

Spectral properties of canonical systems: discreteness and distribution of eigenvalues

JAKOB REIFFENSTEIN * HARALD WORACEK †

Abstract: In this survey paper we review classical results and recent progress about a certain topic in the spectral theory of two-dimensional canonical systems. Namely, we consider the questions whether the spectrum σ is discrete, and if it is, what is its density. Here we measure density by the growth of the counting function of σ in the sense of integrability or lim sup-conditions relative to suitable comparison functions. These questions have been around for many years. However, full answers have been obtained only very recently – in partly still unpublished work.

The way we measure density of eigenvalues must be clearly distinguished from spectral asymptotics, where one asks for an asymptotic expansion of eigenvalues. We explicitly and on purpose do not go into this direction and do not present any results about spectral asymptotics.

We understand this survey as a focussed presentation of results revolving around the initially stated questions, and not as an exhaustive account on the literature which is in the one or other way related to the area. It does not contain any proofs, but we do comment on proof methods.

The theorems we present are very diverse. They rely on different methods from operator theory, complex analysis, and classical analysis, and beautifully invoke the interplay between these areas. Besides the fundamental theorems solving the problem and several selected additions, we decided to include a number of results devoted to the spectral theory of Jacobi matrices, in other words, to the Hamburger moment problem. The connection between the theories of canonical systems and moment problems gives rise to important new insights, yet seems to be less widely known than other connections, e.g., with Krein-Feller or Schrödinger operators.

We compile all necessary prerequisites from the general theory to make the exposition as self-contained as possible. It is our aim that this survey can be read and enjoyed by a broad community, including non-specialist readers.

AMS MSC 2020: 34 L 15, 37 J 99, 30 D 15, 47 B 10, 47 B 36, 44 A 60

Keywords: canonical system, discrete spectrum, distribution of eigenvalues, growth of entire function, Jacobi matrix, indeterminate moment problem

Introduction

The present paper is a survey, not containing any proofs, where we review classical results and recent progress about a certain topic in the spectral theory of two-dimensional canonical systems. These are first-order systems of the form

$$y'(t) = zJH(t)y(t), \quad t \in (a, b),$$

where $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is the spectral parameter, J is the symplectic matrix $J := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and H is the Hamiltonian of the system. We deal with systems whose Hamiltonian satisfies $H(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, $H(t)^T = H(t)$, $H(t) \geq 0$ for a.a. $t \in (a, b)$, $H \in L^1((a, c), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$ for all $c \in (a, b)$, and $H(t) \neq 0$ a.e.

†This work was supported by the project I 4600 of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), and by the Sverker Lerheden foundation.

Canonical systems play an important role in many contexts; we mention two:

- ▷ Several particular equations can be transformed to the form of a canonical systems by sometimes more and sometimes less explicit formulae. This applies in particular to Schrödinger- or Sturm-Liouville equations, Dirac systems, Jacobi matrices, and Krein-Feller operators (Krein strings).
- ▷ Canonical systems are a universal model for self-adjoint operators with simple spectrum. Every such operator is unitarily equivalent to the differential operator induced by some canonical system in a natural way.

Each two self-adjoint realisations of the above differential equation are at most 2-dimensional perturbations of each other, and hence share most of their spectral properties. When talking about such properties we may thus pick up any self-adjoint realisation.

The theorems we present revolve around the following two questions:

- (1) When is the spectrum discrete ?
- (2) If the spectrum is discrete, how densely is it distributed ?

Here we understand “density” of a discrete subset σ of \mathbb{R} as being measured by the growth of the counting function

$$n(r) := \#(\sigma \cap (-r, r))$$

when r tends to infinity. We measure the speed of growth of $n(r)$ in ways familiar from complex analysis like finiteness of $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{q(r)}$ or $\int_1^\infty \frac{n(r)}{q(r)} dr$, where $q(r)$ is a suitable comparison function (for a start think of a power $q(r) = r^\rho$ with $\rho > 0$). It must be said very clearly that we do not discuss results about actual asymptotics of $n(r)$. There is a vast literature about spectral asymptotics of various types of equations, but it is most explicitly not our aim to go into this direction.

Question (1) is answered by a single theorem reading as “The spectrum is discrete, if and only if...”. Contrasting this, question (2) has many facets. The full answer boils down to two theorems: one settling the case of “dense” spectrum, and another settling the case of “sparse” spectrum. It is a good, though not fully correct, intuition to imagine the set \mathbb{Z} of integers as the border between those two situations. These two cases are very different in their nature, and so are the proof methods.

A guide to reading the paper

On the top level of structuring, the content is arranged in five parts.

Part I: Fundamental Theorems 21

We present the fundamental theorems that answer questions (1) and (2). In the discreteness characterisation and in the case of dense spectrum, the formulae are explicit in terms of the Hamiltonian and can be applied in practice. For sparse spectrum formulae are again explicit, but evaluating them is much more difficult (we discuss situations where the density of the spectrum can be described more explicitly later on).

Part II: The limit circle case 37

We discuss the situation where H is integrable on the whole interval (a, b) . In this case the spectrum is always sparse, and there is a tight connection between the distribution of the spectrum and the growth of a certain entire function. This opens up another way of approach, which in particular leads to an algorithm to evaluate the general formula up to a small error.

Part III: Moment problems and Jacobi matrices 46

The following three notions are just different ways to view one and the same object: moment sequences, Jacobi matrices, Hamiltonians of a certain discrete form (which we call Hamburger Hamiltonians). The connection between moment sequences and Jacobi matrices is standard, the connection with canonical systems seems to be less widely known, though it has been around for many years. This interaction proves to be very fruitful, and we use it to discuss question (2) in this setting. In this part we focus on results stated in terms of the moment sequence, its orthonormal polynomials, and its Jacobi parameters. Some of them are obtained making a detour via Hamburger Hamiltonians.

Part IV: Hamburger Hamiltonians 59

In this part we focus on results about Hamburger Hamiltonians. When the Hamiltonian does not vary too wildly a fairly complete picture can be given. Translating the results presented in this part to Jacobi parameters and the moment sequence is usually hard (if not impossible).

Part V: Additions and Examples 71

We present a selection of theorems and examples about various topics. Among them a construction of Hamiltonians whose monodromy matrix has prescribed growth, and a result where in one very concrete situation not only finiteness of $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{q(r)}$ (for appropriate $q(r)$) is shown, but the actual value of this limit is determined. Further, we give results that illuminate the ways in which the growth of $n(r)$ depends on the Hamiltonian, and illustrate the peculiarities of sparse spectrum. Last but not least we give a brief account on the literature about Krein strings going back to the pioneering work of M.G. Krein in the 1950's. The results about the string equation were a great source of motivation and inspiration when developing the general theory.

Stepping down one level in our structuring hierarchy, each of Parts I–V consists of several sections, in each of which we focus on one specific result or one specific circle of ideas. A brief description guiding through the sections of each single part is provided on the first page of the respective part.

Moving on to one single section, each of them is manufactured as follows: we start with a few introductory words, then present the results to which the section is dedicated, and close with remarks about original sources, proof methods, connections to other results, and similar.

Preceding Parts I–V we provide a prologue, where we place some subjects specific for the theory of canonical systems. The aim is to prepare a common ground for all readers. We close the paper with an appendix, where we collect a few subjects that we need from general theory and that might not be familiar to

every reader. We include a list of notation, a subject index, and the bibliography at the end of the paper.

Concerning dependencies between the different sections, we tried to implement the following idea:

- ▷ All readers should browse through Section **A** in the prologue. After having done that, each reader is welcome to proceed to any section in Parts I–V according to his or her interest, but should be prepared to return to Sections **B** and **C** of the prologue or to visit the appendix if necessary.
- ▷ As a rough guideline, the sections in Parts I–V can be read independently of each other.

Table of contents

Introduction	1
A guide to reading the paper	2
Table of contents	4
 Prologue : Two-dimensional canonical systems	
A Canonical systems	8
A.1 The differential equation	8
A.2 Weyl’s method of nested disks	9
A.3 The monodromy matrix	10
A.4 The Weyl coefficient	11
B The operator model	12
C Two particular classes of systems	14
C.1 Hamburger Hamiltonians: the power moment problem	15
C.2 Pontryagin-type Hamiltonians: generalisation of limit circle case	18
 ▷▷ Part I: Fundamental Theorems	
1 The discreteness criterion	22
2 Independence from off-diagonal via the Matsaev property	24
3 Spectrum with large density: approach via operator ideals	27
4 Trace class and sparse spectrum: the Weyl coefficient approach	30
 ▷▷ Part II: The limit circle case	
5 The Krein–de Branges formula	38
6 Algorithm to evaluate growth	39
7 Romanov’s Theorem I: bound by discretisation	42
8 Romanov’s Theorem II: bound by coverings	44

▷▷ Part III: Moment problems and Jacobi matrices	
9 Growth in terms of orthogonal polynomials	47
10 An elementary lower bound	48
11 The Livšic estimate	50
12 Convergence exponents as lower bounds	52
13 A theorem of Berezanskii	55
14 Growth from power asymptotics	56
▷▷ Part IV: Hamburger Hamiltonians	
15 A scale of lower bounds	60
16 Upper bounds in terms of convergence exponents	61
17 Upper bounds in terms of tails of convergent series	64
18 A Berezanskii-type theorem	66
19 Exploiting regular variation I: upper bound from majorants	67
20 Exploiting regular variation II: lower bound from minorants	69
▷▷ Part V: Additions and examples	
21 Hamiltonians with continuous rotation angle	72
22 An illustrative example: the chirp function	74
23 Hamburger Hamiltonians with regularly varying data	75
24 Hamburger Hamiltonians with power-log decay	80
25 Bochkov's theorem about type	83
26 Modifying the rotation of the Hamiltonian	84
27 Cutting out pieces of the Hamiltonian	85
28 Exploiting symmetry	87
29 Krein strings	89
30 Inverse results	91
Appendix: Auxiliary notions	
D Regularly varying functions	94

E Entire functions of Cartwright class	97
F J -inner matrix functions	100
List of notation	102
Subject index	103
References	106

PROLOGUE

Two-dimensional canonical systems

In this part we collect some basic notions and results from the theory of canonical systems and their spectral theory. Furthermore, we discuss two particular types of Hamiltonians. This is done in order to provide prerequisites necessary for reading and understanding the content of the core Parts I-V. It is by no means an account of the whole theory; the compilation is made specifically for the purpose of this paper and merely covers the present needs.

In Section **A** we present what is needed in all further sections. This includes Weyl's limit circle/limit point distinction, the monodromy matrix, and the Weyl coefficient. In Section **B** we briefly discuss the operator model associated with a canonical system, which is needed in Part I. The operator theoretic viewpoint is also a major source of motivation to deal with growth properties of the monodromy matrix, which are discussed specifically in Part II. Section **C** is devoted to two particular classes of Hamiltonians. First, we introduce Hamburger Hamiltonians and explain their relationship to Jacobi matrices and the power moment problem; this class is further studied in Parts III and IV. Second, we introduce Pontryagin-type Hamiltonians, a class that forms a modest extension of limit circle case; these occur in Part II.

Table of contents

§ A . Canonical systems	8
§§ A.1 . The differential equation	8
§§ A.2 . Weyl's method of nested disks	9
§§ A.3 . The monodromy matrix	10
§§ A.4 . The Weyl coefficient	11
§ B . The operator model	12
§ C . Two particular classes of systems	14
§§ C.1 . Hamburger Hamiltonians: the power moment problem	15
§§ C.2 . Pontryagin-type Hamiltonians: generalisation of limit circle case	18

A Canonical systems

References for the material presented in this section are [BHS20; Rem18; Rom14; Win95; DM76; GK70; Bra68; Atk64] and, historically, [Wey10; Tit46].

A.1 The differential equation

A two dimensional *canonical system* is a differential equation of the form

$$y'(t) = zJH(t)y(t) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

on some interval (a, b) where $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$. Here $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is the spectral parameter, J is the symplectic matrix $J := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $H \in L^1_{\text{loc}}((a, b), \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2})$ is the *Hamiltonian* of the system. A solution $y: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ is supposed to be locally absolutely continuous and satisfy (A.1) for a.a. $t \in (a, b)$.

We consider a class of canonical systems whose Hamiltonian has certain analytic and algebraic properties.

A.1 Definition. Let $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$. We denote by $\mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ the set of all measurable functions $H: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, such that

- ▷ for a.a. $t \in (a, b)$ it holds that $H(t) = H(t)^T$ and $H(t) \geq 0$;
- ▷ for each $c \in (a, b)$ we have $H \in L^1((a, c), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$;
- ▷ the set $\{t \in (a, b) \mid H(t) = 0\}$ has measure zero.

Given $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} W_H(t, z)J = zW_H(t, z)H(t), & t \in (a, b) \text{ a.e.}, \\ W_H(a, z) = I, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

has a unique absolutely continuous solution $W_H: [a, b) \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$. We refer to $W_H(t, z)$ as the *fundamental solution* of the canonical system (A.1). The entries of $W_H(t, z)$ are denoted as $w_{H,ij}(t, z)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$.

A.2 Remark. Compared to the equation (A.1) we passed in (A.2) to transposes, so that now the transposed rows of $W_H(t, z)$ are solutions of (A.1). This is practical for technical reasons but has no intrinsic meaning.

Intuitively speaking a transformation of the independent variable in (A.1) will not change any essential properties of the equation (A.1) and its solutions. This is formalised by the following notion.

A.3 Definition. Let $-\infty < a < b \leq \infty$ and $-\infty < \tilde{a} < \tilde{b} \leq \infty$, and let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and $\tilde{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{a},\tilde{b}}$. We say that \tilde{H} is a *reparameterisation* of H , if there exists an increasing bijection $\varphi: [\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}) \rightarrow [a, b)$ such that φ and φ^{-1} are locally absolutely continuous and $\tilde{H}(s) = H(\varphi(s))\varphi'(s)$, $s \in (\tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$ a.e.

If $\tilde{H}(s) = H(\varphi(s))\varphi'(s)$, the fundamental solution transforms accordingly as

$$W_{\tilde{H}}(s, z) = W_H(\varphi(s), z), \quad s \in (\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}).$$

A.4 Remark. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. The function $\mathfrak{t}(t) := \int_a^t \operatorname{tr} H(s) \, ds$ is increasing, absolutely continuous, and has absolutely continuous inverse. Hence, we may use $\varphi := \mathfrak{t}^{-1}$ to produce a reparameterisation \tilde{H} of H . This reparameterisation satisfies $\operatorname{tr} \tilde{H}(s) = 1$ a.e. Note here that a positive semidefinite matrix A is nonzero if and only if $\operatorname{tr} A > 0$.

Hamiltonians whose trace is (a.e.) identically equal to 1 are called *trace-normalised*. Due to the above remark one can often restrict considerations to trace-normalised Hamiltonians. However, it is not always a good idea to restrict generality.

We observe that reparameterisation induces an equivalence relation on the set

$$\bigcup_{-\infty < a < b \leq \infty} \mathbb{H}_{a,b}.$$

In the following we use the notation

$$\xi_\phi := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

There may exist intervals where a Hamiltonian is of a particularly simple form.

A.5 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. A nonempty interval $(c, d) \subseteq (a, b)$ is called *indivisible* for H , if there exists $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H(t) = \operatorname{tr} H(t) \cdot \xi_\phi \xi_\phi^T \quad \text{for } t \in (c, d) \text{ a.e.}$$

The number ϕ , which is determined up to integer multiples of π , is called the *type* of the indivisible interval (c, d) .

We call $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ *definite* if (a, b) is not indivisible.

We note that H is definite if and only if the matrix $\int_a^b H(t) \, dt$ is positive definite (and not only positive semidefinite, which it always is).

Sometimes indivisible intervals are considered exceptional, but this is not at all the case; on the contrary, see Section C.1.

A.2 Weyl's method of nested disks

We denote by \mathbb{C}^+ the open upper half-plane

$$\mathbb{C}^+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}.$$

Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and $(t, z) \in [a, b) \times \mathbb{C}$, and consider the fractional linear transformation

$$\zeta \mapsto \frac{w_{H,11}(t, z)\zeta + w_{H,12}(t, z)}{w_{H,21}(t, z)\zeta + w_{H,22}(t, z)} \tag{A.3}$$

as a map of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ onto itself. Moreover, denote by $\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ the closure of the upper half-plane in the sphere, explicitly

$$\overline{\mathbb{C}^+} := \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

For each $t \in [a, b)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ the transformation (A.3) maps $\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ onto some closed disk $\Omega_{t,z}$ contained in $\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$. These disks $\Omega_{t,z}$ are called *Weyl disks*. For each fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ the Weyl disks $(\Omega_{t,z})_{t \in [a,b)}$, are nested in the sense that

$$\forall s, t \in [a, b): s \leq t \Rightarrow \Omega_{s,z} \supseteq \Omega_{t,z}$$

and hence there are two possible scenarios:

- ▷ The intersection $\bigcap_{t \in [a,b)} \Omega_{t,z}$ is a disk with positive radius;
- ▷ The intersection $\bigcap_{t \in [a,b)} \Omega_{t,z}$ consists of a single point.

The chordal radius of $\Omega_{t,z}$ splits as $\rho(z) \cdot (\int_a^t \text{tr} H(s) ds)^{-1}$ with some continuous function ρ depending only on z . Hence, if the limit disk has positive radius for one z then this is true for every z . Moreover, it has positive radius if and only if $\int_a^b \text{tr} H(s) ds < \infty$, and in turn if and only if $H \in L^1((a, b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$.

This motivates the following terminology.

A.6 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. We say that H is in *limit circle case*, if $H \in L^1((a, b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$. Otherwise, H is in *limit point case*.

We note that two Hamiltonians that are reparameterisations of each other are together in limit circle or limit point case.

A.3 The monodromy matrix

Assume that H is in limit circle case, i.e., $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b} \cap L^1((a, b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$. Then the fundamental solution can be extended continuously to the right endpoint b . We call $W_H(b, z)$ the *monodromy matrix* of H , and denote it as $W_H(z)$ and its entries as $w_{H,ij}(z)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. The fractional linear transformations (A.3) depend continuously on t , and hence the limit disk $\bigcap_{t \in [a,b)} \Omega_{t,z}$ is the image of $\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ under

$$\zeta \mapsto \frac{w_{H,11}(z)\zeta + w_{H,12}(z)}{w_{H,21}(z)\zeta + w_{H,22}(z)}.$$

The monodromy matrix has the power series expansion

$$W_H(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} W_{H,n} z^n$$

where the coefficients $W_{H,n}$ are defined by the recurrence

$$W_{H,0} = I, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}: W_{H,n+1} = \int_a^b W_{H,n}(s) H(s) ds.$$

We note that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: W_{H,n} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \wedge \|W_{H,n}\| \leq \frac{1}{n!} \left(\int_a^b \|H(t)\| dt \right)^n.$$

The matrix $W_H(z)$ is analytic, in fact entire with exponential type not exceeding $\int_a^b \|H(t)\| dt$, and by the differential equation it has a positivity property. Here, and always, we use the spectral norm of a matrix.

A.7 Definition. We denote by \mathcal{M}_0 the set of all matrix functions $W(z) = (w_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1}^2$ whose entries are entire functions and take real values along the real axis, that satisfy $\det W(z) = 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, and

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+: \frac{W(z)JW(z)^* - J}{z - \bar{z}} \geq 0.$$

A.8 Theorem.

- (i) Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case. Then $W_H \in \mathcal{M}_0$.
- (ii) The map $H \mapsto W_H$ induces a bijection of the quotient set of

$$\bigcup_{-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty} \left(\mathbb{H}_{a,b} \cap L^1((a,b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}) \right)$$

modulo reparameterisation onto \mathcal{M}_0 .

We remark that, using appropriate topologies, the map $H \mapsto W_H$ becomes a homeomorphism.

A.4 The Weyl coefficient

Assume that H is in limit point case, i.e., $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b} \setminus L^1((a,b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$. Then the fundamental solution does not extend to the right endpoint b . A result analogous to Theorem A.8 requires a different analytic object.

A.9 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit point case. Then we define a function $q_H: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ by the requirement that

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+: \bigcap_{t \in [a,b)} \Omega_{t,z} = \{q_H(z)\}.$$

This function is called the *Weyl coefficient* of H .

It is customary to extend q_H to the lower half-plane by symmetry as

$$q_H(\bar{z}) := \overline{q_H(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

In some contexts the function q_H is also called the *Titchmarsh-Weyl coefficient* or the *m-function*.

For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and $\tau_t: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$, $t \in [a, b)$, we have

$$q_H(z) = \lim_{t \rightarrow b} \frac{w_{H,11}(t, z)\tau_t(z) + w_{H,12}(t, z)}{w_{H,21}(t, z)\tau_t(z) + w_{H,22}(t, z)},$$

and this limit is attained uniformly in $(\tau_t)_{t \in [a, b)}$ and locally uniformly in z .

The Weyl coefficient is analytic and has a positivity property.

A.10 Definition. A complex valued function q is called a *Nevanlinna function*, if it is defined and analytic in \mathbb{C}^+ and satisfies $q(\mathbb{C}^+) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$. The *Nevanlinna class* is the set of all Nevanlinna functions, and we denote it as \mathcal{N}_0 .

In the literature it is also common to use the name *Herglotz function* instead of Nevanlinna function. Note that a function $q \in \mathcal{N}_0$ satisfies $q(\mathbb{C}^+) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$ unless it is a real constant. Sometimes the function that is identically equal to ∞ is also considered an element of \mathcal{N}_0 . We shall not do so, and write $\mathcal{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ when we have to include the constant ∞ .

A.11 Theorem.

- (i) Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit point case. Then $q_H \in \mathcal{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$.
- (ii) The map $H \mapsto q_H$ induces a bijection of the quotient set of

$$\bigcup_{-\infty < a < b \leq +\infty} \left(\mathbb{H}_{a,b} \setminus L^1((a, b), \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}) \right)$$

modulo reparameterisation onto $\mathcal{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$.

We remark that, using appropriate topologies, the map $H \mapsto q_H$ becomes a homeomorphism.

B The operator model

References for this section are [BHS20; Rem18; HSW00] and, historically, [Orc69; Kac83; Kac85].

The operator model for a canonical system is defined mostly analogously to that of a Schrödinger operator. There is a maximal and a minimal operator, which are adjoint to each other. The minimal operator is symmetric and has equal deficiency indices. Self-adjoint realizations are then obtained by imposing boundary conditions at the endpoints of the interval (a, b) . Notable differences to the Schrödinger case are that the Hilbert space is a weighted L^2 -space, and that the operator is formally defined as a linear relation which might have a multi-valued part (which is hardly problematic).

First we define the *model space* $L^2(H)$ associated with a Hamiltonian.

B.1 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. Then we set

$$\mathfrak{L}^2(H) := \left\{ f: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \left| \begin{array}{l} f \text{ measurable, } \int_a^b f(t)^* H(t) f(t) dt < \infty, \\ (c, d) \text{ indivisible type } \phi \Rightarrow \xi_\phi^T f \text{ constant on } (c, d) \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

and let $L^2(H)$ be the factor space of $\mathfrak{L}^2(H)$ modulo the equivalence relation that identifies two functions f_1, f_2 when $Hf_1 = Hf_2$ a.e.

With the natural scalar product, $L^2(H)$ becomes a Hilbert space.

Next we define the maximal and minimal relation associated with H .

B.2 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite. The *maximal relation* associated with H is

$$T_{\max}(H) := \left\{ (f; g) \in L^2(H) \times L^2(H) \left| \begin{array}{l} f \text{ has an absolutely continuous} \\ \text{representative } \hat{f} \text{ with } \hat{f}' = JHg \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

The *minimal relation* associated with H is

$$T_{\min}(H) := \text{Clos} \{ (f; g) \in T_{\max}(H) \mid \hat{f} \text{ has compact support in } (a, b) \}.$$

The assumption that H is definite guarantees that the representative \hat{f} is unique for each $(f; g) \in T_{\max}(H)$, and hence $T_{\min}(H)$ is well-defined.

The minimal relation is symmetric and its adjoint is the maximal relation:

$$T_{\min}(H) \subseteq T_{\min}(H)^* = T_{\max}(H).$$

The case distinction limit circle/limit point manifests itself in the following operator theoretic alternative:

- ▷ If H is in limit circle case, $T_{\min}(H)$ has deficiency indices $(2, 2)$;
- ▷ If H is in limit point case, $T_{\min}(H)$ has deficiency indices $(1, 1)$.

If limit circle case takes place, the self-adjoint extensions of $T_{\min}(H)$ are obtained by imposing boundary conditions at both endpoints of a, b . These boundary conditions may be separated or coupled. If limit point case holds, it is enough to impose a boundary condition at a , and the self-adjoint extensions are precisely the restrictions of $T_{\max}(H)$ by a boundary condition of the form $(\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)^T \hat{f}(a) = 0$ where $\alpha \in [0, \pi)$.

In any case, each two self-adjoint restrictions of $T_{\max}(H)$ are finite-rank perturbations of each other, and therefore we have:

- ▷ If one self-adjoint realisation has discrete spectrum, so does every other;
- ▷ In limit circle case, the spectrum of every self-adjoint realisation is discrete, and the difference between the number of eigenvalues of two self-adjoint realisations in any finite interval is at most 2;
- ▷ In limit point case, if spectra are discrete, then the eigenvalues of any two self-adjoint realisations interlace each other.

The large-scale distribution of eigenvalues is thus independent of the particular choice of boundary conditions. It is convenient to use the following self-adjoint realisation by default.

B.3 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite. We define the *model operator* A_H as follows:

▷ If H is in limit circle case, set

$$A_H := \{(f; g) \in T_{\max}(H) \mid (1, 0)\hat{f}(a) = (0, 1)\hat{f}(b) = 0\};$$

▷ If H is in limit point case, set

$$A_H := \{(f; g) \in T_{\max}(H) \mid (1, 0)\hat{f}(a) = 0\}.$$

As a self-adjoint linear relation, A_H decomposes into the orthogonal sum of a self-adjoint operator and the purely multi-valued relation $A_H \cap (\{0\} \times L^2(H))$. We write $\sigma(H)$ for the spectrum of the operator part of A_H .

We can now give operator theoretic meaning to monodromy matrix and Weyl coefficient. In line with the scope of this survey, we do not discuss spectral representations in detail and confine our interest to the case that $\sigma(H)$ is discrete.

B.4 Theorem. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite.

- ▷ If H is in limit circle case, then $\sigma(H)$ is discrete and coincides with the set of zeroes of $w_{H,22}$;
- ▷ If H is in limit point case, then $\sigma(H)$ is discrete if and only if q_H has a meromorphic continuation to \mathbb{C} whose values along the real axis are real;
- ▷ If H is in limit point case and $\sigma(H)$ is discrete, then $\sigma(H)$ ($= \sigma_p(H)$) is equal to the set of poles of q_H and all eigenvalues are simple.

C Two particular classes of systems

The connection between canonical systems and the Hamburger power moment problem, presented in Section C.1, is first formulated explicitly in [Kac99]. The formulae have been around for much longer, even in a more general setting e.g. as in [KL79; KL81]. For moment problems themselves there is a variety of textbooks, e.g., [ST43; Akh65; Sch17].

The class of Hamiltonians presented in Section C.2 is a rather recent invention which appeared in the context of indefinite inner product spaces, see [KW06; WW14; LW02; Wor11] and is also related with a notion from [BD95].

C.1 Hamburger Hamiltonians: the power moment problem

In this subsection we explain the connection between three – a priori – different kinds of objects.

C.1 Definition.

1°. A sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of real numbers is called *positive*, if

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, (\xi_n)_{n=0}^N \in \mathbb{C}^{N+1}: \sum_{i,j=0}^N s_{i+j} \xi_i \bar{\xi}_j \geq 0.$$

2°. Assume we have two sequences, $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, such that $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then we define a tridiagonal infinite matrix as

$$\mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & b_0 & 0 & & \\ b_0 & a_1 & b_1 & 0 & \\ 0 & b_1 & a_2 & b_2 & \\ & 0 & b_2 & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and refer to \mathcal{J} as the *Jacobi matrix* with parameters a_n, b_n .

3°. Assume we have two sequences, $l := (l_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\phi := (\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$, such that $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and set

$$x_0 := 0, \quad x_n := \sum_{j=1}^n l_j, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad L := \sum_{j=1}^\infty l_j \in (0, \infty].$$

Then we define a Hamiltonian $H_{l,\phi}: [0, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ as

$$H_{l,\phi}(t) := \xi_{\phi_j} \xi_{\phi_j}^T \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t \in [x_{j-1}, x_j),$$

and refer to $H_{l,\phi}$ as the *Hamburger Hamiltonian* with lengths l_j and angles ϕ_j .

We observe that a Hamburger Hamiltonian consists of a sequence of indivisible intervals accumulating at the right endpoint of the interval:

$$H_{l,\phi}: \begin{array}{c} \xi_{\phi_1} \xi_{\phi_1}^T \quad \xi_{\phi_2} \xi_{\phi_2}^T \quad \xi_{\phi_3} \xi_{\phi_3}^T \quad \dots \\ \left| \begin{array}{ccccccc} \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow & \leftarrow \\ 0 & l_1 & x_1 & l_2 & x_2 & l_3 & x_3 & \dots & L \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Note that the lengths l_j are unique for every Hamburger Hamiltonian, due to the condition that $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$. Each angle ϕ_j , however, is only determined up to an integer multiple of π . The term Hamburger Hamiltonian for this type of Hamiltonian was coined by I.S. Kac to reference the connection we are going to explain in the sequel.

We start by recalling some facts about the moment problem. The *Hamburger moment problem* is the task of describing, for a sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of real numbers, the set

$$\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty) := \left\{ \mu \mid \begin{array}{l} \mu \text{ positive measure on } \mathbb{R} \\ s_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^n d\mu(t) \text{ for } n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{array} \right\}.$$

This problem was treated extensively in work of H. Hamburger, M. Riesz, R. Nevanlinna, and many others. The moment problem has a solution, i.e., $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty) \neq \emptyset$, if and only if the sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is positive, i.e., all quadratic forms $\sum_{i,j=0}^n s_{i+j} \xi_i \bar{\xi}_j$ are positive semidefinite. If so, there are two possible alternatives for the set $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$:

- ▷ $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$ contains exactly one element – we say that the moment problem is *determinate*;
- ▷ $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$ has infinitely many elements – we say that the moment problem is *indeterminate*.

In the indeterminate case, $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$ can be described via the set of its Cauchy-transforms.

