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#### Abstract

Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ be a cubic hypersurface cut out by the vanishing of a non-degenerate rational cubic form in $n$ variables. Let $N(X, B)$ denote the number of rational points on $X$ of height at most $B$. In this article we obtain lower bounds for $N(X, B)$ for cubic hypersufaces, provided only that $n$ is large enough. In particular, we show that $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-9}$ if $n \geqslant 39$, thereby proving a conjecture of T. D. Wooley for non-conical cubic hypersurfaces with large enough dimension.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \in \mathbf{Z}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ be a cubic form with integer coefficients and let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ denote the hypersurface cut out by the vanishing of $C$. Determining whether $X$ has a Q -rational point is a fundamental problem in number theory. This article studies the distribution of the set of rational points $X(\mathbf{Q})$ for cubic hypersurfaces that have a Q-rational point. Since $C$ is a cubic form, it is clear that $X(\mathbf{R}) \neq \emptyset$. If $n \geqslant 10$, Demyanov [15] and Lewis [25] have shown that

[^0]$X\left(\mathbf{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \emptyset$ for each prime $p$. While these are clearly necessary conditions to ensure that $X(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$, a folklore conjecture states that these conditions are also sufficient.

Conjecture 1.1. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ be a cubic hypersurface with $n \geqslant 10$. Then $X(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$.

Although Conjecture 1.1 is still unresolved, the circle method has been used to make partial progress. Heath-Brown [21] has shown that $X(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$ provided that $n \geqslant 14$. Further, if $X$ is non-singular, a landmark result of Heath-Brown [18] shows that $X$ has a Q-rational point if $n \geqslant 10$. For non-singular hypersurfaces, another result by Hooley [22] has shown that if $n \geqslant 9$, then $X$ has a Q -rational point provided that $X$ has a rational point over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ for each prime $p$.

Turning to the distribution of rational points, Kollár [23] has shown that if $X$ is geometrically integral and not a cone, then $X / \mathrm{Q}$ is unirational provided that $X(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$. In particular, this implies that $X(\mathbf{Q})$ is Zariski dense in $X$. Thus it makes sense to define the counting function

$$
N(X, B)=\#\{\mathbf{x} \in X(\mathbf{Q}): H(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant B\}
$$

where $H(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the usual naive height function on $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}(\mathbf{Q})$.
In this article, we obtain lower bounds for $N(X, B)$ for general cubic hypersurfaces $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$. Past work has primarily obtained lower bounds for $N(X, B)$ under additional hypotheses on $X$. Hooley [22] has shown that if $n-\sigma \geqslant 10$, then

$$
N(X, B) \geqslant c_{X} B^{n-3}
$$

where $c_{X}$ is a constant that depends only on $X$ and $\sigma$ is the dimension of the singular locus of $X$. Moreover, $c_{X}>0$ if $X$ has a non-singular point over every completion of $\mathbf{Q}$.

Asymptotic formulae for $N(X, B)$ are known to hold for cubic hypersurfaces $X$ cut out by the vanishing of cubic forms $C$ with large enough $h$-invariant, a quantity which we will define below. Davenport and Lewis [13] have shown that there exists $\delta>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(X, B)=c B^{n-3}+O\left(B^{n-3-\delta}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds if the $h$-invariant of $C$ is at least 17 . By combining the approach in [13] with [21], one can deduce the following result, a proof of which can be found in [1].
Theorem 1.2. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ be a cubic hypersurface cut out by the vanishing of $C(\mathbf{x})$ such that its h-invariant is at least 14 . Then there exists $\delta>0$ such that the asymptotic formula (1.1) holds.

In addition to the results mentioned above, generalising classical work of Birch, Davenport and Lewis [2], Schindler and Skorobogatov [28] have also obtained asymptotic formulae for $N(X, B)$ for the family of hypersurfaces cut out by the vanishing of cubic forms of the shape

$$
b_{1} N_{K_{1} / \mathbf{Q}}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)+b_{2} N_{K_{2} / \mathbf{Q}}\left(x_{4}, x_{5}, x_{6}\right)+b_{3} N_{K_{3} / \mathbf{Q}}\left(x_{7}, x_{8}, x_{9}\right)
$$

where $b_{i} \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $N_{K_{i} / \mathbf{Q}}$ are norm forms that arise from cubic extensions $K_{i}$ of $\mathbf{Q}$. For $X$ associated to cubic forms of the shape $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \Phi_{i}\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right)$, where $\Phi_{i}$ are non-singular integral binary cubic forms, Brüdern and Wooley [10 have obtained lower bounds for $N(X, B)$. In more recent work, Liu, Wu and Zhao [26] have obtained an asymptotic formula for $N\left(X_{n}, B\right)$ for the family of hypersurfaces

$$
X_{n}: z^{3}-y\left(x_{1}^{2}+\ldots+x_{n}^{2}\right)=0
$$

for $n \equiv 0 \bmod 4$. If $X$ is cut out by the vanishing of a diagonal cubic form, then subject to local solubility conditions, an asymptotic formula for $N(X, B)$ follows from work of Vaughan [32] if $n \geqslant 8$. In addition, lower bounds can be deduced if $n \geqslant 7$ by adapting the methods in 33.

As a result, existing estimates for $N(X, B)$ are conditional on hypotheses on the singularities of $X$, on the dimension of linear subspaces in $X$, or for hypersurfaces cut out by cubic forms that have a specific shape.

Although there has been extensive work in understanding the counting function $N(X, B)$ for lower dimensional cubic hypersurfaces, this will not be the focus of our present work. We refer the interested reader to work of Blomer, Brüdern and Salberger [3] on cubic fourfolds, work of de la Bretèche [14] on Fano threefolds and the book [5, §2.3] for an overview of results on cubic surfaces.

We will now define the $h$-invariant, denoted $h=h(C)=h(X)$, which will play an important role in our work. The $h$-invariant is defined to be the smallest integer $k$ such that there exist linear forms $l_{1}, \ldots, l_{k}$ and quadratic forms $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{k}$ with integer coefficients satisfying

$$
C(\mathbf{x})=l_{1}(\mathbf{x}) f_{1}(\mathbf{x})+\ldots+l_{k}(\mathbf{x}) f_{k}(\mathbf{x})
$$

Equivalently, $h$ is the codimension of the largest $\mathbf{Q}$-linear subspace contained in the affine cone over $X$. Then $0 \leqslant h \leqslant n$. It is clear that $h=0$ if and only if $C$ is identically 0 and that $X(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $h \neq n$. Therefore, if $B$ is large enough, we see that

$$
N(X, B) \geqslant \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } n=h+1  \tag{1.2}\\ c_{n-h} B^{n-h} & \text { if } n \geqslant h+2\end{cases}
$$

for some $c_{n-h}>0$ that depends only on $X$.
Note that (1.2) along with [21, Theorem 1] and Theorem 1.2 imply the following 'trivial' estimate.

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ is a cubic hypersurface with $n \geqslant 14$. Then if $B$ is large enough, we have

$$
N(X, B) \gg \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } n=14 \\ B^{n-13} & \text { if } n \geqslant 15\end{cases}
$$

In Section 2 we will state our main result, which will improve on Theorem 1.3. A simple probabilistic heuristic leads us to expect that $N(X, B) \approx B^{n-3}$. However, this can fail for general cubic hypersurfaces. For example, if $C(\mathbf{x})=x_{1} x_{2}^{2}+x_{3}\left(x_{4}^{2}+\ldots+x_{n}^{2}\right)$, we clearly have $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-2}$. It is also possible to construct badly degenerate hypersurfaces $X$ that have far fewer points than predicted by the probabilistic heuristic. Consider the following example of Wooley [35].

Let $p$ be a fixed prime number and let $\mathbf{F}_{p}$ denote the field with cardinality $p$. Let $K / \mathbf{F}_{p}$ be a cubic extension with basis $\left\{\omega_{1}, \omega_{2}, \omega_{3}\right\}$ and consider the cubic polynomial

$$
\bar{N}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)=N_{K / \mathbf{F}_{p}}\left(\omega_{1} x_{1}+\omega_{2} x_{2}+\omega_{3} x_{3}\right),
$$

where $N_{K / \mathbf{F}_{p}}: K \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_{p}$ denotes the norm map. Let $N\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)$ be any lift of $\bar{N}$ to the integers. Define

$$
F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{9}\right)=N\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)+p N\left(x_{4}, x_{5}, x_{6}\right)+p^{2} N\left(x_{7}, x_{8}, x_{9}\right) .
$$

Then it is easy to verify that if $F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{9}\right)=0$, we must have that $x_{i}=0$. Let $L_{1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, L_{9}(\mathbf{x})$ be $\mathbf{Q}$-linearly independent linear forms with integer coefficients in $n \geqslant 9$ variables. Define

$$
C(\mathbf{x})=F\left(L_{1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, L_{9}(\mathbf{x})\right)
$$

If $X$ is the hypersurface cut out by the vanishing of $C$, then it follows that $N(X, B) \leqslant c B^{n-9}$, for some constant $c$ that depends only on $X$. Based on this example, Wooley [35] has made the following conjecture on the distribution of rational points on $X$, which may be seen as a quantitative strengthening of Conjecture 1.1.

Conjecture 1.4 (T. D. Wooley). Let $n \geqslant 10$ be an integer. Let $X \subset$ $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ be a cubic hypersurface. Then there exists a constant $c>0$ depending only on $X$ such that $N(X, B) \geqslant c B^{n-9}$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$.

In this article, we prove Wooley's conjecture if $n$ is large enough and if $X$ is not a cone.

Theorem 1.5. Suppose that $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ is a non-conical cubic hypersurface with $n \geqslant 39$. Then $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-9}$, where the implied constant depends only on $X$.

In fact, one can do better for most non-conical cubic hypersurfaces $X$ with large enough dimension. Except for a specific family of hypersurfaces, we will show (see Theorem 2.7 in the next section) for any $\delta>0$ that $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-7-\delta}$ if $n \gg \delta^{-1}$.

It would be desirous to remove the assumption in Theorem 1.5 that $X$ is non-conical, but this appears to be a challenging problem. However, if $X$ is cut out by the vanishing of a non-degenerate rational cubic form in $n-l$ variables, then Wooley's conjecture holds trivially if $n-l \leqslant 9$ and from Theorem 1.5 if $n-l \geqslant 39$.

Notation. By $\mathbf{A}^{h}$ we will denote affine $h$-space. All implicit constants will be allowed to depend on the cubic form $C$ and the weight functions that will appear in the work. Any further dependence will be indicated by an appropriate subscript.
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## 2. Overview of the proof

In this section, we will give an outline of the proof of Theorem 1.5. We begin by stating the following theorem, which improves on (1.2) if $h \geqslant 8$ and if $n$ is large enough in terms of $h$, and also show that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.5,

Theorem 2.1. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ be a non-conical cubic hypersurface cut out by the vanishing of a rational cubic form $C$ with h-invariant
$h(C) \geqslant 8$. Assume that $n \geqslant h+17$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be a small fixed real number. Set

$$
\beta(n, h, \varepsilon)=\frac{2(h-1)(n-h-7)}{3(n-h)-3}-2-\varepsilon .
$$

and

$$
\alpha(n, h, \varepsilon)=\min \left\{\frac{h-5}{2}, \frac{2 h-12}{3}, \beta(n, h, \varepsilon)\right\} .
$$

Then we have

$$
N(X, B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{n-h+\alpha(n, h, \varepsilon)} .
$$

To see that Theorem 1.5 can be deduced from Theorem 2.1, observe that Theorem 1.5 stems from (1.2) if $h \leqslant 9$ and from Theorem 1.2 if $h \geqslant 14$. As a result, it suffices to restrict to the case where $h \in$ $\{10,11,12,13\}$. For $h$ in this range, the estimate $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-9}$ is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1, provided that $n \geqslant 39$.

Theorem 2.1 is the main technical result of our article, and it appears to be the first result that obtains non-trivial lower bounds for general cubic hypersurfaces. We will give an overview of its proof below. We start by introducing the counting function we utilise in the proof.

Define

$$
N(B)=\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{n} \cap B[-1,1]^{n}: C(\mathbf{x})=0\right\}
$$

As $N(B)=2 N(X, B)$, in order to obtain a lower bound for $N(X, B)$, it will suffice to study the counting function $N(B)$.
2.1. The fibration method. The fibration argument, which is at the heart of the proof of Theorem [2.1, is similar to an idea that was used by Watson [34] to study the solubility of cubic equations in at least 19 variables. A similar approach was also deployed by Swarbrick Jones [30] in his work on weak approximation.

Recall that $h$ is the smallest integer such that $C(\mathbf{x})$ can be written in the following form:

$$
C(\mathbf{z})=l_{1}(\mathbf{z}) f_{1}(\mathbf{z})+\ldots+l_{h}(\mathbf{z}) f_{h}(\mathbf{z}),
$$

where $l_{i}$ and $f_{i}$ are non-zero linear and quadratic forms respectively with rational coefficients. After making a change of variables, we may represent $C(\mathbf{z})$ by

$$
C(\mathbf{z})=z_{1} g_{1}(\mathbf{z})+\ldots+z_{h} g_{h}(\mathbf{z})
$$

where $g_{i}$ are non-zero quadratic forms. Note that this (or any other) linear change of variables will only affect the implied constant in the lower bound we will obtain for $N(B)$, which is allowed to depend on $C$.

Set $\mathbf{z}=(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ where $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-h}\right)$ and $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ so that

$$
\begin{align*}
C(\mathbf{z})=C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & =y_{1} g_{1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})+\ldots+y_{h} g_{h}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

for quadratic forms $F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $q_{j}(\mathbf{y})$ and a cubic form $R(\mathbf{y})$.
Let $C$ be as in (2.1). Let $Z \subset \mathbf{A}^{n}$ denote the (affine) hypersurface cut out by the equation $C=0$. Let

$$
\begin{align*}
\pi: Z & \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{h} \\
(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & \mapsto \mathbf{y} \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

be the projection map. Then the fibre over a point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{A}^{h}$ is given by

$$
Z_{\mathbf{y}}: \sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y})=0
$$

Associated to each cubic hypersurface is the following invariant, which will play a key role in our fibration argument.
Definition 2.2. Let $Z_{\eta}$ denote the generic fibre of the morphism $\pi$, where $\eta$ is the generic point in $\mathbf{A}^{h}$. The rank of the fibration $\pi$, denoted $r=r(C)$, is defined to be the rank of the quadratic part of $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$.

In other words, $r$ is the rank of the quadratic form $\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ over the algebraic function field $\mathbf{Q}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. More concretely, it is the order of the largest minor of $M[\mathbf{y}]$, the matrix associated with $\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$, which does not vanish identically in $\mathbf{y}$. Note that $0 \leqslant$ $r \leqslant n-h$.

If $r$ is the rank of $\pi$, then for 'typical' $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h}$, we will have that $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbf{Q}} \sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})=r$. Let

$$
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \text { and } Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})
$$

so that the fibre of $\pi$ over $\mathbf{y}$ is nothing but $Z_{\mathbf{y}}: F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$. When $r$ is 'large', we will use use the circle method to count points on the affine quadric $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ and sum over $\mathbf{y}$ to get a lower bound for $N(B)$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant B}} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B \\(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=1 \\ F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0}} 1 . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For this strategy to work, we must ensure that the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$ is soluble for sufficiently many $|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant B$, and also obtain estimates for
counting solutions to $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ that are uniform in $\mathbf{y}$. To tackle the latter problem, we will use the smooth $\delta$-function form of the circle method [19, Theorem 1].

We will encounter contrasting behaviour based on the real solubility of $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$, which we will now describe. If for each $\mathbf{y}$, the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is semidefinite, then we will show (see Lemma 6.6) that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, where $l$ is a linear form and $F$ is a semidefinite quadratic form. Our problem then reduces to counting solutions to a given definite quadratic form by 'completing the square' to remove terms that are linear in $\mathbf{x}$ in (2.1), while ensuring that the resulting equation is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$ for sufficiently many $\mathbf{y} \in B[-1,1]^{n} \cap \mathbf{Z}^{n}$. Using this approach, we will prove the following result in Section 6.1.

Theorem 2.3. Let $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be a rational cubic form as in (2.1) with $h=h(C)$ and let $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ denote the cubic hypersurface $C=0$. Suppose that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, with $l$ a linear form and $F$ a semidefinite quadratic form of rank equal to $r \geqslant 5$, where $r$ is the rank of the fibration $\pi$. Set

$$
\gamma(n, h, r)=\min \left\{\frac{h-5}{2}, \frac{r-n+3 h-8}{3}\right\} .
$$

Then we have

$$
N(X, B) \gg B^{n-h+\gamma(n, h, r)} .
$$

On the other hand, if $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$ is not as in Theorem 2.3, we proceed as follows. Let $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B$ be a parameter. We will construct a non-empty compact set $\Omega_{\infty}$ such that whenever $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$, the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is indefinite and the product of its non-zero eigenvalues has absolute value $\gg Y^{r}$, where $r=r(C)$ is the rank of $\pi$. In particular, this product is, up to a constant, as large as it can be. This is because the eigenvalues of $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$ are $O(Y)$, as the matrix associated to $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$ has coefficients that are $O(Y)$. Furthermore, if the set of minors of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{y}]$ have no common factor, we will show in Section 4 using an application of the Ekedahl sieve [16] that for a positive proportion of integer vectors $\mathbf{y} \in Y \Omega_{\infty}$, the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$ has non-singular solutions modulo $p$ for each prime $p \gg_{C} 1$. Combining this with the fact that the smooth points of $X\left(\mathbf{Q}_{p}\right)$ are Zariski dense in $X$, we deduce that a positive proportion of fibres of $\pi$ are everywhere locally soluble. Hence by the Hasse principle for affine quadrics, we get that for a positive proportion of $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$, the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$.

Next, we deploy the circle method, as in work of the first author [24], to show for a smooth function $w$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0} w\left(B^{-1} \mathbf{x}\right)=\sigma_{\infty}(w, \mathbf{y}) \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{y}) B^{n-h-2}+O(\mathscr{E}(B, Y)) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma_{\infty}(w, \mathbf{y})$ and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{y})$ are the 'singular integral', which measures the density of real solutions to the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ and the 'singular series', which measures the density of $p$-adic solutions for each prime $p$ and $\mathscr{E}(B, Y)$ is the error term. It is important here that the error term is uniform in the coefficients of $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ and the parameter $Y$ is chosen to ensure that the main term exceeds the error term. We also remark that the error term in (2.4) grows larger as $r$ becomes smaller.

In order to sum over $\mathbf{y}$ in (2.3) using (2.4), we will need good lower bounds for both $\sigma_{\infty}(w, \mathbf{y})$ as well as for $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{y})$. However, having ensured that the absolute value of the eigenvalues of $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$ is $\gg Y^{r}$, and that $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ has a smooth solution modulo $p$ for each $p>_{C} 1$, we can deduce that $\sigma_{\infty}(w, \mathbf{y}) \mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{y}) \gg Y^{-1-\varepsilon}$. This allows us to conclude that

$$
N(B) \gg B^{n-h-2} Y^{h-1-\varepsilon},
$$

for $Y=B^{\delta}$, and $\delta=\delta(n, h, r)>0$.
It still remains to treat the case where the minors of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{y}]$ have a common factor, in which case we can no longer apply the Ekedahl sieve. Nevertheless, we are able to obtain optimal bounds for $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$ on average. To do this, we begin by characterising those cubic forms that have this property and then we use exponential sum techniques over finite fields to handle the resulting counting problems. These are some of the key ideas that go into the proof of the following result, which is the subject of Section 6.2,

Theorem 2.4. Let $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be a rational cubic form as in (2.1) with $h=h(C) \geqslant 6$ and let $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ denote the cubic hypersurface $C=0$. Let $r$ denote the rank of the fibration $\pi$ and assume that $r \geqslant \min \{5, n-h-4\}$. Suppose that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, for any linear form $l$ and any semidefinite quadratic form $F$ of rank $r$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be a small fixed real number. Set

$$
\delta(n, h, r, \varepsilon)= \begin{cases}\frac{2(r-4)(h-1)}{r+2(n-h)}-2-\varepsilon & \text { if } r \text { is even and } 2 r-m<8, \\ \frac{2(-3)(h-1)}{r+2(n-h)+1}-2-\varepsilon & \text { otherwise } .\end{cases}
$$

Then we have

$$
N(X, B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{n-h+\delta(n, h, r, \varepsilon)} .
$$

This leaves us with those hypersurfaces for which $r \leqslant n-h-5$. The following result allows us to extract additional information regarding such $C$.

Lemma 2.5. Let $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be as in (2.1). If $r=r(C)<n-h$ then after a linear change of variables, $C$ is linear in $n-h-r$ of the $x_{i}$.

