

CONVERGENCE FOR NONCOMMUTATIVE RATIONAL FUNCTIONS EVALUATED IN RANDOM MATRICES

BENOÎT COLLINS, TOBIAS MAI, AKIHIRO MIYAGAWA, FÉLIX PARRAUD,
AND SHENG YIN ^{1,2}

ABSTRACT. One of the main applications of free probability is to show that for appropriately chosen independent copies of d random matrix models, any noncommutative polynomial in these d variables has a spectral distribution that converges asymptotically and can be described with the help of free probability. This paper aims to show that this can be extended to noncommutative rational functions, answering an open question by Roland Speicher.

This paper also provides a noncommutative probability approach to approximating the free field. At the algebraic level, its construction relies on the approximation by generic matrices. On the other hand, it admits many embeddings in the algebra of operators affiliated with a II_1 factor. A consequence of our result is that, as soon as the generators admit a random matrix model, the approximation of any self-adjoint noncommutative rational function by generic matrices can be upgraded at the level of convergence in distribution.

1. INTRODUCTION

Following the earlier work of Ching [8], Avitzour [3] and Voiculescu [41] introduced a reduced free product C^* -algebra. In particular, Voiculescu noticed that the underlying concept of freeness can be interpreted as some highly noncommutative analog of the notion of independence in classical probability theory; this insight motivated him to develop what became known as free probability. His early investigations lead him, in particular, to the free central limit theorem in the spirit of other noncommutative central limit theorems such as [19], [24]. Generally, non-trivial free products of groups yield ICC class groups, and their von Neumann algebra is a factor. Therefore they have only one finite trace, and it was natural to study free product factors from the point of view of noncommutative probability spaces – a pair consisting of an algebra and a trace. This point of view has been spectacularly successful, and arguably one of its most significant – and initially unexpected – achievements was to describe the limiting spectrum of noncommutative polynomials in i.i.d. random matrices. This phenomenon is known as asymptotic freeness. It was initially described in [42, 44]. It has been subsequently enhanced in many directions, and a notable direction of improvement was the study of the norm of a random matrix (strong asymptotic freeness). A beautiful breakthrough was made in 2005 by Haagerup, and Thorbjørnsen in [21], where they proved the almost sure convergence of the norm of a polynomial evaluated in independent GUE matrices. This method was then refined in multiple directions; the case of Gaussian orthogonal and symplectic matrices was tackled in [37], that of Wigner matrices in [7, 2], and that of Wigner and deterministic matrices in [30, 4]. Besides that, Collins and Male proved in [15] the same result with unitary Haar matrices instead

of GUE matrices by mapping this problem with Male's previous results. Those result has allowed turning an area of pure mathematics into a very useful tool for applied mathematics that relies heavily on random matrix models.

The models whose limiting behavior is well-understood thanks to asymptotic freeness involve the arithmetic operations of multiplication, addition, and scalar multiplication. Other useful operations have also been successfully studied through free probability, such as taking matrix values or Hadamard products (asymptotic freeness with amalgamation). We refer to [33] for an exposition of many classical and recent results in this direction. Recently, it has also been possible to involve systematically the composition with smooth functions, even at the level of strong convergence, cf. [16, 36].

However, one arithmetic operation that remains largely unexplored in the context of random matrix models is the inverse. The purpose of this paper is to address this question. A recent result in [47] shows that taking the inverse is a stable operation if the strong convergence replaces the convergence in distribution for matrices. More precisely, for a sequence of matrices that strongly converges in distribution towards a limiting object – an operator which we also call a (noncommutative) random variable – the sequence of their inverses will eventually be well-defined and strongly converges in distribution to the inverse of the limiting random variable, provided that this random variable has a bounded inverse. Furthermore, such a result can be extended from an inverse to noncommutative rational functions in multiple variables (a counterpart of commutative rational functions that has been developed by many pioneers, see, for examples [1, 9]) by a recursive structure of rational functions (and their representing rational expressions) or by a linearization trick for rational functions.

However, to go beyond the case of bounded evaluations, a problem that one faces about the inverse is that using it might fail to result in a well-defined model when the inverse is performed on non-invertible matrices. On the other hand, the limiting object has recently been at the center of the attention of free probabilists, and many breakthroughs have been obtained, see among others [32]. Incidentally, the limiting theory relies on the theory of noncommutative rational functions and the embedding question of the rational functions in the generating operators into the algebra of unbounded operators affiliated with the underlying von Neumann algebra. This embedding question was affirmatively answered long ago in [27], whose goal was to answer the Atiyah conjecture for some families of groups, including the free groups. It was recently noted that this result also answered the well-definedness question for rational functions in freely independent Haar unitary random variables in the context of free probability. Moreover, in [32], the well-definedness was further proved for a large family of random variables beyond the free Haar unitaries.

Let us also mention that there are many natural random matrix models involving the inverse operation and that this is an important topic nowadays, see e.g. [18, 29]. One goal of our manuscript is to provide a unified approach to the study of the limiting spectral distribution under such generality. Therefore, the natural questions are:

- can we make sense of random matrix models involving inverses?
- do they converge towards their natural limiting candidates, whose properties have been unveiled recently?

Speicher asked these questions during a meeting at MFO in 2019, [38]. Partial answers have been given under some assumptions, such as bounded evaluation and specific random matrix models, cf. [47, 18, 48]. Let us mention that [20, Theorem 5.2] considers, for freely independent semicirculars (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) , the operator $(x_1 + ix_2)(x_3 + ix_4)^{-1}$, whose radial part fits in the context of our study. While our results do not tell anything about the convergence of the spectral measure to the Brown measure, we can say that the radial part of $(X_1^N + iX_2^N)(X_3^N + iX_4^N)^{-1}$, for independent GUE matrices $(X_1^N, X_2^N, X_3^N, X_4^N)$, converges to the radial part of $(x_1 + ix_2)(x_3 + ix_4)^{-1}$, which sheds some additional light on this operator. The purpose of this paper is to settle these questions in a very general setup. Our main results can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let $X^N = (X_1^N, \dots, X_{d_1}^N)$ be a d_1 -tuple of self-adjoint random matrices and let $U^N = (U_1^N, \dots, U_{d_2}^N)$ be a d_2 -tuple of unitary random matrices. Further, let R be a non-degenerate square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in $d = d_1 + d_2$ variables which is self-adjoint of type (d_1, d_2) ; see Definition 10. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) *(X^N, U^N) converges almost surely in $*$ -distribution towards a d -tuple of noncommutative random variables (x, u) in some tracial W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) satisfying the regularity condition $\Delta(x, u) = d$; see Sections 2.4 and 2.5.*
- (ii) *For N large enough $R(X^N, U^N)$ is well-defined almost surely.*

Then $R(x, u)$ is well-defined, and the empirical measure of $R(X^N, U^N)$ converges almost surely in law towards the analytic distribution of $R(x, u)$.

The assumption (ii) is satisfied for random matrix models (X^N, U^N) whose law on $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the product measure of the Lebesgue measure on $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}$ and the Haar measure on $U_N(\mathbb{C})$.

In particular, the assumptions (i) and (ii) are satisfied for random matrix models satisfying the following conditions:

- *(X^N, U^N) are almost surely asymptotically free.*
- *The law of each X_j^N has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}$ and its eigenvalue distribution almost surely converges weakly to some compactly supported probability measure on \mathbb{R} that is non-atomic.*
- *U^N are i.i.d. Haar distributed.*

The main part of Theorem 1 will be proved in Theorem 23 and Theorem 27. Theorem 23 ensures that $r(x, u)$ is well-defined as long as $\Delta(x, u) = d$, whereas Theorem 27 proves that the convergence in $*$ -distribution implies the convergence of the empirical measure. Note that we prove this theorem for any sequence of deterministic matrices which satisfies assumptions (i) and (ii). Thus this theorem can be used outside of the field of random matrices. Finally in Theorem 18, we prove that assumption (ii) is satisfied for “absolutely continuous” random matrix models (X^N, U^N) . In combination with this, Corollary 17 ensures that the particular random matrix model (X^N, U^N) satisfies the assumptions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.

An interpretation of our results is as follows: the free field $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ together with a $*$ -structure can be endowed with a noncommutative probability structure through its embedding in the $*$ -algebra of operators affiliated to a II_1 factor. Let us elaborate on this noncommutative probability structure. To each selfadjoint

rational function R of the free field one can associate a probability measure on \mathbb{R} (i.e. an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$), which may have unbounded support. One sees that this map $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle_{\text{sa}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ strictly generalizes the tracial map on the $*$ -algebra generated by the generators because, in general, elements of the free field do not have moments. In addition, it allows one to define a noncommutative probability structure directly on a $*$ -free field without necessarily resorting to von Neumann algebras and affiliated operators. In this context, our result says that any matrix approximation of the free noncommutative tracial $*$ -algebra generated by the generators of the free field in the sense of noncommutative distribution convergence, can be upgraded into pointwise convergence of the map $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle_{\text{sa}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. Consequently, this interpretation may allow us to read the information on the algebraic side (the free field) out of information on the probabilistic side (probability measures). For example, the inner rank of a self-adjoint matrix A over $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ can be seen from the asymptotic proportion of zero eigenvalues in the spectrum of the evaluation of A at any approximation matrices that model the free field.

For a d -tuple X satisfying $\Delta(X) = d$, we know from [32] that the division closure $D(X)$ of $\mathbb{C}\langle X \rangle$ in the $*$ -algebra $W^*(X)$ of all closed and densely defined operators that are affiliated with $W^*(X)$ provides a model of the free field $\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle$. It would be interesting to find a criterion similar to [17, 28] which allows us to decide whether an element in $W^*(X)$ belongs to the division closure $D(X)$. If $d \geq 2$ and X are free Haar unitaries, then $W^*(X)$ is isomorphic to the free group factor $L(\mathbb{F}_d)$; in this case, such a criterion was provided by Linnell in [28], building on the paper [17] by Duchamp and Reutenauer in which they proved a conjecture of Connes [12].

This paper is organized as follows: following this introductory section, section 2 gathers necessary facts about noncommutative rational functions and expressions; section 3 shows that the random matrix model is well-defined for a dimension large enough, and section 4 evaluates the limiting distribution.

