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Abstract
Scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz-Nevanlinna functions are characterized by the interlacing property of their poles and zeros together with some growth properties. We give a characterization of matrix-valued Herglotz-Nevanlinna functions by means of a higher-order interlacing property. As an application we deduce a matrix version of the classical Hermite-Biehler Theorem for entire functions.

1 Introduction
Interlacing patterns of the zeros of two polynomials have occurred already in the middle of the 19th century. The work of Sturm, Cauchy, and Hermite [6] established a connection between the stability1 of a polynomial $p$ in terms of interlacing of the real zeros of two associated polynomials, now known as the Hermite-Biehler Theorem. This criterion can be found in different versions in the work of Biehler [2] and Hurwitz [9]. Hurwitz in fact mentions the successful application of a related result during the construction of the turbine system of the Swiss bathing resort Davos.

In modern times, the Hermite-Biehler Theorem has been developed further and there are versions for polynomials with complex coefficients [8], multivariate polynomials [18], for entire functions [12], and polynomials with $l$ zeros in the left half-plane and $r$ zeros in the right half-plane [7]. The geometry of zeros of a polynomial is relevant in combinatorics [3] as well as in spectral theory [14], [15] and in control theory [17], where Kharitonov’s Theorem [10] is a prominent consequence of the Hermite-Biehler Theorem. Moreover, the class of Hermite-Biehler functions is essential for de Branges’ theory of Hilbert spaces of entire functions [4]. Let us recall:

\begin{theorem}[Hermite-Biehler] Let $A(z)$ and $B(z)$ be polynomials with real coefficients. Set $p = A + iB$. Then all zeros of $p$ belong to the open lower half-plane $\mathbb{C}_-$, if and only if the following two conditions hold:

(i) The zeros of $A$ and $B$ are all real, simple, and interlace.

(ii) For one (and hence for all) $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $A'(x)B(x) - B'(x)A(x) > 0$.
\end{theorem}

A generalization of this theorem to entire functions is due to Levin, Meiman and Naimark and can be found in Chapter VII of Levin’s book [12].
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1 A polynomial is called stable if all of its zeros have negative real part.
Our motivation for the present work was to find a version of the Hermite-Biehler Theorem for matrix-valued functions. Items (i), (ii) in Theorem 1.1 essentially mean that \( q := \frac{A}{B} \) is a meromorphic Herglotz function, i.e., a function meromorphic on \( \mathbb{C} \) taking real values on \( \mathbb{R} \) that maps the open upper half-plane \( \mathbb{C}_+ \) to \( \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R} \). The task of extending the theorem to matrix-valued functions thus boils down to investigating the pattern of zeros and poles of matrix-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions.

The main result of this paper is Theorem 4.3. In this theorem we show that matrix-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions can be characterized by an interlacing-like condition imposed on the zeros and poles of principal minors.

In Section 5, we use this result to prove Theorem 5.6, which can be seen as a version of the Hermite-Biehler Theorem for matrix-valued functions.
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2 Preliminaries

For a function \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) defined on some set \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C} \), we set \( f^\#(z) := f(\overline{z})^* \) whenever \( \overline{z} \in \Omega \). We say that \( f \) is \#-real if \( \Omega \) is symmetric w.r.t. the real axis, and \( f = f^\# \) on \( \Omega \). The \#-real part of a function \( f \) is given by \( Rf := \frac{1}{2}(f + f^\#) \), while \( If := \frac{1}{2i}(f - f^\#) \) is the \#-imaginary part of the function \( f \). Then \( A := Rf \) and \( B := If \) are the unique \#-real functions s.t. \( f = A + iB \). On the other hand, the \(*\)-real and \(*\)-imaginary part of a (constant) complex matrix \( M \) will be denoted by \( \text{Re} M := \frac{1}{2}(M + M^*) \), while \( \text{Im} M := \frac{1}{2i}(M - M^*) \).

The open lower and upper half-plane we will call \( \mathbb{C}_\pm := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \pm \text{Im} z > 0 \} \).

2.1 Definition. A Herglotz function is a function \( Q : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \) that is holomorphic, \#-real, and satisfies \( \text{Im} Q(z) \geq 0 \) for all \( z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \). If \( Q \) admits a meromorphic continuation to all of \( \mathbb{C} \), we say that \( Q \) is a meromorphic Herglotz function. For convenience, the continuation is then called \( Q \) as well.

Herglotz functions are often also called Nevanlinna functions, or Herglotz-Nevanlinna functions. Any piece of literature about them will contain the fundamental theorem giving a unique integral representation for every Herglotz function. As we will only need it for meromorphic Herglotz functions, the theorem will be given in a simpler version.

2.2 Theorem. Let \( Q : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \). Then \( Q \) is a meromorphic Herglotz function if and only if it admits the following representation,

\[
Q(z) = C + Dz + \sum_{j \in M} A_j \left( \frac{1}{z_j - z} - \frac{z_j}{1 + z_j^2} \right)
\tag{1}
\]

where \( C = C^* \), \( D \geq 0 \), and \((z_j)_{j \in M}\) is a finite or infinite sequence of real numbers without finite limit points. Moreover,

(i) \( C = \text{Re} Q(i) \);

(ii) \( D = \lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{\text{Im} Q(\tau)}{\tau} \).
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(iii) Let \(-\infty < c < d < +\infty\), where neither \(c\) nor \(d\) occur in the sequence \((z_j)_{z \in M}\). Then

\[
\sum_{j \in M, c < z_j < d} A_j = \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\tau \to 0} \int_c^d \text{Im} Q(x + i\tau) \, dx;
\]

(iv) If all diagonal entries of \(Q\) vanish, then \(Q(z) \equiv C\).

(v) If \(\det Q \neq 0\), then \(\det Q(z) \neq 0\) for every nonreal \(z\).

For a scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz function \(q \neq 0\), there is more to say. Namely, the zeros and poles of \(q\) interlace, which follows immediately from the fact that \(q(x)\) is strictly increasing for real \(x\).