C.2 Theorem. *Let $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ be a positive sequence and assume that the moment problem is indeterminate. Then there exist four entire functions A, B, C, D , such that the formula*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{t-z} d\mu(t) = \frac{A(z)\tau(z) - C(z)}{-B(z)\tau(z) + D(z)} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

establishes a bijection between $\mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$ and $\mathcal{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$.

The matrix

$$W(z) := \begin{pmatrix} A(z) & C(z) \\ B(z) & D(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

is called the *Nevanlinna matrix* of the sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$.

Relating 1° and 2°.

Given a positive sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ we obtain an associated sequence $(p_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of *orthonormal polynomials*. Namely, by applying the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalisation process to the sequence $(z^n)_{n=0}^\infty$ in a space $L^2(\mu)$ where $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((s_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$. The polynomials p_n do not depend on the choice of μ . They satisfy a *three-term recurrence*: there exist $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0: zp_n(z) = b_n p_{n+1}(z) + a_n p_n(z) + b_{n-1} p_{n-1}(z). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Here we formally set $b_{-1} := -1$, $p_{-1}(z) := 0$. The parameters $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ occurring in (C.2) are uniquely determined by the sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and are called the *Jacobi parameters* of the moment sequence.

C.3 Theorem. *The assignment outlined above gives a bijective correspondence between the set of all positive sequences $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ with $s_0 = 1$ and the set of all pairs of sequences $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ where a_n are real and b_n are positive.*

The restriction in the theorem to the case that $s_0 = 1$ is no loss of generality: rescaling the sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ by any positive factor corresponds to rescaling solutions of the moment problem by the same factor.

C.4 Remark. Given a moment sequence we may also define another sequence of polynomials $(q_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, called the *orthogonal polynomials of the second kind*. Namely, $(q_n)_{n=-1}^\infty$ is the solution of the recurrence (C.2) with the initial conditions (recall that we have set $b_{-1} := -1$)

$$q_0(z) = 0, \quad q_{-1}(z) = -1.$$

The moment problem is indeterminate if and only if the series $\sum_{n=0}^\infty (p_n(0)^2 + q_n(0)^2)$ converges. If it is indeterminate, the entries of the Nevanlinna matrix can be expressed as series involving the polynomials p_n and q_n .

Relating 2° and 3°.

Jacobi- and Hamiltonian parameters are related in a purely algebraic (yet, not simple) way. Assume we have sequences $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty, (b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ with a_n real and b_n positive. Then we define sequences $(l_j)_{j=1}^\infty, (\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ with l_j positive and ϕ_j real by recursively solving the equations

$$l_1 = 1, \quad \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}, \tag{C.3}$$

$$a_0 = \tan \phi_2, \tag{C.4}$$

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0: b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l_{k+1}l_{k+2}} |\sin(\phi_{k+2} - \phi_{k+1})|}, \tag{C.5}$$

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: a_k = \frac{\cot(\phi_{k+1} - \phi_{k+2}) + \cot(\phi_k - \phi_{k+1})}{l_{k+1}}, \tag{C.6}$$

where the numbers ϕ_j are determined up to integer multiples of π (for example we could choose $\phi_j \in [0, \pi)$). Conversely, given sequences $(l_j)_{j=1}^\infty, (\phi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $l_j > 0$, $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the equations (C.4)–(C.6) define $(a_n)_{n=0}^\infty, (b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ with a_n real and b_n positive. These constructions obviously set up a bijective correspondence between the set of all Jacobi matrices and the set of all Hamburger Hamiltonians with $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

The restriction to the case that $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ is no essential loss of generality: appending one indivisible interval at the initial endpoint of a Hamiltonian or removing one, respectively, are transformations that are easily understood and can be handled explicitly.

The correspondence introduced above also relates model operators, which we now introduce. Given a Jacobi matrix, the *Jacobi operator* is the closure in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$ of the linear operator mapping elements u of $\{u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \mid u_n = 0 \text{ for almost all } n\}$ to $\mathcal{J}u$. Given a Hamburger Hamiltonian $H_{l,\phi}$, we define a symmetric extension of $T_{\min}(H_{l,\phi})$ as

$$S_{H_{l,\phi}} := \text{Clos} \{ (f; g) \in T_{\max}(H_{l,\phi}) \mid (1, 0)\hat{f}(0) = 0, \sup \text{supp } \hat{f} < L \}.$$

C.5 Theorem. *Let \mathcal{J} and $H_{l,\phi}$ correspond to each other by means of the above bijection. Then the Jacobi operator is unitarily equivalent to $S_{H_{l,\phi}}$.*

The extension $S_{H_{l,\phi}}$ (and with it the corresponding Jacobi operator) is self-adjoint if $H_{l,\phi}$ is in limit point case, and it has deficiency indices $(1, 1)$ if $H_{l,\phi}$ is in limit circle case. Since a Hamburger Hamiltonian is trace-normalised, limit point case takes place if and only if $L = \infty$.

We mention that it is also possible to start with any Hamburger Hamiltonian $H_{l,\phi}$, dropping the restriction that $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$, and define Jacobi parameters by (C.6) and (C.5). However, in order for the Jacobi operator to be unitarily equivalent to $S_{H_{l,\phi}}$, the formula (C.4) for a_0 has to be modified. Furthermore, the case $\phi_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$ has to be treated separately, because S_H then has a nontrivial multi-valued part.

Relating 1° and 3°.

By composing the above two bijections we obtain a bijective correspondence between the set of all positive sequences $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ with $s_0 = 1$ and all Hamburger Hamiltonians $H_{l,\phi}$ with $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$. There is a very interesting direct connection between $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ and $H_{l,\phi}$.

C.6 Theorem. *Let $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ be a positive sequence with $s_0 = 1$, and let $H_{l,\phi}$ be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with $l_1 = 1, \phi_1 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ that corresponds to the sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ by the above bijection.*

- (i) *The moment problem for $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is indeterminate, if and only if $H_{l,\phi}$ is in limit circle case.*
- (ii) *Assume that the moment problem is indeterminate, let $W(z)$ be the Nevanlinna matrix of the moment problem and $W_{H_{l,\phi}}(z)$ the monodromy matrix of $H_{l,\phi}$. Then*

$$W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} W_{H_{l,\phi}}(z) J \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We remark that there exist formulae expressing the parameters of the Hamiltonian corresponding to a positive sequence in terms of the orthogonal polynomials of that sequence:

$$p_n(0) = \sqrt{l_{n+1}} \sin(\phi_{n+1}), \quad q_n(0) = -\sqrt{l_{n+1}} \cos(\phi_{n+1}). \quad (\text{C.7})$$

C.2 Pontryagin-type Hamiltonians: generalisation of limit circle case

In this section we introduce a class of Hamiltonians that are in limit point case, yet behave very similarly to Hamiltonians in limit circle case.

Before we can give the definition of said class, we need to carry out a preliminary discussion.

C.7 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. Then we set

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ f: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \mid \forall c \in (a, b): f|_{(a,c)} \in L^2(H|_{(a,c)}) \right\},$$

$$(V_H f)(t) := \int_a^t JH(s)f(s) ds, \quad t \in [a, b), f \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Note that $L^2(H) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbb{C}^2 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, where we understand \mathbb{C}^2 as set of constant functions.

In the following we work with functions of the form $\sum_{j=0}^n V_H^j a_j$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}^2$. We call such functions *H-polynomials*. This terminology is chosen by analogy with the case when V is the classical Volterra operator $(Vf)(t) := \int_0^t f(s) ds$.

C.8 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. Then we set

$$C_n := \left\{ a_n \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid \exists a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}^2: \sum_{j=0}^n V_H^j a_j \in L^2(H) \right\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$\Delta(H) := \inf \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \dim C_n = 2 \} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Note that H is in limit circle case if and only if $\Delta(H) = 0$.

C.9 Lemma. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that

$$\exists \phi \in [0, \pi): \xi_\phi \in L^2(H) \wedge \limsup_{t \rightarrow b} \left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi ds \cdot \int_a^t \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(s) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} ds \right) < \infty. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Then V_H maps $L^2(H)$ boundedly into itself.

We remark that the condition (C.8) means that $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$, cf. Theorem 1.2.

This lemma implies that, under the condition (C.8), we have

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: C_n \subseteq C_{n+1}.$$

C.10 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. We say that H is of *Pontryagin type*, if

- (i) $\exists \phi \in [0, \pi): \xi_\phi \in L^2(H) \wedge \lim_{t \rightarrow b} \left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi ds \cdot \int_a^t \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(s) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} ds \right) = 0,$
- (ii) $\Delta(H) < \infty.$

We remark that the condition (i) means that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) = \emptyset$, cf. Corollary 1.3.

The class of Pontryagin type Hamiltonians can be seen as a mild generalisation of limit circle case Hamiltonians. This, and our choice of terminology, is motivated by the fact that a Hamiltonian is of Pontryagin type if and only if it is a section of an indefinite Hamiltonian in the sense of [KW06] that is in limit circle case. Such indefinite Hamiltonians give rise to an operator model in a Pontryagin space instead of a Hilbert space.

C.11 Example. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the Hamiltonian $H \in \mathbb{H}_{0,1}$ defined as

$$H(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \left(\frac{1}{1-t}\right)^\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Then

- ▷ $\alpha < 1$: limit circle case.
- ▷ $\alpha \in [2 - \frac{1}{n}, 2 - \frac{1}{n+1})$, $n \geq 1$: Pontryagin type with $\Delta(H) = n$.
- ▷ $\alpha = 2$: $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \neq \emptyset$ and $\Delta(H) = \infty$.
- ▷ $\alpha > 2$: $0 \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$.

Pontryagin type Hamiltonians can be characterised in terms of their Weyl coefficients. The following is shown in [LW02, Theorem 5.1].

C.12 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit point case. Then H is of Pontryagin type, if and only if its Weyl coefficient q_H has the following properties:*

- (i) q_H has a meromorphic extension to the whole plane \mathbb{C} .
- (ii) Denote by P the set of poles of q_H , and set

$$n_+(r) := \#[P \cap (0, r)], \quad n_-(r) := \#[P \cap (-r, 0)].$$

Then the limits

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{w \in P \\ |w| \leq r}} \frac{1}{w}, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_+(r)}{r}, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_-(r)}{r},$$

exist in \mathbb{R} , and the last two limits are equal.

- (iii) Denote by p the entire function defined as

$$p(z) := \begin{cases} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\substack{w \in P \\ |w| \leq r}} (1 - \frac{z}{w}) & \text{if } 0 \notin P, \\ z \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\substack{w \in P \setminus \{0\} \\ |w| \leq r}} (1 - \frac{z}{w}) & \text{if } 0 \in P. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $w \in P$, let c_w be minus the residuum of q_H at w . Then there exists $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{w \in P} \frac{1}{(1 + w^{2(1+\Delta)})p'(w)c_w} < \infty. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

If q_H satisfies (i)–(iii), then $\Delta(H)$ is the minimum of all numbers $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfy (C.9).

PART I

Fundamental Theorems

In this part we present the fundamental theorems that determine, explicitly in terms of H ,

- (1) whether the spectrum is discrete, and
- (2) if it is discrete, how large its density is.

We understand “density” in the sense familiar from complex analysis, namely, we ask for convergence of series or finiteness of limit superior w.r.t. to comparison functions g (the model case being $g(r) = r^\rho$ with some $\rho > 0$), and also use corresponding wording:

▷ *Convergence class*: $\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{g(|\lambda|)} < \infty$;

▷ *Finite (or minimal-) type*: $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{g(r)} < \infty$ (or $= 0$, respectively), where

$$n_H(r) := \#\{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \mid |\lambda| < r\}.$$

We note that every discrete subset of \mathbb{R} can be realised as $\sigma(H)$ for some H .

Question (1) is answered by Theorem 1.2. The given condition is surprisingly simple. Question (2) has two facets: the case that $\sigma(H)$ has large density and the case that $\sigma(H)$ is sparse. Intuitively, though not fully correct, large density means that $\sigma(H)$ is “more dense than the integers”, while sparse means roughly “at most as dense as \mathbb{Z} ”. The case of dense spectrum is settled by Theorems 3.1 and 3.3. The given conditions are explicit and accessible from a computational viewpoint. The case of sparse spectrum is settled by Theorem 4.2. The formula is still explicit, yet hard to evaluate.

A major result on the way to understand spectrum with large density is Theorem 2.4, that contains an astonishing independence property and emphasises the role of integer distribution as a borderline from an operator theoretic viewpoint.

Table of contents

§ 1. The discreteness criterion	22
§ 2. Independence from off-diagonal via the Matsaev property	24
§ 3. Spectrum with large density: approach via operator ideals	27
§ 4. Trace class and sparse spectrum: the Weyl coefficient approach	30

1 The discreteness criterion

For a Hamiltonian $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ we denote the radius of the possible gap around 0 in the essential spectrum as

$$R_H := \inf \{ |t| \mid t \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \} \in [0, \infty].$$

Observe that $\sigma(H)$ is discrete if and only if $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H)$ has a gap around zero with infinite radius, i.e., $R_H = \infty$.

The below theorem contains a two-sided estimate for R_H . Before we formulate this result, we have to note the following fact.

1.1 Lemma. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. If $R_H > 0$, then there exists $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi \, dt < \infty.$$

1.2 Theorem. *There exist constants $\gamma_+, \gamma_- > 0$ such that the following statement holds.*

▷ *Let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, assume that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi \, dt < \infty$, and set*

$$\alpha := \limsup_{t \rightarrow b} \left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi \, ds \cdot \int_a^t \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(s) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} \, ds \right) \in [0, \infty]. \quad (1.1)$$

*Then*¹

$$\gamma_- \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \leq R_H \leq \gamma_+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

In particular, we have the following *discreteness criterion*.

1.3 Corollary. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. Then $\sigma(H)$ is discrete, if and only if there exists $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi \, dt < \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow b} \left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi \, ds \cdot \int_a^t \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(s) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} \, ds \right) = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Observe that the conditions (1.2) and (1.3) depend only on the “diagonal entries” $\xi_\phi^T H \xi_\phi$ and $\xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}$ of H , while the “off-diagonal” $\xi_\phi^T H \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}$ does not occur in the formulae.

Indeed it is a crucial step in the proof to show this *independence theorem*, where we mean independence from the off-diagonal. We again state a quantitative version.

¹Here we use the usual conventions for algebra in $[0, \infty]$: $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$ and $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$.

1.4 Theorem. *There exist constants $\tilde{\gamma}_+, \tilde{\gamma}_- > 0$ such that the following statement holds.*

▷ *Let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, assume that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$, and denote*

$$H_d(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi & 0 \\ 0 & \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(t) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } t \in (a, b). \quad (1.4)$$

Then

$$\tilde{\gamma}_- R_{H_d} \leq R_H \leq \tilde{\gamma}_+ R_{H_d}.$$

To make it explicit, here is the formulation for discreteness only.

1.5 Corollary. *Let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, and assume that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$. Moreover, let H_d be as in (1.4). Then $\sigma(H)$ is discrete, if and only if $\sigma(H_d)$ is discrete.*

▷▷ Remarks ◀◀

✱ For the case of strings (equivalently, diagonal Hamiltonians, cf. Section 29), the discreteness criterion was shown already at a very early stage by I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein in [KK58], see also [KK68b, 11.9°]. After a long period of no progress, a necessary condition and a (different) sufficient condition for discreteness was announced in [Kac95]. Proofs have never been published, and the reason may be that there was a flaw in the argument (cf. the discussion in [RW20, Appendix B]).

The final solution is given by R. Romanov and H. Woracek in [RW20], where Corollary 1.5 and Corollary 1.3 are established using operator theoretic methods. In that paper constants were not traced. The quantitative versions Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.2 are taken from the work of C. Remling and K. Scarbrough [RS20b] where a different approach via oscillation theory is used.

✱ In [RS20b] numerical values for the constants $\gamma_\pm, \tilde{\gamma}_\pm$ are given:

$$\gamma_- = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_- = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \gamma_+ = \tilde{\gamma}_+ = \frac{2}{3 - \sqrt{5}}.$$

The lower bounds in Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 with these constants $\gamma_-, \tilde{\gamma}_-$ are sharp, see the example in [RS20b, §5] where $\alpha = 1, R_H = \frac{1}{4}, R_{H_d} = \frac{1}{2}$. The stated value for γ_+ and $\tilde{\gamma}_+$ is almost certainly not optimal, and the optimal value is not known.

✱ For diagonal Hamiltonians a more accurate estimate can be given. Assume H is diagonal, let α be the limit superior from (1.1), and denote by β the limit inferior of the same expression. Then

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\alpha}} \leq R_H \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\beta}}.$$

In particular, if the expression from (1.1) has a limit, the numerical value of R_H is determined.

✱ For the proof of the discreteness criterion one could, after having established the independence theorem, refer to the mentioned connection with strings and [KK58]. However, the proofs in [RW20] and [RS20b] do not do this, and hence yield new proofs for the Kac-Krein theorem.

In this context let us mention that the two cases [KK58, (0.8), (0.9)] correspond to different ways of rewriting the string to a diagonal Hamiltonian, and to having “ $\phi = 0$ ” or “ $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$ ” in the above formulations.

✱ The fact that H is dominated by H_d in Theorem 1.4 (meaning that $R_H \geq \text{const} \cdot R_{H_d}$) is not hard to see. The difficult, and rather surprising, part is that also a converse inequality holds.

✱ Hamiltonians H for which $\sigma(H)$ is discrete are related with *structure Hamiltonians*, a notion which occurs in the theory of de Branges’ Hilbert spaces of entire functions. See e.g. [Wor15b] for this notion and [Kac07] for the relation. The question how to characterise those Hamiltonians that are the structure Hamiltonian of some de Branges space is posed by L. de Branges in [Bra68] as an “important problem”. By means of the relation made explicit by I.S. Kac, it is equivalent to characterise discreteness of $\sigma(H)$.

✱ Based on the discreteness criterion one can – in theory – decide for all types of equations that can be reformulated as a canonical system whether their spectrum is discrete. However, despite that the condition in terms of H given in Theorem 1.2 is so simple, it seems very hard (if not impossible) to express it in terms of the data of other equations without imposing restrictions on the data like smoothness or regularity. For instance, rewriting it in terms of Jacobi parameters or a moment sequence seems to be out of reach.

✱ Lemma 1.1 is folklore; an explicit argument can be found in [Rem18, Theorem 3.8(b)] or [RW20, Lemma 6.1].

In the context of this lemma, we remark that for almost all purposes one can restrict w.l.o.g. to the case that the “integrable direction” ϕ is one specific direction, e.g., to the case $\phi = 0$ which amounts to $\int_a^b h_1(t) dt < \infty$. This follows since rotating the Hamiltonian by some angle is a simple transformation: let $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\tilde{H}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi & \sin \psi \\ -\sin \psi & \cos \psi \end{pmatrix} H(t) \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi & \sin \psi \\ -\sin \psi & \cos \psi \end{pmatrix}^{-1},$$

then the model operator $A_{\tilde{H}}$ is unitarily equivalent to a one-dimensional perturbation of A_H .

2 Independence from off-diagonal via the Matsaev property

The *Calkin correspondence* is the map that assigns to a compact operator on some Hilbert space \mathcal{H} the sequence of its s -numbers

$$\mathcal{C}: \begin{cases} \mathfrak{S}_\infty & \rightarrow c_0 \\ T & \mapsto (s_n(T))_{n=1}^\infty \end{cases}$$

Here we denote by \mathfrak{S}_∞ the ideal of all compact operators, and $s_n(T)$ is the n -th *s-number* (in our context equivalently, the n -th *approximation number*)

$$s_n(T) := \inf \{ \|T - F\| \mid F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \dim \operatorname{ran} F < n \}.$$

Provided that \mathcal{H} is separable, every proper ideal in the ring $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} is contained in $\mathfrak{S}_\infty(\mathcal{H})$, and hence corresponds to a certain space of sequences. For a self-adjoint operator A with discrete spectrum, the Calkin correspondence thus translates properties of the distribution of the spectrum into membership in operator ideals of resolvents of A .

2.1 Example. Let A be a self-adjoint operator with discrete spectrum, and let $p \in (0, \infty)$. Then (for z being any point of the resolvent set)

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|\lambda|^p} < \infty \iff (A - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_p$$

Here \mathfrak{S}_p denotes the *Schatten-von Neumann ideal*, which is defined as the inverse image under \mathcal{C} of the sequence space ℓ^p .

We see that the *convergence exponent*

$$\rho := \inf \left\{ p > 0 \mid \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(A) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|\lambda|^p} < \infty \right\} \in [0, \infty]$$

of $\sigma(A)$ can be expressed in terms of the Schatten-von Neumann ideals \mathfrak{S}_p as

$$\rho = \inf \{ p > 0 \mid (A - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_p \}.$$

For $p \in [1, \infty)$, the ideals \mathfrak{S}_p carry another structure besides being merely operator ideals: \mathfrak{S}_p is a Banach space with the norm carried over from ℓ^p , and this norm enjoys additional algebraic properties. The following notion formalises this observation.

2.2 Definition. Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space. A *symmetrically normed ideal* (*s.n.-ideal* for short) in \mathcal{H} is an ideal \mathfrak{J} of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\mathfrak{J} \notin \{\{0\}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\}$ that is endowed with a norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{J}}$, such that

- (i) \mathfrak{J} is complete with $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{J}}$,
- (ii) $\forall T \in \mathfrak{J}, A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}): \|ATB\|_{\mathfrak{J}} \leq \|A\| \cdot \|T\|_{\mathfrak{J}} \cdot \|B\|$,
- (iii) $\|T\|_{\mathfrak{J}} = \|T\|$ for all $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\dim \operatorname{ran} T = 1$.

A property that many, but not all, s.n.-ideals have is the following.

2.3 Definition. Let \mathfrak{J} be a s.n.-ideal with $\mathfrak{J} \neq \mathfrak{S}_\infty$. We say that \mathfrak{J} has the *Matsaev property*, if

$$\forall T \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty, \sigma(T) = \{0\}: T + T^* \in \mathfrak{J} \implies T \in \mathfrak{J}. \quad (2.1)$$

This choice of terminology is motivated by a classical result due to V.I. Matsaev, who showed that all ideals \mathfrak{S}_p with $1 < p < \infty$ satisfy (2.1) (even with a norm estimate). We should point out that the *trace class ideal* \mathfrak{S}_1 does not have the Matsaev property.

The second part of the following theorem is a crucial – and quite unexpected – result.

2.4 Theorem. *Let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, and assume that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$. Denote again*

$$H_d(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi & 0 \\ 0 & \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}}^T H(t) \xi_{\phi+\frac{\pi}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in (a, b).$$

Then the following statements hold.

▷ **Diagonal dominance:** *Let \mathfrak{J} be an operator ideal. Then (for $z \notin \sigma(H) \cup \sigma(H_d)$)*

$$(A_{H_d} - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{J} \implies (A_H - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{J}$$

▷ **Independence theorem:** *Let \mathfrak{J} be an s.n.-ideal with the Matsaev property. Then (for $z \notin \sigma(H) \cup \sigma(H_d)$)*

$$(A_{H_d} - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{J} \iff (A_H - z)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{J}$$

The following example demonstrates validity and failure of independence from the off-diagonal.

2.5 Example. Let $\alpha > 0$ and set

$$m(t) := \frac{1}{1-t} \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{1-t} \right)^{-\alpha}, \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Consider the Hamiltonian on $(0, 1)$ defined as

$$H(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -m(t) \\ -m(t) & m(t)^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\sigma(H)$ and $\sigma(H_d)$ are discrete, and the respective convergence exponents ρ_H and ρ_{H_d} are

$$\rho_H = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 2), \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \alpha \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad \rho_{H_d} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\ 1 & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we always have $(A_{H_d} - z)^{-1} \notin \mathfrak{S}_1$.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ The Calkin correspondence, identifying ideals with sequence spaces, goes back to J.W. Calkin [Cal41] and D.J.H. Garling [Gar67]. An elaborate account on the topic can be found in the textbook [GK69], see also [Sim05]. Those normed sequence spaces that correspond to s.n.-ideals have been identified only comparatively recently by N.J. Kalton and F.A. Sukochev in [KS08].

✱ Matsaev’s theorem for the ideals \mathfrak{S}_p is shown in [Mat61], see also [GK70, Theorem 6.2]. A characterisation of the Matsaev property for a large class of s.n.-ideals is given by G.I. Russu in [Rus79], [Rus80], see also [RW20, Theorem 2.5]. A full characterisation in terms of the sequence space can be obtained from work of F.A. Sukochev, K. Tulenov, D. Zanin [STZ19].

As a rule of thumb one may say that the Matsaev property holds for an s.n.-ideal \mathfrak{J} unless \mathfrak{J} is too close to \mathfrak{S}_1 or to \mathfrak{S}_∞ , or the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{J}}$ behaves in a weird way.

✱ The independence theorem was proved by R. Romanov and H. Woracek in [RW20, Theorem 3.6], even under a slightly weaker assumption on \mathfrak{J} than stated above. The proof is based on an operator theoretic trick. Diagonal dominance, proved in [RW20, Theorem 3.4], is an expected result and was implicitly present in earlier literature.

✱ Example 2.5 is [RW20, Example 1.7]. Its proof requires the results from Section 3.

✱ The independence theorem sheds light on the specialty of integer distribution from an operator theoretic perspective. Namely, Schatten–von Neumann classes \mathfrak{S}_p are s.n.-ideals only if $p \geq 1$ and for $p = 1$ the Matsaev property fails.

Compare this with the Krein–de Branges formula further below, which also emphasises specialty of integer distribution, but from a function theoretic perspective.

3 Spectrum with large density: approach via operator ideals

Even though the results in this section hold true for Hamiltonians in either limit circle or limit point case, they are mostly relevant for limit point Hamiltonians. The reason for that is that they rely on Theorem 2.4 (ii). The *Krein–de Branges formula* (discussed in detail in Section 5) states that for a Hamiltonian H in limit circle case the eigenvalue counting function

$$n_H(r) := \#\{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \mid |\lambda| < r\}$$

satisfies

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{r} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_a^b \sqrt{\det H(t)} dt < \infty.$$

Thus, if H is in limit circle case, membership in s.n.-ideals with the Matsaev property almost always come for free.

Due to the independence theorem the task is to decide membership of resolvents in an operator ideal for a diagonal Hamiltonian. This can be done by exploiting a method that goes back, at least, to the paper [Ale+02] of A.B. Aleksandrov, S. Janson, V.V. Peller, R. Rochberg. In order to obtain meaningful results on the spectral side, we apply the general theory with certain *Lorentz ideals* and *Orlicz spaces*.

The first theorem deals with convergence class conditions.

3.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ with $\sigma(H)$ discrete, let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that² $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$, and assume³ that $\xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi$ does not vanish a.e. on any interval (c, b) with $c < b$. Moreover, let \mathfrak{q} be a regularly varying function with index > 1 (cf. Section D). Then, setting $\psi := \phi + \frac{\pi}{2}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}(|\lambda|)} < \infty &\iff \\ \int_a^b \left(\mathfrak{q} \left[\left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi ds \cdot \int_a^t \xi_\psi^T H(s) \xi_\psi ds \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \right)^{-1} \frac{\xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi}{\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi ds} dt < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Usual *convergence class w.r.t. an order ρ* is the particular case $\mathfrak{q}(r) = r^\rho$. In this case the integrand in (3.1) simplifies.

3.2 Corollary. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ with $\sigma(H)$ discrete, let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$, and assume that $\xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi$ does not vanish a.e. on any interval (c, b) with $c < b$. Moreover, let $\rho > 1$. Then, setting $\psi := \phi + \frac{\pi}{2}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|\lambda|^\rho} < \infty &\iff \\ \int_a^b \left(\int_t^b \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi ds \right)^{\frac{\rho}{2}-1} \left(\int_a^t \xi_\psi^T H(s) \xi_\psi ds \right)^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \cdot \xi_\phi^T H(s) \xi_\phi dt < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

In the second theorem we deal with finite type conditions and minimal type conditions. This case is more complicated concerning presentation (not concerning content), since the respective conditions cannot anymore be written in integral form as (3.1) and (3.2). They have a sequential (instead of integral-) form.

3.3 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ with $\sigma(H)$ discrete, let $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt < \infty$, and assume that $\xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi$ does not vanish a.e. on any interval (c, b) with $c < b$. Choose $a = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots$ such that*

$$\int_{c_n}^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt = 2^{-n} \int_a^b \xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi dt.$$

²Such an angle always exists, cf. Lemma 1.1.

³We will explain in the remarks below that this is no loss in generality.

Set $\psi := \phi + \frac{\pi}{2}$ and

$$\omega_n := 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\int_{c_{n-1}}^{c_n} \xi_\psi^T H(t) \xi_\psi dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

and let $(\omega_n^*)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the nonincreasing rearrangement⁴ of $(\omega_n)_{n=1}^\infty$.

Let \mathfrak{g} be a regularly varying function with index > 1 , and let \mathfrak{f} be an asymptotic inverse of \mathfrak{g} (cf. Section D). Then

$$\begin{aligned} n_H(r) = O(\mathfrak{g}(r)) &\iff \omega_n^* = O\left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}(n)}\right), \\ n_H(r) = o(\mathfrak{g}(r)) &\iff \omega_n^* = o\left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}(n)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall Example 2.5 which, apart from demonstrating validity and failure of the independence theorem, already showed how sensitively ρ_H depends on the data. An example of a slightly different kind is the following.

3.4 *Example.* Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 0$ with $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \neq (0, 0)$, set

$$h(t) := \left(\frac{1}{1-t}\right)^2 \left(1 + \log \frac{1}{1-t}\right)^{-\alpha_1} \left(1 + \log^+ \log \frac{1}{1-t}\right)^{-\alpha_2}, \quad t \in (0, 1),$$

and consider the Hamiltonian defined on $(0, 1)$ as

$$H(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & h(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the spectrum $\sigma(H)$ is discrete, and its convergence exponent is

$$\begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \alpha_1 = 0 \\ \frac{2}{\alpha_1} & \text{if } \alpha_1 \in (0, 2) \\ 1 & \text{if } \alpha_1 \geq 2 \end{cases}.$$

In the case that $\alpha_1 \in (0, 2)$, we moreover know that

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{r^{\frac{2}{\alpha_1}} (\log r)^{-\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}}} < \infty.$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* The results presented above are taken from the work [RW20] of R. Romanov and H. Woracek. The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 produce sequential conditions, and for the case of convergence class this can be rewritten to the integral form stated in Theorem 3.1.