Proof. We will argue as in the proof of [34, Lemma 3]. Let $M_{i}$ denote the matrix associated with the quadratic form $F_{i}$. Since $r$ is the rank of the fibration $\pi$, at least one of the matrices $M_{i}$ must have rank equal to $r$. We may assume without loss of generality that $\operatorname{rank}\left(M_{1}\right)=r$. Furthermore, we can make a change of variables and ensure that $M_{1}=$ $\operatorname{Diag}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)$ is a diagonal matrix. Then we may write

$$
M[\mathbf{y}]=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} N_{11}^{(i)} & \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{12}^{(i)} \\
\sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{21}^{(i)} & \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{22}^{(i)}
\end{array}\right),
$$

with $N_{11}^{(j)}$ matrices of order $r$, such that $N_{11}^{(1)}=M_{1}$ and $N_{22}^{(j)}$ matrices of order $n-h-r$.

To show that $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is linear in $x_{i}$ with $r+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h$ it suffices to show that $\frac{\partial^{2} C}{\partial x_{i} x_{j}}=0$ if $r+1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n-h$, or in other words that each matrix $N_{22}^{(j)}$ has all its elements equal to 0 .

By hypothesis, any minor of order $r+1$ in $M[\mathbf{y}]$ must vanish identically in $\mathbf{y}$. Consider in particular the $(r+1) \times(r+1)$ submatrices of $M[\mathbf{y}]$ of the form

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} N_{11}^{(i)} & \mathbf{u} \\
\mathbf{v} & w
\end{array}\right)
$$

for any column $\mathbf{u}$ of $\sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{12}^{(i)}$, any row $\mathbf{v}$ of $\sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{21}^{(i)}$ and any matrix entry $w \in \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{22}^{(i)}$, obtained by bordering $\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} N_{11}^{(i)}$. In the determinant of each of these matrices, consider the coefficients of $y_{1}^{r} y_{j}$, where $j \geqslant 2$. These terms constitute the determinant of the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
M_{1} & 0 \\
0 & \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{22}^{(i)}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

As a result, there are no linear terms (in the $y_{j}$, with $j \geqslant 2$ ) in any minor of order $r+1$ of the above matrix. Since $\operatorname{det} M_{1} \neq 0$, we have $N_{22}^{(i)}=0$ and the lemma follows.

Observe that if $r=n-h-k$, then $C$ is linear in $k$ variables. As a result, after relabelling the variables, we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=x_{1} Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+x_{k} Q_{k}(\mathbf{y})+S(\mathbf{y}) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-k}\right), Q_{i}$ are quadratic forms and $S$ is a cubic form. Let $Z \subset \mathbf{A}^{n}$ denote the hypersurface $C=0$. Consider the morphism

$$
\begin{align*}
& \pi^{\prime}: Z \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{n-k} \\
& (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mapsto \mathbf{y} \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Then the fibres of $\pi^{\prime}$ are the affine hyperplanes

$$
Z_{\mathbf{y}}: x_{1} Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+x_{k} Q_{k}(\mathbf{y})+S(\mathbf{y})=0
$$

For $C$ as in (2.5), we obtain near optimal lower bounds for $N(X, B)$.
Theorem 2.6. $\operatorname{Let} C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be a rational cubic form in $n$ variables such that $h(C) \geqslant 8$. Suppose that $C(\mathbf{x})$ is of the shape (2.5) with $k \geqslant 5$. Assume that $C(\mathbf{x})$ is non-degenerate in at least 5 of the variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}$. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ denote the cubic hypersurface $C=0$. Then for any $\varepsilon>0$, we have

$$
N(B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{n-3-\varepsilon}
$$

To prove Theorem 2.6, we use the morphism $\pi^{\prime}$ to count points on $X$. Let

$$
l_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})
$$

The fibres of $\pi^{\prime}$ are given by $Z_{\mathbf{y}}: l_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$. Our task then will be to count solutions to $l_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$ with $|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B$ for each fixed $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right)$ with $|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y$ for some parameter $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B$.

If the quadratic forms $Q_{i}$ in (2.5) have no common linear factor, we will once again show using the Ekedahl sieve in Section 4 that a positive proportion of fibres of $\pi^{\prime}$ have an integer solution. If this is not the case, we will use a Lang-Weil type estimate for cubic forms due to Davenport and Lewis [12] to reach a similar conclusion.

To count solutions to $l_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$, we adapt work of Thunder [31] to obtain (see Section 5) an asymptotic formula whose error term depends on the successive minima of the lattice

$$
\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{k}: \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0\right\}
$$

It will be important to show that the first successive minimum of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$ is 'large' on average. In this endeavour, we are led to calculating the ranks of certain quadric bundles over algebraic function fields (see Section (3.3). Using this and bounds towards the Dimension Growth Conjecture, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.6, which is the carried out in Section 7.

With Theorems 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6 at hand, Theorem 2.1 follows from Lemma 2.5 by the following argument. Let $r$ denote the rank of the
fibration $\pi$ in (2.2). Suppose that $n-h-4 \leqslant r \leqslant n-h$. Then Theorem 2.1 will follow from Theorem 2.3 if $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, for some linear form $l$ and semidefinite quadratic form $F$. If this is not the case, Theorem 2.1 follows from the lower bound in Theorem 2.4, as $h \geqslant 8$ by assumption. Finally, if $r \leqslant n-h-5$, then $C(\mathbf{x})$ is linear in five or more variables by Lemma [2.5, whence $C(\mathbf{x})$ is of the shape in (2.5). By our assumption that $C$ is non-degenerate, we may appeal to Theorem [2.6 to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1.

We end this section by highlighting the following result, which is a consequence of Theorems 2.4 and 2.6.

Theorem 2.7. Let $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be a non-degenerate cubic form as in (2.1) and let $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$. Assume that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, for any linear form $l$ and any semidefinite quadratic form $F$ of rank $r$. Let $X \subset \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{n-1}$ denote the hypersurface defined by $C=0$. Let $\delta>0$. Then if $n \gg \delta^{-1}$, then

$$
N(X, B)>_{\delta} B^{n-7-\delta}
$$

Proof. By Theorem (1.2) and 1.2 it suffices to prove this for cubic hypersurfaces with $8 \leqslant h \leqslant 13$. As $Q_{\mathbf{y}} \neq l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, we may apply Theorem 2.4 if the rank of $\pi$ is at least $n-h-4$, and Theorem 2.6 otherwise. In the former case, observe that for each fixed $h, \gamma(n, h, \varepsilon) \rightarrow$ $2(h-1) / 3-2-\varepsilon$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, if $n \gg \delta^{-1}$, we get that $N(X, B) \gg B^{n-h-2+\frac{2(h-1)}{3}-\delta} \gg B^{n-7-\delta}$ and the corollary follows.

Theorem 2.7 is the limit of our method, and it would be interesting to prove that a similar lower bound also holds for cubic hypersurfaces as in the statement of Theorem 2.3. We end by remarking that with additional work, it is possible to remove the hypothesis $h \geqslant 8$ in Theorem [2.6 by appealing to [6] instead of [12, Theorem 3]. However, we have decided not to do this here, in light of the estimate in Theorem 2.7.

## 3. Preliminaries

3.1. Cubic forms over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$. In the proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we will need the following technical lemma, which asserts the existence of non-singular $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ points on the fibres $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ we will encounter. The lemma is identical to [34, Lemma 4]. However, we record a proof below (for $C$ that is absolutely irreducible) that was suggested to us by Tim Browning.
Lemma 3.1. Let $C\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l}, y_{l+1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$ be a cubic polynomial with integer coefficients in $n$ variables such that the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial C}{\partial x_{i}}$ do not all vanish identically. Assume that $C$ is irreducible. Let $p$ be
a prime and assume that $C=0$ has a non-singular solution over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$. Then there exists $v=v_{p} \geqslant 1$ and $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) \in\left(\mathbf{Z} / p^{2 v-1} \mathbf{Z}\right)^{n}$ such that

$$
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v-1} \text { and }\left(\frac{\partial C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{1}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{l}}\right) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p^{v}
$$

Proof. Given the existence of a non-singular solution the equation $C=$ 0 over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$, it follows from the $p$-adic implicit function theorem that the $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ solutions to $C=0$ are Zariski dense (see, for example, [8, Lemma 3.4]. The lemma follows from our assumption that the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial C}{\partial x_{i}}$ do not all vanish identically.
3.2. Non-singular solutions to polynomial equations. In this section, we will study the existence of non-singular solutions to quadratic polynomials. We begin with the following lemma, which is a generalisation of [7, Lemma 1].

Lemma 3.2. Let $p \neq 2$ be a prime. Let

$$
F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)=Q\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{r} B_{i} x_{i}+N
$$

be a quadratic polynomial with integer coefficients. Suppose that $Q$ is of rankr and that $p$ does not divide the discriminant of $Q$. Let $M$ denote the matrix associated with $Q$ and let $\boldsymbol{B}=\left(B_{1}, \ldots, B_{r}\right)$. Let $\varepsilon_{p}=1$ if $p \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and equal to $i$ if $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}: F(\mathbf{x})=0 \text { and } \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\right\}= & p^{m-1}+\varepsilon_{p}^{r}\left(\frac{\operatorname{det} M}{p}\right) \times \\
& p^{\frac{r}{2}-1} K_{r}\left(4 N-\boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}, p\right) \\
& -\kappa_{p},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
K_{r}(w ; p)= \begin{cases}\varepsilon_{p}\left(\frac{w}{p}\right) p^{1 / 2} & \text { if } r \text { is odd }  \tag{3.1}\\ p-1 & \text { if } p \mid w \text { and } r \text { is even } \\ -1 & \text { if } p \nmid w \text { and } r \text { is even }\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\kappa_{p}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } p \mid 4 N-\boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B} \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Let $\mathscr{N}^{*}$ denote the cardinality of non-singular solutions to the equation $F(\mathbf{x})=0$ in $\mathbf{F}_{p}$. Then we have

$$
\mathscr{N}^{*}=\frac{1}{p} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \bmod p \\ \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}}} \sum_{a(\bmod p)} e_{p}(a F(\mathbf{x})) .
$$

The condition $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ implies that $2 M \mathbf{x} \not \equiv-\boldsymbol{B} \bmod p$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} \not \equiv$ $-\overline{2} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B} \bmod p$. Here, and in the rest of the paper, for $c \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{*}, \bar{c}$ will denote the multiplicative inverse of $c$. As

$$
F\left(-\overline{2} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}\right) \equiv-\overline{4} \boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}+N \bmod p
$$

we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{N}^{*}= & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{a(\bmod p) \mathbf{x} \bmod p} e_{p}(a F(\mathbf{x})) \\
& -\frac{1}{p} \sum_{a(\bmod p)} e_{p}\left(-a\left(4 N-\boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}\right)\right. \\
= & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{a(\bmod p) \mathbf{x} \bmod p} e_{p}(a F(\mathbf{x}))-\kappa_{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

To analyse the first sum, we recall that there exists a matrix $R$ such that $R^{t} M R=\operatorname{Diag}\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{r}\right)$ with with the property that $p \nmid \operatorname{det} R$ and $p \nmid A_{i}$. Put $\boldsymbol{D}=R^{t} \boldsymbol{B}$. Replacing $\mathbf{x}$ with $R^{t} \mathbf{x}$, we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{N}^{*}= & p^{m-1}+\frac{1}{p} \sum_{a(\bmod p)}^{*} e_{p}(a N) \prod_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{x_{i}(\bmod p)} e_{p}\left(a\left(A_{i} x_{i}+D_{i} x_{i}\right)\right)-\kappa_{p} \\
= & p^{m-1}+\varepsilon_{p}^{r}\left(\frac{\operatorname{det} M}{p}\right) p^{\frac{r}{2}-1} \sum_{a(\bmod p)}^{*}\left(\frac{a}{p}\right)^{r} e_{p}\left(a\left(N-\overline{4} \sum_{i=1}^{r} \overline{A_{i}} D_{i}^{2}\right)\right. \\
& \quad-\kappa_{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\sum^{*}$ denotes restriction to coprime residue classes modulo $p$. The lemma follows from observing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{r} \overline{A_{i}} D_{i}^{2} & =\boldsymbol{D}^{t} \operatorname{Diag}\left(\overline{A_{1}}, \ldots, \overline{A_{r}}\right) D \\
& =\boldsymbol{B}^{t} R R^{-1} M^{-1}\left(R^{t}\right)^{-1} R^{t} \boldsymbol{B}=\boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

The evaluation of $K_{r}(w ; p)$ in (3.1) is well-known and this completes the proof of the lemma.

As an application of the preceding lemma, we have

Lemma 3.3. $\operatorname{Let} p \neq 2$ be a prime. Let $F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)=Q\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)+$ $L\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)+N$ be a quadratic polynomial with integer coefficients, where $Q(\mathbf{x})$ is a quadratic form of rank at least 3 over $\mathbf{F}_{p}, L(\mathbf{x})$ is a linear form and $N$ is an integer. Then

$$
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}: F(\mathbf{x})=0 \text { and } \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\right\}=p^{m-1}+O\left(p^{m-2}\right)
$$

Proof. Since $p \neq 2$, we can diagonalise $Q$ over $\mathbf{F}_{p}$. As a result, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$
F(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{r} A_{i} x_{i}^{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{m} B_{i} x_{i}+N
$$

with $r \geqslant 3, p \nmid A_{1}, \ldots, A_{r}$ and $p \mid A_{r+1}, \ldots, A_{m}$. Let $\mathscr{N}^{*}$ denote the number of solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}$ to the equation $F(\mathbf{x})=0$ such that $\nabla F(\mathbf{x})=\left(2 A_{1} x_{1}+B_{1}, \ldots, 2 A_{n} x_{m}+B_{m}\right) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p$. Since $p \mid A_{i}$ for $i>r$, we see that $\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p$ if and only if

$$
\left(2 A_{1} x_{1}+B_{1}, \ldots, 2 A_{r} x_{r}+B_{r}, B_{r+1}, \ldots, B_{m}\right) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p .
$$

Observe that if at least one of $B_{r+1}, \ldots, B_{m}$ is coprime to $p, B_{r+1}$, say, then fixing all the other $x_{i}$ fixes $x_{r+1}$, whence it follows that $\mathscr{N}^{*}=p^{m-1}$ in this case. As a result, we may assume for the rest of the proof that $p \mid B_{r+1}, \ldots, B_{n}$, in which case, we have $F(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left(A_{i} x_{i}^{2}+B_{i} x_{i}\right)+N$ over $\mathbf{F}_{p}$.

Consequently, we get from Lemma 3.2 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{N}^{*}= & p^{m-1} \\
& +\varepsilon_{p}^{r}\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{r} A_{i}}{p}\right) p^{m-\frac{r}{2}-1} K_{r}\left(4 N-\sum_{i=1}^{r} \overline{A_{i}} B_{i}^{2} ; p\right)-\kappa_{p} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The lemma follows from (3.1), since $r \geqslant 3$.
Next we will now record a well-known result due to Davenport on lifting non-singular solutions from prime moduli to congruences modulo prime powers.

Lemma 3.4. Let $G\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)$ be a polynomial equation with integer coefficients. Suppose that

$$
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}: G(\mathbf{x})=0 \text { and } \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\right\} \geqslant p^{m-1}+O\left(p^{m-2}\right)
$$

Then for all $t \geqslant 1$ we have

$$
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{t}: G(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{t}\right\} \geqslant p^{t(m-1)}+O\left(p^{t(m-1)-1}\right)
$$

Suppose that the set

$$
\left\{\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}: G(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1} \text { and } \nabla G(\mathbf{x}) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p^{v_{p}}\right\}
$$

is non-empty for some $v_{p} \geqslant 1$. Then for all $t \geqslant 2 v_{p}-1$ we have

$$
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{t}: G(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{t}\right\} \geqslant p^{-\left(2 v_{p}-1\right)(m-1)} p^{t(m-1)}
$$

Proof. This follows from [11, Lemma 17.1].
3.3. Calculating the rank of certain quadrics over function fields. Let $v \geqslant 4$ be an integer. Let $K$ denote the function field $\mathbf{Q}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{v}\right)$ in $m$ variables. Let $\psi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \psi_{v}(\mathbf{y})$ be integral quadratic forms. Set

$$
\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=x_{1} \psi_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+x_{v} \psi_{v}(\mathbf{y})
$$

Over $K$, the polynomial $\Psi$ is a quadratic form in $\mathbf{y}$. Note that we may diagonalise $\Psi$ over $K$. As a result, we have $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{r} u_{i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i}^{2}$, where $u_{i}(\mathbf{x}) \in K$ and $r=\operatorname{rank}_{K} \Psi$ is an invariant of $\Psi$. In this section, we will show that $\Psi$ is geometrically irreducible over $K$ provided that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and that $\Psi$ is non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$ variables. The following result is well-known.

Lemma 3.5. Suppose that $Q(\mathbf{z})$ is a quadratic form over an algebraically closed field $k$. Then $Q(\mathbf{z})$ is reducible if and only if $\operatorname{rank} Q \leqslant 2$.

Write $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant m} a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i} y_{j}$ with $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$ linear forms in $\mathbf{x}$ with integer coefficients. Suppose that $r=2$. This implies that $\operatorname{rank} \psi_{i} \leqslant 2$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant v$ and $\operatorname{rank} \psi=2$ for some $i$. Assume without loss of generality that rank $\psi_{1}=2$. Then by making a linear change of variables, we may assume that $\psi_{1}(\mathbf{y})=a_{1} y_{1}^{2}+a_{2} y_{2}^{2}$, for some non-zero integers $a_{1}$ and $a_{2}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.5 we see that $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$ is identically zero if $i, j \geqslant 3$. Also observe that $a_{k, l}(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of $x_{1}$ whenever $k \neq l$.

We clearly have $a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) \in K^{*}$. Completing the square, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})= & a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})\left(y_{1}+\frac{a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})}{2 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})} y_{2}+\ldots+\frac{a_{1, n}(\mathbf{x})}{2 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})} y_{m}\right)^{2}+  \tag{3.2}\\
& G\left(\mathbf{x}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
G\left(\mathbf{x}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=\sum_{2 \leqslant i, j \leqslant m}\left(a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})-\frac{a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) a_{1, j}(\mathbf{x})}{4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})}\right) y_{i} y_{j} .
$$

Set

$$
\Delta_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})=4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})-a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) a_{1, j}(\mathbf{x})
$$

Note that $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) / 2 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}), \Delta_{i, j}(\mathbf{x}) \in K$ and $\Delta_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})=-a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) a_{1, j}(\mathbf{x})$ if $i, j \geqslant 3$, as $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})=0$ whenever $i, j \geqslant 3$. Observe that $\operatorname{rank}_{K} \Psi=2$ if and only if $\operatorname{rank}_{K} G=1$. Suppose that this is the case. As $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of $x_{1}$, we find that $\Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) \in K^{*}$. As a result, we may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(\mathbf{x}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)=\frac{\Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})}{4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})}\left(y_{2}+\frac{\Delta_{2,3}(\mathbf{x})}{2 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})} y_{3}+\ldots+\frac{\Delta_{2, n}(\mathbf{x})}{2 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})} y_{m}\right)^{2} . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) \Delta_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})=\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x}) \Delta_{2, j}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i, j \geqslant 3$. The above equation constrains the possibilities for $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$, as we show below.
Lemma 3.6. Suppose that (3.4) holds for each $3 \leqslant i, j \leqslant m$. If $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$ for some $i \geqslant 3$, then $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})=a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$.

Proof. Observe that if $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$ for some $i \geqslant 3$, then appealing to (3.4) with $j=i$, we get that $4 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) \Delta_{i, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$. As $\Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) \in K^{*}$, we find that $\Delta_{i, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$, which in turn implies that $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$. As a consequence, we get that $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$, whence we also get that $a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$. The lemma follows.
Lemma 3.7. Suppose that (3.4) holds for each $3 \leqslant i, j \leqslant m$. Suppose that $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for some $3 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Then $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})=0$ and there exists $\kappa_{i} \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=\kappa_{i} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})=-\kappa_{i}^{2} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$.
Proof. As $i \geqslant 3$, we have that $\Delta_{i, i}(\mathbf{x})=-a_{1, i}^{2}(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore, applying (3.4) with $j=i$ we get that $\Delta_{2, i}^{2}(\mathbf{x})=-4 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) a_{1, i}^{2}(\mathbf{x})$. This implies that there exists a linear form $l_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) l_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $-4 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})=l_{i}^{2}(\mathbf{x})$. Note that by our hypothesis that $\Delta_{2, i} \in K^{*}$, we must have that $a_{1, i}, l_{i} \in K^{*}$.

Since $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$ divides $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})-a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}) a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$ and since $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of $x_{1}$, we see that $a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) \mid a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})$ over $\mathbf{Q}$. This implies that $a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=\kappa_{i} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$, for some $\kappa_{i} \in \mathbf{Q}$, which implies that $l_{i}(\mathbf{x})=4 \kappa_{i} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})-a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$.

Inserting this into the relation $l_{i}^{2}(\mathbf{x})=-4 \Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})$, we get that

$$
\left(4 \kappa_{i} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})-a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})\right)^{2}=-4\left(4 a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})-a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})^{2}\right)
$$

Reducing modulo the linear polynomial $a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$ in $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{x}]$, we see that $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$ is divisible by $a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$, whence we get that $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})=0$, as $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of $x_{1}$. This shows that $l_{i}(\mathbf{x})=4 \kappa_{i} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$, which implies that $\Delta_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})=-4 \kappa_{i}^{2} a_{1,1}^{2}(\mathbf{x})$. From this we obtain the relation $a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})=$ $-\kappa_{i}^{2} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$, which completes the proof of the lemma.