Conversely, given two sequences \(a_M, ..., a_N\) and \(b_M, ..., b_N\) with \(M, \hat{M} \geq -\infty\) and \(N, \hat{N} \leq +\infty\) that are interlacing, i.e., \(b_k < a_k < b_{k+1}\), there is a unique, up to a multiplicative constant, meromorphic Herglotz function having zeros \(\{a_k\}\) and poles \(\{b_k\}\). To avoid technicalities, we only state the following result for the case \(M = -\infty\) and \(N = +\infty\), but a similar formula holds for every pair of interlacing sequences.

2.3 Theorem (\cite{II} Chapter VII, Theorem 1). Let the scalar-valued function \(q\) be meromorphic on \(\mathbb{C}\) and holomorphic on \(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}\) such that the set of poles of \(q\) is bounded neither from below nor from above. Then \(q\) is Herglotz if and only if

\[
q(z) = c \frac{a_0 - z}{b_0 - z} \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1 - \frac{z}{a_j}}{1 - \frac{z}{b_j}};
\]

where \(b_j < a_j < b_{j+1}, j \in \mathbb{Z}, a_{-1} < 0 < b_1,\) and \(c > 0\).

For any such pair of interlacing sequences, the product converges uniformly on compact subsets of \(\mathbb{C}\) not containing any of the points \(b_k\).

3 The \(n\)-interlacing property

In order to get an analog of Theorem 2.3 for matrix-valued Herglotz functions, we need a higher-order version of the interlacing property. We will formulate it in terms of divisor functions, where the function \(\theta\) is called a divisor function if it is defined on a subset of \(\mathbb{C}\) taking values in \(\mathbb{Z}\) such that \(\theta^{-1}(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})\) is a discrete set. For a scalar-valued meromorphic function \(f\), denote by \(\theta_f\) the divisor function of \(f\), i.e., \(\theta_f(z) = n\) if \(z\) is a zero of multiplicity \(n\) of \(f\), \(\theta_f(z) = -n\) if \(z\) is a pole of multiplicity \(n\) of \(f\), and \(\theta_f(z) = 0\) otherwise.

3.1 Definition. Let \(\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z}\) be a divisor function, and let \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Then \(\theta\) is called \(n\)-interlacing, if for every \(-\infty < a < b < +\infty\) we have

\[
\left| \sum_{x \in (a, b)} \theta(x) \right| \leq n.
\]

If \(f\) is a meromorphic function on some open set \(\Omega \supset \mathbb{R}\), we say that \(f\) satisfies the \(n\)-interlacing condition if all zeros and poles of \(f\) are real and the function \(\theta_f|_{\mathbb{R}}\) is \(n\)-interlacing.

The following fact might also be of independent interest.

3.2 Proposition. Let \(\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z}\) be a divisor function and let \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Then \(\theta\) is \(n\)-interlacing if and only if there exist \(1\)-interlacing divisor functions \(\theta_1, ..., \theta_n\) such that \(\theta = \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j\).
Proof. The backwards implication is evident. For the forward implication, assume that $\theta$ is $n$-interlacing.

Set

$$\Theta(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{t \in [0,x]} \theta(t), & x \geq 0, \\ -\sum_{t \in (x,0]} \theta(t), & x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Then $\Theta$ is a well-defined step function because of $\theta$ having discrete support. We use the notation $\Theta(x-)$ for $\lim_{t \nearrow x} \Theta(t)$ and $\Theta(x+)$ for $\lim_{t \searrow x} \Theta(t)$. For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\theta_j(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Theta(x+) > j \geq \Theta(x-), \\ -1 & \text{if } \Theta(x-) > j \geq \Theta(x+), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We show that each $\theta_j(x)$ is already 1-interlacing.

Suppose that we are given $x < y$ such that $\theta_j(x) = \theta_j(y) = 1$. Then $\Theta(x-) \leq j < \Theta(x+)$ and $\Theta(y-) \leq j < \Theta(y+)$. In particular,

$$\Theta(x+) > j \geq \Theta(y-).$$

Hence, $t_0 := \inf \{t > x : \Theta(t+) \leq j \}$ is well-defined, and $t_0 \in (x,y)$ such that $\Theta(t_0-) > j \geq \Theta(t_0+).$ Therefore, $\theta_j(t_0) = -1$. Analogously, we see that between points $\tilde{x} < \tilde{y}$ with $\theta_j(\tilde{x}) = \theta_j(\tilde{y}) = -1$, there is $t_0$ satisfying $\theta_j(t_0) = 1$. We conclude that $\theta_j$ is 1-interlacing.

We check that $\theta = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_j$. Letting $x < y$, observe that

$$|\Theta(y) - \Theta(x)| = \left| \sum_{t \in (x,y)} \theta(t) \right| \leq n.$$

Writing $j_- := \min \{\Theta(x) : x \in \mathbb{R} \}$ and $j_+ := \max \{\Theta(x) : x \in \mathbb{R} \}$, it follows that $j_+ - j_- \leq n$.

However, from our definition of $\theta_j$ we can see that $\theta_j \equiv 0$ if $j \geq j_+$ or $j < j_-$, which means that all but at most $n$ of the functions $\theta_j$ vanish.

Now, the definition of $\Theta$ yields

$$\theta(x) = \Theta(x+) - \Theta(x-) = \begin{cases} \left| \{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \Theta(x+) > j \geq \Theta(x-) \} \right|, & \Theta(x+) > \Theta(x-), \\ -\left| \{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \Theta(x-) > j \geq \Theta(x+) \} \right|, & \Theta(x+) < \Theta(x-), \\ 0, & \Theta(x+) = \Theta(x-) \end{cases}$$

$$= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_j(x).$$

We already know that the number of non-vanishing $\theta_j$ is at most $n$. The proof is complete. \(\square\)

3.3 Theorem. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $f$ be meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$. Then $f$ satisfies the $n$-interlacing condition if and only if there exist scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions $q_1, \ldots, q_n$, a complex constant $C$, and an entire function $g$, such that $g(0) = 0$ and

$$f(z) = Ce^{g(z)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (4)$$

If, in addition, $f$ is $\#$-real, then $g$ is $\#$-real and $C$ is real.
Proof. Proposition 3.2 provides us with 1-interlacing functions \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n \) such that \( \theta_f = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \theta_n \).