⁴Since $\sigma(H)$ is assumed to be discrete, we have $(\omega_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$. Hence, this sequence can be rearranged so to become nonincreasing.

* The assumption that $\xi_\phi^T H(t) \xi_\phi$ does not vanish a.e. on any interval (c, b) with $c < b$ is no loss of generality. Because, if it were violated, $\sigma(H)$ would be equal to the spectrum of one self-adjoint realisation of the cut-off Hamiltonian $H|_{(a,c)}$ which is in limit circle case.

* A distribution of $\sigma(H)$ that is more dense than the integers can occur only from growth of H towards its limit point endpoint b . This becomes nicely visible in the condition from Theorem 3.1: for each $c < b$ the integral (3.1) is certainly finite when integration runs only from a to c .

* Rewriting the sequential conditions in Theorem 3.3 to a closed form similar as in Theorem 3.1 fails because of the need to pass to the nonincreasing rearrangement of $(\omega_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. It would be interesting to have a condition that is more directly formulated in terms of H .

* Example 3.4 is taken from [RW20, Example 1.6].

* Membership of resolvents $(A_H - z)^{-1}$ in the Hilbert-Schmidt ideal \mathfrak{S}_2 was characterised earlier in [KW07, Theorem 2.4]. This case is very simple, since one has available the classical criterion that an integral operator is Hilbert-Schmidt if and only if its kernel is L^2 (and the proof in the mentioned paper exploits this). The independence theorem is not needed in this case.

* Using the connection between Krein strings and diagonal Hamiltonians (Section 29), Theorem 3.1 gives an alternative approach to the results of I.S. Kac in [Kac62] and [Kac86] for orders between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1. It must be emphasised in this place that the form of the conditions in the mentioned papers, as well as their proof, is very different. In fact, we do not have a direct computational argument that shows equivalence of the conditions in Kac's papers and the conditions obtained by rewriting Theorem 3.1.

4 Trace class and sparse spectrum: the Weyl coefficient approach

Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$. We again denote

$$n_H(r) := \#\{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \mid |\lambda| < r\}.$$

For the case that $n_H(r)$ grows slower than r^2 we can give a formula in terms of H for the Stieltjes transform of $\frac{n_H(\sqrt{r})}{r}$. This result is specific for slow growth, since it relies on a product representation of functions with real and symmetric zeroes that does not have exponential factors as a general Weierstraß product does.

In order to formulate the theorem, we need to introduce some notation. Given a Hamiltonian $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, we write

$$H(t) = \begin{pmatrix} h_1(t) & h_3(t) \\ h_3(t) & h_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in (a, b) \text{ a.e.},$$

and set

$$\Omega_H(s, t) := \int_s^t H(u) \, du, \quad \omega_{H,j}(s, t) := \int_s^t h_j(u) \, du,$$

for $s, t \in [a, b], s \leq t$. If H is in limit circle case, we can extend the definition of Ω_H and $\omega_{H,j}$ to the range $s, t \in [a, b], s \leq t$.

4.1 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, $r_0 \geq 0$, and $c_-, c_+ > 0$.

(i) We call \hat{t} a *compatible function* for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ , if

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{t}: (r_0, \infty) &\rightarrow (a, b), \\ \forall r \in (r_0, \infty): \frac{c_-}{r^2} &\leq \det \Omega_H(a, \hat{t}(r)) \leq \frac{c_+}{r^2}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If \hat{t} is a compatible function for H, r_0 , we denote

$$\Gamma(\hat{t}) := \{(t, r) \in (a, b) \times (r_0, \infty) \mid \hat{t}(r) \leq t\}.$$

(iii) We call (\hat{t}, \hat{s}) a *compatible pair* for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ , if \hat{t} is a compatible function for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}: \Gamma(\hat{t}) &\rightarrow [a, b), \\ \forall (t, r) \in \Gamma(\hat{t}): \hat{s}(t, r) &\leq t, \frac{c_-}{r^2} \leq \det \Omega_H(\hat{s}(t, r), t) \leq \frac{c_+}{r^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that compatible pairs always exist provided that (a, b) is not indivisible. This follows since $\det \Omega_H$ is a continuous and monotone (in either of its two arguments) function.

We use the following notation to compare functions up to constants. If f, g are functions defined on some set D and taking positive real numbers as values, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f \lesssim g &:\Leftrightarrow \exists C > 0 \forall x \in D: f(x) \leq Cg(x), \\ f \asymp g &:\Leftrightarrow f \lesssim g \wedge g \lesssim f. \end{aligned}$$

In the formulation of the next results recall Lemma 1.1 and the discussion in the remarks to Section 1.

4.2 Theorem. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and that $\sigma(H)$ is discrete. For normalisation assume that $\int_a^b h_1(t) dt < \infty$. Let $r_0 \geq 0$, $c_-, c_+ > 0$, and let (\hat{t}, \hat{s}) be a compatible pair for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ . For $t \in (a, b)$ and $r > r_0$ set

$$K_H(t; r) := \mathbb{1}_{[a, \hat{t}(r)]}(t) \frac{\omega_{H,2}(a, t) h_1(t)}{\frac{c_+}{r^2} + \omega_{H,3}(a, t)^2} + \mathbb{1}_{[\hat{t}(r), b)}(t) \frac{h_1(t)}{\omega_{H,1}(\hat{s}(t; r), t)}.$$

Then

$$r^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt \asymp \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt, \quad r > r_0, \quad (4.1)$$

where this relation includes that one side is finite if and only if the other side is. The constants implicit in this relation depend on c_-, c_+ but not on H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s} .

The formula (4.1) gives a meaningful result about the speed of growth of $n_H(r)$ only if the integrals on either side are finite. The integral on the left-hand side of (4.1) is finite for some (equivalently, for every) $r > 0$ if and only if

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t^2} dt < \infty,$$

which, in turn, is equivalent to $\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} < \infty$.

If we are willing to accept that constants depend on H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s} , then the first summand of $K_H(t; r)$ can be neglected.

4.3 Proposition. *In the situation of Theorem 4.2 we have*

$$\int_a^{\hat{t}(r)} K_H(t; r) dt \leq 2 \log r + \gamma, \quad r > r_0,$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ depends on $c_-, c_+, H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s}$.

Using Abelian and Tauberian theorems we can pass from the Stieltjes transform in (4.1) to the function $n_H(r)$ itself. This gives rise to the following two theorems, which are the counterparts of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3. The reader should observe the particular case of the theorems that $\mathfrak{g}(r) = r^\rho$ for some $\rho \in (0, 2)$, cf. Corollaries 4.5 and 4.8, and also consult the examples given in the remarks below.

The result for *convergence class* reads as follows.

4.4 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and that $\sigma(H)$ is discrete. For normalisation assume that $\int_a^b h_1(t) dt < \infty$. Let $r_0 \geq 1$, $c_-, c_+ > 0$, and let (\hat{t}, \hat{s}) be a compatible pair for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ .*

Let \mathfrak{g} be regularly varying with $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \in [0, 2]$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(r) \ll r^2$ and $\mathfrak{g}|_Y \asymp 1$ on every compact set $Y \subseteq [1, \infty)$. Moreover:

- ▷ *If $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \in (0, 2)$, set $\mathfrak{g}^* := \mathfrak{g}$.*
- ▷ *If $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} = 0$, assume that we have a regularly varying function \mathfrak{g}^* such that $\frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is locally integrable and*

$$\int_t^\infty \int_u^\infty \frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}^*(s)} \frac{ds}{s} \frac{du}{u} \asymp \frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}(t)}.$$

- ▷ *If $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} = 2$, assume that we have a regularly varying function \mathfrak{g}^* such that $\frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}^*}$ is locally integrable and*

$$\int_1^t \frac{s^2}{\mathfrak{g}^*(s)} \frac{ds}{s} \asymp \frac{t^2}{\mathfrak{g}(t)}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H)} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}(|\lambda|)} < \infty \iff \int_{r_0}^\infty \frac{1}{r \mathfrak{g}^*(r)} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt dr < \infty.$$

In the boundary cases $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \in \{0, 2\}$ we do not know whether a function \mathfrak{g}^* with the required properties can always be found (see the remarks below for a class of functions \mathfrak{g} where \mathfrak{g}^* can be found). However, if \mathfrak{g}^* exists, then necessarily $\mathfrak{g} = o(\mathfrak{g}^*)$.

We have the obvious corollary for the case of *convergence class w.r.t. an order* ρ .

4.5 Corollary. *Let $\rho \in (0, 2)$, and consider the situation of Theorem 4.4. Then*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H)} \frac{1}{|\lambda|^\rho} < \infty \iff \int_{r'_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^{\rho+1}} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt dr < \infty.$$

Let us emphasize the case that $\rho = 1$ where we have a characterisation of *trace class resolvents*. In addition, we can give a neat formula for the trace of the inverse of the operator A_H .

4.6 Proposition. *Consider the situation of Theorem 4.4. Then*

$$A_H^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_1 \iff \int_{r_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^2} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt dr < \infty.$$

If $A_H^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_1$, then

$$\text{tr}(A_H^{-1}) = - \lim_{t \rightarrow b} \int_a^t h_3(s) ds.$$

In the context of finite type or minimal type we obtain the following result.

4.7 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and that $\sigma(H)$ is discrete. For normalisation assume that $\int_a^b h_1(t) dt < \infty$. Let $r_0 \geq 1$, $c_-, c_+ > 0$, and let (\hat{t}, \hat{s}) be a compatible pair for H, r_0 with constants c_-, c_+ .*

(i) *We have*

$$n_H(r) \lesssim \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt.$$

The constant implicit in this relation depends on c_-, c_+ but not on H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s} .

(ii) *Let \mathfrak{g} be regularly varying with $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \geq 0$ such that $\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{g}(t)}{t^3} dt < \infty$ and $\mathfrak{g}|_Y \asymp 1$ on every compact set $Y \subseteq [1, \infty)$. Set*

$$\mathfrak{g}_*(r) := \begin{cases} \int_1^r \frac{\mathfrak{g}(t)}{t} dt & \text{if } \text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} = 0, \\ \mathfrak{g}(r) & \text{if } \text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \in (0, 2), \\ r^2 \int_r^{\infty} \frac{\mathfrak{g}(t)}{t^3} dt & \text{if } \text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} = 2. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists $C_- > 0$, which depends on $c_-, c_+, \text{Ind } \mathfrak{g}$ but not on $H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s}, \mathfrak{g}$, such that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_-}{\mathfrak{g}_*(r)} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{\mathfrak{g}(r)}.$$

Note that in the boundary cases $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} \in \{0, 2\}$ we have $\mathbf{g} = o(\mathbf{g}_*)$.

The obvious corollary for the case of *type w.r.t. an order* ρ reads as follows.

4.8 Corollary. *Let $\rho \in (0, 2)$, and consider the situation of Theorem 4.7. Then*

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_-}{r^\rho} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{r^\rho} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_+}{r^\rho} \int_a^b K_H(t; r) dt$$

where C_-, C_+ depend on $c_-, c_+, \text{Ind } \mathbf{g}$ but not on $H, r_0, \hat{t}, \hat{s}, \mathbf{g}$.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ These results are taken from the recent work [LRW24] of M. Langer, J. Reiffenstein, and H. Woracek. The proof of Theorem 4.2 is analytic and relies on a trick. It first uses the canonical differential equation which leads to an integral formula for $\log |w_{H,22}(z)|$. The trick is to realise that the integrand in this expression is, for each single point, the imaginary part of the Weyl coefficient of some canonical system depending on the point. This allows to invoke the work about high-energy asymptotics of Weyl coefficients from [LPW24] and [Rei23].

✱ In contrast to the results in Section 3, the statements in this section are interesting for Hamiltonians in limit circle and limit point case equally as much.

✱ Assume that H is in the limit circle case. Then we can use the formula

$$\frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt = \log |w_{H,22}(ir)|, \quad (4.2)$$

to obtain knowledge about the growth of $\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\|$ when $r \rightarrow \infty$. The formula (4.2), and the fact that the growth of one entry of W_H along the imaginary axis governs the behaviour of the whole monodromy matrix in the whole plane, holds for function theoretic reasons, cf. Section E and Section F.

✱ It is obvious that the formula (4.1) is cumbersome, and in general difficult or even impossible to evaluate. If H is in limit circle case there exists a method that considerably simplifies this problem, namely, an algorithm that evaluates the right-hand side of (4.1) up to a small error. This result will be presented in Section 6.

✱ If $\det H(t) = 0$ for a.a. t (which is necessary for the spectrum to be sparser than the integers, by the Krein-de Branges formula), we have the intuition that the speed of growth of $n_H(r)$ is related to the maximum local rotation of $\text{ran } H(t)$. This is quantified by the notion of a compatible pair from Definition 4.1, which measures the size of $\det \Omega_H(s, t)$. The connection is made by the following fact, cf. [LRW24, Lemma 6.3]: for a Hamiltonian of the form $H(t) = \xi_{\phi(t)} \xi_{\phi(t)}^T$, so that $\phi(t)$ gives the rotation of $\text{ran } H(t)$, it holds that

$$\det \Omega_H(s, t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \int_s^t \sin^2(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) dx dy. \quad (4.3)$$

A more direct instantiation of this intuition is the algorithm mentioned in the previous item.

✱ Consider the situation where the regularly varying function g in Theorems 4.4 and 4.7 is a *Lindelöf comparison function* (D.1). First, assume that $\text{Ind } g = 0$:

$$g(r) = \prod_{k=n}^N (\log^{[k]} r)^{\beta_k} \quad (4.4)$$

for large enough r with $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$ and $\beta_n > 0$. Then a function g^* as in Theorem 4.4 exists, namely,

$$g^*(r) := g(r) \cdot \log r \prod_{j=1}^n \log^{[j]} r.$$

Second, let $\text{Ind } g = 2$:

$$g(r) = r^2 \prod_{k=n}^N (\log^{[k]} r)^{\beta_k} \quad (4.5)$$

for large enough r with $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq N$ and $\beta_n < 0$. Again a function g^* as in Theorem 4.4 exists, namely,

$$g^*(r) := g(r) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \log^{[j]} r.$$

Somewhat surprisingly, the gap between g and g^* is different depending on whether $\text{Ind } g = 0$ or $\text{Ind } g = 2$.

In Theorem 4.7 we have in both cases (that g is of the form (4.4) or (4.5)) that

$$g_*(r) = g(r) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \log^{[j]} r.$$

✱ With the same method as in Proposition 4.6 we can compute the trace of powers A_H^{-p} for $p \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$. Recall that membership of A_H^{-1} in \mathfrak{S}_p for such p is characterised in Corollary 3.2.

For $p = 2$ we reobtain the formula for the Hilbert–Schmidt norm given in [KW07]: if $A_H^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_2$, then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H)} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} = 2 \int_a^b \omega_{H,2}(a, t) h_1(t) dt.$$

For $p = 3$ we get: if $A_H^{-1} \in \mathfrak{S}_3$, then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \sigma(H)} \frac{1}{\lambda^3} = 12 \cdot \lim_{t \rightarrow b} \int_a^t \int_a^s \omega_{H,2}(a, x) h_3(x) dx h_1(s) ds.$$

The formulae for higher p are getting more cumbersome, but retain their structure of being iterated integrals over entries of H . This is expected, thinking of the work [Kac62] where for a Krein string membership in \mathfrak{S}_p for integers $p \geq 2$ is characterised by finiteness of certain iterated integrals.

* For orders between 1 and 2 we have an overlap with the operator theoretic method from Section 3. We do not know if one can show equivalence of the respective conditions by direct computation.

* For Krein strings, a criterion similar to Theorem 4.4 is given by I.S. Kac [Kac86]. Equivalence of the conditions can, at least under certain smoothness assumptions, be verified by direct computation.

PART II

The limit circle case

Assume that the Hamiltonian H is in limit circle case. Then the fundamental solution exists up to the right endpoint of the interval, and we have the monodromy matrix $W_H(z)$ which is an entire function of exponential type. The spectrum $\sigma(H)$ coincides with the zero set of its entry $w_{H,22}(z)$, in particular $\sigma(H)$ is discrete.

These facts add another dimension to the question for density of $\sigma(H)$: we can use the connection between growth and zero distribution of entire functions. For example, the convergence exponent of $\sigma(H)$ is equal to the order of the entire function $w_{H,22}$. More detailed information can be extracted from the central connection (4.2) between $n_H(r)$ and $w_{H,22}(z)$.

The Krein-de Branges formula gives a simple expression in terms of H for the exponential type of $w_{H,22}(z)$ and hence for $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{r}$, cf. Theorem 5.1. It fully settles the case when the type is positive, equivalently, when $\det H(t)$ does not vanish identically. In this case the eigenvalues have integer asymptotics.

The case that $\det H(t) = 0$ is much more involved. One may say that the growth of $W_H(z)$ is proportional to the maximum local rotation of $\operatorname{ran} H(t)$. This vague statement is instantiated in different ways. An algorithm that evaluates $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)|$ up to a possible error of size $\log r$ is based on partitioning the interval into parts with equal rotation, cf. Theorem 6.2. An upper bound, for $\log \max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\|$, is obtained by approximating H with piecewise constant Hamiltonians, cf. Theorem 7.1. Another result determines the order of W_H using coverings of (a, b) that make certain sums involving integrals of H small, cf. Lemma 8.2.

Table of contents

§. 5 The Krein–de Branges formula	38
§. 6 Algorithm to evaluate growth	39
§. 7 Romanov’s Theorem I: bound by discretisation	42
§. 8 Romanov’s Theorem II: bound by coverings	44

5 The Krein–de Branges formula

The *Krein–de Branges formula* gives precise information on the distribution of $\sigma(H)$ compared to the integers.

5.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case. Then the entries of $W_H(z)$ are entire functions of Cartwright class in \mathbb{C}^+ and \mathbb{C}^- . Denote by*

$$0 < \lambda_1^+ < \lambda_2^+ < \dots \quad \text{and} \quad 0 > \lambda_1^- > \lambda_2^- > \dots$$

the (finite or infinite) sequences of positive and negative, respectively, elements of $\sigma(H)$. Then⁵

$$\pi \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\lambda_n^+} = \pi \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{|\lambda_n^-|} = \limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{y} \log^+ |w_{H,ij}(iy)| = \int_a^b \sqrt{\det H(t)} \, dt.$$

There are two essential assertions in this theorem: one is the function theoretic part that we have Cartwright class, and the other is the computation of the type as integral over $\sqrt{\det H}$. The first is related to a functional analytic property of de Branges' Hilbert spaces of entire functions, the latter stems from a differential inequality. The stated asymptotic of eigenvalues is then a consequence (recall Theorem F.2 and Theorem E.3).

The Krein–de Branges formula continues to hold for a certain class of limit point Hamiltonians. The corresponding variant reads as follows.

5.2 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be of Pontryagin type (see Section C.2), and let*

$$0 < \lambda_1^+ < \lambda_2^+ < \dots \quad \text{and} \quad 0 > \lambda_1^- > \lambda_2^- > \dots$$

be the (finite or infinite) sequences of positive and negative, respectively, elements of $\sigma(H)$. Then the product

$$A(z) := \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma(H) \\ 0 < |\lambda| \leq R}} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\lambda}\right)$$

converges locally uniformly on \mathbb{C} , and is an entire function of Cartwright class in \mathbb{C}^+ and \mathbb{C}^- . We have

$$\sqrt{\det H} \in L^1(a, b), \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\pi \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\lambda_n^+} = \pi \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{|\lambda_n^-|} = \limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{y} \log^+ |A(iy)| = \int_a^b \sqrt{\det H(t)} \, dt.$$

⁵Here the limit of a finite sequence is understood as being equal to 0.

▷▷ Remarks ◀◀

✱ Original references for Theorem 5.1 are [Kre51b, (3.4)] and [Bra61, Theorem X]. The version stated in Theorem 5.2 is obtained by combining [LW13b, Theorem 4.1] with [LW13a, Theorem 4.21]. A variant for higher-dimensional canonical systems (in limit circle case) is also available, see e.g. [GK70, Theorem 6.1].

✱ The Krein-de Branges formula sheds light on the specialty of integer distribution from a function theoretic perspective. Namely, that one has the Cartwright class property of the monodromy matrix and thus obtains at most integer density in the limit circle case. Compare this with the origin of the distinction into dense or sparse spectra in Sections 3 and 4: the operator theoretic facts that Schatten–von Neumann classes \mathfrak{S}_p are s.n.-ideals only if $p \geq 1$ and that for $p = 1$ the Matsaev property fails.

✱ Using the connection Theorem C.5 between power moment problems and Hamburger Hamiltonians, the Krein–de Branges formula gives a one-line proof of the classical result of M. Riesz from [Rie23] (see also [Akh65, Theorem 2.4.3]), that the entries of the Nevanlinna matrix of an indeterminate moment problem are of minimal exponential type. Namely: the determinant of a Hamburger Hamiltonian is identically equal to 0. The version in Theorem 5.2 will lead in the obvious way to a generalisation of Riesz’s result; however, this has not been carried out yet.

✱ Using the connection between strings and diagonal Hamiltonians (laid out in Section 29), the Krein–de Branges formula yields a proof of M.G. Krein’s result announced in [Kre51a] (see also [Kre52, Theorema 1, 4] or [KK68b, 11.8°]) about the asymptotics of the eigenvalues of a string. The version in Theorem 5.2 leads to a generalisation of Krein’s result, cf. [Wor15a].

6 Algorithm to evaluate growth

The formula given in Theorem 4.2 is explicit in H , but it is often difficult to evaluate the integral on the right-hand side of (4.1) in practice. For Hamiltonians in limit circle case there is an algorithm that simplifies evaluation of the formula at the cost of a small loss of precision.

Recall the notation $\Omega_H(s, t) := \int_s^t H(u) du$ and (4.3) where we explained that $\det \Omega_H(s, t)$ quantifies the maximum local rotation of $\text{ran } H(t)$.

6.1 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case. For each $r > 0$ we define points $\sigma_j^{(r)}$ and a number $\kappa_H(r)$ by the following procedure.

▷ Set $\sigma_0^{(r)} := a$.

▷ If $\det \Omega_H(\sigma_{j-1}^{(r)}, b) > \frac{1}{r^2}$, let $\sigma_j^{(r)} \in (\sigma_{j-1}^{(r)}, b)$ be the unique point such that

$$\det \Omega_H(\sigma_{j-1}^{(r)}, \sigma_j^{(r)}) = \frac{1}{r^2}.$$

Otherwise, set $\sigma_j^{(r)} := b$ and $\kappa_H(r) := j$, and terminate.

By an argument involving Minkowski's determinant inequality this algorithm terminates for each r after finitely many steps. In fact, we have

$$\kappa_H(r) \leq \left\lceil r \cdot \sqrt{\det \Omega_H(a, b)} \right\rceil + 1.$$

The function κ_H is nondecreasing.

6.2 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and in limit circle case. Then there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that for $r > r_0$*

$$\kappa_H(r) \lesssim \log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim \kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) \log r. \quad (6.1)$$

The number r_0 and the constants implicit in (6.1) depend on $\text{tr} \Omega_H(a, b)$.

When comparing $n_H(r)$ to a regularly varying function, the algorithmic character of this theorem becomes more pronounced: in this case it is enough to compute $\kappa_H(r)$ for countably many values of r .

6.3 Proposition. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and in limit circle case. Moreover, let \mathfrak{q} be regularly varying and nondecreasing, and let $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing and unbounded sequence of positive numbers with $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{r_{n+1}}{r_n} < \infty$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\kappa_H \left(\frac{r_n}{\log r_n} \right) \cdot \log r_n}{\mathfrak{q}(r_n)} < \infty &\implies \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right)}{\mathfrak{q}(r)} < \infty \\ &\implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\kappa_H(r_n)}{\mathfrak{q}(r_n)} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can compute the convergence exponent of $\sigma(H)$ from the sequence $(\kappa_H(r_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

6.4 Corollary. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ and assume that H is definite and in limit circle case. Moreover, let $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing and unbounded sequence of positive numbers with $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{r_{n+1}}{r_n} < \infty$. Then the convergence exponent ρ_H of $\sigma(H)$ is given as*

$$\rho_H = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \kappa_H(r_n)}{\log r_n}.$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ Theorem 6.2 was first proved in the slightly weaker form

$$\kappa_H(r) \lesssim \log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim \kappa_H(r) \log r \quad (6.2)$$

in a paper of M. Langer, J. Reiffenstein, and H. Woracek, cf. [LRW24, Theorem 5.3]. Its proof is obtained by direct but somewhat tricky estimates of the integrand $K_H(t; r)$ in (4.1). The improved upper estimate is proved in [Rei] using Romanov's Theorem I (cf. Section 7) which is a more directly derived general upper bound.

✱ If κ_H is well-behaved, e.g., $\kappa_H(r) \asymp r^{\rho_H} (\log r)^\sigma$, the gap between the lower and upper bounds in Theorem 6.2 is of size $(\log r)^{1-\rho_H}$, i.e., it gets smaller as ρ_H increases and closes at $\rho_H = 1$.

✱ The results presented in this section are bound to the limit circle case, and we do not know an analogue of Theorem 6.2 for the limit point case.

✱ Regarding sharpness of the estimates in Theorem 6.2, we distinguish cases depending on ρ_H .

▷ $\rho_H = 0$: In all examples we are aware of, the upper bound in Theorem 6.2 is the correct one, i.e.,

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) \log r. \quad (6.3)$$

Trivial examples are Hamiltonians consisting of a finite number of indivisible intervals only, for which both sides of (6.3) are \asymp to $\log r$. A concrete and nontrivial example is

$$H(t) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } e^{-(2n+1)} \leq t < e^{-2n}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } e^{-(2n+2)} \leq t < e^{-(2n+1)} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

For this Hamiltonian, both sides of (6.3) are \asymp to $(\log r)^2$.

▷ $\rho_H \in (0, 1)$: Here we only have examples for which the lower bound in Theorem 6.2 is correct:

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \kappa_H(r). \quad (6.4)$$

A concrete and nontrivial example is $H(t) := \xi_{\phi(t)} \xi_{\phi(t)}^T$ where $\phi(t)$ is the Weierstraß function $\phi(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \cos(8^n \pi t)$. For this Hamiltonian

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \kappa_H(r) \asymp r^{\frac{3}{4}}.$$

Varying the parameters of the Weierstraß function yields a scale of examples covering the range of orders $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, cf. Example 21.3. Examples with $\rho_H \leq \frac{1}{2}$ can be found in Section 23 or, more concretely, in Section 24.

▷ $\rho_H = 1$: Typically there is no gap in this case, such as for $\kappa_H(r) \asymp r(\log r)^\sigma$. Trivial examples are Hamiltonians with $\det H \neq 0$, for which both sides of (6.4) are \asymp to r . We do not have examples where κ_H is of a more complicated form.

✱ We do not have examples with

$$\kappa_H(r) \ll \log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \ll \kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) \log r.$$

7 Romanov's Theorem I: bound by discretisation

If H consists of a finite number of indivisible intervals only, then $W_H(z)$ is a polynomial whose degree equals the number of indivisible intervals. This suggests that $W_H(z)$ will grow slowly if H can be approximated well by such simple Hamiltonians. The below theorem quantifies this intuition.

7.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case, assume that $\det H(t) = 0$ a.e., and write $H(t) = \operatorname{tr} H(t) \cdot \xi_{\phi(t)} \xi_{\phi(t)}^T$ with some measurable function $\phi: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume we are given a set of parameters \mathbf{p} that consists of a number $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a partition $a = y_0 < y_1 < \dots < y_N = b$, rotation parameters $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_N \in \mathbb{R}$, and distortion parameters $a_1, \dots, a_N \in (0, 1]$, and set*

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\mathbf{p}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^N a_j^2 \int_{y_{j-1}}^{y_j} \cos^2(\phi(t) - \psi_j) \cdot \operatorname{tr} H(t) \, dt, \\ A_2(\mathbf{p}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{a_j^2} \int_{y_{j-1}}^{y_j} \sin^2(\phi(t) - \psi_j) \cdot \operatorname{tr} H(t) \, dt, \\ A_3(\mathbf{p}) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \log \left(\max \left\{ \frac{a_j}{a_{j+1}}, \frac{a_{j+1}}{a_j} \right\} \cdot |\cos(\psi_j - \psi_{j+1})| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{|\sin(\psi_j - \psi_{j+1})|}{a_j a_{j+1}} \right), \\ A_4(\mathbf{p}) &:= -\log a_1 - \log a_N. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for every $r > 0$,

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \leq r \cdot (A_1(\mathbf{p}) + A_2(\mathbf{p})) + A_3(\mathbf{p}) + A_4(\mathbf{p}). \quad (7.1)$$

7.2 Remark. If a parameter set \mathbf{p} is fixed, then (7.1) does not give any new information about the growth when $r \rightarrow \infty$. On the contrary, we know even better since $\det H = 0$ implies $\log \|W_H(z)\| = o(r)$.

The strength of Theorem 7.1 lies in the quantitative aspect: the estimate (7.1) holds for all y_j, ψ_j, a_j, r . The trick to successfully apply the theorem is to make the approximation \mathbf{p} dependent on r :

- ▷ Choose a family of parameters $(\mathbf{p}(r))_{r>0}$ and apply Theorem 7.1 with each of them,
- ▷ for each r use the bound (7.1) obtained from $\mathbf{p}(r)$,
- ▷ send $r \rightarrow \infty$.

As we see from this remark, applying Theorem 7.1 usually requires some clever guessing. The next result only requires guessing the partitions, and then uses a predefined r -dependent choice of rotation and distortion parameters. It yields an upper estimate that is almost as good as the one from Theorem 7.1 (see the remarks for details).

7.3 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case with $\det H = 0$. Assume we have $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a partition*

$$a = y_0 < y_1 < \cdots < y_k = b. \quad (7.2)$$

Set

$$M := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{\det \Omega(y_{j-1}, y_j)}. \quad (7.3)$$

Then, for every $r > 0$,

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \leq k \log^+ r + 3Mr + \gamma \cdot k + \log^+ r + \gamma',$$

where γ, γ' depend only on $\text{tr} \Omega(a, b)$.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ A first variant of Theorem 7.1 was shown by R. Romanov in [Rom17] as Theorem 1 of that paper. The presently stated version is taken from [PW22, Theorem 4.1]. It improves upon Romanov's theorem, even on the rough scale of order (for more details see the remarks to Section 21). The proof of Theorem 7.1 is carried out by slightly tedious but elementary estimates using Grönwall's Lemma.