Acknowledgments. The problem considered in this paper appeared in the context of the MSc studies of A. Miyagawa, under the supervision of B. Collins (cf [34]), and related questions were discussed during the visit of T. Mai in Kyoto in 2019. T. Mai is grateful for the great hospitality of B. Collins and the entire Department of Mathematics at Kyoto University. F. Parraud, T. Mai, and S. Yin benefited from the hospitality of MFO, during which R. Speicher stated the conjecture leading to this paper. The authors thank G. Cébron, A. Connes, M. de la Salle, and R. Speicher for valuable discussions. We thank an anonymous referee for a careful reading of our manuscript and for valuable comments and suggestions.

BC was supported by JSPS KAKENHI 17K18734 and 17H04823. FP was partially supported by Labex Milyon (ANR-10-LABX-0070) of Université de Lyon. SY was supported by ANR project MESA.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Noncommutative rational functions and expressions. Let us denote by $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ the algebra of noncommutative polynomials over \mathbb{C} in the indeterminates x_1, \dots, x_d . It is well-known that for its commutative counterpart, namely the ring of commutative polynomials, one can uniquely construct the field of fractions of this polynomial ring by the quotients of polynomials. However, constructing a skew field of fractions of $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ is highly non-trivial. Moreover, there exist

skew fields of fractions of $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ which are not isomorphic (see, for example, [9, Exercise 7.2.13]). Nevertheless, there exists a unique field of fractions of $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$, which has some universal property. We call this skew field of fractions of $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$ the *free field* and denote it by $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle$. An element in the free field is called a *noncommutative rational function*.

Since the precise definition of the universal property of the free field is not relevant to this paper, we refer the interested reader to [9, Chapter 7] for a more detailed description (as well as some ring-theoretic construction) of the free field. We take the existence of the free field for granted and apply some recent results about it.

Like a commutative rational function can be represented by a class of quotients of polynomials, a noncommutative rational function can be represented by a class of noncommutative rational expressions. One can think of a noncommutative rational expression as a representation of a noncommutative rational function. Actually, in [1], Amitsur constructed the free field $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle$ from noncommutative rational expressions (see also [26, Section 2]).

More precisely, *noncommutative rational expressions* are syntactically valid combinations of \mathbb{C} and symbols x_1, \dots, x_d with $+$, \cdot , $^{-1}$, and $()$, which are respectively corresponding to addition, multiplication, taking inverse, and ordering these operations. For the sake of completeness, let us mention that polynomial expressions are obtained in precisely the same manner but without involving inverses. We admit that this definition, though easy to grasp, is not entirely rigorous as it relies on the tacit agreement about what is meant by syntactically valid. Thus we refer here to [23] for an alternative definition based on the graph theory, by which arithmetic operations for rational expressions can be interpreted as operations on graphs (see also [48, Section IV.1]). We emphasize that noncommutative rational expressions (in contrast to noncommutative rational functions, which we will define later) are formal objects obeying no arithmetic rules like commutativity or associativity. For example, though clearly, they represent the same function, $x_1 + (-1) \cdot x_1$ and 0 are two distinct rational expressions. Similarly, $x_1 \cdot (x_2 \cdot x_1)$ and $(x_1 \cdot x_2) \cdot x_1$ are different noncommutative rational expressions. Still, since they show the same behavior when evaluated on associative algebras, we will write shorthand $x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot x_1$ or even $x_1 x_2 x_1$ for better legibility as the inherent ambiguity does not cause any problems.

One can also define *matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions*; see Definition 2.1 in [25]. Those are possible combinations of symbols $A \otimes 1$ and $A \otimes x_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$, for each rectangular matrix A over \mathbb{C} of arbitrary size, with $+$, \cdot , $^{-1}$, and $()$, where the operations are required to be compatible with the matrix sizes. Notice that \otimes has only symbolic meaning here but will turn into the ordinary tensor product (over \mathbb{C}) under evaluation, as will be defined below.

Let us enumerate the rules which allow us to recursively compute for every matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R the domain $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ of R for every unital complex algebra \mathcal{A} and evaluations $R(X)$ of R at any point $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$; note that the evaluation $R(X)$ of a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R and every point $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ belongs to $M_{p \times q}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \cong M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{A})$.

- If $R = A \otimes 1$ for some $A \in M_{p \times q}(\mathbb{C})$, then R is a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression with $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) := \mathcal{A}^d$ and $R(X) := A \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}$ for every $X \in \mathcal{A}^d$.

- If $R = A \otimes x_j$ for some $A \in M_{p \times q}(\mathbb{C})$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$, then R is a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression with $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) := \mathcal{A}^d$ and $R(X) := A \otimes X_j$ for every $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in \mathcal{A}^d$.
- If R_1, R_2 are $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions, then $R_1 + R_2$ is a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression with $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1 + R_2) := \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1) \cap \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_2)$ and $(R_1 + R_2)(X) := R_1(X) +_{\mathcal{A}} R_2(X)$ for every $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1 + R_2)$, where $+_{\mathcal{A}}$ stands for the addition $M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{A}) \times M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{A})$.
- If R_1, R_2 are $p \times q$ respectively $q \times r$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions, then $R_1 \cdot R_2$ is a $p \times r$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression with $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1 \cdot R_2) := \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1) \cap \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_2)$ and $(R_1 \cdot R_2)(X) := R_1(X) \cdot_{\mathcal{A}} R_2(X)$ for every $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_1 \cdot R_2)$, where $\cdot_{\mathcal{A}}$ stands for the matrix multiplication $M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{A}) \times M_{q \times r}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_{p \times r}(\mathcal{A})$.
- If R is a $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression, then

$$\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R^{-1}) := \{X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) \mid R(X) \text{ is invertible in } M_p(\mathcal{A})\}$$
 and $R^{-1}(X) := R(X)^{-1}$ for every $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R^{-1})$.

Note that the (scalar-valued) noncommutative rational expressions we introduced before belong to the larger class of 1×1 matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions; see Remark 2.11 in [25].

For the reader's convenience, we introduce two types of matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions, which are important in a practical sense.

- A noncommutative rational expression evaluated in formal tensor products of matrices and formal variables like as

$$R = r(A_1 \otimes x_1, A_2 \otimes x_2, \dots, A_d \otimes x_d)$$

where r is a (scalar-valued) noncommutative rational expression and $A_i \in M_p(\mathbb{C})$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. In other words, in this case, we amplify formal variables by matrices and then consider their (scalar-valued) rational expression.

- A matrix which consists of (scalar-valued) noncommutative rational expressions

$$R = (r_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q}.$$

This can be seen as a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression by identifying with $\sum_{ij} (a_i \otimes 1) r_{ij} (b_j \otimes 1)$ where $a_i \in M_{p \times 1}(\mathbb{C})$ and $b_j \in M_{1 \times q}(\mathbb{C})$ are standard basis of \mathbb{C}^p and \mathbb{C}^q . We will implicitly use this viewpoint later (for example, in the proof of Proposition 21).

A class of matrix-valued noncommutative polynomial expressions is affine linear pencils. An *affine linear pencil* (in d variables with coefficients from $M_k(\mathbb{C})$) is a $k \times k$ matrix-valued noncommutative polynomial expression of the form

$$A = A_0 \otimes 1 + A_1 \otimes x_1 + \dots + A_d \otimes x_d$$

with coefficient matrices A_0, A_1, \dots, A_d belonging to $M_k(\mathbb{C})$. Notice, once again, that we omit the parentheses for better readability, as each syntactically valid placement of parentheses will produce the same result under evaluation. If \mathcal{A} is any unital complex algebra and $X \in \mathcal{A}^d$, then

$$A(X) = A_0 \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + A_1 \otimes X_1 + \dots + A_d \otimes X_d \in M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \cong M_k(\mathcal{A}).$$

Of particular interest are matrix evaluations. For each matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R , we put

$$\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R) := \prod_{N=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R),$$

i.e., $\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ is the subset of all square matrices over \mathbb{C} where evaluation of R is well-defined. A matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R is said to be *non-degenerate* if it satisfies $\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R) \neq \emptyset$. In the sequel, we will make use of the following important fact.

Theorem 2 (Remark 2.3 in [25]). *Let R be a non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression. Then there exists some $N_0 = N_0(R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R) \neq \emptyset$ for all $N \geq N_0$.*

Two non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions R_1, R_2 are called *$M(\mathbb{C})$ -evaluation equivalent* if the condition $R_1(X) = R_2(X)$ is satisfied for all $X \in \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R_1) \cap \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R_2)$.

As we mentioned earlier, one can construct the free field out of noncommutative rational expressions. This construction can be done by evaluating (scalar-valued) noncommutative rational expressions on scalar-valued matrices. For a non-degenerate noncommutative rational expression r , we denote by $[r]$ its equivalence class of noncommutative rational expressions with respect to $M(\mathbb{C})$ -evaluation equivalence. We endow the set of all such equivalence classes with the arithmetic operations $+$ and \cdot defined by $[r_1] + [r_2] := [r_1 + r_2]$ and $[r_1] \cdot [r_2] := [r_1 \cdot r_2]$. Notice that the arithmetic operations are indeed well-defined as one has $\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(r_1) \cap \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(r_2) \neq \emptyset$ for any two non-degenerate scalar-valued noncommutative rational expressions r_1 and r_2 ; see the footnote on page 52 of [26], for instance. It is known (see Proposition 2.2 in [26]) that the set of all equivalence classes of noncommutative rational expressions with respect to $M(\mathbb{C})$ -evaluation equivalence endowed with the arithmetic operations $+$ and \cdot forms the free field $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle$.

2.2. Linearization. Let us recall the following terminology introduced in [22, Definition 4.10].

Definition 3 (Formal linear representation). Let R be a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in the variables x_1, \dots, x_d . A *formal linear representation* $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of R (of dimension k) consists of an affine linear pencil

$$A = A_0 \otimes 1 + A_1 \otimes x_1 + \dots + A_d \otimes x_d$$

in d variables and with coefficients A_0, A_1, \dots, A_d from $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ and matrices $u \in M_{p \times k}(\mathbb{C})$ and $v \in M_{k \times q}(\mathbb{C})$, such that the following condition is satisfied: for every unital complex algebra \mathcal{A} , we have that $\text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) \subseteq \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A^{-1})$ and for each $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ it holds that $R(X) = uA(X)^{-1}v$, where $A(X) \in M_k(\mathcal{A})$.

