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Abstract. There is a vast theory of the asymptotic behavior of orthogonal polynomials with respect to a measure on \( \mathbb{R} \) and its applications to Jacobi matrices. That theory has an obvious affine invariance and a very special role for \( \infty \). We extend aspects of this theory in the setting of rational functions with poles on \( \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{ \infty \} \), obtaining a formulation which allows multiple poles and proving an invariance with respect to \( \mathbb{R} \)-preserving Möbius transformations. We obtain a characterization of Stahl–Totik regularity of a GMP matrix in terms of its matrix elements; as an application, we provide an alternative proof of a theorem about a Cesàro–Nevai property of regular Jacobi matrices on finite gap sets.

1. Introduction

There is a vast theory of orthogonal polynomials with respect to measures on \( \mathbb{C} \) and their root asymptotics, exemplified by the Ullman–Stahl–Totik theory of regularity. Let \( \mu \) be a compactly supported probability measure and \( \{ p_n \}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) the corresponding orthonormal polynomials, obtained by the Gram–Schmidt process from \( \{ z^n \}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) in \( L^2(d\mu) \). Then

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} |p_n(z)|^{1/n} \geq e^{G_E(z, \infty)}
\]

for \( z \) outside the convex hull of \( \mu \), where \( E \) is the essential support of \( \mu \) and \( G_E \) denotes the potential theoretic Green function for the domain \( \mathbb{C} \setminus E \); if that domain is not Greenian, one takes \( G_E = +\infty \) instead. For measures compactly supported in \( \mathbb{R} \), this theory can be interpreted in terms of self-adjoint operators. In particular, for any bounded half-line Jacobi matrix

\[
J = \begin{pmatrix}
 b_1 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots \\
 a_1 & b_2 & a_2 & \cdots \\
 & a_2 & \ddots & \cdots \\
 & & & \ddots
\end{pmatrix}
\]

with \( a_\ell > 0, b_\ell \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{n} a_\ell \right)^{1/n} \leq \text{Cap} \sigma_{\text{ess}}(J),
\]

where Cap denotes logarithmic capacity. For both of these universal inequalities, the case of equality (and existence of limit) is called Stahl–Totik regularity \([21]\); the theory originated with the case \( E = [-2, 2] \), first studied by Ullman \([24]\).
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We extend aspects of this theory to the setting of rational functions with poles in \( \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{ \infty \} \). One motivation for this is the search for a more conformally invariant theory. Statements such as \([1.1], [1.2]\) rescale in obvious ways with respect to affine transformations (automorphisms of \( \mathbb{C} \)) which preserve \( \mathbb{R} \), so it is obvious that an affine pushforward of a Stahl–Totik regular measure is Stahl–Totik regular. However, the point \( \infty \) has a very special role throughout the theory: for a Möbius transformation \( f \) which does not preserve \( \infty \), \( p_n \circ f \) are rational functions with a pole at \( f^{-1}(\infty) \), and \( f(J) \) as defined by the functional calculus is not a finite band matrix. Thus, it is a nontrivial question whether a Möbius pushforward of a Stahl–Totik regular measure is Stahl–Totik regular.

The set of Möbius transformations which preserve \( \mathbb{R} \) is the semidirect group product \( \operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \{ \operatorname{id}, z \mapsto -z \} \), whose normal subgroup \( \operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \) corresponds to the orientation preserving case. Denote by \( f_* \mu \) the pushforward of \( \mu \), defined by \( (f_* \mu)(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A)) \) for Borel sets \( A \). As an example of our techniques, we obtain the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( f \in \operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \{ \operatorname{id}, z \mapsto -z \} \). If \( \mu \) is a Stahl–Totik regular measure on \( \mathbb{R} \) and \( \infty \notin \operatorname{supp}(f_* \mu) \), then the pushforward measure \( f_* \mu \) is also Stahl–Totik regular.

However, we will mostly work in the more general setting when multiple poles on \( \mathbb{R} \) are allowed, which arises naturally in the spectral theory of self-adjoint operators. Denote by \( T_{f, d\mu} \) the multiplication operator by \( f \) in \( L^2(d\mu) \). The matrix representation for \( T_{f, d\mu(x)} \) in the basis of orthogonal polynomials is a Jacobi matrix, and through this classical connection, the theory of orthogonal polynomials is inextricably linked to the spectral theory of Jacobi matrices. In this matrix representation, resolvents \( T_{(c-z)^{-1}, d\mu(x)} \) are not finite-diagonal matrices. However, in a basis of orthogonal rational functions with poles at \( c_1, \ldots, c_g, \infty \), the multiplication operators \( T_{(c_1-z)^{-1}, d\mu(x)}, \ldots, T_{(c_g-z)^{-1}, d\mu(x)}, T_{x, d\mu(x)} \) all have precisely \( 2g+1 \) nontrivial diagonals. The corresponding matrix representations are called GMP matrices; they were introduced by Yuditskii \([22]\).

We should also compare this to the case of CMV matrices: for a measure supported on the unit circle, Stahl–Totik regularity is still defined in terms of orthogonal polynomials, but the CMV basis \([2, 18]\) is given in terms of positive and negative powers of \( z \), i.e., orthonormal rational functions with poles at \( \infty \) and \( 0 \). The symmetries in that setting lead to explicit formulas for the CMV basis in terms of the orthogonal polynomials; it is then a matter of calculation to relate the exponential growth rate of the CMV basis to that of the orthogonal polynomials, and to interpret regularity in terms of the CMV basis. In our setting, there is no such symmetry and no formula for orthonormal rational functions in terms of orthonormal polynomials.

In order to state our results in a conformally invariant way, we will use the following notations and conventions throughout the paper. The measure \( \mu \) will be a probability measure on \( \mathbb{R} \). We denote by \( \operatorname{supp} \mu \) its support in \( \mathbb{R} \), and we consider its essential support (the support with isolated points removed), denoted

\[
\mathcal{E} = \operatorname{ess \ supp} \mu.
\]

We will always assume that \( \mu \) is nontrivial; equivalently, \( \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset \).

Fix a finite sequence with no repetitions, \( C = (c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}) \) with \( c_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{supp} \mu \) for all \( k \). Consider the sequence \( \{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) where \( r_0 = 1 \) and for \( n = j(g+1) + k, 1 \leq k \leq g+1 \),

\[
r_n(z) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{z^{j+1}} & c_k \in \mathbb{R} \\
\frac{1}{z^{j+1}} & c_k = \infty
\end{cases}
\]

(1.3)

Applying the Gram–Schmidt process to this sequence in \( L^2(d\mu) \) gives the sequence of orthonormal rational functions \( \{ \tau_n \}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) whose behavior we will study. We note that the special case \( \operatorname{supp} \mu \subset \mathbb{R} \),
$g = 0$, $C = (\infty)$ corresponds to the standard construction of orthonormal polynomials associated to the measure $\mu$ (note that, since we denote by $\text{supp} \mu$ the support in $\mathbb{R}$, the statement $\text{supp} \mu \subset \mathbb{R}$ implies that $\mu$ is compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}$), and our first results are an extension of the same techniques.

The first result is a universal lower bound on the growth of $\{\tau_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ in terms of a potential theoretic quantity. If $E$ is not a polar set, we use the (potential theoretic) Green function for the domain $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$, denoted $G_E$, and we define

$$G_E(z, C) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{g+1} \sum_{k=1}^{g+1} G_E(z, c_k) & E \text{ is not polar} \\ +\infty & E \text{ is polar} \end{cases}$$

(1.4)

**Theorem 1.2.** For all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} |\tau_n(z)|^{1/n} \geq e^{G_E(z, C)}.$$

This is a good place to point out that our current setup is not related to the recent paper [11], in which the behavior was compared to a Martin function at a boundary point of the domain. Here, the behavior is compared to a combination of Green functions (1.4), all the poles are in the interior of the domain $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$, and the difficulty comes instead from the multiple poles.

Another universal inequality for orthonormal polynomials comes from comparing their leading coefficients to the capacity of $E$. In our setting, the analog of the leading coefficient must be considered in a pole-dependent way. Denote

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \text{span}\{r_\ell \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq n\}.$$

By the nature of the Gram–Schmidt process, there is a $\kappa_n > 0$ such that

$$\tau_n - \kappa_n r_n \in \mathcal{L}_{n-1}.$$

The Gram–Schmidt process can be reformulated as the $L^2(d\mu)$-extremal problem

$$\kappa_n = \max \left\{ \text{Re} \kappa : f = \kappa r_n + h, h \in \mathcal{L}_{n-1}, \|f\|_{L^2(d\mu)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$  

(1.5)

By strict convexity of the $L^2$-norm, these $L^2$-extremal problems have unique extremizers given by $f = \tau_n$, and $\kappa_n$ is explicitly characterized as a kind of leading coefficient for $\tau_n$ with respect to the pole at $c_k$ where $n = j(g+1) + k$, $1 \leq k \leq g+1$. Below, we will also relate the constants $\kappa_n$ to off-diagonal coefficients of certain matrix representations.

The growth of the leading coefficients $\kappa_n$ will be studied along sequences $n = j(g+1) + k$ for a fixed $k$, and bounded by quantities related to the pole $c_k$. If $E$ is not a polar set, it is a basic property of the Green function that the limits

$$\gamma^k_E = \begin{cases} \lim_{z \to c_k} (G_E(z, c_k) + \log |z - c_k|), & c_k \neq \infty \\ \lim_{z \to c_k} (G_E(z, c_k) - \log |z|), & c_k = \infty \end{cases}$$

exist. Note that, if $c_k = \infty$, $\gamma^k_E$ is precisely the Robin constant for the set $E$. We further define constants $\lambda_k$ by

$$\log \lambda_k = \begin{cases} \gamma^k_E + \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq g+1} G_E(c_k, c_\ell) & E \text{ is not polar} \\ +\infty & E \text{ is polar} \end{cases}$$

(1.6)

**Theorem 1.3.** For all $1 \leq k \leq g+1$, for the subsequence $n(j) = j(g+1) + k$,

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} \kappa_n^{1/n(j)} \geq \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}.$$

(1.7)
Corollary 1.7. Let the same length. Then

\[ \lim_{j \to \infty} \kappa_{n(j)}^{1/n(j)} = \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}. \]

Thm. 1.4. The following are equivalent:

(i) For some \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), for the subsequence \( n(j) = j(g + 1) + k \),

\[ \lim_{j \to \infty} \kappa_{n(j)}^{1/n(j)} = \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}. \]

(ii) For all \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), for the subsequence \( n(j) = j(g + 1) + k \),

\[ \lim_{j \to \infty} \kappa_{n(j)}^{1/n(j)} = \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}. \]

(iii)

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{g+1} \kappa_{n+\ell} \right)^{1/n} = \left( \prod_{k=1}^{g+1} \lambda_k \right)^{1/(g+1)}. \]

(iv) For q.e. \( z \in \mathbb{E} \), we have \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} |\tau_n(z)|^{1/n} \leq 1 \);

(v) For some \( z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \), \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} |\tau_n(z)|^{1/n} \leq e^{g_E(z, \mathbb{C})} \);

(vi) For all \( z \in \mathbb{C} \), \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} |\tau_n(z)|^{1/n} \leq e^{g_E(z, \mathbb{C})} \);

(vii) Uniformly on compact subsets of \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \), \( \lim_{n \to \infty} |\tau_n(z)|^{1/n} = e^{g_E(z, \mathbb{C})} \).

Definition 1.5. The measure \( \mu \) is \( \mathbb{C} \)-regular if it obeys one (and therefore all) of the assumptions of Thm. 1.4.

In this terminology, Stahl-Totik regularity is precisely \((\infty)\)-regularity, i.e., \( \mathbb{C} \)-regularity for the special case \( \text{supp} \mu \subset \mathbb{R}, \ g = 0, \ \mathbb{C} = (\infty) \). Theorems 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 are closely motivated by foundational results for Stahl-Totik regularity. A new phenomenon appears through the periodicity with which poles are taken in Theorem 1.4 (i) provides control over the entire sequence. This phenomenon doesn’t have an exact analog for orthogonal polynomials, where \( g = 0 \). We will also see below that this is essential in order to characterize the regularity of a GMP matrix using only the entries of the matrix itself and not its resolvents.

Moreover, we show that the regular behavior described by Theorem 1.4 is independent of the set of poles \( \mathbb{C} \):

Theorem 1.6. Let \( \mathbb{C}_1, \mathbb{C}_2 \) be two finite sequences of elements from \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp} \mu \), not necessarily of the same length. Then \( \mu \) is \( \mathbb{C}_1 \)-regular if and only if it is \( \mathbb{C}_2 \)-regular.

