

# Nodal current of complexified horocyclic eigenfunctions

Mikhail Dubashinskiy

May 18, 2022

**Abstract.** We study horocyclic eigenfunctions on Lobachevsky plane. These are functions  $u: \mathbb{C}^+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C}: \Im z > 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\left(-y^2 \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\right) + 2i\tau y \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) u(x + iy) = s^2 u(x + iy)$ ,  $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}^+$ , with  $\tau, s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tau$  large and  $s/\tau$  small. In other words, we study eigenfunctions of *magnetic* quantum Hamiltonian on hyperbolic plane. Asymptotic behavior of such functions is related to horocycle flow on  $T\mathbb{C}^+$  by semiclassical correspondence. If a sequence of horocyclic functions possesses microlocal quantum unique ergodicity at the admissible energy level (with  $\hbar = 1/\tau$ ) then we may find asymptotic distribution of divisor of  $u$  analytically continued to the complexified Lobachevsky plane.

## Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Coordinates and flows	5
3	Construction of automorphic kernel	7
4	Kernel $L_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ gives a semiclassical PDO	13
5	Logarithm of weak* convergence	18
6	Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1	19
	Bibliography	22

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In hyperbolic Lobachevsky plane  $\mathbb{H}$  implemented as upper half-plane  $\mathbb{C}^+$  consider differential operator

$$D^\tau := -\Delta_{\mathbb{H}} + 2i\tau y \frac{\partial}{\partial x},$$

---

Chebyshev Laboratory, St. Petersburg State University, 14th Line 29b, Vasilyevsky Island, Saint Petersburg 199178, Russia.

e-mail: [mikhail.dubashinskiy@gmail.com](mailto:mikhail.dubashinskiy@gmail.com)

Research is supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant 19-71-30002.

Keywords: quantum unique ergodicity, semiclassical limit, Fourier integral operator, nodal distribution, horocycle flow.

MSC 2020 Primary: 58J51; Secondary: 11F37, 37D40, 58J40, 32A60.

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

here  $\Delta_{\mathbb{H}} := y^2 \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right)$  is the hyperbolic Laplacian,  $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}^+$ . We study asymptotic properties of solutions of eigenfunction equation  $D^\tau u = s^2 u$ ,  $u: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , for  $\tau$  large with  $s/\tau$  small.

Let  $\tau_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $s_n \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Suppose that functions  $u_n: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are such that

$$D^{\tau_n} u_n = s_n^2 u_n$$

and also  $\tau_n/s_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$ . We mostly drop subscript  $n$  in what follows.

If we take Planck constant  $\hbar = 1/\tau$  then principal symbol of  $\tau^{-2} D^\tau$  is  $2H_1 - 1$  where, for  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define *magnetic Hamiltonian*

$$H_b(x, y, \xi_1, \xi_2) := \frac{(y\xi_1 - b)^2 + (y\xi_2)^2}{2}: T^*\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

( $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $(\xi_1, \xi_2)$  are coordinates conjugate to  $(x, y)$ ). Thus, local frequencies of function  $u$  with  $D^\tau u = s^2 u$  and  $s/\tau$  small have to concentrate near set  $\{H_1 = 1/2\} \subset T^*\mathbb{H}$ . Notice that, on this set,  $H_1$  understood as classical Hamiltonian, generates right *horocyclic* flow. If we fold  $\mathbb{H}$  into a compact hyperbolic surface by means of action of a group of isometries then horocyclic flow is known to possess unique ergodicity property — unlike geodesic flow which is only ergodic (but is of hyperbolic Anosov type instead). Bohr correspondence principle then leads to different conclusions on quantizations of these flows.

We say that  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is *Quantum Uniquely Ergodic (QUE)* sequence if, for any  $a \in C_0^\infty(T^*\mathbb{H})$  understood as a symbol, we have

$$\langle (\text{Op}_{1/\tau_n} a) u_n, u_n \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{H})} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{H_1=1/2\}} a d\mu_L.$$

Here,  $\mu_L$  is *horocyclic Liouville measure* supported by  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ , see Section 2. Operator  $\text{Op}_{1/\tau_n} a: L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{H})$  is any of quantizations of classical observable  $a$ , see [Zw] for details. QUE property of functions  $u_n$  means that their local frequencies scaled  $1/\tau$  times become uniformly distributed at the admissible energy level  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ .

Frequency equidistribution of functions  $u_n$  leads to consequences on their complexifications. Any real-analytic manifold admits a complexification which is not unique. Any two of such complexifications are biholomorphically equivalent near the original manifold. This is known as Bruhat–Whitney Theorem, see [BW59]. So we may just take  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}} := \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  as complexified hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}$ . For  $t$  small and positive, we define *horocyclic Grauert tube*  $\mathcal{G}_t \subset \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ , it is a neighborhood of  $\mathbb{H}$  in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  invariant with respect to complexified isometries of  $\mathbb{H}$ , see details in Section 2 below. We have  $\mathcal{G}_{t_1} \subset \mathcal{G}_{t_2}$  for  $t_1 < t_2$  and  $\bigcap_{t \text{ small}} \mathcal{G}_t = \mathbb{H}$ . In  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ , we introduce *horocyclic coordinates*  $(x, y, t, \theta)$ , all of them are real.

It is easy to see that functions  $u_n$  can be analytically continued to  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$  (Lemma 3.2). Consider nodal set  $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_n := \{P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}: u_n(P) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . In all its *non-singular* points set  $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_n$  is an analytic submanifold of complex dimension 1 and thus is canonically endowed with orientation. For any non-singular point  $P \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_n$  there is integer multiplicity of zero of  $u_n$  at  $P$ , denote this multiplicity by  $m_n(P)$ . Therefore,  $m_n$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_n$  naturally give rise to de Rham current  $\mathcal{Z}_n$  of dimension 2:  $\mathcal{Z}_n(\omega) := \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_n} m_n \omega$  for smooth compactly supported 2-form  $\omega$  in  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_n(\cdot)$  denotes application of current  $\mathcal{Z}_n$  to a test form.

In a more analytic way, nodal current given by  $u_n$  is equal to de Rham current defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}_n(\omega) = \frac{i}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}} \partial \bar{\partial} \log |u_n| \wedge \omega$$

for test form  $\omega$  lin  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ . This is known as *Lelong–Poincaré formula*. Function  $\log |u_n|$  is understood as 4-current therein. Operators  $\partial, \bar{\partial}$  on currents are permanent to those on forms and are given by the complex structure in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . See more in [Ch], [LG].

Denote by  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z, r)$  open ball in hyperbolic metric centered in  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  and having radius  $r > 0$ . Our main result is

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that  $D^{\tau_n} u_n = s_n^2 u_n$  with  $s_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $s_n/\tau_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  and  $\tau_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ . Assume also that  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, z \in \mathbb{H}} \|u_n\|_{L^1(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z, 1))} < +\infty$ .*

*If  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a QUE sequence then, for nodal currents given by these functions, we have*

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_n}{\tau_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i}{2\pi} \bar{\partial} \partial \log \left( \frac{2 + (t^2 + 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 + (t^2 - 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}})$$

*for  $\bar{t}$  small enough. Here,  $t, \theta$  are horocyclic coordinate functions in  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$  whereas operators  $\partial, \bar{\partial}$  are given by the complex structure in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ .*

Our main example of horocyclic QUE sequence is as follows. Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete torsion-free group of isometries of hyperbolic Lobachevsky plane  $\mathbb{H}$ . If  $\mathbb{H}$  is implemented as upper complex half-plane  $\mathbb{C}^+$  then any  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  can be written as  $\gamma z = \frac{az + b}{cz + d}$  for  $a, b, c, d$  real with  $ad - bc = 1$ . A function  $u: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is called  $\tau$ -form with respect to  $\Gamma$  ( $\tau$  is an integer) if  $u(\gamma z) = \left(\frac{cz+d}{\bar{c}\bar{z}+\bar{d}}\right)^{\tau} u(z)$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  of the form  $z \mapsto \frac{az + b}{cz + d}$ .