We are now ready to characterise all $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ such that $r=2$.
Lemma 3.8. Let $\psi_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ be integral quadratic forms and set $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{v} x_{i} \psi_{i}(\mathbf{y})$. Suppose that $\operatorname{rank}_{K} \Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=2$, where $K=\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})$. Then after a $\mathbf{Q}$-linear change of variables, $\Psi$ is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1}^{2}+a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1} y_{2}+a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) y_{2}^{2}, \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{1}+\kappa y_{2}\right)\left\{a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})\left(y_{1}-\kappa y_{2}\right)+\sum_{i=3}^{l} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i}\right\} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\kappa \in \mathbf{Q}, 3 \leqslant l \leqslant m$ is an integer and $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$ are linear forms in $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{x}]$.

Proof. Write $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant m} a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i} y_{j}$ with $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$ linear forms in $\mathbf{x}$ with integer coefficients. As $\operatorname{rank}_{K} \Psi=2$, equations (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) hold. Also recall that we may assume that $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})=0$ whenever $i, j \geqslant 3$.

We may assume for the rest of the proof that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, considered as an integral quadratic form (in $\mathbf{y}$ ), has at least 3 variables. For otherwise, one can write $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1}^{2}+a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1} y_{2}+a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x}) y_{2}^{2}$, where $a_{i, j}(\mathbf{x})$ are linear forms, which is of the shape in (3.5). Our task then will be to show that $\Psi$ is of the shape (3.6).

Suppose first that $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=0$ for each $i \geqslant 3$. Then we get from Lemma 3.6 and (3.2) and (3.3) that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ depends only on $y_{1}, y_{2}$. However, by the argument in the previous paragraph, this contradicts the non-degeneracy assumption on $\Psi$. Thus there exists at least one $i \geqslant 3$ such that $\Delta_{2, i}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$.

Let $S \subset\{3, \ldots, m\}$ denote the set of indices $s$ such that $\Delta_{2, s}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$. Then $S \neq \emptyset$. For ease of notation, we will assume that $S=\{3, \ldots, l\}$ for some $3 \leqslant l \leqslant m$. Then by Lemmas 3.6 we get that $a_{1, j}(\mathbf{x})=$ $a_{2, j}(\mathbf{x})=0$ for each $j>l$. As $S$ is non-empty, we get from Lemma 3.7 that $a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x})=0$.

Let $i \in S$. By Lemma 3.7 we get that and that there exists $\kappa_{i} \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x})=\kappa_{i} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x})$ and $a_{2,2}(\mathbf{x})=-\kappa_{i}^{2} a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})$. If $|S| \geqslant 2$, then by taking $i, j \in S$ with $i \neq j$, we see that $\kappa_{i}=\kappa_{j}=\kappa$, say.

As a result, we see get that there exists $\kappa \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & =a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1}^{2}+a_{1,2}(\mathbf{x}) y_{2}^{2}+\sum_{i=3}^{l} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{1} y_{i}+\sum_{i=3}^{l} a_{2, i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{2} y_{i} \\
& =a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})\left(y_{1}^{2}-\kappa^{2} y_{2}^{2}\right)+\left(y_{1}+\kappa y_{2}\right) \sum_{i=3}^{l} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i} \\
& =\left(y_{1}+\kappa y_{2}\right)\left\{a_{1,1}(\mathbf{x})\left(y_{1}-\kappa y_{2}\right)+\sum_{i=3}^{l} a_{1, i}(\mathbf{x}) y_{i}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.
Proposition 3.9. Let $v \geqslant 4$. Suppose that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=x_{1} \psi_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+$ $x_{v} \psi_{v}(\mathbf{y})$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and non-degenerate in the variables $x_{i}$. Then $\Psi$ is geometrically integral over $K=\mathbf{Q}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{v}\right)$.

Proof. Let $r=\operatorname{rank}_{K} \Psi$, as before. By Lemma 3.5, it will suffice to show that $r \geqslant 3$. Since $\Psi$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$, we may invoke Gauss's lemma to conclude that $\Psi$ is irreducible over $K$, whence $r \geqslant 2$ and $\Psi$ is geometrically reduced. If $r=2$, Lemma 3.8 shows that $\Psi$ is equal to (3.5) or equal to (3.6). However, the former case is not possible as $v \geqslant 4$ and $\Psi$ is non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$. The latter case is also not possible as $\Psi$ is assumed to be irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$. This shows that $r \geqslant 3$ and the proposition follows.

## 4. Solubility of fibres of $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$

4.1. Introduction. Let $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be as in (2.1) or in (2.5) and let $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ be the morphisms in (2.2) and (2.6) respectively with fibres $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$. In this section, we will show using the Ekedahl sieve [16] that a positive proportion of fibres $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ (a notion we will make precise below), of $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ have non-singular $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ points for each prime $p$. Since the fibres of $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are cut out by the vanishing of equations of degree 1 or 2 , the Hasse principle holds. If we assume that these fibres are also soluble over $\mathbf{R}$, we obtain solubility over $\mathbf{Z}$. The main results are as follows.

Theorem 4.1. Set $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right)$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}): \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{n-k} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

be an irreducible cubic form with integer coefficients, with $Q_{i}$ and $q_{j}$ quadratic forms and $R$ a cubic form. Suppose that $C$ has a non-singular solution over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ for each prime $p$. Let $Z$ denote the hypersurface cut
out by $C=0$ and let $\pi$ be as in (2.2) with fibres $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$. Assume that $\operatorname{rank} \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ over the function field $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{y})$ is at least 5 and that the minors of order 3 of $M[\mathbf{y}]$, the matrix associated to the quadratic form $\sum_{i=1}^{k} y_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$, have no common factor over $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$. Let $\Omega_{\infty} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n-k}$ be a compact set.

Then there exists an integer $M$ such that for each $Y \geqslant 1$ there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y) \subset Y \Omega_{\infty} \cap \mathbf{Z}^{k}$ such that the following statements hold.
(1) Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$. If $p \mid M$, there exists an integer $v_{p}=v_{p}(C)$ that depends only on $C$ such that there exists $\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ with the property that $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ and $\frac{\partial C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_{i}} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p^{v}$ for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-k$. If $p \nmid M$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\#\{\mathbf{x}(\bmod p): C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & \equiv 0 \bmod p, \mathbf{x} \text { non-singular }\} \\
& =p^{n-k-1}+O\left(p^{n-k-2}\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where the implied constant is independent of $p$.
(2) If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$, the fibre $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ over $\mathbf{y}$ has a smooth point over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$.
(3) There exists a constant $\sigma=\sigma\left(C, \Omega_{\infty}\right)>0$ such that

$$
\lim _{Y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\# \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)}{Y^{k}} \rightarrow \sigma
$$

In particular, if $Y$ is large enough, then we have

$$
\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y) \gg Y^{k}
$$

Theorem 4.2. Set $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-k}\right)$ and $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right)$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}): x_{1} Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+x_{n-k} Q_{n-k}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

be an irreducible cubic form with integer coefficients, with $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ quadratic forms and $R(\mathbf{y})$ a cubic form. Assume that $Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{n-k}(\mathbf{y})$ have no common factors. Suppose that $k, n-k \geqslant 2$, that $C$ is irreducible and that $C$ has a non-singular zero over every completion $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$. Let $Z$ denote the hypersurface cut out by $C=0$ and let $\pi^{\prime}$ be as in (2.6). Let $\Omega_{\infty} \subset \mathbf{R}^{k}$ be a compact set such that for any $Y \geqslant 1$, we have that the fibre $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ of $\pi^{\prime}$ over $\mathbf{y}$ has a real point for any $\mathbf{y} \in Y \Omega_{\infty}$.

Then for each $Y \geqslant 1$ there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y) \subset Y \Omega_{\infty} \cap \mathbf{Z}^{k}$ such that the following statements hold.
(1) For any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$, the fibre $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ of $\pi^{\prime}$ over $\mathbf{y}$ has a point over $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})\right)<_{C} 1$.
(2) There exists a constant $\sigma=\sigma\left(C, \Omega_{\infty}\right)>0$ such that

$$
\lim _{Y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\# \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)}{Y^{k}} \rightarrow \sigma
$$

In particular, if $Y$ is large enough, then we have

$$
\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y) \gg Y^{k}
$$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1, Let $\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{J}$ denote the minors of order 3 of $M[\mathbf{y}]$. Define the variety

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{L} \subset \mathbf{A}^{k}: \phi_{1}(\mathbf{y})=\ldots=\phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})=0 . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then by hypothesis, $\mathscr{L}$ is codimension at least 2 in $\mathbf{A}^{k}$. We will now define certain subsets $\Omega_{p} \subset \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}$ for each prime $p$.

Let $M^{\prime}$ denote the product of the primes that divide all the coefficients of each of the $\phi_{i}$ in (4.4). Set $M=2 M^{\prime}$. Lemma 3.1] shows that for each $p \mid M$ there exists an integer $v_{p} \geqslant 1$ and $\mathbf{r} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ such that the equation $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ is soluble with the proviso that $\frac{\partial C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{i}} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p^{v}$ for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-k$. Define for $p \mid M$

$$
\Omega_{p}=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}: \mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{r} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}\right\} .
$$

As $\Omega_{p}$ is defined by a congruence condition, it follows that $\mu_{p}\left(\Omega_{p}\right)>0$, where $\mu_{p}$ is the normalised Haar measure on $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$. If $p \nmid M$, put

$$
\Omega_{p}=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}: \mathbf{y} \bmod p \notin \mathscr{L}\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right)\right\}
$$

with $\mathscr{L}$ as in (4.4). Observe that if $\mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{p}$, then $\mathbf{y}+p \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k} \subset \Omega_{p}$, whence $\mu_{p}\left(\Omega_{p}\right)>0$, where $\mu_{p}$ is the normalised Haar measure of $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$.

Set

$$
\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{k} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}: \mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{p} \text { for all primes } p\right\}
$$

where $\Omega_{\infty}$ is as in the statement of the theorem. Since $\mathscr{L}$ is of codimension at least 2, we see that [4, Equation (3.4)] holds. We have also verified that $\mu_{p}\left(\Omega_{p}\right)>0$ for each prime $p$. Thus the hypotheses of [4, Proposition 3.2] are all satisfied, whence

$$
\lim _{Y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\# \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)}{Y^{k}} \rightarrow \sigma
$$

for some $\sigma=\sigma\left(\Omega_{\infty}, C\right)>0$. This proves the third statement of the theorem. We will now prove the first two statements.

Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$. If $p \mid M$, we get from the construction of $\Omega_{p}$ that $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ and $\frac{\partial C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\partial x_{i}} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p^{v}$ for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-k$. For $p \nmid M$, the fact that $\mathbf{y} \bmod p \in \Omega_{p}$ implies that $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbf{F}_{p}} M[\mathbf{y}] \geqslant 3$. Therefore, the estimate (4.2) follows from an application of Lemma 3.3. This proves the first statement of the theorem. The second statement follows from invoking Hensel's lemma, and the theorem follows.

Remark 4.3. Let $\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$ be as in the statement of the preceding theorem and let $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right) \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$. Set $g=\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right)$. Then observe that for $p \mid M$, the $p$-adic valuation, $v_{p}(g) \leqslant 2 v_{p}-1$, where $v_{p}$ is as in the definition of $\Omega_{p}$. In addition, we also have $p \nmid g$ for each prime $p \nmid M$, by construction of $\Omega_{p}$. Thus we get that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)<_{C} 1$ for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$.
4.3. Proof of Theorem 4.2. In order to apply Ekedahl's sieve to study the solubility of (4.3), we will require the following lemma.
Lemma 4.4. Let $k$. Suppose that $Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{n-k}(\mathbf{y})$ have no common factors. Let $\mathscr{L} \subset \mathbf{A}^{k}: Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})=\ldots=Q_{n-k}(\mathbf{y})=0$. Suppose that $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ have no common linear factors. Suppose that $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}$ such that $\mathbf{y}(\bmod p) \notin \mathscr{L}\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right)$. Then the fibre $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ of $\pi^{\prime}$ over $\mathbf{y}$ has a smooth point over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$.
Proof. Under the hypothesis of the lemma, it follows that $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \not \equiv$ $0(\bmod p)$ for some index $i$. Thus we get a solution $\mathbf{x}(\bmod p)$ to the linear equation $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \equiv 0(\bmod p)$. This is non-singular, by definition, which we can lift to a solution in $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ by Hensel's lemma.
Proof of Theorem 4.2. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we begin by defining certain subsets $\Omega_{p}$ for each prime $p$. We will show for each prime $p$ that if $\mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{p}$, then $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ has a smooth point over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$. Recall that the fibres $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ of $\pi^{\prime}$ are cut out by the vanishing of linear polynomials, so $Z_{\mathbf{y}}$ has a point over $\mathbf{Z}$ if it is everywhere locally soluble.

Let $g$ denote the greatest common factor of the coefficients of the quadratic forms $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$. Then $g<_{C} 1$. Let $p$ be a prime. If $p \mid g$, set

$$
\Omega_{p}=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}: \mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{r} \bmod p^{2 v-1}\right\}
$$

where $\mathbf{r}$ and $p$ are as in the statement of Lemma 3.1. As $\Omega_{p}$ is defined by a congruence condition, it is clear that $\mu_{p}\left(\Omega_{p}\right)>0$.

If $p \nmid g$, define

$$
\Omega_{p}=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k}: \mathbf{y}(\bmod p) \notin \mathscr{L}\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right)\right\}
$$

where $\mathscr{L}$ is the variety defined in Lemma 4.4. Note that $\mathscr{L}$ has codimension at least 2 since $n-k \geqslant 2$, by assumption. Since the quadratic forms $Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{m}(\mathbf{y})$ are coprime, it is clear that $\Omega_{p} \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, if $\mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{p}$, then $\mathbf{y}+p \mathbf{Z}_{p}^{k} \subset \Omega_{p}$, whence $\mu_{p}\left(\Omega_{p}\right)>0$.

Set

$$
\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{k} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}: \mathbf{y} \in \Omega_{p} \text { for all primes } p\right\}
$$

where $\Omega_{\infty}$ is as in the statement of the theorem. Observe that if $\mathbf{y} \in$ $\mathscr{C}_{k}(Y)$, then

$$
\operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{m}(\mathbf{y})\right)<_{C} 1
$$

This proves the first statement of Theorem4.2. Since $\mathscr{L}$ is of codimension at least 2 , the second statement readily follows from [4, Proposition 3.2]. This completes the proof.

## 5. Counting solutions to linear equations

Let $\mathbf{a}=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{n}$ i.e., that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)=1$ and let $b \in \mathbf{Z}$. Set

$$
N(\mathbf{a}, b, B)=\#\left\{\left(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2}+1\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B: \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} x_{i}+b=0\right\} .
$$

In this section, we will be obtain an asymptotic formula for $N(\mathbf{a}, b, B)$ that is uniform in the coefficients $a_{i}$ and $b$. The main result is the following proposition, which we will prove by appealing to work of Thunder 31.

Proposition 5.1. Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{n}$ and let $b \in \mathbf{Z}$. Suppose that $B \geqslant$ $\left(|b| /\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}$, for some $\eta>0$. Let $\lambda_{1}$ denote the length of the smallest non-zero vector in the lattice

$$
\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{n}:\langle\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}\rangle=0\right\} .
$$

Then there exists a constant $c=c(n)>0$, independent of a and $b$, such that

$$
N(\mathbf{a}, b, B)=\frac{c B^{n-1}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}+O\left(\frac{B^{n-1-\eta}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}\right)+O\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{B^{j}}{\lambda_{1}^{j}}\right)
$$

and the implicit constants in the error terms depend only on $n$.
We will also need the following straightforward generalisation of Proposition 5.1. For an integer $g$ set

$$
N_{g}(\mathbf{a}, b, B)=\#\left\{\left(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2}+1\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B:(\mathbf{x}, g)=1 \text { and } \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} x_{i}+b=0\right\} .
$$

Then we have
Corollary 5.2. Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{n}$ and let $b \in \mathbf{Z}$. Suppose that $B \geqslant$ $\left(|b| /\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}$, for some $\eta>0$. Let $\lambda_{1}$ denote the length of the smallest non-zero vector in the lattice

$$
\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{n}:\langle\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}\rangle=0\right\}
$$

Then there exists a constant $c=c(n)>0$, independent of $\mathbf{a}, b$ and $g$, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{g}(\mathbf{a}, b, B)= & \prod_{p \mid(b, g)}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\right) \frac{c B^{n-1}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}+O\left(d(g) \frac{B^{n-1-\eta}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}\right) \\
& +O\left(d(g) \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{B^{j}}{\lambda_{1}^{j}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $d(g)$ is the number of divisors of $g$ and the implicit constants in the error terms depend only on $n$.

Observe that Corollary 5.2 follows from Proposition 5.1 since

$$
N_{g}(\mathbf{a}, b, B)=\sum_{d \mid(b, g)} \mu(d) N\left(\mathbf{a}, b / d, \sqrt{B^{2} / d^{2}-1}\right)
$$

and the fact that $\sqrt{B^{2} / d^{2}-1}=B / d+O(d / B)$.
5.1. Preliminaries. Define

$$
S=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}^{n+1}: \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} x_{i}+b x_{n+1}=0\right\}
$$

Then $S$ is an $n$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbf{Q}^{n+1}$ and $S \not \subset \mathbf{Q}^{n}$. Let $V=$ $S \cap \mathbf{Q}^{n}$, whence $V$ is an $n-1$ dimensional subspace of $S$ and there exists $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbf{Q}^{n}$ such that $S=\mathbf{Q}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, 1) \oplus V$. Clearly we must have $\langle\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\rangle+b=0$ and

$$
V=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Q}^{n}: \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}=0\right\} .
$$

Let $V_{\mathbf{R}}^{\perp}$ denote the orthogonal complement of $V_{\mathbf{R}}$. Let $\mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n-1}$ be a basis for $V$. Then $V_{\mathbf{R}}^{\perp}$ is spanned by $\mathbf{a}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{e}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{n-1}$, a form a basis for $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. Thus we may write $\boldsymbol{\beta}=\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{i} \mathbf{e}_{i}+\lambda_{n} \mathbf{a}$ for some $\lambda_{i} \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $\pi: \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow V_{\mathbf{R}}^{\perp}$ denote the projection map onto $V_{\mathbf{R}}^{\perp}$. Then we have $\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta})=\lambda_{n} \mathbf{a}$. However, since $\mathbf{a} . \beta=-b=\lambda_{n}\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}^{2}$, we get that

$$
\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta})=-b \hat{\mathbf{a}} /\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}
$$

with $\hat{\mathbf{a}}=\mathbf{a} /\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}$.
5.2. Counting lattice points in certain domains. Set $I(V)=V \cap$ $\mathbf{Z}^{n}$. Then $I(V)=\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$. We may assume without loss of generality that $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbf{Z}^{n}$. Define

$$
\lambda(\mathbf{Z}, B)=\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in I(V):\left(\|\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{2}^{2}+1\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B\right\}
$$

Then we clearly have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda(\mathbf{Z}, B)=N(\mathbf{a}, b, B) \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Write $\boldsymbol{\beta}=\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}+\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta})$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime} \in V_{\mathbf{R}}$. Then for $\mathbf{x} \in I(V)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}\rangle & =\left\langle\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}, \mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}\right\rangle+\langle\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \pi(\boldsymbol{\beta})\rangle \\
& =\left\langle\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}, \mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}\right\rangle+\frac{b^{2}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

As a result, we have

$$
\lambda(\mathbf{Z}, B)=\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in I(V):\left(\left\|\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{b^{2}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}^{2}}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B\right\}
$$

This shows that $\lambda(\mathbf{Z}, B)$ is the number of lattice points in a domain that is a translate of a ball of radius $B$.