Corollary 1.7. Let \( \text{supp} \mu \subset \mathbb{R} \). Let \( \mathbb{C} \) be a finite sequence of elements from \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp} \mu \). Then \( \mu \) is \( \mathbb{C} \)-regular if and only if it is Stahl-Totik regular.

Thus, Theorem 1.4 should not be seen as describing equivalent conditions for a new class of measures, but rather a new set of regular behaviors for the familiar class of Stahl-Totik regular measures.

We consistently work with poles on \( \mathbb{R} \) since our main interest is tied to self-adjoint problems. Some of our results are in a sense complementary to the setting of [21, Section 6.1], where poles are allowed in the complement of the convex hull of \( \text{supp} \mu \), and the behavior of orthogonal rational functions is considered with respect to a Stahl-Totik regular measure. Due to this, it is natural to expect that these results hold more generally, for measures on \( \mathbb{C} \) and general collections of poles and Möbius transformations. Moreover, in our setup the poles are repeated exactly periodically, but we expect this can be generalized to a sequence of poles which has a limiting average distribution. Related questions for orthogonal rational functions were also studied by [2, 8].
As noted in [21, Section 6.1], poles in the gaps of \( \text{supp} \mu \) can cause interpolation defects in the problem of interpolation by rational functions. In our work, these interpolation defects show up as possible reductions in the order of the poles. For example, consider \( \mathbb{C} = (\infty, 0) \). Then, by construction, \( \tau_{2j+1} \) is allowed a pole at 0 of order at most \( j \). However, if \( \mu \) is symmetric with respect to \( z \mapsto -z \), the functions \( \tau_n \) will have an even/odd symmetry. Since \( \tau_{2j+1} \) contains a nontrivial multiple of \( z^{j+1} \), it follows that \( \tau_{2j+1}(z) = (-1)^{j+1} \tau_{2j+1}(-z) \). By this symmetry, the actual order of the pole at 0 is \( j + 1 - k \) for some even \( k \), so it cannot be equal to \( j \) (it will follow from our results that in this case, the order of the pole is \( j - 1 \)). The same effect can be seen for the pole at \( \infty \) for \( \mathbb{C} = (0, \infty) \). In the polynomial case, this does not occur: \( p_n \) always has a pole at \( \infty \) of order exactly \( n \).

We will consider at once the distribution of zeros of \( \tau_n \) and the possible reductions in the order of the poles. We will prove that all zeros of \( \tau_n \) are real and simple, and that \( n - g \leq \deg \tau_n \leq n \).

We define the normalized zero counting measure

\[
\nu_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w : \tau_n(w) = 0} \delta_w.
\]

Although we normalize by \( n \), \( \nu_n \) may not be a probability measure: however \( 1 - g/n \leq \nu_n(\mathbb{R}) \leq 1 \). Therefore, normalizing by \( \deg \tau_n \) instead of by \( n \) would not affect the limits as \( n \to \infty \).

We will now describe the weak limit behavior of the measures \( \nu_n \) as \( n \to \infty \). To avoid pathological cases, we assume that \( \mathbb{E} \) is not polar; in that case, denoting by \( \omega_\mathbb{E}(dx, w) \) the harmonic measure for the domain \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{E} \) at the point \( w \), we define the probability measure on \( \mathbb{E} \),

\[
\rho_{\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{C}} = \frac{1}{g + 1} \sum_{j=1}^{g+1} \omega_\mathbb{E}(dx, c_j).
\]

The results below describe weak limits of measures in the topology dual to \( C(\mathbb{R}) \).

**Theorem 1.8.** Let \( \mu \) be a probability measure on \( \mathbb{R} \). Assume that \( \mathbb{E} \) is not a polar set.

(a) If \( \mu \) is regular, then \( w\text{-lim}_{n \to \infty} \nu_n = \rho_{\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{C}} \).

(b) If \( w\text{-lim}_{n \to \infty} \nu_n = \rho_{\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{C}} \), then \( \mu \) is regular or there exists a polar set \( \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \mu(\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{X}) = 0 \).

We now turn to matrix representations of self-adjoint operators. Fix a sequence \( \mathbb{C} = (c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}) \) such that \( c_k = \infty \) for some \( k \). A half-line GMP matrix \( \mathbb{C} \) is the matrix representation for multiplication by \( x \) in the basis \( \{\tau_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \); its matrix elements are

\[
A_{mn} = \int \overline{\tau_m(x)} \tau_n(x) \, d\mu(x).
\]

The condition that \( c_k = \infty \) for some \( k \) guarantees that \( A_{mn} = 0 \) for \( |m - n| > g + 1 \), so these matrix elements generate a bounded operator \( A \) on \( l^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \) such that \( A_{mn} = (\epsilon_m, A\epsilon_n) \), where \( (\epsilon_n)_{n=0}^\infty \) denotes the standard basis of \( l^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \). We say that \( A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}) \).

GMP matrices have the property that some of their resolvents are also GMP matrices; namely, for any \( \ell \neq k \), \( (c_\ell - A)^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}(f(\mathbb{C})) \) where \( f \) is the Möbius transform \( f : z \mapsto (c_\ell - z)^{-1} \) and \( f(\mathbb{C}) = (f(c_1), \ldots, f(c_{g+1})) \).

Note that the special case \( g = 0 \), \( \mathbb{C} = (\infty) \) gives precisely a Jacobi matrix. A Jacobi matrix is said to be regular if it is obtained by this construction from a regular measure; analogously, we will call a GMP matrix regular if it is obtained from a regular measure. Just as regularity of a Jacobi matrix can be characterized in terms of its off-diagonal entries, we will show that regularity of a
GMP matrix can be characterized in terms of its entries in the outermost nontrivial diagonal. We will also obtain a GMP matrix analog of the inequality (1.2).

The GMP matrix has an additional block matrix structure; in particular, for a GMP matrix with \( c_k = \infty \), on the outermost nonzero diagonal \( m = n - g - 1 \), the only nonzero terms appear for \( n = j(g + 1) + k \), and those are strictly positive. Thus, we denote

\[
\beta_j = \langle e_{j(g+1)+k}, Ac_{j+1)(g+1)+k} \rangle
\]

(1.8)

**Theorem 1.9.** Fix a probability measure \( \mu \) with \( \text{supp} \mu \subset \mathbb{R} \) and a sequence \( C = (c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}) \) with \( c_k = \infty \). Then

\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \beta_{\ell} \right)^{1/j} \leq \lambda_{k}^{-1}.
\]

Moreover, the measure \( \mu \) is Stahl–Totik regular if and only if

\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \beta_{\ell} \right)^{1/j} = \lambda_{k}^{-1}.
\]

(1.10)

The proof will use a relation between the sequence \( \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \) and the constants \( \{\kappa_{j(g+1)+k}\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \), with \( k \) still fixed so that \( c_k = \infty \). In particular, the characterization of regularity in Theorem 1.9 is made possible by the characterization of regularity in terms of the subsequence \( \{\kappa_{j(g+1)+k}\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \) for a single \( k \). Theorem 1.9 also corroborates the perspective that regularity of the measure is the fundamental notion which manifests itself equally well in many different matrix representations.

Since the resolvents \( (c_{\ell} - A)^{-1} \) are also GMP matrices and their measures are pushforwards of the original measure, they are also regular GMP matrices; in this sense, Theorem 1.9 provides \( g + 1 \) criteria for regularity, one corresponding to each subsequence \( n(j) = j(g + 1) + \ell \).

As an application of this theory, we show that it provides an alternative proof of a theorem for Jacobi matrices originally conjectured by Simon [19]. Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R} \) be a compact finite gap set,

\[
E = [b_0, a_0] \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{g} (a_k, b_k),
\]

(1.11)

and denote by \( \mathcal{T}_E^+ \) the set of almost periodic half-line Jacobi matrices with \( \sigma_{ac}(J) = \sigma_{nc}(J) = E \) [4, 12]. Through algebro-geometric techniques and the reflectionless property, this class of Jacobi matrices has been widely studied for their spectral properties and quasiperiodicity. They also provide natural reference points for perturbations, which is our current interest. On bounded half-line Jacobi matrices \( J \), we consider the metric

\[
d(J, \tilde{J}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k}(|a_k - \tilde{a}_k| + |b_k - \tilde{b}_k|).
\]

(1.12)

On norm-bounded sets of Jacobi matrices, convergence in this metric corresponds to strong operator convergence. However, instead of distance to a fixed Jacobi matrix \( \tilde{J} \), we will consider the distance to \( \mathcal{T}_E^+ \),

\[
d(J, \mathcal{T}_E^+) = \inf_{J' \in \mathcal{T}_E^+} d(J, J') = \min_{J' \in \mathcal{T}_E^+} d(J, J').
\]

Denote by \( S_+ \) the right shift operator on \( \ell^2(N_0) \), \( S_+ e_n = e_{n+1} \). The condition \( d((S_+^m)^{\ast} J S_+^m, \mathcal{T}_E^+) \to 0 \) as \( m \to \infty \) is called the Nevai condition. For \( E = [-2, 2] \), this corresponds simply to the commonly considered condition \( a_n \to 1, b_n \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \) [15]. In general, as a consequence of [17], the Nevai condition implies regularity. The converse is false; however:
Theorem 1.10. If \( E \subset \mathbb{R} \) is a compact finite gap set and \( J \) is a regular Jacobi matrix with \( \sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = E \), then
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} d((S^+_E)^m J S^+_E, T^+_E) = 0. \tag{1.13}
\]

The condition (1.13) is described as the Cesàro–Nevai condition; it was first studied by Golinskii–Khrushchev [13] in the OPUC setting with essential spectrum equal to \( \partial D \). Theorem 1.10 was conjectured by Simon [19] and proved in the special case when \( E \) is the spectrum of a periodic Jacobi matrix with all gaps open by using the periodic discriminant and techniques from Damanik–Killip–Simon [6] to reduce to a block Jacobi setting. It was then proved in general by Krüger [14] by very different methods. We show that Simon’s strategy can be developed into a general proof, if instead of the periodic discriminant and techniques from [6] we use the Ahlfors function, GMP matrices, and techniques of Yuditskii [25].

For the compact finite gap set \( E \subset \mathbb{R} \), among all analytic functions \( C \setminus E \to D \) which vanish at \( \infty \), the Ahlfors function \( \Psi \) takes the largest value of \( \Re(z\Psi(z)) \) at \( z = \infty \). The Ahlfors function has precisely one zero in each gap, denoted \( c_k \in (a_k, b_k) \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq g \), a zero at \( c_{g+1} = \infty \), and no other zeros; see also [20, Chapter 8]. In particular, for the finite gap set \( E \), this generates a particularly natural sequence of poles \( \mathbf{C}_E = (c_1, \ldots, c_g, \infty) \).

The Ahlfors function was used by Yuditskii [25] to define a discriminant for finite gap sets,
\[
\Delta_E(z) = \Psi(z) + \frac{1}{\Psi(z)}. \tag{1.14}
\]

This function is not equal to the periodic discriminant, but it has some similar properties and it is available more generally (even when \( E \) is not a periodic spectrum). Namely, \( \Delta_E \) extends to a meromorphic function on \( \mathbb{C} \) and \( (\Delta_E)^{-1}([-2, 2]) = E \). It was introduced by Yuditskii to solve the Killip–Simon problem for finite gap essential spectra. In fact, the discriminant is a rational function of the form
\[
\Delta_E(z) = \lambda_{g+1} z + d + \sum_{k=1}^{g} \frac{\lambda_k}{c_k - z} \tag{1.15}
\]
for some \( d \in \mathbb{R} \); in particular, we will explain that the constants \( \lambda_j > 0 \) in (1.15) match the general definition (1.6).

