exactly as in [By, (5.3)], but for the convenience of the reader we provide the computation for the off-diagonal term. The off-diagonal term of the trace formula is

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2} \frac{(m_2/m_1)^{i\tau}}{(m_1 m_2)^u} \chi(m_1) \overline{\chi(m_2)} \sum_{D|c} \frac{1}{c} \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1)} \psi(d) S_{\psi}(m_2, m_1 \ell/d^2; c) \phi \left( \frac{4\pi \sqrt{m_1 m_2 \ell/d^2}}{c} \right).$$

We keep  $m_1, m_2$  fixed, and manipulate the two inner sums over  $c$  and  $d$ . Since  $(\ell, D) = 1$ , we can write these two sums as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1)} \sum_{dD|c} \frac{d}{c} \psi(d) S_{\psi}(m_2, m_1 \ell/d^2; c/d) \phi \left( \frac{4\pi \sqrt{m_1 m_2 \ell/d^2}}{c/d} \right) \\ &= \sum_{D|c} \frac{1}{c} \phi \left( \frac{4\pi \sqrt{m_1 m_2 \ell}}{c} \right) \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1, c)} d \psi(d) S_{\psi}(m_2, m_1 \ell/d^2; c/d). \end{aligned}$$

We keep  $c$  fixed and consider the innermost sum over  $d$ . It equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1, c)} d \psi(d) \sum_{a(c/d)}^* \psi(a) e \left( \frac{am_2 + \bar{a}m_1 \ell/d^2}{c/d} \right) \\ &= \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1, c)} d \sum_{a(c/d)}^* \sum_{\substack{b(c/d) \\ ab \equiv \ell/d(c/d)}} \psi(ad) e \left( \frac{adm_2 + bm_1}{c} \right) \\ &= \sum_{d|(\ell, m_1, c)} \sum_{a(c)} \sum_{\substack{b(c) \\ (a, c) = d \\ ab \equiv \ell(c)}} \psi(a) e \left( \frac{am_2 + bm_1}{c} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If  $d \mid (\ell, c)$  and  $(a, c) = d$ , then the  $b$ -sum vanishes unless  $d \mid m_1$ . Hence we can drop the condition  $d \mid m_1$  in the first sum, because it is automatic. Next, if  $(a, c) = d$ , then the congruence  $ab \equiv \ell(c)$  forces  $d \mid \ell$ , hence we can also drop the condition  $d \mid \ell$ , so that the previous display equals  $S_{\psi}(m_1, m_2, -\ell; c)$  as desired.

In Step 4 on [BH, p. 69], we apply [By, Lemma 2] to our new situation. Here we see that the display after [By, (1.3)] has an additional factor  $\psi(a_2)$ , and hence the second display after [By, (1.4)] has an additional factor

$$(3) \quad \psi(-m_2 + c_2q/N),$$

in the notation of [By]. In the notation of [BH],  $q/N$  in (3) equals  $c/q$ , which in turn is divisible by  $D/q$ . Our definition of  $D$  in (1) ensures that (3) is independent of  $c_2$ , hence the only change in the display [BH, (4.10)] is an extra factor  $\psi(-m_2)$  inside the sum. Now (1) implies that the second line of [BH, (4.12)] becomes

$$(\ell q)^\varepsilon \left(\frac{\ell}{q}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1+|\tau|}{a} + 1\right) \left(\frac{(\frac{N}{N_\psi}, q)(N, q)^{1/2}}{N} + \frac{(\frac{N}{N_\psi}, q)^{1/2}(N, q)^{1/2}}{\ell^{\frac{1}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right),$$

and similarly for [BH, (4.13)]. The rest remains unchanged. This proves (2).

Finally, we would like to correct an error in the proof of [BH, Proposition 3]. On [BH, p. 75] it is assumed that  $V$  is independent of  $t$ . This is a priori not the case. Instead of the approximate functional equation [BH, (2.12)] one should use the uniform approximate functional equation of [BH1, Proposition 1]. This introduces an error of  $D^{1/2}T^{-A}$  in (7.2) and the argument goes through as claimed.

We also remark that [BH, (7.3)] holds only on the support of the test function  $\psi$  (which is all that is needed), and for the display after [BH, (7.4)] one has to first write  $V$  as an inverse Mellin transform to separate variables.

#### REFERENCES

- [BH] V. Blomer, G. Harcos, *Hybrid bounds for twisted L-functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **621** (2008), 53–79.
- [BH1] V. Blomer, G. Harcos, *A hybrid asymptotic formula for the second moment of Rankin-Selberg L-functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **105** (2012), 473–505.
- [By] V. A. Bykovskii, *A trace formula for the scalar product of Hecke series and its applications*, translated in J. Math. Sci (New York) **89** (1998), 915–932.
- [FKM] E. Fouvry, E. Kowalski, P. Michel, *Algebraic twists of modular forms and Hecke orbits*, arXiv:1207.0617
- [Ho] J. Hoffstein, *Multiple Dirichlet series and shifted convolutions*, arXiv:1110.4868
- [Mu] R. Munshi, *The circle method and bounds for L-functions - I*, arXiv:1202.4068
- [Wu] H. Wu, *Burgess-like subconvex bounds for  $GL_2 \times GL_1$* , arXiv:1209.5950

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, BUNSENSTR. 3-5, 37073 GÖTTINGEN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* `blomer@uni-math.gwdg.de`

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, POB 127, BUDAPEST H-1364,  
 HUNGARY  
*E-mail address:* `gharcos@renyi.hu`