✱ Theorem 7.3 is taken from work of J. Reiffenstein [Rei]. There also explicit values for the constants γ, γ' are given, namely

$$\gamma = \log^+ \text{tr} \Omega(a, b) + 3 + 2 \log 2, \quad \gamma' = \log^+ \text{tr} \Omega(a, b) + \log 2.$$

✱ The upper bound $\kappa_H(r/\log r) \log r$ in Theorem 6.2 is what we obtain when applying Theorem 7.3 with the r -dependent partitions defined in Definition 6.1. This even yields the more explicit estimate

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(b; z)\| \right) \leq \kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) (4 \log r + \gamma) + \log r + \gamma', \quad (7.4)$$

where γ, γ' are as in the previous item. We point out that in the background lies an application of Theorem 7.1 with parameter sets $\mathfrak{p}(r)$ chosen in a certain deterministic way.

✱ It is unclear whether or not the choice of parameters mentioned in the previous item is optimal, or if making a different choice can lead to an asymptotically better upper bound. That is, if $J(r)$ is the infimum of upper bounds produced by Theorem 7.1, taken over all parameter sets \mathfrak{p} , we do not know if for all Hamiltonians

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp J(r).$$

However, we have

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \leq J(r) \lesssim \kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) \log r \lesssim \log r \cdot \log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right),$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 6.2. Since (7.4) is obtained from Theorem 7.3 we see that the optimal upper bounds from Theorems 7.1 and 7.3 are both accurate up to a factor of $\log r$.

Revisiting the context of Theorem 6.2, we do not know if there exists a Hamiltonian H for which

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(r)}{\kappa_H \left(\frac{r}{\log r} \right) \log r} = 0.$$

8 Romanov's Theorem II: bound by coverings

Minkowski's determinant inequality states that, for any two positive semidefinite matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ the determinant of $A + B$ can be estimated as

$$\sqrt{\det(A + B)} \geq \sqrt{\det A} + \sqrt{\det B},$$

where equality holds if and only if A and B are linearly dependent. For a Hamiltonian $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ in limit circle case, applying this inequality to matrices of the form $\Omega_H(s, t) := \int_s^t H(x) dx$, we get

$$\sqrt{\det \Omega_H(s, u)} \geq \sqrt{\det \Omega_H(s, t)} + \sqrt{\det \Omega_H(t, u)}, \quad t \in (s, u). \quad (8.1)$$

Thinking of $\det \Omega_H$ as a quantifier for the rotation of $\text{ran } H(x)$ (see (4.3)), the matrices $\Omega_H(s, t)$ and $\Omega_H(t, u)$ should be close to linearly dependent when $\text{ran } H(x)$ rotates slowly in $[s, u]$, leading to a small relative loss when applying (8.1).

The main result of this section determines the order of the monodromy matrix based on how well $\sqrt{\det \Omega}$ can be split up using (8.1), thus establishing a connection between the rotation of $\text{ran } H(x)$ and the growth of the monodromy matrix. Recall the notation ρ_H for the common order of all entries of the monodromy matrix (cf. Corollary F.4).

8.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case. Then the order ρ_H of the monodromy matrix is equal to the infimum of all numbers $\alpha > 0$ that satisfy*

- (*) *For every sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a covering $\{[c_j, d_j] \mid j = 1, \dots, k(N)\}$ of $[a, b]$, such that*

$$k(N) \leq N, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{k(N)} \sqrt{\det \Omega_H(c_j, d_j)} \lesssim N^{1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

For every Hamiltonian there is an explicit family of coverings testifying to the validity of (*) for every $\alpha > \rho_H$. The coverings in this family are partitions of $[a, b]$ that are “equidistant” with respect to $\det \Omega_H$.

8.2 Lemma. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case, but not a finite rank Hamiltonian. Then for any $\alpha > \rho_H$ the property (*) from Theorem 8.1 is satisfied, where the coverings can be chosen as $\{[\sigma_{j-1}^{(r(N))}, \sigma_j^{(r(N))}] \mid j = 1, \dots, N\}$, with $\sigma_j^{(r)}$ defined as in Definition 6.1 and $r(N)$ chosen such that $\kappa_H(r(N)) = N$.*

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ These results are taken from work of J. Reiffenstein [Rei].

✱ Lemma 8.2, which leads to the lower bound in Theorem 8.1, is shown using the lower bound in Theorem 6.2. The upper bound in Theorem 8.1 is a consequence of Theorem 7.3, which in turn uses Romanov's Theorem I, cf. Section 7.

✱ Theorem 8.1 is a striking extension of a theorem of R. Romanov, namely, of [Rom17, Theorem 2]. In Romanov's original version H is supposed to be a.e. diagonal with $\det H \equiv 0$ and $\operatorname{tr} H \equiv 1$. This means that $H(t)$ can take only the two values

$$H_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

✱ Since the coverings provided in Lemma 8.2 come from partitions of $[a, b]$, a reformulation of Theorem 8.1 using partitions instead of coverings is possible. One reason to stick with coverings is historical, as that is what was used in [Rom17, Theorem 2].

✱ No criterion is known for deciding whether or not (*) is satisfied for ρ_H itself.

✱ An interesting application of (Romanov's original variant of) Theorem 8.1 can be found in [Rom17, Section 7.2].

PART III

Moment problems and Jacobi matrices

In this part we study the context of the Hamburger power moment problem. We focus on the indeterminate case, and mainly present results formulated in the language of Jacobi parameters.

First we discuss a somewhat isolated theorem that is mainly of theoretical interest, cf. Theorem 9.1. In theory it fully determines the growth of the Nevanlinna matrix in terms of the coefficients of the orthogonal polynomials. But it has the drawback of being virtually impossible to apply; we know of only one nontrivial application (for this see Section 25).

An elementary lower bound for the growth of the Nevanlinna matrix in terms of the Jacobi parameters is given in Theorem 10.1. The historically probably first result where growth different from exponential type is considered is due to M.S. Livšic dating back to 1939, cf. Theorem 11.1. It gives a lower bound in terms of the moment sequence and appears from the nowadays viewpoint as a consequence of Theorem 10.1.

Recently, another lower bound in terms of Jacobi parameters was established, cf. Theorem 12.1. This bound is most easy to apply, and the fact that it holds in full generality is quite surprising. It is closely related to a classical result of Yu.M. Berezanskii in 1956. We give a recent significant improvement of Berezanskii's result in Theorem 13.1. Finally, we discuss Jacobi matrices whose parameters have power asymptotics. In this situation a fairly complete picture can be given, cf. Theorem 14.1 and Theorem 14.2.

Many of the results presented in this part are proven by translating to a canonical system and referring to results formulated in the language of Hamiltonian parameters.

It must be said that there is a large number of results about the determinate case dealing with eigenvalue asymptotics. These are out of the scope of this paper, and we do not touch upon that part of the literature.

Table of contents

§. 9 Growth in terms of orthogonal polynomials	47
§. 10 An elementary lower bound	48
§. 11 The Livšic estimate	50
§. 12 Convergence exponents as lower bounds	52
§. 13 A theorem of Berezanskii	55
§. 14 Growth from power asymptotics	56

9 Growth in terms of orthogonal polynomials

For an indeterminate moment sequence, the orthonormal polynomials p_n form an orthonormal basis in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space generated from the Nevanlinna matrix. The growth of the Nevanlinna matrix $W(z)$ can be expressed in terms of p_n : set

$$\Delta(z) = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |p_n(z)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W(z)\| \right) = \log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \Delta(z) \right) + O(\log r).$$

This is seen by an elementary argument using the reproducing kernel Hilbert space built from $W(z)$.

9.1 Theorem. *Let $(s_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be an indeterminate moment sequence, and write the orthonormal polynomial p_n of degree n as*

$$p_n(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_{k,n} z^k. \quad (9.1)$$

Then

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2 \right) r^{2k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \max_{|z|=r} \Delta(z) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^k.$$

This two-sided estimate leads to formulae for order and type.

9.2 Corollary. *Consider the situation of Theorem 9.1.*

(i) *Let ρ and τ be order and type of the Nevanlinna matrix. Then*

$$\rho = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2k \log k}{-\log \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2},$$

and if $\rho > 0$

$$\tau = \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[k \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2 \right)^{\frac{\rho}{2k}} \right].$$

(ii) *Let ℓ, \mathfrak{g} be regularly varying functions which are asymptotic inverses of each other, and denote by $\tau_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the type of the Nevanlinna matrix w.r.t. \mathfrak{g} . Then*

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{g}} = \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\ell(k)^{\rho} \left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2 \right)^{\frac{\rho}{2k}} \right].$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ This result goes back to the work [BS14] of C. Berg and R. Szwarc, and the version stated as Theorem 9.1 is extracted from that paper. An efficient proof of the theorem runs along the lines indicated before the statement.

Corollary 9.2 is obtained simply by applying the standard formulae that express order and type of an entire function in terms of its Taylor coefficients. See [Lev80, Theorem I.2] for the statement in item (i), and [Lev80, Theorem 2'] (in conjunction with [BGT89, Proposition 7.4.1]) for item (ii). Recall also Corollary F.4.

✱ In theory the question for the speed of growth of the Nevanlinna matrix is fully answered by Theorem 9.1 and its corollary. Unfortunately this answer is of limited practical use. Applying the results requires precise knowledge about all coefficients of all orthonormal polynomials, and additionally the ability to handle the series $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2$; this is hardly possible. We know of only one nontrivial situation where the formula for type from Corollary 9.2 can be evaluated. This will be presented in Section 25.

✱ Theorem 9.1 can be used to give an alternative proof of an important (but actually much more elementary) lower bound for the growth of the Nevanlinna matrix, see the remarks in Section 10.

10 An elementary lower bound

The below theorem contains a lower bound for the growth of the Nevanlinna matrix in terms of the Jacobi parameters b_n which is easily applicable, elementary to prove, and sharp.

10.1 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case, and denote the corresponding Nevanlinna matrix as $W(z) = (w_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1}^2$. Let G be the function*

$$G(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^{2n}}{(b_0 \cdots b_{n-1})^2}.$$

Then G is entire, and (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$G(r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim |w_{11}(ir)| \tag{10.1}$$

where the constant implicit in \lesssim depends on \mathcal{J} .

If the parameters b_n are dominated by a regularly varying function, the growth of $G(r)$ can be estimated explicitly.

10.2 Corollary. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case, and denote the corresponding Nevanlinna matrix as $W(z) = (w_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1}^2$. Let $\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$ be regularly varying functions that are asymptotic inverses of each other. Then*

$$b_n \lesssim \mathfrak{f}(n) \implies \log |w_{11}(ir)| \gtrsim \mathfrak{g}(r).$$

We are led to lower bounds for order and type.

10.3 Corollary. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case.*

(i) *Let ρ and τ be order and type of the Nevanlinna matrix. Then*

$$\rho \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \log n}{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log b_j}, \quad (10.2)$$

and if $\rho > 0$

$$\tau \geq \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{(b_0 \cdot \dots \cdot b_{n-1})^{\frac{e}{n}}}.$$

(ii) *Let $\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$ be regularly varying functions which are asymptotic inverses of each other, and denote by $\tau_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the type of the Nevanlinna matrix w.r.t. \mathfrak{g} . Then*

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{g}} \geq \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathfrak{f}(n)^\rho}{(b_0 \cdot \dots \cdot b_{n-1})^{\frac{e}{n}}}.$$

Corollary 10.2, and with it Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.3, is sharp. Properties which in conjunction ensure that the lower bound is attained are: a regular behaviour of the parameters, sufficiently fast growth of the off-diagonal, and relative smallness of the diagonal. We state a simple version that can be easily formulated.

10.4 Proposition. *Let \mathfrak{f} be a regularly varying function with $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{f} > 2$, and let \mathfrak{g} be an asymptotic inverse of \mathfrak{f} . Let $b_n > 0$ be such that*

$$b_n \asymp \mathfrak{f}(n), \quad \frac{b_n}{\sqrt{b_{n-1}b_{n+1}}} - 1 \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}),$$

set $a_n := 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Then \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case and its Nevanlinna matrix satisfies

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W(z)\| \right) \asymp \mathfrak{g}(r).$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.2 are taken from [PW22, Section 2]. The proof is elementary: for the theorem one passes to the associated Hamburger Hamiltonian, and merely observes that a polynomial with real coefficients can be estimated by its leading term; the corollary follows from the common connection between growth of an entire function and its Taylor coefficients, e.g. [Lev80, Theorems I.2, I.2'] (in conjunction with [BGT89, Proposition 7.4.1]),

✱ A generalisation of Corollary 10.2, in terms of the associated Hamburger Hamiltonian, is given in [Rei25b, Theorem 3.6], cf. Theorem 20.1. The statement of Corollary 10.2 is the special case $k = 2$ in that result, as (C.5) and a short calculation shows.

✱ Proposition 10.4 follows by passing to Hamiltonian parameters and using [PRW23, Theorem 5.3]. The translation, however, is not trivial. One can use [Yaf20, Theorem 4.1] which implies that $l_{n+1} = p_n(0)^2 + q_n(0)^2 \asymp \frac{1}{b_n}$.

Note further that the condition $\frac{b_n}{\sqrt{b_{n-1}b_{n+1}}} - 1 \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ cannot be dropped. As an example, take

$$a_n := 0, \quad b_n := \begin{cases} (n+1)^{\frac{5}{2}}(n+2)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } n \text{ odd} \\ (n+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(n+2)^{\frac{5}{2}} & \text{if } n \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly $b_n \sim n^3$. However, the corresponding Hamiltonian parameters are $\phi_n = n\frac{\pi}{2}$ and

$$l_{2n-1} = n^{-1}, \quad l_{2n} = n^{-5}$$

which shows that the Jacobi matrix is in limit point case.

✱ The estimates in Corollary 10.3 (i) were first given in [BS14, Proposition 7.1] with a proof that uses Corollary 9.2 (just drop all terms in the sum $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} b_{k,n}^2$ but the first one, and remember [Akh65, p.86]). Using the stated argument for the proof of Theorem 10.1, one obtains an elementary direct proof of Corollary 10.3, cf. [PRW17, Remark 2.15].

✱ Despite giving the correct order for a wide range of Jacobi matrices, the bound (10.1) may also fail drastically, even on the rough scale of order as in (10.2). One can say that this is expected; remember the alternative proof by dropping – a lot of – summands. The following example is obtained by translating [PRW17, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.6] to the language of Jacobi parameters.

Let $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $r \in (0, \rho)$, and set

$$a_n := 0, \quad b_n := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 0, 1, \\ (n \log^2 n)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} & \text{if } n \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}, n > 2, \\ (n \log^2 n)^{\frac{1}{\rho} + 2(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{\rho})} & \text{if } n \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}, n > 2. \end{cases}$$

Then \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case and the order of the Nevanlinna matrix is equal to ρ , while the limit superior in (10.2) is equal to r .

11 The Livšic estimate

Already back in 1939 M.S. Livšic gave a lower bound for the Nevanlinna matrix in terms of the moment sequence $(s_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ itself. From a nowadays viewpoint, his theorem appears as a consequence of the results from Section 10.

11.1 Theorem. Let $(s_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ be an indeterminate moment sequence, and denote the corresponding Nevanlinna matrix as $W(z) = (w_{ij}(z))_{i,j=1}^2$. Let F be the Livšic function

$$F(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^{2n}}{s_{2n}}.$$

Then F is entire, and (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$F(r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim |w_{11}(ir)|.$$

The analogue of Corollary 10.3 reads as follows.

11.2 Corollary. Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{F} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{F} is in limit circle case.

(i) Let ρ and τ be order and type of the Nevanlinna matrix. Then

$$\rho \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n \log n}{\log s_{2n}}, \quad (11.1)$$

and if $\rho > 0$

$$\tau \geq \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{(s_{2n})^{\frac{\rho}{2n}}}.$$

(ii) Let ℓ, \mathfrak{g} be regularly varying functions which are asymptotic inverses of each other, and denote by $\tau_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the type of the Nevanlinna matrix w.r.t. \mathfrak{g} . Then

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{g}} \geq \frac{1}{e\rho} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell(n)^\rho}{(s_{2n})^{\frac{\rho}{2n}}}.$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ The original reference for Theorem 11.1 is [Liv39, Theorema 2]. More accessible sources are [BS14, §7] or [PRW17, p.224].

✱ The argument for the proof of Theorem 11.1 and Corollary 11.2 from [PRW17] is by reduction to Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.3: noting that $(b_0 \cdot \dots \cdot b_{n-1})^{-1}$ is the leading coefficient of the orthonormal polynomial of degree n , yields

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_{2n}}} \leq \frac{1}{b_0 \cdot \dots \cdot b_{n-1}}, \quad (11.2)$$

cf. [Akh65, p.86] and [PRW17, (3.8)]. Corollary 11.2 readily follows from Corollary 10.3. To deduce Theorem 11.1 from Theorem 10.1, observe that $F(r) \leq G(r)$, where G is as in Theorem 10.1.

✱ The Livšic bound (11.1) is sharp. In fact, it gives the correct value for ρ in a large class of examples; see the remarks to Section 13.

✱ From (11.2) and the remarks in Section 10 we obtain that Livšic's bound (11.1) may fail drastically. Given $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $r \in (0, \rho)$, there exists an indeterminate moment sequence such that the order of the Nevanlinna matrix is ρ while

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2n \log n}{\log s_{2n}} \leq r. \quad (11.3)$$

We expect, but do not know, that the example can be chosen such that equality holds in (11.3).

12 Convergence exponents as lower bounds

Consider a Jacobi matrix in limit circle case, i.e., corresponding to an indeterminate moment problem. We present two lower bounds for the growth of the Nevanlinna matrix in terms of convergence exponents, which are easy to apply and surprisingly often give the correct order. We also give more quantitative lower bounds, which are less flexible but still widely applicable. Contrasting the bound exhibited in Section 10, the proofs are not elementary.

Recall that, since we assume limit circle case, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_n} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{b_n b_{n+1}} < \infty. \quad (12.1)$$

This is because either of the conditions

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_n} = \infty \quad (\text{Carleman's condition})$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{b_n b_{n+1}} = \infty \quad (\text{Dennis-Wall condition})$$

implies limit point case. Consequently, assuming limit circle case both sequences

$$(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}, \quad \left(b_n b_{n+1} / \sqrt{a_{n+1}^2 + b_n^2 + b_{n+1}^2} \right)_{n=0}^{\infty} \quad (12.2)$$

have finite convergence exponent not exceeding 1.

12.1 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case. Then the order of its Nevanlinna matrix is not less than either of the convergence exponents of the sequences in (12.2).*

There are also more quantitative versions of this lower bound – a sequential one as well as one that holds for all large r , but with a less explicit right-hand side.

12.2 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case, and denote the corresponding Nevanlinna matrix as $W(z) = (w_{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$. Then*

- (i) Suppose we have functions $\ell, \mathfrak{g}: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ell(b_j) = \infty$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{g}(1/j) < \infty$. Then there exists an increasing and unbounded sequence $(r_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ of positive numbers with

$$\log |w_{21}(ir_m)| \gtrsim \frac{1}{\mathfrak{g}^-(\ell(r_m))}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\mathfrak{g}^-(t) := \sup\{r > 0 \mid \mathfrak{g}(r) < t\}$.

- (ii) For all large enough $r > 0$ we have

$$\log |w_{21}(ir)| \gtrsim r \sum_{n=h(r)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_n},$$

where $h(r) := 1 + \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : b_n < r\}$.

Both items remain true when $(b_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is replaced with the sequence $(b_n b_{n+1} / \sqrt{a_{n+1}^2 + b_n^2 + b_{n+1}^2})_{n=0}^{\infty}$.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* The fact that Carleman's condition implies limit point case is a classical result from [Car26], see also [Akh65, p.24(1°)]. A one-line proof can be given by passing to the Hamiltonian parameters: we have $\frac{1}{b_n} \leq \sqrt{l_n l_{n+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(l_n + l_{n+1})$. For the Dennis–Wall condition see [Akh65, p.25]

Let us note in this context that this implies a necessary condition for indeterminacy which is in terms of the moment sequence itself: $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\sqrt[2n]{s_{2n}}} < \infty$ whenever \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case, cf. [Akh65, p.85(11°)].

* Theorem 12.1 and Theorem 12.2 are taken from work [Rei25b] of J. Reiffenstein. After passing over to the associated Hamburger Hamiltonian, they appear as particular cases of more general theorems that rely on the Weyl coefficient approach, cf. Sections 4 and 6. This makes Theorems 12.1 and 12.2 intrinsically different from the lower bound discussed in Section 10 and Livšic's bound in Theorem 11.1, since those results are shown by an elementary estimate of polynomials.

* The two sequences in (12.2) are just the first and second in an infinite scale of sequences whose convergence exponents are all lower bounds for the monodromy matrix, cf. Section 15.

* In many situations the order of the Nevanlinna matrix coincides with the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$. Large classes of Jacobi matrices with this property are presented in Sections 13 and 14. In these cases it is clear that the convergence exponents of the two sequences in (12.2) coincide. Nonetheless, there are examples where these sequences have different convergence exponents and the order of the Nevanlinna matrix is equal to the convergence exponent of the second sequence in (12.2); see the remarks to Section 15.

✱ The convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ does not at all capture the parameters a_n and neither takes into account sparse occurrences of small b_n . Hence, it is somewhat obvious that it cannot always give the correct value for the order of the Nevanlinna matrix. A simple example that shows this is given by the parameters

$$b_n := n^{\frac{5}{3}}, \quad a_n := 2n^{\frac{5}{3}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right),$$

for which limit circle case takes place, the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is $\frac{3}{5}$, but the order of the Nevanlinna matrix is $\frac{3}{4}$. Note that in this example the second sequence in (12.2) also has convergence exponent $\frac{3}{5}$.

This example is just one instance of Theorem 14.2; see the remarks to Section 14. The key property, which makes this phenomenon possible, is that diagonal and off-diagonal are of almost the same size with quotient 2. Intuitively this makes the Jacobi matrix “close to limit point case” and allows the Nevanlinna matrix to behave in an unusual way.

✱ The order ρ of the Nevanlinna matrix of a Jacobi operator in limit circle case can be expressed via the eigenvalue counting function $n(r)$ of one of its self-adjoint extensions as

$$\rho = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log n(r)}{\log r}.$$

If we consider instead a Jacobi operator in limit point case whose spectrum is still discrete, we may ask whether this lim sup, defined using the eigenvalue counting function of the Jacobi operator, is again bounded below by the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$.

The following example from [JM07, Theorem 2.2] shows that the answer to this question is negative: Let $a_n := n^\alpha$, $b_n := n^\beta$, where $\beta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \geq 2\beta + 1$. Then the eigenvalues λ_n , arranged increasingly, of the Jacobi matrix with parameters a_n, b_n satisfy $\lambda_n = n^\alpha + O(n^{1+2\beta-\alpha})$. Intuitively, the Jacobi operator with these parameters is close to a diagonal operator, whose eigenvalues are precisely its diagonal entries.

✱ Under additional assumptions on the regularity of b_n the bound from item (ii) of Theorem 12.2 can be evaluated. For example, if $b_n \asymp \mathfrak{q}(n)$ with some regularly varying function, then the bound is $\gtrsim \mathfrak{f}(r)$ where \mathfrak{f} is an asymptotic inverse of \mathfrak{q} . Thus we reobtain a particular case of Corollary 10.2.

✱ Let us compare the lower bounds for order from Theorem 12.1 and (10.2). Denote the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ by γ , then

$$\gamma \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log n}{\log b_n} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \log n}{\sum_{j=0}^n \log b_j},$$

i.e., the term in the middle is an estimate for both of our lower bounds. If $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is nondecreasing, then the first inequality holds with equality, and hence the bound from Theorem 12.1 is potentially better. If, for example, the limit superior in the middle exists as a limit, then equality holds throughout, i.e., the bounds from Theorem 12.1 and (10.2) coincide.

13 A theorem of Berezanskii

We exhibit a particular class of Jacobi matrices for which the general lower bound from Theorem 12.1 is attained. In short, the theorem says: if the off-diagonal b_n behaves regularly and the diagonal a_n is relatively small, then the negation of Carleman's condition is sufficient for \mathcal{J} to be in limit circle case and the order of the Nevanlinna matrix to be equal to the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$.

13.1 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$, and let \mathcal{J} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Set*

$$\alpha_n := \frac{a_n}{\sqrt{b_{n-1}b_n}},$$

and assume that the following three conditions hold.

▷ Carleman's condition violated:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_n} < \infty.$$

▷ Relative smallness and regularity of the diagonal:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_{n+1} - \alpha_n| < \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \in (-2, 2).$$

▷ Regularity of the off-diagonal:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left| \frac{b_n}{\sqrt{b_{n-1}b_{n+1}}} - 1 \right| < \infty. \tag{13.1}$$

Then \mathcal{J} is in limit circle case, and the order of the Nevanlinna matrix of \mathcal{J} is equal to the convergence exponent of the sequence $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$.

▷▷ Remarks ◀◀

✱ Theorem 13.1 is taken from [Rei25b]. It is a significant improvement of a classical result due to Yu.M. Berezanskii in [Ber56] who assumed a stronger regularity of b_n and that a_n are bounded. A more accessible reference is [BS14], where a variant improving upon the original result is given. It states that the conclusion of Theorem 13.1 follow under the assumptions that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1+|a_n|}{\sqrt{b_n b_{n-1}}} < \infty$ (meaning that Carleman's condition is violated and the diagonal is small), and that the sequence $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ is log-concave or log-convex (meaning that $b_n^2 \geq b_{n-1}b_{n+1}$ for all n , or $b_n^2 \leq b_{n-1}b_{n+1}$ for all n , respectively).

✱ Under the hypothesis of Berezanskii's theorem (in the variant from [BS14]) the Livšic's bound (11.1) coincides with the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$, and hence gives the correct value for the order of the Nevanlinna matrix. This is shown in [BS14, Theorem 7.5].

✱ Let ρ be the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$. If $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{b_n^\rho} < \infty$, then the Nevanlinna matrix is of finite type w.r.t. its order ρ . Under the conditions required in [BS14] one also has

$$\frac{1}{b_n} = O(n^{-\frac{1}{\rho}}).$$

14 Growth from power asymptotics

Consider parameters $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$ having power asymptotics of the form

$$b_n = n^{\beta_1} \left(x_0 + \frac{x_1}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\epsilon}}\right) \right), \quad a_n = n^{\beta_2} \left(y_0 + \frac{y_1}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\epsilon}}\right) \right) \quad (14.1)$$

where

$$\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x_0 > 0, y_0 \neq 0, \quad x_1, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \epsilon > 0.$$

For this class of Jacobi matrices, one can almost fully decide whether \mathcal{F} is in limit circle case, and if it is, what is the order of the Nevanlinna matrix. We should say explicitly that we do not investigate the limit point case, apart from giving conditions under which limit point case prevails.

There are three essentially different cases.

▷ Large diagonal:

$$\beta_2 > \beta_1 \quad \text{or} \quad (\beta_1 = \beta_2 \wedge |y_0| > 2x_0).$$

▷ Small diagonal:

$$\beta_2 < \beta_1 \quad \text{or} \quad (\beta_1 = \beta_2 \wedge |y_0| < 2x_0).$$

▷ Critical case:

$$\beta_2 = \beta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |y_0| = 2x_0.$$

We state two theorems. The first settles the cases of large and small diagonal, and the second goes into the critical case.

14.1 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$ be as in (14.1) and let \mathcal{F} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters.*

- (i) *If \mathcal{F} has “large diagonal”, then \mathcal{F} is in limit point case.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{F} has “small diagonal”, then \mathcal{F} is in limit circle case if and only if $\beta_1 > 1$.*
- (iii) *If \mathcal{F} has “small diagonal” and is in limit circle case, then the Nevanlinna matrix is of order $\frac{1}{\beta_1}$ with finite and positive type.*

In order to handle the critical case, where off-diagonal and diagonal entries of \mathcal{F} are comparable with ratio ± 2 , we require one more term in the asymptotic expansion of the parameters:

$$b_n = n^{\beta_1} \left(x_0 + \frac{x_1}{n} + \frac{x_2}{n^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}\right) \right), \quad a_n = n^{\beta_2} \left(y_0 + \frac{y_1}{n} + \frac{y_2}{n^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}\right) \right) \quad (14.2)$$

where

$$\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x_0 > 0, y_0 \neq 0, \quad x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \epsilon > 0.$$

14.2 Theorem. *Let $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_n > 0$ be as in (14.2) and let \mathcal{F} be the Jacobi matrix with these parameters. Assume that \mathcal{F} is in the “critical case”.*

(i) \mathcal{F} is in limit circle case, if and only if either

$$\frac{3}{2} < \beta_1 < 2 \left(\frac{x_1}{x_0} - \frac{y_1}{y_0} \right),$$

or

$$\beta_1 = 2 \left(\frac{x_1}{x_0} - \frac{y_1}{y_0} \right) \wedge 1 < \frac{x_1}{x_0} - \frac{y_1}{y_0} < \frac{3}{4} + \frac{2x_2}{x_0} - \frac{2y_2}{y_0} + \frac{y_1}{y_0} - \frac{2x_1y_1}{x_0y_0} + \frac{2y_1^2}{y_0^2}.$$

(ii) Assume that \mathcal{F} is in limit circle case.

- ▷ If $\beta_1 > 2$, then the Nevanlinna matrix is of order $\frac{1}{\beta_1}$ with finite and positive type.
- ▷ If $\beta_1 < 2$, then the Nevanlinna matrix is of order $\frac{1}{2(\beta_1-1)}$ with finite and positive type.
- ▷ If $\beta_1 = 2$, then the Nevanlinna matrix is of order $\frac{1}{2}$ with positive type. It has finite type w.r.t. the regularly varying function $r^{\frac{1}{2}} \log r$.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* The above results are obtained by combining work of R. Pruckner [Pru20] and J. Reiffenstein [Rei25a], and referring to [PRW23].

* We used the assumptions (14.1) and (14.2) on the asymptotic expansion of parameters to increase readability, but in some cases they can be relaxed. For details we refer to [Rei25a, Theorem 3.4].

* The proofs of Theorem 14.1 and Theorem 14.2 are quite different. What they have in common is that the starting point is an asymptotic analysis of the solutions of the three-term recurrence, which is more complicated in the second theorem than in the first. In Theorem 14.1 the bounds come from an explicit analysis of the fundamental solution, while for Theorem 14.2 they are obtained by passing to the Hamiltonian parameters.