As a first glimpse of our proof of Theorem 1.10, we note that it uses the following chain of implications. Starting with a regular Jacobi matrix with essential spectrum \( E \), by a change of one Jacobi coefficient, which does not affect regularity, we can assume that \( c_k \notin \text{supp} \mu \) (Lemma 6.1). Under this assumption, regularity of the Jacobi matrix implies regularity of the corresponding GMP matrix \( \Lambda \) and the resolvents \( (\epsilon_k - A)^{-1} \), \( k = 1, \ldots, g \), which can be characterized in terms of their coefficients by Theorem 1.9. By properties of the Yuditskii discriminant, this further implies regularity of the block Jacobi matrix \( \Delta_E(A) \). Let us briefly recall that a block Jacobi matrix is of the form
\[
J = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{v}_0 & \mathbf{v}_0 & \mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 & \mathbf{v}_3 & \cdots \\
\mathbf{v}_0^* & \mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 & \mathbf{v}_3 & \cdots \\
\mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 & \mathbf{v}_3 & \cdots \\
\mathbf{v}_2 & \mathbf{v}_3 & \cdots \\
\mathbf{v}_3 & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots 
\end{bmatrix} \tag{1.16}
\]
where \( v_j \) and \( w_j \) are \( d \times d \) matrices, \( v_j = w_j^* \), and \( \det v_j \neq 0 \) for each \( j \). Type 3 block Jacobi matrices have each \( v_j \) lower triangular and positive on the diagonal. An extension of regularity to block Jacobi matrices was developed by Damanik–Pushnitski–Simon \(^2\); in particular, \( J \) is regular for the set \([-2, 2]\) if \( \sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = [-2, 2] \) and

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} |\det v_j| \right)^{1/n} = 1. \tag{1.17}
\]

This chain of arguments will result in the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.11.** Let \( J \) be a regular Jacobi matrix, \( \mathbb{E} = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) \) a finite gap set, and \( \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{E} \) the corresponding sequence of zeros of the Ahlfors function. Assuming \( c_k \notin \sigma(J) \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq g \), denote by \( A \) the GMP matrix corresponding to \( J \) with respect to the sequence \( \mathbb{C}_\mathbb{E} \). Then \( \Delta_\mathbb{E}(A) \) is a regular type 3 block Jacobi matrix with essential spectrum \([-2, 2]\).

With this lemma, it will follow that \( J = \Delta_\mathbb{E}(A) \) obeys a Cesàro–Nevai condition. That Cesàro–Nevai condition will imply \((1.13)\) by a modification of arguments of \([25]\). The strategy is clear: just as \([25]\) uses a certain square-summability in terms of \( v_j, w_j \) to prove finiteness of \( l^2 \)-norm of \( \{d((S_n^*)^n J S_n^+, T_\mathbb{E}^+)^{\infty}_{n=0}\} \), we will use Cesàro decay in terms of \( v_j, w_j \) to conclude the Cesàro decay \((1.13)\). This can be expected due to a certain locality in the dependence between the terms of the series considered; this idea first appeared in \([19]\) in the setting of periodic spectra with all gaps open. However, some care is needed, since the locality is only approximate in some steps; this is already visible in \((1.12)\). Also, substantial modifications are needed throughout the proof due to the possibility of \( \lim \inf \|v_j\| = 0 \) (this cannot happen in the Killip–Simon class), which locally breaks some of the estimates. The fix is that this can only happen along a sparse subsequence, but the combination of a bad sparse subsequence and approximate locality means that we cannot simply ignore a bad subsequence once from the start; we must maintain it throughout the proof. Finally, it will be natural to use a Hilbert–Schmidt type functional instead of a Killip–Simon type functional used in \([25]\). We will describe these modifications and otherwise freely rely on the detailed analysis of \([25]\).

The rest of the paper will not exactly follow the order given in this introduction. In Section 2, we describe the behavior of our problem with respect to Möbius transformations, and we describe the distribution of zeros of the rational function \( \tau_n \). In Section 3, we recall the structure of GMP matrices and relate their matrix coefficients to the quantities \( \kappa_n \), and use this to provide a first statement about exponential growth of orthonormal rational functions on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \). In Section 4, we combine this with potential theoretic techniques to characterize limits of \( \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n| \) as \( n \to \infty \) and prove the universal lower bounds. In Section 5, we prove the results for \( C \)-regularity and Stahl–Totik regularity. In Section 6 we describe a proof of Theorem \((1.10)\).

### 2. Orthonormal rational functions and Möbius transformations

In the introduction, starting from the measure \( \mu \) and sequence of poles \( \mathcal{C} \), we defined a sequence \( \{r_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) and the orthonormal rational functions \( \{\tau_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \). In the next statement, we will denote these by \( r_n(z; \mathcal{C}) \) and \( \tau_n(z; \mu, \mathcal{C}) \), in order to state precisely the invariance of the setup with respect to Möbius transformations.

**Lemma 2.1.** If \( f \) is a Möbius transformation which preserves \( \mathbb{R} \), then

\[
\tau_n(z; \mu, \mathcal{C}) = \rho^n \tau_n(f(z); f_*\mu, f(\mathcal{C})), \tag{2.1}
\]
where \( f(C) = (f(c_1), \ldots, f(c_{g+1})) \) and
\[
\rho = \begin{cases} +1 & f \in \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \\ -1 & f \in (\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \{\text{id}, z \mapsto -z\}) \setminus \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \end{cases}
\]

Proof. Note that the sequence \( \{r_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \) does not have this property: \( r_n(z; C) \) is not equal to \( \rho^nr_n(f(z); f(C)) \). However, if we denote
\[
\mathcal{L}_n(C) = \text{span}\{r_\ell(\cdot; C) \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq n\},
\]
then it suffices to have
\[
r_n(f(z); f(C)) - c_n\rho r_n(z; C) \in \mathcal{L}_{n-1}(C) \tag{2.2}
\]
for some constants \( c_n > 0 \). If (2.2) holds, then applying the Gram–Schmidt process to the sequences \( \{r_n(f(z); f(C))\}_{n=0}^\infty \) and \( \{r_n(z; C)\}_{n=0}^\infty \) will give the same sequence of orthonormal functions, up to the sign change \( \rho^n \), which is precisely (2.1).

Note that, if (2.1) holds for \( f_1, f_2 \), it holds for their composition, so it suffices to verify (2.2) for a set of generators of \( \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \{\text{id}, z \mapsto -z\} \). In particular, (2.2) is checked by straightforward calculations for affine transformations and for the inversion \( f(z) = 1/z \), which implies the general statement since affine maps and inversion generate \( \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \{\text{id}, z \mapsto -z\} \).

Let us emphasize what this lemma does and what it doesn’t do. Since the Möbius transformation acts on both the measure and the sequence of poles, Lemma 2.1 does not by itself prove Theorem 1.1. Lemma 2.1 can only say that if \( \mu \) is Stahl–Totik regular, then \( f_\mu \) is \( (f(\infty)) \)-regular, which is not sufficient unless \( f \) is affine. The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be more involved.

However, Lemma 2.1 provides a very useful conformal invariance for many of our proofs. This can be compared to choosing a convenient reference frame. Since potential theoretic notions such as Green functions are conformally invariant, our results will be invariant with respect to Möbius transformations. We will often use this invariance in the proofs to fix a convenient point at \( \infty \); note that technical ingredients of the proof, such as polynomial factorizations, give a preferred role to \( \infty \) so they break symmetry. For instance, we will often use the observation that the subspace \( \mathcal{L}_n \) can be represented as
\[
\mathcal{L}_n = \left\{ \frac{P}{R_n} \mid P \in \mathcal{P}_n \right\} \tag{2.3}
\]
for some suitable polynomial \( R_n \) with factors which account for finite poles \( c_k \neq \infty \). We will use the representation (2.3) after placing a convenient point at \( \infty \). This idea is already seen in the next proof.

Lemma 2.2. All zeros of the rational function \( \tau_n \) are simple and lie in \( \overline{\mathbb{R}} \). Moreover, \( n - g \leq \deg \tau_n \leq n \).

Let \( n = j(g+1) + k \), \( 1 \leq k \leq g+1 \), and denote by \( I \) the connected component of \( c_k \) in \( \overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \text{supp} \mu \). Then \( \tau_n \) has no zeros in \( I \) and at most one zero in any other connected component of \( \overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \text{supp} \mu \).

Proof. Fix \( 1 \leq k \leq g+1 \) and without loss of generality, assume \( c_k = \infty \). Then, in the representations (2.3), we can notice that \( R_{n-1} = R_n \). In particular, then \( \tau_n \in \mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n-1} \) implies the representation \( \tau_n = f_n(R_n) \) for some polynomial \( P_n \) of degree \( n \).

Recall that \( \tau_n, n = k + (j-1)(g+1) \) is the unique minimizer for the extremal problem (1.5). By complex conjugation symmetry, the minimizer is real. To proceed further, we study zeros of \( P_n \) by using Markov correction terms.
We say that a rational function $M$ is an admissible Markov correction term if $M > 0$ a.e. on $E$ and $M(z)P_n(z) \in P_{n-1}$. In this case, using $\langle M\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle > 0$, we see that the function $g(\epsilon) = \|\tau_n - \epsilon M\tau_n\|^2$ obeys

$$g'(0) = -2\langle M\tau_n, \tau_n \rangle < 0.$$  

Thus, for small enough $\epsilon > 0$, the function

$$\tilde{\tau}_n = \tau_n - \epsilon M\tau_n$$

obeys $\|\tilde{\tau}_n\|_{L^2(d\mu)} < \|\tau_n\|_{L^2(d\mu)}$. Since $\tilde{\tau}_n$ is of the form $\tilde{\tau}_n = \kappa_n z^j + h(z)$ for some $h(z) \in \mathcal{L}_{n-1}$ and in particular has the same leading coefficient as $\tau_n$, the function $\tilde{\tau}_n/\|\tilde{\tau}_n\|_{L^2(d\mu)} \in \mathcal{L}_n$ contradicts extremality of $\tau_n$. In other words, for the extremizer $\tau_n$, there cannot be any admissible Markov correction terms.

Assume that $P_n$ has a non-real zero $w \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Then, since $\tau_n$ is real, $P_n(\overline{w}) = 0$, so the Markov correction term $M(z; w) = \frac{1}{(z-w)(\overline{z-w})}$ would be admissible, leading to contradiction.

Assume that $P_n$ has two zeros $x_1, x_2$ in the same connected component of $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \text{supp } \mu$; then, the Markov correction term $M(z; x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{(z-x_1)(z-x_2)}$ would be admissible, leading to contradiction.

There are no zeros of $P_n$ in $I$. Otherwise, if $x \in I$ was a zero, the Markov term

$$M(z, x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{z-x}, & x < \inf \mathbb{E} \\ \frac{1}{x-z}, & x > \sup \mathbb{E} \end{cases}$$

would be admissible.

Finally, all zeros of $P_n$ are simple: otherwise, if $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ was a double zero, the Markov term $M(z, x_0) = \frac{1}{(z-x_0)^2}$ would be admissible.

The properties of zeros of $\tau_n$ follow from those of $P_n$. There may be cancellations in the representation $\tau_n = \frac{P_n}{n!}$, but since $P_n$ has at most a simple zero at $c_\ell$, the only possible cancellations are simple factors $(z - c_\ell)$, $\ell \neq k$. Thus, $n - g \leq \deg \tau_n \leq n$. □

The use of Markov correction factors is standard in the Chebyshev polynomial literature and is applied here with a modification for the $L^2$-extremal problem (in the $L^\infty$-setting, singularities in $M$ are treated with a separate argument near the singularity, which would not work here).

**Corollary 2.3.** The measures $\nu_n$ are a precompact family with respect to weak convergence on $C(\mathbb{R})$. Any accumulation point $\nu = \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \nu_{n_\epsilon}$ is a probability measure and supp $\nu \subset \mathbb{E}$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.2 $\nu_n(\overline{\mathbb{R}}) \leq 1$, so precompactness follows by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. If $\nu = \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \nu_{n_\epsilon}$, then since $1 - \frac{M}{n!} \leq \nu_{n_\epsilon}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}) \leq 1$, $\nu(\overline{\mathbb{R}}) = 1$.