In [Ze92], [D21] the following has been proven:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\Gamma < \text{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H})$  be a torsion-free group with a compact fundamental domain  $F$ , whereas  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$  be integers.*

*Suppose that functions  $u_n: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , are such that  $u_n$  is a  $\tau_n$ -form with respect to  $\Gamma$ , normed as  $\int_F |u_n|^2 d\mathcal{A}_2 = 2\pi \mathcal{A}_2(F)$ , and such that  $D^{\tau_n} u_n = s_n^2 u_n$  in  $\mathbb{H}$  with  $s_n \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $\mathcal{A}_2$  denotes hyperbolic area measure on  $\mathbb{H}$ ).*

*If  $\frac{\tau_n}{s_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$  then sequence  $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is quantum uniquely ergodic. (Observables for function  $u_n$  are quantized using Planck constant  $\hbar = 1/\tau_n$ .)*

In fact, this is a quantization of Furstenberg Theorem on unique ergodicity of horocycle flow on a compact hyperbolic surface ([Furst73], [Ma75]), up to some calculations on gauge invariance. Thus, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to functions from Theorem 1.2 and gives control on behavior of nodal sets of their complexifications.

In proof, we generally follow lines by Zelditch ([Ze07]). In his paper, he studies similar questions on free-particle quantum wavefunction. Geodesic flow is then instead of horocycle flow. In our paper, from physicist's viewpoint, we quantize magnetic particle on  $\mathbb{H}$ . As well as [Ze07], our paper fits into the idea of Boutet de Monvel Theorem. The latter claims that growth of complexified eigenfunction  $u$ , when we move away from the original real manifold into its complexification, is governed by microlocal distribution of  $u$  in the real part of manifold under consideration. This

theorem, in a particular case of Laplacian on a real-analytic manifold, was stated in [Bou79] and has been proved much later in [Ze11], [Leb13], [St14].

Unfortunately, our setting is not covered by the existing results in the spirit of Boutet de Monvel Theorem. In this paper, we first write, using [Fay77], analytic continuation of  $u$  to  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$  via an integral operator. We construct a kernel  $\tilde{K}(z_1, z_2)$  ( $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{H}$ ) such that  $v(z_2) := \int_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{K}(z_1, z_2) u(z_1) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1)$  is a scalar multiple of  $u$  whenever  $u$  is an eigenfunction of  $D^\tau$ . (Kernel  $\tilde{K}$  also depends on  $\tau$ .) Also,  $z \mapsto \tilde{K}(z_1, z)$  can be continued analytically to  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ , this leads to explicit formula for  $u$  on  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ . Section 3 is devoted to studying properties of kernel  $\tilde{K}$ .

For  $t < \bar{t}$ , put  $\Sigma_t := \partial\mathcal{G}_t \subset \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Pinned neighborhood  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$  is sliced into sets  $\Sigma_t$  ( $t$  ranges  $(0, \bar{t})$ ), each of them is a 3-dimensional submanifold in  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ . There is a natural horocyclic parametrization  $M: \{(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \in T^*\mathbb{H}: H_1(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = 1/2\} \rightarrow \Sigma_t$ . (In the notation used below, we have the following: if  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $\xi_1 dx + \xi_2 dy \in T_z^*\mathbb{H}$ ,  $H_1(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = 1/2$  with  $\xi_1 = (1 + \cos \theta)/\Im z$ ,  $\xi_2 = \sin \theta/\Im z$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $M(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = h_{-it}(z, \theta)$ . The latter  $h_{-it}(z, \theta)$  is complexified horocyclic flow starting from  $z$  at the slope  $\theta$  with respect to real axis.) Define measure  $S_t$  on  $\Sigma_t$  by  $S_t := M_{\#}\mu_L$ , where, recall,  $\mu_L$  is Liouville measure on  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$  and  $M_{\#}$  denotes push-forward of a measure by mapping  $M$ . See Section 2 for more details on horocyclic parametrization.

In Section 4 we construct smooth functions  $b(z, \xi_1, \xi_2): T^*\mathbb{H} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ ,  $B: \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H} \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  with the following property. For any  $a \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma_t)$ , there exists a symbol  $\underline{a}: T^*\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, first,  $\underline{a}$  coincides to  $b \cdot (a \circ M)$  on  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ , second, for  $A := \text{Op}_{1/\tau} \underline{a}$ , we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_t} dS_t(P) a(P) B(P) |u(P)|^2 \sim \tau^{-3} \cdot \langle Au, u \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{H})} \quad \text{as } \tau \rightarrow \infty \quad (1)$$

(see Proposition 4.2). Function  $B$  is given by an expression depending on  $\tau$  and frequency  $s$  of  $u$  but not on  $u$  itself.

Since  $u$  is analytically continued to  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$  via an integral operator, the left-hand side of (1) can be written as

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}} \int_{\mathbb{H}} u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) L_t(z_1, z_2) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2)$$

with some kernel  $L_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Operator given by this kernel is a priori a *semiclassical Fourier Integral Operator with complex phase* because operator given by  $\tilde{K}$  turns to be such an operator. Unfortunately, it seems that up to date there does not exist a complete theory of these operators. We reduce the left-hand side of (1) to a semiclassical pseudodifferential operator by a straightforward calculation by means of complex stationary phase method (see [TrII], [HörI]).

Since  $a$  can be taken arbitrarily, relation (1) implies that  $\tau^3 \cdot B(P) \cdot |u(P)|^2$  tends weak\* to a strictly positive function on  $\Sigma_t$  as well as on  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ . To find distribution of nodal set of  $u$ , it remains to apply Lelong–Poincaré formula to  $u$ . To take logarithm of weak\* convergence of  $\tau^3 \cdot B(P) \cdot |u(P)|^2$ , we use some standard techniques related to plurisubharmonic functions (Section 5). In the concluding Section 6 we find  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{dB}{\tau}$ . This requires additional argument because expression for  $B$  is rather involved.

The main difference of this paper from [Ze07] is presence of gauge factor  $\left( \frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_2}{\bar{z}_1 - z_2} \right)^\tau$  in kernels of operators propagating eigenfunctions. Analytic extension of this factor

to vicinity of  $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$  in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  need not be unimodular. In order to hit the energy level  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$  in (1), we have to equalize this factor to obtain a kernel  $\tilde{K}$  of the form  $\left(\frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_2}{\bar{z}_1 - z_2}\right)^\tau \cdot (\text{function of } \text{dist}(z_1, z_2))$  with the following property: for  $P \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$

close to  $\mathbb{H}$  and complexified kernel  $\tilde{K}(z, P)$  ( $z \in \mathbb{H}$ ), maximizer  $\arg \max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} |\tilde{K}(z, P)|$  has

to be equal to some prescribed point in  $\mathbb{H}$  (or, rather the same but maximizing over  $P$  ranging certain two-dimensional surface in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ ). Maximal value of this  $|\tilde{K}|$  leads to the growth estimates on eigenfunction  $u$  and thence to the answer in Theorem 1.1.

**Acknowledgments.** Author used [Sage] for most routine symbolic calculations.

## 2 Coordinates and flows

In this paper, we denote by  $\mathbb{H}$  the standard upper-halfplane model of Lobachevsky hyperbolic plane. Metric tensor in  $\mathbb{H}$  is given by  $(dx^2 + dy^2) \cdot y^{-2}$ ,  $x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $y > 0$ .

Point  $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  will be generally denoted by  $P$ , we write  $X(P)$  for  $X$  and  $Y(P)$  for  $Y$ . Complex structure in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  is that of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Thus, mappings  $P \mapsto X(P)$  and  $P \mapsto Y(P)$  are analytic on  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . We also use  $Z(P) := X(P) + iY(P)$  and  $\tilde{Z}(P) := X(P) - iY(P)$ , the analytic continuation of functions  $z$  and, respectively,  $\bar{z}$  from  $\mathbb{H}$  to  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ .

Recall that for  $z, w \in \mathbb{H}$  we have  $\text{dist}(z, w) = \text{arccosh} \left(1 + \frac{|z - w|^2}{2\Im z \Im w}\right)$ . Thus, for  $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $P \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  ( $Y(P) \neq 0$ ) we may put

$$\cosh \text{dist}(z, P) := 1 + \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)},$$

and the latter is single-valued function holomorphic with respect to  $P$ .