Note that we use here a different sign convention by requiring $R(X) = uA(X)^{-1}v$ instead of $R(X) = -uA(X)^{-1}v$; this, however, does not affect the validity of the particular results that we will take from [22]. Furthermore, as we will exclusively work with formal linear representations for matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions, we will go without specifying them as matrix-valued formal linear representations like it was done in [22].

It follows from [22, Theorem 4.12] that, indeed, every matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R admits a formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$. For the reader's convenience, we include with Theorem 4 the precise statement and its constructive proof. In doing so, we will see that Algorithm 4.11 in [22], on which the proof of Theorem 4.12 in the same paper relies, provides a formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of the $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R with the additional property that the dimension k of ρ is larger than $\max\{p, q\}$ and that both u and v have maximal rank; we will call such ρ *proper*. Note that if R is a scalar-valued rational expression, then a proper formal linear representation ρ simply means that u and v are non-zero vectors. In general, due to the restriction $k \geq \max\{p, q\}$, we have that the rank of u is p and the rank of v is q for any proper formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of R . This notion of proper formal linear representation will be important in the sequel.

Theorem 4 (Theorem 4.12 in [22]). *Every matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression admits a formal linear representation in the sense of Definition 3 which is also proper.*

Proof. Here, we give the algorithm which inductively builds a proper linear representation of any matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression. For $R = A \otimes 1$ or $R = A \otimes x_j$ for some $A \in M_{p \times q}(\mathbb{C})$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$ we have

$$R(X) = \begin{pmatrix} I_p & 0_{p \times q} \end{pmatrix} \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} I_p \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} & -R(X) & \\ \hline 0_{q \times p} & I_q \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} & \end{array} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0_{p \times q} \\ I_q \end{pmatrix}$$

where $I_p \in M_p(\mathbb{C})$ is an identity matrix. We obtain a proper formal linear representation in this way.

If the $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative expressions R_1 and R_2 admit proper formal linear representations (u_1, A_1, v_1) and (u_2, A_2, v_2) then we have

$$(R_1 + R_2)(X) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & u_2 \end{pmatrix} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_1(X) & 0_{k_1 \times k_2} \\ \hline 0_{k_2 \times k_1} & A_2(X) \end{array} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This gives us a proper formal linear representation since $(u_1 \ u_2)$, resp. $(v_1 \ v_2)^T$ is of rank p , resp. q .

If R_1, R_2 are $p \times q$, resp. $q \times r$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions and admit formal linear representations (u_1, A_1, v_1) , resp. (u_2, A_2, v_2) of dimension k_1 , resp. k_2 then we have

$$(R_1 \cdot R_2)(X) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & 0_{p \times k_2} \end{pmatrix} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_1(X) & -v_1 u_2 \\ \hline 0_{k_2 \times k_1} & A_2(X) \end{array} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0_{k_1 \times r} \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain a proper formal linear representation since $(u_1 \ 0_{p \times k_2})$, resp. $(0_{k_1 \times r} \ v_2)^T$ is of rank p , resp. q .

If R is a $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression which admits a formal linear representation (u, A, v) of dimension k , then we have

$$R^{-1}(X) = \begin{pmatrix} I_p & 0_{p \times k} \end{pmatrix} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0_{p \times p} & u \\ \hline v & A(X) \end{array} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -I_p \\ 0_{k \times p} \end{pmatrix},$$

where X belongs to an appropriate domain for each step. This gives us a proper formal linear representation.

Finally, since all matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions can be represented by finitely many of the above steps, any matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression has such a formal linear representation that is proper. \square

In the non-degenerate case, formal linear representations are connected with the concept of representations for noncommutative rational functions, which is used, for instance, in [10, 11]; this will be addressed in Remark 6 and Remark 9. Before, we need to recall the following terminology.

Definition 5 (Inner rank and fullness). Let \mathcal{R} be a ring. For $A \in M_{n \times m}(\mathcal{R})$ we define the *inner rank* $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}(A)$ by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{R}}(A) = \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} \mid A = BC, B \in M_{n \times r}(\mathcal{R}), C \in M_{r \times m}(\mathcal{R})\},$$

and $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}(0) = 0$. In addition we call A *full* if $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}(A) = \min\{n, m\}$.

Remark 6. (i) Let A be a matrix over noncommutative polynomials in a tuple $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ of formal variables. According to Theorem 7.5.13 in [9] (see also A.2 in [31]), we have

$$\rho_{\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle}(A) = \rho_{\mathbb{C}}(A).$$

For this reason, we say A is full for a square matrix A over the noncommutative polynomials without mentioning which algebra we consider.

- (ii) Let A be an affine linear pencil in x with coefficients taken from $M_k(\mathbb{C})$. We may view A as an element in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle \cong M_k(\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle)$, i.e., $A = A(x)$ is considered as a matrix over the ring $\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle$. We notice that if there exists a tuple $X \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^d$ such that $A(X)$ is invertible in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C}) \cong M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})$, or equivalently, if $\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(A^{-1}) \neq \emptyset$, then A must be full. In fact, if A is not full, then any factorization $A = BC$ with $B \in M_{k \times r}(\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle)$ and $C \in M_{r \times k}(\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle)$ for $r = \rho(A) < k$ yields under evaluation $A(X) = B(X)C(X)$ at any point $X \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^d$, so that $A(X)$ is never invertible.

On the other hand, if A is full, then A is invertible as a matrix over $\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle$. Indeed, fullness and invertibility are equivalent for any skew field (see Lemma 5.20 in [31]).

- (iii) Now, let R be a non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression. From Theorem 4, we know that there exists a formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$; in particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R) &\subseteq \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(A^{-1}) \\ &= \prod_{N=1}^{\infty} \{X \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^d \mid A(X) \text{ invertible in } M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since R is non-degenerate, we find $X \in \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R)$; from the aforementioned inclusion and (ii), we infer that A is a full matrix.

- (iv) Suppose that R is a non-degenerate $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression such that R^{-1} is non-degenerate as well. Let $\rho = (u, A, v)$ be a formal linear representation of R ; we associate to ρ the affine linear pencil

$$\tilde{A} := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{p \times p} & u \\ v & A \end{pmatrix}.$$

We claim that both A and \tilde{A} are full. For A , we already know from (iii) that this is true. To check fullness of \tilde{A} , we use that R^{-1} is non-degenerate, which

guarantees the existence of some $X \in \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R^{-1})$. Since in particular $X \in \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R)$, we get as ρ is a formal linear representation of R that $A(X)$ is invertible and $R(X) = uA(X)^{-1}v$. Because $X \in \text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R^{-1})$, we know that $R(X)$ is invertible. Hence, the Schur complement formula implies that the matrix $\tilde{A}(X)$ is invertible. Thanks to (ii), this implies that the affine linear pencil \tilde{A} is full.

The following lemma explains that non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions induce matrices over the free field in some very natural way.

Lemma 7. *Let R be a $p \times q$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in d formal variables. If R is non-degenerate, then $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(R)$ and consequently, $R(x) \in M_{p \times q}(\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)$.*

Proof. Let us denote by \mathfrak{R}_0 the set of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions R which have the property $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(R)$. We want to show that \mathfrak{R}_0 consists of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions. To verify this assertion, we proceed as follows. Firstly, we notice that both $R_1 + R_2$ and $R_1 \cdot R_2$ belong to \mathfrak{R}_0 whenever we take $R_1, R_2 \in \mathfrak{R}_0$ for which the respective arithmetic operation is defined. Secondly, we consider some $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$ which is of size $p \times p$ and has the property that R^{-1} is non-degenerate. By Theorem 4, there exists a formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of R , say of dimension k , and according to Remark 6 (iv) we have that both A and the associated affine linear pencil

$$\tilde{A} := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{p \times p} & u \\ v & A \end{pmatrix}$$

are full, i.e., $A(x) \in M_k(\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)$ and $\tilde{A}(x) \in M_{k+p}(\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)$ become invertible as matrices over the free field $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle$. Since $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(R)$ as $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$, we get $R(x) = uA(x)^{-1}v$, because ρ is a formal linear representation of R . Putting these observations together, the Schur complement formula yields that $R(x) \in M_p(\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle)$ must be invertible, i.e., $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(R^{-1})$ and thus $R^{-1} \in \mathfrak{R}_0$, as desired. \square

Remark 8. With arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 7 as based on Remark 6 (iv), one finds that if R_1, R_2 are non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions satisfying $R_1(x) = R_2(x)$, then $R_1 \sim_{M(\mathbb{C})} R_2$. In other words, matrix identities over $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle$ are preserved under well-defined matrix evaluations.

Remark 9. In the scalar-valued case, the conclusion of Lemma 7 can be strengthened slightly. For that purpose, it is helpful to denote the formal variables out of which the noncommutative rational expressions are built by χ_1, \dots, χ_d to distinguish them from the variables x_1, \dots, x_d of the free skew field $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle$; note that accordingly $x_j = [\chi_j]$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. Now, if r is any non-degenerate scalar-valued noncommutative rational expression in the formal variables χ_1, \dots, χ_d , then Lemma 7 tells us that $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(r)$ and $r(x) \in \mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle$. Moreover, we have the equality $r(x) = [r]$. This can be shown with a recursive argument similar to the proof of Lemma 7; notice that if a non-degenerate scalar-valued noncommutative rational expression r satisfies $r(x) = [r]$ and has the additional property that r^{-1} is non-degenerate, then $r(x) = [r]$ is invertible in $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle$, which implies $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x \rangle\rangle}(r^{-1})$ with $r^{-1}(x) = [r]^{-1} = [r^{-1}]$.

This has the consequence that every formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of r satisfies $[r] = r(x) = uA(x)^{-1}v$. In the language of [10, 11], this means that the formal linear representation ρ of r induces a (pure and linear) representation of the corresponding noncommutative rational function $[r]$.