Let $(a, b)$ be a connected component of $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \mathbb{E}$. Let us prove that $\nu((a, b)) = 0$. By Möbius invariance, it suffices to assume that $(a, b)$ is a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}$. As supp $\mu \setminus \mathbb{E}$ is a discrete set, we have

$$\# \{x \in \text{supp } \mu : a + 1/r < x < b - 1/r\} = M < \infty.$$  

So, by Lemma 2.2 $\nu_{n_\epsilon}((a + 1/r, b - 1/r)) \leq \frac{2M+1}{n!r}$ and by the Portmanteau theorem and sending $r \to \infty$, $\nu((a, b)) = 0$ and supp $\nu \subset \mathbb{E}$. □
3. GMP matrices and exponential growth of orthonormal rational functions

In this section, we consider orthonormal rational functions through the framework of GMP matrices. We begin by recalling the structure of GMP matrices [25]. The GMP matrix has a tridiagonal block matrix structure, with the beginnings of new blocks corresponding to occurrences of \( c_k = \infty \). Explicitly,

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
B_0 & A_0 \\
A_0^* & B_1 & A_1 \\
& A_1^* & B_2 & A_2 \\
& & & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & & & A_g^* & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & & & & & \ddots
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( B_0 \) is a \( k \times k \) matrix, \( A_0 \) is a \( k \times (g + 1) \) matrix, and \( A_j, B_j \) for \( j \geq 1 \) are \((g + 1) \times (g + 1)\) matrices. We will also index the entries of these matrices from 0 to \( g \). Let \( X^- \) denote the upper triangular part of a matrix \( X \) (excluding the diagonal) and \( X^+ \) the lower triangular part (including the diagonal). Then for \( j \geq 1 \) \( A_j, B_j \) are of the form

\[
A_j = \tilde{p}_j \tilde{q}_j^T, \quad B_j = \tilde{C} + (\tilde{q}_j \tilde{p}_j^T)^+ + (\tilde{p}_j \tilde{q}_j^T)^-,
\]

where \( \tilde{p}_j, \tilde{q}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{g+1} \), with \( \langle \tilde{p}_j \rangle_0 > 0 \) and \( \tilde{C} = \text{diag}\{0, c_{k+1}, \ldots, c_{g+1}, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1}\} \) (with the obvious modification of \( k = 1 \) or \( k = g + 1 \)) and \( \delta_0 \) denotes the standard first basis vector of \( \mathbb{R}^{g+1} \).

We will refer to \( \{\tilde{p}_j, \tilde{q}_j\} \) as the GMP coefficients of \( A \). While the precise structure will not be essential throughout the paper, we point out two things. First on the outermost diagonal of \( A \) in each block there is only one non-vanishing entry, given by \( \langle \tilde{p}_j \rangle_0 \), which is positive and which is at a different position depending on the position of \( \infty \) in the sequence \( C \). And second, in general as a self-adjoint matrix \( B_j \) could depend on \((g + 1)(g + 2)/2\) parameters, but we see that in fact they only depend on \( 2(g + 1) \). This is not that surprising due to their close relation to three-diagonal Jacobi matrices. A similar phenomena also appears for their unitary analogs [3].

Now the various notations for the off-diagonal blocks \( A_j \), the vectors \( \tilde{p}_j \) which determine them, and the coefficients \( \beta_j \) defined in (3.1) are related as

\[
\beta_j = \langle e_{j(g+1)+k}, A e_{(j+1)(g+1)+k} \rangle = \langle A_j \rangle_0 = \langle \tilde{p}_j \rangle_0.
\]

Recall that \( k \) is fixed here so that \( c_k = \infty \). The coefficients \( \beta_j \) are a special case of the coefficients

\[
\beta_j = \begin{cases}
\langle e_{j(g+1)+k}, (c_k - A)^{-1}e_{(j+1)(g+1)+k} \rangle & c_k \neq \infty \\
\langle e_{j(g+1)+k}, Ae_{(j+1)(g+1)+k} \rangle & c_k = \infty
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \beta_j = A_{j(g+1)+k} \), and the coefficients \( A_{j(g+1)+\ell} \) for \( \ell \neq k \) instead occur as outermost diagonal coefficients for the GMP matrix \((c_k - A)^{-1}\). In our later applications to the discriminant to \( A \), both the coefficients of \( A \) and of its resolvents will appear, so we will work with \( A_n \) throughout.

Next, we connect the coefficients (3.2) to the solutions of the \( L^2 \)-extremal problem (1.5).

Lemma 3.1. For all \( n \),

\[
\kappa_n / \kappa_{n+g+1} = A_n.
\]

Proof. Let \( n = j(g + 1) + k \). By self-adjointness,

\[
A_n = \langle e_n, r_k(A)e_{n+g+1} \rangle = \langle r_k \tau_n, \tau_{n+g+1} \rangle = \langle \kappa_n r_n + h, \tau_n + g + 1 \rangle
\]
for some $h \in \mathcal{L}_{n+g}$. By orthogonality, $\langle \tau_{n+g+1}, h \rangle = 0$, so $\langle \tau_{n+g+1}, r_{n+g+1} \rangle = \frac{1}{\kappa_{n+g+1}}$ implies that

$$A_n = \langle \tau_{n+g+1}, r_{n+g+1} \rangle + h = \frac{\kappa_n}{\kappa_{n+g+1}}.$$  

\[ \square \]

We now adapt to GMP matrices ideas from the theory of regularity for Jacobi matrices \[18\].

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(C)$. For all $j \geq 1$, $\|\vec{p}_j\| \leq \|A\|$.  

**Proof.** Fix $k$ such that $c_k = \infty$. Fix $j \geq 1$ and denote $n = j(g+1) + k$. For any $\ell = 0, \ldots, g$,

$$c^{(p_j)\ell} = \langle c_{n-g-1+\ell}, A c_n \rangle = \int \tau_{n-g-1+\ell}(x)x\tau_n(x)d\mu(x).$$

Since the vectors $\tau_{n-g-1+\ell}$ are orthonormal, by the Bessel inequality,

$$\|\vec{p}_j\|^2 \leq \int |x\tau_n(x)|^2d\mu(x) \leq \|A\|^2 \int |\tau_n(x)|^2d\mu(x) = \|A\|^2$$

since $\|A\| = \sup_{x \in \text{supp} \mu} |x|$.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 3.3.** For $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| > 0. \quad (3.4)$$

**Proof.** We adapt the proof of \[18\] Proposition 2.2]. It suffices to prove \[3.4\] along the subsequences $n(j) = j(g+1) + k, j \to \infty$, for $1 \leq k \leq g+1$. Moreover, due to \[\mathbb{R}\]-preserving conformal invariance, it suffices to fix $k$ and prove

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log |\tau_n(j)(z)| > 0 \quad (3.5)$$

under the assumption that $c_k = \infty$. This allows us to use the associated GMP matrix $A \in \mathcal{A}(C)$.

Note that for any $m$, since $\{\tau_{j}\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(d\mu)$,

$$\sum_{\ell} A_{m\ell} \tau_{\ell}(z) = \sum_{\ell} (z\tau_m(z), \tau_{\ell}(z))\tau_{\ell}(z) = z\tau_m(z).$$

This equality holds in $L^2(d\mu)$, but since all functions are rational, it also holds pointwise. Thus, if we fix $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, the sequence $\varphi = \{\tau(z)\}_{z=0}^{\infty}$ is a formal eigensolution for $A$ at energy $z$, i.e. $(A - z)\varphi = 0$ componentwise. Since $A$ is represented as a block tridiagonal matrix, let us also write $\varphi$ in a matching block form, as $\varphi^T = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{u}_0^T & \vec{u}_1^T & \vec{u}_2^T & \ldots \end{bmatrix}$ where

$$\vec{u}_0^T = [\tau_0(z) \ldots \tau_{k-1}(z)], \quad \vec{u}_j^T = [\tau_{n(j)-1-1}(z) \ldots \tau_{n(j)-1}(z)], \quad j \geq 1.$$  

We also consider the projection of $\varphi$ onto the first $j + 1$ blocks,

$$\vec{\varphi}_j^T = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{u}_0^T & \ldots & \vec{u}_j^T & 0 & \ldots \end{bmatrix},$$

and compute $(A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j$. By the block tridiagonal structure of $A$, for $m < n(j-1)$ we have $\langle e_m, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = 0$. For $0 \leq \ell \leq g$, we have

$$\langle e_{n(j-1)+\ell}, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = \langle e_{n(j-1)+\ell}, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = (p_j)_{\ell}\tau_{n(j)}(z)$$

so that $\langle e_{n(j-1)+\ell}, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = -(p_j)_{\ell}\tau_{n(j)}(z)$. Moreover,

$$\langle e_{n(j)}, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = \langle e_{n(j)}, A\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = (p_j)^* u_j(z).$$

For $m > n(j)$, we again have $\langle e_m, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = 0$. In conclusion, $(A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j$ has only two nontrivial blocks,

$$(A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j^T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \ldots & 0 & -(\vec{p}_j^*\tau_{n(j)}(z))^\top & ((\vec{p}_j^* u_j)^\top & 0 & \ldots & \end{bmatrix}.$$
In particular, we can compute
\[ \langle \vec{\varphi}_j, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle = -\vec{u}^*_j \tau_{n(j)}(z) \vec{p}_j. \] (3.6)

Since \( A \) is self-adjoint and \( \vec{\varphi}_j \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \), by a standard consequence of the spectral theorem [23, Lemma 2.7.],
\[ |\text{Im } z||\vec{\varphi}_j||^2 \leq |\langle \vec{\varphi}_j, (A - z)\vec{\varphi}_j \rangle|. \]

Using (3.6) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives
\[ |\text{Im } z| \sum_{m=0}^{j} \|\vec{u}_m\|^2 \leq |\tau_{n(j)}(z)||\vec{p}_j||\vec{u}_j|. \] (3.7)

Applying the AM-GM inequality to the right-hand side of (3.7) gives
\[ |\tau_{n(j)}(z)| \|\vec{u}_j\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (C\|\vec{u}_j\|^2 + C^{-1}|\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^2) \]
which together with (3.7) implies
\[ |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^2 \geq C^2 \sum_{m=0}^{j} \|\vec{u}_m\|^2. \] (3.8)

Since \( |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^2 \leq \|\vec{u}_{j+1}\|^2 \), this implies that
\[ \sum_{m=0}^{j+1} \|\vec{u}_m\|^2 \geq (1 + C^2) \sum_{m=0}^{j} \|\vec{u}_m\|^2. \]

Since \( \|\vec{u}_0\| \geq |\tau_0(z)| = 1 \), this implies by induction that
\[ \sum_{m=0}^{j} \|\vec{u}_m\|^2 \geq (1 + C^2)^j. \]

Combining this with (3.8) gives a lower bound on \( |\tau_{n(j)}(z)| \) which implies (3.6). \( \square \)

The estimates in the previous proof also lead to the following:

**Corollary 3.4.** For any \( z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \), the quantities
\[ \liminf_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{j(g + 1) + k} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+k}(z)|, \quad \limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{j(g + 1) + k} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+k}(z)| \]
are independent of \( k \in \{1, \ldots, g + 1\} \).

**Proof.** Assume \( j \geq 1 \). For \( k - g - 1 \leq \ell \leq k - 1 \), the estimate (3.8) gives
\[ |\tau_{j(g+1)+k}(z)| \geq C^2 \|\vec{u}_j\|^2 \geq C^2 |\tau_{j(g+1)+\ell}(z)|^2 \]
which implies
\[ \liminf_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{j(g + 1) + k} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+k}(z)| \geq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{j(g + 1) + \ell} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+\ell}(z)|. \] (3.9)
and
\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{f(g+1)+k} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+k}(z)| \geq \limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{f(g+1)+\ell} \log |\tau_{j(g+1)+\ell}(z)|. \tag{3.10}
\]
Clearly, the right-hand sides don’t change if \(\ell\) is shifted by \(g+1\), so (3.9), (3.10) hold for all \(k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, g+1\}\) with \(k \neq \ell\). By symmetry, since the roles of \(k, \ell\) can be switched, we conclude that equality holds in (3.9), (3.10). \(\Box\)

4. Growth rates of orthonormal rational functions

In this section, we will combine the positivity \((3.4)\) with potential theory techniques in order to study exponential growth rates of orthonormal rational functions. Our main conclusions will be conformally invariant, but our proofs will use potential theory arguments and objects such as the logarithmic potential of a finite measure \(\nu\),

\[\Phi_\nu(z) = \int \log|z-x|d\nu(x),\]

which is well defined when \(\text{supp} \nu\) does not contain \(\infty\).