Any isometry of the form  $z \mapsto \frac{az + b}{cz + d}$ ,  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $ad - bc = 1$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , can be extended analytically to  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ , up to possible zeroes in the denominator:

$$\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \ni (X, Y) \mapsto \gamma(X, Y) = \left( \frac{(aX + b)(cX + d) + acY^2}{(cX + d)^2 + (cY)^2}, \frac{Y}{(cX + d)^2 + (cY)^2} \right).$$

We have  $Z(\gamma(P)) = \gamma(Z(P))$  and  $\tilde{Z}(\gamma(P)) = \gamma(\tilde{Z}(P))$ . Obviously, such isometries preserve complexified distance  $\cosh \text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . For complexification of *gauge factor*  $\frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_2}{\bar{z}_1 - z_2}$ , we several times apply the following relation:

$$\frac{\gamma z - \gamma \tilde{Z}}{\gamma \bar{z} - \gamma \tilde{Z}} = \frac{(c\bar{z} + d)(cZ + d)}{(cz + d)(c\tilde{Z} + d)} \cdot \frac{z - \tilde{Z}}{\bar{z} - \tilde{Z}}. \quad (2)$$

A (right) *horocycle* on Lobachevsky plane  $\mathbb{H}$  is a parametrized curve of constant geodesic curvature 1 curving to the right and passed with the *unit* speed. An equivalent definition is: 1. the curve  $t \mapsto (-t, 1)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , in  $(x, y)$ -coordinates in  $\mathbb{H}$  is a right horocycle, 2. any shift of this curve by an isometry of  $\mathbb{H}$  is also a horocycle.

We widely use *horocyclic* coordinates in subsets in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Let  $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let

$$v = y \cdot \left( \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \in T_z \mathbb{H} \quad (3)$$

be unit vector based in  $z$ . There exists a unique horocycle parametrized as  $t \mapsto \phi(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , with  $\phi'(0) = v$ . Put  $h_t(z, \theta) := \phi(t) \in \mathbb{H}$ . Obviously,  $\Re h_t(z, \theta)$ ,  $\Im h_t(z, \theta)$  depend analytically on  $t$ . Therefore, mapping  $t \mapsto h_t(z, \theta)$  with  $z, \theta$  fixed admits an analytic by  $t$  continuation for complex  $t$  with  $\Im t$  small enough. In fact, we may define  $h_{-it}(z, \theta) \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  for  $|t|$  small with  $X(h_{-it}(z, \theta))$ ,  $Y(h_{-it}(z, \theta))$  depending analytically on  $t$ .

Denote  $\Sigma_t := \{h_{-it}(z, \theta) : z \in \mathbb{H}, \theta \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and also  $\Sigma_{t, \theta} := \{h_{-it}(z, \theta) : z \in \mathbb{H}\}$ . For  $\bar{t}$  small and positive put  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} := \mathbb{H} \cup \bigcup_{t < \bar{t}} \Sigma_t$ . This set is called *horocyclic Grauert tube*. These are points from  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  close to  $\mathbb{H}$  in a sense — horocyclic sense. For  $t$  small enough we have  $\mathcal{G}_t \subset \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . Also, by the construction, set  $\mathcal{G}_t$  is invariant with respect to complexified isometries of  $\mathbb{H}$  given above.

Let us find parametrization of horocyclic Grauert tube. When  $\theta = \pi$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have  $h_t(x + iy, \pi) = x - ty + iy$ . Thus,  $h_{-it}(x + iy, \pi) = (x + ity, y)$ . If  $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi$ , and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  is close to 0 then  $h_{-it}(z, \theta) = (X, Y)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \Re X &= x + y \cdot \frac{(t^4 - 2t^2 + (t^4 - 4t^2) \cos \theta) \sin \theta}{t^4 + (t^4 - 4t^2) \cos^2 \theta + 2(t^4 - 2t^2) \cos \theta + 4}, \\ \Im X &= y \cdot \frac{2(t^3 + (t^3 - 2t) \cos \theta)}{t^4 + (t^4 - 4t^2) \cos^2 \theta + 2(t^4 - 2t^2) \cos \theta + 4}, \\ \Re Y &= y \cdot \frac{2(2 - (1 + \cos \theta)t^2)}{t^4 + (t^4 - 4t^2) \cos^2 \theta + 2(t^4 - 2t^2) \cos \theta + 4}, \\ \Im Y &= -y \cdot \frac{4t \sin \theta}{t^4 + (t^4 - 4t^2) \cos^2 \theta + 2(t^4 - 2t^2) \cos \theta + 4}. \end{aligned}$$

(We have applied rotation  $z \mapsto \frac{z \cdot \sin \theta - (1 + \cos \theta)}{(1 + \cos \theta) \cdot z + \sin \theta}$  around  $i$  which takes  $h_t(i, \pi)$  to  $h_t(i, \theta)$  and therefore takes  $h_{-it}(i, \pi)$  to  $h_{-it}(i, \theta)$ ; then we applied isometry  $z_1 \mapsto z_1 \cdot y + x$ ,  $z_1 \in \mathbb{H}$  or  $z_1 \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . See also calculations in the proof of Lemma 3.4.) Observe that

$$\Re Y > 0, |\Im X|, |\Im Y| < \Re Y \quad (4)$$

if  $t$  is small enough.

In the above parametrization, take new variables  $x, y, v_1 = t \cos \theta, v_2 = t \sin \theta$ . We see that  $(x, y, v_1, v_2) \mapsto (X, Y)$  is  $C^1$ -smooth. Also,

$$\frac{\partial(\Re X, \Im X, \Re Y, \Im Y)}{\partial(x, y, v_1, v_2)} \Big|_{t=0, x+iy=i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is non-degenerate and therefore is such in any other  $x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ . By implicit function theorem we see that if  $\bar{t} > 0$  is small enough then  $(x + iy, t, \theta) \mapsto h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta)$  is a bijection of  $\mathbb{H} \times (0, \bar{t}) \times (\mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi)$  onto  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ .

Hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}$  is endowed with Riemann area  $d\mathcal{A}_2 = \frac{dx dy}{y^2}$ . Tangent spherical bundle  $S_1\mathbb{H}$  is endowed with Liouville measure  $\tilde{\mu}_L$ : if vectors from this bundle are parametrized as in (3) then  $d\tilde{\mu}_L = \frac{dx dy d\theta}{y^2}$ .

Function  $H_1$  defined at Introduction and understood as a Hamiltonian generates identification  $\phi_1: T\mathbb{H} \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{H}$  given by

$$\phi_1 \left( x, y, v_x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + v_y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) = \left( x, y, \frac{v_x + y}{y^2} dx + \frac{v_y}{y^2} dy \right) \in T_{x+iy}^*\mathbb{H}$$

for  $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}^+$ ,  $v_x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + v_y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \in T_{x+iy}\mathbb{H}$  (see also [Takh]). Horocyclic Liouville measure  $\mu_L$  on the set  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$  mentioned in the Introduction is given by  $\mu_L := (\phi_1)_\# \tilde{\mu}_L$ .

Push-forward of measure  $\tilde{\mu}_L$  by the mapping

$$S_1\mathbb{H} \cap T_{x+iy}\mathbb{H} \ni y \cdot \left( \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \mapsto h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta) \in \Sigma_t$$

will be denoted by  $S_t$ , this is the uniform measure on slice  $\Sigma_t$ .

### 3 Construction of automorphic kernel

In what follows, we fix some  $\bar{t}$  small enough.

**Lemma 3.1** (on maximum of absolute value). *For  $t \in (0, \bar{t})$ , put  $c_t := \frac{4}{4t - t^3}$  and*

$$K_t(z, P) := \left( \frac{z - \tilde{Z}(P)}{\bar{z} - Z(P)} \right) e^{-c_t \cdot \cosh \text{dist}(z, P)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{H}, P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}. \quad (5)$$

1. *Function  $\Phi_t(z, P) = \log K_t(z, P)$  is single-valued when  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ .*

2. *For  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  fixed,*

$$\max_{P \in \Sigma_{t, \theta}} |K_t(z, P)|$$

*is attained at  $P = h_{-it}(z, \theta)$ .*

3. *Hesse matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{xx} \Re \Phi_t(z_0, h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta)) & \partial_{xy} \Re \Phi_t(z_0, h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta)) \\ \partial_{xy} \Re \Phi_t(z_0, h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta)) & \partial_{yy} \Re \Phi_t(z_0, h_{-it}(x + iy, \theta)) \end{pmatrix}$$

*is non-degenerate when  $x + iy = z_0$ .*

**Proof.** First claim follows from (4): it implies that  $z_0 - \tilde{Z}(P)$ ,  $\bar{z}_0 - Z(P)$  are non-zero.

Let's prove the second assertion. By  $y$ -scale and  $x$ -shift we see that it is enough to consider only the case  $x + iy = i$ . Due to invariance of  $K$  with respect to  $y$ -scales and  $x$ -shifts we see that it suffices to show that

$$\arg \max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \log |K_t(z, h_{-it}(i, \theta))| = i.$$

Further, rotation around point  $i$  reduces the question to the case of  $\theta = \pi$  (see (2)). In this case we have  $h_{-it}(i, t) = P_0 := (it, 1)$ , whereas  $Z(P_0) = i(1+t)$ ,  $\tilde{Z}(P_0) = i(t-1)$ , and we are going to show that  $\max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \log |K_t(z, P_0)|$  is attained at  $z = i$ . To this end, we show that  $|K_t(x + iy, P_0)|$  with  $y$  fixed decreases by  $x$  for  $x \geq 0$  and increases by  $x$  for  $x \leq 0$ . Also, we will show that  $|K_t(iy, P_0)|$  attains its maximum at  $iy = i$ . We start with the latter.