✱ The proof of Theorem 14.1 yields explicit bounds for the type τ of the Nevanlinna matrix, and by complex analysis thus bounds for the counting function of the spectrum of \mathcal{J} . In the “critical case” only a lower bound is given explicitly:

▷ If \mathcal{J} has parameters (14.1), “small diagonal”, and is in limit circle case, then

$$\tau \geq \beta_1 \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}}, \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_{\mathcal{J}}(r)}{n^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}}} \geq \frac{\beta_1 - 1}{\beta_1} \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}},$$

where $n_{\mathcal{J}}(r)$ is the number of eigenvalues of absolute value less than r of the Jacobi operator. If \mathcal{J} has parameters (14.2), is in the “critical case” and in limit circle case, the same lower bounds hold.

▷ If \mathcal{J} has parameters (14.1), “small diagonal”, and is in limit circle case, then

$$\tau \leq \frac{\pi}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{\beta_1})} \left(\frac{a}{x_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}}, \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_{\mathcal{J}}(r)}{n^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}}} \leq \frac{e\pi}{\beta_1 \sin(\frac{\pi}{\beta_1})} \left(\frac{a}{x_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_1}},$$

where

$$a := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta_2 < \beta_1, \\ \left(1 - \frac{y_0^2}{4x_0^2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \beta_1 = \beta_2 \wedge |y_0| < 2x_0. \end{cases}$$

✱ From a very recent perspective, Theorem 14.1 (ii),(iii) are a consequence of Berezanskii’s theorem as stated in Theorem 13.1. When Theorem 14.1 was originally proved in [Pru20], this version of Berezanskii’s theorem was not yet available. Furthermore, Pruckner’s work features the type estimates presented above, which Theorem 13.1 does not provide.

✱ Consider the “critical case” as in Theorem 14.2. Then the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is $\frac{1}{\beta_1}$. If $\beta_1 < 2$, the order of the Nevanlinna matrix is $\frac{1}{2(\beta_1-1)}$, and hence strictly larger than this convergence exponent (this yields the explicit example given in the remarks to Section 12). Up to our knowledge, Theorem 14.2 yields the first examples of Jacobi matrices in limit circle case whose order can be computed and is different from the convergence exponent of $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

✱ We do not know whether the results presented above are already close to being sharp when it comes to assumptions on the regularity of the parameters, or if the hypothesis that they possess power asymptotics with a certain number of terms (or as in [Rei25a]) can be weakened significantly.

✱ In the limit point case there is a vast literature about spectral asymptotics (but we do not go into this direction). We do not know results that make assertions about the distribution of the spectrum in limit point case without knowing actual asymptotics.

PART IV

Hamburger Hamiltonians

In this part we change perspectives towards the study of Hamburger Hamiltonians. That is, we look at Hamburger moment problems and Jacobi matrices from the canonical systems point of view. As in Part III we focus on the indeterminate case, in the present language the limit circle case. It turns out that the parameters of the Hamiltonian are often better suited for determining the growth of the monodromy matrix than the moment sequence or the Jacobi parameters.

A Hamburger Hamiltonian H is given by the sequences $(l_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(\phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of its lengths and angles. On an intuitive level one may say that the growth of the monodromy matrix W_H is given by a combination of three factors: the rate of decay of the lengths l_j , the decay of the angle-differences $|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|$, and the speed of possible convergence of the angles, each measured pointwise or in an averaged sense. Fast decay of lengths and angle-differences and fast convergence of angles means slow growth of the monodromy matrix. We present a variety of results giving upper and lower bounds for W_H , each of which gives quantitative meaning to the above intuition in its own way.

There is a distinct threshold between quickly and slowly decaying lengths and angle-differences, corresponding to the order of W_H being less than and larger than $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. In the case of fast decay (and some regularity of the data) the growth of W_H is determined by the lengths and angle-differences only. Contrasting this, in the case of slow decay the growth of W_H is also sensible to the speed of possible convergence of angles. In particular, there are lower and upper bounds for W_H in terms of the lengths and angle-differences, which are distinct even on the level of order and can both be attained.

Table of contents

§. 15 A scale of lower bounds	60
§. 16 Upper bounds in terms of convergence exponents	61
§. 17 Upper bounds in terms of tails of convergent series	64
§. 18 A Berezanskii-type theorem	66
§. 19 Exploiting regular variation I: upper bound from majorants	67
§. 20 Exploiting regular variation II: lower bound from minorants	69

15 A scale of lower bounds

Consider a Hamburger Hamiltonian in limit circle case given by lengths l_j and angles ϕ_j , and recall the notation $x_n := \sum_{j=1}^n l_j$ and $W_H = (w_{H,ij})_{i,j=1}^2$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$, we define a sequence $(b_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^\infty$ of positive numbers as

$$b_n^{(k)} := \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=n+1}^{n+k} l_i l_j \sin^2(\phi_i - \phi_j) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (15.1)$$

We have $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{b_n^{(k)}} < \infty$ for all k and $b_n^{(k)} \geq b_n^{(k+1)}$ for all k and n . In particular, the convergence exponent of the sequence $(b_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^\infty$ is at most 1 and depends nondecreasingly on k .

15.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case. Then, for each $k \geq 2$, the order of the monodromy matrix of H is not less than the convergence exponent of the sequence $(b_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^\infty$.*

In the following theorem we collect two versions of this lower bound that estimate $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)|$ in a more quantitative way. The first bound holds on a sequence $r_m \rightarrow \infty$ whereas the second is true for all large r .

15.2 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case. The following statements hold true for any $k \geq 2$.*

- (i) *Let $\ell, \mathbf{g}: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \ell(b_n^{(k)}) = \infty$ and $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbf{g}(1/n) < \infty$. Then there exists an increasing and unbounded sequence $(r_m)_{m=1}^\infty$ of positive numbers with*

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir_m)| \gtrsim \frac{1}{\mathbf{g}^-(\ell(r_m))}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\mathbf{g}^-(t) := \sup\{r > 0: \mathbf{g}(r) < t\}$.

- (ii) *Assume we have a sequence $(f_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of nonnegative numbers such that*

$$b_n^{(k)} \lesssim \frac{1}{f_n}.$$

Then (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \gtrsim r \sum_{n=h(r)}^\infty f_n$$

where

$$h(r) := 1 + \max\{n \in \mathbb{N}: f_n > r^{-1}\}.$$

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ The two statements in Theorem 15.2 are related but in general incomparable. Both are taken from work of J. Reiffenstein [Rei25b]. The proofs are different in their nature, but both of them use the Weyl coefficient approach, cf. Sections 4 and 6.

✱ The above results should be seen as a scale of bounds emanating from the lower bounds in terms of the Jacobi parameters b_n that we discussed in Section 12. In fact,

$$b_n^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l_{n+2}l_{n+1}|\sin(\phi_{n+2} - \phi_{n+1})|}} = b_n \quad (15.2)$$

and a computation shows that

$$b_n^{(3)} = \frac{b_n b_{n+1}}{\sqrt{a_{n+1}^2 + b_n^2 + b_{n+1}^2}}. \quad (15.3)$$

We see that Theorem 12.1 matches the particular cases “ $k = 2, 3$ ” in Theorem 15.1. Analogously, Theorem 12.2 follows from Theorem 15.2.

✱ By comparing (15.1) with (4.3) we have

$$b_n^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \Omega_H(x_n, x_{n+k})}}.$$

✱ In many situations the correct value for the order ρ of the monodromy matrix is already given by the convergence exponent of $(b_n^{(2)})_{n=0}^\infty$. Due to Theorem 15.1 and monotonicity in k of the convergence exponents of $(b_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^\infty$, in such a situation the convergence exponents all coincide.

✱ An example where not all sequences $(b_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^\infty$ have the same convergence exponent given in [Rei25b, Example 3.4]. Let $\alpha_1 > \alpha_0 > 1$, and set

$$l_j := \begin{cases} j^{-\alpha_0} & \text{if } j \text{ even} \\ j^{-\alpha_1} & \text{if } j \text{ odd} \end{cases} \quad \phi_j := j \frac{\pi}{4}$$

Then the convergence exponent of $(b_n^{(2)})_{n=0}^\infty$ is $\frac{2}{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1}$ while the one of $(b_n^{(3)})_{n=0}^\infty$ is $\frac{1}{\alpha_0}$. The latter gives the correct value: W_H is of order $\frac{1}{\alpha_0}$ with positive type.

16 Upper bounds in terms of convergence exponents

The upper estimates in this section feature convergence exponents as a measure for the growth of sequences associated with the lengths l_j and angles ϕ_j of a Hamburger Hamiltonian. While the influence of the lengths on the bound is straightforward, the angles can only improve the bound if their increments are summable or the angles themselves converge.

Recall the fact that a Hamburger Hamiltonian is in limit circle case, if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} l_j < \infty$.

We first give a pointwise upper bound for $w_{H,22}(ir)$, i.e., the lower right entry of the monodromy matrix W_H along the imaginary axis. Recall in this context that the growth along the imaginary axis of one entry of W_H dominates W_H itself in the sense of Corollary E.4 and Proposition F.3.

16.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case.*

(i) *Suppose we have $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ such that*

$$(l_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad (|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^{\frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

Then (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim r^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}}. \quad (16.1)$$

(ii) *Suppose we have $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha, \omega \geq 1$ such that*

$$(l_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad (l_j \sin^2(\phi_j - \psi))_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^{\frac{1}{\omega}}. \quad (16.2)$$

Then (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim r^{\frac{2}{\alpha+\omega}}. \quad (16.3)$$

Taking infima of possible upper bounds from Theorem 16.1 we obtain explicit upper bounds for the order. The suprema defined below can be written in terms of actual convergence exponents, but we feel that this would reduce readability.

16.2 Corollary. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case, let ρ_H be the order of its monodromy matrix, and let*

$$\alpha_0 := \sup \left\{ \alpha > 0 \mid \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} l_j^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} < \infty \right\} \geq 1.$$

(i) *Assume that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| < \infty$, and set*

$$\beta_0 := \sup \left\{ \beta > 0 \mid \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|^{\frac{1}{\beta}} < \infty \right\}.$$

Then

$$\rho_H \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \beta_0}.$$

(ii) Fix $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ and set

$$\omega_0 := \sup \left\{ \omega > 0 \mid \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (l_j \sin^2(\phi_j - \psi))^{\frac{1}{\omega}} < \infty \right\}.$$

Then

$$\rho_H \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_0 + \omega_0}.$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ These results stem from [Rei25b, Theorems 4.4, 4.7], and their proofs are consequences of the Weyl coefficient approach.

✱ The first upper bound for the order in terms of a convergence exponent was given in [BS14, Theorem 4.7]. It is formulated in the language of orthogonal polynomials as an upper estimate for $P(z) := \sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |p_n(z)|^2}$. It was rewritten to the Hamiltonian setting in [PRW17, Proposition 2.3], and states that $(l_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^p$ implies $\rho_H \leq p$ with finite type (the angles are not taken into account). The proof is carried out by an elementary estimate of a product, noting that the monodromy matrix is an infinite product of linear polynomial factors.

✱ The upper bound from the previous item can be reobtained from item (ii) of Theorem 16.1, taking $\alpha := \omega := \frac{1}{p}$. In contrast to [BS14] we do not get an explicit type estimate from Theorem 16.1.

✱ A weaker variant, which does not consider the angles either and which has an additional multiplicative factor $\log r$ on the right-hand side of the estimate, can be obtained from Romanov's Theorem I. This is shown in the discussion in [Rom17, §4.3].

✱ Usually one of the bounds from Corollary 16.2 is correct if we can properly take into account the angles, but both are far from the truth if we fail to do so (which is usually the case when the angles do not converge). For instance, take $\delta_l \geq 1$ and consider the following situations.

(i) Assume that

$$l_1 := 1, \quad l_j := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{j^{\delta_l}} & \text{if } \delta_l > 1, \\ \frac{1}{j \log^2 j} & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j \geq 2,$$

$$|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \asymp j^{-\delta_\phi} \quad \text{with } \delta_\phi > 1.$$

Applying the first item of Corollary 16.2 yields $\rho_H \leq \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$. In fact we have $\rho_H = \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$ due to Theorem 15.1 (taking $k = 2$).

(ii) With the same lengths as in (i), consider the angles

$$\phi_j := \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{(-1)^k}{k^{\delta_\phi}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{with } \delta_\phi \leq 1.$$

We first note that the first item of Corollary 16.2 is not applicable. Nevertheless, due to $|\phi_{j+2} - \phi_j| \asymp j^{-\delta_\phi - 1}$ the limit $\psi := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \phi_j$ exists and the estimate $|\phi_j - \psi| \lesssim j^{-\delta_\phi}$ holds. Hence, in the second item of Corollary 16.2 we have $\alpha_0 = \delta_l$, $\omega_0 = \delta_l + 2\delta_\phi$. It follows that the order of W_H is not larger than $\frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$, so as in (i) we arrive at $\rho_H = \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$.

(iii) With the same lengths as in (i), consider the angles

$$\phi_j := \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{1}{k^{\delta_\phi}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{with } \delta_\phi \leq 1.$$

Again the first item of Corollary 16.2 is not applicable, while the second item is applicable but there is no convergence of angles. For any ψ we have $\omega_0 = \delta_l$ and thus only $\rho_H \leq 1/\delta_l$. But this upper bound is not optimal: By Proposition 23.7, which makes use of the fact that the lengths, angles, and angle-differences in this example are regularly varying, we have

$$\rho_H = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi} & \text{if } \delta_l + \delta_\phi > 2, \\ \frac{1 - \delta_\phi}{\delta_l - \delta_\phi} & \text{if } \delta_l + \delta_\phi \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

See also Example 23.1.

✱ Theorem 16.1 (i) and Corollary 16.2 (i) ask us to assess the decay of the lengths and the decay of the angle-differences separately, while each of the lower bounds in Section 15 needs only one sequence (of terms combining the lengths and angle-differences) as input. If both the lengths and the angle-differences are regularly varying and such that Corollary 16.2 (i) applies, explicit computations enabled by Karamata's theorem show that the lower and upper bounds for the order of W_H obtained from Theorem 15.1 and Corollary 16.2 (i) coincide.

17 Upper bounds in terms of tails of convergent series

We present two upper bounds for the lower right entry $w_{H,22}$ of W_H along the imaginary axis, which take into account the decay of data in an averaged sense. The first result, Theorem 17.1, also assumes summability conditions as in Section 16. Recall that the growth along the imaginary axis of one entry of W_H dominates W_H itself in the sense of Corollary E.4 and Proposition F.3.

17.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume we have $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(l_j)_{j=1}^\infty \in \ell^\alpha, \quad (|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|)_{j=1}^\infty \in \ell^{\frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

Fix $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$, let $F: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be the increasing function

$$F(n) := n^{\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}} \left[\left(\sum_{j=n+1}^\infty l_j \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=n+1}^\infty l_j \sin^2(\phi_j - \psi) \right) \right]^{-\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha}},$$

and let $F^- : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be its left inverse

$$F^-(r) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid F(n) \leq r\}.$$

Then H is in limit circle case and (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim (rF^-(r))^{1-\beta} \frac{1}{\alpha+1}.$$

In the following variant the contributions of lengths and angles are fully separated. It requires as an assumption that the telescoping sum of angle-differences converges absolutely.

17.2 Theorem. Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case, and that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| < \infty$. Let $G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be the decreasing function

$$G(n) := \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} l_j \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and let $G^- : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be its left inverse

$$G^-(r) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid G(n) \geq r\}.$$

Then (for, say, $r \geq 2$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim G^-\left(\frac{\log r}{\sqrt{r}}\right) \cdot \log r.$$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* These results are taken from work of J. Reiffenstein [Rei25b]. Their proofs rely on the Weyl coefficient approach, cf. Section 4, and direct estimates of the integral of K_H over $[0, L]$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the contributions of $[0, x_n]$ and of $[x_n, L]$ are estimated in different ways, and choosing $n = F^-(r)$ (in Theorem 17.1) or $n = G^-(r)$ (in Theorem 17.2) balances these contributions.

* Consider again the second part of the example from the remarks to Section 16: For $\delta_l \geq 1, \delta_\phi \geq 0$ set

$$l_1 := 1, \quad l_j := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{j^{\delta_l}} & \text{if } \delta_l > 1, \\ \frac{1}{j \log^2 j} & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j \geq 2,$$

$$\phi_j := j^{1-\delta_\phi}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$ we can apply Theorem 17.1 with $\alpha := \delta_l - \epsilon$ and $\beta := \delta_\phi - \epsilon$, yielding

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \lesssim r^{\frac{\delta_l - \delta_\phi + \epsilon}{\delta_l^2 - \delta_\phi + \epsilon(2 - \delta_l)}}.$$

Since ϵ can be taken arbitrarily small, as upper bound for the order of W_H we obtain $\rho_H \leq (\delta_l - \delta_\phi)/(\delta_l^2 - \delta_\phi)$. While this upper bound is better than the one we obtained in the remarks to Section 16, it does not give the correct value of ρ_H which is $(1 - \delta_\phi)/(\delta_l - \delta_\phi)$, cf. Proposition 23.7.

✱ If both the lengths l_j and the angle-differences $|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|$ are regularly varying, using Karamata's theorem we see that the lower and upper bounds for the order of W_H obtained from Theorem 15.1 and Theorem 17.2 coincide. In this context Theorem 17.2 is an improvement upon Corollary 16.2 (i) since it provides a regularly varying upper bound for $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)|$ whose index is the same as the order of W_H . Yet an even better estimate is available (see the remarks to Section 19), which addresses regularly varying data specifically.

18 A Berezanskii-type theorem

As a motivation we revisit Berezanskii's theorem discussed in Section 13 from the Hamiltonian viewpoint. Theorem 13.1 determines the order of the Nevanlinna matrix from the off-diagonal Jacobi parameters. There are three assumptions in that theorem. The first is that *Carleman's condition* is violated, which in terms of the Hamiltonian parameters means that

$$(\sqrt{l_n l_{n+1}} \cdot |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)|)_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell^1.$$

The other two assumptions, about regularity of off-diagonal and smallness of diagonal, can hardly be translated. Let us turn to the conclusion of Theorem 13.1, which has a perfect translation: $(l_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell^1$ and the order ρ_H of the monodromy matrix is equal to the convergence exponent of the sequence $([\sqrt{l_n l_{n+1}} \cdot |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)|]^{-1})_{n=1}^\infty$.

The result we present now is of a similar kind. It gives conditions in terms of lengths and angles, sufficient for the order of the monodromy matrix to be computed as a certain convergence exponent.

18.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case, and, for simplicity of presentation, that $\phi_n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that the following three conditions hold.*

$$\triangleright \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (l_n \sin^2 \phi_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n < \infty.$$

\triangleright *The sequence $(l_n \sin^2 \phi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is nonincreasing and $(|\cot \phi_n - \cot \phi_{n+1}|)_{n=1}^\infty$ is nondecreasing.*

$$\triangleright \sup_{n \geq 1} |\cot \phi_n - \cot \phi_{n+1}| < \infty.$$

Then the order of the monodromy matrix is equal to the convergence exponent of the sequence $([l_n \sin^2 \phi_n]^{-1})_{n=1}^\infty$.

A typical case where the assumption on angle-differences is satisfied occurs when the angles perform a walk on the grid $\text{Arcot } \mathbb{Z}$, since then $|\cot \phi_n - \cot \phi_{n+1}| = 1$ for all $n \geq 1$.

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ Theorem 18.1 is taken from [PW19]. Its proof is altogether quite unusual. One uses formal symmetrisation to get a “Hamburger Hamiltonian with positive and negative lengths”. In turn, one passes to a Hamburger Hamiltonian that is possibly in limit point case, and applies the result [Kac90, Theorem 1] of I.S. Kac about Stieltjes strings.

✱ Theorem 18.1 and Theorem 13.1 have some overlap. The core of Berezanskii’s theorem is the case that $a_n = 0$ (adding a “small diagonal” can be understood as a small perturbation). For vanishing diagonal the translation from Jacobi parameters to Hamiltonian parameters is simple, and for orders $< \frac{1}{2}$ (to be precise, knowing that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{l_n} \log n < \infty$) the assertion of Berezanskii’s theorem (in its original variant) follows from Theorem 18.1.

✱ In general Theorem 18.1 and Berezanskii’s theorem (in the strong variant from [Rei25b] stated in Theorem 13.1) are incomparable. Theorem 18.1 is weaker in the sense that it is bound to orders $\leq \frac{1}{2}$ and requires limit circle case as an a priori assumption. On the other hand, it is stronger in the sense that “smallness and regularity of the diagonal” is not necessarily present: in [PW19, Example 4.8] an example is given where Theorem 18.1 applies, while the corresponding Jacobi parameters satisfy $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_{n+1}}{b_n} = 1$ and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|a_n|}{b_n} = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|a_n|}{b_n} = 2.$$

19 Exploiting regular variation I: upper bound from majorants

To improve computability one can work with regularly varying majorants instead of the lengths and angles themselves. By doing so, it becomes possible to treat even irregularly behaving lengths and angles, potentially at the cost of some loss of precision.

19.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case.*

Let $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ and let d_l, d_ϕ, c_l, c_ϕ be regularly varying functions that are \sim to some nonincreasing functions, such that $d_l \asymp 1 \asymp d_\phi$ locally, $c_\phi(t) \lesssim c_l(t)$ for sufficiently large t , $\text{Ind } d_l + \text{Ind } d_\phi < 0$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (c_l c_\phi)(t) = 0$. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} l_j &\lesssim d_l(j), & |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| &\lesssim d_\phi(j), \\ \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} l_j &\lesssim c_l(N), & \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} l_j \sin^2(\phi_j - \psi) &\lesssim c_\phi(N). \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{D}(t) := \frac{1}{(d_l d_\phi)(t)}, \quad \delta := \text{Ind } \mathcal{D}, \quad \mathcal{C}(t) := \frac{1}{(c_l c_\phi)^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)}, \quad \gamma := \text{Ind } \mathcal{C},$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_l &:= -\text{Ind } d_l, & \delta &:= \text{Ind } \mathfrak{D} = \delta_l + \delta_\phi, \\ \delta_\phi &:= -\text{Ind } d_\phi, & \gamma &:= \text{Ind } \mathfrak{C}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ be an asymptotic inverse of \mathfrak{D} , and set

$$\mathfrak{h}(r) := \sup \left\{ t \in [1, \infty) \mid \sup_{1 \leq s \leq t} \frac{d_\phi(s)}{r d_l(s)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Then we have the following bounds for the monodromy matrix W_H and its order ρ_H .

Data satisfies	$\max_{ z =r} \log \ W_H(z)\ $ is \lesssim	$\rho_H \leq$
$\mathfrak{D}(t) \lesssim t \mathfrak{C}(t)$	$\frac{r}{\mathfrak{C}(f^-(r))}$ where $f(t) := t \mathfrak{C}(t) \log \left[\alpha \frac{t \mathfrak{C}(t)}{\mathfrak{D}(t)} \right]$ $\alpha := 4 \sup_{t \geq 1} \frac{\mathfrak{D}(t)}{t \mathfrak{C}(t)}$	$\frac{1}{1+\gamma}$
$t \mathfrak{C}(t) \lesssim \mathfrak{D}(t)$, $\int_1^\infty \mathfrak{D}(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds < \infty$, ($\gamma > 0$ or $\frac{d_\phi}{d_l} \approx$ to nondecreasing)	$r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty \mathfrak{D}(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds$	$\frac{1}{\delta}$
$\int_1^\infty \mathfrak{D}(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds = \infty$, $\frac{1}{d_l(t)} \lesssim t \mathfrak{C}(t)$, ($\delta, \gamma \neq (2, 0)$)	$\frac{r}{\mathfrak{C}(f_1^-(r))}$ where $f_1(t) := [\mathfrak{C}(t) \int_1^t \mathfrak{D}(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds]^2$	$\frac{2-\delta+\gamma}{2-\delta+2\gamma}$
$t \mathfrak{C}(t) \lesssim \frac{1}{d_l(t)}$, $\int_1^\infty d_l(s) ds < \infty$, $\delta_l > \delta_\phi$	$r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty \mathfrak{D}(s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds$ $+ r \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty d_l(s) ds$	$\frac{1-\delta_\phi}{\delta_l-\delta_\phi}$

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ This theorem is taken from the recent work [PRW23] of R. Pruckner, J. Reiffenstein and H. Woracek, where it is deduced from a general (much more cumbersome) result, namely [PRW23, Theorem 2.2].

✱ Theorem 19.1 still allows small oscillations of lengths and angle-differences: a function that is \asymp to a regularly varying function need not necessarily be itself regularly varying.

✱ The main assumptions on the data d_l, d_ϕ, c_l, c_ϕ made in Theorem 19.1 are that those functions are regularly varying and that $\text{Ind } d_l + \text{Ind } d_\phi < 0$. The monotonicity assumptions are only minor restrictions: for example they are automatically fulfilled unless the function under consideration is slowly varying. The assumption that $c_\phi \lesssim c_l$ is no loss in generality, since replacing c_ϕ by $\min\{c_\phi, c_l\}$ does not affect validity of any of the other assumptions.

✱ Intuitively the function $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ is just the inverse to the quotient $\frac{d_\phi}{d_l}$ (which is of course formally not correct). In fact, the situation is as follows: If the

quotient $\frac{d_\phi}{d_l}$ is bounded, we have eventually $\mathfrak{h}(r) = \infty$. If $\text{Ind} \frac{d_\phi}{d_l} > 0$, then $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ is an asymptotic inverse of $\frac{d_\phi}{d_l}$. However, if $\text{Ind} \frac{d_\phi}{d_l} = 0$, oscillations are possible, and then it is necessary to define $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ as the written supremum.

✱ An illustrative example, where we discuss in detail the situation that lengths and angles are majorised by certain concrete and simple regularly varying functions, is given in Section 24.

✱ Theorem 19.1 has an overlap with Theorem 17.2: Assume that we are given only regularly varying functions d_l, d_ϕ , such that: d_l, d_ϕ are locally $\asymp 1$, satisfy $\text{Ind} d_l, \text{Ind} d_\phi < -1$, and majorise our data as

$$l_j \lesssim d_l(j), \quad |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \lesssim d_\phi(j).$$

Then we can use the trivial choices $c_l(t) := t d_l(t)$ and $c_\phi(t) := t^3 d_l(t) d_\phi(t)^2$ in Theorem 19.1. The upper bound for $\max_{|z|=r} \log \|W_H(z)\|$ obtained in this way is $\mathfrak{k}(r)$, while Theorem 17.2 gives the upper bound $\mathfrak{k}(r/(\log r)^2) \log r$. Since $\text{Ind} \mathfrak{k} < \frac{1}{2}$, the bound from Theorem 19.1 is better, but only by a slowly varying factor.

✱ A systematic treatment of the case where we are only given functions d_l, d_ϕ is presented in Section 23.

20 Exploiting regular variation II: lower bound from minorants

We present two theorems and a corollary. The first theorem is generic, while the second deals with a particular situation. Recall that $w_{H,22}$ denotes the lower right entry of W_H .

20.1 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case. Let $\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$ be regularly varying functions that are asymptotic inverses of each other, and fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Then*

$$\left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=n+1}^{n+k} l_i l_j \sin^2(\phi_i - \phi_j) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}(n)} \implies \log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \gtrsim \mathfrak{g}(r).$$

Taking $k = 2$ and using notation similar to Section 19 we obtain as a corollary:

20.2 Corollary. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case. Let d_l and d_ϕ be regularly varying and such that*

$$l_n \gtrsim d_l(n), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \gtrsim d_\phi(n),$$

and let $\mathfrak{k}(r)$ be an asymptotic inverse of $\mathfrak{D}(t) := \frac{1}{(d_l d_\phi)(t)}$. Then (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \gtrsim \mathfrak{k}(r).$$

20.3 Theorem. *Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$, and let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles. Assume that H is in limit circle case. Let d_l and d_ϕ be regularly varying with $-1 < \text{Ind } d_\phi < 0$, such that*

$$l_n \gtrsim d_l(n), \quad |\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n| \asymp d_\phi(n),$$

Further assume that $(\phi_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ is eventually monotone. Then, letting $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ be an asymptotic inverse of $\frac{d_\phi(t)}{d_l(t)}$, we have (for, say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \gtrsim r \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty d_l(t) dt.$$

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ Theorem 20.1 is a consequence of Theorem 15.2 (ii), and Karamata's theorem. Theorem 20.3 is [Rei25a, Theorem 1.1]. Both results are not elementary and use the Weyl coefficient approach.

✱ Corollary 20.2, although a corollary of Theorem 20.1 for $k = 2$, also has an elementary proof, for which we refer to [PW22, Corollary 2.5].

✱ We will see in Section 23 that the lower bounds in Corollary 20.2 and theorem 20.3 are sharp. Interestingly, the generic and elementary bound from Corollary 20.2 is attained quite often.

✱ Theorem 20.3 deals with the extreme situation that angles are eventually monotone. A sharp lower bound that takes into account oscillations of the angles is at present not available.

PART V

Additions and examples

In this part we collect some selected theorems and examples that supplement the general theory and illustrate phenomena related to growth and density. In the first two sections we discuss Hamiltonians with continuous rotation angle. First we present some general results, then a concrete (and enlightening) example. In the second pair of sections we turn to Hamburger Hamiltonians. Again we first give some general results and then a concrete example.

In Section 25 we revisit the setting of Jacobi matrices and present a recent result which is important, yet somewhat peculiar. There for one very particular Hamiltonian not only finiteness of $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_H(r)}{r^\rho}$ (where ρ is the order) is shown, but the actual value of this limit superior is determined. This theorem is out of the realm of the general results presented in Part II, since those determine for intrinsic reasons the limit superior only up to universal multiplicative constants, and thus cannot possibly determine its exact value.

The next two sections contain one perturbation result each, and in the pair of sections following those we discuss symmetry and Krein strings. Exploiting symmetry is a practical tool. The work on strings of I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein has played an important role in the development of many results about canonical systems and cannot be appreciated enough.

Last but not least, in Section 30, we touch upon the inverse problem (where we focus on the limit circle case): can one construct Hamiltonians whose monodromy matrix has prescribed growth?