Theorem 4.1. Fix \(1 \leq k \leq g+1\) and denote by \(I\) the connected component of \(\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp} \mu\) containing \(c_k\). Suppose there is a subsequence \(n_\ell = j(g+1)+k\) such that \(w-lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n_\ell} = \nu\) and \(\frac{1}{n_\ell} \log \kappa_{n_\ell} \to \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}\) as \(\ell \to \infty\). Then uniformly on compact subsets of \((\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}) \cup (I \setminus \{c_k\})\), we have

\[h(z) := \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |\tau_{n_\ell}(z)|.\]

The function \(h\) is determined by \(\nu\) and \(\alpha\); in particular, if \(c_k = \infty\),

\[h(z) = \alpha + \Phi_\nu(z) - \frac{1}{g+1} \sum_{m=1}^{g+1} \log |c_m - z|. \tag{4.1}\]

Moreover,

(a) \(\alpha = -\infty\) is impossible;
(b) If \(\alpha = +\infty\), the limit is \(h = +\infty\);
(c) If \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\), the limit \(h\) extends to a positive harmonic function on \(\mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\})\) such that

\[h(z) = -\frac{1}{g+1} \log |c_m - z| + O(1), \quad z \to c_m \neq \infty \tag{4.2}\]

\[h(z) = \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z| + O(1), \quad z \to c_m = \infty. \tag{4.3}\]

Proof. By using \(\mathbb{R}\)-preserving conformal invariance, we can assume without loss of generality that \(c_k = \infty\). We will use the representation \((2.3)\) of the subspace \(L_n\). For \(n = j(g+1)+k\), counting degrees of the poles leads to

\[\tau_n = \frac{P_n}{R_n}, \quad R_n(z) = \prod_{m=1}^{k-1} (c_m - z) \prod_{m=1}^{g+1} (c_m - z)^2, \]
with \( \deg P_n = n \). This may not be the minimal representation of \( \tau_n \), but by the proof of Lemma 2.2, the only possible cancellations are simple factors \((c_m - z)\) for each \( m \neq k \), so we get the minimal representation \( \tau_n(z) = P(z)/Q(z) \) with

\[
P(z) = \kappa_n \prod_{w: \tau_n(w) = 0} (z - w), \quad Q(z) = \prod_{m=1, m \neq k}^{g+1} (c_m - z)^{j + \delta_{m,j}}
\]

where \(|\delta_{m,j}| \leq 1\) for each \( j \). All that matters is that \( \delta_{m,j}/j \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \). It will be useful to turn this rational function representation into a kind of Riesz representation,

\[
\log |\tau_n(z)| = \log \kappa_n + n \int \log|x - z|d\nu_n(x) - \sum_{1 \leq m \leq g+1, m \neq k} (j + \delta_{m,j}) \log|c_m - z|.
\tag{4.4}
\]

Since \( c_k = \infty \), note that \( K = \mathbb{R} \setminus I \) is a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R} \). Denote \( \Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus K \). For any \( z \in \Omega \), the map \( x \mapsto \log |x - z| \) is continuous on \( K \), so \( \Phi_{\nu_n}(z) \to \Phi_P(z) \) as \( \ell \to \infty \). In fact, convergence is uniform on compact subsets of \( \Omega \): since \( \nu_n(K) \leq 1 \) for all \( \ell \), the estimate

\[
\log \left| \frac{x - z_1}{x - z_2} \right| \leq \log \left( 1 + \frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{\text{dist}(z_2, K)} \right) \leq \frac{|z_1 - z_2|}{\text{dist}(z_2, K)}, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \Omega
\]

implies uniform equicontinuity of the potentials \( \Phi_{\nu_n} \) on compact subsets of \( \Omega \), and the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem implies uniform convergence on compacts.

Note that (b) follows from (4.1). By Corollary 2.3, \( \text{supp} \nu \subset E \) and \( \Phi_P(z) \) is harmonic on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus E \), so the right hand side extends to a harmonic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}) \) and we denote this extension also by \( h \). By Lemma 2.3, \( h \) is positive on \( \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{C}_- \), so \( \alpha \neq -\infty \); moreover, by the mean value property, \( h \) is positive on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}) \).

The remaining asymptotic properties follow from (4.1). Under the assumption \( c_k = \infty \), \( \text{supp} \nu \) is a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R} \), and \( \Phi_P(z) = \log |z| + O(1) \) as \( z \to \infty \). It then follows that \( h(z) = \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z| + O(1) \) as \( z \to \infty \). Of course, \( h(z) = -\frac{1}{g+1} \log |z - c_m| + O(1) \) near each \( c_m \neq c_k \).

The previous theorem motivates interest in positive harmonic functions on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}) \). If \( E \) is polar, by Myrberg’s theorem [1, Theorem 5.3.8], any such function is constant. If \( E \) is not polar, knowing the asymptotic behavior of \( h \) at the poles, positivity of \( h \) improves to the following lower bound on \( h \). The following Lemma reflects a standard minimality property of the Green function [3, Section VII.10].

**Lemma 4.2.** Assume that \( E \) is a nonpolar closed subset of \( \mathbb{R} \). Let \( h \) be a positive superharmonic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}) \). Suppose \( h(z) + \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z - c_k| \) has an existent limit at \( c_k \) for each finite \( c_k \), and \( h(z) - \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z| \) has an existent limit at \( \infty \) if one of the \( c_k = \infty \). Then

\[
h(z) \geq \mathcal{G}_E(z, \mathbb{C})
\]

for \( z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus E \). For \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), define

\[
\alpha_k = \begin{cases} 
\lim_{z \to c_k} (h(z) + \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z - c_k|), & c_k \neq \infty \\
\lim_{z \to \infty} (h(z) - \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z|), & c_k = \infty
\end{cases}
\]

Then

\[
\alpha_k \geq \frac{\log \lambda_k}{g+1}
\]

\tag{4.6}
Proof. We will use a stronger, q.e. version of the maximum principle [16, Thm 3.6.9]. Define
\[ \tilde{h}(z) := G_E(z, C) - h(z), \]
which is bounded at \( c_k \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \) and so extends to a subharmonic function on \( \overline{C} \setminus E \). Since \( G_E \) vanishes q.e. on \( E \), we have for \( q.e. \ t \in E \),
\[ \limsup_{z \to t} \tilde{h}(z) = - \liminf_{z \to t} h(z) \leq 0. \]
Now we show \( \tilde{h} \) is bounded above on \( \overline{C} \setminus E \). Let \( U \) be a union of small neighborhoods containing the points \( c_k \) in \( \overline{C} \setminus E \). By the definition of the Green function, \( G_E(z, C) \) defines a harmonic and bounded function on \( \overline{C} \setminus (E \cup U) \). That is, there exists \( M \) such that for all \( z \in \overline{C} \setminus (U \cup E) \) we have
\[ G_E(z, C) \leq M. \]
Since \( h \geq 0 \), it follows on \( \overline{C} \setminus (U \cup E) \) that
\[ \tilde{h}(z) = G_E(z, C) - h(z) \leq G_E(z, C) \leq M. \]
On the other hand, by properties of the Green functions we have
\[ \log \lambda_k \ = \ \begin{cases} \lim_{z \to c_k} (G_E(z, C) + \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z - c_k|), & c_k \neq \infty \\ \lim_{z \to \infty} (G_E(z, C) - \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z|), & c_k = \infty \end{cases} \]
Then, by assumption, for \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), \( \tilde{h}(z) = \log \lambda_k \ - \alpha_k + o(1) \) as \( z \to c_k \) and, in particular, the difference is bounded in a small neighborhood of \( c_k \). Thus, \( \tilde{h} \) is bounded above on \( \overline{C} \setminus E \).
So, by the maximum principle \( \tilde{h} \leq 0 \implies G_E(z, C) \leq h(z) \) on \( \overline{C} \setminus E \). Since \( 0 \geq \lim_{z \to c_k} \tilde{h}(z) = \log \lambda_k - \alpha_k \), we have (4.6).

Lemma 4.3. Under the same assumptions as Lemma 4.2, the following are equivalent:

(i) Equality in (4.6) for all \( k \) with \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \)
(ii) Equality in (4.6) for a single \( k \) with \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \)
(iii) Equality holds in (4.3)

Proof. (i) \implies (ii): trivial. Suppose then (ii): with the notation of the previous lemma, by assumption, \( \tilde{h}(c_k) = 0 \) and \( \tilde{h} \) achieves a global maximum. By the maximum principle for subharmonic functions [16, Theorem 2.3.1], \( \tilde{h} \equiv 0 \) on \( \overline{C} \setminus E \). Finally, if (iii) holds, then evaluating \( \tilde{h}(c_k) \) for each \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \) yields (i). \( \square \)

We will now prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Using conformal invariance, we take \( c_k = \infty \). Fix \( z \in \overline{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \) and select a sequence \( (n_\ell)_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \) such that
\[ \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |r_n(z)| = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |r_{n_\ell}(z)|. \]
By precompactness of the \( (\nu_n) \), we may pass to a further subsequence, which we denote again by \( (n_\ell)_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \), so that \( \nu \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n_\ell} = \nu \) and \( \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log \kappa_{n_\ell} \to \alpha \) for some \( \nu \) and \( \alpha \). Then for \( h \) as in Theorem 1.1
\[ \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |r_{n_\ell}(z)| = h(z). \]
on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. If $\alpha = +\infty$, then there is nothing to show. Suppose $\alpha < \infty$. If $E$ is not polar we apply (iii) of Theorem 4.1 to find $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and we may use (c) of the same theorem and Lemma 4.2 to conclude.

If instead $E$ is polar, by Myrberg’s theorem, $h$ is constant on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\})$. Computing the limit at $c_k$ we see $h \equiv +\infty$. In particular, $\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| = +\infty$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We fix $1 \leq k \leq g+1$ and assume again by conformal invariance that $c_k = \infty$. Using precompactness of the measures $(\nu_j)$, we find a subsequence $n_\ell = j_\ell (g+1) + k$ with

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log \kappa_{n_\ell} = \liminf_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log \kappa_{n(j)} =: \alpha$$

and $w\text{-}\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n_\ell} = \nu$. If $\alpha = +\infty$, we are done. Suppose then $\alpha < \infty$, then we have by Theorem 4.1 (iii), $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, if $E$ is nonpolar, by (v) and Lemma 4.2 $h(z) \geq G_E(z, \mathbb{C})$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. In particular, by the representation (4.1) we see that $\alpha = \lim_{z \to \infty} (h(z) - \frac{1}{g+1} \log |z|)$, and so (1.6) yields the desired inequality.

If instead $E$ is polar, by Theorem 1.2 for each $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$h(z) = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |\tau_{n_\ell}| \geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| = +\infty.$$ 

and so by Theorem 4.1 (b), $\alpha = +\infty$. □

5. Regularity

We will begin by proving a version of Theorem 1.4 for a fixed $k$.

Lemma 5.1. Fix $k \in \{1, \ldots, g+1\}$. Along the subsequence $n(j) = j(j+1) + k$, the following are equivalent:

(i) $\lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log \kappa_{n(j)} = \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}$;
(ii) For q.e. $z \in E$, we have $\limsup_{j \to \infty} |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^{1/n(j)} \leq 1$;
(iii) For some $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $\limsup_{j \to \infty} |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^{1/n(j)} \leq e^{G_E(z, \mathbb{C})}$;
(iv) For all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $\limsup_{j \to \infty} |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^{1/n(j)} \leq e^{G_E(z, \mathbb{C})}$;
(v) Uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{j \to \infty} |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|^{1/n(j)} = e^{G_E(z, \mathbb{C})}$.

Proof. Using conformal invariance, we will assume throughout the proof that $c_k = \infty$. First, suppose that $E$ is polar. In this case (iii) is vacuous, and since $G_E \equiv +\infty$, (iii) and (iv) are trivially true. Since $\lambda_k = +\infty$, (iv) follows from Theorem 1.3. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, weak convergence of measures implies uniform convergence of their potentials. Thus, since $\nu_j$ are a precompact family, so are $\Phi_{n(j)}$. Thus, the convergence $\lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log \kappa_{n(j)} = +\infty$ implies that $\lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log |\tau_{n(j)}(z)| = +\infty$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, so (v) holds.

For the remainder of the proof, we will assume $E$ is not polar. Moreover, we will repeatedly use the fact that if any subsequence of a sequence in a topological space has a further subsequence which converges to a limit, then the sequence itself converges to this limit. In particular, when concluding (v), we apply this fact in the Fréchet space of harmonic functions on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets.

(iii) $\implies$ (v): Given a subsequence of $n(j) = j(j+1)+k$, using precompactness of the measures $\nu_j$, we pass to a further subsequence $n_\ell = j_\ell (g+1) + k$ with $w\text{-}\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n_\ell} = \nu$ and $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log \kappa_{n_\ell} =: \alpha$, with $\alpha$ real or infinite. By Theorem 4.1 (b), uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$h(z) = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |\tau_{n_\ell}(z)|$$
with $h$ given by (4.1). Using the assumption, for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we have

$$h(z_0) \leq \limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log |\tau_{n(j)}(z_0)| < \infty.$$  

So, by Theorem 4.1, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h$ has a harmonic extension to $\mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\})$. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.2, $h \geq \mathcal{G}_E$. For assumption, we have the opposite inequality at $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and so, by the maximum principle for harmonic functions, $h = \mathcal{G}_E$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\})$, and in particular on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. Thus, we have (v).