Let \( \theta_j^{-1}([1]) = \{a_j, \tilde{M}_j, \ldots, a_j, N_j\} \) and \( \theta_j^{-1}([-1]) = \{b_j, \tilde{M}_j, \ldots, b_j, N_j\} \), where \( M_j, \tilde{M}_j \geq -\infty \), and \( N_j, \tilde{N}_j \leq +\infty \) and

\[
\cdots < b_{j,k} < a_{j,k} < b_{j,k+1} < a_{j,k+1} < \cdots
\]

We want to define a function having its zeros at the points \( a_{j,k} \) and its poles at the points \( b_{j,k} \), in the same way as in (2). Providing full generality requires some technicalities, however. Let

\[
r_{j}(z) = \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} m_{j,k}(z)
\]

where

\[
m_{j,k}(z) := \begin{cases} \frac{1-z/a_{j,k}}{1-z/b_{j,k}}, & \max\{M_j, \tilde{M}_j\} \leq k \leq \min\{N_j, \tilde{N}_j\}, \quad a_{j,k} \neq 0, b_{j,k} \neq 0; \\
\frac{a_{j,k}-z}{b_{j,k}-z}, & \max\{M_j, \tilde{M}_j\} \leq k \leq \min\{N_j, \tilde{N}_j\}, \quad (a_{j,k} = 0 \lor b_{j,k} = 0); \\
a_{j,k}-z, & k = M_j < \tilde{M}_j; \\
\frac{1}{b_{j,k}-z}, & k = \tilde{N}_j > N_j; \\
1, & \text{else.}
\end{cases}
\]

By Theorem 2.3 the product \( r_j \) converges locally uniformly, and either \( r_j \) or \(-r_j\) is a Herglotz function. Letting \( q_j := \pm r_j \) such that \( q_j \) is Herglotz, the function \( \frac{q_1 \cdots q_n}{q_1 \cdots q_n} \) is entire and does not have any zeros, and therefore can be written as \( Ce^g \), with some entire function \( g \) satisfying \( g(0) = 0 \). Hence, representation (1) holds.

Suppose that, additionally, \( f \) is \#-real. Since the functions \( q_1, \ldots, q_n \) are also \#-real, the same goes for \( Ce^g =: e^{g_1} \). We find that \( e^{g_1-g_1^\#} \equiv 1 \), i.e., \( g_1(z) - g_1^\#(z) \equiv 2k\pi i \) for some \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \). Let \( g_2(z) := g_1(z) - k\pi i \), then \( g_2 \) is \#-real, and

\[
f(z) = (1)^k e^{g_2(0)} e^{g_2(z) - g_2(0) - \sum_{q_1}^{n} q_j(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.
\]

is the desired representation.

The relevance of the next statement is that the functions \( q_1, \ldots, q_n \) can be chosen to be meromorphic.

**3.4 Theorem.** Let \( f \neq 0 \) be meromorphic on \( \mathbb{C} \) and \#-real. For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) There exist scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions \( q_1, \ldots, q_n \) such that \( f = \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j \);

(ii) There exists a holomorphic logarithm \( u \) of \( f|_{\mathbb{C}^+} \) with \( \text{Im} u(z) \in (0, n\pi) \) for every \( z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \).

Proof. If \( f = \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j \), then \( u := \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log q_j \) is a logarithm of \( f \) with \( \text{Im} u(z) \in (0, n\pi) \), \( z \in \mathbb{C}^+ \). We show that (i) follows from (ii). Consider any finite interval \((a, b)\) and assume that neither \( a \) nor \( b \) is a pole or a zero of \( f \). Set \( x_0 := \frac{a+b}{2} \) and \( r := \frac{a-b}{2} \). Define \( \gamma_+(z) := x_0 + r e^{it} \) for \( t \in [0, \pi] \) and \( \gamma_-(z) := x_0 + r e^{it} \) for \( t \in [\pi, 2\pi] \). Then

\[
\sum_{x \in (a,b)} \theta_f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\gamma_+} \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \, dz + \int_{\gamma_-} \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \, dz \right).
\]

Observe that \( f = f^\# \) implies that \( u^\# \) is a holomorphic logarithm of \( f^\# \) satisfying \( \text{Im} g^\#(z) \in (-n\pi, 0) \), \( z \in \mathbb{C}^- \). Thus, the modulus of the \#-imaginary parts of both integrals in (6)
is bounded by $n \pi$. So, $|\sum_{x \in (a,b)} \theta_f(x)| \leq n$. Applying Theorem 5.9 yields meromorphic Herglotz functions $q_1, \ldots, q_n$, a real constant $C$, and an entire $\#$-real function $g$ such that $f(z) = C \exp(g(z)) \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Again, each $q_j$ has a holomorphic logarithm in the upper half-plane, which leads to $g(z) = \log C + u(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log q_j(z)$. Therefore, $|\text{Im} g(z)|$ is bounded in $\mathbb{C}_+$. $g$ being $\#$-real implies that $|\text{Im} g(z)|$ is also bounded in $\mathbb{C}_-$ and thus in all of $\mathbb{C}$. By the Liouville Theorem, $g$ is constant, so $f = \tilde{C} \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j$ for some real constant $\tilde{C}$. If $\tilde{C} \geq 0$, then $f = (\tilde{C} q_1) \prod_{j=2}^{n} q_j$, which is the desired representation. This leaves the case $\tilde{C} < 0$. First, we write $f = -(-\tilde{C} q_1) \prod_{j=2}^{n} q_j$, where $-\tilde{C} q_1$ is Herglotz. Then the function $\tilde{u}(z) := i \pi + \log(-\tilde{C} q_1) + \sum_{j=2}^{n} \log q_j$ is another holomorphic logarithm of $f$ and satisfies $\text{Im} \tilde{u}(z) \in (\pi, (n+1)\pi)$ for $z$ in the upper half-plane. Observing that $u(z) = 2r\pi + \tilde{u}(z)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, we get that $(2r+1)\pi < \text{Im} u(z) < (2r + n)\pi$. At the same time, we know that $0 < \text{Im} u(z) < n\pi$. In total, we either have $\text{Im} u(z) \in (0, (n-1)\pi)$ (if $r < 0$) or $\text{Im} u(z) \in (\pi, n\pi)$. In both cases, from what was proven so far, we conclude that there exist meromorphic Herglotz functions $r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1}$ such that $f = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} r_j$ or $f = -\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} r_j$. Setting $\delta(z) \equiv 1$ or $\delta(z) \equiv -1$ leads to $f = \delta(z) \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} r_j$, which proves the theorem because $\delta$ is a meromorphic Herglotz function.