Now, $I(V)$ is an $n-1$ dimensional lattice in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. Therefore there exists a linear transformation $P: \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ such that $P$ induces an isomorphism $V_{\mathbf{R}} \simeq \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $P\left(V_{\mathbf{R}}^{\perp}\right)=\mathbf{0}$. In particular, $P(I(V))$ is a lattice of full rank in $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. Furthermore, $\|P(\mathbf{x})\|_{2}=\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in V_{\mathbf{R}}$. Let $P\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}\right)=\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime \prime}$, for some $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime \prime} \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. Set $\frac{b}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}=a$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda(\mathbf{Z}, B)=\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in P(I(V)):\left(\left\|\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B\right\} . \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

5.3. Volume computations. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{n}(B)=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^{n}:\left(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B\right\} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{D}_{n}(B)=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^{n}:\left(\left\|\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{2}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B\right\} \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since translations preserve volume, we have vol $\widetilde{D}_{n}(B)=\operatorname{vol} D_{n}(B)$.
Lemma 5.3. Let $n \geqslant 2$. Then there exists a constant $C(n)>0$ such that

$$
\operatorname{vol} D_{n}(B)=C(n) \int_{\left(u^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u^{n-1} d u
$$

Proof. Let $V_{n}(B)$ denote the volume in question. Suppose first that $n=2$. Then by switching to polar coordinates we get

$$
V_{2}(B)=\pi \int_{\left(u^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u d u .
$$

Suppose next that $n \geqslant 3$. Then we proceed recursively in the following manner. By Fubini, we write

$$
V_{n}(B)=\int_{\left(x_{n}^{2}+x_{n-1}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} x_{i}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} d x_{n-1} d x_{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} d x_{i}
$$

Switching to polar coordinates we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{n}(B)= & \int_{-\pi / 2}^{\pi / 2} d \theta \int_{\left(u^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} x_{i}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u d u \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} d x_{i} \\
= & \left(\int_{-\pi / 2}^{\pi / 2} d \theta\right)\left(\int_{-\pi / 2}^{\pi / 2} \cos \theta d \theta\right) \times \\
& \int_{\left(u^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n-3} x_{i}^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u^{2} d u \prod_{i=1}^{n-3} d x_{i} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proceeding in this fashion, after $n-2$ steps we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{n}(B) & =\prod_{j=0}^{n-2} \int_{-\pi / 2}^{\pi / 2} \cos ^{j} \theta d \theta \int_{\left(u^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u^{n-1} d u \\
& =\prod_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{j+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{j}{2}+1\right)} \int_{\left(u^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u^{n-1} d u
\end{aligned}
$$

by [17, Equation 3.621.5], for example. Taking

$$
C(n)=\prod_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{j+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{j}{2}+1\right)}=\frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}
$$

completes the proof.
Lemma 5.4. For $1 \leqslant l \leqslant n$ let $V(l, B)$ (resp. $\widetilde{V}(l, B)$ ) denote the sum of the volumes of the regions $D_{l}(B)$ defined in (5.3) (resp. $\widetilde{D}_{l}(B)$ defined in (5.4)) projected onto $\mathbf{R}^{l}$ by setting $n-l$ coordinates to be zero. Set $V(0, B)=\widetilde{V}(0, B)=1$. Suppose that $|a| \leqslant B^{1-\eta}$ for some $\eta>0$. Then there exists constants $c(l, n) \neq 0$ such that

$$
\widetilde{V}(l, B)=V(l, B)=B^{l}\left(c(l, n)+O\left(B^{-\eta}\right)\right) .
$$

Proof. If $l=0$, then there is nothing to prove. So we may suppose that $1 \leqslant l \leqslant n$. A calculation similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 5.3 shows that there exist constants $c(l, n)$ such that

$$
V(l, B)=c(l, n) \int_{\left(u^{2}+a^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B} u^{l-1} d u .
$$

Set $u=a w$. Then we have

$$
V(l, B)=c(l, n) a^{l} \int_{\left(w^{2}+1\right)^{1 / 2} \leqslant B / a} w^{l-1} d w .
$$

Next, make the change of variables $w^{2}+1=x$. Then we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
V(l, B) & =\frac{c(l, n)}{2} a^{l} \int_{1 \leqslant x \leqslant B^{2} / a^{2}}(x-1)^{\frac{l-2}{2}} d x \\
& =\frac{a^{l} c(l, n)}{2} \int_{0}^{B^{2} / a^{2}-1} x^{\frac{l-2}{2}} d x \\
& =\frac{a^{l} c(l, n)}{2 l}\left(B^{2} / a^{2}-1\right)^{\frac{l}{2}} \\
& =B^{l}\left(c(l, n)+O\left(a^{2} / B^{2}\right)\right)=B^{l}\left(c(n, l)+O\left(B^{-\eta}\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

say, since $|a| \leqslant B^{1-\eta}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

### 5.4. Proof of Proposition 5.1. For $1 \leqslant i<n-1$ let

$$
\mathrm{d}_{i}=\min _{\substack{L \subset I(V) \\ \operatorname{rank} L=i}} \operatorname{det} L
$$

and set $\mathrm{d}_{0}=1$. By (5.1) and (5.2) and by invoking [31, Theorem 5] we get that

$$
N(\mathbf{a}, b, B)=\frac{V(4, B)}{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{2}}+O\left(\sum_{l=0}^{n-2} \frac{V(l, B)}{\mathrm{d}_{l}}\right)
$$

where $V(l, B)$ are as in the statement of Lemma 5.4.
Let $\lambda_{1} \leqslant \lambda_{2} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \lambda_{n-1}$ denote the successive minima of the lattice $I(V)$ with respect to the unit ball. Then by Minkowski's second theorem, for $0 \leqslant l \leqslant n-2$, it follows that $\mathrm{d}_{l} \gg \lambda_{1} \ldots \lambda_{l} \geqslant \lambda_{1}^{l}$. Proposition 5.1 now follows from Lemma 5.4.

## 6. Proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. Let $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be a cubic form in $n$ variables with $h(C)=h$, as in (2.1). Let $Z \subset \mathbf{A}^{n}$ be the cubic hypersurface $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=0$. Let $\pi$ be as in (2.2). Then the fibre over a point $\mathbf{y}$ is the affine quadric $Z_{\mathbf{y}}: F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) . \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will denote the quadratic part of $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=y_{1} F_{1}(\mathbf{x})+\ldots+y_{h} F_{h}(\mathbf{x}) . \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $M[\mathbf{y}]$ be the matrix associated with the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$. Let $r=r(C)$ denote the rank of the fibration $\pi$ (see Definition (2.2).

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)=\#\left\{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B:(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=1 \text { and } F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0\right\} \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for any $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B$, we have

$$
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \\|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y}} N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)
$$

To prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, we will show that there are 'many' $\mathbf{y}$ so that the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble, and for each such $\mathbf{y}$ we will use the circle method to obtain a lower bound for $N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)$. While studying the solubility of the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$, we will encounter two distinct classes of quadratic forms $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ : forms that can be written as $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l(\mathbf{y}) F(\mathbf{x})$, with $l$ linear and $F$ a non-singular definite quadratic form in $r(C)$ variables, and those that cannot be written in this form.

Observe that if $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l(\mathbf{y}) F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)$, then

$$
M[\mathbf{y}]=l(\mathbf{y}) N \quad \text { with } \quad N=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
N_{1} & \mathbf{0}_{r \times n-r}  \tag{6.4}\\
\mathbf{0}_{n-r \times r} & \mathbf{0}_{n-r \times n-r}
\end{array}\right),
$$

with $N_{1}$ a symmetric definite matrix of order $r$ and $\mathbf{0}_{u \times v} \in \operatorname{Mat}_{u, v}$ is the zero matrix. If this the case, we will say that $C$ satisfies

Hypothesis 1. Let $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ be as in (6.1) and (6.2). There exists a linear form $l(\mathbf{y})$ and a definite quadratic form $F(\mathbf{x})$ of rank $r=$ $r(C)$ such that after a linear change of variables, $Q_{\mathbf{y}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-h}\right)=$ $l(\mathbf{y}) F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)$, or equivalently, that there exists a symmetric definite matrix $N_{1}$ of order $r$ such that (6.4) holds.

Note that if $C$ satisfies Hypothesis 1, then for each fixed $\mathbf{y}$ the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is definite.
6.1. Proof of Theorem [2.3. To prove the theorem, we may assume that $h \leqslant 13$, for otherwise, the result is superseded by Theorem 1.2, We have by assumption that $r \geqslant \min \{n-h-4,5\}$. By the hypothesis of Theorem [2.3, $C$ satisfies Hypothesis [1. We may therefore assume without loss of generality that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=y_{1} F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)$ with $r \geqslant 5$. Thus we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{6.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will assume that $F$ is positive-definite, the negative-definite case can be handled similarly. We will prove the following propositions, from which Theorem 2.3 easily follows, since $n-h-4 \leqslant r \leqslant n-h$, by assumption.

Proposition 6.1. Let $C$ be as in (6.5) with $F$ positive definite. Assume that $y_{1} \mid q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Then we have

$$
N(B) \gg B^{r-2+\frac{2}{3}(n-r-1)} .
$$

Proposition 6.2. Let $C$ be as in (6.5) with $F$ positive definite. Assume that $y_{1} \nmid q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Then we have

$$
N(B) \gg B^{n-h-2+\frac{h-1}{2}}
$$

Let $M$ denote the matrix associated to $F$ and let $\Delta$ denote the discriminant of $F(\mathbf{x})$. The key tool we will use to count solutions to (6.5) is the following result.

Proposition 6.3. Let $F$ be a non-singular, positive-definite quadratic form of rank $r$ and determinant $\Delta$. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbf{Z}^{r}$ and let $P^{2}=N$ be an integer with $P$ large. Suppose that $F(\boldsymbol{\xi})-N \equiv 0(\bmod 2 \Delta)$. Assume that $|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \ll P$. Let $w(\mathbf{x})$ be a smooth, positive bump function around a real solution to $F(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi} / P)=1$. Define

$$
M(F, N)=\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, 2 \Delta)=1 \\ F(\mathbf{x}+\xi)=N}} w\left(P^{-1} \mathbf{x}\right)
$$

Then there exist constants $c=c_{F, N}>0$ that depends only on $F$ and $N$, and $\delta>0$ such that

$$
M(F, N)=c \prod_{p \mid 2 \Delta}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^{r}}\right) P^{r-2}+O\left(P^{r-2-\delta}\right)
$$

Moreover, we have the bound $c=c_{F, N} \gg 1$, where the implied constant depends only on the coefficients of $F$.

In order to prove the proposition, we will need the following lemma.
Lemma 6.4. Let $F$ be a non-singular positive definite quadratic form of rank $r$ with determinant $\Delta$. Let d be a squarefree integer such that $d \mid 2 \Delta$. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbf{Z}^{r}$ and let $P^{2}=N$ be an integer with $P$ large. Suppose that $F(\boldsymbol{\xi})-N \equiv 0(\bmod 2 \Delta)$. Assume that $|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \ll P$. Assume that $|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \ll P$. Set

$$
M_{d}(F, N)=\sum_{\substack{F(\mathbf{x})=N \\ \mathbf{x} \equiv \xi(\bmod d)}} w\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\xi}}{P}\right) .
$$

Then there exist constants $c=c_{F, N}>0$ that depends only on $F$ and $N$ and $\delta>0$ that are independent of $d$ such that

$$
M_{d}(F, N)=\frac{c P^{r-2}}{d^{r}}+O\left(P^{r-2-\delta}\right)
$$

Moreover, we have the bound $c \gg 1$, where the implied constant depends only on the coefficients of $F$.

Proof. The proof of the lemma is a straightforward adaptation of [19, Theorem 4], so we will only give a brief sketch. We begin by remarking that since all constants in our work are allowed to depend on $C$, we have that $d \ll \Delta \ll 1$. Using the smooth $\delta$-function [19, Theorem 1], we may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{d}(F, N)=\frac{c_{P}}{d^{r}} \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{Z}^{r}} \sum_{q \ll P} q^{-(n-h)} S_{d, q}(\mathbf{c}) I_{q}(\mathbf{c}), \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{P}=1+O_{J}\left(P^{-J}\right)$, for any integer $J \geqslant 1$,

$$
S_{d, q}(\mathbf{c})=\sum_{\substack{a(\bmod q) \\
\multirow{2}{c}{\left(\begin{array}{c}
\bmod d q) \\
\mathbf{b}=\xi(\bmod d)
\end{array}\right.}( \begin{array} { c } 
{ \operatorname { m o d } d q ) \\
\mathbf { b } = \xi ( \operatorname { m o d } d ) }
\end{array}}} e_{q}(a(F(\mathbf{b})-N)) e_{d q}(\mathbf{b} . \mathbf{c}),
$$

and

$$
I_{q}(\mathbf{c})=\int w\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\xi}}{P}\right) h\left(r, \frac{F(\mathbf{x})-N}{N}\right) e_{d q}(-\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{x}) d \mathbf{x}
$$

with $r=q / P$. The main difference between the exponential sum $S_{q}(\mathbf{c})$ defined above and the analogous sum in Heath-Brown's work is the appearance of the additional congruence condition modulo $d$. In place of [19, Lemma 23], we have the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{d, q}(\mathbf{c})=S_{1, q_{1}}\left(\overline{q_{2}} \mathbf{c}\right) S_{d, q_{2}}\left(\overline{q_{1}} \mathbf{c}\right), \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $q=q_{1} q_{2}$ with $\left(q_{1}, d\right)=1$ and $q_{2} \mid d^{\infty}$ and $\overline{q_{2}}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\overline{q_{1}}\right)$ denotes the multiplicative inverse of $q_{2}\left(\bmod q_{1}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.q_{1}\left(\bmod q_{2}\right)\right)$. Using (6.7) and by arguing as in the proof of [19, Lemma 28], we have for $|\mathbf{c}| \ll P$ that

$$
\sum_{q \leqslant X} S_{q}(\mathbf{c}) \ll_{\varepsilon} X^{\frac{3+r}{2}+\varepsilon} P^{\varepsilon} .
$$

By [19, Lemma 19], it follows that $I_{q}(\mathbf{c}) \ll P^{-A}$ unless $|\mathbf{c}| \ll P^{\varepsilon}$. For $\mathbf{c}$ in this range, [19, Lemma 22] ensures that for any $\varepsilon>0$ we have

$$
I_{q}(\mathbf{c}) \ll_{\varepsilon} P^{n}\left(\frac{P^{2}|\mathbf{c}|}{q^{2}}\right)^{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{P|\mathbf{c}|}{q}\right)^{1-\frac{r}{2}}
$$

Combining these estimates, we have that

$$
\frac{c_{P}}{d^{r}} \sum_{\mathbf{c} \neq \mathbf{0}} \sum_{q \ll P} q^{-r} S_{q}(\mathbf{c}) I_{q}(\mathbf{c}) \ll_{\varepsilon} P^{\frac{r}{2}+\varepsilon} .
$$

All that remains is to evaluate the main term

$$
\frac{c_{P}}{d^{r}} \sum_{q \ll P} q^{-r} S_{q}(\mathbf{0}) I_{q}(\mathbf{0})
$$

Observe that (6.7) ensures that

$$
S_{q}(\mathbf{0})=\sum_{a(\bmod q)}^{*} \sum_{\mathbf{b}(\bmod q)} e_{q}(a(F(\mathbf{b})-N))
$$

which is identical to the exponential sum in the proof of [19, Theorem 4]. Also,

$$
I_{q}(\mathbf{0})=P^{r} \int w(\mathbf{x}) h(r, F(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi} / P)-1) d \mathbf{x}
$$

By definition of the function $w(\mathbf{x})$ it follows from [19, Theorem 3 and Lemma 13] that $I_{q}(\mathbf{0})=P^{r}\left(c_{\infty}+O_{N}\left((q / P)^{N}\right)\right)$, where

$$
c_{\infty}=\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}(2 \varepsilon)^{-1} \int_{|F(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi} / P)-1|<\varepsilon} w(\mathbf{x}) d \mathbf{x}>0 .
$$

Note that although $c_{\infty}$ has mild dependence on $P$, it is clear that $c_{\infty} \gg 1$ uniformly in $P$. Proceeding as in the evaluation of the main term in [19, Theorem 4], we get that

$$
\frac{c_{P}}{d^{r}} \sum_{q \ll P} q^{-r} S_{q}(\mathbf{0}) I_{q}(\mathbf{0})=\frac{c_{F, N} c_{\infty} P^{r-2}}{d^{r}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(P^{\frac{r}{2}+\varepsilon}\right)
$$

with $c_{F, N}=\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^{-r} S_{q}(\mathbf{0})$. Note that $c_{F, N}>0$ since $\operatorname{rank} F \geqslant 5$. Setting $c=c_{\infty} c_{F, N}$ we obtain the asymptotic formula in the statement of the lemma. The lower bound $c>_{F} 1$ follows from [7, Proposition 2], since $r=\operatorname{rank} F \geqslant 5$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
M(F, N) & =\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, 2 \Delta)=1 \\
F(\mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi})=N}} w\left(P^{-1} \mathbf{x}\right) \\
& =\sum_{d \mid 2 \Delta} \mu(d) \sum_{F(d \mathbf{x}+\boldsymbol{\xi})=N} w\left(P^{-1} d \mathbf{x}\right) \\
& =\sum_{d \mid 2 \Delta} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{F(\mathbf{x})=N \\
\mathbf{x}=\boldsymbol{\xi}(\bmod d)}} w\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\xi}}{P}\right)  \tag{6.8}\\
& =\sum_{d \mid 2 \Delta} \mu(d) M_{d}(F, N),
\end{align*}
$$

say. Note that $F(\boldsymbol{\xi})-N \equiv 0(\bmod 2 \Delta)$, by assumption. As a result, the sum $M_{d}(F, N)$ is well-defined. The Proposition is an immediate consequence of Lemma 6.4.

Turning to the proof of Propositions 6.1 and 6.2, we will set $\mathbf{y}=$ $2 \Delta\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)=2 \Delta(1, \mathbf{z})$ in (6.5). Then we get

$$
\begin{align*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=2 \Delta & F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)+4 \Delta^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)  \tag{6.9}\\
& +8 \Delta^{3} R\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

For this choice of $\mathbf{y}$, we see that (6.5) is soluble so long as

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)+2 \Delta \sum_{j=1}^{n-h} x_{j} q_{j}(1, \mathbf{z})+4 \Delta^{2} R(1, \mathbf{z})=0 \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that this equation has a non-trivial solution in $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$ provided that it is soluble modulo $\Delta$. However, this follows since $\operatorname{rank} F \geqslant 5$. Therefore, in order to count solutions to (6.10), all that is required is to ensure solubility over $\mathbf{R}$.

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(\mathbf{z})=\left(q_{1}(1, \mathbf{z}), \ldots, q_{r}(1, \mathbf{z})\right) . \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe that the matrix $\operatorname{Adj} M$, the adjoint matrix of $M$, has integer coefficients, whence

$$
\Delta^{2} F^{-1}(s(\mathbf{z}))=F((\operatorname{Adj} M) s(\mathbf{z}))
$$

is an integer, where $F^{-1}$ is the quadratic form with matrix $M^{-1}$. By adding and subtracting $F((\operatorname{Adj} M) s(\mathbf{z}))$, we get that (6.10) is soluble if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
F(\mathbf{x}+(\operatorname{Adj} M) s(\mathbf{z}))=\Delta^{2}( & \left.F^{-1}(s(\mathbf{z}))-4 R(1, \mathbf{z})\right) \\
& +\Delta \sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} x_{i} q_{i}\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right) \tag{6.12}
\end{align*}
$$

is soluble.
Lemma 6.5. Let $C$ be as in (6.5) with $F$ positive definite. Assume that $y_{1} \mid q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Suppose that one of the following statements hold:
(1) If $r<n-h$, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $q_{j}(0, \mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ for some $r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-h$, or
(2) If $r=n-h$, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $R(0, \mathbf{z}) \neq 0$.

Then there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{n-r-1} \cap[-B, B]^{n-r-1}$ such that for any $\left(x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_{n-h}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \in \mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)$, the equation (6.12) is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$ and that

$$
\sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} x_{i} q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})-\Delta R(1, \mathbf{z}) \geqslant B^{2} / 4
$$

Moreover, we have $\left|\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)\right| \gg B^{\frac{2}{3}(n-r-1)}$.
Proof. As we have already observed, to ensure solubility of (6.12) over $\mathbf{Z}$, it suffices to check that it is soluble over $\mathbf{R}$. We will treat the case where the first alternative of the lemma holds. A similar argument works in the other case, so we omit the details.