§. 21 Hamiltonians with continuous rotation angle	72
§. 22 An illustrative example: the chirp function	74
§. 23 Hamburger Hamiltonians with regularly varying data	75
§. 24 Hamburger Hamiltonians with power-log decay	80
§. 25 Bochkov's theorem about type	83
§. 26 Modifying the rotation of the Hamiltonian	84
§. 27 Cutting out pieces of the Hamiltonian	85
§. 28 Exploiting symmetry	87
§. 29 Krein strings	89
§. 30 Inverse results	91

21 Hamiltonians with continuous rotation angle

For continuously rotating Hamiltonians one can show a growth estimate in terms of the quality of continuity of their rotation (measured, e.g., by the Hölder exponent). The intuition is that smoothly rotating Hamiltonians have slowly growing fundamental matrices. This intuition is legitimate only up to Lipschitz continuity (so one must not think of differentiability or similar) and for orders between $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1. It breaks down at growth of speed $r^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

21.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case, and assume that H can be written in the form*

$$H(t) = \operatorname{tr} H(t) \cdot \xi_{\phi(t)} \xi_{\phi(t)}^T, \quad t \in (a, b) \text{ a.e.}, \quad (21.1)$$

with a continuous function $\phi: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\omega(\delta) := \sup \{ |\phi(t) - \phi(s)| \mid t, s \in [a, b], |t - s| \leq \delta \}$$

be the modulus of continuity of ϕ , let Ω be the inverse function of $\delta \mapsto \delta\omega(\delta)$, and denote

$$\Gamma(r) := \frac{1}{\Omega(\frac{1}{r})}.$$

Moreover, set $l := b - a$ and $L := \int_a^b \operatorname{tr} H(t) dt$. Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \leq 3l \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{L}{l}r\right) + O(\log r). \quad (21.2)$$

Observe that Γ depends monotonically on ω . This leads to the following corollary.

21.2 Corollary. *Consider a Hamiltonian H of the form (21.1), and let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. If ϕ is Hölder continuous with exponent κ , then*

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim r^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa}}.$$

As the following example shows the estimate in this corollary is sharp.

21.3 Example. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta > \frac{1}{\alpha}$. The Weierstraß function with parameters α, β is

$$\varphi(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^n \cos(\beta^n \pi t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is Hölder continuous with exponent $\kappa := -\frac{\log \alpha}{\log \beta}$.

The growth of the monodromy matrix corresponding to the Hamiltonian $H(t) := \xi_{\varphi(t)} \xi_{\varphi(t)}^T$, $t \in (0, 1)$, can be determined when β is an even integer with $\beta > \frac{1+\pi/2}{\alpha}$ (this assumption is there for technical reasons; it is probably not necessary). It is

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp r^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa}}.$$

The modulus of continuity of φ satisfies $\omega(\delta) \asymp \delta^\kappa$, which yields that also $\Gamma(r) \asymp r^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa}}$.

Since ω is the modulus of continuity of a continuous function, we have $\Gamma(r) \gtrsim r^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and hence the bound from Theorem 21.1 can never go below $r^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The next result emphasises that order $\frac{1}{2}$ is indeed an intrinsic threshold.

21.4 Proposition. *Let H be as in (21.1).*

(i) *Assume that ϕ is Lipschitz continuous and not constant. Then*

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp r^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

(ii) *Assume that ϕ is monotone and bounded. If the order of W_H is less than $\frac{1}{2}$, then $\phi' = 0$ a.e.*

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ Theorem 21.1 and Corollary 21.2 are established in [PW22, §5] as an application of Romanov’s Theorem I (cf. Theorem 7.1), and Example 21.3 is [LRW24, Theorem 7.4]. Item (i) of Proposition 21.4 is [LRW24, Remark 6.7], and item (ii) is essentially [RS20a, Theorem 1.6(c)].

✱ Corollary 21.2 improves upon [Rom17, Corollary 4(1)] where the bound $r^{1-\frac{\kappa}{2}}$ is given.

✱ Also on a finer scale than powers the bound from Theorem 21.1 is sharp, at least up to a small gap (and we expect that this gap can be removed). Examples are constructed in [PW22, §6]: Let g be a regularly varying function with $\text{Ind } g \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, let m be regularly varying such that $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{m(t)} dt < \infty$, and let n be an asymptotic inverse of m . Then there exists H as in Theorem 21.1, such that $\Gamma \asymp g$ and

$$(n \circ g)(r) \lesssim \log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim g(r).$$

Choosing for example $m(r) := r(\log r)^{1+\epsilon}$ with some $\epsilon > 0$, then $(n \circ g)(r) \asymp \frac{g(r)}{(\log r)^{1+\epsilon}}$.

✱ The bound from Theorem 21.1 may fail badly: there exist Hamiltonians with continuous rotation angle whose monodromy matrix has arbitrary small order. Examples are constructed e.g., in [PW22, Example 5.5] or [RS20a, Theorem 1.6(b)].

An example where the order of W_H is in $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, but is still strictly smaller than what is given by Corollary 21.2, is presented in Theorem 22.1. See the remarks to Section 22.

✱ A discrete variant of Theorem 21.1 is given in [Rei25b]. It reads as follows: Let $l_j > 0$ and $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$, let H be the Hamburger Hamiltonian with these lengths and angles, cf. Definition C.1, and recall the notation $x_n := \sum_{j=1}^n l_j$. Assume that H is in limit circle case. Moreover, let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. If the angles satisfy the discrete Hölder condition

$$|\phi_{m+1} - \phi_n| \lesssim |x_m - x_n|^\kappa \quad \text{for } n, m \in \mathbb{N},$$

then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim r^{\frac{1}{1+\kappa}}.$$

✱ At present no work has been undertaken to deal with continuously rotating Hamiltonians in limit point case.

22 An illustrative example: the chirp function


We give an example of Hamiltonians with Hölder continuous and possibly oscillating rotation angle, for which the formula (4.1) for the growth of $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)|$ can be evaluated (recall here the connection (4.2)).

22.1 Theorem. *Let $(\gamma, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (0, 0)$, let $\varphi: (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the chirp signal*

$$\varphi(t) := t^\gamma \sin \left(\frac{1}{t^\beta} \right),$$

and consider the Hamiltonian $H(t) := \xi_{\varphi(t)} \xi_{\varphi(t)}^T$, $t \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \begin{cases} r^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+\gamma+1}} & \text{if } \beta > \gamma + 1 \wedge \gamma \geq 0, \\ r^{\frac{\beta-\gamma}{\beta-\gamma+1}} & \text{if } \beta > \gamma + 1 \wedge \gamma < 0, \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} \log r & \text{if } \beta = \gamma + 1, \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \beta < \gamma + 1. \end{cases} \quad (22.1)$$



▷▷ Remarks ◀◀

✱ This result is [LRW24, Theorem 6.9]. To prove Theorem 22.1 one estimates $\kappa_H(r)$ (see Definition 6.1) from below with some expression, and estimates the integral on the right side of (4.1) with the same expression from above. Applying Theorem 6.2 finishes the argument.

✱ For the Hamiltonians H as in the theorem we have $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)| \asymp \kappa_H(r)$. Thus they provide examples where the lower bound in Theorem 6.2 is attained.

✱ In this example the speed of growth of $\log |w_{H,22}(ir)|$ is determined by the behaviour of H at a single point (namely, the left endpoint 0). In fact, let $c \in (0, 1)$. Since φ is Lipschitz continuous on $(c, 1)$, the monodromy matrix of the restriction of H to $(c, 1)$ satisfies

$$\log |w_{H|_{(c,1)},22}(ir)| \asymp r^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

cf. Proposition 21.4. Now note that the exponent appearing in the first and second case on the right side of (22.1) is $> \frac{1}{2}$.

✱ It is interesting to analyse the dependency on (β, γ) of the exponent appearing on the right side of (22.1).

- ▷ If the frequency is small relative to decay/increase, we are in the last case of (22.1), and the growth is as slow as it possible can be (recall the previous remark).
- ▷ If $\varphi(t)$ oscillates with relatively high frequency, the growth ranges over all possible powers r^α with $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$.
- ▷ We have to distinguish whether oscillations are damped or amplified. In the first case the exponent α depends only on the relation between frequency and damping, in the second case frequency and amplification act as independent parameters.

✱ Theorem 22.1 illustrates a limitation of Corollary 21.2. Consider parameters $\beta \geq \gamma > 0$. In this case $\varphi(t)$ is *Hölder continuous* with Hölder exponent $\frac{\gamma}{\beta+1}$. Corollary 21.2 implies $\rho_H \leq (1 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta+1})^{-1} = \frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\gamma+1}$, which is not the correct value. With a reparametrisation trick one can improve this to $\rho_H \leq \frac{\beta}{\beta+\gamma}$, cf. [PW22, Example 5.6]. However, this is still not the correct value for ρ_H (unless $\beta = \gamma$).

23 Hamburger Hamiltonians with regularly varying data

In this section we consider Hamburger Hamiltonians in limit circle case whose lengths l_j and angle-differences $|\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|$ are bounded by, or even comparable to, functions d_l and d_ϕ that satisfy:

- ▷ d_l and d_ϕ are regularly varying,
- ▷ d_l and d_ϕ are locally $\asymp 1$,

▷ \mathcal{d}_ϕ is \sim to some nonincreasing function.

The second and third requirements are made for technical reasons; the second is no restriction, and the third is a minor restriction. Denote

$$\delta_l := -\text{Ind } \mathcal{d}_l, \quad \delta_\phi := -\text{Ind } \mathcal{d}_\phi,$$

then $\delta_l \geq 1$ with $\int_1^\infty \mathcal{d}_l(t) dt < \infty$ since the lengths are summable, and $\delta_\phi \geq 0$ since the sine of angle-differences is bounded.

For data with

$$l_j \asymp \mathcal{d}_l(n), \quad |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \asymp \mathcal{d}_\phi(n), \quad (23.1)$$


a fairly complete picture can be given, nicely illustrating the way how lengths and angles influence the growth of W_H . However, it must be emphasised that (23.1) does not contain enough information to always determine the growth (e.g. the order) of the monodromy matrix.

One may say that there are two regions of essentially different behaviour, one corresponding to slow growth and the other to faster growth. The border line is the threshold “ $\rho_H = \frac{1}{2}$ ” (where ρ_H is the order of W_H). Finally, there is one exceptional point where not much can be said.

- (I) Region of simple behaviour (small orders): $\delta_l + \delta_\phi > 2$.
- (II) *Critical triangle* (large orders): $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$.
- (III) Switching line ($\rho_H = \frac{1}{2}$): $\delta_l + \delta_\phi = 2$ with $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi) \neq (1, 1)$.
- (IV) Exceptional point: $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi) = (1, 1)$.

Overview on the scale of order

On the rough scale of order only the indices δ_l and δ_ϕ of the functions \mathcal{d}_l and \mathcal{d}_ϕ , respectively, play a role. Assuming (23.1) we have the following picture:



The formula for ρ_H in the region of simple behaviour should be seen as a lower bound and an upper bound which coincide in that region. In this way we may describe the picture as follows:

- ▷ The lower bound “ $\frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi} \leq \rho_H$ ” holds throughout the whole picture.
- ▷ The upper bound is different in different regions. It coincides with the lower bound in (I), and splits from it when passing through the switching line.
- ▷ In the exceptional point (IV), the upper bound jumps to the trivial bound “ $\rho_H \leq 1$ ”.

The bounds in the critical triangle are sharp.

23.1 Example ((II)). Let $\delta_l \in [1, 2)$ and $\delta_\phi \in [0, 2 - \delta_l)$.

(i) Set

$$l_1 := 1, \quad l_j := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{j^{\delta_l}} & \text{if } \delta_l > 1, \\ \frac{1}{j \log^2 j} & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j \geq 2,$$

$$\phi_j := \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{(-1)^k}{k^{\delta_\phi}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $\rho_H = \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$.

(ii) Take the same lengths as in (i), but use

$$\phi_j := \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{1}{k^{\delta_\phi}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

instead. Then $\rho_H = \frac{1 - \delta_\phi}{\delta_l - \delta_\phi}$.

In the exceptional point all values in the interval $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ can be attained.

23.2 Example (IV). Let $\nu \in (1, 2)$, and consider a Hamburger Hamiltonian H with

$$l_j \asymp \frac{1}{j \log^\nu j}, \quad |\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j| \asymp \frac{1}{j}. \quad (23.2)$$

Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp r^{\frac{1}{\nu}}.$$

If (23.2) holds with “ $\nu = 2$ ”, then $\rho_H = \frac{1}{2}$. If

$$l_j \asymp \frac{1}{j(\log j)(\log \log j)^\alpha}, \quad |\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j| \asymp \frac{1}{j}$$

with some $\alpha > 1$, then $\rho_H = 1$.

Results in detail

Now we take into account the actual functions d_l, d_ϕ and not only their indices. First, we state the lower bound which again holds throughout.

23.3 Proposition (lower bound). *Assume that lengths and angles satisfy*

$$l_j \gtrsim d_l(n), \quad |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \gtrsim d_\phi(n).$$

Let $k(r)$ be an asymptotic inverse of the function $[d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{-1}$. Then

$$k(r) \lesssim \log |w_{H,22}(ir)|.$$

We have $\text{Ind } k(r) = \frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}$.

We come to upper bounds. In the now considered finer picture the reason for the different behaviour in different regions becomes much clearer.

- ▷ Apart from the exceptional point (IV) one has to distinguish between a region of convergence, where $\int_1^\infty [d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt < \infty$, and a region of divergence where this integral is infinite. Region (I) belongs to the region of convergence, and (II) to the region of divergence. In (I) upper and lower bounds coincide, while in (II) they split.
- ▷ The role played by the switching line (III) is much more subtle than in the previous rough picture. Already in the part of that line belonging to the region of convergence the upper and lower bounds start to split (even before entering the region of divergence or the critical triangle). Within the switching line the gap between the bounds is slowly varying.
- ▷ The case that $d_\phi \simeq 1$ (jumping angles) is also exceptional: the upper and lower bounds coincide unless $\delta_l = 2$ where they differ by a slowly varying factor.
- ▷ In the exceptional point (IV) we have, in general, no better information than the trivial upper bound $\lesssim r$.

The exact formulae read as follows.

23.4 Proposition (upper bound; region of convergence). *Assume that lengths and angles satisfy*

$$l_j \lesssim d_l(n), \quad |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)| \lesssim d_\phi(n), \quad (23.3)$$

and that

$$\int_1^\infty [d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt < \infty, \quad (\delta_l, \delta_\phi) \neq (1, 1).$$

Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{k(r)}^\infty [d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt.$$

23.5 Proposition (upper bounds; region of divergence). *Assume that lengths and angles satisfy (23.3) and that*

$$\int_1^\infty [d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt = \infty, \quad (\delta_l, \delta_\phi) \neq (1, 1).$$

Let $\mathfrak{h}(r)$ be an asymptotic inverse of $\frac{d_\phi(t)}{d_l(t)}$, which exists since in the present case $\delta_l > \delta_\phi$. Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \lesssim \begin{cases} r \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty d_l(t) dt & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \\ \mathfrak{h}(r) d_\phi(\mathfrak{h}(r)) & \text{if } \delta_l > 1 \wedge \delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2, \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_1^{\mathfrak{h}(r)} [d_l(t)d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt & \text{if } \delta_l + \delta_\phi = 2. \end{cases}$$

23.6 Proposition (comparison of upper and lower bounds). *Denote by \mathfrak{b} the upper bound exhibited in Propositions 23.4 and 23.5 if $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi) \neq (1, 1)$, and $\mathfrak{b}(r) := r$ if $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi) = (1, 1)$. We compare $\mathfrak{b}(r)$ to the lower bound $\mathfrak{k}(r)$ from Proposition 23.3.*

(I) *Assume that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi > 2$. Then $\mathfrak{k}(r) \asymp \mathfrak{b}(r)$.*

(II) *Assume that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$.*

▷ *If $\delta_\phi > 0$, then $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)}$ has positive index.*

▷ *If $\delta_\phi = 0$ and $d_\phi(t) \ll 1$, then $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)}$ is slowly varying with $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)} \ll 1$.*

▷ *If $\delta_\phi = 0$, $d_\phi(t) \asymp 1$, and $\delta_l > 1$, then $\mathfrak{k}(r) \asymp \mathfrak{b}(r)$.*

▷ *If $\delta_\phi = 0$, $d_\phi(t) \asymp 1$, and $\delta_l = 1$, then $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)}$ is slowly varying with $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)} \ll 1$.*

(III) *Assume that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi = 2$ and $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi) \neq (1, 1)$. Then $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)}$ is slowly varying with $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)} \ll 1$.*

(IV) *Assume that $\delta_l = \delta_\phi = 1$, then $\frac{\mathfrak{b}(r)}{\mathfrak{k}(r)}$ has index $\frac{1}{2}$.*

About sharpness

In the critical triangle the size of $\log \max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\|$ depends on the distribution of signs of the angle differences $\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)$. The next result exhibits two extreme cases: eventually constant signs vs. nearly alternating signs.

23.7 Proposition (Region (II): extreme cases). *Assume that lengths and angles satisfy (23.1) and that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$.*

▷ *If $\delta_\phi > 0$, $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j| < \pi$, and $(\phi_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ is eventually monotone, then*

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp r \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty d_l(t) dt.$$

▷ If $\delta_l > 1$ and there exists $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\sin(\phi_j - \psi)| \lesssim |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \mathfrak{k}(r).$$

▷▷ **Remarks** ◀◀

✱ The lower bound in Proposition 23.3 is just Corollary 20.2. The upper bounds in Propositions 23.4 and 23.5 follow from Theorem 19.1 by making appropriate choices for the additional data c_l, c_ϕ . In most cases one can use

$$c_l(t) = c_\phi(t) := \int_t^\infty d_l(s) ds,$$

in one boundary case we use

$$c_l(t) := \int_t^\infty d_l(s) ds, \quad c_\phi(t) := \int_t^\infty d_l(s) ds \cdot \left(\int_t^\infty d_\phi(s) ds \right)^2.$$

For details see [PRW23, Corollary 4.7]. Proposition 23.7 is contained in [Rei25a, Theorem 1.2]. Example 23.1 follows from Proposition 23.7, and Example 23.2 is [Rei25a, Proposition 3.4] combined with the monotonicity result Theorem 27.1 (i) for the boundary cases $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$. Finally, Proposition 23.6 is a simple application of Karamata's theorem.

✱ The bound in the second case of Proposition 23.5 can be rewritten in different forms. First, by the definition of \mathfrak{h} , we have

$$\mathfrak{h}(r) d_\phi(\mathfrak{h}(r)) = r \mathfrak{h}(r) d_l(\mathfrak{h}(r)),$$

and second, by Karamata's theorem, we have

$$r \mathfrak{h}(r) d_l(\mathfrak{h}(r)) = \begin{cases} r \int_{\mathfrak{h}(r)}^\infty d_l(t) dt & \text{if } \delta_l > 1, \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_1^{\mathfrak{h}(r)} [d_l(t) d_\phi(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dt & \text{if } \delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2. \end{cases}$$

✱ The intuition behind the requirement in the second item of Proposition 23.7 is that ϕ_j should converge to ψ such that the signs of $\phi_j - \psi$ are roughly alternating. In fact, if these signs are exactly alternating, then we have $|\phi_j - \psi| \leq |\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j|$ for all j . Contrasting this, in the first item the series of angles diverges as fast as it possibly can.

24 Hamburger Hamiltonians with power-log decay

We consider a very concrete scale of examples to illustrate the results from Sections 19, 20 and 23. In order to give an efficient presentation, we use the following notation.

24.1 Definition. Let f be a function defined on $(0, \infty)$ or \mathbb{N} (or similar) and taking values in $(0, \infty)$. Further, let $(\delta, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Then we write

$$f \doteq (\delta, \alpha) \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad f(t) \asymp t^{-\delta}(\log t)^{-\alpha} \text{ for } t \text{ suff. large}$$

and analogously “ $f \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\delta, \alpha)$ ” or “ $f \stackrel{\circ}{\geq} (\delta, \alpha)$ ”, if the above holds with “ \lesssim ” or “ \gtrsim ”, respectively.

Moreover, let \preceq denote the lexicographical order on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.

We consider a Hamburger Hamiltonian in limit circle case, and compare its lengths l_n , its angle-differences $|\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)|$, and the speed of possible convergence of its angles $|\sin(\phi_n - \psi)|$ towards some limit angle ψ , to power-log functions:

$$l_n \text{ vs. } (\delta_l, \alpha_l), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \text{ vs. } (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi), \quad |\sin(\phi_n - \psi)| \text{ vs. } (\lambda, \kappa)$$

Since $(l_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell^1$, $(|\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)|)_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded, and $|\sin(\phi_n - \psi)|$ compares to the telescoping series of angle-differences, it is natural to put the following assumptions on the parameters $\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda, \alpha_l, \alpha_\phi, \kappa$:

$$(\delta_l, \alpha_l) \succ (1, 1), \quad (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi) \succeq (0, 0), \quad (24.1)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (0, 0) & \text{if } (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi) \preceq (1, 1), \\ (0, \alpha_\phi - 1) & \text{if } \delta_\phi = 1, \alpha_\phi > 1, \\ (\delta_\phi - 1, \alpha_\phi) & \text{if } \delta_\phi > 1, \end{array} \right\} \preceq (\lambda, \kappa) \preceq (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi). \quad (24.2)$$

Throughout this section we keep this notation and the standing assumptions (24.1) and (24.2).

We always have the lower bound from Corollary 20.2.

24.2 Proposition (lower bound). *Assume that lengths and angles satisfy*

$$l_n \stackrel{\circ}{\geq} (\delta_l, \alpha_l), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \stackrel{\circ}{\geq} (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi).$$

Then

$$-\left(\frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}, -\frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi} \right) \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} \log |w_{H,22}(ir)|.$$

For the discussion of upper bounds we distinguish four parameter regions in the $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda)$ -space. This is parallel to the case distinction (I)–(IV) which appeared in Section 23, yet slightly refined.

- (I) $\delta_l + \delta_\phi > 2$.
- (II) $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$.
- (III) $\delta_l + \delta_\phi = 2$ with $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda) \neq (1, 1, 0)$.
- (IV) $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda) = (1, 1, 0)$.

Unless we are in region (I), where upper and lower bounds coincide, there will occur further case distinctions. Contrasting Section 23 we can also treat the exceptional point (IV).

24.3 Proposition (upper bound; I). *Assume that*

$$l_n \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\delta_l, \alpha_l), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi),$$

and that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi > 2$. Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} - \left(\frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}, -\frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi} \right). \quad (24.3)$$

24.4 Proposition (upper bound; II). *Assume that*

$$l_n \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\delta_l, \alpha_l), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi), \quad |\sin(\phi_n - \psi)| \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} (\lambda, \kappa), \quad (24.4)$$

and that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$. Then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} - \left(\frac{1 - \delta_\phi + \lambda}{\delta_l - \delta_\phi + 2\lambda}, -\Gamma_{\text{II}}(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda, \alpha_l, \alpha_\phi, \kappa) \right),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\text{II}} := \begin{cases} \frac{\kappa(2-\delta_l-\delta_\phi)+\alpha_l(1-\delta_\phi+\lambda)+\alpha_\phi(\delta_l-1+\lambda)}{\delta_l-\delta_\phi+2\lambda} & \text{if } \delta_l > 1, \\ \frac{\kappa(1-\delta_\phi)+\alpha_l(1-\delta_\phi+\lambda)+\alpha_\phi\lambda-\frac{1}{2}(1-\delta_\phi)}{1-\delta_\phi+2\lambda} & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \lambda > 0, \\ \alpha_l + \kappa - 1 & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \lambda = 0, \kappa \geq 1, \\ \alpha_l - 1 & \text{if } \delta_l = 1, \lambda = 0, \kappa < 1. \end{cases}$$

24.5 Proposition (upper bound; III). *Assume (24.4) and that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi = 2$ and $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda) \neq (1, 1, 0)$. Then*

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} - \left(\frac{1}{2}, -\Gamma_{\text{III}}(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda, \alpha_l, \alpha_\phi) \right),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\text{III}} := \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi - 2}{2(1 - \delta_\phi + \lambda)} & \text{if } \alpha_l + \alpha_\phi < 2, \delta_l > 1, \\ \frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi - 2}{2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

24.6 Proposition (upper bound; IV). *Assume (24.4) and that $(\delta_l, \delta_\phi, \lambda) = (1, 1, 0)$. Then*

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \stackrel{\circ}{\leq} \begin{cases} -\left(\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi - 2}{2}\right) & \text{if } \alpha_l + \alpha_\phi > 2, \\ -\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) & \text{if } \alpha_l + \alpha_\phi = 2, \\ -\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_\phi + \kappa}{\alpha_l - \alpha_\phi + 2\kappa}, 0\right) & \text{if } \alpha_l + \alpha_\phi < 2. \end{cases}$$

24.7 Proposition (Region (II): extreme cases). *Assume that*

$$l_n \stackrel{\circ}{=} (\delta_l, \alpha_l), \quad |\sin(\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n)| \stackrel{\circ}{=} (\delta_\phi, \alpha_\phi),$$

and that $\delta_l + \delta_\phi < 2$.

▷ If $\delta_\phi > 0$, $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j| < \pi$ and $(\phi_j)_{j=0}^\infty$ is eventually monotone, then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \stackrel{\circ}{=} - \left(\frac{1 - \delta_\phi}{\delta_l - \delta_\phi}, -\frac{\alpha_l(1 - \delta_\phi) + \alpha_\phi(\delta_l - 1)}{\delta_l - \delta_\phi} \right).$$

▷ If $\delta_l > 1$ and there exists $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\sin(\phi_j - \psi)| \lesssim |\sin(\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)|$, then

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \doteq - \left(\frac{1}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi}, -\frac{\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi}{\delta_l + \delta_\phi} \right).$$

▷▷ **Remarks** ◀◀

✱ Propositions 24.3 to 24.5, and the case in Proposition 24.6 where $\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi > 2$, follow from Theorem 19.1. The case $\alpha_l + \alpha_\phi \leq 2$ in Proposition 24.6 follows from [PRW23, Examples 5.8 and 5.9]; in the extreme case $\lambda = \delta_\phi > 0$ an even better bound is available there.

✱ The lower bound Proposition 24.2 is Corollary 20.2. The lower bound in Proposition 24.7 (i) comes from Theorem 20.3.

✱ For every choice of parameters satisfying (24.1) and (24.2) there is a Hamburger Hamiltonian satisfying (24.4) with equality. An example is obtained as follows. Set $l_1 := 1, \phi_1 := 0$ and

$$l_n := \frac{1}{n^{\delta_l} \log^{\alpha_l} n}, \quad \phi_n := \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\epsilon_n}{n^{\delta_\phi} \log^{\alpha_\phi} n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2,$$

where $\epsilon_n \in \{-1, 1\}$ are chosen such that

$$(\lambda, \kappa) \succ (0, 0) \Rightarrow \psi := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \phi_j \text{ exists } \wedge |\sin(\phi_n - \psi)| \doteq (\lambda, \kappa).$$

25 Bochkov's theorem about type

Up to our knowledge there is only one example of an indeterminate moment problem where not only the order but also the type of the Nevanlinna matrix can be computed without knowing explicit expressions or explicit asymptotics for its entries.

This example is given in terms of the Jacobi parameters, namely, taking $a_n := 0$ and $b_n := (n+1)^p$ where $p > 1$. The corresponding moment problem is indeterminate by Berezanskii's Theorem, cf. Theorem 13.1.

25.1 Theorem. *Let $p > 1$ and consider the moment problem corresponding to the Jacobi parameters*

$$a_n := 0, \quad b_n := (n+1)^p \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This problem is indeterminate and the entries of the Nevanlinna matrix are of order $\frac{1}{p}$ with type

$$p \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{(1-t^{2p})^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \tag{25.1}$$

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ The values for order and type were conjectured by G. Valent in [Val99, Conjecture 1] on the basis of two explicit examples. His starting point was the study of birth-and-death processes with polynomial rates. An explicit translation to the presently stated form can be found in [BS17] (in particular, Remark 1.10 of that paper).

✱ The statement about order in Theorem 25.1 was first established in [Rom17, Corollary 6] by a straightforward application of Romanov’s Theorem I, cf. Theorem 7.1. A different proof can be found in [BS17, §6]. In the latter paper also bounds for the type are given.

✱ The fact that the type is equal to the value (25.1) is shown by I. Bochkov in [Boc21]. He analyses the Taylor coefficients of the power series appearing in the Berg-Szwarc Theorem (Theorem 9.1 and specifically [BS17, Theorem 1.11]). This analysis relies on a combinatorial trick which seems to be quite specific for the situation that the Jacobi parameters are powers (though, as far as we know, no serious attempts were made to generalise the approach).

26 Modifying the rotation of the Hamiltonian

It is a very intuitive fact that the density of the eigenvalues should not increase when the rotation of the Hamiltonian becomes slower, and we give two results that instantiate this intuition. As in Section 4 we denote the entries of the Hamiltonian H as follows,

$$H(t) = \begin{pmatrix} h_1(t) & h_3(t) \\ h_3(t) & h_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in (a, b) \text{ a.e.},$$

and set $\omega_{H,j}(s, t) := \int_s^t h_j(u) du$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. As usual, we use $\det \Omega_H(s, t)$ as a measure for the speed of rotation, and the growth of the eigenvalue counting function $n_H(r)$ is expressed via its Stieltjes transform.

26.1 Theorem. *Let $H, \tilde{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be definite, assume that $\int_a^b h_1(t) dt < \infty$, and that H, \tilde{H} are either both in the limit circle or both in the limit point case. Assume that the spectra of A_H and $A_{\tilde{H}}$ are discrete.*

(i) *If there are $\gamma_-, \gamma_+ > 0$ such that*

$$\det \Omega_{\tilde{H}}(s, t) \leq \gamma_+^2 \det \Omega_H(s, t), \quad a < s < t < b, \quad (26.1)$$

$$\omega_{\tilde{H},2}(a, t) \leq \gamma_+ \omega_{H,2}(a, t), \quad t \in (a, b), \quad (26.2)$$

$$\gamma_- h_1(t) \leq \tilde{h}_1(t) \leq \gamma_+ h_1(t), \quad t \in (a, b) \text{ a.e.} \quad (26.3)$$

then (for say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_{\tilde{H}}(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt \lesssim \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt$$

The constant implicit in the relation “ \lesssim ” depends on γ_-, γ_+ but not on H, \tilde{H} .