4 Characterization of matrix-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions

Our goal in this section is to prove a statement of the form “$Q$ is an $n \times n$-matrix-valued meromorphic Herglotz function if and only if its zeros and poles are $n$-interlacing”. It is not yet clear how to understand this, but we see in the next lemma that we should look at the determinant of $Q$.

4.1 Lemma. Let $Q$ be an $n \times n$-matrix-valued Herglotz function. Then there exist scalar Herglotz functions $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ such that $\det Q(z) = q_1(z) \cdots q_n(z)$. If $Q$ is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$, so are $q_1, \ldots, q_n$.

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on $n$. Since the assertion is evident for $n = 1$, only the induction step is to be done. Suppose that the assertion holds for every $n \times n$-matrix-valued Herglotz function, and let $Q$ be a $(n+1) \times (n+1)$-matrix-valued Herglotz function. If $Q(z) \equiv C$ (with self-adjoint $C$), then there is nothing to be proven. The same holds for the case that $\det Q \equiv 0$. Otherwise, by item $(v)$ in Theorem 2.2 $\det Q(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Letting $Q_{(j)}(z)$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, be the submatrix of $Q(z)$ obtained by deleting the $j$-th row and column from $Q$, we can write

$$-Q(z)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\frac{\det Q_{(1)}(z)}{\det Q(z)} & * & \cdots & * \\
* & -\frac{\det Q_{(2)}(z)}{\det Q(z)} & \cdots & * \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & * & \cdots & -\frac{\det Q_{(n)}(z)}{\det Q(z)}
\end{pmatrix}$$

Because $-Q(z)^{-1}$ is Herglotz, all of its diagonal entries $-\frac{\det Q_{(j)}(z)}{\det Q(z)}$ are scalar Herglotz functions. Because we assumed $Q(z)$ to not be constant, and because of Theorem 2.2 $(iv)$, there exists $j_0$ such that $q(z) := -\frac{\det Q_{(j_0)}(z)}{\det Q(z)}$ is not identically zero. Note that $-q(z)^{-1}$ is also a scalar Herglotz function, which implies the assertion by

$$\det Q(z) = \det Q_{(j_0)}(z)[-q(z)^{-1}] = q_1(z) \cdots q_n(z)[-q(z)^{-1}].$$

(7)
We continue with a reminder on linear algebra.

4.2 Definition. Let $M = (m_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, and let $m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Write $i = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$, where $1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_m \leq n$. We define the matrix $M_i$ by

$$M_i := \begin{pmatrix} m_{i_1i_1} & m_{i_1i_2} & \cdots & m_{i_1i_m} \\ m_{i_2i_1} & m_{i_2i_2} & \cdots & m_{i_2i_m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ m_{i_mi_1} & m_{i_mi_2} & \cdots & m_{i_mi_m} \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

A matrix $X$ is called a principal submatrix of $M$ if there exists $1 \leq m \leq n$ and $i = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$, as above, such that $X = M_i$. A principal minor of $M$ is the determinant of a principal submatrix of $M$.

It is easy to see that if $Q$ is an $n \times n$-matrix-valued Herglotz function, then every principal submatrix $Q_i$ is a Herglotz function, too. Therefore, $\det Q_i$ satisfies the $|i|$-interlacing property, where $|i|$ is the length of the multi-index $i$.

In the following main theorem we will show the converse: if $Q$ is a $\#$-real matrix-valued meromorphic function whose subminors all satisfy the interlacing properties of their respective sizes, then $Q$ is a Herglotz function.

However, some additional assumptions on the growth of the function $Q$ have to be imposed. We say that a scalar-valued function $f$ is of bounded type if it can be written as the ratio $g/h$ of two functions $g, h$ that are analytic and bounded in $\mathbb{C}_+$. For such a function $f \neq 0$, the mean type

$$h_f := \limsup_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{\log |f(i\tau)|}{\tau}$$

is finite. A matrix-valued function is said to be of bounded type if all of its entries are. Notably, every Herglotz function is a function of bounded type, as is seen by composing with a Möbius transformation mapping the upper half-plane to the unit circle.

4.3 Theorem. Let $Q$ be an $n \times n$-matrix-valued function that is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$, meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$, and $\#$-real. Suppose that $Q$ is of bounded type, and that $\limsup_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{||Q(i\tau)||}{\tau} < +\infty$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(i) $Q$ is Herglotz;

(ii) For every $m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $i = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$, where $1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_m \leq n$, the function $f_i(z) := \det[Q_i(z)]$ satisfies at least one of the following properties:

a. $f_i$ satisfies the $m$-interlacing property (cf. Definition 3.7), and if the set of poles of multiplicity $m$ is nonempty, then $\lim_{z \to z_0} [(z_0 - z)^m f_i(z)] > 0$ for at least one of those poles $z_0$. In addition, $\lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{f_i(i\tau)}{(i\tau)^m} \geq 0$.

b. $f_i$ can be represented as the product of $m$ scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz functions;

c. If $f_i$ is not constant, it has a holomorphic logarithm $u$ satisfying $\im u(z) \in (0, m\pi)$;

(iii) All residues of $Q$ as well as $\lim_{\tau \to +\infty} \left( -\frac{\im Q(i\tau)}{\tau} \right)$ are nonpositive matrices, and for every choice of $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n$, $f_{(i_1,i_2)}(z) := \det[Q_{(i_1,i_2)}(z)]$ is either constant, or it does not assume nonnegative real values.
If (i) – (iii) hold, then in (ii), all of a. – c. hold.

Proof. The implications (i) ⇒ (ii) and (i) ⇒ (iii) follow from what we already know, if we notice in addition that residues at poles of $Q$, as well as the limit $\lim_{r \to +\infty} \left(- \Im Q(ir) f\right)$, are nonpositive.