(v) $\implies$ (vi): For $z \in \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}$, $\mathcal{G}_E(z, \mathbb{C}) = +\infty$ and there is nothing to show. Fix $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}$ and let $n \ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$ be a subsequence with $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n\ell}(z)| = \limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log |\tau_{n(j)}(z)|$. By passing to a further subsequence, we may assume $\lambda_{n\ell} \to \alpha$, and let $\kappa_{n\ell} =: \alpha$ where $\alpha$ is real or infinite. By assumption, we have $h = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n\ell}(z)| = \mathcal{G}_E$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. So, by (vi) and (vi), $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h$ extends to a harmonic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (E \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\})$. By the representation (4.1), we may extend $h$ subharmonically to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}$. On this set, $\mathcal{G}_E$ is also subharmonic, so, by the weak identity principle [16, Theorem 2.7.5], $h = \mathcal{G}_E$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}$. Thus, by the principle of descent [21, A.III], we have

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n\ell}(z)| \leq h(z) = \mathcal{G}_E(z, \mathbb{C})$$

and (vi) follows.

(vi) $\implies$ (v): Given a subsequence of $n(j) = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$, we use precompactness of the $\nu_{n}$ to pass to a further subsequence $n \ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$ with $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \kappa_{n\ell} =: \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ and $\nu_{n\ell} \to \nu$. Then, in the notation of Theorem 4.1 and by assumption, for a $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n\ell}(z)| = h(z) = \mathcal{G}_E(z, \mathbb{C}).$$

So by, Lemma 4.3, $\alpha = \frac{\log \lambda_k}{g + 1}$. Thus, $\lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}$ is the only accumulation point of $\kappa_{n(j)}^{1/n(j)}$ in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ and we have (v).

(v) $\implies$ (iv): As before, we fix a subsequence of $n(j) = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$ and use precompactness to pass to a further subsequence $n \ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$ with $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n\ell} = \nu$. Then, by Theorem 4.1 and in the notation introduced there, uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n\ell}(z)| = h(z)$$

where $h$ is given by (4.1) with $\alpha = \frac{\log \lambda_k}{g + 1}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.3 (vi), $h(z) = \mathcal{G}_E(z, \mathbb{C})$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. Since the initial subsequence was arbitrary, we have (iv).

(iv) $\implies$ (v): Recalling that the Green function vanishes q.e. on $E$, the claim follows.

(v) $\implies$ (vi): Fixing a subsequence of $n(j)$, we again use precompactness to select a further subsequence $n \ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k$ such that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n\ell} = \nu$ and $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \kappa_{n\ell} =: \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$. By the upper envelope theorem, there is a polar set $X_1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that on $\mathbb{C} \setminus X_1$, $\limsup_{t \to \infty} \Phi_{n\ell} = \Phi_{\nu}$. Now, we let $X_2 := \{t \in E : \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n}(t)| > 0\}$, which is polar by assumption, and $X_3 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Phi_{\infty}(z) = -\infty\}$, which is polar by [16, Theorem 3.5.1]. Then, for a $t \in E \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3)$, we have

$$\alpha \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_{n}(t)| - \Phi_{\nu}(t) + \frac{1}{g + 1} \sum_{m=1}^{g+1} \log |c_m - t| < \infty.$$
So \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \) by Theorem 1.1(ii). Thus, by (ii) of the same theorem, uniformly on compact subsets of \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \)

\[
h(z) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{nt} \log |\tau_{n,t}(z)|
\]
and \( h \) extends to a positive harmonic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus (\mathbb{E} \cup \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\}) \) with logarithmic poles at each of the \( c_m \). So, \( h - G_{E} \) extends to a harmonic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{E} \), and \( h - G_{E} \geq 0 \) there by Lemma 4.2. We now show that in fact \( h = G_{E} \) using the stronger, q.e. maximum principle.

We use the equality in (4.1) to extend \( h \) to a subharmonic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \{c_1, \ldots, c_{g+1}\} \). By the upper envelope theorem and the assumption again, for \( t \in \mathbb{E} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2) \)

\[
h(t) = \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{nt} \log |\tau_{n,t}(t)| \leq 0.
\]

Then, for these \( t \), since \( G_{E} \) is positive, we have

\[
\limsup_{z \to C} (h(z) - G_{E}(z, C)) \leq \limsup_{z \to C} h(z) \leq h(t) \leq 0
\]
by upper semicontinuity. So, \( \limsup_{z \to C} (h(z) - G_{E}(z, C)) \leq 0 \) for q.e. \( t \in \mathbb{E} \).

Since \( h \) is upper semicontinuous on the compact set \( \mathbb{E} \), there is an \( M \) so that \( \sup_{t \in \mathbb{E}} h(t) \leq M \). As in the above, now for any \( t \in \mathbb{E} \), we have

\[
\limsup_{z \to C} (h(z) - G_{E}(z, C)) \leq \limsup_{z \to C} h(z) \leq h(t) \leq M.
\]

So, there is a neighborhood \( \mathcal{U} \) of \( \mathbb{E} \) with \( \sup_{z \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \mathbb{E}} (h - G_{E}) \leq M + 1 \). Since the difference is harmonic on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{U} \), we conclude that \( \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{E}} (h(z) - G_{E}(z, C)) < \infty \). Thus, by the maximum principle and the reverse inequality, \( h = G_{E} \) on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{E} \). Since the first sequence was arbitrary, we have (vi).

Since the implication (v) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii) is clear, we may conclude. \( \square \)

We now put the subsequences together and use Corollary 5.3 to show that regular behavior occurs for one \( k \) if and only if it happens for all.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Applying Lemma 5.1 for all \( k \) implies equivalence of conditions (ii), (iv), (vi), (vii) from Theorem 1.4. By Corollary 5.3 for some \( z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \), the condition

\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{j(g + 1) + k} \log |\tau_{j(g + 1) + k}(z)| \leq G_{E}(z, C)
\]
holds for one value of \( k \) if and only if it holds for all. Due to Lemma 5.1 this immediately implies equivalence of conditions (i) and (iii) from Theorem 1.4. It remains to prove equivalence of (ii), (iii).

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), denote by \( N(n, k) \) the integer such that \( n + 1 \leq N(n, k) \leq n + g + 1 \) and \( N(n, k) - k \) is divisible by \( g + 1 \). Then \( N(n, k)/n \to 1 \) as \( n \to \infty \) so (iii) implies \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{N(n, k)} = \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)} \). Taking the product over \( k = 1, \ldots, g + 1 \) gives (ii).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii): Similarly to the above, Theorem 1.3 shows that for all \( k \),

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{N(n, k)} \geq \lambda_k^{1/(g+1)}.
\]

\((5.2)\)
Thus, if (iii) was false, this would mean that for some \( k = m \), \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \kappa_{N(n,m)}^{1/n} > \lambda_{\lim}^{1/(g+1)} \).

Taking products over \( k \), we would have

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{k=1}^{g+1} \kappa_{N(n,k)} \right)^{1/n} \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \kappa_{N(n,m)}^{1/n} \liminf_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{1 \leq k \leq g+1} \kappa_{N(n,k)} \right)^{1/n} > \left( \prod_{k=1}^{g+1} \lambda_k \right)^{1/(g+1)}
\]

(the last step again uses (5.2) for all \( k \neq m \)). This would contradict (iii), so the proof is complete. \( \square \)

We now prove a seemingly special case of Corollary 1.7.

**Proposition 5.2.** Assume that the sequence \( C \) contains \( \infty \). Then \( \mu \) is Stahl–Totik regular if and only if it is \( C \)-regular.

**Proof.** Assume that \( \mu \) is regular. To prove that \( \mu \) is \( C \)-regular, we will use general results for the regular behavior of polynomials with respect to varying weights [21, Theorem 3.2.1(vi)]. Use the polynomials \( R_n \) defined by (2.3) and the representation \( \tau_n = \frac{P_n}{R_n} \) where \( \deg P_n \leq n \). Consider the measures

\[
d\mu_n(x) = \frac{1}{|R_n(x)|^2} d\mu(x)
\]

Since

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} |R_n(z)|^{1/n} = \prod_{1 \leq m \leq g+1, c_m \neq \infty} |z - c_m|
\]

uniformly on \( E \) and the limit is strictly positive and continuous on \( E \), by [21, Theorem 3.2.1], regularity implies that

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |R_n(z)|^{1/n} = \prod_{1 \leq m \leq g+1, c_m \neq \infty} |z - c_m|
\]

for q.e. \( z \in E \). Since \( \|P_n\|_{L^2(d\mu_n)} = \|\tau_n\|_{L^2(d\mu)} = 1 \), this implies that

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| \leq 0
\]

for q.e. \( z \in E \). Thus, \( \mu \) is \( C \)-regular.

Let us now assume that \( \mu \) is \( C \)-regular and let \( p_n \) denote the orthonormal polynomial with respect to \( \mu \). Fix \( z \in \mathbb{C} \). Since \( \infty \) is in \( \mathbb{C} \), \( p_n \in L_{n(g+1)} \), so the orthonormal polynomials can be expressed in the basis of orthonormal rational functions as

\[
p_n(z) = \sum_{m=0}^{n(g+1)} c_m \tau_m(z), \quad \sum_{m=0}^{n(g+1)} |c_m|^2 = 1.
\]

Thus, in particular, \( |c_0| \leq 1 \) and we get

\[
|p_n(z)| \leq (1 + n(g + 1)) \sup_{0 \leq m \leq n(g+1)} |\tau_m(z)|.
\]

By Theorem 1.4 for q.e. \( z \in E \), \( \limsup_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \log |\tau_\ell(z)| \leq 0 \). Thus, for q.e. \( z \in E \), (5.4) implies

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |p_n(z)| \leq 0.
\]

Thus, \( \mu \) is Stahl–Totik regular. \( \square \)
From this seemingly special case, Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.7 follow easily:

**Proof of Theorem 1.6.** By applying a conformal transformation, the special case shows that \( \mu \) is \( C_1 \)-regular if and only if it is \((c_k)\)-regular for any single \( c_k \) in \( C_1 \). By applying this twice, we conclude that if \( C_1, C_2 \) have a common element, then \( \mu \) is \( C_1 \)-regular if and only if it is \( C_2 \)-regular.

By applying that conclusion twice, we will finish the proof. Namely, for arbitrary \( C_1, C_2 \), choose a sequence \( C_3 \) which has common elements with both \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \). Then \( \mu \) is \( C_1 \)-regular if and only if it is \( C_3 \)-regular if and only if it is \( C_2 \)-regular. \( \Box \)

**Proof of Corollary 1.7.** The result follows by taking \( C_2 = (\infty) \) in Theorem 1.6. \( \Box \)

**Proof of Theorem 1.8.** (a) We note that by Corollary 1.7 we may use Theorem 1.4. Fix \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \), and use conformal invariance to assume \( c_k = \infty \). Given a subsequence of \( n(j) = j(g + 1) + k \), we use precompactness to pass to a further subsequence \( n_\ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k \) with \( \text{w-lim}_{\ell \to \infty} \nu_{n_\ell} = \nu \).

We write

\[
\mathcal{G}_E(z, C) = \Phi_{\rho E, c}(z) + \frac{1}{g + 1} \log \lambda_k - \frac{1}{g + 1} \sum_{m=1}^{g+1} \log |z - c_m| \tag{5.5}
\]

which we will use to show \( \Phi_\nu = \Phi_{\rho E, c} \). By (ii), we may apply Theorem 1.1 with \( \alpha = \frac{1}{g+1} \log \lambda_k \). Then, \( \text{viii} \) yields \( h = \mathcal{G}_E \) off the real line, and thus the equality between the representations (4.1) and (5.5) gives \( \Phi_\nu(z) = \Phi_{\rho E, c}(z) \) on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \). By the weak identity principle, this equality extends to \( \mathbb{C} \). Applying the distributional Laplacian to both sides gives \( \nu = \rho_{E, C} \). Thus, \( \text{w-lim}_{n \to \infty} \nu_n = \rho_{E, C} \).