2.3. Self-adjointness for matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions. When evaluations of matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions R at points $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ for $*$ -algebras \mathcal{A} are considered, it is natural to ask for conditions which guarantee that the result $R(X)$ is self-adjoint, i.e., $R(X)^* = R(X)$. We aim at formulating conditions which concern the matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R and which depend only on the “type” of its arguments X_1, \dots, X_d but not on their concrete realization in some $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} . The case when X_1, \dots, X_d are all self-adjoint was discussed in [22, Section 2.5.7]. The following definition generalizes the latter to matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions in self-adjoint and unitary variables.

Recall that an element X in a complex $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} with unit $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called *self-adjoint* if $X^* = X$, and $U \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be *unitary* if $U^*U = 1_{\mathcal{A}} = UU^*$.

Definition 10 (Self-adjoint matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions). Let R be a square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in $d_1 + d_2$ formal variables which we denote by $x_1, \dots, x_{d_1}, u_1, \dots, u_{d_2}$. We say that R is *self-adjoint of type (d_1, d_2)* , if for every unital complex $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} and all tuples $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{d_1})$ and $U = (U_1, \dots, U_{d_2})$ of self-adjoint respectively unitary elements in \mathcal{A} , the following implication holds:

$$(X, U) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad R(X, U)^* = R(X, U)$$

One comment on this definition is in order. The reader might wonder why the matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions do not explicitly involve other variables $u_1^*, \dots, u_{d_2}^*$ serving as a placeholder for the adjoints of u_1, \dots, u_{d_2} . In fact, for (scalar-valued) noncommutative rational expressions, such an approach was presented, for instance, in the appendix of [18] (a version for noncommutative polynomials also appears in [40]); more precisely, noncommutative rational expressions in collections of self-adjoint variables x , non-self-adjoint variables y , and their adjoints y^* were considered. For our purpose, however, this has the slight disadvantage that non-degenerate noncommutative rational expressions of this kind (take $r(y, y^*) = (yy^* - 1)^{-1}$, for example) may have no unitary elements in their domain. On the other hand, there are noncommutative rational expressions (or even noncommutative polynomial expressions such as $yyy^* + y^*yy^*$) which are not self-adjoint on their entire domain but self-adjoint on unitaries.

The following example illustrates Definition 10 and highlights the effect of having two types of variables.

Example 11. $x_1 + x_2^{-1}$, $i(u_1 - u_1^{-1})$ and $u_1^{-1}x_1^{-1}u_1$ are self-adjoint noncommutative rational expressions since we have for self-adjoint elements X_1, X_2 and a unitary U_1 in their domain,

$$\begin{aligned} (X_1 + X_2^{-1})^* &= X_1^* + (X_2^*)^{-1} = X_1 + X_2^{-1} \\ (i(U_1 - U_1^{-1}))^* &= -i(U_1^* - (U_1^*)^{-1}) = i(U_1 - U_1^{-1}) \\ (U_1^{-1}X_1^{-1}U_1)^* &= U_1^*(X_1^*)^{-1}(U_1^*)^{-1} = U_1^{-1}X_1^{-1}U_1. \end{aligned}$$

However, $u_1 + u_2^{-1}$, $i(x_1 - x_1^{-1})$ and $x_1^{-1}u_1^{-1}x_1$ are not self-adjoint in our definition. So we need to be careful about the roles of formal variables when we consider self-adjoint rational expressions. For the matrix-valued case, the 2×2 respectively 1×1 matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1^{-1} & u_1 \\ u_1^{-1} & x_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad (u_1 \quad x_1 + iu_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -iu_1 \\ iu_1^{-1} & x_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u_1^{-1} \\ x_1 - iu_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

are self-adjoint of type (2, 1) and (2, 2), respectively.

Like in [22, Definition 4.13] for the case of self-adjoint arguments, we can introduce self-adjoint formal linear representations; see also [18, Definition A.5] for the scalar-valued case.

Note that to make the machinery of self-adjoint linearizations ready for further applications, we will switch from now on to a more general situation.

Definition 12 (Self-adjoint formal linear representation). Let R be a $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in d formal variables x_1, \dots, x_d . A tuple $\rho = (Q, w)$ consisting of an affine linear pencil

$$Q = A_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^d (B_j \otimes x_j + B_j^* \otimes x_j^*)$$

in the formal variables x_1, \dots, x_d and x_1^*, \dots, x_d^* , with coefficients being (not necessarily self-adjoint) matrices B_1, \dots, B_d in $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, some self-adjoint matrix $A_0 \in M_k(\mathbb{C})$ and some matrix $w \in M_{k \times p}(\mathbb{C})$ is called a *self-adjoint formal linear representation of R (of dimension k)* if the following condition is satisfied: for every unital complex $*$ -algebra \mathcal{A} and all tuples $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ of (not necessarily self-adjoint) elements in \mathcal{A} , one has

$$X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) \quad \implies \quad (X, X^*) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q^{-1})$$

and for every $X \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ for which $R(X)$ is self-adjoint, it holds true that

$$R(X) = w^* Q(X, X^*)^{-1} w.$$

We point out that in contrast to the related concept introduced in [22, Definition 4.13] the existence of a self-adjoint formal linear representation in the sense of the previous Definition 12 does not enforce R to be self-adjoint at any distinguished points in its domain. In fact, we have the following theorem: every square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression admits a self-adjoint formal linear representation; this is analogous to [22, Theorem 4.14].

Like for formal linear representations, we will say that a self-adjoint formal linear representation $\rho = (Q, w)$ of a self-adjoint $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R is *proper* if the dimension k of ρ is larger than p and if w has a full rank (i.e., the rank of w is p).

Theorem 13. *Every square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in d formal variables admits a self-adjoint formal linear representation in the sense of Definition 12 which is proper.*

Proof. Let $\rho = (v, Q, w)$ be a formal linear representation of R in the variables x_1, \dots, x_d with the affine linear pencil Q being of the form

$$Q = A_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^d B_j \otimes x_j.$$

We consider $\tilde{\rho} = (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{w})$ with the affine linear pencil

$$\tilde{Q} = \tilde{A}_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^d (\tilde{B}_j \otimes x_j + \tilde{B}_j^* \otimes x_j^*)$$

in the variables $x_1, \dots, x_d, x_1^*, \dots, x_d^*$ given by

$$\tilde{A}_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_0^* \\ A_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B}_j := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}v^* \\ w \end{pmatrix}.$$

One verifies that $\tilde{\rho} = (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{w})$ is a self-adjoint formal linear representation of R which is moreover proper whenever ρ is proper. \square

Notice that if R is a $p \times p$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in $d_1 + d_2$ formal variables $x_1, \dots, x_{d_1}, u_1, \dots, u_{d_2}$ which is self-adjoint of type (d_1, d_2) , then each self-adjoint formal linear representation of R can be brought into the simplified form $\rho = (Q, w)$ with an affine linear pencil

$$Q = A_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} A_j \otimes x_j + \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} (B_j \otimes u_j + B_j^* \otimes u_j^*)$$

in the formal variables $x_1, \dots, x_{d_1}, u_1, \dots, u_{d_2}, u_1^*, \dots, u_{d_2}^*$ with coefficients being self-adjoint matrices A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{d_1} and (not necessarily self-adjoint) matrices B_1, \dots, B_{d_2} in $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some matrix $w \in M_{k \times p}(\mathbb{C})$; indeed Theorem 13 yields a self-adjoint formal linear representation of R with an affine linear pencil in the formal variables $x_1, \dots, x_{d_1}, x_1^*, \dots, x_{d_1}^*$ and $u_1, \dots, u_{d_2}, u_1^*, \dots, u_{d_2}^*$, from which we obtain Q of the asserted form by replacing $x_1^*, \dots, x_{d_1}^*$ by x_1, \dots, x_{d_1} and merging their coefficients. In particular, we have

$$(X, U) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R) \quad \implies \quad (X, U, U^*) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q^{-1})$$

and for every $(X, U) \in \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ it holds true that

$$R(X, U) = w^* Q(X, U, U^*)^{-1} w.$$

Example 14. We return to the self-adjoint noncommutative rational expressions presented in Example 11. Let us construct a self-adjoint formal linearization of $x_1 + x_2^{-1}$. Using the algorithm from [22], which we recalled in the proof of Theorem 4, we obtain first a formal linear representation

$$X_1 + X_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Out of the latter, we construct with the help of Theorem 13 the self-adjoint formal linear representation

$$X_1 + X_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -X_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & X_2 \\ 1 & -X_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & X_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The second example is $u_1 + u_1^{-1}$. Since we have for unitary U_1 in any $*$ -algebra

$$U_1 + U_1^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -U_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have a formal self-adjoint linearization

$$U_1 + U_1^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -U_1^* & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & U_1^* \\ 1 & -U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2.4. Unbounded random variables. In this subsection, we set (\mathcal{M}, τ) to be a tracial W^* -probability space (i.e., a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} that is endowed with a faithful normal tracial state $\tau : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$). The condition that τ is a trace is necessary since we are going to consider closed and densely defined operators affiliated with the von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} . We will call these operators unbounded operators. In general, unbounded operators might not well-behave under either addition or composition. However, in the case of tracial W^* -probability space, they form a $*$ -algebra, denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, which provides us a framework in which one has well-defined evaluations of rational expressions.

In a language of probability, this framework allows us to consider random variables that may not have compact support or even finite moments. For a normal random variable X in a W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) , we know that X has finite moments of all orders and its analytic distribution μ_X determined by the moments (i.e., the probability measure associated to X by a representation theorem of Riesz) has a compact support. For an (unbounded) operator X in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, it may not have finite moments. But we could still associate a probability measure to X via the spectral theorem. We refer the interested reader to [35, 6] for more details on unbounded operators (which are also known as measurable operators as the noncommutative analog of measurable functions, cf. [39]).

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the set of self-adjoint projections in \mathcal{M} and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{sa}$ be the set of self-adjoint elements in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Given an element $X \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{sa}$, for a Borel set B on \mathbb{R} , we denote by $\mathbf{1}_B(X) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ the spectral projection of X on B given by the spectral theorem (see, for example, [14]). Then we can associate a probability measure μ_X to X as follows.