We have that $r<n-h$ and there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $q_{j}(0, \mathbf{z}) \neq$ 0 for some $r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-h$. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $q_{j}(0, \mathbf{u}) \neq 0$. Let $U$ be an $\varepsilon$ ball around $\mathbf{u}$, for some fixed $0<\varepsilon<1 / 1000$. Suppose that $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h-1} \cap B^{2 / 3} U$. Then for $B \gg 1$, we have that $\left|q_{j}(0, \mathbf{z})\right| \geqslant A_{1} B^{4 / 3}$ for some $A_{1}>0$. Note that

$$
q_{j}(1, \mathbf{z})=q_{j}(0, \mathbf{z})+O\left(B^{1 / 3}\right)
$$

As a result, we have for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h-1} \cap B^{2 / 3} U$ that $\left|q_{j}(1, \mathbf{z})\right| \geqslant A_{1} B^{4 / 3}$, and that

$$
\max _{\substack{r+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h \\ i \neq j}}\left|q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})\right| \leqslant A_{2} B^{4 / 3} \text { and }|R(1, \mathbf{z})| \leqslant A_{2} B^{2}
$$

for a constant $A_{2}$ that depend on $U$ and the coefficients of $C$.
Let $c_{1}$ be a real number we will specify shortly. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)=\left\{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-r-1}\right. & : \mathbf{z} \in\left(\min \left\{1 / 2,\left(A_{2} \Delta\right)^{-1}\right\} B\right)^{2 / 3} U \\
& c_{1} B^{2 / 3} \leqslant|\mathbf{w}| \leqslant 2 c_{1} B^{2 / 3} \text { and } \\
& \left.\sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} w_{i} q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})-\Delta R(1, \mathbf{z}) \geqslant B^{2} / 4\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that $\sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} w_{i} q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})-\Delta R(1, \mathbf{z}) \geqslant B^{2} / 4$, so long as

$$
w_{j} q_{j}(1, \mathbf{z}) \geqslant \delta B^{2}+\Delta R(1, \mathbf{z})-\sum_{\substack{r+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h \\ i \neq j}} w_{i} q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})
$$

which we may ensure by taking $c_{1}=1 / 16\left(A_{1}+n\right)$, for example. As a result, we have shown that if $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)$, then the equation (6.12) is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$. In addition, it is easy to see that $\left|\mathscr{C}_{n-r+1}(B)\right| \gg B^{2 / 3(n-r-1)}$.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Let $q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=\alpha_{i} y_{1} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$, where $\alpha_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$ are linear forms. Suppose first that $r=n-h$. Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F\left(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right)+y_{1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-h} \alpha_{i} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{6.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

We may suppose that $C$ is irreducible, for otherwise, we have the stronger lower bound $N(B) \gg B^{n-1}$. If $C$ is irreducible, then $h(C) \geqslant 2$. Observe that $C\left(\mathbf{x}, 0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. This implies that $h(R(0, \mathbf{z})) \geqslant 1$, i.e., that the cubic form $R(0, \mathbf{z})$ does not vanish identically. As a result, we get that there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h-1}$ such that $R(0, \mathbf{z})<0$.

On the other hand, if $r<n-h$, then we may assume that $q_{j}(0, \mathbf{z})$ does not vanish identically for some $r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-h$, for otherwise, we may argue as in the previous paragraph. Thus we see that the hypotheses of Lemma 6.5 are satisfied and let $\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)$ be as in statement of that lemma.

We will use the notation $\mathbf{w}=\left(w_{r+1}, \ldots, w_{n-h}\right)$ and $\mathbf{z}=\left(z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)$. Then we have by (6.9), (6.10) and (6.12) that

$$
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)} N_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}(B),
$$

where

$$
\left.N_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}(B)=\#\{\mathbf{x}, 2 \Delta)=1:|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B \text { and } C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, 2 \Delta(1, \mathbf{z}))=0\right\}
$$

By setting $F=F_{1}$,

$$
N=\Delta^{2}\left(F^{-1}(s(\mathbf{z}))-4 R(1, \mathbf{z})\right)+\Delta \sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} w_{i} q_{i}\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right),
$$

and $\boldsymbol{\xi}=(\operatorname{Adj} M) s(\mathbf{z})$, it follows from Proposition 6.3 that $N_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}(B) \gg$ $B^{r-2}$. Putting everything together, we get that $N(B) \gg B^{r-2+\frac{2}{3}(n-r-1)}$, as required.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. By hypothesis, there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$ such that $q_{i}(0, \mathbf{z})$ does not vanish identically. Let $\mathbf{w}=\left(w_{2}, \ldots, w_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $q_{i}(0, \mathbf{w}) \neq 0$. Let $V$ be an $\varepsilon$-ball around $\mathbf{w}$ with $\varepsilon$ small enough such that $q_{i}(0, \mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in V$. There exists a constant $A_{1}>0$ such that for any $B \gg 1$, we get from the mean value theorem that $\left|q_{j}(1, \mathbf{z})\right| \geqslant A_{1} B$ whenever $\mathbf{z} / B^{1 / 2} \in V$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $A_{2}>0$ such that for any $|\mathbf{z}| \leqslant B^{1 / 2}$, we have that $|R(1, \mathbf{z})| \leqslant$ $A_{2} B^{3 / 2}$ and $\left|q_{i}(1, \mathbf{z})\right| \leqslant A_{2} B$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h$.

Let $c_{1}=\frac{1}{\Delta} \min \left\{1, A_{1}^{-1}\right\}$ and $c_{2}=\frac{1}{1000 \Delta} \min \left\{1, A_{2}^{-1}\right\}$. Define

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)=\left\{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-r-1}: \mathbf{w} \in\left[-c_{2} B, c_{2} B\right]^{n-h-r}\right. \text { and } \\
\left.\mathbf{z} /\left(c_{1} B\right)^{1 / 2} \in V\right\} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Then $\left|\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)\right| \gg B^{n-n-r+\frac{h-1}{2}}$. Let $s(\mathbf{z})$ be as in (6.11). Set

$$
P^{2}=N=\Delta^{2}\left(F^{-1}(s(\mathbf{z}))-4 R(1, \mathbf{z})\right)+\Delta \sum_{i=r+1}^{n-h} x_{i} q_{i}\left(1, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)
$$

If $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)$, then we see that $N \geqslant B^{2} / 4$, as $F^{-1}$ is positivedefinite. Put $\boldsymbol{\xi}=(\operatorname{Adj} M) s(\mathbf{z})$. Then for any such $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)$, we see that (6.12) is soluble. Let

$$
\left.N_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}(B)=\#\{\mathbf{x}, 2 \Delta)=1:|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B \text { and } C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, 2 \Delta(1, \mathbf{z}))=0\right\} .
$$

Using Proposition 6.3, we get that $N_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}(B) \gg B^{r-2}$ solutions. As a result,

$$
N(B) \gg B^{r-2}\left|\mathscr{C}_{n-r-1}(B)\right| \gg B^{r-2+n-h-r+\frac{h-1}{2}} .
$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.
6.2. Preliminaries for the proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{R}$ denote the minors of $M[\mathbf{y}]$ of rank $r$. If $\pi$ has rank, then at least one of the minors $\Delta_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ does not vanish identically. Moreover, all minors of higher rank vanish identically in $\mathbf{y}$. In this section, we will prove some technical results that we will need later in the proof of Theorem [2.4.

Lemma 6.6. Suppose that the fribration $\pi$ has rank $r \geqslant 5$ and that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ does not satisfy Hypothesis 1. Let $\Delta(\mathbf{y})$ be a minor of order $r$ that does not vanish identically. Then there exists an open set $U$ in $\mathbf{R}^{h}$ such that $\Delta(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for any $\mathbf{y} \in U$. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{y} \in U$, the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is indefinite.

Proof. We will show that there exists $\mathbf{u}=\left(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{h}$ such that $\operatorname{rank} \sum_{i=1}^{h} u_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ is $r$ and that if $\mathbf{y}$ lies in an $\varepsilon$-ball around $\mathbf{u}$ then $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is indefinite. By shrinking the neighbourhood, if necessary, we will also get that $\Delta(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$. This is the open set we seek. We will discuss the cases where $r=n-h$ and $r<n-h$ separately.

Suppose first that $r=n-h$. Then in this case, $\Delta(\mathbf{y})=\operatorname{det} M[\mathbf{y}]$ does not vanish identically. As a result, at least one of the quadratic forms $F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ is non-singular. Suppose without loss of generality that $F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ is of full rank. If $F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ is also indefinite, set $\mathbf{u}=(1,0, \ldots, 0)$. Then in this case, we can take $U$ to be an $\varepsilon$-ball around $\mathbf{u}$ with $\varepsilon<1 / 2$.

Thus we may assume henceforth that $F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ is definite. Let $s=$ $\operatorname{rank}_{L} \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ where $L=\mathbf{Q}\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. As $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ does not satisfy Hypothesis 11, we have that $s \geqslant 1$. Suppose first that $s \geqslant 2$. Then there exists $\left(u_{2}, \ldots, u_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{h-1}$ such that $\operatorname{rank} \sum_{i=2}^{h} u_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 2$. Since $F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ is definite, there exists an orthogonal transformation $R$ that depends on $\left(u_{2}, \ldots, u_{h}\right)$ such that $F_{1}(R \mathbf{x})$ and $\sum_{i=2}^{h} u_{i} F_{i}(R \mathbf{x})$ are both diagonal quadratic forms. Let $\epsilon=1$ if $F_{1}$ is positive-definite and -1 otherwise. Then there exist $\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ such that

$$
F_{1}(R \mathbf{x})=\epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{n-h} x_{i}^{2} \text { and } \sum_{i=2}^{h} u_{i} F_{i}(R \mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{n-h} \lambda_{i}(\mathbf{z}) x_{i}^{2} .
$$

Since at least two of $\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$, we may choose $u_{1}$ suitably to ensure that

$$
Q_{\mathbf{u}}(R \mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} u_{i} F_{i}(R \mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{n-h} x_{i}^{2}\left(\epsilon u_{1}+\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{z})\right)
$$

is non-singular and indefinite. As a result, we get that $Q_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x})$ is nonsingular and indefinite. Let $U$ be an $\varepsilon$-ball around $\mathbf{u}$. As $\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{z})$ are continuous functions, if $\varepsilon$ is small enough, we get that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is nonsingular and indefinite for any $\mathbf{y} \in U$.

If $s=1$, then it is easy to see that there exist linear forms $l\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ and $m(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})=l\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) m(\mathbf{x})^{2}$. Then after a linear change of variables, we may assume that $l\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ can be replaced by $y_{2}$, whence we may assume that $F_{2}(\mathbf{x})=m(\mathbf{x})^{2}$ and $F_{i}=0$ for $3 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h$. As in the previous case, there exists $R \in O_{n-h}(\mathbf{R})$ and $\epsilon= \pm 1$ such that $F_{1}(R \mathbf{x})$ and $F_{2}(R \mathbf{x})$ are simultaneously diagonal. Thus we get that

$$
u_{1} F_{1}(R \mathbf{x})+u_{2} F_{2}(R \mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{n-h}\left(\epsilon u_{1}+\lambda_{i} u_{2}\right) x_{i}^{2}
$$

where $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$ for exactly one $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-h$. We may now choose $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ appropriately to ensure that $Q_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x})$ is non-singular and indefinite, where $\mathbf{u}=\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)$. Taking $U$ to be a small neighbourhood around $\mathbf{u}$ completes the proof of the lemma when $r=n-h$.

Suppose next that $r<n-h$. Then in this case, we get from Lemma 2.5 that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is linear in at least $n-h-\varrho$ variables $x_{i}$. If $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is independent of $n-h-r$ variables, then the lemma follows by repeating the argument from the full rank case. Therefore, we may suppose that there exist variables $x_{i}$ and $x_{j}$ with $i \neq j$ such that the coefficient of $x_{i}^{2}$ in $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is identically zero, but the coefficient of $x_{i} x_{j}$ is not. Let $L_{i, j}(\mathbf{y})$ denote the coefficient of $x_{i} x_{j}$ appearing in $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Then we may find $\mathbf{y}_{0} \in \mathbf{R}^{h}$ such that $\Delta\left(\mathbf{y}_{0}\right) L_{i, j}\left(\mathbf{y}_{0}\right) \neq 0$. Then it follows that $\operatorname{rank} M\left[\mathbf{y}_{0}\right]=r$. Write

$$
Q_{\mathbf{y}_{0}}(\mathbf{x})=L_{i, j}\left(\mathbf{y}_{0}\right) x_{i} x_{j}+L_{j, j}\left(\mathbf{y}_{0}\right) x_{j}^{2}+\widetilde{Q}\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{0}\right)
$$

where $\widetilde{Q}\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{0}\right)$ is a quadratic form in $\mathbf{x}$ that vanishes if we let all the variables except $x_{i}$ and $x_{j}$ to be 0 . By setting all the $x_{k}$ except $x_{i}$ and $x_{j}$ to be 0 , it is clear that $Q_{\mathbf{y}_{0}}(\mathbf{x})$ is indefinite. Taking $U$ to be an $\varepsilon$-ball around $\mathbf{y}_{0}$ completes the proof of the lemma.

Next, we characterise all matrices $M[\mathbf{y}]$ with the property that all its minors of order 3 have a common factor.

Lemma 6.7. Let $\phi(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$ be the greatest common divisor of the minors of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{y}]=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} M_{i}$. Suppose that $\phi(\mathbf{y})$ is a nonconstant polynomial. Assume that $r=r(C) \geqslant 5$ and suppose that $M_{1}=$ $\operatorname{Diag}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)$ with $a_{i} \neq 0$. Then after $a \mathbf{Q}$-linear change of variables, we may write $M[\mathbf{y}]=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} N_{i}$, such that rank $N_{1}=r$ and $\operatorname{rank} \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} N_{i} \leqslant 2$ for each $\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{A}^{h-1}$.

Proof. We begin by recording an observation that we will use repeatedly in the proof below: that $\phi(1,0, \ldots, 0) \neq 0$, for otherwise, we obtain that rank $M_{1} \leqslant 2$, which contradicts our assumption that rank $M_{1}$ is at least 5 . This observation implies that the degree of $y_{1}$ in the polynomial $\phi(\mathbf{y})$ is equal to the degree of $\phi$.

Suppose first that $l(\mathbf{y}) \mid \phi(\mathbf{y})$, where $l$ is a linear form. Making the change of variables $l(\mathbf{y})=z_{1}, y_{2}=z_{2}, \ldots, y_{n}=z_{n}$, we get that there exist $\alpha_{i} \in \mathbf{Q}$ (with $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$ ) such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
M[\mathbf{y}] & =\left(\sum_{i=1}^{h} \alpha_{i} z_{i}\right) M_{1}+\sum_{i=2}^{h} z_{i} M_{i} \\
& =\alpha_{1} z_{1} M_{1}+\sum_{i=2}^{h} z_{i} N_{i},
\end{aligned}
$$

for some matrices $N_{i}$. Note that $\operatorname{rank} N_{1}=\operatorname{rank} \alpha_{1} M_{1}=\operatorname{rank} M_{1}$, since $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$. Moreover, the condition $z_{1}=0$ implies that rank $\sum_{i=2}^{h} z_{i} N_{i} \leqslant$ 2 , by our assumption that $l$ divides $\phi$, which in turn divides every minor of order 3. Thus the lemma follows in this case.

We will now proceed to show that $\phi$ is always divisible by a linear factor. As $\phi$ divides every minor of order 3 , we see that the degree of $\phi$ is at most 3 , thus it suffices to show that $\phi$ is reducible over $\mathbf{Q}$.

Let $1 \leqslant i_{1}<i_{2}<i_{3} \leqslant n-h$ and $1 \leqslant j_{1}<j_{2}<j_{3} \leqslant n-h$. Set $I=\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}\right\}$ and $J=\left\{j_{1}, j_{2}, j_{3}\right\}$. The minors of $M[\mathbf{y}]$ of order 3 are
of the form

$$
\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})=\operatorname{det}\left(m_{i, j}(\mathbf{y})\right)_{\substack{i \in I \\ j \in J}}
$$

where $m_{i, j}(\mathbf{y})$ denotes the entries of the matrix $M[\mathbf{y}]$.
Suppose first that $\phi$ is irreducible polynomial of degree 3. Suppose that there exists a minor $\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$ with $|I \cap J|=2$ that does not vanish identically. As $\phi$ divides $\Phi_{I, J}$, this forces the degree of $y_{1}$ in $\phi$ to be at most 2, which in turn forces $\phi(1,0, \ldots, 0)=0$, as the degree of $\phi$ is equal to 3 . This implies that the minors $\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$ must all vanish identically whenever $|I \cap J|=2$. For any $(i, j)$ with $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n-h$ and $i \neq j$, consider the minor $\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$ with $I=\{a, b, i\}$ and $J=\{a, b, j\}$ with $a, b \leqslant r$ and $a \neq b$. As $\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$ vanishes identically, we see that the coefficient of $y_{1}^{2} y_{k}$ must be 0 . This forces $m_{i, j}(\mathbf{y})=0$ whenever $i \neq j$. As a result, if $|I \cap J|=3$, with $I=\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3}\right\}$, say, we get that

$$
\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})=\operatorname{det}\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
m_{i_{1}, i_{1}}(\mathbf{y}) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & m_{i_{2}, i_{2}}(\mathbf{y}) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & m_{i_{3}, i_{3}}(\mathbf{y})
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Therefore, we obtain that either $\Phi_{I, J}$ vanishes identically, or it is a product of three linear factors, which contradicts our assumption that $\phi$ is irreducible.

All that remains is to eliminate the possibility that $\phi$ is an irreducible polynomial of degree 2. Suppose that this is the case. As we have already observed, $\phi$ is quadratic in $y_{1}$. Thus we see that the minors $\Phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$ vanish identically whenever $|I \cap J| \leqslant 1$. If $|I \cap J|=2$, then we get that

$$
\phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})=y_{1}^{2} L\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)+y_{1} U\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)+V\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right),
$$

where $L$ is linear, $U$ is quadratic and $V$ is cubic. And if $|I \cap J|=3$, we see that

$$
\phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})=\alpha y_{1}^{3}+y_{1}^{2} S\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)+y_{1} T\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)
$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}, S$ linear and $T$ quadratic. In either case, using the fact that $\phi$ is quadratic in $y_{1}$, we get that $y_{1} \mid \phi_{I, J}(\mathbf{y})$, which contradicts the assumption that $\phi$ is irreducible. This completes the proof of the lemma.

We end this section by using a result of Rojas-León [27] to count the number of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}$ such that $f(\mathbf{x})$ is a quadratic residue modulo $p$ for homogeneous polynomials $f$ subject to some mild hypotheses on the dimension of their singular loci.

Lemma 6.8. $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)$ be a homogeneous form of degree $d$. Suppose that the dimension of the singular locus of $f$ in $\mathbf{A}^{m}$ is at most $m-2$. Then for $p \nmid d$ sufficiently large in terms of the coefficients of $f$, we have

$$
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}:\left(\frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{p}\right)=1\right\} \gg p^{m}
$$

Proof. Let $X=\mathbf{P}^{m}$ denote projective space with homogeneous coordinates $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, z$. We will denote by $L$ the hypersurface in $X$ given by $z=0$. Let $H=f$ and let $H$ also denote the hypersurface cut out by its vanishing in $X$. Let $V=X \backslash(L \cup H)$. We see that $H / L^{4}$ is a function from $V \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{1}$. Note that $X \cap L \cap H$ is pure of codimension 2 in $X$.

Let $\varepsilon^{\prime}=\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} X \cap H$ and let $\delta=\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} X \cap L \cap H$. Then $\delta$ is the dimension of the singular locus of $f$ in $\mathbf{A}^{m}$. Observe that $\varepsilon^{\prime}=\delta$. Let $\chi(t)$ denote the multiplicative character $\left(\frac{t}{p}\right)$. Set

$$
S=\sum_{w \in V\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right)} \chi\left(H(w) / L(w)^{4}\right) .
$$

Then we clearly have

$$
S=\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{m}\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right)} \chi(f(\mathbf{x}))-\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{m}\left(\mathbf{F}_{p}\right): f(\mathbf{x})=0} 1 .
$$

We are now ready to apply [27, Theorem 1.1] with $\varepsilon^{\prime}=\delta$. Note that all the hypotheses of that theorem are satisfied and we deduce that

$$
S \ll p^{\frac{m+\delta+1}{2}} .
$$

As $\delta \leqslant m-2$, by assumption, we get that $S \ll p^{m-1 / 2}$.
Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 \#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}:\left(\frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{p}\right)=1\right\} & =\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}} 1+\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}} \chi(f(\mathbf{x}))-\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}: f(\mathbf{x})=0} 1 \\
& =p^{m}+S=p^{m}+O\left(p^{m-1 / 2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

by the bound in the previous paragraph. This completes the proof of the lemma.
6.3. Counting points on a family of affine quadrics. To prove Theorem 2.4, we may assume once again that $h \leqslant 13$. For otherwise, a stronger result follows from Theorem 1.2. Let $r=r(C)$ denote the rank of the fibration $\pi$. We have by assumption that $r \geqslant \min \{n-h-4,5\}$. In addition, by the hypothesis of Theorem [2.4, it follows that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ does not satisfy Hypothesis 1 .

Let $\mathbf{u}=\left(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{R}^{h}$ be a point in the open set $U$ that was constructed in Lemma 6.6, Let $\Omega_{\infty}$ be a compact ball of radius $c>0$ around $\mathbf{u}$, where $c$ is chosen so that $\Omega_{\infty} \subset U$. Let $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B^{2 / 3-\eta}$ be a parameter, for some $\eta>0$.

For $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h}$ let $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ be as in (6.1). Then $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is a quadratic polynomial in $\mathbf{x}$ whose quadratic part is given by $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ (see (6.2)). For $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$, we have by construction that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is indefinite and of rank equal to $r \geqslant 5$. Furthermore, we have that $\Delta(\mathbf{y}) \gg Y^{r}$, where $\Delta(\mathbf{y})$ is a minor of $M[\mathbf{y}]$ of rank $r$.

Let $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \lambda_{r}(\mathbf{y})$ denote the non-zero eigenvalues of the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$. As $\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ are the eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix of norm $O(Y)$, we see that $\left|\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right| \ll Y$. As $|\Delta(\mathbf{y})| \gg Y^{r}$, we get that $\prod_{i=1}^{r}\left|\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right| \gg Y^{r}$, whence we obtain the bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y \ll\left|\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right| \ll Y \tag{6.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, with the implied constants depending only on the coefficients of the cubic form $C$.