(iii) ⇒ (i):
It suffices to show that $Q$ can be represented in the form

$$Q(z) = C + Dz + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} A_j \left( \frac{1}{z_j - z} - \frac{z_j}{1 + z_j^2} \right).$$

with real $z_j$. The assertion on the non-positivity of residues and $-D = \lim_{r \to +\infty} \left(- \Im Q(ir) f\right)$ then proves the implication. This is done by showing that for any $k,l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$q_{kl}(z) = c_{kl} + d_{kl}z + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{j;kl} \left( \frac{1}{z_j - z} - \frac{z_j}{1 + z_j^2} \right).$$

Of course, for $k = l$, we obtain this representation from the fact that every diagonal entry of $Q$ is a scalar-valued meromorphic Herglotz function. Assume that $k < l$ and set $i = (k,l)$. Since $Q_i$ is a $2 \times 2$ principal submatrix of $Q$, Theorem 2.2 provides scalar Herglotz functions $r_1, r_2$ satisfying $\det Q_i(z) = r_1(z)r_2(z)$. Let $z_{j_0} \in \mathbb{R}$ be a pole of $Q$. Using the notation $\theta_f$ for the divisor of a meromorphic function $f$, $2\theta Q_{kk}(z_{j_0}) = \theta Q_{kl}(z_{j_0})$ because $Q_{kk} = Q_{kl}^\dagger$, and therefore poles and zeros of those functions have the same multiplicities. This leads to

$$|\theta_{Q_{kk}}(z_{j_0})| = \frac{1}{2} |\theta_{Q_{kl}}(z_{j_0})| = \frac{1}{2} |\theta_{Q_{kl}Q_{ll}^{-1}r_1r_2}(z_{j_0})| \leq \frac{1}{2} \max \{|\theta_{Q_{kl}}(z_{j_0})|, |\theta_{r_1}(z_{j_0}) + \theta_{r_2}(z_{j_0})|\} \leq 1$$

because the zeros and poles of the scalar Herglotz functions $Q_{kk}, Q_{ll}, r_1, r_2$ are all simple. Since $k, l$ are arbitrary, this shows that all poles of $Q$ are simple.

It is also easily seen that for the residue $A_{j_0}$ of $Q$ at $z_{j_0}$, we have

$$\det(A_{j_0})_1 = \lim_{z \to z_{j_0}} \left[(z - z_{j_0})^2 \det Q_i(z)\right] = \left( \lim_{z \to z_{j_0}} [(z - z_{j_0})r_1(z)] \right) \left( \lim_{z \to z_{j_0}} [(z - z_{j_0})r_2(z)] \right) \geq 0$$

since residues of scalar Herglotz functions are always nonpositive. Writing

$$(A_{j_0})_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{j_0;kk} & A_{j_0;kl} \\ A_{j_0;lk} & A_{j_0;ll} \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$|A_{j_0;kl}| = |A_{j_0;kl}A_{j_0;lk}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (A_{j_0;kk}A_{j_0;ll})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$
This ensures the convergence of

\[ \psi_{kl}(z) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{j;kl} \left( \frac{1}{z_j - z} - \frac{z_j}{1+z_j^2} \right) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} A_{j;kl} \frac{1+z_jz}{(z_j-z)(1+z_j^2)} \]

on every compact subset of \( \mathbb{C} \) not containing any of the points \( z_j \). If we write \( A_{j;kl} = A_{j;kl}^{r,+} - A_{j;kl}^{r,-} + i \left( A_{j;kl}^{i,+} - A_{j;kl}^{i,-} \right) \), such that the four numbers on the right side of this equation are nonnegative, we see that

\[ \psi_{j;kl} = \psi_{j;kl}^{r,+} - \psi_{j;kl}^{r,-} + i \left( \psi_{j;kl}^{i,+} - \psi_{j;kl}^{i,-} \right) \]

is a linear combination of Herglotz functions, and thus is a function of bounded type.

The function \( g_{kl}(z) := Q_{kl}(z) - \psi_{kl}(z) \) is entire. From the assumption on \( Q \) we obtain that \( g_{kl} \) is of bounded type and satisfies \( \limsup_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{|g_{kl}(ir)|}{\tau} < +\infty \); the same is true for \( g_{ik} = g_{kl}^{#} \). Next comes an application of the theorem of Krein (find it in \([16]\)) stating that an entire function that is of bounded type in both half-planes is of exponential type. Moreover, the mean types in the upper and lower half-plane sum up to a nonnegative number, that is, \( \tau_{g_{kl}} + \tau_{g_{kl}}^* \geq 0 \). At the same time, both mean types are nonpositive here because \( \limsup_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{|g_{kl}(ir)|}{\tau} \) and \( \limsup_{\tau \to +\infty} \frac{|g_{kl}(ir)|}{\tau} \) are both finite. As a result, \( g_{kl} \) is an entire function of exponential type \( \tau_{g_{kl}} = 0 \).

Hence, the entire function \( \tilde{g}_{kl}(z) := \frac{g_{kl}(z)-g_{kl}(0)}{z} \) is of exponential type 0 as well. In addition to that, it is bounded on the imaginary axis, which means that \( \tilde{g}_{kl} \) is constant by the Phragmén-Lindelöf principle \([12]\). This implies \( g_{kl}(z) = c_{kl} + d_{kl}z \) with some constants \( c_{kl}, d_{kl} \), which proves representation \([11]\).

\((iii) \Rightarrow (i)\):

Step 1. For a meromorphic \( m \times m \)-matrix-valued function \( X(z) \) that has a pole of multiplicity one at \( z_0 \), the residue of \( X \) at \( z_0 \) can be calculated by

\[ \text{Res}(X, z_0) = \lim_{z \to z_0} (z - z_0)X(z). \]

In particular,

\[ \det \text{Res}(X, z_0) = \lim_{z \to z_0} \det \left( (z - z_0)X(z) \right) = \lim_{z \to z_0} (z - z_0)^m \det X(z). \tag{10} \]

Step 2. By Theorem 3.3, b. is equivalent to c. If one of those conditions holds, then there exist scalar meromorphic Herglotz functions \( r_1, \ldots, r_m \) such that \( f_i(z) = \det Q_i(z) = r_1(z) \cdots r_m(z) \).