Definition 15. For $X \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{sa}$, we define its *analytic distribution* μ_X by

$$\mu_X(B) := \tau(\mathbf{1}_B(X)), \quad \text{for all Borel sets } B \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore, we define the *cumulative distribution function* of X as the function $\mathcal{F}_X : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by,

$$\mathcal{F}_X(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t 1 d\mu_X(s) = \tau(\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, t]}(X)).$$

In particular, if we take $\mathcal{M} = L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ and $\tau = \mathbb{E}$ for some probability measure space (Ω, \mathbb{P}) , then $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is the $*$ -algebra consisting of all measurable functions, i.e.,

classical random variables. Moreover, the analytic distribution and cumulative distribution defined above coincide with their classical counterparts.

Recall that for a probability measure, μ on \mathbb{R} . A number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is called an *atom* of μ if $\mu(\{\lambda\}) \neq 0$. Thus for a random variable X in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{sa}}$, we say that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an atom for X if λ is an atom for μ_X . Moreover, we see that X has an atom $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if $p_{\ker(\lambda-X)} \neq 0$, where $p_{\ker(\lambda-X)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ is the orthogonal projection onto the kernel of $\lambda - X$ (in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$). For an atom λ of X , we have

$$\mu_X(\{\lambda\}) = \tau(p_{\ker(\lambda-X)}).$$

A closely related notion is a rank defined via the image. That is, we define

$$\text{rk}(X) := \tau(p_{\overline{\text{im}X}}),$$

where $p_{\overline{\text{im}X}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the closure of the image of X . The following alternative description of this rank will be needed later:

$$(1) \quad \text{rk}(X) = \inf\{\tau(r) \mid r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}), rX = X\}.$$

Clearly, since $p_{\overline{\text{im}(X)}}X = X$, we have $\inf\{\tau(r) \mid r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}), rX = X\} \leq \tau(p_{\overline{\text{im}(X)}}) = \text{rk}(X)$. To see it is an equality, note that for any $r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying $rX = X$, $\text{im}(X) \subseteq \text{im}(r)$, which implies that $p_{\overline{\text{im}(X)}} \leq r$.

2.5. The quantity Δ . The regularity condition that we impose in Theorem 27 on the limit of the considered random matrix model involves the quantity Δ which was introduced by Connes and Shlyakhtenko in [13]. We briefly recall the definition. Let (\mathcal{M}, τ) be a tracial W^* -probability space and consider a tuple $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ of (not necessarily self-adjoint) noncommutative random variables in \mathcal{M} . We denote by $\mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau))$ the ideal of all finite rank operators on $L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ and by J Tomita's conjugation operator, i.e., the conjugate-linear map $J : L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ that extends isometrically the conjugation $x \mapsto x^*$ on \mathcal{M} . We then put

$$\Delta(x) := d - \overline{\dim_{\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M}^{\text{op}}} \left\{ (T_1, \dots, T_d) \in \mathcal{F}(L^2(\mathcal{M}, \tau))^d \mid \sum_{j=1}^d [T_j, Jx_j^*J] = 0 \right\}}^{\text{HS}},$$

where the closure is taken with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. Note that in contrast to [13], we do not require the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ to be closed under the involution $*$; see also [32]. Despite this slight deviation from the setting of [13], the following result remains true.

Theorem 16 (Theorem 3.3 (e) in [13]). *Let $1 \leq k < d$ and suppose that the sets $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\{x_{k+1}, \dots, x_d\}$ are freely independent, then*

$$\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) + \Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_d).$$

Further, we recall from [32, Corollary 6.4] that $\Delta(u) = d$ for every d -tuple u of freely independent Haar unitary elements in (\mathcal{M}, τ) .

In the particular case of a d -tuple x consisting of self-adjoint operators in \mathcal{M} , Corollary 4.6 in [13] says that $d \geq \Delta(x) \geq \delta(x)$, where $\delta(x)$ denotes the so-called *microstates free entropy dimension* which Voiculescu introduced in [43, Definition 6.1]. Now, if the x_1, \dots, x_d are freely independent, then Proposition 6.4 in [43] tells us that

$$\delta(x) = d - \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_{x_j}(\{t\})^2,$$

where μ_{x_j} is the analytic distribution of the operator x_j in the sense of Definition 15. We infer that $\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_d) = d$ if x_1, \dots, x_d are self-adjoint, freely independent and their individual analytic distributions $\mu_{x_1}, \dots, \mu_{x_d}$ are all non-atomic. For reference, we summarize these observations by the following corollary.

Corollary 17. *Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_1})$ be a d_1 -tuple of self-adjoint and freely independent elements in (\mathcal{M}, τ) with $\mu_{x_1}, \dots, \mu_{x_{d_1}}$ being non-atomic. Further, let $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{d_2})$ be a d_2 -tuple of freely independent Haar unitary elements in (\mathcal{M}, τ) . Suppose that x and u are freely independent. Then $\Delta(x, u) = d_1 + d_2$.*

3. EVALUATIONS OF NON-DEGENERATE MATRIX-VALUED NONCOMMUTATIVE RATIONAL EXPRESSIONS

By definition, every non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression has a non-empty domain when evaluations in matrices of sufficiently large size are considered. In this section, we show that much more is true. Namely, we establish that the assumptions of Theorem 27 are satisfied in very general situations.

3.1. Evaluations in random matrices. The following result asserts, roughly speaking, that one can almost surely evaluate every non-degenerated matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in “absolutely continuous” random matrix models, provided that their size is large enough. The precise statement reads as follows.

Theorem 18. *Let R be a matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in $d = d_1 + d_2$ formal variables, which is non-degenerate. Suppose that μ_{d_1, d_2}^N is a probability measure on $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ which is absolutely continuous with respect to the product measure of the Lebesgue measure on $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}$ and the Haar measure on $U_N(\mathbb{C})$. If (X^N, U^N) is a tuple of random matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ with law μ_{d_1, d_2}^N , then there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that almost surely $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ for all $N \geq N_0$.*

Remark 19. It is essential to work over the field of complex numbers for Theorem 18 to be true. To see this, let us consider the noncommutative rational expression $r = (x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1)^{-1}$. Note that there are real matrices X_1, X_2 at which one can evaluate r , but in $M_N(\mathbb{R})$ with N odd, there cannot exist symmetric real matrices X_1, X_2 at which the evaluation $r(X_1, X_2)$ would be defined, since necessarily $\det(X_1 X_2 - X_2 X_1) = 0$. Indeed

$$\det(X_1 X_2 - X_2 X_1) = \det({}^t(X_1 X_2 - X_2 X_1)) = -\det(X_1 X_2 - X_2 X_1).$$

This observation is consistent with the proof of Proposition 20, on which Theorem 18 relies since we use complex analysis techniques.

One can also find an algebraic construction of a symmetric matrix in the domain of a noncommutative rational expression in [45, Remark 6.7].

The proof of Theorem 18 relies on a study of evaluations of affine linear pencils. The first step is the following proposition, which requires some notation. Consider an affine linear pencil

$$(2) \quad Q = A_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} A_j \otimes x_j + \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} B_j \otimes u_j$$

in the variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_1})$ and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{d_2})$, say with coefficients A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{d_1} and B_1, \dots, B_{d_2} taken from $M_k(\mathbb{C})$. We regard Q as an element in

$$M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle \cong M_k(\mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle).$$

Given an d -tuple $Z = (Z', Z'')$ of matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, we consider the evaluation of Q at Z which is given by

$$Q(Z) := A_0 \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d_1} A_j \otimes Z'_j + \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} B_j \otimes Z''_j,$$

where $Q(Z)$ lies in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C}) \cong M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})$. Building on such evaluations, we associate Q with functions

$$\phi_Q^{(N)} : M_N(\mathbb{C})^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad Z \longmapsto \det(Q(Z))$$

for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that $\phi_Q^{(N)}$ is a holomorphic commutative polynomial in the dN^2 complex matrix entries appearing in the tuple Z . This allows us to use the machinery of complex analysis to relate $\phi_Q^{(N)}$ with its restriction to the real space $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$.

Proposition 20. *Let Q be an affine linear pencil of the form (2) in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle$ and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\phi_Q^{(N)}|_{M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}} \equiv 0$, then $\phi_Q^{(N)} \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Fix any $Z = (Z', Z'') \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_1} \times M_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ and suppose that the d_2 -tuple Z'' consists of invertible matrices. We write $Z' = X + iY$ with the tuples $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{d_1}), Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{d_1}) \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1}$ that are given by $X_j := \Re(Z'_j)$ and $Y_j := \Im(Z'_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, d_1$. Further, for $j = 1, \dots, d_2$, we consider the polar decomposition $Z''_j = P_j U_j$ of Z''_j with a positive definite matrix $P_j \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ and $U_j \in U_N(\mathbb{C})$. As the matrices P_1, \dots, P_{d_2} are positive definite, we can define a holomorphic function $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$f(z) := \phi_Q^{(N)}(X_1 + zY_1, \dots, X_{d_1} + zY_{d_1}, \\ \exp(-iz \log(P_1))U_1, \dots, \exp(-iz \log(P_{d_2}))U_{d_2})$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Due to the assumption that $\phi_Q^{(N)}|_{M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}} \equiv 0$, we have that $f|_{\mathbb{R}} \equiv 0$. Thus, by the identity principle, it follows that f vanishes identically on \mathbb{C} . In particular, $\phi_Q^{(N)}(Z) = f(i) = 0$. This shows that $\phi_Q^{(N)}$ vanishes on all d -tuples $Z = (Z', Z'') \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_1} \times M_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ satisfying the condition that Z'' consists of invertible matrices. Since those are dense in $M_N(\mathbb{C})^d$, the assertion follows. \square

With the help of Proposition 20, we see that fullness of affine linear pencils Q can be detected by evaluations of Q at points in $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$.

Proposition 21. *Let Q be an affine linear pencil of the form (2) in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) Q is full.
- (ii) there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for each $N \geq N_0$, we have that $\phi_Q^{(N)}|_{M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}} \not\equiv 0$, i.e., one can find some d -tuple $(X^N, U^N) \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ for which $Q(X^N, U^N)$ becomes invertible in $M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. If Q is not full, we have a non-trivial factorization of Q , and its evaluation $Q(X^N, U^N)$ cannot be invertible. This implies (ii) \implies (i).