Let $R_{\mathbf{y}} \in O_{n-h}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $Q_{\mathbf{y}}\left(R_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{x}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y}) x_{i}^{2}$ is a diagonal quadratic form. Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^{n-h}$ be a real solution to the equation

$$
\tilde{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})}{\left|\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right|} x_{i}^{2}=0 .
$$

Let $\left\|F_{\mathbf{y}}\right\|$ denote the largest coefficient (in absolute value) of the quadratic form $Q_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$.

$$
u_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\prod_{i=1}^{n-h} w_{0}\left(z_{i}-x_{i}\right)
$$

Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
w_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=u_{\mathbf{y}}\left(R_{\mathbf{y}}^{t} D \mathbf{x}\right) \tag{6.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
D=\operatorname{Diag}\left(\left|\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})\right|^{1 / 2}, \ldots,\left|\lambda_{r}(\mathbf{y})\right|^{1 / 2},\left\|F_{\mathbf{y}}\right\|^{1 / 2}, \ldots,\left\|F_{\mathbf{y}}\right\|^{1 / 2}\right)
$$

For $P \geqslant 1$ set

$$
N\left(P, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-h} \\ F_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{x}=0 \\(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=1}} w_{\mathbf{y}}\left(P^{-1} \mathbf{x}\right)
$$

Recall the counting function $N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)$ defined in (6.3). Since $w_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is non-negative, we see by setting $P=B \sqrt{Y}$ and (6.14) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B) \gg N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \tag{6.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ be a set such that the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$. Then we obtain

$$
N(B) \gg \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)
$$

In order to get a lower bound for $N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$, we will call upon work of Kumaraswamy [24, Theorem 1.1] to count solutions to the quadratic equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$. Note that all the hypotheses of that theorem are satisfied, as $Q_{\mathbf{y}}$ is indefinite of rank equal to $r \geqslant 5$ by construction, $Y \leqslant B^{2 / 3-\eta}$ and (6.14).

For the rest of this section, we will set $m=n-h$ and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{q}(\mathbf{y})=\sum_{a \bmod q \mathbf{b} \bmod q}^{*} e_{q}\left(a F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{b})\right) \tag{6.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define the singular series

$$
\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^{-m} S_{q}(\mathbf{y})
$$

If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, then $\operatorname{rank} Q_{\mathbf{y}} \geqslant 5$, whence we have

$$
\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\prod_{p} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)
$$

where

$$
\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{S_{p^{k}}(\mathbf{y})}{p^{k m}}=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} p^{-(m-1) t} N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(p^{t}\right)
$$

with

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(p^{t}\right)=\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{t}: F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{t}\right\}
$$

On applying [24, Theorem 1.1], we will encounter the constant $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$. If $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$, then it follows that $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)>0$. We will prove a lower bound for $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$ that is uniform in $\mathbf{y}$ on average.

Let $\left\{\phi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})\right\}$ be the set of minors of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{y}]$. Recall the variety

$$
\mathscr{L} \subset \mathbf{A}^{h}: \phi_{1}(\mathbf{y})=\phi_{2}(\mathbf{y})=\ldots=\phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})=0
$$

that we used in the proof of Theorem 4.1. We have the following results.
Proposition 6.9. Suppose that $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L} \leqslant h-2$. For each $Y \gg 1$, there exists $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, the following statements hold:
(1) For any $\varepsilon>0$ we have $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg_{\varepsilon} Y^{-\varepsilon}$.
(2) The equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$
(3) We have that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)<_{C} 1$.

Proposition 6.10. Suppose that $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L}=h-1$. For each $Y \gg 1$, there exists $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, then the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=1$. Moreover, we have for any $\varepsilon>0$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)>_{\varepsilon} Y^{h-\varepsilon} \tag{6.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will prove Proposition 6.9 first.
6.3.1. When $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L} \leqslant h-2$. The following is the key result which allows us to obtain strong lower bounds for $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$.

Lemma 6.11. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h}$ and assume that $\operatorname{rank} Q_{\mathbf{y}}=r \geqslant 5$. Suppose that there exists a constant $A=A(C)$ that depends only on the cubic form $C$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{p}^{m}: F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0 \text { and } \nabla F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\right\} \geqslant p^{m-1}+O\left(p^{m-2}\right) \tag{6.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $p \nmid A$. Suppose also that for each prime $p \mid A$, we have that there exists $v_{p}=v_{p}(C) \geqslant 1$ such that the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\mathbf{x} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}: F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1} \text { and } \nabla F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \not \equiv \mathbf{0} \bmod p^{v_{p}}\right\} \tag{6.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

is non-empty. Then we have that $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg(1+|\mathbf{y}|)^{-\varepsilon}$.
Proof. Let $\phi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})$ be the minors of $M[\mathbf{y}]$ of order $r$. Then $\phi_{j}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for some $j$, by assumption. Set

$$
\mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})=\left\{p \text { prime }: p \nmid A \operatorname{gcd}\left(\phi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})\right)\right\} .
$$

As we have already remarked, the singular series converges absolutely as $\operatorname{rank} Q_{\mathbf{y}} \geqslant 5$. So we may write

$$
\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\left(\prod_{p \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right)\left(\prod_{p \notin \mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right)
$$

We have

$$
\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{S_{p^{k}}(\mathbf{y})}{p^{k}}
$$

where $S_{p^{k}}(\mathbf{0})$ is as in (6.17). Then if $p \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})$, we obtain from [24, Lemma 2.4] that

$$
\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=1+O\left(p^{-3 / 2}\right)
$$

since $\operatorname{rank} Q_{\mathbf{y}} \geqslant 5$, where the implied constant is independent of $F_{\mathbf{y}}$. As a result, we get that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\prod_{p \notin \mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right) \gg 1 . \tag{6.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose next that (6.19) holds, we get from Lemma 3.4 that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(p^{t}\right) \geqslant p^{t(m-1)}+O\left(p^{t(m-1)-1}\right)
$$

As a result, we get for any $p \nmid A$ that $\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1-c / p$, for some $c>0$, independent of $p$.

Finally, if $p \mid A$, we get from (6.20) and Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(p^{t}\right) \gg$ $p^{t(m-1)}$ if $t>2 v_{p}$, where the implicit constant depends only on $C$, by hypothesis. This implies that $\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)>_{C} 1$ if $p \mid A$. As a result, we get for any $\varepsilon>0$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\prod_{p \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbf{y})} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)\right) & \gg \prod_{p \mid A} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \prod_{p \mid \operatorname{gcd}\left(\phi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{y})\right)}\left(1-\frac{c}{p}\right) \\
& \gg \varepsilon(1+|\mathbf{y}|)^{-\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{y})<_{C}(1+|\mathbf{y}|)^{r}$ for each $i$. The lemma follows from (6.21).
Proof of Proposition 6.9. If $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L} \leqslant h-2$, let $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ be the set we obtain from applying Theorem4.1. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. The first statement of the proposition follows from Lemma 6.11. As $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)>0$, we obtain that $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$. Moreover, by definition, any such $\mathbf{y}$ also lies in $Y \Omega_{\infty}$, whence we get that $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ has a real solution, which shows that $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ is everywhere locally soluble. Therefore, by the Hasse principle for quadratic polynomials, $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is
soluble over Z. The third statement follows from Remark 4.3 and this completes the proof of the proposition.
6.3.2. When $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L}=h-1$. By Lemma 6.7, we get after making a linear change of variables that

$$
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{m} x_{j} q_{j}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y})
$$

where $m=n-h, F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ is an indefinite quadratic form of rank equal to $r$ and rank $\sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 2$ for every $\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{A}^{h-1}$. Note that the polynomials $F_{i}, q_{j}$ and $R$ could be different to the ones we started with. We are recycling notation for ease of exposition.

For the remainder of this section, we set

$$
\begin{equation*}
s=\operatorname{rank}_{L} \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{6.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L=\mathbf{Q}\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. Although our construction of the set $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ will depend on whether $s=0,1$ or 2 , we will adopt a similar approach in each case, which we explain below.

We may assume without loss of generality that $F_{1}$ is non-singular of rank $r$ with discriminant $D$. Let $M$ denote the product of all the coefficients of $C$. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=2 \prod_{p \mid D M} p \tag{6.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

For each prime $p \mid A$, let $v_{p}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{p}=\left(r_{p}^{(1)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right)$ denote the exponent and residue class that we obtain from applying Lemma 3.1. Let $\delta$ be a small fixed constant such that $\delta^{-1}>\prod_{p \mid A} p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ and let $\mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$ denote the set of primes in the interval $[\delta Y / 2, \delta Y]$ that are congruent to $r_{p}^{(1)} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ for every $p \mid A$. We will always choose $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ so that if $\mathbf{y}$ belongs to it, then $y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$. Then by arguing as we did to obtain (6.21), we get that

$$
\prod_{p \nmid A y_{1}} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1 .
$$

Our choice of $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ be will be strongly infulenced by studying the solubility of $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$. Finally, for the finitely many primes $p \mid A$, we will ensure that (6.20) holds by restricting $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ to lie in the arithmetic progression modulo $\mathbf{r}_{p} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$.

Lemma 6.12. Suppose that $s=0$ and that $h(C) \geqslant 6$. Then for each $Y \gg 1$ there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y
$$

Proof. If $s=0$, then we see that $F_{i}(\mathbf{x})=0$ for each $2 \leqslant i \leqslant h$. Suppose first that there exist linear forms $l_{i}$ such that $q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=y_{1} l_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Then we have

$$
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F_{1}(\mathbf{x})+y_{1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y})
$$

Observe that $C\left(\mathbf{x}, 0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ is a cubic form in $n-1$ variables with $h$-invariant at least $h(C)-1$. As a result, we see that $R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ is a cubic form in $h(C)-1$ variables whose $h$-invariant is equal to $h(C)-1$, which implies, in particular that it is non-degenerate. As a result, we find that the equation $R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=0$ has no non-trivial solutions over $\mathbf{F}_{p}$ for large enough $p$. However, according to [12, Theorem 3], any non-degenerate cubic form with $h$-invariant at least 5 has a non-trivial solution over $\mathbf{F}_{p}$ for any prime $p$. This is a contradiction, since $R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ has $h$-invariant at least 5 .

As a result, we may assume that $y_{1} \nmid q_{i}$ for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Let $y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$. This implies that the equation $q_{i}\left(0, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right)$ is not identically zero over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$. As a result, if we set

$$
S\left(y_{1}\right)=\left\{\left(z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right) \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{h-1}: q_{i}\left(0, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{h}\right) \neq 0\right\}
$$

we must have that $\left|S\left(y_{1}\right)\right| \gg y_{1}^{h-1}$. Let $A$ be as in (6.23) and let $v_{p}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{p}$ be the exponents obtained by applying Lemma 3.1 for each $p \mid A$. Define

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}: y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y),\left(y_{2}, y_{1}\right)=1, \text { for each } p \mid A\right. \\
\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \equiv\left(r_{p}^{(2)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right) \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1} \\
\left.\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \bmod y_{1} \in S\left(y_{1}\right)\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

Then it is easy to see that $\left|\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)\right| \gg Y^{h} / \log Y$.
Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. We will now show that $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$. Indeed, if $p \mid A$, then the estimate (6.20) holds by construction. If $p \nmid A$, and $p \neq y_{1}$, then $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbf{F}_{p}} F_{\mathbf{y}} \geqslant 3$ and the estimate (6.19) follows from Lemma 3.3. As a result, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{p \neq y_{1}} \sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1 \tag{6.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, if $p=y_{1}$, we see that $\nabla F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) \not \equiv \mathbf{0}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{m}$. As $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ is a linear equation modulo $y_{1}$, we see that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(y_{1}^{t}\right) \gg y_{1}^{t(m-1)}
$$

for all $t \geqslant 1$, whence we get that $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$, and the lemma follows.
Next, we deal with the case where $s=\operatorname{rank}_{L} \sum_{i=2}^{h} y_{i} F_{i}(\mathbf{x})=1$. Then by an application of Lemma 2.5, we get after a linear change of variables that $F_{i}(\mathbf{x})=\alpha_{i} x_{1}^{2}$ for some $\alpha_{i} \in \mathbf{Z}$, not all equal to 0 . After making another change of variables, we may suppose that there exists $\alpha \neq 0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F_{1}(\mathbf{x})+\alpha y_{2} x_{1}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} q_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{6.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $F_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ an indefinite, non-singular quadratic form of rank $r$. We will need the following lemma later on in the argument.

Lemma 6.13. Let $R\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)$ be a cubic form with $h$-invariant $h(R)$. Suppose that $h(R) \geqslant 3$ and let $q\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)$ be a quadratic form. Set $f(\mathbf{y})=q^{2}(\mathbf{y})-4 y_{1} R(\mathbf{y})$. Let $\operatorname{Sing} f \subset \mathbf{A}^{m}$ denote the singular locus of $f$. Then $\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} f \leqslant m-2$.

Proof. In order to obtain a contradiction, assume that $\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} f=$ $m-1$. This implies that there exists a polynomial $\phi(\mathbf{y})$ such that $\phi \left\lvert\, \operatorname{gcd}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y_{1}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_{m}}\right)\right.$. If $y_{1} \mid \phi$, then we get that $y_{1} \left\lvert\, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_{1}}\right.$ and that $y_{1} \mid f(\mathbf{y})$. We may then deduce that $y_{1} \mid R(\mathbf{y})$, which contradicts our assumption that $h(R) \geqslant 3$. As a result, we must have that $y_{1} \nmid \phi$.

Let $\psi(\mathbf{z})=\phi(0, \mathbf{z})$. Then $\psi$ doesn't vanish identically. Observe that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \mid f^{(i)}(0, \mathbf{z})$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. This in turn implies that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \mid f(0, \mathbf{z})$, whence we get that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \mid q(0, \mathbf{z})$. Using the fact that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \left\lvert\, \frac{\partial f(0, \mathbf{z})}{\partial z_{1}}\right.$, we also obtain that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \left\lvert\,-2 q(0, \mathbf{z}) \frac{\partial q(0, \mathbf{z})}{\partial z_{1}}+R(0, \mathbf{z})\right.$, whence we get that $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \mid R(0, \mathbf{z})$. However, this forces $h(R(0, \mathbf{z})) \leqslant 1$, which contradicts our assumption that $h(R(0, \mathbf{z})) \geqslant 2$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 6.14. Suppose that $s=1$. Assume that $h(C) \geqslant 5$. Then for each $Y \gg 1$ there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y
$$

Proof. Let $C$ be as in (6.25). Suppose first that $y_{1} \nmid q_{t}(\mathbf{y})$ for some $2 \leqslant t \leqslant m$. We will assume without loss of generality that $t=2$.

Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}:\right. & y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y),\left(y_{2}, y_{1}\right)=1, \text { for each } p \mid A \\
& \left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \equiv\left(r_{p}^{(2)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right) \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1} \\
& \text { and } \left.q_{2}\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \not \equiv 0 \bmod y_{1}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{p}$ and $A$ are as before. As $y_{1} \nmid q_{2}(\mathbf{y})$, we get that the set of $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{h-1}$ such that $q_{2}(0, \mathbf{z})=0$ has cardinality $O\left(y_{1}^{h-2}\right)$. Thus we get that $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y$.

Turning to estimating $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$, note that by the same argument as in Lemma 6.12, we have that (6.24) holds. Finally, over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$, we find that

$$
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\alpha y_{2} x_{1}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} q_{i}(0, \mathbf{y})+R(0, \mathbf{y})
$$

and

$$
\nabla F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\left(2 \alpha y_{2} x_{1}+q_{1}(0, \mathbf{y}), q_{2}(0, \mathbf{y}), \ldots, q_{m}(0, \mathbf{y})\right)
$$

If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, using the fact that $q_{2}(0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{*}$, we get that the number of non-singular solutions to $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$ is equal to $y_{1}^{m-1}$. Therefore, we have by Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(y_{1}^{t}\right) \gg y_{1}^{t(m-1)}$ for each $t \geqslant 1$, whence $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$. This shows that $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$ and the lemma follows.

Suppose next that $y_{1} \mid q_{t}(\mathbf{y})$ for each $2 \leqslant t \leqslant m$. Define $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}: y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y)\right.$, for each $p \mid A$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \equiv\left(r_{p}^{(2)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right) \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1} \\
& \left(y_{2}, y_{1}\right)=1 \text { and } \\
& q_{1}^{2}\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)-4 \alpha y_{2} R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \text { is }
\end{aligned}
$$

a non-zero quadratic residue modulo $\left.y_{1}\right\}$.
Observe that if we set $x_{1}=y_{1}=0$ in (6.25), we get $R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. As a result, we see that $h\left(R\left(0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)\right) \geqslant 3$. Let $f(\mathbf{y})=q_{1}^{2}(0, \mathbf{y})-$ $4 \alpha y_{2} R(0, \mathbf{y})$. By Lemma 6.13, we get that $\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} f \leqslant h-3$, and therefore by Lemma 6.8 we get that $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y$.

By the argument used earlier in the lemma, we get for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ that (6.24) holds. All that remains is to estimate $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$. Since $y_{1} \mid$ $q_{t}(\mathbf{y})$ for each $2 \leqslant t \leqslant m$, by assumption, we see that

$$
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=\alpha y_{2} x_{1}^{2}+x_{1} q_{1}(0, \mathbf{y})+R(0, \mathbf{y})
$$

modulo $y_{1}$. If $q_{1}^{2}(0, \mathbf{y})-4 \alpha y_{2} R(0, \mathbf{y})$ is a non-zero quadratic residue modulo $y_{1}$, we get from Lemma 3.2 and (3.1) (or by direct computation) that $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0$ has precisely $2 y_{1}^{m-1}$ non-singular solutions over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$. As a result, we obtain from Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(y_{1}^{t}\right) \gg y_{1}^{t(m-1)}$ for all $t \geqslant 1$,
which implies that that $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Finally, suppose that $s=2$. Set $\mathbf{z}=\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$ so that $\mathbf{y}=\left(y_{1}, \mathbf{z}\right)$. Then we obtain from Lemma 3.8 that there exist integer linear forms $l_{1}(\mathbf{z}), l_{2}(\mathbf{z})$ and $l_{3}(\mathbf{z}) \in L$ such that $4 l_{1} l_{3}-l_{2}^{2} \in L^{*}$
$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F_{1}(\mathbf{x})+l_{1}(\mathbf{z}) x_{1}^{2}+l_{2}(\mathbf{z}) x_{1} x_{2}+l_{3}(\mathbf{z}) x_{2}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} q_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y})$,
or

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} F_{1}(\mathbf{x})+\tilde{l}_{2}(\mathbf{z}) x_{1} x_{2}+x_{1} \sum_{i=3}^{m} \tilde{l}_{i}(\mathbf{z}) x_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i} q_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{6.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\tilde{l}_{i} \in L$ linear forms such that $\tilde{l}_{2}(\mathbf{z}) \in L^{*}$. In either case, we may assume that $F_{1}$ is non-singular with rank $r$.

Lemma 6.15. Suppose that $s=2$. Suppose that if $C$ is as in (6.26) then $\operatorname{dim}_{L} V \neq 1$, where $V=\operatorname{Span}_{\mathbf{Q}}\left\{l_{1}, l_{2}, l_{3}\right\}$, or that $C$ is as in (6.27). Then there exists a set $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y
$$

Proof. Define

$$
G= \begin{cases}4 l_{1} l_{3}-l_{2}^{2} & \text { if } C \text { is of the form (6.26) }  \tag{6.28}\\ 4 \tilde{l}_{2}^{2} & \text { if } C \text { is of the form (6.27) }\end{cases}
$$

Note that $G \in L^{*}$ by assumption. We set

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}:\right. & y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y),\left(y_{2}, y_{1}\right)=1 \\
& G\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \not \equiv 0 \bmod y_{1}, \\
& \left(\frac{G\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)}{y_{1}}\right)=1 \text { and for each } p \mid A \\
& \left.\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \equiv\left(r_{p}^{(2)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right) \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We claim that $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y$. This is obvious if $G=4 \tilde{l}_{2}^{2}$. So suppose that $G=4 l_{1} l_{3}-l_{2}^{2}$. As $\operatorname{dim}_{L} V \neq 1$, by hypothesis of the lemma, it is easy to see that $\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{Sing} G \leqslant h-3$ and the claim now follows from Lemma 6.8.

Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. We must now obtain a lower bound for $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$. By arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.12, we see that (6.24) holds, and all that remains is to consider the behaviour of $\sigma_{p}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$ for $p=y_{1}$.