We have

$$K_t(z, P_0) = \left( \frac{x + iy + i(1-t)}{x - iy - i(1+t)} \right) \cdot \exp \left( -c_t \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{(x-it)^2 + (y-1)^2}{2y} \right) \right)$$

and

$$2 \log |K_t(z, P_0)| = \log \left( \frac{x^2 + (y+1-t)^2}{x^2 + (y+1+t)^2} \right) - c_t \cdot \left( \frac{x^2 - t^2 + (y-1)^2}{y} \right) - 2c_t. \quad (6)$$

By a calculation we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right|_{y=1} 2 \log |K_t(iy, P_0)| = 0.$$

(This is why we take such  $c_t$ .) Further,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} 2 \log |K_t(iy, P_0)| = \\ & = \frac{4(1-y)}{y^2(y+1-t)(y+1+t)(4t-t^3)} \cdot (t^4 - 2t^2 + 1 + y^3 + (t^4 - 4t^2 + 3)y + 3y^2). \end{aligned}$$

The last factor is positive. Thus,  $\arg \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \log |K_t(iy, P_0)| = 1$ .

Now let us differentiate by  $x$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} 2 \log |K_t(x + iy, P_0)| = \\ & = - \frac{8x(t^4 + x^4 + y^4 + 2(t^2 + 1)x^2 + (t^4 - 6t^2 + 2x^2 + 6)y^2 + 4y^3 - 2t^2 + (t^4 - 8t^2 + 4x^2 + 4)y + 1)}{y(x^2 + (y+1-t)^2)(x^2 + (y+1+t)^2)(4t-t^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove that  $|K_t(x + iy, P_0)|$  has maximum at  $x = 0$  (with  $y$  fixed), it is enough to show that the second factor in numerator is non-negative. Coefficients at  $x^2$  are non-negative, thus

$$t^4 - 2t^2 + 1 + y^4 + (t^4 - 6t^2 + 6)y^2 + 4y^3 + (t^4 - 8t^2 + 4)y \geq 0$$

would be sufficient. But this is true provided that  $t^4 - 8t^2 + 4 \geq 0$ , that is,  $t \leq \sqrt{4 - 2\sqrt{3}}$ . The second assertion is proved.

To prove the third claim, we note that Hesse matrix mentioned therein is the same as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{xx} \Re \Phi_t(x + iy, h_{-it}(P_0, \theta)) & \partial_{xy} \Re \Phi_t(x + iy, h_{-it}(P_0, \theta)) \\ \partial_{xy} \Re \Phi_t(x + iy, h_{-it}(P_0, \theta)) & \partial_{yy} \Re \Phi_t(x + iy, h_{-it}(P_0, \theta)) \end{pmatrix}$$



at  $x + iy = i$ . By using (2) again we see that this matrix does not depend on  $\theta$ ; we thus may take  $\theta = \pi$  as above. By computation, the latter matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{4(3t^2 - 4)}{t^5 - 8t^3 + 16t} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{4(t^4 - 3t^2 + 4)}{t^5 - 8t^3 + 16t} \end{pmatrix}$$

and is obviously negatively defined as  $0 < t < 1$ . ■

**Lemma 3.2.** For  $u: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  put  $v(P) := \int_{\mathbb{H}} u(z) K_t^\tau(z, P) d\mathcal{A}_2(z)$  ( $P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ ).

1. If  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{H})$  then integral above converges absolutely together with any of its derivatives with respect to coordinates of  $P$ , also uniformly when  $P$  ranges a compact set in horocyclic Grauert tube  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ . Here,  $\bar{t}$  is small enough whereas  $t$  is fixed and small.
2. If  $u: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is such that  $D^\tau u = \left(-\Delta_{\mathbb{H}} + 2i\tau y \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) u = s^2 u$  then  $v(z) = \mathcal{S}(t, \tau, s)u(z)$  for some  $\mathcal{S}$  not depending neither on  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  nor on  $u$ .
3. Function  $v(P)$  is analytic for  $P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ .

Thus,  $v$  is, up to a constant factor, an analytic continuation of  $u$  to a neighborhood of  $\mathbb{H}$  in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ .

**Remark.** Under conditions of Theorem 1.1, we have, in particular,  $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \|u_n\|_{L^1(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z, 1))} < +\infty$  for any given  $n$ . This implies that each  $u_n$  belongs to  $L^\infty(\mathbb{H})$  (not necessarily uniformly by  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ). This can be seen by appropriate averaging the relation from [Fay77, Theorem 1.2]. Lemma 3.2 is therefore applicable to functions from Theorem 1.1.

**Proof.** Let's prove the first claim. We fix  $\tau$  and  $c_t$ . By applying an isometry we may assume that  $X(P)$  is close to  $it$  and  $Y(P)$  is close to 1. Any derivative of integrand over components  $X(P)$  or  $Y(P)$  can be written as

$$R(x, y, X(P), Y(P)) \cdot \exp\left(-\tau c_t \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)}\right) \cdot u(z)$$

with some rational  $R$ . This  $R$  has singularity at  $y = 0$  and at  $x + iy = \bar{Z}(P)$ ,  $x + iy = \tilde{Z}(P)$ . The latter two are when  $x + iy$  lies below the real axis. Using Cauchy–Bunyakovsky–Schwartz inequality we see that it is enough to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}} (1 + |x|^k + y^k + y^{-k}) \exp \Re\left(-\tau c_t \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)}\right) d\mathcal{A}_2(x + iy) < +\infty \quad (7)$$

for any  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . We take some  $C > 1$  large enough and  $\epsilon$  small enough and subdivide this integral as follows:

1.  $|x| < C$ ,  $y < \epsilon$ . If  $|X(P) - it|$  is small enough then  $\Re(x - X(P))^2 \geq -\frac{t^2 + 1}{2}$ ,  $\Im(x - X(P))^2$  is bounded above. If  $Y(P)$  is close to 1 then  $(y - Y(P))^2$

is close to 1. Then  $\Re((x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2)$  is positive and separated from zero whereas  $|\Im((x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2)|$  is bounded from the above. Thus  $\arg((x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2)$  is separated from  $\pm\pi/2$ . Then  $\Re \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)} \geq \frac{\text{const}}{y}$  provided that  $Y(P)$  is close to 1. Integral (7) then converges over  $\{|x| < C, y < \epsilon\}$ .

2.  $|x| > C, y < 100$ . We have  $y - Y(P) = O(1)$ ,  $\Re(x - X(P))^2 \geq \text{const} \cdot |x|$ ,  $|\arg(x - X(P))^2|$  can be forced to be arbitrarily small. Thus

$$\Re \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)} \geq \text{const} \cdot \frac{|x|}{y}.$$

But

$$\int_{x>C} dx \int_0^{100} dy e^{-\frac{\text{const} \cdot x}{y}} (x^k + y^{-k}) = \int_0^{100} e^{-\frac{\text{const}}{y}} \cdot (P_1(y) + P_2(1/y)) dy < +\infty,$$

here  $P_1, P_2$  are some polynomials.