First, we note that there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_Q^{(N)} \not\equiv 0$ for all $N \geq N_0$. This fact is well-known (see Proposition 2.4 in [46], for instance), but we include the argument for the sake of completeness. Since Q is full, $Q(x)$ is invertible as a matrix over the free skew field $\mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle$; see Remark 6 (ii). Its inverse $Q(x)^{-1} \in M_k(\mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle)$ is represented by some non-degenerate $k \times k$ matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R , i.e., we have $Q^{-1}(x) = R(x)$; this follows by applying Remark 9 entrywise. From Theorem 2, we know that there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R) \neq \emptyset$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Thanks to Remark 8, the identity $Q(x, u)R(x, u) = I_k$ over $\mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle$ continues to hold on $\text{dom}_{M(\mathbb{C})}(R)$, and by applying determinants, we infer that $\phi_Q^{(N)} \not\equiv 0$ for all $N \geq N_0$, as desired.

Having this, Proposition 20 guarantees that $\phi_Q^{(N)}$ does not vanish identically on all of $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$, as we wished to show. \square

In the next step, we involve the concrete random matrix model we want to consider.

Proposition 22. *Let Q be an affine linear pencil of the form (2) in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle x, u \rangle$ which is full. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let (X^N, U^N) be a random matrix in $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ with an absolutely continuous law μ_{d_1, d_2}^N like in Theorem 18. Then there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that almost surely $Q(X^N, U^N)$ is invertible in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C}) \cong M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})$ for all $N \geq N_0$.*

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 21, since Q is assumed to be full, there is an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that none of the functions $\phi_Q^{(N)}|_{M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}}$ for $N \geq N_0$ can vanish identically. Notice that $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}$ is a real manifold of dimension dN^2 . In suitable local charts, we see that $\phi_Q^{(N)}|_{M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{sa}}^{d_1} \times U_N(\mathbb{C})^{d_2}}$ induces a real analytic function on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{dN^2} and can therefore vanish only on a set of Lebesgue measure 0. Due to the choice of μ_{d_1, d_2}^N , we conclude that, for each $N \geq N_0$, the random matrix $Q(X^N, U^N)$ is almost surely invertible in $M_{kN}(\mathbb{C})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 18. We define the set \mathfrak{R}_0 of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions R for which the conclusion of Theorem 18 is true, i.e., there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that almost surely $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ for all $N \geq N_0$. We have to prove that \mathfrak{R}_0 consists, in fact, of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions.

Notice that all matrix-valued noncommutative polynomial expressions obviously belong to \mathfrak{R}_0 . Further, it is easily seen that both $R_1 + R_2$ and $R_1 \cdot R_2$ are in \mathfrak{R}_0 whenever we take $R_1, R_2 \in \mathfrak{R}_0$ for which the respective arithmetic operation makes sense. Therefore, it only remains to prove that if $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$ is square and enjoys the property that R^{-1} is non-degenerate, then necessarily $R^{-1} \in \mathfrak{R}_0$. To verify this, we take any square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R belonging to \mathfrak{R}_0 for which R^{-1} is non-degenerate. Further, let $\rho = (v, Q, w)$ be a formal linear representation of R in the sense of Definition 3, say of dimension k ; see Theorem 4.

By assumption, we have that R^{-1} is a non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression. Thus, Remark 6 (iv) gives us that the affine linear

pencil in d variables with coefficients from $M_{k+p}(\mathbb{C})$ which is given by

$$\tilde{Q} := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{p \times p} & v \\ w & Q \end{pmatrix}$$

is full. Therefore, Proposition 22 tells us that an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ exists such that almost surely $\tilde{Q}(X^N, U^N)$ is invertible in $M_{(k+p)N}(\mathbb{C})$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Since $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$, we may suppose that (after enlarging N_0 if necessary) that at the same time almost surely $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Because ρ is a formal linear representation, the latter implies that almost surely $Q(X^N, U^N)$ is invertible and $R(X^N, U^N) = vQ(X^N, U^N)^{-1}w$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Putting these observations together, again with the help of the Schur complement formula, we see that almost surely $R(X^N, U^N)$ is invertible for all $N \geq N_0$. In other words, we have almost surely that $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R^{-1})$ for all $N \geq N_0$. The latter means that $R^{-1} \in \mathfrak{R}_0$, as desired. \square

3.2. Evaluation in operators with maximal Δ . It follows from [32, Theorem 1.1] that for any d -tuple $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ of (not necessarily self-adjoint) operators in some W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) which satisfy the ‘‘regularity condition’’ $\Delta(X) = d$, where Δ stands for a quantity that was introduced in [13] and which we discussed in Section 2.5, then the canonical evaluation homomorphism

$$\text{ev}_X : \mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$$

which is determined by $1 \mapsto 1$ and $x_j \mapsto X_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$ extends to an injective homomorphism

$$\text{Ev}_X : \mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$$

into the $*$ -algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of all closed and densely defined operators affiliated with \mathcal{M} ; see Section 2.4.

While the result of [32] addresses evaluations of noncommutative rational functions, it leaves open the question of whether also all non-degenerate rational expressions can be evaluated; indeed, this is not immediate as the domain of a rational function is larger than the domain of any of its representing non-degenerate noncommutative rational expressions. This question is answered in the affirmative by the next theorem, which gives the conclusion even in the matrix-valued case. For that purpose, we will consider the canonical amplifications

$$\text{Ev}_X^\bullet : M_\bullet(\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle) \rightarrow M_\bullet(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}).$$

Theorem 23. *Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ be a d -tuple of (not necessarily self-adjoint) operators in some tracial W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) satisfying $\Delta(X) = d$. Then, for every non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression R , we have that $X \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$ and $R(X) = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R(x))$, where $R(x)$ is the matrix over $\mathbb{C}\langle\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle\rangle$ associated to R via Lemma 7.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 18. Here, we consider the set \mathfrak{R}_0 of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions r for which the conclusion of Theorem 23 is true, i.e., we have $X \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$ and $R(X) = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R(x))$. We want to show that \mathfrak{R}_0 consists of all non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions. This can be done in almost the same way as in Theorem 18, except for some slight modifications in the last step. Suppose that $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$ is of size $p \times p$ and has the property that R^{-1} is non-degenerate. Consider a formal linear representation $\rho = (u, A, v)$ of r , say of

dimension k . Like in the proof of Theorem 18, we deduce from Remark 6 (iv) that the associated affine linear pencil

$$\tilde{A} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & A \end{pmatrix}$$

is full. Now, by applying [32, Theorem 5.6] instead of Proposition 22, we get that $\tilde{A}(X)$ is invertible. Having this, we can proceed again like in the proof of Theorem 18, and we arrive at $X \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R^{-1})$. Moreover, since $R(X) = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R(x))$ by the assumption $R \in \mathfrak{R}_0$, we further get that $R^{-1}(X) = R(X)^{-1} = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R(x))^{-1} = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R(x)^{-1}) = \text{Ev}_X^\bullet(R^{-1}(x))$; notice that $R(x)$ is invertible because Lemma 7 guarantees that $x \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{C}\langle x \rangle}(R^{-1})$ as R^{-1} was assumed to be non-degenerate. In summary, we see that $R^{-1} \in \mathfrak{R}_0$. \square

4. CONVERGENCE IN LAW OF THE SPECTRAL MEASURE

4.1. Estimate on the cumulative distribution function of the spectral measure of self-adjoint operators. In this subsection, we list and prove a few properties that we need in the following subsection to prove Theorem 27 about the convergence of the empirical measure of a self-adjoint non-degenerate matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression evaluated in matrices towards the analytic distribution of the limiting operator.

Lemma 24 (Lemma 3.2 in [5]). *For $X \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{sa}}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_X(t) = \max\{\tau(p) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}), p(t - X)p \geq 0\}.$$

The crux of the proof of Theorem 27 lies in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 25. *Let $X, Y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{sa}}$, then*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}_X(t) - \mathcal{F}_{X+Y}(t)| \leq \text{rk}(Y).$$

Proof. We fix $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $r \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ be such that $rY = Y$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $q(t - X)q \geq 0$. Then if we set $p = q \wedge (1 - r)$, we have $pY = 0$ and $pq = p$, thus

$$p(t - X - Y)p = p(t - X)p = pq(t - X)qp \geq 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{F}_{X+Y}(t) \geq \tau(p) \geq \tau(q) - \tau(r).$$

By taking the supremum over q and the infimum over r , we get that

$$\mathcal{F}_{X+Y}(t) \geq \mathcal{F}_X(t) - \text{rk}(Y).$$

Now let's assume that q is such that $q(t - X - Y)q \geq 0$, then similarly with $p = q \wedge (1 - r)$,

$$p(t - X)p = p(t - X - Y)p = pq(t - X - Y)pq \geq 0.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{F}_X(t) \geq \tau(p) \geq \tau(q) - \tau(r).$$

And once again, by taking the supremum over q and the infimum over r , we get that

$$\mathcal{F}_X(t) \geq \mathcal{F}_{X+Y}(t) - \text{rk}(Y).$$

Hence the conclusion. \square

The authors are indebted to Mikael de la Salle for indicating to them the following lemma.

Lemma 26. *Let $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, $X \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{sa}$, then $\text{rk}(pXp) \leq \text{rk}(X)$.*

Proof. Let $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ be such that $qX = X$, $r = p \wedge (1 - q)$, then $r + 1 - p$ is such that

$$(r + 1 - p)pXp = rpXp = rXp = rqXp = 0.$$

Consequently, $(p - r)pXp = pXp$. And since $p \geq r$, $p - r$ is a self-adjoint projection, hence

$$\text{rk}(pXp) \leq \tau(p - r) \leq \tau(q).$$

Hence the conclusion is obtained by taking the infimum over q . \square

4.2. Main result. This subsection focuses on proving the convergence in law of the empirical measure of matrix-valued noncommutative rational expressions evaluated in matrices under some assumptions. Theorem 27 is for deterministic matrices, but it can easily be extended to random matrices by applying this result almost surely.