(b) The main ingredient is a variant of Schnol's theorem; for any \( n, \int |\tau_n|^2 \, d\mu = 1 \), so

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2} \int |\tau_n|^2 \, d\mu < \infty
\]

By Tonelli's theorem, it follows that \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2} |\tau_n|^2 < \infty \) \( \mu \)-a.e., so there exists a Borel set \( B \subset \mathbb{C} \) with \( \mu(\mathbb{C} \setminus B) = 0 \) such that

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| \leq 0, \quad \forall z \in B. \tag{5.6}
\]

Suppose \( \mu \) is not regular. Then, by Theorem 1.4 (iii), there is a \( 1 \leq k \leq g + 1 \) with

\[
\limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{1}{n(j)} \log \kappa_{n(j)} > \frac{1}{g+1} \log \lambda_k
\]

Using conformal invariance, we may assume \( c_k = \infty \), and we can pass to a subsequence \( n_\ell = j_\ell(g + 1) + k \) such that \( \alpha := \text{lim}_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log \kappa_{n_\ell} > \frac{1}{g+1} \log \lambda_k \), where \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) by Theorem 1.1 (iii). Since \( \text{w-lim}_{n \to \infty} \nu_n = \rho_{E, C} \), by comparing (4.1) and (5.5), we have for \( z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |\tau_{n_\ell}(z)| = \mathcal{G}_E(z, C) + d \tag{5.7}
\]

where \( d = \alpha - \frac{1}{g+1} \log \lambda_k > 0 \). By the upper envelope theorem applied to the sequence \( \{\nu_{n_\ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \), there exists a polar set \( X \) such that (5.7) also holds for all \( z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus X \). Moreover, since \( \mathcal{G}_E(z, C) \geq 0 \) for
all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\tau_n(z)| \geq \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_\ell} \log |\tau_{n_\ell}(z)| \geq d, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus X.$$  

Comparing with (5.6) shows that $B \subset X$, so $\mu$ is supported on the polar set $X$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Defining $n(j) = j(\gamma + 1) + \kappa$ and using Lemma 6.1 to compute a telescoping product,

$$\left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \beta_\ell \right)^{1/j} = \left( \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \frac{\kappa_{n(\ell)}}{\kappa_{n(\ell+1)}} \right)^{1/j} = \kappa_{n(1)}^{1/j} \kappa_{n(j+1)}^{-1/j}. $$  

(5.8)

The first term on the right-hand side is independent of $j$, so $\kappa_{n(1)}^{1/j} \to 1$ as $j \to \infty$. For the second factor, using Theorem 1.3 we compute

$$\liminf_{j \to \infty} \kappa_{n(j+1)}^{1/j} \geq \lambda_k$$

and we have the upper bound (1.9) for the lim sup of (5.8). Similarly, using the criterion Theorem 1.10 (iii), it follows from (5.8) that $\mu$ is C-regular if and only if (1.10) holds. □

6. Cesàro-Nevai Condition for Finite Gap Sets

We begin by mentioning that in Theorem 1.10 we can assume without loss of generality that $c_\kappa \notin \sigma(J)$. This follows from the following Lemma:

Lemma 6.1. Let $J$ be a Jacobi matrix with $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = \mathbb{E}$ and let $\tilde{J} = J + \langle \cdot, c_0 \rangle e_0$. For all but finitely many values of $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{J}$ is a Jacobi matrix with $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{J}) = \mathbb{E}$ and $c_\kappa \notin \sigma(\tilde{J})$ for $1 \leq k \leq g$.

Proof. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{J}) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(J)$, so it suffices to ensure that $c_\kappa \notin \sigma_d(\tilde{J})$. By coefficient stripping, if $m(z)$ is the $m$ function corresponding to $\tilde{J}$, then

$$m(z) = \frac{1}{b_1 + t - z - a_1^2 \kappa_1(z)}$$

where $\kappa_1(z)$ is the $m$ function for $S_+^* J S_+$. In particular, eigenvalues of $\tilde{J}$ correspond to zeros of $b_1 + t - z - a_1^2 \kappa_1(z)$. Thus, for any $t$ such that $b_1 + t - c_\kappa - a_1^2 \kappa_1(c_\kappa) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq g$, we have $c_\kappa \notin \sigma_\text{ess}(\tilde{J})$ for $1 \leq j \leq g$. □

It was noted in [25, Section 2.2] that

$$- \log |\Psi(z)| = \sum_{k=1}^{g+1} G_\mathbb{E}(z, c_k)$$  

(6.1)

and that the Yuditskii discriminant has the form (1.13) for some $\lambda_k > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that the constants $\lambda_k$ can be found by computing the residue of $\Delta_\mathbb{E}$ at the poles $c_\kappa$. By using (1.14) and (6.1), we find the residues to be the same constants $\lambda_k$ in a more general setting in (1.6).

Proof of Lemma 1.7. Denote by $\mu$ the canonical spectral measure for $J$. Note that

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(A) = \text{ess sup} \mu = \mathbb{E} = \Delta_\mathbb{E}^{-1}([0, 2])$$

Since $\Delta_\mathbb{E}$ maps $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{c_1, \ldots, c_g\}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and is piecewise strictly monotone, by a spectral mapping theorem, this implies that for $J = \Delta_\mathbb{E}(A)$, $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = [-2, 2]$.

As noted in the introduction, regularity of the Jacobi matrix $J$ implies C$\mathbb{E}$-regularity by Corollary 1.7 and this can be characterized in terms of GMP matrix coefficients by Theorem 1.9. The
GMP matrix structure together with (1.13) implies that $J = \Delta_E(A)$ is a type 3 block Jacobi matrix (1.10): the diagonal entries of the off-diagonal blocks $v_j$ are given by $\lambda_k A_{j(g+1)+k}$ for $k = 0, \ldots, g$, with the convention $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{g+1}$. Thus,

$$\det v_j = \prod_{k=0}^g \lambda_k A_{j(g+1)+k}.$$  

By applying the criterion for regularity in Theorem 1.12 to the GMP matrix $A$ and to its resolvents $(c_k - A)^{-1}$, we conclude that $J$ obeys (1.17). It follows that $J$ is regular with $\sigma_{ess}(J) = [-2, 2]$. \hfill \Box

In this section, in order to make precise statements, it will be necessary to also introduce full-line GMP matrices, that is, operators acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. For this reason, we will denote half-line GMP matrices by $A_+$. If $A_+$ is such that $\sigma_{ess}(A_+) = E$ and the corresponding measure is regular on $E$, then $\Delta_E(A_+)$ is a block Jacobi matrix which due to Lemma 1.11 is regular for $[-2, 2]$. Therefore, if $\{v_\ell, w_\ell\}$ denote the block Jacobi coefficients of $\Delta_E(A_+)$, by [19, Theorem 3.1] we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell - I\| + \|w_\ell\| = 0. \quad (6.2)$$

We note that since $C = \sup_\ell (\|v_\ell(A) - I\| + \|w_\ell\|) < \infty$, it follows from Cauchy-Schwarz and the AM-GM inequality that

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell - I\| + \|w_\ell\|\right)^2 \leq \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell - I\|^2 + \|w_\ell\|^2 \leq 2C \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell - I\| + \|w_\ell\|$$

and thus

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell\|^2 + \|v_\ell - I\|^2 = 0 \iff \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell\| + \|v_\ell - I\| = 0. \quad (6.3)$$

We will use this equivalence freely in the following.

In the setting of periodic Jacobi matrices and polynomial discriminants (i.e., $\Delta$ is a polynomial and $\{v_\ell, w_\ell\}$ are the coefficients of the block Jacobi matrix $\Delta(J_+)$) it is shown in [6] that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \|v_\ell\|^2 + \|v_\ell - I\|^2 < \infty \iff \sum_{m=1}^\infty d((S_+^*)^m J S_+^m J)^2 < \infty. \quad (6.4)$$

It was then stated in [19] that since all the arguments in [6] are local, in this setting (6.3) yields (1.13). Let us emphasize that finite gap sets whose isospectral torus consists of periodic Jacobi matrices are very special and the arguments in [19] only apply to this setting. Yuditskii [22] has extended the work of [19] and one has the same localness, but since the construction is quite involved, we will sketch the main ideas of proof. In this case, the condition on the right-hand side of (6.4) is still the same, i.e., a condition for a Jacobi matrix $J_+$, but on the left-hand side $\{v_\ell, w_\ell\}$ are the coefficients of the block Jacobi matrix $\Delta_E(A)$, where $A$ is an associated GMP matrix and $\Delta_E$ is the rational function as defined in (1.13).

We will start with the main ingredients of the proof that the left-hand side in (6.4) implies the right-hand side and mention certain modifications to our setting. After this preparatory work will show how this can be applied to our setting. Recall that in the beginning of Section 3 we mentioned that except certain initial conditions affecting the blocks $A_0, B_0$, all blocks of half-line GMP matrices are of the same structure (6.1). This structure can clearly be extended to an operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. We
denote this class of operators by $A(C, Z)$. We then say an operator $A \in A(C, Z)$ is a full-line GMP matrix, if all the resolvents $(c_{\ell} - A)^{-1}$ exist for any $\ell \neq k$ and $(c_{\ell} - A)^{-1} \in A(f(C), Z)$ where $f$ is the Möbius transform $f : z \mapsto (c_{\ell} - z)^{-1}$ and $f(C) = (f(c_1), \ldots, f(c_{g+1}))$. In this case we write $A \in \text{GMP}(C, Z)$. Again we call the generating coefficients $\{\vec{p}_j, \vec{q}_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ the GMP coefficients of $A$.

We will also use the notion of the isospectral torus of periodic GMP matrices [10]. Let $E$ be a finite gap set and $C_E$ be the collection of zeros of the Ahlfors function. We call a GMP matrix 1-periodic or simply periodic if $S_{g+1}A S^{-g} = A$ where $S$ denotes the shift operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. We then define the isospectral torus of periodic GMP matrices by

$$\mathcal{T}_E(C_E) = \{ A \in A(C_E), A \text{ is periodic and } \sigma(A) = E \}.$$  

As for Jacobi matrices, one can show that the spectrum is purely absolutely continuous and of multiplicity 2. However, we point out that for arbitrary finite gap sets, the isospectral torus of Jacobi matrices usually consists of almost periodic operators, whereas for GMP matrices we can always work with periodic operators. This also makes it possible to characterize the isospectral torus by a magic formula for GMP matrices: let $A \in \text{GMP}(C_E, Z)$, then

$$A \in \mathcal{T}_E(C_E) \iff \Delta_E(A) = S_{g+1} + S^{-g},$$

where $S$ denotes the right shift operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. We point out that if as in [10, Theorem 1.10] $J = \Delta_E(A)$ denotes the $(g + 1) \times (g + 1)$-block Jacobi matrix with coefficients $\{v_\ell, w_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$, then (6.5) means that $v_1 = I$ and $w_1 = 0$.

Finally, recall that $A_k(A)$, for $k = 0, \ldots, g$, denotes the outermost positive entry of the resolvent $(c_{k} - A)^{-1}$ and is an algebraic expression in terms of the GMP coefficients $\{\vec{p}_j, \vec{q}_j\}$ of $A$. Therefore, having in mind $1.15$ and taking a look at the outermost diagonal of (6.8), we get that $A \in \mathcal{T}_E(C_E)$ implies that

$$A_k(A) \lambda_k = 1.$$  

Together with an additional equation related to the value of $d$ in [1.15], see [10, Theorem 1.10] for details, this gives an description of $\mathcal{T}_E(C_E)$ as an algebraic manifold. That is, there exists an algebraic polynomial $F_E : \mathbb{R}^{2g+2} \to \mathbb{R}^{g+1}$, so that the periodic GMP matrix $A$ with GMP parameters $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{2g+1}$ lies in $\mathcal{T}_E(C_E)$ if and only if

$$F_E(\vec{p}, \vec{q}) = 0.$$  

We will denote this manifold by $\mathcal{I}_E$. Considering the dimensions in the definition of $F_E$ it will not come as a surprise that $\mathcal{T}_E \cong \mathbb{R}^g / \mathbb{Z}^g$, which can be rigorously seen from the parametrization (6.14).

For a GMP matrix $A \in \text{GMP}(C_E, Z)$ define the functional

$$H_+(A) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|v_{\ell-1} - I\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \|w_\ell\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \|v_\ell - I\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$  

If $P_+$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm, then we have

$$H_+(A) = \|P_+(\Delta_E(A) - (S_{g+1} + S^{-g}))\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$  

A key observation is that the functional $H_+(A)$ is related to the shift action of $S_{g+1}$ on the GMP matrix $A$. But finally we want to conclude something about $SJ = S^*JS$. 