3.  $|x| > C, 100 < y < C$ . Then notice that  $|\arg(x - X(P))^2|, |\arg(y - Y(P))^2|$  are separated from  $\pi/2$ . The rest is the same as in the previous case.
4.  $|x| > C, y > C$ . Then both  $\arg(x - X(P))^2, \arg(y - Y(P))^2$  can be forced to be arbitrarily small, and their real parts are bounded from the below by  $\text{const} \cdot x^2$  and  $\text{const} \cdot y^2$ , respectively. Then

$$\Re \frac{(x - X(P))^2 + (y - Y(P))^2}{2yY(P)} \geq \text{const} \cdot \frac{x^2 + y^2}{y}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_C^\infty dx \int_C^{+\infty} dy e^{-\text{const} \cdot \frac{x^2+y^2}{y}} (x^k + y^k) &\leq \int_0^{\pi/2} d\phi \int_0^{+\infty} dr e^{-\frac{\text{const} r}{\sin \phi}} r^{k+1} (\sin^k \phi + \cos^k \phi) \leq \\ &\leq \pi \cdot \int_0^{+\infty} dr e^{-\text{const} r} \cdot r^{k+1} < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

5.  $|x| < C, y > C$ . Then  $(x - X(P))^2 = O(1)$ ,  $\Re(y - Y(P))^2 \geq \text{const} \cdot y^2$ ,  $\arg(y - Y(P))^2$  can be forced to be arbitrarily small. The integral (7) is majorized by  $C \cdot \int_C^{+\infty} (\text{const} + y^k) e^{-\text{const} \cdot y} dy$  which is finite.
6.  $|x| < C, \epsilon < y < C$ . This a proper part of our integral and there is no convergence problem.

The proof of the first assertion is thus complete. To prove the second one, we use [Fay77, Theorem 1.5]. In our case,  $g(\cosh r) = \exp(-\tau c_t \cosh r)$ . For the majorant  $g_1$  we may take  $g$  itself. If  $z, z'$  are as in [Fay77, Theorem 1.5] then  $\mathcal{A}_2\{z'' \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z', \delta) : \text{dist}(z'', z) < \text{dist}(z', z)\}$  increases when  $\text{dist}(z', z)$  increases; the desired requirement on majorant follows from non-increase of  $g$ .

The third assertion of our Lemma follows from analyticity of  $K_t(z, P)$  with respect to  $X(P)$  and  $Y(P)$ . Proof of Lemma is complete. ■

Now we perturb  $t$  replacing it in  $c_t$  but reserving in  $\Sigma_{t,\theta}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** For  $\eta$  close enough to  $t$  and  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , function

$$P \mapsto |K_\eta(z, P)|$$

has the unique maximum point at  $\Sigma_{t,\theta}$ . We denote this maximizer by  $Q(z, \theta, t, \eta)$ .

**Proof.** By implicit function theorem and by the third assertion of Lemma 3.1. ■

For  $\eta$  close enough to  $t$ , put

$$\varphi(t, \eta, \theta) := \log \max_{P \in \Sigma_{t,\theta}} |K_\eta(z, P)| = \log |K_\eta(z, Q(z, \theta, t, \eta))|.$$

Recall that function  $\Phi_\eta = \log K_\eta: \mathbb{H} \times \mathcal{G}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  has been defined at Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.4.** For  $z_0, t$  fixed, mapping  $\mathcal{T}_{z_0,t}(\theta, \eta) := \Im d_z \Phi_\eta(z, Q(z_0, \theta, t, \eta))|_{z=z_0}$  is a diffeomorphism of  $(\mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi) \times (\text{some neighbourhood of } t)$  onto a neighborhood of circle  $T_{z_0}^* \mathbb{H} \cap \{H_{-1} = 1/2\}$ .

Clearly,  $\mathcal{T}_{z,t}$  is degree  $-1$  homogeneous with respect to  $\Im z$ . If  $\mathcal{T}_{z,t}(\theta, \eta) = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in T_z^* \mathbb{H}$  then we write  $\theta =: \Theta_{z,t}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$  and  $\eta =: H_{z,t}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ . The latter mappings are defined near  $\{H_{-1} = 1/2\}$ . On this level set, if  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $\xi_1 dx + \xi_2 dy \in T_z^* \mathbb{H}$ ,  $H_{-1}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = 1/2$  with  $\xi_1 = (-1 - \cos \theta)/\Im z$ ,  $\xi_2 = -\sin \theta/\Im z$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{z,t}(\xi_1, \xi_2) &= \theta, \\ H_{z,t}(\xi_1, \xi_2) &= t. \end{aligned}$$

This is seen from the calculations from the proof below.

**Proof of Lemma 3.4.** Fix  $t$ . We first consider the case  $\theta = \pi$ .

Put  $C = c_\eta$ . It depends smoothly and diffeomorphically on  $\eta$ . By a differentiation, we see that  $\arg \max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} |K_\eta(z, h_{-it}(i, \pi))|$  is  $z_0 = iy(\eta)$  with  $y(\eta) > 0$  depending smoothly on  $C$  and such that

$$\frac{4ty^2(\eta)}{-t^4 + y^4(\eta) + 2y^3(\eta) + 2t^2 + 2t^2y(\eta) - 1 - 2y(\eta)} = C = \frac{4}{4\eta - \eta^3}.$$

We have  $\frac{dC}{dy(\eta)} \Big|_{y(\eta)=1} = -\frac{8(t^4 - 3t^2 + 4)}{t^7 - 8t^5 + 16t^3} \neq 0$  when  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore,  $y(\eta)$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $C$  smoothly bijectively correspond one to others near  $y = 1$ ,  $\eta = t$ ,  $C = c_t$ , and any of them can be taken as an independent variable.

Put  $Q_\pi := h_{-it}(i, \pi) = (it, 1) = Q(i, \pi, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ . We obviously have  $\Im \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=y(\eta)} \Phi_\eta(iy, Q_\pi) = 0$  since the function under differentiation is real. By a calculation, at  $y = y(\eta)$  we have

$$\Im \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \Phi_\eta(x + iy, Q_\pi) \Big|_{y=y(\eta), x=0} = \frac{2(1 - y(\eta))}{t^2 + y^2(\eta) - 1}.$$

By change of variable  $z' = z/y(\eta)$  we see that

$$d_z|_{z=i} \Phi_\eta(z, Q_\pi) = i \cdot \frac{2y(\eta)(1 - y(\eta))}{t^2 + y^2(\eta) - 1} dy.$$

Notice also that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=1} \frac{2y(1-y)}{t^2 + y^2 - 1} = -2/t^2 \neq 0. \quad (8)$$

Consider mapping  $R_{\theta_1}: z \mapsto \frac{z \cos \theta_1 + \sin \theta_1}{-z \sin \theta_1 + \cos \theta_1}$ ,  $\theta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . We have  $R_{\theta_1} i = i$ ,  $R'_{\theta_1}(i) = e^{2\theta_1 i}$ , so this is rotation around  $i$  by angle  $2\theta_1$ . Now, for  $\theta \in \mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi$  put

$$R := R_{(\pi-\theta)/2}: z \mapsto \frac{z \sin(\theta/2) + \cos(\theta/2)}{-z \cos(\theta/2) + \sin(\theta/2)} = \frac{z \cdot \sin \theta + (1 + \cos \theta)}{-(1 + \cos \theta) \cdot z + \sin \theta}$$

and  $R^{-1} := R_{(\pi+\theta)/2}$ .

Arguing as in the beginning of proof of Lemma 3.1, we conclude that

$$R^{-1} h_{-it}(i, \pi) = Q(R^{-1}(iy(\eta)), \theta, t, \eta) =: Q_\theta.$$

By (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\eta(z, Q_\theta) &= \Phi_\eta(Rz, RQ_\theta) - \log \left( \frac{\bar{z} \cos(\theta/2) - \sin(\theta/2)}{z \cos(\theta/2) - \sin(\theta/2)} \right) + \text{function of } Q_\theta = \\ &= \Phi_\eta(Rz, RQ_\theta) + \log \left( \frac{z(\cos \theta + 1) - \sin \theta}{\bar{z}(\cos \theta + 1) - \sin \theta} \right) + \text{function of } Q_\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $d_z \Phi_\eta(z, h_{-it}(i, \pi))|_{z=i} = 0$ , we have

$$d_z \Phi_t(z, Q_\theta)|_{z=i} = d_z \log \left( \frac{z(\cos \theta + 1) - \sin \theta}{\bar{z}(\cos \theta + 1) - \sin \theta} \right) \Big|_{z=i} = -(1 + \cos \theta) \cdot i dx - \sin \theta \cdot i dy. \quad (9)$$

Next, suppose that  $F(z)$  is some function and that  $\gamma z = \frac{az + b}{cz + d}$ . Let  $d_z F|_{z=\gamma z_0} = i\alpha dx + i\beta dy$ . Put  $F_1(z) := F(\gamma z) + \log \left( \frac{cz+d}{c\bar{z}+d} \right)$ . If  $dF_1|_{z_0} = i\alpha_1 dx + i\beta_1 dy$  then

$$(\alpha \Im(\gamma z) + 1)^2 + (\beta \Im(\gamma z))^2 = (\alpha_1 \Im z + 1)^2 + (\beta_1 \Im z)^2 \quad (10)$$

(*energy conservation under automorphic change of variables*). This can be checked by a direct calculation.