At any pole \( z_0 \) of \( f \) we have

\[ \lim_{z \to z_0} [(z_j - z)^m f_i(z)] = [\lim_{z \to z_0} (z_0 - z)r_1(z)] \cdots [\lim_{z \to z_0} (z_0 - z)r_m(z)] > 0. \tag{11} \]

Condition a. is, by Theorem 3.3, only equivalent to \( e^{-g}f_1 \) or \( -e^{-g}f_1 \) being a product of \( m \) meromorphic Herglotz functions (depending on the sign of \( C \)). If \( f_1 \) does not have a pole of multiplicity \( m \) at \( z_0 \), then \( \lim_{z \to z_0} [(z_j - z)^m f_i(z)] = 0 \). Otherwise, if \( z_0 \) is a pole of multiplicity \( m \) of \( f_1 \), the assertion guarantees that \( -e^{-g}f_1 \) is not a product of \( m \) Herglotz functions, which means that \( e^{-g}f_1 \) is. So, just as in \([11]\), \( \lim_{z \to z_0} [(z_j - z)^m f_i(z)] > 0 \), where \( e^{g(z_0)} > 0 \) because
$g$ is chosen to be a $\#$-real function. We see that if we assume (ii), then for every $1 \leq m \leq n$ and every principal $m \times m$-submatrix $Q_i$ we get that

$$\det \text{Res}(-Q_i, z_0) \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

Representation (10) can now be obtained in the same way as for the implication (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Moreover, the matrices $A_j$ are the residues of $-Q$. Formula (12) gives nonnegativity of all principal subminors of $A_j = \text{Res}(-Q, z_j)$. Applying Sylvester’s criterion (see [12], equations (7.6.9)-(7.6.12)), we obtain $A_j \geq 0$.

Step 3. We prove that the Matrix $D$ in the representation (9) is positive semidefinite. Choose $i = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$ as above. Then $f_1 = \det Q_i$ satisfies one of $a.-c.$ If it satisfies $a.$, then $\det D_i = \lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{f_i(\tau i)}{(i\tau)^n} \geq 0$. Otherwise, $b.$ is satisfied. Therefore, $\hat{f}_1(z) = f_i(-\frac{1}{2})$ still satisfies $a.$, which leads to $\det D_i = \lim_{r \to +\infty} \frac{f_i(\tau i)}{(i\tau)^n} = \lim_{z \to 0} ((-z)^m \hat{f}_1(z)) \geq 0$. By Sylvester’s criterion, $D \geq 0$.

5 The Hermite-Biehler Theorem for de Branges matrices

When extending the classical Hermite-Biehler Theorem from polynomials to entire functions, in order for the zeros and poles of $A$ and $B$ to interlace, it is not anymore sufficient that the zeros of $E$ lie in the lower half-plane. Instead, one introduces the class HB as the set of all entire functions that have no real zeros, and satisfy

$$|E(z)| > |E^\#(z)|, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+,$$

see e.g. (12). A straightforward way to define a matrix-valued Hermite-Biehler class HB$_n$ is to require its elements $E : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ to be entire and satisfy $\det E \neq 0$ and

$$E(z)E(z)^* - E^\#(z)E^\#(z)^* \geq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+. \quad (14)$$

Sometimes it is more convenient to set $s_E(z) := E(z)^{-1}E^\#(z)$ and require it to belong to the Schur class

$$S_n := \left\{ s : \mathbb{C}_+ \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \mid I - s(z)s(z)^* \geq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \right\}. \quad (15)$$

In this case, for real $x$ we get that $E(x)E(x)^* - E(x)^*E(x)$ is positive semidefinite while having zero trace, which is only possible for the zero matrix. Hence, $s_E$ even belongs to the subclass of inner Schur functions

$$S_n^{\text{inner}} := \left\{ s \in S_n^{n \times n} \mid I - s(x)s(x)^* = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (16)$$

This set is well-defined since it can be shown that every $f \in S_n^{n \times n}$ has nontangential boundary values at almost all points $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

We introduce a generalization of the class HB$_n$, adopting the terminology from [1], Section 5.10.

5.1 Definition. A meromorphic function

$$\mathcal{E} = [E_-, E_+] : \mathbb{C}_+ \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times 2n} \quad (17)$$

is called a de Branges matrix if $\det E_+ \neq 0$, and $E^{-1}_+E_-$ belongs to $S_n^{\text{inner}}$.

\footnote{Remember that $b.$ and $c.$ are equivalent.}
A meromorphic function $E$ clearly belongs to $\mathbb{HB}_n$ if and only if it is entire, and $[E^*, E]$ is a de Branges matrix.

Let us turn to the connection between de Branges matrices and meromorphic Herglotz functions. In analogy to Theorem 1.1 let

$$A := \frac{E_+ + E_-}{2}, \quad B := \frac{E_+ - E_-}{2i}.$$ 

Then, for $s := E_+^{-1}E_-,$

$$E_+(z)[I - s(z)s(z)^*]E_+(z)^* = E_+(z)E_+(z)^* - E_-(z)E_-(z)^*$$

$$= \left( A(z) + iB(z) \right) \left( A(z)^* - iB(z)^* \right) - \left( A(z) - iB(z) \right) \left( A(z)^* + iB(z)^* \right)$$

$$= 2i \left( B(z)A(z)^* - A(z)B(z)^* \right).$$

Under the assumption that $B$ is invertible everywhere in $\mathbb{C}_+, \text{ the function } Q := B^{-1}A \text{ is a Herglotz function because of }$

$$\text{Im } Q(z) = \frac{1}{4} \left[ B(z)^{-1}E_+(z) \right] [I - s(z)s(z)^*] \left[ B(z)^{-1}E_+(z) \right]^* \geq 0.$$ 

If, in addition, $E$ is meromorphic in some open domain $\Omega \supset \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R}, \text{ then Im } Q \text{ vanishes on the real line, and } Q \text{ is a meromorphic Herglotz function. In what follows, we will show that invertibility of } B \text{ is not necessary in order to define a meromorphic Herglotz function } Q \text{ in a meaningful way. However, we will require that } s = E_+^{-1}E_- \text{ admits a meromorphic continuation to an open } \Omega \supset \mathbb{C}_+.$

Because invertibility of $B$ is not given, we will work with the Moore-Penrose inverse $T^+$ of a matrix $T.$ It is defined by the properties

- $TT^+T = T,$
- $T^+TT^+ = T^+,$
- $TT^+$ and $T^+T$ are both Hermitian.