If $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ is as in (6.27), then over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$ we may make the linear change of variables

$$
\tilde{l}_{2}\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) x_{2}+\sum_{i=3}^{m} \tilde{l}_{i}\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) x_{i} \mapsto x_{2}
$$

and observe that $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ has the form

$$
x_{1} x_{2}+x_{1} q_{1}(0, \mathbf{y})+\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i} x_{i}+N
$$

for some $B_{i}$ and $N \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$.
If $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ is as in (6.26), then over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$, we see that

$$
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=l_{1}(\mathbf{y}) x_{1}^{2}+l_{2}(\mathbf{y}) x_{1} x_{2}+l_{3}(\mathbf{y}) x_{2}^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} B_{i} x_{i}+N
$$

for some $B_{i}$ and $N \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$. If $\left(B_{i}, y_{1}\right)=1$, for some $i \geqslant 3$, as we have observed previously, we obtain the estimate $N_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=y_{1}^{m-1}$, whence we get that $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=1$, which is sufficient to deduce the lemma.

Therefore, we may suppose that $B_{i}=0$ for each $3 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. As a result, over $\mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$, the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}$ is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{x}^{t} M \mathbf{x}+\mathbf{B}^{t} \mathbf{x}+N \tag{6.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $M$ is given by one of the following two matrices,

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 1 / 2 \\
1 / 2 & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { or } \quad\left(\begin{array}{cc}
l_{1}(\mathbf{z}) & l_{2}(\mathbf{z}) / 2 \\
l_{2}(\mathbf{z}) / 2 & l_{3}(\mathbf{z})
\end{array}\right)
$$

$\mathbf{B}=\left(B_{1}, B_{2}\right) \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{2}$ and $N \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}$.
By Lemma 3.2, we get that the number of non-singular solutions to (6.29) is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{1}^{m-2}\left\{y_{1}+\left(\frac{-\operatorname{det} M}{y_{1}}\right) y_{1} K_{2}\left(4 N-\boldsymbol{B}^{t} M^{-1} \boldsymbol{B}, y_{1}\right)-\kappa_{y_{1}}\right\} . \tag{6.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that (up to squares) $-\operatorname{det} M=G$, where $G$ is as in (6.28). Observe by (3.1) that (6.30) is $\gg y_{1}^{m-1}$, so long as $\left(\frac{G}{y_{1}}\right)=1$, which holds by construction of $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. Thus we get by applying Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\mathbf{y}}\left(y_{1}^{t}\right) \gg y_{1}^{t(m-1)}$ for all $t \geqslant 1$, whence we get that $\sigma_{y_{1}}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$ and this completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 6.16. Suppose that $s=2$. Suppose that $C$ is as in (6.26) and that $\operatorname{dim}_{L} V=1$, where $V=\operatorname{Span}_{\mathbf{Q}}\left\{l_{1}, l_{2}, l_{3}\right\}$. Then there exists a set
$\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg Y^{h} / \log Y .
$$

Proof. As $\operatorname{dim}_{L} V=1$, we may assume without loss of generality that $l_{1}=A y_{2}, l_{2}=B y_{2}, l_{3}=C y_{2}$, for some $A, B, C \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $B^{2}-$ $4 A C \neq 0$. The proof will be similar to that of Lemma 6.15, so we will only point out the key differences.

Let $J=4 A C-B^{2}$. Then by quadratic reciprocity, there exist integers $r$ and $\Delta$ (depending on $J$ ) such that if $p \equiv r \bmod \Delta$ then $\left(\frac{J}{p}\right)=1$. Consider the cubic polynomial

$$
\tilde{C}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=C\left(\mathbf{x}, \Delta y_{1}+r, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) .
$$

Observe that $\tilde{C}$ is irreducible, given that $C$ is irreducible. As the set of $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ rational points of $C$ are Zariski dense and since $\tilde{C}\left(\mathbf{x}, 0, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=$ $C\left(\mathbf{x}, r, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$, we see that $\tilde{C}$ has a non-singular solution over $\mathbf{Q}_{p}$ for any $p$. Furthermore, it is clear that the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial \tilde{C}}{\partial x_{i}}$ cannot all vanish. Thus all the hypotheses of Lemma 2.5 are satisfied.

We redefine the parameter $A$ from (6.23) as follows:

$$
A=2 \prod_{p \mid D \Delta M} p
$$

where $D$ is the discriminant of $F_{1}$ and $M$ is the product of coefficients of $C$.

For each prime $p \mid A$, let $v_{p}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{p}=\left(r_{p}^{(1)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right)$ denote the exponent and residue class that we obtain from applying Lemma 3.1 to $\tilde{C}$. Let $\delta$ be a small fixed constant such that $\delta^{-1}>\prod_{p \mid A} p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ and let $\mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$ denote the set of primes in the interval $[\delta Y / 2, \delta Y]$ that are congruent to $r_{p}^{(1)} \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}$ for every $p \mid A$. As before, we will choose $y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$. Observe now that if $Y$ is large enough, then we have ensured by construction of $\tilde{C}$ that $\left(\frac{J}{p}\right)=1$.

Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}:\right. & y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y),\left(y_{2}, y_{1}\right)=1 \\
& \text { and for each } p \mid A \\
& \left.\left(y_{2}, \ldots, y_{h}\right) \equiv\left(r_{p}^{(2)}, \ldots, r_{p}^{(h)}\right) \bmod p^{2 v_{p}-1}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then it is easily verified that $\left|\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)\right| \gg Y^{h} / \log Y$.
To estimate $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, we will follow the argument from Lemma 6.15. In particular, it suffices to analyse the behaviour
of (6.29). In this case, we see that $-\operatorname{det} M=J y_{2}^{2}$, whence we obtain $\left(\frac{-\operatorname{det} M}{y_{1}}\right)=1$. Thus we get $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1$ and the lemma follows.
Proof of Proposition 6.10. If $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L}=h-1$, (6.18) follows from taking $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ to be as in Lemmas 6.12, 6.14, 6.15, or 6.16 depending on the value of $s$ (see (6.22)). In each case, we see that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=1$ for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, by construction, as we have ensured that $\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)=1$. Next, observe that by our analysis of $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right)$, we obtain that $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}_{p}$ for each prime $p$, whenever $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. As $\mathbf{y}$ also lies in $Y \Omega_{\infty}$, we also get real solubility for the equation $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$. Therefore, by the Hasse principle for quadratic polynomials, $F_{\mathbf{y}}=0$ is soluble over Z. This completes the proof of the proposition.
6.4. Proof of Theorem 2.4. Suppose that Hypothesis 1 holds. Let $\Omega_{\infty}$ be as in $\S$ 6.3. Let $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B^{2 / 3-\eta}$ for some $\eta>0$. Define

$$
\mathscr{E}(B, Y)=B^{m-\frac{r}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} Y^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{r-3}{4}}+B^{m-\frac{r}{2}-\frac{\kappa}{2}} Y^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{r+\kappa}{4}-2}
$$

Our task now will be to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{m-2} Y^{h-1-\varepsilon}+O_{\varepsilon}\left((B Y)^{\varepsilon} \mathscr{E}(B, Y) Y^{h}\right) \tag{6.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then Theorem 2.4 will follow by choosing $Y$ appropriately.
Let $\mathscr{L}$ be the variety defined in (4.4). Suppose that $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L}=h-$ 1 and let $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{h} \cap Y \Omega_{\infty}$ be as in Proposition 6.10. Let $\mathbf{y} \in$ $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$. Then $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)=1$. Recall the counting function $N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)$ from (6.3). We have by (6.16) that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B) \gg N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)
$$

where $w_{\mathbf{y}}$ is as in (6.15) and

$$
N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\sum_{F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0} w_{\mathbf{y}}\left((B \sqrt{Y})^{-1} g \mathbf{x}\right)
$$

Set

$$
\kappa= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } 2 \mid r \\ 1 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

We get from Theorem [24, Theorem 1.1], that for any $\varepsilon>0$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right)=\frac{\sigma_{\infty}\left(\tilde{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}, u_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) B^{m-2} Y^{\frac{m}{2}-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^{r}\left|\lambda_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\|F_{\mathbf{y}}\right\|^{\frac{m-r}{2}}}+O\left((B Y)^{\varepsilon} \mathscr{E}(B, Y)\right) \tag{6.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we get by using the fact that $\tilde{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a solution in the support of $u_{\mathbf{y}}$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{\infty}\left(\tilde{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}, u_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg 1 \tag{6.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

independent of $\mathbf{y}$. Thus we obtain from (6.14), (6.32) and (6.33) that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B) \gg N\left(B \sqrt{Y}, w_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg_{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) B^{m-2} Y^{-1}+O_{\varepsilon}\left((B Y)^{\varepsilon} \mathscr{E}(B, Y)\right)
$$

Summing over $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ we get from Proposition 6.10 that (6.31) holds.

Suppose next that $\operatorname{dim} \mathscr{L} \leqslant h-2$. We will show that (6.31) holds in this case as well. Let $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ be the set we obtain from Proposition 6.9, Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$ and let $g=g_{\mathbf{y}}=\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{h}\right)$. Then $g<_{C} 1$. In this case we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B) & \gg \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}, g)=1 \\
F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})=0}} w_{\mathbf{y}}\left((B \sqrt{Y})^{-1} g \mathbf{x}\right) \\
& \gg \sum_{d \mid g} \mu(d) \sum_{F_{\mathbf{y}}(d \mathbf{x})=0} w_{\mathbf{y}}\left(d(B \sqrt{Y})^{-1} \mathbf{x}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that $F_{\mathbf{y}}(d \mathbf{x})=C(d \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=d^{3} C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} / d)=d^{3} F_{\mathbf{y} / d}(\mathbf{x})$. As $\mathbf{y} / d \in$ $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, we see that $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y} / d}\right) \gg Y^{-\varepsilon}$. As a result, we may proceed as before to conclude once again that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)>_{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) B^{m-2} Y^{-1}+O_{\varepsilon}\left((B Y)^{\varepsilon} \mathscr{E}(B, Y)\right)
$$

Using the lower bound $\mathfrak{S}\left(F_{\mathbf{y}}\right) \gg Y^{-\varepsilon}$ and summing over $\mathscr{C}_{h}(Y)$, we get that (6.31) holds, as required.

All that remains now is to choose $Y$ in (6.31) so that the main term exceeds the error term. On writing

$$
\mathscr{E}(B, Y)=B^{m-\frac{r}{2}} Y^{\frac{m}{2}+\frac{r-3}{4}}\left\{B^{-\frac{1}{2}}+B^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} Y^{\frac{\kappa-5}{4}}\right\}
$$

we see that

$$
\max \left\{B^{-\frac{1}{2}}, B^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} Y^{\frac{\kappa-5}{4}}\right\}= \begin{cases}B^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}} Y^{\frac{\kappa-5}{4}} & \text { if } \kappa=0 \text { and } Y \ll B^{\frac{2}{5}} \\ B^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Recall that $m=n-h$ and define for $\varepsilon>0$

$$
Y= \begin{cases}B^{\frac{2(r-4)}{2 m+r-4}-\varepsilon} & \text { if } r \text { is even and } 2 r-m<8 \\ B^{\frac{2(r-3)}{2 m+r+1}-\varepsilon} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

With this choice of $Y$, we see that the error term in (6.31) is smaller than the main term and we get that

$$
N(B) \ggg{ }_{\varepsilon} B^{n-h-2} Y^{h-1-\varepsilon} .
$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

## 7. Proof of Theorem 2.6

In this section we will examine cubic forms that are of the following shape:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x})=x_{1} Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+x_{5} Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{y}=\left(x_{6}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, the $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ are non-zero quadratic forms and $R(\mathbf{y})$ is a cubic form. Our aim will be to prove Theorem [2.6.
7.1. Preliminaries. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will assume that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$ variables. This implies that none of the quadratic forms $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ can vanish identically.

Suppose that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is reducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and let

$$
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}),
$$

where $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a linear form and $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a quadratic form. We will now show that $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is independent of $\mathbf{x}$ and that $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ for linear forms $l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$. Note that such $l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ are necessarily coprime. For otherwise, $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ becomes degenerate in $\mathbf{x}$.

Let $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{5} \alpha_{i} x_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n-5} l_{i} y_{i}$, say. Suppose first that $l_{i}=0$ for each $i$. As $F$ is linear in $\mathbf{x}$, we see that $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ can only comprise of terms of terms that are quadratic in $y_{j}$. Then $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=G(\mathbf{y})$, whence $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{x}) G(\mathbf{y})$. Making a linear change of variables, $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ can be made independent of $x_{2}, \ldots, x_{4}$, which contradicts our assumption that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is non-degenerate in $\mathbf{x}$.

So we must have that $l_{i} \neq 0$ for some $i$. As $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is at most quadratic in $\mathbf{y}$, we see that $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ cannot have terms that are quadratic in $\mathbf{y}$. Observe now that $\alpha_{j}=0$ for each $1 \leqslant j \leqslant 5$, for otherwise, by the linearity of $F$ in $\mathbf{x}, q$ cannot have terms of the form $x_{u} y_{v}$ or $x_{u} x_{v}$, which would force $q=0$, which is impossible.

To recap, we have shown that $l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{y})$ depends only on $\mathbf{y}$ and that $q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{u, v} s_{u, v} x_{u} y_{v}=\sum_{u} x_{u} \sum_{v} s_{u, v} y_{v}$, for $s_{u, v} \in \mathbf{Z}$. Put $l_{u}(\mathbf{y})=\sum_{v} s_{u, v} y_{v}$. Then we get

$$
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{u=1}^{5} x_{u} l_{u}(\mathbf{y}),
$$

as required. We record our findings in the following result.
Lemma 7.1. Suppose that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ given in (7.2) is non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$. If $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is reducible over $\mathbf{Q}$, then there exist linear forms $l(\mathbf{y})$, $l_{1}(\mathbf{y}), l_{2}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, l_{5}(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{y}]$ such that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$.

Remark 7.2. Although we will not use this observation in our work, the preceding argument shows that if $F$ is irreducible, then $F$ is, in fact, geometrically irreducible.

As a result of Lemma [7.1, our proof of Theorem 2.6 naturally splits into the case where $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is irreducible, and the case where $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ has a linear factor over $\mathbf{Q}$. The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of the following theorems, which clearly imply Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 7.3. Let $C(\mathbf{x})$ be a form in $n$ variables such that $h(C) \geqslant$ 8. Suppose that $C(\mathbf{x})$ is of the form given in (17.1). Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is reducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$. Then for any $\varepsilon>0$ we have

$$
N(B) \gg{ }_{\varepsilon} B^{n-3-\varepsilon} .
$$

Theorem 7.4. Let $C(\mathbf{x})$ be a cubic form in $n \geqslant 10$ variables. Suppose that $C(\mathbf{x})$ is of the form given in (7.1). Assume that the cubic form $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and non-degenerate in the $x_{i}$. Then for any $\varepsilon>0$ we have

$$
N(B) \ggg{ }_{\varepsilon} B^{n-3-\varepsilon} .
$$

Our approach in proving the theorems will be as follows. For any non-empty compact set $\Omega_{\infty} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n-5}$, and a parameter $Y \leqslant B$, both of which will be chosen later, we have

$$
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in Y \Omega_{\infty} \cap \mathbf{Z}^{n-5} \\ \text { such that } \\ \text { solu, that }=0 \text { is } \\ \text { soluble over } \mathbf{Z}}} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}| \leq B \\(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{n} \\ C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=0}} 1 .
$$

For an integer $l$, let

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{\mathbf{y}, l}(B)=\#\{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant B:(\mathbf{x}, l)=1 \text { and } C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=0\} \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our strategy will be to obtain an asymptotic formula for $N_{\mathbf{y}}(B)$ by appealing to Proposition 5.1. To be able to execute the $\mathbf{y}$-sum in Theorem 7.4, we will need to restrict $\mathbf{y}$ to lie in a carefully chosen subset, which ensures, in particular, the solubility of the equation $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=0$.

Lemma 7.5. Let

$$
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{k} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \alpha_{i} x_{i} y_{i}+R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right)
$$

where $R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right)=\alpha_{3} x_{3} y_{3} y_{k}+\alpha_{4} x_{4} y_{4} y_{k}+\alpha_{5} x_{5} y_{5} y_{k}+R(\mathbf{y})$, with $\alpha_{i} \neq 0$ and $R$ a cubic form. Suppose that $h(C) \geqslant 8$. Let $g=\operatorname{gcd}\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}\right)$
and let $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{i} / g$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2$. Define

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{C}(Y)=\left\{\left|x_{3}\right|,\left|x_{4}\right|,\left|x_{5}\right|,|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y:\right. & \left(\beta_{1} y_{1}, \beta_{2} y_{2}\right)=1, y_{k} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y) \\
& \left.R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \equiv 0 \bmod y_{k}\right\} \tag{7.4}
\end{align*}
$$

If $\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$, then $C\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, g x_{3}, g x_{4}, g x_{5}, g \mathbf{y}\right)=0$ soluble over Z. Moreover, we have $|\mathscr{C}(Y)| \gg Y^{n-3} / \log Y$.

Proof. Let $\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$. For $\mathbf{b}=\left(b_{3}, \ldots, b_{n-5}\right) \in \mathbf{A}^{n-7}$, let $\hat{\mathbf{b}}=\left(b_{3}, \ldots, b_{k-1}, 0, b_{k+1}, \ldots, b_{n-5}\right) \in \mathbf{A}^{n-7}$. Define

$$
M\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{k}\right)=\#\left\{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}_{y_{1}}^{n-5}: R(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \equiv 0\left(\bmod y_{k}\right)\right\}
$$

Observe that modulo $y_{k}$ we have $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=R(\hat{\mathbf{y}})=R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}\right)$. For any fixed $y_{1}, y_{2}$, set

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{y_{1}, y_{2}}\left(y_{3}, \ldots, y_{k-1}, y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_{n-5}\right)= \\
& \quad R\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, \ldots, y_{k-1}, 0, y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_{n-5}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $S_{y_{1}, y_{2}}$ is a cubic polynomial in $n-8$ variables whose cubic part is independent of $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$.

Since $S_{y_{1}, y_{2}}$ was obtained by fixing 3 of the variables in $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we have $h\left(S_{y_{1}, y_{2}}\right) \geqslant h(C)-3$. Then according to [12, Theorem 3], we have

$$
\begin{align*}
M\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{k}\right) & =y_{k}^{n-9}+O\left(y_{k}^{n-8-\frac{h(C)-3}{4}}\right)  \tag{7.5}\\
& \gg y_{k}^{n-9}
\end{align*}
$$

if $h(C) \geqslant 8$. Note that the implied constant depends only on the cubic part of $S$, which, as we have already noted, is independent of $y_{1}, y_{2}$.

We may write

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{C}(Y)| & =\sum_{\substack{\left|x_{3}\right|,\left|x_{4}\right|,\left|x_{5}\right| \leqslant Y}} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\left(\beta_{1} y_{1}, \beta_{2} y_{2}\right)=1 \\
y_{1} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y) \\
R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \equiv 0 \bmod y_{k}}} 1 \\
& \geqslant Y^{3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\left(\beta_{1} y_{1}, \beta_{2} y_{2}\right)=1 \\
y_{k} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y) \\
R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \equiv 0 \bmod y_{k}}} 1,
\end{aligned}
$$

as $R_{1}$ is independent of $x_{3}, x_{4}$ and $x_{5}$ modulo $y_{k}$. Fixing $y_{1}, y_{2}$ and $y_{k}$ and splitting up the other variables $y_{i}$ into progressions modulo $y_{k}$, we
get from (7.5) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{C}(Y)| & \gg Y^{3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\left(\beta_{1} y_{1}, \beta_{2} y_{2}\right)=1 \\
y_{k} \in \mathscr{P}(\delta Y)}}\left(Y / y_{k}\right)^{n-8} y_{k}^{n-9} \\
& \gg Y^{n-3} / \log Y
\end{aligned}
$$

since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \#\left\{\left|y_{1}\right|,\left|y_{2}\right| \leqslant Y:\left(\beta_{1} y_{1}, \beta_{2} y_{2}\right)=1\right\}= \\
& \quad Y^{2} \prod_{p \nmid \beta}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^{2}}\right) \prod_{p \mid \beta}\left(1-\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{2}\left(p, \alpha_{i}\right)}{p^{2}}\right)+O(Y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 7.6. Let $C$ be as in (7.1) and that $n \geqslant 10 . \operatorname{Let} Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})$ be non-zero quadratic forms with no common factors. Then there exists a compact set $\Omega_{\infty} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n-5}$ with the property that for any $P>_{C} 1$, there exists a set $\mathscr{C}(P) \subset \mathbf{Z}^{n-5} \cap P \Omega_{\infty}$, for which the following hold.
(1) For any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(P)$, there exists $i$ such that $\left|Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})\right| \gg P^{2}$.
(2) For any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(P)$, the equation (7.1) is soluble over $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})\right)<_{C} 1$.
(3) We have $\# \mathscr{C}(P) \gg P^{n-5}$.