By (9) we see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Im d_z \Phi_\eta(z, Q(z_0, \theta, t, \eta)) \Big|_{z=z_0, \eta=t}$$

is tangent to  $T_{z_0}^* \mathbb{H} \cap \{H_{-1} = 1/2\}$ . Further, (10) and (8) imply that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \Im d_z \Phi_\eta(z, Q(z_0, \theta, t, \eta)) \Big|_{z=z_0, \eta=t}$$

is transverse to  $T_{z_0}^* \mathbb{H} \cap \{H_{-1} = 1/2\}$ . Thus, Jacobian of

$$(\theta, \eta) \mapsto d_z \Im \Phi_\eta(z, Q(z_0, \theta, t, \eta))|_{z=z_0}$$

is non-zero near  $\eta = t$ . Together with (9), this concludes the proof of Lemma.  $\blacksquare$

## 4 Kernel $L_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ gives a semiclassical PDO

Now, let us introduce kernel of quadratic form. Take some  $t_1, t_2 < \bar{t}$  positive and close enough one to another,  $t_1 < t_2$ ; take  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ . Pick  $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  smooth, nonnegative and supported by  $[t_1, t_2]$ . Take any  $a \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma_t)$  with  $\text{supp } a$  small enough. Consider operator with kernel

$$\begin{aligned} L_t(z_1, z_2) &:= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\eta g(\eta) \int_{\Sigma_t} dS_t(P) \left( \frac{z_1 - \tilde{Z}(P)}{\bar{z}_1 - \bar{Z}(P)} \right)^\tau e^{-\tau c_\eta \cdot \cosh \text{dist}(z_1, P)} a(P) \times \\ &\quad \times e^{-\tau c_\eta \cdot \overline{\cosh \text{dist}(z_2, P)}} \left( \frac{\bar{z}_2 - \bar{Z}(P)}{z_2 - \bar{Z}(P)} \right)^\tau e^{-2\tau\varphi(t, \eta, \theta(P))} = \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\eta g(\eta) \int_{\Sigma_t} dS_t(P) K_\eta^\tau(z_1, P) a(P) \overline{K_\eta^\tau(z_2, P)} \cdot e^{-2\tau\varphi(t, \eta, \theta(P))}, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{H}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here, for  $P \in \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ , we write  $\theta(P)$  for angular coordinate of  $P$  in horocyclic coordinates  $(x, y, t, \theta)$ ; recall also that  $dS_t(\cdot)$  is invariant Liouville measure transferred to  $\Sigma_t$  by horocyclic parametrization from Section 2, function  $\varphi$  has been defined before Lemma 3.4. We assume that  $\text{supp } g$  is small enough such that  $\mathcal{T}_{z,t}$  is a diffeomorphism of  $(\mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi) \times \text{supp } g$  onto some closed neighborhood of  $T_z \mathbb{H} \cap \{H_{-1} = 1/2\}$ .

**Remark.** We want  $L_t(\cdot, \cdot)$  to give a semiclassical PDO. If we drop mollification by  $g$  in its definition then remaining  $\tilde{L}(z_1, z_2) := \int_{\Sigma_t} dS_t(P) K_t^\tau(z_1, P) a(P) \overline{K_t^\tau(z_2, P)} \cdot e^{-2\tau\varphi(t, t, \theta(P))}$  will not be such an operator: the symbol is too singular. That is why we perturbed  $t$  by taking  $\eta$  close to  $t$  and took average by  $\eta$  as above.

Recall that  $\mathcal{S}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  is defined in Lemma 3.2. From the second assertion of that Lemma we derive the following

**Proposition 4.1.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{H}} \int_{\mathbb{H}} u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) L_t(z_1, z_2) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2) &= \\ &= \int_{\Sigma_t} |u(P)|^2 a(P) \left( \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\eta g(\eta) |\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)|^2 \cdot e^{-2\tau\varphi(t, \eta, \theta(P))} \right) dS_t(P). \end{aligned}$$

We thus put

$$B(P) := \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\eta g(\eta) |\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)|^2 \cdot e^{-2\tau\varphi(t, \eta, \theta(P))}$$

for  $P \in \Sigma_t$ .

**Remark.**  $B(P) \neq 0$  if  $g \neq 0$  is non-negative. Indeed, otherwise  $\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)$  vanishes at a non-degenerate interval of  $\eta$ 's. Using [Fay77] we have

$$\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s) = \int_1^{+\infty} e^{-\tau c_\eta \cdot \cosh r} \mathcal{P}_{s, \tau}(r) d \cosh r$$

with  $\mathcal{P}_{s,\tau}(r) = (1 - \tanh^2 r/2)^{s_1} \cdot {}_2F_1(s_1 - \tau, s_1 + \tau, 1; \tanh^2 r/2)$ ,  $s_1(s_1 - 1) = -s^2$ . In any case, for  $s_1, \tau$  fixed, we have  $\mathcal{P}_{s,\tau}(r) = O(e^{Nr})$  as  $r$  approaches  $+\infty$  for some  $N$  large enough (see [DLMF, §15.4(ii)]). We then conclude that  $\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)$  is analytic in  $c_\eta$  and thus cannot have continuous set of zeroes.

For technical reasons, let us introduce slices of  $L_t(z_1, z_2)$  by integrals over  $\Sigma_{t,\theta}$  with  $\theta \in \mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi$  and  $\eta$  fixed. For positive  $t < \bar{t}$  define measure  $\mathcal{A}_{2,t}$  on  $\Sigma_{t,\theta}$  to be push-forward of measure  $\mathcal{A}_2$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  by mapping  $z \mapsto h_{-it}(z, \theta)$ . Put

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Sigma_{t,\theta}} d\mathcal{A}_{2,t}(P) \left( \frac{z_1 - \tilde{Z}(P)}{\bar{z}_1 - Z(P)} \right)^\tau e^{-\tau c_\eta \cosh \text{dist}(z_1, P)} a(P) e^{-\tau c_\eta \overline{\cosh \text{dist}(z_2, P)}} \left( \frac{\bar{z}_2 - \bar{\tilde{Z}}(P)}{z_2 - \bar{Z}(P)} \right)^\tau e^{-2\tau \varphi(t, \eta, \theta(P))} = \\ & = \int_{\Sigma_{t,\theta}} d\mathcal{A}_{2,t}(P) K_\eta^\tau(z_1, P) a(P) \overline{K_\eta^\tau(z_2, P)} \cdot e^{-2\tau \varphi(t, \eta, \theta)} =: L_{t,\eta,\theta}(z_1, z_2), \quad \eta \in (t_1, t_2), \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{H}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 4.2.** *There exists a smooth function  $b_{1,t}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \in C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{H})$  depending smoothly also on  $t$  but not depending on  $u$  with the following property:*

*Let  $a \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma_t)$  be as above whereas  $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  being supported by  $[t_1, t_2]$ . Put*

$$s(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) := b_{1,t}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \cdot g(\mathbb{H}_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)) \cdot a(h_{-it}(z, \Theta_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2))).$$

*If  $A := \text{Op}_{1/\tau} s$  is semiclassical PDO with symbol  $s$  then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{H}} \int_{\mathbb{H}} u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) L_t(z_1, z_2) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2) = O(1/\tau^4) + \tau^{-3} \cdot \langle Au, u \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{H})}.$$

Notice that  $\mathbb{H}_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)$ ,  $\Theta_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)$  are initially defined for  $(z, \xi_1, \xi_2)$  near  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ . By making  $\text{supp } g$  sufficiently small we can make symbol  $s$  well defined for all  $\xi_1, \xi_2$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $z_2 = z_1$  and  $\eta = t$ . Then by Laplace method and by Lemma 3.1, we have:

$$L_{t,t,\theta}(z_1, z_1) = b_1(t, \theta) \cdot \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot a(h_{-it}(z_1, \theta)) + O\left(\frac{1}{\tau^2}\right)$$

with some  $b_1$  smooth and separated from zero. Indeed,

$$h_{-it}(z_1, \theta) = \arg \max_{P \in \Sigma_{t,\theta}} |K_t(z_1, P)|$$

and this stationary point is non-degenerate.