In fact, every matrix has a unique Moore-Penrose inverse. It is readily checked that $(T^+)^+ = T,$ and that $(\lambda T)^+ = \frac{1}{\lambda} T^+$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$ Additionally, $\ker T = \ker T^+T$ because of

$$\ker T \subseteq \ker T^+T \subseteq \ker TT^+T = \ker T. \quad (18)$$

The Moore-Penrose inverse of a holomorphic function $F$ is holomorphic if and only if ran $F$ and $\ker F$ are both locally constant (see [11, Remark 3.8]).

The next theorem is taken from [5, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2] and sheds light on the Moore-Penrose inverse of a Herglotz function.

5.2 Theorem. Let $Q$ be a Herglotz function. Then $\ker Q(z)$ and ran $Q(z)$ are independent of $z.$ Take an orthonormal basis $(u_1, ..., u_p)$ of ran $Q(z)$ and set $U := [u_1, u_2, ..., u_p].$ Then $q(z) := U^*Q(z)U$ is an $r \times r$-matrix-valued Herglotz function, and $q(z)$ is invertible for every $z \in \mathbb{C}_+.$ Moreover, the following assertions hold:

- $(i) \quad Q(z) = Uq(z)U^*$;
(ii) \(-Q(z)^+ = U[-q(z)^{-1}]U^* \) is Herglotz;

(iii) \(U^* U = I \) and \(U U^* = Q(z)Q(z)^+ = Q(z)^+Q(z)\) is the orthogonal projection onto \(\text{ran} \, Q(z)\) (which is independent of \(z\)).

5.3 Lemma. Let \(M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}\) such that \(\text{Im} \, M \geq 0\). Then \(\ker M = \ker M^*\) and \(\text{ran} \, M = \text{ran} \, M^*\).

Proof. Let \(v \in \ker M\). Set \(\alpha := \text{Re} \, M, \beta := \text{Im} \, M \geq 0\), then from \(0 = (Mv,v) = (\alpha v, v) + i(\beta v, v)\) we see that \((\beta v, v) = 0\) and definiteness of \(\beta\) gives \(\beta v = 0\). Hence, \(\alpha v = 0\) as well, and we have

\[ M^*v = \alpha v - i\beta v = 0 \]

This shows that \(\ker M \subseteq \ker M^*\). The other inclusion is shown in the same way. \(\square\)

For \(s \in S_n^{n \times n}\), introduce the function \(R(s) := s(z) - I\). Then

\[ 0 \leq I - s(z)s(z)^* = I - (R(z) + I)(R(z) + I)^* = -R(z) - R(z)^* - R(z)R(z)^* \]

and

\[ 2 \text{Im}(-iR(z)) = -2 \text{Re} \, R(z) = -R(z) - R(z)^* \geq R(z)R(z)^* \geq 0. \] (19)

Hence, \(-iR\) is a Herglotz function, but generally not a meromorphic Herglotz function (in the sense that it is meromorphic on \(\mathbb{C}\) and \#-real). Observe that

\[ B = -\frac{E_+R}{2i}, \quad A = \frac{1}{2}E_+(R + 2I). \] (20)

If \(B\) is invertible, it follows that \(B^{-1}A = -iR^{-1}(R + 2I)\). If \(B\) is not invertible, we define \(Q(z) := -iR(z)^+(R(z) + 2I)\) as an analog of \(B^{-1}A\).

The following theorem is reminiscent of Theorem 5.73 in [1], in the sense that a connection between de Branges matrices and Herglotz functions is established. However, in [1] the associated Herglotz function has an absolutely continuous measure in its integral representation, while we are interested in the meromorphic Herglotz function \(Q(z) := -iR(z)^+(R(z) + 2I)\).

5.4 Theorem. Let \(E = [E_-, E_+] : \mathbb{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times 2n}\) be meromorphic, such that \(\det E_+ \neq 0\), and \(s(z) = E_+(z)^{-1}E_-(z)\) admits a meromorphic continuation to some open domain \(\Omega \supset \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R}\).

Let \(R(z) = s(z) - I\) and \(Q(z) = -iR(z)^+(R(z) + 2I)\). Then the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) \(E\) is a de Branges matrix;

(ii) \(Q\) is a meromorphic Herglotz function.

Proof. We prove first that (ii) follows from (i). The calculation in [19] shows that \(-iR\) is a Herglotz function. In view of Theorem 5.2 we can write \(R(z) = Ur(z)U^*\), where \(r(z) = U^*R(z)U\) and \(-ir(z)\) is Herglotz. In addition, \(r\) has a meromorphic continuation to \(\Omega\), which implies that \(R(z)^+ = Ur(z)^{-1}U^*\) is meromorphic on \(\Omega\), too. Hence, \(Q\) is meromorphic on \(\Omega\), and

\[ \text{Im} \, Q = -R^+R - R^+ - (R^+)^* = R^+[-RR^* - R^* - R](R^+)^* = R^+[I - ss^*](R^+)^* \geq 0. \]
On the real line, the right side equates to zero a.e., and thus $Q$ is a meromorphic Herglotz function.

For the proof of the other implication, we show that $-iR$ is, again, a Herglotz function: we know that $R$ is meromorphic on $\Omega$, and for every $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, the matrix $R(z)^+ R(z)$ is an orthogonal projection and thus positive semidefinite. The matrix $Q(z) + iR(z)^+ R(z)$ has nonnegative $*$-imaginary part, so Theorem 5.2 implies that

$$-iR(z) = -2\left(Q(z) + iR(z)^+ R(z)\right)^+ \tag{21}$$

has nonnegative $*$-imaginary part. In particular, $\text{ran } R(z) = \text{ran } R(z)^*$ and $\ker R(z) = \ker R(z)^*$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \cup \mathbb{R}$ because of Lemma 5.3.