- (ii) Assume that H, \tilde{H} are both in limit circle case and that (26.1) holds for some $\gamma_+ > 0$. Then (for say, $r \geq 1$)

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_{\tilde{H}}(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt \lesssim \log r \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt,$$

where the constant implicit in the relation “ \lesssim ” depends on γ_+ but not on H, \tilde{H} .

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ This result is shown in [LRW24, Theorem 7.1].

✱ Assume that $\tilde{H}(t) \leq H(t)$ for a.e. $t \in (a, b)$. Then (26.1), (26.2), and the second inequality in (26.3) are automatically satisfied. Thus, it is enough to assume additionally that $\tilde{h}_1 \lesssim h_1$ in order to ensure that Theorem 26.1 (i) is applicable.

27 Cutting out pieces of the Hamiltonian

It is a very intuitive fact that the growth of the monodromy matrix should not increase when one cuts out pieces of the Hamiltonian, and this intuition can indeed be established. We give two variants of this fact.

First, we have to make precise what we mean by “cutting out pieces” of a Hamiltonian. To this end, assume we have $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ (which is in limit circle case) and let $\Delta \subseteq [a, b]$ be measurable with nonzero Lebesgue measure. Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(t) &:= \int_a^t \mathbb{1}_\Delta(u) du, \quad t \in [a, b], & \tilde{a} &:= 0, \quad \tilde{b} := \lambda(b), \\ \chi(s) &:= \min\{t \in [a, b] \mid \lambda(t) \geq s\}, \quad s \in [\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}], \\ \tilde{H}(s) &:= H(\chi(s)), \quad s \in [\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\tilde{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}}$, and we think of \tilde{H} as the Hamiltonian that emerged from H by cutting out the complement of Δ from $[a, b]$.

27.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be in limit circle case, let $\Delta \subseteq [a, b]$ be measurable with nonzero Lebesgue measure, and let $\tilde{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}}$ be the Hamiltonian that emerges by cutting out the complement of Δ . Assume that \tilde{H} is definite.*

- (i) We have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_{\tilde{H}}(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt \lesssim \log r \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_H(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt$$

for sufficiently large r .

(ii) Assume additionally that for every H -indivisible interval $(c, d) \subseteq (a, b)$ either $(c, d) \cap \Delta$ or $(c, d) \setminus \Delta$ has measure zero. Then

$$n_{\tilde{H}}(r) \leq n_H(r) \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$


▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

✱ Item (i) in Theorem 27.1 is [LRW24, Theorem 5.10], and item (ii) follows from [PW22, Theorem 3.4]. Interestingly, the proofs of these two results are very different. The first is purely analytic and the second is operator theoretic.

✱ We comment on the proof of Theorem 27.1 (i). It is straightforward to show that $\kappa_H(r) \geq \kappa_{\tilde{H}}(r)$ for all $r > 0$ where κ_H and $\kappa_{\tilde{H}}$ are as in Definition 6.1 with some constant $c > 0$. Namely, one proceeds executing the algorithm in Definition 6.1 and notes that

$$\det \Omega_{\tilde{H}}(\lambda(\sigma_{j-1}^{(r)}), \lambda(\sigma_j^{(r)})) \leq \det \Omega_H(\sigma_{j-1}^{(r)}, \sigma_j^{(r)}) \leq \frac{1}{r^2},$$

which leads to $\kappa_H(r) \geq \kappa_{\tilde{H}}(r)$.



✱ We comment on the proof of Theorem 27.1 (ii). Under the stated additional assumption one can relate the operator models associated with H and \tilde{H} . First, the map V acting as

$$V: f \mapsto (f \circ \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{1}_\Delta$$

induces an isometry of $L^2(\tilde{H})$ into $L^2(H)$. Now consider the multiplication operator $M_{\mathbf{1}_\Delta}$ with $\mathbf{1}_\Delta$, and the Volterra operator R_H defined as the inverse of the restriction of the maximal operator with boundary condition “ $f(a) = 0$ ”. Then $\text{ran } M_{\mathbf{1}_\Delta} R_H V \subseteq \text{ran } V$ and $R_{\tilde{H}} = V^{-1} M_{\mathbf{1}_\Delta} R_H V$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} L^2(H) & \xrightarrow{R_H} & L^2(H) & \xrightarrow{M_{\mathbf{1}_\Delta}} & \text{ran}(M_{\mathbf{1}_\Delta} R_H V) \\ \uparrow V & & & & \downarrow \subseteq \\ L^2(\tilde{H}) & \xrightarrow{R_{\tilde{H}}} & L^2(\tilde{H}) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{V} & \text{ran } V \\ & & & \xleftarrow{V^{-1}} & \end{array}$$

28 Exploiting symmetry

We call a Hamiltonian $H = \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & h_3 \\ h_3 & h_2 \end{pmatrix}$ *diagonal* if $h_3 = 0$ a.e. If H is diagonal many formulae simplify because the canonical system splits and can easily be rewritten as a scalar second order equation of familiar form. On the level of solutions of the system (and Weyl functions, spectrum, etc.) this is expressed by symmetry properties. Diagonal Hamiltonians can be transformed to non-diagonal ones of a very particular kind via a splitting procedure, and this process can be reversed.

First we state the mentioned symmetry properties.

28.1 Theorem. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$.*

- (i) *Assume that H is in limit circle case, and consider the monodromy matrix $W_H = (w_{H,ij})_{i,j=1}^2$ of H . Then H is diagonal if and only if the functions $w_{H,11}, w_{H,22}$ are even and $w_{H,12}, w_{H,21}$ are odd.*
- (ii) *Assume that H is in limit point case, and consider the Weyl coefficient q_H of H . Then H is diagonal if and only if the function q_H is odd.*

Second we explain the splitting procedure: a diagonal Hamiltonian gives rise to two non-diagonal ones.

28.2 Definition. Let $H \in \mathbb{H}_{a,b}$ be diagonal. Set

$$\tilde{m}(t) := \int_a^t h_1(s) ds, \quad \hat{m}(t) := \int_a^t h_2(s) ds,$$

and let $\tilde{\rho}$ and $\hat{\rho}$ be the left-continuous right inverses of \tilde{m} and \hat{m} , respectively.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [a, b] & \xrightarrow{\tilde{m}} & [0, \int_a^b h_1(x) dx] \\ & \tilde{\rho} & \\ \tilde{m} \circ \tilde{\rho} & = & \text{id} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} [a, b] & \xrightarrow{\hat{m}} & [0, \int_a^b h_2(x) dx] \\ & \hat{\rho} & \\ \hat{m} \circ \hat{\rho} & = & \text{id} \end{array}$$

- (i) Assume that H is in limit circle case. Then we define $\check{H}: (0, \int_a^b h_2(s) ds) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and $\hat{H}: (0, \int_a^b h_1(s) ds) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ as

$$\check{H}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{m} \circ \hat{\rho})(t)^2 & (\tilde{m} \circ \hat{\rho})(t) \\ (\tilde{m} \circ \hat{\rho})(t) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (28.1)$$

$$\hat{H}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -(\hat{m} \circ \tilde{\rho})(t) \\ -(\hat{m} \circ \tilde{\rho})(t) & (\hat{m} \circ \tilde{\rho})(t)^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (28.2)$$

- (ii) Assume that H is in limit point case. Then we define $\check{H}, \hat{H}: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ by the formulae (28.1) and (28.2), respectively, and by

$$\check{H}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t > \int_a^b h_1(s) ds,$$

$$\hat{H}(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t > \int_a^b h_2(s) ds.$$

Note that these additional definitions are nonvoid for at most one of \check{H} and \hat{H} , since $\int_a^b (h_1(s) + h_2(s)) ds = \infty$.

Clearly, the functions \check{H} and \hat{H} are Hamiltonians on their respective domains. They are both in limit circle case if H is, and they are both in limit point case if H is.

The monodromy matrices of H and \check{H}, \hat{H} and their Weyl coefficients, respectively, are related by simple explicit formulae. They perfectly express the nature of symmetry for a diagonal Hamiltonian.

28.3 Theorem. *Let H be a diagonal Hamiltonian.*

(i) *Assume that H is in limit circle case. Then*

$$W_{\check{H}}(t, z^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{z} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} W_H(t, z) \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & w'_{H,12}(t,0) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$W_{\hat{H}}(t, z^2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{z} \end{pmatrix} W_H(t, z) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -w'_{H,21}(t,0) & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(ii) *Assume that H is in limit point case. Then*

$$zq_{\check{H}}(z^2) = q_H(z) = \frac{1}{z}q_{\hat{H}}(z^2).$$

The relevance of this result for the present setting is that zeroes and growth of $w_{H,22}$ or poles of q_H , respectively, are related to zeroes and growth or poles of the corresponding functions for \check{H} and \hat{H} just by taking square roots. Hence, any knowledge about one of H, \check{H}, \hat{H} translates immediately to the other two.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

✱ The proof of Theorem 28.1 is contained in [KWW07]. Theorem 28.3 is established by a straightforward computation.

✱ As we presented the matters, they look really ad hoc. But this is not at all so; there is a very clean reason behind. It rests on another characterisation of diagonality in terms of the model space $L^2(H)$ which reads as follows:

▷ H is diagonal if and only if the involution

$$\iota: \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} -f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

maps $L^2(H)$ isometrically into itself.

The proof is by elementary computation.

Having an isometric involution on a Hilbert space automatically leads to an orthogonal decomposition of the space. Namely, we have the orthogonal projections $\hat{P} := \frac{1}{2}(\text{id} + \iota)$ and $\check{P} := \frac{1}{2}(\text{id} - \iota)$, and the corresponding decomposition

$$L^2(H) = \text{ran } \check{P} \oplus \text{ran } \hat{P}.$$

It turns out that the spaces $\text{ran } \check{P}$ and $\text{ran } \hat{P}$ can be identified with the model spaces of some Hamiltonians, and these are \check{H} and \hat{H} :

$$\text{ran } \check{P} \cong L^2(\check{H}), \quad \text{ran } \hat{P} \cong L^2(\hat{H}).$$

The isomorphisms are known explicitly and the model operators decompose accordingly, cf. [WW14, §2.f] and [KWW07].

✱ On the level of Nevanlinna functions, the splitting of an odd function q is also classical and occurred in the context of strings, cf. [KK68a].

✱ The splitting concept is common to all kinds of objects related with canonical systems, and can be extended to a sign-indefinite setting. This is in parts still work in progress, see [KWW06a; KWW06b; KWW06c; WW13; WW].

29 Krein strings

A *string* is a pair, we write it as $S[L, \mu]$, where $L \in [0, \infty]$ and μ is a positive Borel measure on \mathbb{R} (compact sets are assumed to have finite measure) with $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq [0, L]$, $\text{supp } \mu = L$, and $\mu(\{L\}) = 0$. The number L is called the *length* of the string, and the distribution function

$$m(x) := \mu((-\infty, x)), \quad x \in [-\infty, \infty]$$

its *mass-function*.

When Fourier's method is applied to the partial differential equation that describes the vibrations of a string on the interval $[0, L]$ with free left endpoint 0 whose mass on the interval $[0, x]$ is $m(x)$, then the equation

$$y'(x) + \int_{[0, x]} zy(u) d\mu(u) = 0$$

arises, which is called the *string equation*. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}$ there exist unique solutions $\varphi(x, z)$ and $\psi(x, z)$ of the string equation satisfying the initial conditions

$$\varphi(0, z) = 1, \quad \varphi'(0-, z) = 0, \quad \psi(0, z) = 0, \quad \psi'(0-, z) = 1.$$

The limit

$$q_S(z) := \lim_{x \rightarrow L} \frac{\psi(x, z)}{\varphi(x, z)} \tag{29.1}$$

exists locally uniformly on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, and is called the *principal Titchmarsh-Weyl coefficient* of the string $S[L, \mu]$. An important theorem of M.G. Krein states that the assignment $S[L, \mu] \mapsto q_S$ is a bijection between all strings and all *Stieltjes class* functions, i.e., functions q that are analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ and admit a representation of the form

$$q(z) := b + \int_{[0, \infty)} \frac{d\sigma(t)}{t - z},$$

where $b \geq 0$ and σ is a positive Borel measure with $\int_{[0, \infty)} \frac{d\sigma(t)}{1+t} < \infty$. The measure occurring in the representation of the function q_S is called the *principal spectral measure* of the string $S[L, \mu]$.

A string gives rise to a diagonal Hamiltonian.

29.1 Definition. Let $S[L, \mu]$ be a string. Denote by λ the Lebesgue measure, and set $\tau(x) := x + m(x)$. Then τ is an increasing function of $[0, L]$ onto a subset of $[0, \infty]$ whose complement consists of an at most countable union of intervals.

We define

$$H_d(t) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d\lambda}{d(\lambda+\mu)}(\tau^{-1}(t)) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{d\mu}{d(\lambda+\mu)}(\tau^{-1}(t)) \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } t \in \text{ran } \tau, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \text{ran } \tau. \end{cases} \quad (29.2)$$

Clearly, H_d is a trace-normalised Hamiltonian on the interval $(0, \infty)$. Its relation to the string equation is as follows.

29.2 Theorem. Let $S[L, \mu]$ be a string, and let H_d be as in (29.2). The fundamental solution $W_d(t, z)$ of the Hamiltonian H_d can be expressed in terms of the functions φ, ψ as

$$W_d(t, z) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi'(\tau^{-1}(t), z^2) & z\psi(\tau^{-1}(t), z^2) \\ \frac{1}{z}\varphi'(\tau^{-1}(t), z^2) & \varphi(\tau^{-1}(t), z^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in \text{ran } \tau. \quad (29.3)$$

The complement of $\text{ran } \tau$ consists of indivisible intervals, and hence the values of $W_d(t, z)$ for $t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \text{ran } \tau$ can be obtained from (29.3) by linear interpolation.

The Weyl function q_{H_d} is related to the principal Titchmarsh–Weyl coefficient of the string as

$$q_{H_d}(z) = zq_S(z^2).$$

The assignment $S[L, \mu] \mapsto H_d$ can be reversed: using the notation from Definition 28.2, we have

$$m(x) = (\hat{m} \circ \check{\rho})(x). \quad (29.4)$$

Together, (29.2) and (29.4) yield a bijective correspondence between strings and (trace normed) diagonal Hamiltonians.

▷▷ Remarks ◁◁

* A standard reference for strings is [KK68b; Kac94], or also [DM76]. The (operator) theory of Krein strings historically precedes the theory of canonical systems. In fact, the first initiated a lot of research about the latter. The connection between strings and Hamiltonians was long known as “common knowledge”. An explicit presentation, which includes a detailed study of the corresponding operator models, is given in [KWW07].

* The spectrum of a string is encoded in its principal Titchmarsh–Weyl coefficient in the same way as the spectrum of a canonical system is encoded in its Weyl function. In particular, $S[L, \mu]$ has discrete spectrum if and only if the corresponding diagonal Hamiltonian H_d has. Moreover, if the spectrum is discrete, the eigenvalues of H_d are obtained from those of $S[L, \mu]$ by taking all square roots.

✱ In the present context we mention in particular the work of I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein about the distribution of eigenvalues of a string with discrete spectrum [Kre52; KK58; Kac59; Kac62; Kac73; Kac78; Kac86; Kac90]. From the nowadays viewpoint those results appear as particular cases of general results about canonical systems, but this is neither fully true nor fair to say: a translation from one setting to the other by means of explicit computation is in some cases not known, and the work about strings – including proof methods – was a great inspiration for the general case.

30 Inverse results

In this section we discuss the problem:

- ▷ Given a regularly varying function \mathfrak{g} , can we construct a Hamiltonian H that is in limit circle case and satisfies

$$\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} \|W_H(z)\| \right) \asymp \mathfrak{g}(r) \quad ? \quad (30.1)$$

The case $\mathfrak{g}(r) \asymp r$ is of course trivial: by the Krein-de Branges formula we can take any Hamiltonian whose determinant does not vanish identically (and only such). The same is true in the case that $\mathfrak{g}(r) \asymp \log r$, for which (30.1) is satisfied for any Hamiltonian consisting only of a finite number of indivisible intervals (and only for those). Hence, we may focus on functions \mathfrak{g} with

$$\log r = o(\mathfrak{g}(r)), \quad \mathfrak{g}(r) = o(r). \quad (30.2)$$

The first is necessary for elementary reasons (the Cauchy estimates), concerning the second recall Theorem E.3 (ii).

Existence of Hamiltonian with (30.1) can always be granted.

30.1 Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a regularly varying function satisfying (30.2). Then there exists a Hamiltonian H which is in limit circle case and such that (30.1) holds.*

If $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}(t)} dt < \infty$, where \mathfrak{f} is an asymptotic inverse of \mathfrak{g} , then H can be chosen to be a Hamburger Hamiltonian.

Theorem 30.1 is not constructive regarding our initially posed problem: in the proof one entry of W_H is constructed, but not H itself. In the following theorem we present large classes of regularly varying functions, where one can easily write down a Hamiltonian satisfying (30.1). Solutions to the problem can be of very different kind; we exhibit a discrete and a continuous solution.

30.2 Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{g} be increasing and smoothly varying with positive index, and let \mathfrak{f} be the inverse function of \mathfrak{g} .*

- (i) *Assume that $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and set*

$$l_n := \frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}(n)}, \quad \phi_n := n \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Then the Hamburger Hamiltonian with lengths l_n and angles ϕ_n satisfies (30.1).

- (ii) Assume that $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and let ϕ be the inverse function of $\frac{r}{\tilde{r}(r)}$. Then the Hamiltonian $H(t) := \xi_{\phi(t)} \xi_{\phi(t)}^T$, defined on some interval $(0, b)$, satisfies (30.1).
-

▷▷ **Remarks** ◁◁

* Theorem 30.1 is taken from [BW06, Theorem 3.1, Remark 3.2(iii)]. Alternative approaches could proceed via [BP95, Theorem 5.6] or (at least for small growth) via [RS20a, §5]. Item (i) of Theorem 30.2 is obtained from Proposition 23.6, item (ii) is from [LRW24, Theorem 6.13].

* We stated two situations in Theorem 30.2 that are perfectly simple and explicit. There are also other cases of functions \mathbf{g} for which explicit constructions are possible. For example in [LRW24, Theorem 6.13] also some \mathbf{g} with $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} = \frac{1}{2}$ are treated. A full (constructive) solution of the problem is not known.

* The assumption in Theorem 30.2 that \mathbf{g} is smoothly varying and increasing is no loss in generality since $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} > 0$, cf. Theorem D.7.

APPENDIX

Auxiliary notions

In this short appendix we collect some auxiliary notions and results that are used in the core Parts I-V, but might not be common knowledge to all readers. We include: regular variation in the sense of J. Karamata, entire functions of Cartwright class, and J -inner matrix functions.

Table of contents

§D. Regularly varying functions	94
§E. Entire functions of Cartwright class	97
§F. J -inner matrix functions	100

D Regularly varying functions

In complex analysis the growth of the maximum modulus $\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|$ of an entire function F is compared to functions of the form $\exp(\mathfrak{g}(r))$. The most classical comparison functions are powers $\mathfrak{g}(r) = r^\rho$, and this leads to the notions of order and type. Let us recall that for an entire function F one defines the *order* of F as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(F) &:= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\log r} \\ &= \inf \{ \rho > 0 \mid \exists c, c' > 0 \forall z \in \mathbb{C}: |F(z)| \leq ce^{c'r^\rho} \} \in [0, \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\rho(F) < \infty$, the *type* of F w.r.t. to its order is

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(F) &:= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{r^{\rho(F)}} \\ &= \inf \{ \tau > 0 \mid \exists c > 0 \forall z \in \mathbb{C}: |F(z)| \leq ce^{\tau r^{\rho(F)}} \} \in [0, \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

A refined comparison scale was introduced already at a very early stage by E. Lindelöf [Lin05] who considered comparison functions behaving for $r \rightarrow \infty$ like

$$\mathfrak{g}(r) := r^\alpha \cdot (\log r)^{\beta_1} \cdot (\log \log r)^{\beta_2} \cdot \dots \cdot \underbrace{(\log \dots \log r)^{\beta_m}}_{m^{\text{th}} \text{ iterate}}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$. We refer to functions of this form as *Lindelöf comparison functions*.

Functions that are nowadays commonly used as comparison functions are regularly varying functions in Karamata sense. An up-to-date standard reference is [BGT89, Chapter 7]; for other levels of generality see [Sen76; Lev80; Rub96], and historically [Kar30; Kar31b; Kar31a].

D.1 Definition. A function $\mathfrak{g}: [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is called *regularly varying* at ∞ with *index* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, if it is measurable and

$$\forall \lambda \in (0, \infty): \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathfrak{g}(\lambda r)}{\mathfrak{g}(r)} = \lambda^\alpha. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We write $\text{Ind } \mathfrak{g}$ for the index of a regularly varying function \mathfrak{g} . A regularly varying function with index 0 is also called *slowly varying*.

Observe that a function of the form (D.1) is regularly varying with index α .

The notion of type admits an immediate generalisation to arbitrary comparison functions.

D.2 Definition. Let \mathfrak{g} be a regularly varying function. For an entire function F we define the *type* of F w.r.t. to the comparison function \mathfrak{g} as

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathfrak{g}}(F) &:= \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\mathfrak{g}(r)} \\ &= \inf \{ \tau > 0 \mid \exists c > 0 \forall z \in \mathbb{C}: |F(z)| \leq ce^{\tau \mathfrak{g}(r)} \} \in [0, \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

We note the particular case that $g(r) = r$: the number $\tau_r(F)$ is called the *exponential type* of the function F .

In the sequel we state a number of fundamental theorems on regularly varying functions. The basis for many of these results are the following two theorems: the *uniform convergence theorem* and the *representation theorem*.

D.3 Theorem. *Assume that g is regularly varying with index α . Then the limit (D.2) is attained uniformly for*

$$\begin{cases} \lambda \in [a, b] \text{ for all } 0 < a < b < \infty & \text{if } \alpha = 0, \\ \lambda \in (0, b] \text{ for all } 0 < b < \infty & \text{if } \alpha > 0, \\ \lambda \in [a, \infty) \text{ for all } 0 < a < \infty & \text{if } \alpha < 0. \end{cases}$$

D.4 Theorem. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. A function $g: [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is regularly varying with index α if and only if it has a representation of the form*

$$g(r) = r^\alpha \cdot c(r) \exp \left(\int_1^r \epsilon(u) \frac{du}{u} \right), \quad r \in [1, \infty),$$

where c, ϵ are measurable, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} c(r) = c \in (0, \infty)$, and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(r) = 0$.

If g is slowly varying (i.e., $\alpha = 0$) and eventually nondecreasing (nonincreasing), then ϵ may be taken eventually nonnegative (nonpositive).

It is a legitimate intuition that regularly varying functions fill in the scale of powers, and that a regularly varying function with index α behaves roughly like the power r^α . The next two results express this intuition very clearly.

The first is a variant of the *Potter bounds*. Here we use the following notation to asymptotically compare two functions. Assume f, g are defined on a ray like $[1, \infty)$ and assume positive values. Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} f \sim g &:\Leftrightarrow \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(r)}{g(r)} = 1, \\ f \ll g &:\Leftrightarrow \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(r)}{g(r)} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

D.5 Theorem. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and let g be regularly varying with $\text{Ind } g = \alpha$.*

- (i) $\forall \epsilon > 0: r^{\alpha-\epsilon} \ll g(r) \ll r^{\alpha+\epsilon}$,
- (ii) $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log g(r)}{\log r} = \alpha$,
- (iii) *For all $\epsilon > 0$ the quotients $\frac{g(r)}{r^{\alpha-\epsilon}}$ and $\frac{r^{\alpha+\epsilon}}{g(r)}$ are \sim to an eventually increasing function.*

The second is *Karamata theorem* about asymptotic integration.

D.6 Theorem. *Let g be regularly varying with index $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- (i) Assume that $\alpha \geq -1$. Then the function $x \mapsto \int_1^x \mathbf{g}(t) dt$ is regularly varying with index $\alpha + 1$, and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \left(x \mathbf{g}(x) / \int_1^x \mathbf{g}(t) dt \right) = \alpha + 1.$$

- (ii) Assume that $\alpha \leq -1$ and $\int_1^\infty \mathbf{g}(t) dt < \infty$. Then the function $x \mapsto \int_x^\infty \mathbf{g}(t) dt$ is regularly varying with index $\alpha + 1$, and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \left(x \mathbf{g}(x) / \int_x^\infty \mathbf{g}(t) dt \right) = -(\alpha + 1).$$

Regularly varying functions \mathbf{g} are used to quantify growth for $r \rightarrow \infty$, and hence the values of $\mathbf{g}(r)$ for small r are irrelevant. This allows to change \mathbf{g} on any finite interval without changing the essence of results, and this freedom can be used to assume that \mathbf{g} has some additional properties. For example any regularly varying function can be smoothened.

D.7 Theorem. *Let \mathbf{g} be regularly varying. Then there exists a function \mathbf{f} which is infinitely differentiable and such that $\mathbf{g} \sim \mathbf{f}$.*

Note that in this theorem \mathbf{f} is automatically regularly varying with the same index as \mathbf{g} .

Let \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f} be regularly varying. We say that \mathbf{f} is an *asymptotic inverse* of \mathbf{g} if

$$(\mathbf{g} \circ \mathbf{f})(x) \sim (\mathbf{f} \circ \mathbf{g})(x) \sim x. \tag{D.3}$$

If an asymptotic inverse exists, it is determined uniquely up to \sim . The following result states that an asymptotic inverse exists provided \mathbf{g} has positive index.

D.8 Theorem. *Let \mathbf{g} be regularly varying with index $\alpha > 0$, and set*

$$\mathbf{g}^-(x) := \sup \{ t \in [1, \infty) \mid \mathbf{g}(t) < x \}.$$

Then \mathbf{g}^- is regularly varying with index $\frac{1}{\alpha}$, and is an asymptotic inverse of \mathbf{g} .

We recall a practical formula for computing asymptotic inverses of functions of a certain form.

D.9 Remark. Let \mathbf{g} be a regularly varying function of the form

$$\mathbf{g}(r) = r^\rho [\mathbf{h}(\log r)]$$

with $\rho > 0$ and \mathbf{h} regularly varying. Then

$$\mathbf{f}(r) := \rho^{-\frac{\text{Ind } \mathbf{h}}{\rho}} \cdot \left[\frac{r}{\mathbf{h}(\log r)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

is an asymptotic inverse of \mathbf{g} .

J. Karamata also established a result that characterises regular variation of the *Stieltjes transform* and gives precise information about its size. We state a formulation taken from [LW24] which includes a boundary case that is often excluded in the literature.

D.10 Theorem. *Let μ be a measure on $[0, \infty)$, which is not the zero measure and satisfies $\int_{[0, \infty)} (1+t)^{-1} d\mu(t) < \infty$, and set*

$$\mathcal{S}[\mu](x) := \int_{[0, \infty)} \frac{d\mu(t)}{t+x}, \quad x > 0.$$

Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (i) *The distribution function $t \mapsto \mu([0, t])$ is regularly varying with index α ;*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{S}[\mu]$ is regularly varying with index $\alpha - 1$.*

If (i) and (ii) hold, then $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and

$$\mathcal{S}[\mu](x) \sim C_\alpha \int_x^\infty \frac{\mu([0, t])}{t^2} dt, \quad x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

with

$$C_\alpha := \begin{cases} \frac{\pi\alpha(1-\alpha)}{\sin(\pi\alpha)} & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\ 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \{0, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

The integral in (D.4) is finite for every $x > 0$.

E Entire functions of Cartwright class

We recall a notion from complex analysis.

E.1 Definition. An entire function F is said to be of *Cartwright class*, if it is of finite exponential type and satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\log^+ |F(x)|}{1+x^2} dx < \infty.$$

The following characterisation of Cartwright class goes back to M.G. Krein [Kre47] (see also [RR94, Theorem 6.17]).

E.2 Theorem. *An entire function is of Cartwright class if and only if both restrictions $f|_{\mathbb{C}^+}$ and $f|_{\mathbb{C}^-}$ can be represented as a quotient of two bounded analytic functions in the respective domain \mathbb{C}^+ or \mathbb{C}^- .*

Functions of Cartwright class have very particular properties when it comes to growth and zero-distribution, see [Koo98] or also [Lev80; Boa54]. We state what is needed in the context of this paper.

E.3 Theorem. Let F be an entire function of Cartwright class that has only real zeroes, and satisfies $F = F^\#$ and $F(0) = 1$. Let τ be the exponential type of F and w_1, w_2, \dots be the zeroes of F listed according to their multiplicities.

(i) The limit $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|w_n| \leq R} \frac{1}{w_n}$ exists, and we have

$$F(z) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{|w_n| \leq R} \left(1 - \frac{z}{w_n}\right).$$

(ii) We have $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(re^{i\vartheta})|) = \tau$, and

$$\forall \vartheta \in (0, \pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi): \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F(re^{i\vartheta})|}{r} = \tau \cdot |\sin \vartheta|.$$

Along the real axis we have $\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F(\pm r)|}{r} = 0$.

(iii) Denote $n_F^+(r) := \#\{n \mid w_n \in (0, r)\}$ and $n_F^-(r) := \#\{n \mid w_n \in (-r, 0)\}$. Then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_F^+(r)}{r} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_F^-(r)}{r} = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \tau.$$

(iv) Denote $n_F(r) := \#\{n \mid w_n \in (-r, r)\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \forall r > 0: \log |F(ir)| &= \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t+r^2} \cdot \frac{n_F(\sqrt{t})}{t} dt & (E.1) \\ \forall z \in \mathbb{C}: \log |F(z)| &\leq \int_0^{|z|} \frac{n_F(t)}{t} dt + |z| \int_{|z|}^\infty \frac{n_F(t)}{t^2} dt \end{aligned}$$

The second relation yields a meaningful result only if $\int_0^\infty \frac{n_F(t)}{t^2} dt < \infty$.

We note that the relation (E.1) implies that

$$\forall r > 0: n_F(r) \leq \frac{2}{\log 2} \cdot \log |F(ir)|.$$

Applying Karamata's theorems to evaluate the asymptotic behaviour of Stieltjes transform and integrals leads to the following result (see [LRW24, Remark 4.16 and Lemma 4.18]). It says that the growth of $F(z)$ is governed by its behaviour along the imaginary axis.

E.4 Corollary. Let F be as in Theorem E.3, and let \mathbf{g} be regularly varying with $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{g}(r) = \infty$.