Now, we are going to perturb these  $z_2$  and  $\eta$ ; thus, we now assume that  $z_2$  is close enough to  $z_1$  whereas  $\eta$  is close to  $t$ . By the definition of  $\varphi$ , we have  $|K_\eta(z_j, P) e^{-\varphi(t, \eta, \theta)}| \leq 1$  for  $P \in \Sigma_{t,\theta}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . We make use of almost analytic continuation technique from [TrII]. We thus write  $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$  and again consider it as a subset of  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ . Parametrize  $\Sigma_{t,\theta}$  as  $\{h_{-it}(z, \theta) : z \in \mathbb{H}\}$  and put  $f(z) := h_{-it}(z, \theta)$ . Let us suppose that  $\text{supp } a$  is close enough to  $f(z_1)$ . Function  $z \mapsto K_\eta(z_1, f(z))$  admits a holomorphic continuation from  $z \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, +\infty)$  to some neighborhood of  $f^{-1}(\text{supp } a \cap \Sigma_{t,\theta})$  in  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ . This is easily seen from the explicit parametrization of horocyclic Grauert tube (in fact, linear by components of  $z$ ) and from (5).

By [TrII, Lemma X.2.3], we may assume that  $z \mapsto a(f(z))$  is *almost-analytically* extended to  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  from  $\mathbb{H}$ , denote this extension by  $a_1 = a_1(z)$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ . Also,

denote by  $\Phi_1(z_2, z, \eta)$  ( $z$  ranges some neighborhood of  $f^{-1}(\text{supp } a \cap \Sigma_{t,\theta})$  in  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ ) an almost-analytic extension of  $z \mapsto \overline{\Phi_\eta(z_2, f(z))}$  which also does exist by the same reason.

By the third assertion of Lemma 3.1, for  $z_2$  close to  $z_1$  and  $\eta$  close to  $t$ , there exists the unique  $z_0 = z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  for which

$$d_z|_{z=z_0} (\Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z)) + \Phi_1(z_2, z, \eta)) = 0.$$

This  $z_0$  depends smoothly on its arguments and  $h_{-it}(z_0(z, z, t, \eta, \theta), \theta) = Q(z, \theta, t, \eta)$ ,  $Q$  being defined in Lemma 3.3.

Now take

$$d_{z_1}|_{z_1=z_2} (\Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))) + \Phi_1(z_2, z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta), \eta)). \quad (12)$$

Since

$$d_{z_0}|_{z_1=z_2} (\Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))) + \Phi_1(z_2, z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta), \eta)) = 0,$$

we conclude that (12) equals  $d_z|_{z=z_1} \Phi_\eta(z, Q(z_1, \theta, t, \eta)) = i\mathcal{T}_{z_1, t}(\theta, \eta)$  (see Lemma 3.4).

By complex stationary phase method as stated in [TrII, X.3] we have, as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t,\eta,\theta}(z_1, z_2) &= O(1/\tau^4) + \\ &+ \left( \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot a_1(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta)) \cdot b_2(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) + \frac{1}{\tau^2} \cdot a_2(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta)) \cdot b_3(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\tau^3} \cdot a_3(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta)) \cdot b_4(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) \right) \times \\ &\times \exp(\tau \cdot (\Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))) + \Phi_1(z_2, z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta), \eta) - 2\varphi(t, \eta, \theta))). \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $b_2, b_3, b_4$  are smooth functions of their arguments,  $b_2$  is separated from zero;  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  and are linear combinations with smooth coefficients of derivatives of  $a_1 = a_1(z)$  with respect to  $z$ .

After integration of obtained expression by  $d\eta$  and  $d\theta$ , we expect that the main contribution to the  $L_t(z_1, z_2) = \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\eta g(\eta) L_{t,\eta,\theta}(z_1, z_2)$  will be given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\tau} \cdot a_1(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta)) \cdot b_2(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) \times \\ &\times \exp(\tau \cdot d_{z_1}|_{z_1=z_2} (\Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))) + \Phi_1(z_2, z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta), \eta)) [z_1 - z_2]). \end{aligned}$$

(If  $\omega \in T^*\mathbb{H}$  is a covector then by  $\omega[z_1 - z_2]$  we denote application of  $\omega$  to vector  $z_1 - z_2$ .) Let's prove it in a bit more details. We are going to deal with the  $1/\tau$  order term in expansion in (13), the others are treated similarly. Put

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{PDO}}(z_1, z_2) &= \tau^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi_2 g(\mathbf{H}_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2)) \cdot b_2(z_1, z_2, t, \mathbf{H}_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2), \Theta_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2)) \times \\ &\quad \times \left| \det \frac{\partial(\Theta_{z_2, t}, \mathbf{H}_{z_2, t})}{\partial(\xi_1, \xi_2)} \right| a(h_{-it}(z_2, \Theta_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2))) e^{i\tau(\xi_1 dx + \xi_2 dy)[z_1 - z_2]}. \end{aligned}$$

(We changed variables in main term in integral for  $L_t(\cdot, \cdot)$  as  $(\theta, \eta) \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{z_2, t}(\theta, \eta)$  and multiplied by  $\tau^3$ .) We are going to show that if

$$\tilde{b}(z_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) := (2\pi)^2 b_2(z_2, z_2, t, \mathbf{H}_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2), \Theta_{z_2, t}(\xi_1, \xi_2)) \cdot \left| \det \frac{\partial(\Theta_{z_2, t}, \mathbf{H}_{z_2, t})}{\partial(\xi_1, \xi_2)} \right|$$

then  $b_{1,t}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) := \tilde{b}(z, -\xi_1, -\xi_2)$  satisfies the requirements from the statement of our Proposition.

Denote  $F := \Phi_\eta(z_1, f(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))) + \Phi_1(z_2, z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta), \eta) - 2\varphi(t, \eta, \theta)$ , this is the exponent in (13). Notice that  $\Re F \leq 0$  due to [TrII, Lemma X.2.5]. Observe that  $\det \frac{\partial}{\partial(\theta, \eta)} d_{z_1} F|_{z_1=z_2} \neq 0$ . More carefully, consider matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \Re z_1 \partial \theta} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \Re z_1 \partial \eta} \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \Im z_1 \partial \theta} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \Im z_1 \partial \eta} \end{pmatrix}$$

If we write  $\mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}(\theta, \eta) = \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(1)} dx + \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(2)} dy \in T_{z_2} \mathbb{H}$  then the latter matrix, at  $z_1 = z_2$ , is

$$i \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(1)}}{\partial \theta} & \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(1)}}{\partial \eta} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(2)}}{\partial \theta} & \frac{\partial \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}^{(2)}}{\partial \eta} \end{pmatrix}$$

and, by Lemma 3.4, is non-degenerate. Also  $F|_{z_1=z_2} = 0$  and therefore  $d_{\theta,\eta} F|_{z_1=z_2} = 0$ . Then, for  $z_1$  close to  $z_2$ ,  $|d_{\theta,\eta} F| \geq \text{const} \cdot |z_1 - z_2|$ .

Suppose that  $|z_1 - z_2| \geq \tau^{-2/3}$  but  $|z_1 - z_2|$  is small enough (less than some constant not depending on  $\tau$ ). Assume that  $z_1 - z_2$  lies in some cone thin enough. By localization of  $I_1 := \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\eta g(\eta) a_1(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta)) b_2(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta) e^{\tau F}$  we may assume that there exists a unit vector  $v$  in  $(\theta, \eta)$ -plane such that

$$|d_{\theta,\eta} F[v]| \geq \text{const} \cdot |z_1 - z_2| \quad (14)$$

on the whole support of integrand. In localization of  $I_1$  change variables such that this integral will be sliced in  $v$ -direction. Then repeated integration by parts in  $v$ -direction shows that  $I_1 = O(\tau^{-N})$  for any  $N$  since  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are well separated and every integration brings  $\tau \cdot |z_1 - z_2|$  to denominator.

More formally, put  $z = z_1 - z_2 = r e^{i\phi}$ ,  $G(z) := \frac{\partial F}{\partial v}$  and integrate localized  $I_1$  by parts in  $v$ -direction. We have  $\tau G$  in denominator after this. Since  $G|_{z=0} = 0$ , we have  $G(z) = r \int_0^1 \langle \nabla_z G(\rho z), e^{i\phi} \rangle d\rho$ . Thus,  $G/r$  is smooth in  $v$ -direction and, by (14), is separated from zero with  $z$  small. This allows further integration by parts and leads to estimate  $I_1 = O(\tau^{-N})$  for any  $N$ .