Theorem 27. *Let $X^N = (X_1^N, \dots, X_{d_1}^N)$ be a d_1 -tuple of deterministic self-adjoint matrices and let $U^N = (U_1^N, \dots, U_{d_2}^N)$ be a d_2 -tuple of deterministic unitary matrices. Further, let R be a non-degenerate square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in $d = d_1 + d_2$ variables which is self-adjoint of type (d_1, d_2) in the sense of Definition 10. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) (X^N, U^N) converges in $*$ -distribution towards a d -tuple of noncommutative random variables (x, u) in some tracial W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) satisfying $\Delta(x, u) = d$.
- (ii) For N large enough $R(X^N, U^N)$ is well-defined, i.e., there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ for all $N \geq N_0$.

Then $(x, u) \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$, so that $R(x, u)$ is well-defined, and the empirical measure of $R(X^N, U^N)$ converges in law towards the analytic distribution of $R(x, u)$.

The fact that $(x, u) \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$ holds was established already in Theorem 23. Accordingly, the main statement of Theorem 27 is the convergence of the empirical measure of $R(X^N, U^N)$ towards the spectral measure of $R(x, u)$. This convergence result actually holds in a more general setting than the above theorem. We summarize it as the following proposition.

Proposition 28. *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X^N = (X_1^N, \dots, X_d^N)$ be a d -tuple of (possibly unbounded) operators affiliated with some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{M}^{(N)}, \tau^{(N)})$. Furthermore, for any $*$ -polynomial P we assume $P(X^N, X^{N*}) \in L^1(\mathcal{M}^{(N)}, \tau^{(N)})$ and $\tau^{(N)}(P(X^N, X^{N*}))$ converges towards $\tau(P(X, X^*))$ where $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ is a d -tuple of noncommutative (bounded) random variables in some tracial W^* -probability space (\mathcal{M}, τ) . Let R be a square matrix-valued noncommutative rational expression in d variables such that, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ which are sufficiently large,*

- (i) $X^N \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}^{(N)}}}(R)$ and $X \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$,
- (ii) $R(X^N)$ and $R(X)$ are self-adjoint.

Then the analytic distribution of $R(X^N)$ converges in law towards the analytic distribution of $R(X)$.

Once Proposition 28 is shown, the statement about the convergence in Theorem 27 follows immediately. Indeed, the condition formulated in Item (i) of Proposition 28 is satisfied as we have $(X^N, U^N) \in \text{dom}_{M_N(\mathbb{C})}(R)$ for all $N \geq N_0$ by Item (ii) of Theorem 27 and $(x, u) \in \text{dom}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(R)$ by Theorem 23; further, we have that $R(X^N, U^N)$ for all $N \geq N_0$ and $R(x, u)$ are self-adjoint thanks to Definition 10 as R is supposed to be self-adjoint of type (d_1, d_2) , so that the condition in Item (ii) of Proposition 28 is fulfilled as well.

Let us outline the proof of Proposition 28. Let $\rho = (Q, w)$ be a self-adjoint formal linear representation of R in the sense of Definition 12 which is moreover proper as given by Theorem 13. Thanks to Lemma 25, we can ignore the singularity in 0 of $Q(X, X^*)^{-1}$. More precisely, as long as the spectral measure of $Q(X, X^*)$ has no atom at 0, we can use Lemma 25 to prove that the cumulative distribution function of $w^*Q(X, X^*)^{-1}w$ is close to the one of $w^*f_\varepsilon(Q(X, X^*))w$ where f_ε is a continuous function which is equal to $t \mapsto t^{-1}$ outside of a neighborhood of 0 of size ε . Then we can use the convergence in $*$ -distribution of X^N to show that the cumulative distribution function of $w^*f_\varepsilon(Q(X^N, X^{N*}))w$ converges towards the correct limit when we let N go to infinity and ε go to 0.

It is important to note that in this subsection, by convergence in $*$ -distribution of X^N of noncommutative random variables $X^N = (X_1^N, \dots, X_d^N)$, we mean that the trace of any noncommutative $*$ -polynomial P evaluated in X^N converges towards the trace of $P(X, X^*)$ where X is a d -tuple of noncommutative random variables in some tracial W^* -probability space. In particular, this does *not* exclude the case where the operator norm of X_i^N is not bounded over N . This forces us to do a few more computations since the convergence in law of the analytic measure of $P(X^N, X^{N*})$ towards the analytic measure of the limiting operator, while still valid, is not immediate anymore.

Proof of Proposition 28. Let $\rho = (Q, w)$ be a proper self-adjoint formal linear representation (of dimension k) of R . If $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is the size of R , then since $k \geq p$ and w have full rank, there exists a matrix $T \in \text{GL}_k(\mathbb{C})$ such that $w = Tw_0$ where $w_0 \in M_{k \times p}(\mathbb{C})$ is the rectangular matrix whose diagonal coefficients are all 1, and non-diagonal coefficients are all 0. By replacing Q by T^*QT , one can assume without loss of generality that $w = w_0$.

Notice that by assumption $Q_N := Q(X^N, X^{N*})$ is invertible in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{(N)}$ and $R(X^N) = w^*Q_N^{-1}w$. Further, we have also that $Q_\infty := Q(X, X^*)$ is invertible in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and $R(X) = w^*Q_\infty^{-1}w$. Thanks to Lévy's continuity theorem, to prove the convergence in law of the empirical measure of $R(X^N)$ towards the analytical distribution of $R(X)$, we only need to prove that the cumulative distribution function of the empirical measure of $R(X^N)$ converges towards the one of the analytical distribution of $R(X)$ at every point of continuity. I.e., we need to show that $\mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_N w}(t)$ converges towards $\mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty w}(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the function $s \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty w}(s)$ is continuous in t . To do so, let $g : t \mapsto t^{-1}$ and $f_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that on the complementary set of $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$, $f_\varepsilon = g$. We have for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) \right| &\leq \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus thanks to Lemma 25,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) \right| &\leq \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) \right| \\ &\quad + \text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_N)w) \\ &\quad + \text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)w). \end{aligned}$$

Since $w = w_0$, we have that for any $X \in M_p(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(wXw^*) &= \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} X & 0_{p \times (k-p)} \\ 0_{(k-p) \times p} & 0_{k-p} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{p}{k} \text{rk}(X). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)w) = \frac{k}{p} \times \text{rk}(ww^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)ww^*) \leq \frac{k}{p} \times \text{rk}((f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)),$$

where in the last inequality, we used Lemma 26. Besides $\mathbf{1}_{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]}(Q_\infty)$ is a self-adjoint projection such that $\mathbf{1}_{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]}(Q_\infty)(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty) = (f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)$. Consequently, with Tr_k the non-renormalized trace on $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ and τ the trace on \mathcal{M} ,

$$\text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)w) \leq \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau(\mathbf{1}_{[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]}(Q_\infty)).$$

Let h_ε be a continuous function which takes value 1 on $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$, 0 outside of $[-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$ and in $[0, 1]$ elsewhere, then

$$(3) \quad \text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)w) \leq \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau(h_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)).$$

Hence by applying the same reasoning to Q_N , we get after combining those estimates that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) \right| &\leq \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau(h_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)}(h_\varepsilon(Q_N)). \end{aligned}$$

To use the Portmanteau theorem, we want to prove that the analytic distribution of $w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w$ converges towards the analytic distribution of $w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w$. However, since this self-adjoint operator is uniformly bounded over N , we need to prove the convergence of the moments. That is, that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w)^l \right) = \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_p \otimes \tau \left((w^*f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w)^l \right)$$

for any l . The strategy consists in approximating f_ε by a polynomial and then using the convergence in $*$ -distribution of X^N . However, the fact that we did not assume the operator norm of X_i^N to be bounded over N forces us to make additional estimates.

Let $C = \|Q_\infty\| + 1$, and h be a non-negative continuous function which takes value 0 on $[-C, C]$, 1 outside of $[-C - 1, C + 1]$ and in $[0, 1]$ elsewhere. Let P_m be a polynomial such that $\|f_\varepsilon - P_m\|_{C^0([-C-1, C+1])} \leq 1/m$. We set

$$B^N := (f_\varepsilon(Q_N) - P_m(Q_N))(1 - h(Q_N)) \quad \text{and} \quad C^N := (f_\varepsilon(Q_N) - P_m(Q_N))h(Q_N),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^l \right) - \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^l \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^{i-1} w^* (B^N + C^N) w (w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{l-i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have for any i ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^{i-1} w^* (B^N + C^N) w (w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{l-i} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} (w^* B^N w w^* B^N w)} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} (w^* C^N w w^* C^N w)} \right) \\ & \quad \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{2(l-i)} (w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^{2(i-1)} \right)} \\ & \leq \left(\sqrt{\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} ((B^N)^2)} + \sqrt{\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} ((C^N)^2)} \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{4(l-i)} \right) \right)^{1/4} \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^{4(i-1)} \right) \right)^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Since f_ε is bounded by a constant K , we have that

$$\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N) w)^{4(i-1)} \right) \leq K^{4(i-1)}.$$

Thanks to the convergence in $*$ -distribution of X^N , and since the expression $w^* P_m(Q_N) w$ is a matrix of polynomials in X^N , we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{4(l-i)} \right) = \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau \left((w^* P_m(Q_\infty) w)^{4(l-i)} \right),$$

which means that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((w^* P_m(Q_N) w)^{4(l-i)} \right) \leq (K + 1/m)^{4(l-i)}.$$

We also have

$$\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((B^N)^2 \right) \leq \frac{k}{m}.$$

Finally since f_ε is bounded, there exists an integer g such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $|f_\varepsilon(t) - P_m(t)| \leq (1 + t^2)^g$, thus for any $r \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((C^N)^2 \right) & \leq \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((C^N)^2 Q_N^{2r} \right)}{N C^{2r}} \\ & \leq \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((1 + Q_N^2)^{2g} Q_N^{2r} \right)}{N C^{2r}}. \end{aligned}$$