(i) Assume that $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \text{Ind } \mathbf{g}) \text{Ind } \mathbf{g} \cdot \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} \\ \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_F(r)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} \leq \frac{2}{\log 2} \cdot \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F(ir)|}{\mathbf{g}(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Assume that $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)| \right) / \int_1^r \mathbf{g}(t) \frac{dt}{t} \right) \\ \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_F(r)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} \leq \frac{2}{\log 2} \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F(ir)|}{\mathbf{g}(r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.2})$$

(iii) Assume that $\text{Ind } \mathbf{g} = 1$ and $\int_1^\infty \frac{\mathbf{g}(t)}{t^2} dt < \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\log \left(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)| \right) / r \int_r^\infty \frac{\mathbf{g}(t)}{t} \frac{dt}{t} \right) \\ \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_F(r)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} \leq \frac{2}{\log 2} \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |F(ir)|}{\mathbf{g}(r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.3})$$

In (E.2) only one inequality gives a meaningful result: if the left-hand side is positive, the right-hand side is infinite, and if the right-hand side is finite the left-hand side is zero. This follows from a general fact about entire functions of order zero, cf. [BP07, Appendix]:

E.5 Theorem. Let \mathbf{g} be slowly varying with $\log r = o(\mathbf{g}(r))$, and let F be an entire function with

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} < \infty.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\mathbf{g}(r)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\min_{|z|=r} |F(z)|)}{\mathbf{g}(r)}.$$

To illustrate the size of the gap between the comparison functions on the left-hand and right-hand sides of (E.2) and (E.3), we consider Lindelöf comparison functions. In this example all integrals can be computed explicitly.

E.6 Example. Let \mathbf{g} be defined (for sufficiently large r) as

$$\mathbf{g}(r) = r^\delta \prod_{k=1}^N (\log^{[k]} r)^{\beta_k},$$

where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\beta_1 > 0$ if $\delta = 0$ while $\beta_n < -1$ if $\delta = 1$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \int_1^r \mathbf{g}(t) \frac{dt}{t} \asymp \mathbf{g}(r) \cdot \log r & \text{if } \delta = 0, \\ r \int_r^\infty \frac{\mathbf{g}(t)}{t} \frac{dt}{t} \asymp \mathbf{g}(r) \cdot \log r & \text{if } \delta = 1. \end{cases}$$

F J -inner matrix functions

In this section we discuss monodromy matrices as stand-alone objects from the function-theoretic viewpoint. Recall the notation

$$f^\#(z) := \overline{f(\bar{z})}, \quad J := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

F.1 Definition. Let $W: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ be a matrix-valued function, and write $W = (w_{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$. We say that W is J -inner, if

- (i) the entries w_{ij} are entire and $w_{ij}^\# = w_{ij}$,
- (ii) for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ we have

$$\frac{1}{i}(W(z)JW(z)^* - J) \geq 0.$$

Assume that W is J -inner. For $z \in \mathbb{C}^-$ we have $\frac{1}{i}(W(z)JW(z)^* - J) \leq 0$. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then $W(z)JW(z)^* - J = 0$, and since $W(z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ thus $W(z) \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. It also follows that $\det W(z) = 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. In particular, the functions w_{11}, w_{12} have no common zeroes, and the same holds for each of the pairs w_{21}, w_{22} and w_{11}, w_{21} and w_{12}, w_{22} .

F.2 Theorem. Let W be a J -inner matrix function.

- (i) Each of the quotients

$$\frac{w_{11}}{w_{21}}, \frac{w_{12}}{w_{22}}, \frac{w_{12}}{w_{11}}, \frac{w_{22}}{w_{21}}, \tag{F.1}$$

is a Nevanlinna function (cf. Definition A.10).

- (ii) Each entry w_{ij} , $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, belongs to the Cartwright class.

Item (i) follows by elementary manipulations exploiting positivity of $\frac{1}{i}(W(z)JW(z)^* - J)$. Item (ii) is a deeper result due to M.G. Krein in [Kre51b, Teorema 2]. For us this is an important fact, since it makes available the function theoretic machinery from Section E.

We note that a J -inner matrix function gives rise to a whole family of Nevanlinna functions, not only those in (F.1).

In the next proposition we give some properties of meromorphic functions of Nevanlinna class \mathcal{N}_0 .

F.3 Proposition. Let A, B be entire functions with $A = A^\#, B = B^\#$, that have no common zeroes, and assume that $\frac{B}{A}$ is a Nevanlinna function.

- (i) Each of the functions A, B has only real and simple zeroes, and the zeroes of A and B interlace.

(ii) Let $\ell: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a function with $\log r = o(\ell(r))$. Then

$$\forall \vartheta \in (0, \pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi): \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |A(re^{i\vartheta})|}{\ell(r)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |B(re^{i\vartheta})|}{\ell(r)}.$$

If ℓ is regularly varying this also holds for $\vartheta \in \{0, \pi\}$. If $\ell(r) \sim \sup_{|s-r| \leq 1} \ell(s)$, then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |A(z)|)}{\ell(r)} = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\max_{|z|=r} |B(z)|)}{\ell(r)}.$$

Item (i) can be found, e.g., in [Lev80, Theorem VII.1]. Item (ii) follows from the proof of [BW06, Proposition 2.3], and by continuity in ϑ for the case $\vartheta \in \{0, \pi\}$, cf. [Lev80, §16].

Let us make one corollary explicit.

F.4 Corollary. *Let W be a J -inner matrix function. Then all entries of W have the same order and type.*

List of notation

A_H , 14	$h_2(t)$, 30
$H_d(t)$, 23, 26	$h_3(t)$, 30
J , 8	$n_H(r)$, 27, 30
$K_H(t; r)$, 31	$n_{\bar{f}}(r)$, 58
$L^2(H)$, 13	q_H , 11
R_H , 22	$w_{H,ij}(t, z)$, 8
$T_{\max}(H)$, 13	$w_{H,ij}(z)$, 10
$T_{\min}(H)$, 13	
V_H , 18	
$W_H(t, z)$, 8	
$W_H(z)$, 10	
$\Delta(H)$, 19	
$\Delta(z)$, 47	
$\Omega_H(s, t)$, 30, 39, 44	
$\Omega_{t,z}$, 10	
\asymp , 31	
\mathbb{C}^+ , 9	
$\mathbb{H}_{a,b}$, 8	
$\kappa_H(r)$, 39	
\lesssim , 31	
\ll , 95	
\mathcal{C} , 24	
\mathcal{M}_0 , 11	
\mathcal{N}_0 , 12	
$\mathfrak{L}^2(H)$, 13	
\mathfrak{S}_∞ , 25	
\mathfrak{S}_p , 25	
$\mathfrak{t}(t)$, 9	
$\mathfrak{C}(t)$, 67	
$\mathfrak{D}(t)$, 67, 69	
\mathfrak{J} , 15	
$\mathfrak{h}(r)$, 68, 70, 79	
$\mathfrak{k}(r)$, 68, 69, 78	
$\omega_{H,j}(s, t)$, 30	
\mathbb{C}^\mp , 10	
$\rho(F)$, 94	
$\sigma(H)$, 14	
$\sigma_j^{(r)}$, 39, 45	
\sim , 95	
$\tau(F)$, 94	
$\tau_q(F)$, 94	
ξ_ϕ , 9	
$b_n^{(k)}$, 60	
$f^\#$, 100	
$h_1(t)$, 30	

Subject index

- H*-polynomial, 19
- J*-inner, 100
- m*-function, 12
- s*-number, 25

- approximation number, 25
- asymptotic inverse, 96

- Calkin correspondence, 24
- canonical system, 8
- Carleman's condition, 52, 55, 66
- Cartwright class, 97
- compatible function, 31
- compatible pair, 31
- convergence class, 21, 32
 - w.r.t. order, 28, 33
- convergence exponent, 25
- critical triangle, 76

- definite, 9
- Dennis–Wall condition, 52
- diagonal dominance, 26
- discreteness criterion, 22

- exponential type, 95

- finite/minimal type, 21
- fundamental solution, 8

- Hölder continuous, 72, 75
- Hamiltonian, 8
 - definite, 9
 - diagonal, 87
 - Hamburger, 15
 - angles, 15
 - lengths, 15
 - limit circle, 10
 - limit point, 10
 - Pontryagin type, 19
 - trace-normalised, 9
- Herglotz function, 12

- independence theorem, 22, 26
- indivisible interval, 9
 - type, 9

- Jacobi
 - matrix, 15
 - operator, 17
 - parameters, 16

- Karamata theorem
 - asymptotic integration, 95
 - Stieltjes transform, 97
- Krein–de Branges formula, 27, 38

- limit circle case, 10
- limit point case, 10
- Lindelöf comparison function, 35, 94
- Livšic function, 51
- Lorentz ideal, 28

- Matsaev property, 25
- modulus of continuity, 72
- moment problem, 16
 - determinate, 16
 - indeterminate, 16
- monodromy matrix, 10

- Nevanlinna class, 12
- Nevanlinna function, 12
- Nevanlinna matrix, 16

- operator model
 - maximal relation, 13
 - minimal relation, 13
 - model operator, 14
 - model space, 12
- order, 94
- Orlicz space, 28
- orthogonal polynomials
 - second kind, 17
- orthonormal polynomials, 16

- Pontryagin type, 19
- positive sequence, 15
- principal spectral measure, 89
- principal Titchmarsh–Weyl coefficient, 89

- regular variation, 94
 - asymptotic integration, 95
 - asymptotic inverse, 96

- index, 94
- Potter bounds, 95
- representation theorem, 95
- Stieltjes transform, 97
- uniform convergence theorem, 95
- reparameterisation, 8
- s.n.-ideal, 25
- Schatten-von Neumann ideal, 25
- slow variation, 94
- Stieltjes class, 89
- Stieltjes transform, 97
- string, 89
 - length, 89
 - mass-function, 89
- string equation, 89
- structure Hamiltonian, 24
- symmetrically normed ideal, 25
- Theorem
 - J -inner matrix functions, 100
 - algorithmic bounds, 40
 - Berezanskii, 55
 - Berezanskii-type, 66
 - Bochkov, 83
 - Cartwright class
 - characterisation, 97
 - growth and zeroes, 98
 - characterisation of Pontryagin type, 20
 - chirp function, 74
 - comparing two Hamiltonians, 84
 - convergence class
 - dense spectrum, 28
 - sparse spectrum, 32
 - cutting out pieces, 85
 - diagonal dominance, 26
 - direct and inverse spectral theorem
 - limit circle case, 11
 - limit point case, 12
 - discreteness criterion, 22
 - essential spectrum, 22
 - finite/minimal type
 - dense spectrum, 28
 - sparse spectrum, 33
 - formula for n_H (slow growth), 31
 - growth of order zero, 99
 - Hamburger Hamiltonian
 - monotone angles, 70
 - regular variation, 67, 69
 - independence theorem, 23, 26
 - Jacobi matrices vs. Hamburger Hamiltonians, 17
 - Jacobi parameters with power asymptotics, 57
 - Krein-de Branges formula
 - limit circle, 38
 - Pontryagin type, 38
 - moment sequence vs. Jacobi parameters, 16
 - monodromy matrix
 - continuous angle, 72
 - inverse result on growth, 91
 - lower bound (Hamburger Hamiltonian), 60, 69, 70
 - prescribed growth, 91
 - upper bound (Hamburger Hamiltonian), 62, 64, 67
 - Nevanlinna matrix
 - Berg-Szwarc, 47
 - Livšic, 50
 - lower bound, 48, 52
 - Nevanlinna matrix vs. monodromy matrix, 18
 - Nevanlinna parameterisation, 16
 - regular variation
 - asymptotic integration, 95
 - asymptotic inversion, 96
 - Potter bounds, 95
 - representation theorem, 95
 - smooth variation, 96
 - Stieltjes transform, 97
 - uniform convergence, 95
 - Romanov's Theorem I (improved version), 42
 - Romanov's Theorem I (partition only), 43
 - Romanov's Theorem II (general version), 44
 - spectral properties of A_H , 14
 - string vs. Hamiltonian, 90
- three-term recurrence, 16
- Titchmarsh-Weyl coefficient, 12
- trace class ideal, 26
- trace class resolvents, 33

trace-normalised, 9
type
 w.r.t. comparison function, 94
 w.r.t. order, 34, 94
Weyl coefficient, 11
Weyl disk, 10

References

- [Akh65] N.I. Akhiezer, *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis*, Translated by N. Kemmer, Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1965.
- [Ale+02] A.B. Aleksandrov, S. Janson, V.V. Peller, and R. Rochberg, “An interesting class of operators with unusual Schatten-von Neumann behavior”, in: *Function spaces, interpolation theory and related topics (Lund, 2000)*, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2002, pp. 61–149.
- [Atk64] F.V. Atkinson, *Discrete and continuous boundary problems*, Mathematics in Science and Engineering, Vol. 8, New York: Academic Press, 1964.
- [BW06] A.D. Baranov and H. Woracek, “Subspaces of de Branges spaces with prescribed growth”, *Algebra i Analiz* 18.5 (2006), pp. 23–45.
- [BHS20] J. Behrndt, S. Hassi, and H. de Snoo, *Boundary value problems, Weyl functions, and differential operators*, Monographs in Mathematics 108, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2020.
- [Ber56] Yu.M. Berezanskii, “Expansion according to eigenfunction of a partial difference equation of order two”, *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč.* 5 (1956), pp. 203–268.
- [BD95] C. Berg and A.J. Duran, “The index of determinacy for measures and the l^2 -norm of orthonormal polynomials”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 347.8 (1995), pp. 2795–2811.
- [BP95] C. Berg and H.L. Pedersen, “Nevanlinna matrices of entire functions”, *Math. Nachr.* 171 (1995), pp. 29–52.
- [BP07] C. Berg and H.L. Pedersen, “Logarithmic order and type of indeterminate moment problems”, in: *Difference equations, special functions and orthogonal polynomials*, With an appendix by Walter Hayman, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2007, pp. 51–79.
- [BS14] C. Berg and R. Szwarc, “On the order of indeterminate moment problems”, *Adv. Math.* 250 (2014), pp. 105–143.
- [BS17] C. Berg and R. Szwarc, “Symmetric moment problems and a conjecture of Valent”, *Mat. Sb.* 208.3 (2017), pp. 28–53.
- [BGT89] N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, and J.L. Teugels, *Regular variation*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 27, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [Boa54] R.P. Boas Jr., *Entire functions*, New York: Academic Press Inc., 1954.
- [Boc21] I. Bochkov, “Polynomial birth-death processes and the 2nd conjecture of Valent”, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 20 (2021), pp. 15555–15573.
- [Bra61] L. de Branges, “Some Hilbert spaces of entire functions. II”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 99 (1961), pp. 118–152.
- [Bra68] L. de Branges, *Hilbert spaces of entire functions*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.

- [Cal41] J.W. Calkin, “Two-Sided Ideals and Congruences in the Ring of Bounded Operators in Hilbert Space”, *Annals of Mathematics* 42.4 (1941), pp. 839–873.
- [Car26] T. Carleman, *Les fonctions quasi analytiques. Leçons professées au Collège de France*. French, Collection de monographies sur la théorie des fonctions. Paris: Gauthier-Villars. 115 p. (1926). 1926.
- [DM76] H. Dym and H.P. McKean, *Gaussian processes, function theory, and the inverse spectral problem*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Vol. 31, New York: Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], 1976.
- [Gar67] D.J.H. Garling, “On ideals of operators in Hilbert space”, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* 17 (1967), pp. 115–138.
- [GK69] I.C. Gohberg and M.G. Krein, *Introduction to the theory of linear nonselfadjoint operators*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 18, Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1969.
- [GK70] I.C. Gohberg and M.G. Krein, *Theory and applications of Volterra operators in Hilbert space*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 24, Translated from the Russian by A. Feinstein, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1970.
- [HSW00] S. Hassi, H. de Snoo, and H. Winkler, “Boundary-value problems for two-dimensional canonical systems”, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 36.4 (2000), pp. 445–479.
- [JM07] J. Janas and M. Malejki, “Alternative approaches to asymptotic behaviour of eigenvalues of some unbounded Jacobi matrices”, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 200.1 (2007), pp. 342–356.
- [Kac59] I.S. Kac, “Density of the spectrum of a string”, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 126 (1959), pp. 1180–1182.
- [Kac62] I.S. Kac, “On the genus of the spectrum of a singular string”, Russian, *Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika* 1962.1 (26) (1962), pp. 57–64.
- [Kac73] I.S. Kac, “Spectral density of the string”, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 211 (1973), pp. 520–523.
- [Kac78] I.S. Kac, “Some general theorems on the density of the spectrum of a string”, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 238.4 (1978), pp. 785–788.
- [Kac83] I.S. Kac, “Linear relations generated by canonical differential equations”, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 17.4 (1983), pp. 86–87.
- [Kac85] I.S. Kac, “Linear relations, generated by a canonical differential equation on an interval with a regular endpoint, and expansibility in eigenfunctions”, Russian, *VINITI Deponirovannye Nauchnye Raboty* 195.1 (1985), Deposited in Ukr NIINTI, No. 1453, 1984, 50 pp., b.o. 720.
- [Kac86] I.S. Kac, “Integral estimates for the distribution of the spectrum of a string”, *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* 27.2 (1986), pp. 62–74, 221.

- [Kac90] I.S. Kac, “Tightness of the spectrum of a singular string”, *Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mat.* 3 (1990), pp. 23–30.
- [Kac94] I.S. Kac, “The spectral theory of a string”, *Ukrain. Mat. Zh.* 46.3 (1994), pp. 155–176.
- [Kac95] I.S. Kac, “A criterion for the discreteness of a singular canonical system”, Russian, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 29.3 (1995), English translation: *Funct. Anal. Appl.* 29 (1995), no. 3, 207–210 (1996), pp. 75–78.
- [Kac99] I.S. Kac, “Inclusion of the Hamburger power moment problem in the spectral theory of canonical systems”, Russian, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* 262.Issled. po Linein. Oper. i Teor. Funkts. 27 (1999), English translation: *J. Math. Sci. (New York)* 110 (2002), no. 5, 2991–3004, pp. 147–171, 234.
- [Kac07] I.S. Kac, “On the nature of the de Branges Hamiltonian”, Russian, *Ukrain. Mat. Zh.* 59.5 (2007), English translation: *Ukrainian Math. J.* 59 (2007), no. 5, 718–743, pp. 658–678.
- [KK58] I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein, “Criteria for the discreteness of the spectrum of a singular string”, *Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Matematika* 1958.2 (3) (1958), pp. 136–153.
- [KK68a] I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein, “ R -functions — Analytic functions mapping the upper half plane into itself”, Russian, in: *Addition I* in F.V. Atkinson, *Дискретные и непрерывные граничные задачи* (Russian translation). English translation: *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2)* 103 (1974), 1–19, Izdat. “Mir”, Moscow, 1968, pp. 629–647.
- [KK68b] I.S. Kac and M.G. Krein, “On spectral functions of a string”, Russian, in: *Addition II* in F.V. Atkinson, *Дискретные и непрерывные граничные задачи* (Russian translation). English translation: *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2)* 103 (1974), 19–102, Izdat. “Mir”, Moscow, 1968, pp. 648–737.
- [KWW06a] M. Kaltenböck, H. Winkler, and H. Woracek, “De Branges spaces of entire functions symmetric about the origin”, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 56.4 (2006), pp. 483–509.
- [KWW06b] M. Kaltenböck, H. Winkler, and H. Woracek, “Generalized Nevanlinna functions with essentially positive spectrum”, *J. Operator Theory* 55.1 (2006), pp. 17–48.
- [KWW06c] M. Kaltenböck, H. Winkler, and H. Woracek, “Singularities of generalized strings”, in: *Operator theory and indefinite inner product spaces*, vol. 163, *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.* Basel: Birkhäuser, 2006, pp. 191–248.
- [KWW07] M. Kaltenböck, H. Winkler, and H. Woracek, “Strings, dual strings, and related canonical systems”, *Math. Nachr.* 280.13-14 (2007), pp. 1518–1536.
- [KW06] M. Kaltenböck and H. Woracek, “Pontryagin spaces of entire functions. IV”, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* 72.3-4 (2006), pp. 709–835.

- [KW07] M. Kaltenböck and H. Woracek, “Canonical differential equations of Hilbert-Schmidt type”, in: *Operator theory in inner product spaces*, vol. 175, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2007, pp. 159–168.
- [KS08] N.J. Kalton and F.A. Sukochev, “Symmetric norms and spaces of operators”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 621 (2008), pp. 81–121.
- [Kar30] J. Karamata, “Sur un mode de croissance régulière des fonctions.”, French, *Mathematica, Cluj* 4 (1930), pp. 38–53.
- [Kar31a] J. Karamata, “Neuer Beweis und Verallgemeinerung der Tauberschen Sätze, welche die Laplacesche und Stieltjessche Transformation betreffen”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 164 (1931), pp. 27–39.
- [Kar31b] J. Karamata, “Neuer Beweis und Verallgemeinerung einiger Tauberian-Sätze”, *Math. Z.* 33.1 (1931), pp. 294–299.
- [Koo98] P. Koosis, *The logarithmic integral. I*, vol. 12, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Corrected reprint of the 1988 original, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [Kre47] M.G. Krein, “A contribution to the theory of entire functions of exponential type”, *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR* 11 (1947), pp. 309–326.
- [Kre51a] M.G. Krein, “Determination of the density of a nonhomogeneous symmetric cord by its frequency spectrum”, *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* 76 (1951), pp. 345–348.
- [Kre51b] M.G. Krein, “On the theory of entire matrix functions of exponential type”, *Ukrain. Mat. Zhurnal* 3 (1951), English translation in Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 95 (1997), 361–371, pp. 164–173.
- [Kre52] M.G. Krein, “On a generalization of investigations of Stieltjes”, *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* 87 (1952), pp. 881–884.
- [KL79] M.G. Krein and H. Langer, “On some extension problems which are closely connected with the theory of Hermitian operators in a space Π_κ . III. Indefinite analogues of the Hamburger and Stieltjes moment problems. Part 1”, *Beiträge Anal.* 14 (1979), pp. 25–40.
- [KL81] M.G. Krein and H. Langer, “On some extension problems which are closely connected with the theory of Hermitian operators in a space Π_κ . III. Indefinite analogues of the Hamburger and Stieltjes moment problems. Part 2”, *Beiträge Anal.* 15 (1981), pp. 27–45.
- [LPW24] M. Langer, R. Pruckner, and H. Woracek, “Estimates for the Weyl coefficient of a two-dimensional canonical system”, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* 25 (2024), pp. 2259–2330.
- [LRW24] M. Langer, J. Reiffenstein, and H. Woracek, *Eigenvalue distribution of canonical systems: trace class and sparse spectrum*, Dec. 28, 2024, arXiv: [2412.20124v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.20124v1).
- [LW02] M. Langer and H. Woracek, “A characterization of intermediate Weyl coefficients”, *Monatsh. Math.* 135.2 (2002), pp. 137–155.

- [LW13a] M. Langer and H. Woracek, “Indefinite Hamiltonian systems whose Titchmarsh-Weyl coefficients have no finite generalized poles of non-positive type”, *Oper. Matrices* 7.3 (2013), pp. 477–555.
- [LW13b] M. Langer and H. Woracek, “The exponential type of the fundamental solution of an indefinite Hamiltonian system”, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory* 7.1 (2013), pp. 285–312.
- [LW24] M. Langer and H. Woracek, “Karamata’s theorem for regularised Cauchy transforms”, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* (2024), DOI:10.1017/prm.2023.128, 61p.
- [Lev80] B.Ja. Levin, *Distribution of zeros of entire functions*, Revised, Translations of Mathematical Monographs 5, Translated from the Russian by R. P. Boas, J. M. Danskin, F. M. Goodspeed, J. Korevaar, A. L. Shields and H. P. Thielman, Providence, R.I.: American Mathematical Society, 1980.
- [Lin05] E. Lindelöf, “Sur les fonctions entières d’ordre entier.”, French, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (3)* 22 (1905), pp. 369–395.
- [Liv39] M.S. Livšic, “On some questions concerning the determinate case of Hamburger’s moment problem”, Russian. English summary, *Rec. Math. N. S. [Mat. Sbornik]* 6(48) (1939), pp. 293–306.
- [Mat61] V.I. Matsaev, “Volterra operators obtained from self-adjoint operators by perturbation”, Russian, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 139 (1961), pp. 810–813.
- [Orc69] B.C. Orcutt, “Canonical differential equations”, PhD thesis, University of Virginia, 1969.
- [Pru20] R. Pruckner, “Density of the spectrum of Jacobi matrices with power asymptotics”, *Asymptot. Anal.* 117.3-4 (2020), pp. 199–213.
- [PRW23] R. Pruckner, J. Reiffenstein, and H. Woracek, *An upper bound for the Nevanlinna matrix of an indeterminate moment sequence*, July 20, 2023, arXiv: [2307.10748v1](#).
- [PRW17] R. Pruckner, R. Romanov, and H. Woracek, “Bounds on order of indeterminate moment sequences”, *Constr. Approx.* 46 (2017), pp. 199–225.
- [PW19] R. Pruckner and H. Woracek, “Estimates for the order of Nevanlinna matrices and a Berezanskii-type theorem”, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 149.6 (2019), pp. 1637–1661.
- [PW22] R. Pruckner and H. Woracek, “A growth estimate for the monodromy matrix of a canonical system”, *J. Spectr. Theory* 12.4 (2022), pp. 1623–1657.
- [Rei23] J. Reiffenstein, “A quantitative formula for the imaginary part of a Weyl coefficient”, *J. Spectr. Theory* 13.2 (2023), pp. 555–591.
- [Rei25a] J. Reiffenstein, *Growth estimates for Nevanlinna matrices of order larger than one half*, Jan. 20, 2025, arXiv: [2501.11400v1](#).
- [Rei25b] J. Reiffenstein, *Nevanlinna matrix estimates without regularity conditions*, Mar. 25, 2025, arXiv: [2503.19563v1](#).

- [Rei] J. Reiffenstein, “A Krein-de Branges type formula for determinant zero canonical systems”, work in progress.
- [Rem18] C. Remling, *Spectral Theory of Canonical Systems*, De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics Series, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2018.
- [RS20a] C. Remling and K. Scarbrough, “Oscillation theory and semi-bounded canonical systems”, *J. Spectr. Theory* 10.4 (2020), pp. 1333–1359.
- [RS20b] C. Remling and K. Scarbrough, “The essential spectrum of canonical systems”, *J. Approx. Theory* 254 (2020), pp. 105395, 11.
- [Rie23] M. Riesz, “Sur le problème des moments. III.”, French, *Ark. Mat. Astron. Fys.* 17.16 (1923), p. 52.
- [Rom14] R. Romanov, *Canonical systems and de Branges spaces*, version 1, Aug. 26, 2014, arXiv: [1408.6022v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.6022v1) [math.SP].
- [Rom17] R. Romanov, “Order problem for canonical systems and a conjecture of Valent”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369.2 (2017), pp. 1061–1078.
- [RW20] R. Romanov and H. Woracek, “Canonical systems with discrete spectrum”, *J. Funct. Anal.* 278.4 (2020), 108318, 44 pp.
- [RR94] M. Rosenblum and J. Rovnyak, *Topics in Hardy classes and univalent functions*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks], Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1994.
- [Rub96] L.A. Rubel, *Entire and meromorphic functions*, Universitext, With the assistance of James E. Colliander, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [Rus79] G.I. Russu, “Volterra operators with imaginary components from a symmetrically-normed ideal”, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 13.4 (1979), pp. 87–88.
- [Rus80] G.I. Russu, “Volterra operators with imaginary components from a given symmetrically normed ideal”, Russian, *Mat. Issled.* 54 (1980), Linear operators, pp. 141–151, 168.
- [Sch17] K. Schmüdgen, *The moment problem*, vol. 277, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [Sen76] E. Seneta, *Regularly varying functions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 508, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.
- [ST43] J. A. Shohat and J. D. Tamarkin, *The Problem of Moments*, American Mathematical Society Mathematical surveys, vol. I, New York: American Mathematical Society, 1943.
- [Sim05] B. Simon, *Trace ideals and their applications*, Second, vol. 120, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [STZ19] F. Sukochev, K. Tulenov, and D. Zanin, “The optimal range of the Calderón operator and its applications”, *J. Funct. Anal.* 277.10 (2019), pp. 3513–3559.

- [Tit46] E.C. Titchmarsh, *Eigenfunction Expansions Associated with Second-Order Differential Equations*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1946.
- [Val99] G. Valent, “Indeterminate moment problems and a conjecture on the growth of the entire functions in the Nevanlinna parametrization”, in: *Applications and computation of orthogonal polynomials (Oberwolfach, 1998)*, vol. 131, Internat. Ser. Numer. Math. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1999, pp. 227–237.
- [Wey10] H. Weyl, “Über gewöhnliche Differentialgleichungen mit Singularitäten und die zugehörigen Entwicklungen willkürlicher Funktionen”, German, *Math. Ann.* 68.2 (1910), pp. 220–269.
- [Win95] H. Winkler, “The inverse spectral problem for canonical systems”, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 22.3 (1995), pp. 360–374.
- [WW13] H. Winkler and H. Woracek, “Symmetry in de Branges almost Pontryagin spaces”, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 76.2 (2013), pp. 179–212.
- [WW14] H. Winkler and H. Woracek, “A growth condition for Hamiltonian systems related with Krein strings”, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* 80.1-2 (2014), pp. 31–94.
- [WW] H. Winkler and H. Woracek, “Symmetry in some classes related with canonical systems”, unpublished manuscript.
- [Wor11] H. Woracek, “Existence of zero-free functions N -associated to a de Branges Pontryagin space”, *Monatsh. Math.* 162.4 (2011), pp. 453–506.
- [Wor15a] H. Woracek, “Asymptotics of eigenvalues for a class of singular Krein strings”, *Collect. Math.* 66.3 (2015), pp. 469–479.
- [Wor15b] H. Woracek, “De Branges spaces and growth aspects.”, English, in: *Operator theory. With 51 figures and 2 tables. In 2 volumes*, Basel: Springer, 2015, pp. 489–523.
- [Yaf20] D.R. Yafaev, “Asymptotic behavior of orthogonal polynomials without the Carleman condition”, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 279.7 (2020), p. 108648.

J. Reiffenstein
 Department of Mathematics
 Stockholms universitet
 106 91 Stockholm
 SWEDEN
 email: jakob.reiffenstein@math.su.se

H. Woracek
 Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing
 Vienna University of Technology
 Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10/101
 1040 Wien
 AUSTRIA
 email: harald.woracek@tuwien.ac.at