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## A B S T R A C T

We obtain several estimates for bilinear forms with exponential sums with binomials $m x^{k}+n x^{\ell}$. In particular we show the existence of nontrivial cancellations between such sums when the coefficients $m$ and $n$ vary over rather sparse sets of general nature.
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## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background and motivation

For a positive integer $q$, we denote by $\mathbb{Z}_{q}$ the residue ring modulo $q$ and also denote by $\mathbb{Z}_{q}^{*}$ the group of units of $\mathbb{Z}_{q}$.

For fixed integers $k$ and $\ell$, we consider exponential sums with binomials

$$
S_{k, \ell, q}(m, n)=\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{q}^{*}} \mathbf{e}_{q}\left(m x^{k}+n x^{\ell}\right)
$$

where for negative powers of $x$ are computed modulo $q$ and

$$
\mathbf{e}_{q}(z)=\exp (2 \pi i z / q)
$$

The case $(k, \ell)=(1,-1)$ corresponds to the case of Kloosterman sums. We note that when both $k$ and $\ell$ are positive there is no reason to restrict the summation to $\mathbb{Z}_{q}^{*}$. However, motivated by the choice $(k, \ell)=(-2,1)$ which is important for applications to square-free numbers in progressions, see [13] we only consider this case. It is also important for the validity of the bound (1.3) below.

Furthermore, given two sets $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{q}$ and two sequences of weights $\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\left\{\alpha_{m}\right\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}=\left\{\beta_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$, we define the following bilinear forms with the binomial sums $S_{k, \ell, q}(m, n)$ :

$$
\mathcal{S}_{k, \ell, q}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta} ; \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})=\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_{m} \beta_{n} S_{k, \ell, q}(m, n) .
$$

We also consider the following special cases

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S}_{k, \ell, q}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} ; \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) & =\mathcal{S}_{k, \ell, q}\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\{1\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}} ; \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}\right) \\
& =\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_{m} S_{k, \ell, q}(m, n) \tag{1.1}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{S}_{k, \ell, q}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) & =\mathcal{S}_{k, \ell, q}\left(\{1\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}},\{1\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}} ; \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}\right) \\
& =\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} S_{k, \ell, q}(m, n) \tag{1.2}
\end{align*}
$$

For $(k, \ell)=(1,-1)$, that is, for Kloosterman sums, such bilinear forms have been introduced by Fouvry, Kowalski and Michel [3] who have also demonstrated the importance of estimating them beyond of what follows immediately from the Weil bound of Kloosterman sums (see, for example, [7, Chapter 11]), that is, better than the bound (1.3) below.
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