And so for any $r \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} \left((C^N)^2 \right) & \leq \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_k \otimes \tau \left((1 + Q_\infty^2)^{2g} Q_\infty^{2r} \right)}{C^{2r}} \\ & \leq k \left\| (1 + Q_\infty^2)^{2g} \right\| \frac{(C-1)^{2r}}{C^{2r}}. \end{aligned}$$

So by letting r go to infinity, we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau^{(N)} ((C^N)^2) = 0.$$

By combining those results, we obtain

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_p \otimes \tau^{(N)} ((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w)^l) - \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}_p \otimes \tau ((w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w)^l) \right| = \mathcal{O}(1/m).$$

Thus, by letting m go to infinity, we get the convergence of the moments. This implies that the analytic distribution of $w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w$ converges towards the analytic distribution of $w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w$. Thanks to Portmanteau's theorem and Lemma 24, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) &\geq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) \\ &\geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w}(t) \geq \lim_{s \rightarrow t, s < t} \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow t, s < t} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(s) \right| + \frac{2}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau (h_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the convergence in $*$ -distribution of X^N once again in the last line, coupled with an argument similar to the one which let us prove the convergence of the moments of $w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_N)w$. But by using Lemma 25 one more time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* f_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)w}(s) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(s) \right| + 2 \text{rk}(w^*(f_\varepsilon - g)(Q_\infty)w). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by using equation (3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_N^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{s \rightarrow t, s < t} \left| \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty^{-1}w}(s) \right| + \frac{4}{p} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau (h_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

Since we made the assumption that t was a point of continuity of the function $s \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty w}(s)$, we have that $\lim_{s \rightarrow t, s < t} |\mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty w}(t) - \mathcal{F}_{w^* Q_\infty w}(s)| = 0$. Besides, by the dominated convergence theorem, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau (h_\varepsilon(Q_\infty)) = \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(Q_\infty))$, which is equal to 0 since otherwise the distribution of Q_∞ would have an atom in 0, in contradiction to the invertibility of Q_∞ ; indeed, analogous to the proof of [32, Corollary 5.13], we notice that $Q_\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(Q_\infty) = 0$ and conclude from the latter that since Q_∞ is invertible over $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ we necessarily have that $\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(Q_\infty) = 0$ and hence $\mu_{Q_\infty}(\{0\}) = \frac{1}{k} \text{Tr}_k \otimes \tau (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(Q_\infty)) = 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Amitsur. Rational identities and applications to algebra and geometry. *Journal of Algebra*, 3(3):304–359, 1966.
- [2] G. W. Anderson. Convergence of the largest singular value of a polynomial in independent Wigner matrices. *Ann. Probab.* 41, no. 3B, 2103–2181, 2013.
- [3] D. Avitzour. Free products of C^* -algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 271 (1982), 423–435.
- [4] S. Belinschi and M. Capitaine. Spectral properties of polynomials in independent Wigner and deterministic matrices. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273:3901–3973, 2016.

- [5] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu. Free Convolution of Measures with Unbounded Support. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):733–773, 1993.
- [6] B. Blackadar Operator algebras. Theory of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras, *Berlin:Springer*, 2006.
- [7] M. Capitaine and C. Donati-Martin. Strong asymptotic freeness for Wigner and Wishart matrices. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(2):767–803, 2007.
- [8] W.-M. Ching. Free products of von Neumann algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 178 (1973) 147-163.
- [9] P. M. Cohn. Free ideal rings and localization in general rings. *Cambridge university press*, 3, 2006.
- [10] P. M. Cohn and C. Reutenauer. A normal form in free fields. *Can. J. Math.*, 46(3):517–531, 1994.
- [11] P. M. Cohn and C. Reutenauer. On the construction of the free field. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.*, 9(3-4):307–323, 1999.
- [12] A. Connes. *Noncommutative geometry. Transl. from the French by Sterling Berberian*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1994.
- [13] A. Connes and D. Shlyakhtenko. L^2 -homology for von Neumann algebras. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 586:125–168, 2005.
- [14] J. B. Conway, A course in functional analysis *New York etc.: Springer-Verlag*, 1990.
- [15] B. Collins and C. Male. The strong asymptotic freeness of Haar and deterministic matrices. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 47(1):147–163, 2014.
- [16] B. Collins, A. Guionnet and F. Parraud. On the operator norm of non-commutative polynomials in deterministic matrices and iid GUE matrices. *Cambridge Journal of Mathematics*, 10(1):195–260, 2022.
- [17] G. Duchamp and C. Reutenauer. Un critère de rationalité provenant de la géométrie non commutative. *Invent. Math.* 128(3):613–622, 1997.
- [18] L. Erdős, T. Krüger, and Y. Nemish. Scattering in quantum dots via noncommutative rational functions. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 22, No. 12, 4205-4269 (2021).
- [19] M. Fannes and J. Quaegebeur. Central limits of product mappings between CAR algebras, *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.* 19 (1983), 469-491.
- [20] U. Haagerup and H. Schultz. Brown measures of unbounded operators affiliated with a finite von Neumann algebra. *Math. Scand.* 100 (2007), no. 2, 209–263.
- [21] U. Haagerup and S. Thorbjørnsen. A new application of random matrices: $\text{Ext}(C_{\text{red}}^*(\mathbb{F}_2))$ is not a group. *Ann. of Math.*, 162(2):711–775, 2005.
- [22] J. W. Helton, T. Mai, and R. Speicher. Applications of realizations (aka linearizations) to free probability. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 274(1):1–79, 2018.
- [23] P. Hrubeš and A. Wigderson. Non-commutative arithmetic circuits with division. *Theory Comput.*, 11, 357–393, 2015.
- [24] R. L. Hudson, M. D. Wilkinson, and S. N. Peck, Translation-invariant integrals, and Fourier Analysis on Clifford and Grassmann algebras, *J. Functional Analysis*, 27(1980), 68-87.
- [25] D. S. Kaliuzhnyi-Verbovetskyi and V. Vinnikov. Singularities of rational functions and minimal factorizations: the noncommutative and the commutative setting. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 430(4):869–889, 2009.
- [26] D. S. Kaliuzhnyi-Verbovetskyi and V. Vinnikov. Noncommutative rational functions, their difference-differential calculus and realizations. *Multidimensional Syst. Signal Process.*, 23(1-2):49–77, 2012.
- [27] P. A. Linnell. Division rings and group von Neumann algebras. *Forum Math.*, 5(6):561–576, 1993.
- [28] P. A. Linnell. A rationality criterion for unbounded operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 171(1):115–121, 2000.
- [29] Z. Ma and F. Yang. Sample canonical correlation coefficients of high-dimensional random vectors with finite rank correlations *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03297*, 2021.
- [30] C. Male. The norm of polynomials in large random and deterministic matrices. With an appendix by Dimitri Shlyakhtenko. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 154, no. 3-4, 477-532, 2012.
- [31] T. Mai, R. Speicher, and S. Yin. The free field: zero divisors, Atiyah property and realizations via unbounded operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04150v2*, 2018.

- [32] T. Mai, R. Speicher, and S. Yin. The free field: realization via unbounded operators and Atiyah property. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08187*, 2019.
- [33] J. A. Mingo and R. Speicher. *Free probability and random matrices*, volume 35 of *Fields Institute Monographs*. Springer, New York; Fields Institute for Research in Mathematical Sciences, Toronto, ON, 2017.
- [34] A. Miyagawa. The estimation of non-commutative derivatives and the asymptotics for the free field in free probability theory. *MSc Thesis, Kyoto University*, 100, 2021.
- [35] F. J. Murray and J. von Neumann, On Rings of Operators, *Ann. Math.*, 37(1):116–229, 1936.
- [36] F. Parraud. On the operator norm of non-commutative polynomials in deterministic matrices and iid Haar unitary matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 182(3), 751–806, 2022.
- [37] H. Schultz. Non-commutative polynomials of independent Gaussian random matrices. The real and symplectic cases. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 131(2):261–309, 2005.
- [38] R. Speicher. Regularity of non-commutative distributions and random matrices. *Publications of MFO*, OWR-2019-56, p3513.
- [39] M. Terp, L_p spaces associated with von Neumann algebras, *Math. Institute, Copenhagen Univ.*, 1981.
- [40] C. Vargas. A general solution to (free) deterministic equivalents. In *Contributions of Mexican mathematicians abroad in pure and applied mathematics. Second meeting “Matemáticos Mexicanos en el Mundo”, Centro de Investigación en Matemáticas, Guanajuato, Mexico, December 15–19, 2014*, pages 131–158. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS); México: Sociedad Matemática Mexicana, 2018.
- [41] D. Voiculescu. Symmetries of some reduced free product C^* -algebras. In: Araki, H., Moore, C.C., Stratila, ŞV., Voiculescu, DV. (eds) *Operator Algebras and their Connections with Topology and Ergodic Theory. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol 1132. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [42] D. Voiculescu. Limit laws for random matrices and free products. *Invent. Math.*, 104(1):201–220, 1991.
- [43] D. Voiculescu. The analogues of entropy and of Fisher’s information measure in free probability theory. II. *Invent. Math.*, 118(3):411–440, 1994.
- [44] D. Voiculescu. A strengthened asymptotic freeness result for random matrices with applications to free entropy. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (1):41–63, 1998.
- [45] J. Volčič. Matrix coefficient realization theory of noncommutative rational functions. *Journal of Algebra*, 499:397–437, 04 2018.
- [46] J. Volčič. Hilbert’s 17th problem in free skew fields. *Forum Math. Sigma* 9, Paper No. e61, 21 p. (2021).
- [47] S. Yin. Non-commutative rational functions in strongly convergent random variables. *Adv. Oper. Theory*, 3(1):178–192, 2018.
- [48] S. Yin. On the rational functions in non-commutative random variables. PhD thesis Universität des Saarlandes, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: collins@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

SAARLAND UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, D-66123 SAARBRÜCKEN, GERMANY

Email address: mai@math.uni-sb.de

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: miyagawa.akihiro.43v@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

UNIVERSITÉ DE LYON, ENSL, UMPA, 46 ALLÉE D’ITALIE, 69007 LYON., DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: felix.parraud@ens-lyon.fr

¹IMT, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE, UPS, F-31400 TOULOUSE, FRANCE

²DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TX 76706, USA

Email address: sheng_yin@baylor.edu