This leads to the introduction of the Jacobi flow on GMP matrices. Due to Proposition 5.5, there is, up to a certain identification, a one-to-one correspondence between Jacobi matrices, $J$, satisfying $c_k \notin \sigma(J)$ and GMP matrices $A \in \text{GMP}(C_E, \mathbb{Z})$. Let us denote this mapping by $\mathcal{F}$. Then the Jacobi flow on $\text{GMP}(C_E, \mathbb{Z})$ is defined by the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{GMP} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & \text{GMP} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Jacobi} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & \text{Jacobi}
\end{array}
\]

(6.10)

This is one of the reasons why it is natural to work with full-line operators. If we would consider in this construction the shift action on $\ell^2(N_0)$, which is not unitary, then it may happen that for some $m$, $c_k \in \sigma((S_+^*)^m J^* S_m^*)$ and thus the corresponding half-line GMP matrix would not be well defined. It is shown in Equation (4.8) and Lemma 4.4 that there exists a block-diagonal unitary mapping $U_A$, such that

\[
J^* = S^{-1}U^*_A A U_A S.
\]

(6.11)

The following lemma, which follows essentially from (6.11), allows to compute the “derivative” in Jacobi flow direction and is essential in order to extract from finiteness of $H_+(A)$ properties of the associated Jacobi matrix $J$.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let

\[
\delta_j H_+(A) = \|(\Delta_E(J^+ A) - (S^{g+1} + S^{-(s+1)})e_{-1})\|_{HS}^2.
\]

Then

\[
H_+(A) = H_+(J^+ A) + \delta_j H_+(A).
\]

(6.12)

This is an analog of [25, Lemma 6.1], but note that there $H_+(A)$ was defined slightly differently. This formulation was natural in this setting, since it comes from spectral theoretical sum rules. Since we will start already with the condition (6.2), defining $H_+(A)$ by (6.8) seems more natural.

Let us define

\[
\tilde{H}_+(A) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta_j H_+(A(m)), \quad \text{where } A(m) = J^{om}(A).
\]

Since all terms are positive, iterating (6.12) yields

\[
\tilde{H}_+(A) \leq H_+(A).
\]

One can now use $\tilde{H}_+(A) < \infty$ to show that $A(m)$ is $\ell^2$-close to be periodic and that the periodic operator is $\ell^2$-close to $\mathcal{T}E$. That is, if $\{\tilde{p}_j(m), \tilde{q}_j(m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ denote the GMP parameters of $A(m)$, then [25, Theorem 1.20]

\[
\{\tilde{p}_0(m) - \tilde{p}_{}^{-1}(m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{R}^{g+1}),
\]

\[
\{\tilde{q}_0(m) - \tilde{q}_{}^{-1}(m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{R}^{g+1}),
\]

\[
\{F_E(\tilde{p}_0(m), \tilde{q}_0(m))\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{R}^{g+2}).
\]

(6.13)

To show how one obtains from (6.13) convergence of $(S_+^*)^m J S_m^*$ to $\mathcal{T}_E$ in the sense of (6.4), we need one more ingredient: it is well known that there are continuous functions, $A, B$, on $\mathbb{R}^g / \mathbb{Z}^g$,
which can be expressed explicitly in terms of the theta function associated to $E$ \cite[Theorem 9.4.]{29}, and a fixed element $\chi \in \mathbb{R}^g / \mathbb{Z}^g$, such that

$$T_{E} = \{ J(\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^g / \mathbb{Z}^g \}$$

and $J(\alpha)$ is the Jacobi matrix built from the coefficients

$$a_m(\alpha) = A(\alpha - m\chi), \quad b_m(\alpha) = B(\alpha - m\chi).$$

Recall that by the definition of the Jacobi flow, if $J_+$ is the Jacobi matrix associated to $A_+$, then $(S^+)^m J_+ S^+_m$ is the Jacobi matrix associated to $P_+ A(m) P_+$. Using a certain “open-gap” condition for $A_{E}$, one can now conclude from \eqref{6.13} that there is an element $J(\alpha_m) \in T_{E}^+$, such that

$$\{a_m - A(\alpha_m - m\chi)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0), \quad \{b_m - B(\alpha_m - m\chi)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0),$$

where $\{a_m, b_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ denote the coefficients of $J_+$. This is used to prove \eqref{6.4}.

Before we start with our construction, we have to mention a certain technical issue. In proving \eqref{6.4}, it is constantly used that for all $0 \leq k \leq g$

$$\{\lambda_k A_k(A(m)) - 1\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \implies \inf_m \lambda_k A_k(A(m)) > 0.$$

Let us introduce the notation $\{f_m\} \in CS$ for sequences $\{f_m\}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} |f_m| = 0,$$

and we call a set $T \subset \mathbb{N}$ sparse if

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{|T \cap \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}|}{N} = 0.$$

An elementary observation, which will be used repeatedly, is that for $f \in CS$, the set $\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid |f_m| \geq \delta\}$ is sparse for any $\delta > 0$. This follows immediately from Markov’s inequality. Note that we will only have $\{\lambda_k A_k(A(m)) - 1\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in CS$ and therefore

$$\liminf_{m \to \infty} \lambda_k A_k(A(m)) = 0$$

is possible. But the set where $\lambda_k A_k(A(m)) < 1/2$ is sparse, i.e., we still have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{|\{1 \leq m \leq N : \lambda_k A_k(A(m)) < 1/2\}|}{N} = 0.$$\hspace{1cm}\text{(6.16)}

This allows us to apply all estimates assuming $\lambda_k A_k(A(m)) \geq 1/2$ and treat the remaining $m$ using \eqref{6.10}. For a given GMP matrix $A$, let us define

$$I_N = \{m : \exists k : \lambda_k A_k(A(m)) < 1/2\} \cap [1, N]$$

and we note that $H_+(A) \in CS$ implies that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{|I_N|}{N} = 0.$$\hspace{1cm}\text{(6.17)}

We are finally ready to adapt Yuditskii’s construction \cite{30} to our setting. Let $\mu$ be a regular measure with ess sup $\mu = E$ and $c_k \notin \text{supp } \mu$ and let $J_+$ and $A_+$ be the associated Jacobi and GMP matrix, respectively. Moreover let $\{v_i, w_i\}$ denote the block Jacobi coefficients of $A_{E}(A_+)$. First of all, by \cite[Lemma 5.1]{30} we can extend $J_+$ respectively $A_+$ by an element from the isospectral torus to full-line operators such that still $c_k \notin \sigma(A)$ and therefore $A \in \mathcal{A}(C_{E}, Z)$. Furthermore, let $A_N$ be the GMP matrix obtained by truncating $A$ after the $N$-th block and extending it by some element
A ∈ T_E(C_E). Again we can do this and still ensure that c_k ∉ σ(A_N). Having in mind that elements from T_E(C_E) satisfy the magic formula (6.5) and since computing the coefficients of (c_k - A)^{-1} in the kth block only requires the entries from the consecutive blocks of A_N, cf. [25, Lemma 3.2], it follows from compactness of T_E(C_E) that

$$H_+(A_N) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} (\|v_{\ell-1} - I\|_{HS}^2 + \|w_{\ell} - I\|_{HS}^2 + \|v_\ell - I\|_{HS}^2) + O(1),$$

where the constant in O(1) depends on E and A. Therefore,

$$\tilde{H}_+(A_N) \leq H_+(A_N) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} (\|v_{\ell-1} - I\|_{HS}^2 + \|w_{\ell} - I\|_{HS}^2 + \|v_\ell - I\|_{HS}^2) + O(1). \quad (6.19)$$

Using that also the Jacobi flow can be computed locally and analyzing the proof of [25, Theorem 1.20] one can get a more quantitative statement instead of (6.13). That is, there is an N independent constant C such that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{N} \|\tilde{p}_0(m) - \tilde{p}_{-1}(m)\|^2 \leq C(H_+(A_N) + |I_N|) + O(1),$$

$$\sum_{m=1}^{N} \|\tilde{q}_0(m) - \tilde{q}_{-1}(m)\|^2 \leq C(H_+(A_N) + |I_N|) + O(1),$$

$$\sum_{m=1}^{N} \|F_E(\tilde{p}_0(m), \tilde{q}_0(m))\|^2 \leq C(H_+(A_N) + |I_N|) + O(1),$$

where the O(1) comes from the fact that in order to compute the GMP coefficients for m = N, one would need also the (N + 1)st block of A, which was truncated in the definition of A_N. However, this suffices to show that there is an element J(α_m) ∈ T_E^+, so that for some N independent constant C we have

$$\sum_{m=1}^{N} (a_m - A(\alpha_m - m\chi))^2 \leq C(H_+(A_N) + |I_N|) + O(1),$$

$$\sum_{m=1}^{N} (b_m - B(\alpha_m - m\chi))^2 \leq C(H_+(A_N) + |I_N|) + O(1),$$

where again \{a_m, b_m\}_{m∈\mathbb{N}_0} denote the coefficients of J_+. Thus, dividing by N and sending N → ∞, we obtain by (6.3), (6.18) and (6.19) that

$$\{a_m - A(\alpha_m - m\chi)\}_{m∈\mathbb{N}_0}, \{b_m - B(\alpha_m - m\chi)\}_{m∈\mathbb{N}_0} \subset CS. \quad (6.20)$$

Moreover, similarly to the proof of [25, Theorem 1.5], a Lipschitz estimate on the difference of characters with respect to the corresponding \tilde{p} vectors shows that \{α_m+1 - α_m\}_{m∈\mathbb{N}_0} ∈ CS.

**Lemma 6.3.** For fixed \(L ∈ \mathbb{N}\) and \(δ > 0\), the set

$$B_{L,δ} = \{m : |α_m + \ell - α_m| ≤ δ \text{ for all } \ell = 0, \ldots, L - 1\}$$

has a sparse complement, i.e., \(|B_{L,δ} \cap \{0, \ldots, N\}| \rightarrow 1\) as \(N → ∞\).
Proof. Since shifts and linear combinations of CS sequences are in CS, \( \{ \alpha_{m+\ell} - \alpha_m \}_{m=0}^{\infty} \in \text{CS} \) for any \( \ell \). Thus, for any \( \ell \), the set \( \{ m : |\alpha_{m+\ell} - \alpha_m| > \delta \} \) is sparse; the complement of \( B_{L,\delta} \) is a union of finitely many sparse sets, so it is sparse. 

To prove Theorem 1.10 it remains to prove that, for every \( \epsilon > 0 \),

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \text{dist}(T_E^+, (S_+^*)^m J_+ S_+^m) \leq \epsilon. 
\] (6.21)

Fix \( L \) so that \( \sum_{\ell=L}^{\infty} e^{-\ell} \|J_+\| \leq \epsilon/16 \). Choose \( \delta > 0 \) so that

\[
|A(\beta_1) - A(\beta_2)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{8L}, \quad |B(\beta_1) - B(\beta_2)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{8L}
\] (6.22)

whenever \( |\beta_1 - \beta_2| \leq \delta \).

Since \( \text{dist}(T_E^+, (S_+^*)^m J_+ S_+^m) \) is uniformly bounded in \( m \) and the complement of \( B_{L,\delta} \) is sparse,

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq N} \sum_{m \in B_{L,\delta}} \text{dist}(T_E^+, (S_+^*)^m J_+ S_+^m) = 0.
\]

For \( m \in B_{L,\delta} \), estimating the distance to \( T_E^+ \) by the distance to \( J(\alpha_m - m\chi) \) gives

\[
\text{dist}(T_E^+, (S_+^*)^m J_+ S_+^m) \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} e^{-\ell} (|a_{m+\ell} - A(\alpha_m - (m+\ell)\chi)| + |b_{m+\ell} - B(\alpha_m - (m+\ell)\chi)|).
\]

Using (6.22) for \( \ell < L \) and using our choice of \( L \) to bound the tail of the series, we obtain

\[
\text{dist}(T_E^+, (S_+^*)^m J_+ S_+^m) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} e^{-\ell} (|a_{m+\ell} - A(\alpha_m - (m+\ell)\chi)| + |b_{m+\ell} - B(\alpha_m - (m+\ell)\chi)|).
\]

Thus, to prove (6.21), it remains to prove

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq N} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} e^{-\ell} g_{m+\ell} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},
\] (6.23)

where \( g_p = |a_p - A(\alpha_p - p\chi)| + |b_p - B(\alpha_p - p\chi)| \). Note \( g \in \text{CS} \) by (6.20). Enlarging the range of summation, we obtain

\[
\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq N} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} e^{-\ell} g_{m+\ell} \leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N+L} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} e^{-\ell} g_p.
\]

Now the sum in \( \ell \) can be separated as an explicit constant, so this \( \limsup \) is zero since \( g \in \text{CS} \). Then (6.23) follows, and the proof of (6.21) is complete.
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