Proof. We begin by constructing the set $\Omega_{\infty}$. By hypothesis, none of the quadratic forms $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ vanish identically. In particular, we have that $\operatorname{rank} Q_{1}=r \geqslant 1$. Then there exists an orthogonal matrix $U \in O_{n}(\mathbf{R})$ such that $Q_{1}(U \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{r} A_{i} y_{i}^{2}$ is diagonal and $A_{i} \neq 0$. Consequently, we can find disjoint subsets $I, J \subset\{1,2, \ldots, r\}$ such that $I \cup J=\{1,2, \ldots, r\}$ and

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{r} A_{i} y_{i}^{2}=\sum_{i \in I}\left|A_{i}\right| y_{i}^{2}-\sum_{j \in J}\left|A_{i}\right| y_{i}^{2} .
$$

For $i \in I$ and $j \in J$ let

$$
\mathscr{U}_{i}=\left[1 / \sqrt{\left|A_{i}\right|}, 2 / \sqrt{\left|A_{i}\right|}\right] \text { and } \mathscr{H}_{i}=\left[1 / 4 \sqrt{n\left|A_{i}\right|}, 1 / 2 \sqrt{n\left|A_{i}\right|}\right] .
$$

Define $\mathscr{B} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n-5}$ to be the set consisting of tuples $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-5}\right)$ such that $x_{i} \in \mathscr{U}_{i}$ if $i \in I, x_{j} \in \mathscr{V}_{j}$ if $j \in J$ and $x_{k} \in[-1,1]$ if $k>r$. Then $Q_{1}(U \mathbf{z}) \gg 1$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathscr{B}$. Set $\Omega_{\infty}=U \mathscr{B}$.

Let $P \geqslant 1$. Observe that if $\mathbf{y} \in P \Omega_{\infty}$, then $\mathbf{y}=U \mathbf{z}$, for some $\mathbf{z} \in P \mathscr{B}$, whence $\left|Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})\right|=\left|Q_{1}(U \mathbf{z})\right|=\left|\sum_{i=1}^{r} A_{i} z_{i}^{2}\right| \gg P^{2}$. This completes the proof of the second statement of the lemma.

We will deduce the other statements by appealing to Proposition 4.2, Let $X \in \mathbf{A}^{n}$ denote the hypersurface cut out by the equation $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=$ 0 . Recall the map $\pi$ from Section 4. Then for any $P \geqslant 1$, it follows that $P \Omega_{\infty} \subset \pi(X(\mathbf{R}))$. To see this, note that $Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ whenever $\mathbf{y} \in P \Omega_{\infty}$. As a result, there exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^{5}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})+R(\mathbf{y})=0$. Thus the hypotheses of Theorem 4.2 are all satisfied and the lemma follows.
7.2. Proof of Theorem 7.3, Let $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be as in (7.1). Suppose that $l(\mathbf{y})$ is a linear form that divides each $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$. Then after making a change of variables, we may suppose that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{k} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \alpha_{i} x_{i} y_{i}+R(\mathbf{y}) \tag{7.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k$ is an integer between 1 and $n-5$ and $\alpha_{i}$ are integers. Suppose that $k \geqslant 5$. The case where $1 \leqslant k \leqslant 4$ is handled similarly, the details of which are left to the reader.

Since $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is non-degenerate, in the $x_{i}$, we see that $\alpha_{i} \neq 0$. We will rewrite this as follows,

$$
C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{k} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \alpha_{i} x_{i} y_{i}+R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right)
$$

where $R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right)=\alpha_{3} x_{3} y_{3} y_{k}+\alpha_{4} x_{4} y_{4} y_{k}+\alpha_{5} x_{5} y_{5} y_{k}+R(\mathbf{y})$.
Let $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B$ be a parameter. Let $\mathscr{P}(\delta Y)$ denote the set of primes in the interval $[\delta Y, 2 \delta Y]$, where $0<\delta<1 / 10$ is a small fixed real number. Let $g=\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}\right)$ and set $\beta_{1}=\alpha_{1} / g$ and $\beta_{2}=\alpha_{2} / g$. We have the following lemma.

Replacing $x_{3}, x_{4}$ and $x_{5}$ by $g x_{3}, g x_{4}$ and $g x_{5}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ by $g \mathbf{y}$ in (7.6), we see that to solve the equation $C\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, g x_{3}, x_{4}, g x_{5}, g \mathbf{y}\right)=0$ it suffices to solve

$$
y_{k}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{2} \beta_{i} x_{i} y_{i}\right)+R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right)=0
$$

where $\beta_{i}=\alpha_{i} / g$. Note that $\left(\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}\right)=1$. Thus we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{\substack{\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) \in \mathscr{C}(Y)}} \sum_{\substack{\left.\left|x_{1}\right|,\left|x_{2}\right| \leqslant B / g \\ x_{1}, x_{2}, g\right)=1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{2} \beta_{i} x_{i} y_{i}+R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) / y_{k}=0}} 1 . \tag{7.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By construction, we have that $R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) / y_{k} \ll Y^{2}$. Let

$$
\Lambda_{y_{1}, y_{2}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{2}: \sum_{i=1}^{2} \beta_{i} x_{i} y_{i}=0\right\}
$$

Since $\alpha_{i} \neq 0$, we see that $\operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{y_{1}, y_{2}}=1$ and $\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{y_{1}, y_{2}} \gg Y$. Consequently, if $Y \leqslant B^{1-\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon>0$, by Corollary 5.2 we get that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\#\left\{\left|x_{1}\right|,\left|x_{2}\right| \leqslant B / g \text { and }(\mathbf{x}, g)=1: \sum_{i=1}^{2} \beta_{i} x_{i} y_{i}=-R_{1}\left(x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, \mathbf{y}\right) / y_{k}\right\} \\
\gg B / Y+O(1)
\end{gathered}
$$

Therefore, by (7.7) and by Lemma 7.5 we have for any $Y \leqslant B^{1-\varepsilon}$ that

$$
N(B) \gg \frac{B Y^{n-4}}{\log Y}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{n-3} / \log Y\right)
$$

Theorem 7.3 follows from setting $Y=B^{1-\varepsilon}$.
7.3. Proof of Theorem 7.4. We begin with the following result.

Lemma 7.7. Let $v \geqslant 4$. Let $\psi_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \psi_{v}(\mathbf{y})$ be quadratic forms in $m$ variables with integer coefficients. Suppose that $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=x_{1} \psi_{1}(\mathbf{y})+$ $\ldots+x_{v} \psi_{v}(\mathbf{y})$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ and non-degenerate in the variables $x_{i}$. Let $Z_{\mathbf{x}} \subset \mathbf{A}^{m}$ denote the variety cut out by the equation $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=$ 0 . Then the set

$$
\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{v}: Z_{\mathbf{x}} \text { is not integral }\right\}
$$

is contained in a proper subvariety of $\mathbf{A}^{v}$. In particular, there exists a minor of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{x}]$ that does not vanish identically, where $M[\mathbf{x}]$ denotes the matrix of the quadratic form $\Psi$ over $\mathbf{Q}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{v}\right)$.

Proof. Let $Z \subset \mathbf{A}^{m+v}$ denote the variety cut out by $\sum_{i=1}^{v} x_{i} \psi_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0$. Let $\pi: Z \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{v}$ denote the natural projection map $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$. It is clear that $\pi$ is a morphism of finite type with fibres $Z_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $\eta=(0)$ denote the generic point of $\mathbf{A}^{v}$. Then the generic fibre $Z_{\eta}$ is nothing but Spec $\frac{K[\mathbf{y}]}{(F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))}$, where $K=\mathbf{Q}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{v}\right)$. Recall that a scheme is integral if and only if it is reduced and irreducible. We have by Proposition 3.9 that $Z_{\eta}$ is geometrically integral. As a result, the first assertion of the lemma follows from [29, Tag 0559] and [29, Tag 0578] applied to $\pi$, since $\mathbf{A}^{v}$ is irreducible. The second statement of the lemma follows from Lemma 3.5.

Let $M[\mathbf{x}]$ denote the matrix associated with the quadratic form $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$. Let $\left\{\phi_{1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{x})\right\}$ denote the set of minors of $M[\mathbf{x}]$ that do not vanish identically. This set is non-empty by Lemma 7.7 , We will now discuss two separate cases:
(1) The minors $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ have no common linear factor.
(2) $l(\mathbf{x}) \mid \phi_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant J$ and $l(\mathbf{x})$ is a linear form.
7.3.1. Case 1: The minors $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ have no common linear factor. Let $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant B$ be a parameter we will choose later. Since $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is irreducible, it follows from Lemma 7.1 that $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ have no common factor.

Let $\mathscr{C}(Y)$ denote the set constructed in Lemma 7.6 and let $\mathbf{y} \in$ $\mathscr{C}(Y)$. Then $\operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})\right)<_{C}$. As a result, if $p \mid \mathbf{y}$, then $p^{2} \mid \operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})\right)<_{C} 1$. This shows that for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$, we have that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-5}\right)<_{C} 1$. Therefore if we let $g(\mathbf{y})=\operatorname{gcd}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-5}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(B) \geqslant \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)} N_{\mathbf{y}, g(\mathbf{y})}(B) \tag{7.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $N_{\mathbf{y}, g(\mathbf{y})}(B)$ as in (7.3) and $g(\mathbf{y})<_{C} 1$.
Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{5}: \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0\right\} . \tag{7.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$ is a lattice in $\mathbf{R}^{5}$. If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$, as $Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \gg Y^{2}$ for some $i$, we get that $\operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4$. Let $G(\mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{5} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})^{2}$. Then we also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}} & =\frac{\sqrt{G(\mathbf{y})}}{\operatorname{gcd}\left(Q_{1}(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})\right)} \\
& \gg Y^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

As a result, if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$ then $|R(\mathbf{y})| / \operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \ll B^{1-\eta}$. Therefore, appealing to Corollary 5.2 and noting that $g(\mathbf{y}) \ll 1$, we get that

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}, g(\mathbf{y})}(B) \gg \frac{B^{4}}{\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}}+O\left(\sum_{j=0}^{3} \frac{B^{j}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{j}}\right),
$$

where $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \geqslant 1$ is the first successive minimum of the lattice $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$.
As $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \ll\left(\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1 / 4} \ll Y^{1 / 2} \ll B^{1 / 2-\eta / 2}$, we see that $B^{j} / \lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{j} \leqslant$ $B^{3} / \lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}$ for each $0 \leqslant j \leqslant 2$. Therefore, we have

$$
N_{\mathbf{y}, g(\mathbf{y})}(B) \gg \frac{B^{4}}{\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}}+O\left(\frac{B^{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}}\right) .
$$

Summing over vectors $\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)$, we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
N(B) & \geqslant \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)} N_{\mathbf{y}}(B) \\
& \gg B^{4} Y^{-2} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)} 1+O\left(\sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4}} \frac{B^{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}}\right)  \tag{7.10}\\
& \gg B^{4} Y^{n-7}+O\left(\sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4}} \frac{B^{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

by Lemma 7.6. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
E T=\sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\ \operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4}} \frac{B^{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}} \tag{7.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

To estimate $E T$, we will require the following lemma, which is an effective version of Hilbert's irreducibility theorem.

Lemma 7.8. Suppose that $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the hypotheses in the statement of Proposition 7.4. Let $\left\{\phi_{1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, \phi_{J}(\mathbf{x})\right\}$ be the set of minors of order 3 of $M[\mathbf{x}]$ that do not vanish identically. Suppose that $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ have no common linear factors. Then for $\varepsilon>0$ we have

$$
\#\left\{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant R: \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \text { is reducible over } \mathbf{Q}\right\}<_{\varepsilon} R^{3+\varepsilon} .
$$

Proof. We have by Lemma 7.7 that the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{5}$ for which $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is reducible is contained in a proper subvariety in $\mathbf{A}^{5}$. For any such $\mathbf{x}$, Lemma 3.5 ensures that rank $M[\mathbf{x}] \leqslant 2$. Therefore, if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{5}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is reducible, then $\phi(\mathbf{x})=0$, for each minor $\phi$ of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{x}]$.

Suppose first that there exists a minor $\Delta(\mathbf{x})$ of order 3 that is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$. Then an upper bound for the number of $|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant R$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is reducible is given by $\#\{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant R: \Delta(\mathbf{x})=0\}$, which is $O_{\varepsilon}\left(R^{3+\varepsilon}\right)$, for any $\varepsilon>0$, by [9, Theorem 3].

Suppose next that we are in the case where all the minors $\phi_{i}$ have a linear factor. Then by our assumption that $\phi_{i}$ have no common factor, there exist at least two minors of order $3, \Delta_{1}(\mathbf{x})=l_{1}(\mathbf{x}) q_{1}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Delta_{2}(\mathbf{x})=l_{2}(\mathbf{x}) q_{2}(\mathbf{x})$, say, with $l_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ non-constant. In this case, the set
of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{5}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ is reducible lies in

$$
\mathscr{X}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{5}: \Delta_{1}(\mathbf{x})=\Delta_{2}(\mathbf{x})=0\right\}
$$

Using the fact that $l_{1}(\mathbf{x}) \nmid \Delta_{2}(\mathbf{x})$ and $l_{2}(\mathbf{x}) \nmid \Delta_{1}(\mathbf{x})$, we get that $\mathscr{X}$ lies in a codimension 2 subvariety in $\mathbf{A}^{5}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

As rank $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4$ for each $\mathbf{y}$ in (7.11), we have that

$$
\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \ll\left(\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1 / 4} \ll Y^{1 / 2}
$$

Therefore we may write

$$
\begin{aligned}
E T & =B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 2} \\
R \text { dyadic }}} R^{-3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\text { such that } \\
\text { rank } \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4 \\
\text { and } \\
R \leqslant \lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \leqslant 2 R}} 1 \\
& \ll B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 2} \\
R \text { dyadic }}} R^{-3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y}} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant 2 R \\
\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}}} 1 \\
& \ll B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 2} \\
R \text { dyadic }}} \sum_{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant 2 R} \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{5}|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0 \\
& 1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 7.8 and [20, Theorem 2] we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
E T & \lll \varepsilon B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 2} \\
R \text { dyadic }}} R^{-3}\left\{R^{5} Y^{n-7+\varepsilon}+R^{3} Y^{n-6+\varepsilon}\right\} \\
& \lll \varepsilon B^{3} Y^{n-6+\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}
$$

for any fixed $\varepsilon>0$. By setting $Y=B^{1-2 \varepsilon}$ the first case of Proposition 7.4 follows from (7.10).
7.3.2. Case 2: The minors $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{x})$ are divisible by a common linear factor. Let $l(\mathbf{x})$ be a linear form in $\mathbf{x}$. Let $Z_{l} \subset \mathbf{A}^{n}$ be the variety defined by $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=l(\mathbf{x})=0$. Make the change of variables $l(\mathbf{x})=z_{5}$. Then we get

$$
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=m_{1}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{1}(\mathbf{y})+\ldots+m_{5}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{5}(\mathbf{y})
$$

for linear forms $m_{1}(\mathbf{z}), \ldots, m_{5}(\mathbf{z})$. Let $m_{i}(\mathbf{z})=\sum_{j=1}^{5} \tau_{i, j} z_{j}$ and set

$$
\tau_{i}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{4}\right)=m_{i}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{4}, 0\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{4} \tau_{i, j} z_{j}
$$

Let

$$
F_{l}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=\sum_{j=1}^{4} z_{j} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i, j} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})=\sum_{j=1}^{4} z_{j} G_{j}(\mathbf{y})
$$

Then we find that

$$
Z_{l} \subset \mathbf{A}^{4} \times \mathbf{A}^{n-5}: F_{l}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})=0
$$

Suppose first that $Z_{l}$ is irreducible. Since $Z_{l}$ is non-degenerate in $z_{i}$, we get from Lemma 7.7 that get that the set

$$
\left\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{A}^{4}: F_{l}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \text { is reducible over } \mathbf{Q}\right\}
$$

is contained in a proper subvariety of $\mathbf{A}^{4}$. Taking $l(\mathbf{x})$ to be the linear factor that divides every minor of order 3 in $M[\mathbf{x}]$, this in turn implies that the set

$$
\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{A}^{5}: F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \text { is reducible over } \mathbf{Q}\right\}
$$

is contained in a codimension 2 subvariety in $\mathbf{A}^{5}$. As a result, we get that

$$
\#\left\{|\mathbf{x}| \leqslant R: \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \text { is reducible over } \mathbf{Q}\right\} \ll R^{3}
$$

Using the above estimate in place of Lemma [7.8, we may argue as in Section 7.3.1 to conclude that $N(B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{n-3-\varepsilon}$ if $Z_{l}$ is irreducible.

Turning to the case where $Z_{l}$ is reducible, we find that

$$
F_{l}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})=t(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{j=1}^{4} z_{j} g_{j}(\mathbf{y})
$$

for linear forms $t(\mathbf{y})$ and $g_{j}(\mathbf{y})$. Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & =\sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i}(\mathbf{z}) Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})+z_{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i, 5} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \\
& =F_{l}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})+z_{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i, 5} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \\
& =t(\mathbf{y}) \sum_{j=1}^{4} g_{j}(\mathbf{y}) z_{j}+z_{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \tau_{i, 5} Q_{i}(\mathbf{y})
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, by making a change of variables, we may suppose that

$$
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=y_{1} \sum_{i=1}^{4} z_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})+z_{5} Q(\mathbf{y})
$$

for certain linear forms $l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ that have no common factor, and a nonzero quadratic form $Q(\mathbf{y})$.

We proceed once again as in Section 7.3.1, Let $\eta>0$ and $1 \leqslant Y \leqslant$ $B^{1-\eta}$. Let $\mathscr{C}(Y)$ be as in Lemma 7.6 and let $\Lambda_{\mathrm{y}}$ be as in (7.9). Then we get from (7.8) and (7.10) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(B) \gg \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)} \frac{B^{4}}{\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}}+O\left(\sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\ \operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4}} \frac{B^{3}}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}}\right) \tag{7.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})$ is the length of the shortest non-zero vector in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$. Note that $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \ll\left(\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}\right)^{1 / 4} \ll Y^{1 / 2}$. Arguing as before, we get from Lemma 7.6 that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{C}(Y)} \frac{B^{4}}{\operatorname{det} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}} \gg B^{4} Y^{n-7} \tag{7.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moving on to estimating the error term in (7.12), define the lattice

$$
\widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^{4}: \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0\right\} .
$$

If $l_{i}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$, for some $i$, we see that $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$ is a sublattice of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$ of rank 3 . Observe that if $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{5}\right) \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$, then $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}\right) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$ as long as $y_{1} \neq 0$.

Suppose that $R \leqslant \lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y}) \leqslant 2 R$ for some $R \geqslant 1$. Then there exists a vector $\mathbf{x}$ in the annulus $R \leqslant|\mathbf{x}|_{2} \leqslant 2 R$ such that $\mathbf{x}$ has the least length in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$. Then if $y_{1} \neq 0$, we find that $\mathbf{z}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}\right) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$, which has shorter norm. So the shortest non-zero vector in $\Lambda_{y}$ must, in fact, lie in $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$. Note that the length of the shortest integer vector in $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$ is bounded by $Y^{1 / r}$, where $r=\operatorname{rank} \widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}}$. As a result, if we let

$$
E T=B^{3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\ \operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4}} \frac{1}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}},
$$

we must have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E T & \ll B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 3} \\
Y \text { dyadic }}} \frac{1}{R^{3}} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
y_{1} \neq 0 \\
l_{i}(\mathbf{y} \neq 0 \\
\text { for some } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \widetilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{y}} \cap \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{4} \\
R \ll|\mathbf{x}| \ll R}} 1 \\
& +B^{3} \sum_{\substack{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y \\
\text { rank } \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}=4 \\
\text { either } y_{1}=0, \\
\text { or } l_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0 \\
\text { for each i }}} \frac{1}{\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})^{3}} \\
& =B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 3} \\
Y \text { dyadic }}} \frac{1}{R^{3}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{4} \\
R \ll|\mathbf{x}| \ll R \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0}} \sum_{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y} 1+B^{3} Y^{n-6}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the fact that if either $y_{1}=0$, or if $l_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0$ for each $i$, then $\operatorname{rank} \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \neq 4$ unless $Q(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$, which forces $x_{5}=0$, whence $\lambda_{1}(\mathbf{y})=1$.

Since $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\mathrm{prim}}^{4}$ and since $l_{i}(\mathbf{y})$ have no common linear factors, we have

$$
\#\left\{|\mathbf{y}| \leqslant Y: \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{i} l_{i}(\mathbf{y})=0\right\} \ll \frac{Y^{n-6}}{|\mathbf{x}|_{2}}+Y^{n-7}
$$

Consequently, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
E T & \ll B^{3} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 3} \\
Y \text { dyadic }}} \frac{1}{R^{3}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}_{\text {prim }}^{4} \\
R \ll|\mathbf{x}| \ll R}}\left(\frac{Y^{n-6}}{R}+B^{3} Y^{n-7}\right)+B^{3} Y^{n-6} \\
& \ll B^{3} Y^{n-6} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant R \ll Y^{1 / 3} \\
Y \text { dyadic }}}(1+R / Y) \lll \varepsilon B^{3} Y^{n-6+\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $\varepsilon>0$. Thus by setting $Y=B^{1-2 \varepsilon}$, we get from (7.13) that

$$
N(B) \gg_{\varepsilon} B^{n-3-\varepsilon}
$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 7.4.
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