Observe next that

$$R^*(I - ss^*)R = R^* R[ - R^* R - R^+ - (R^+)^+] R^* R = R^* R \text{ Im } QR^* R \geq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+. \tag{22}$$

Let $P = R^*(z) R(z) = R(z) R^+(z)$ (independent of $z$) be the orthogonal projection with range $\text{ran } R = \text{ran } R^*$ and kernel $\ker R^+ = \ker R$, then, for every $z$,

$$(I - ss^*)(I - P) = (-RR^* - R^* - R)(I - P) = 0 = (I - P)(I - ss^*).$$

It follows that

$$I - ss^* = P(I - ss^*)P = RR^* (I - ss^*) RR^+ = (R^+)^* [R^* (I - ss^*) R] R^+ \geq 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+ \tag{23}$$

and $I - ss^* = 0$ a.e. on $\mathbb{R}$. \hfill $\square$

It is also possible to start with a meromorphic Herglotz function $Q$ and parametrize the meromorphic functions $R$ such that $Q = -iR^+(R + 2I)$. If such an $R$ is given, then from equation (21) we see that $-iR$ is a Herglotz function, so $\text{ran } R = \text{ran } R^+ \supseteq \text{ran } Q$. In fact, there is a one-to-one correspondence between such functions $R$ and linear subspaces containing $\text{ran } Q$.

5.5 Lemma. Let $Q$ be a meromorphic, $n \times n$-matrix-valued Herglotz function and let $L$ be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ that contains $\text{ran } Q$. Then there is a unique function $R$ that is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}_+$ such that $Q(z) = -iR(z)^+(R(z) + 2I)$ and $\text{ran } R(z) = L$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

Proof. Let $P_L$ be the orthogonal projection onto $L$. Then a function $R$ satisfying the above conditions can be defined by

$$R(z) := -2i(Q(z) + iP_L)^+. \tag{24}$$

Indeed, $R$ is meromorphic because $Q + iP_L$ is a Herglotz function, and by Theorem 5.2, $-iR$ is Herglotz as well. The theorem also states that $R^+ R = RR^+$ is constant, and $\ker R^+ R = \ker R^+ = \ker (Q(z) + iP_L)$. We know from Lemma 5.3 that

$$\ker (Q(z) + iP_L)$$

$$= (\ker \text{ Re } Q(z)) \cap (\ker (\text{ Im } Q(z) + P_L)) = \ker (\text{ Re } Q(z)) \cap \ker (\text{ Im } Q(z)) \cap \ker P_L$$

$$= \ker Q(z) \cap L^\perp = L^+. \tag{23}$$

Clearly, $R^+ R$ is an orthogonal projection, and it follows that $R^+ R = P_L$. Putting $R^+ R$ in place of $P_L$ in (21) implies $Q = -iR^+(R + 2I)$. Uniqueness of $R$ follows in the same way. \hfill $\square$
In the setting of the above lemma, $R$ admits a meromorphic continuation to $C$: In view of Theorem 4.3, pick an orthonormal basis $(u_1, \ldots, u_p)$ of $L = \text{ran}(Q + iP_L)$ and let $U = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p]$. Then $\tilde{q}(z) := U^* (Q(z) + iP_L) U$ is an $r \times r$-matrix-valued Herglotz function in $C_+$, and $\tilde{q}(z)$ is invertible for every $z \in C_+$. Since $Q$ is meromorphic on $C$, it follows that $R(z) = -2iU\tilde{q}(z)^{-1}U^*$ is meromorphic on $C$ as well. Looking at the statement of Theorem 5.4, we get as a corollary that an $s \in \mathcal{S}^{n \times n}$ admits a meromorphic continuation to all of $C$ if and only if it admits a meromorphic continuation to some open $\Omega \supset C_+ \cup \mathbb{R}$.

When combining Theorem 4.3 with Theorem 5.4 one obtains the following statement, which can be viewed as a matrix-valued version of the Hermite-Biehler Theorem.

5.6 Theorem. Let $E = [E_-, E_+] : C_+ \rightarrow C^{n \times 2n}$ be meromorphic, such that $\det E_+ \neq 0$, and $s(z) = E_+(z)^{-1}E_-(z)$ admits a meromorphic continuation to some open domain $\Omega \supset C_+ \cup \mathbb{R}$. Let $R(z) = s(z) - I$ and $Q(z) = -iR(z)^* (R(z) + 2I)$. Then $E$ is a de Branges matrix if and only if

(i) $R$ is of bounded type in $C_+$;

(ii) Except for poles, ran $R(z)$ and ker $R(z)$ are independent of $z \in C_+$;

(iii) $Q$ is $\#$-real;

(iv) $\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \|Q(z)\|_{\tau} < +\infty$.

(v) For every $m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $i = (i_1, \ldots, i_m)$, where $1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_m \leq n$, $f(z) := \det [Q_i(z)]$ satisfies the $m$-interlacing property. If the set of poles of multiplicity $m$ is nonempty, then $\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} [(z_0 - z)^m f_i(z)] > 0$ for at least one of those poles $z_0$. In addition, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\|f(z)\|_{\tau}}{\|z\|_\tau} \geq 0$.

Proof. If $E$ is a de Branges matrix, then the first four properties follow from the previous results, and the last one from Theorem 4.3. For the reverse implication, we need to check that $Q$ is a meromorphic Herglotz function, then apply Theorem 5.4. To do this, we use Theorem 4.3 which requires $Q$ to be meromorphic and $\#$-real, have no nonreal poles, be of bounded type, and satisfy

$\limsup_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \|Q(z)\|_{\tau} < +\infty$. Let $(u_1, \ldots, u_p)$ and $(v_1, \ldots, v_p)$ be orthonormal bases of ran $R$ and ran $R^*$, respectively. Set $U = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p]$ and $V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p]$, then $r(z) := U^* R(z) V$ is invertible, and we have $R(z) = UR(z)V^*$ as well as $R(z)^+ = VR(z)^{-1}U^*$. Since $R$ is of bounded type, there are bounded holomorphic functions $G, h$ on $C_+$, where $G$ is $n \times n$-matrix-valued and $h$ is scalar-valued, such that $R = \frac{G}{h}$ on $C_+$. Then $g(z) := U^* G(z) V$ is invertible for every $z \in C_+$, and $g$ as well as $g^{-1}$ are of bounded type. We have $r = \frac{g}{h}$, so $R(z)^+ = h(z) V g(z)^{-1} U^*$ has no poles and is of bounded type as well. The proof is complete. \[\square\]

\footnote{But $-iR$ is not what we call a \textit{meromorphic Herglotz function} because it does not have to take on real values on the real line.}

\footnote{It is easy to see that the dimensions of those bases have to agree.}
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