The remainder of the proof goes through without change. Therefore (3.13) holds without exception.

We now substitute from (3.6) and (3.12) in (2.10) to get

\[
\left(\frac{hh}{p+1}\right) \sum_{n \equiv 1 (p+1)} \frac{B_0\left(\frac{\mu + y}{h}\right)}{B_1(y)} = \frac{(hh)^{p-\sigma}}{p-1} \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{B_0\left(\frac{\mu + y}{h}\right)}{B_1(y)}\right).
\]

This evidently completes the proof of (1.10) when \( p > 1 \).

When \( p = 0 \), we have

\[
S_0(h, k; x, y) = \sum_{n \equiv 1 (p+1)} B_0\left(\frac{\mu + y}{h}\right) = B_0(y),
\]

so that

\[
S_0 = \lambda \left(\frac{B_0\left(\frac{\mu + y}{h}\right)}{B_1(y)}\right).
\]

On the other hand,

\[
(Bh + Bk + ky + kx) = \lambda B_0(y) + \lambda B_1(x).
\]

Since \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \), it is clear that (1.10) holds when \( p = 0 \).
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S. 129³ statt "zu 1 teilerfreien Zahlen" lies "zu 1 teilerfreien Zahlen";
S. 131³ statt "\( \sigma > r+1 > 1 \)" lies "\( \sigma > r+1 < 1 \)".