The same concerns  $L_{\text{PDO}}$ .

Now assume that  $|z_1 - z_2| \leq \tau^{-2/3}$ . In  $I_1$ , apply Taylor expansion by degrees of  $\Re(z_1 - z_2)$  and  $\Im(z_1 - z_2)$  in  $a_1(z_0(z_1, z_2, t, \eta, \theta))$  and in  $b_2$ . Also, write

$$e^{\tau F} = e^{\tau \cdot i \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}(\theta,\eta)[z_1-z_2]} \cdot e^{\tau \cdot O(|z_1-z_2|^2)},$$

and expand the second factor by Taylor (the exponent is  $o(1)$  therein). Degree of the expansions above can be taken large enough such that all the remainders are  $O(1/\tau^4)$  which fits into precision claimed in the statement of our Proposition. We thus obtain a sum of terms like  $1/\tau \cdot (\Re(z_1 - z_2))^\alpha (\Im(z_1 - z_2))^\beta \tau^\gamma e^{\tau \cdot i \mathcal{T}_{z_2,t}(\theta,\eta)[z_1-z_2]} \times (\text{some amplitude})$ , and in all terms except for the main one we have  $\alpha + \beta > \gamma$ . In  $I_1$ , change variable as



$(\theta, \eta) \mapsto (\xi_1, \xi_2) = \mathcal{T}_{z_2, t}(\theta, \eta)$ . In all terms in  $I_1$  except the main one we may integrate by parts  $\alpha$  times with respect to  $\xi_1$  and  $\beta$  times with respect to  $\xi_2$ . Calderon–Vaillancourt Theorem then implies that all terms except for the main one give operators with  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}$ -norms being  $O(\tau^{-4})$ .

The latter arguments concern the case when  $z_1$  is close enough to  $z_2$  and both range a compact set. We also need to show that  $L_t(z_1, z_2)$  gives a small operator in  $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$  when  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are separated one from another by a positive constant or when at least one of them is far from  $f^{-1}(\text{supp } a)$ . These cases are not covered by the above arguments. It is enough to estimate each  $L_{t, \eta, \theta}(z_1, z_2)$ . If at least one of  $z_1$  or  $z_2$  is far away from  $\text{supp } a$  then we apply argument similar to that of the technical part in Lemma 3.2 using condition  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, z \in \mathbb{H}} \|u_n\|_{L^1(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z, 1))} < +\infty$  from the statement of our

main Theorem 1.1; this requires an estimation which we omit in this exposition. If  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are not far from  $\text{supp } a$  but separated then we integrate by a bounded set when evaluating the operator. From the proof of the second assertion of Lemma 3.2

we see that either  $\left(\frac{z_1 - \tilde{Z}(P)}{\bar{z}_1 - Z(P)}\right)^\tau e^{-\tau c_\eta \cdot \cosh \text{dist}(z_1, P) - \tau \varphi(t, \eta, \theta)}$  is small or the same for  $z_2$

(absolute value is  $\leq e^{-c\tau}$  with some  $c$  positive) whenever  $t$  is small enough. This gives the desired.

Now, let's check the signs. Form given by PDO with symbol  $s$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau^2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2) u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi'_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi'_2 s(z_2, (\xi'_1, \xi'_2)) e^{i\tau(\xi'_1, \xi'_2)[z_2 - z_1]} = \\ & = \frac{\tau^2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2) u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\xi_2 s(z_2, (-\xi_1, -\xi_2)) e^{i\tau(\xi_1, \xi_2)[z_1 - z_2]}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $s$  is as in the statement of our Proposition then the latter is  $\int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_1) \int_{\mathbb{H}} d\mathcal{A}_2(z_2) u(z_1) \bar{u}(z_2) L_{\text{PDO}}(z_1, z_2)$ . But  $\tau^{-3} L_{\text{PDO}}$  gives the main part of kernel  $L_t(z_1, z_2)$ . Proof is complete. ■

Now recall that functions  $u$  are uniformly distributed at  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ . This implies that, for  $A$  as in Proposition 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Au, u \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{H})} & \rightarrow \int_{\{H_1=1/2\}} b_{1,t}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \cdot g(\mathbb{H}_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)) \cdot a(h_{-it}(z, \Theta_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2))) d\mu_L(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \\ & = g(t) \cdot \int_{\{H_1=1/2\}} b_{1,t}(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \cdot a(h_{-it}(z, \Theta_{z,t}(-\xi_1, -\xi_2))) d\mu_L(z, \xi_1, \xi_2) \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ . Recall that  $\mu_L$  is appropriately normed Liouville measure on  $\{H_1 = 1/2\}$ , see Section 2. Since we may take arbitrary  $a$ , we conclude that  $\tau^3 \cdot |u(P)|^2 \cdot B(P) \cdot dS_t(P)$  converge to a measure mutually absolutely continuous with respect to  $dS_t(P)$ . In other words,  $\tau^3 \cdot |u(P)|^2 \cdot B(P)$  become equidistributed on  $\Sigma_t$  — up to a smooth non-vanishing factor.

Convergence in (15) is uniform when  $a$  ranges some compact set of symbols, namely, when all derivatives of  $a$  up to some sufficient order are bounded. The same concerns all the remainders in proof of Proposition 4.2. Thus, integration of result of that Proposition over  $t$  finally leads us to the following

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $t_1 < t_2 < \bar{t}$  with  $t_1$  close enough to  $t_2$ . Put*

$$\Omega_{t_1, t_2} := \bigcup_{t \in (t_1, t_2)} \Sigma_t = \mathcal{G}_{t_2} \setminus \text{clos } \mathcal{G}_{t_1}.$$

*There exists a smooth strictly positive function  $b_3: \Omega_{t_1, t_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  with the following property:*

*Let  $g \in C_0^\infty([t_1, t_2])$ . Put*

$$B(P) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} d\eta g(\eta) |\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)|^2 \cdot e^{-2\tau\varphi(t(P), \eta, \theta(P))}, \quad P \in \Omega_{t_1, t_2},$$

*where  $t(P)$  and  $\theta(P)$  are the corresponding horocyclic coordinates of  $P$ . For such  $B$  we have*

$$\tau^3 |u(P)|^2 \cdot B(P) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow \infty}^* g(t(P)) \times b_3(P).$$

*Here, both sides of weak\* convergence are understood as densities of measures with respect to some (say, horocyclic) coordinates in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  whereas the limit relation is understood in the sense of  $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega_{t_1, t_2})$ .*

## 5 Logarithm of weak\* convergence

**Lemma 5.1.** *For  $t_1, t_2, g, \Omega_{t_1, t_2}, B$  as in Proposition 4.3, if  $g > 0$  on  $(t_1, t_2)$  then we have*

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \cdot \log(|u|^2 B) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow \infty} 0 \text{ in } L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega_{t_1, t_2}).$$

**Proof.** We generally follow lines by Zelditch ([Ze07]).

Put  $\tilde{B} := \int_{\text{supp } g} d\eta g(\eta) |\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau, s)|^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $w(P) := u(P) \cdot \sqrt{\tilde{B}}$ ,  $B_1(P) := B(P)/\tilde{B}$ . We then have  $|w|^2 B_1 = |u|^2 B$ .

We claim that

$$\log^+(|u|^2 \cdot B) = O(\tau) \tag{16}$$

uniformly for  $P$  separated from  $\mathbb{H}$ . Indeed, suppose that  $|u(P_0)|^2 \cdot B(P_0) \geq \exp(C\tau)$  for some  $P_0$  and for  $C$  large enough. For some neighborhood  $U \subset \Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  of point  $P_0$  we have  $B(P) \geq B(P_0) \cdot \exp(-C_1\tau)$  if  $P \in U$ ,  $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is bounded from the above; this follows from positivity of  $g$  and can be easily seen from the explicit formula for  $B$  and continuity of  $\varphi$ . If  $D \subset \Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  is a ball around  $P_0$  in some holomorphic system of coordinates and  $\mathcal{A}_4$  is 4-dimensional volume in these coordinates then

$$\int_D |u(P)|^2 d\mathcal{A}_4(P) \geq \text{const} \cdot |u(P_0)|^2,$$

and therefore

$$\int_D |u(P)|^2 B(P) d\mathcal{A}_4(P) \geq \text{const} \cdot |u(P_0)|^2 B(P_0) \exp(-C_1\tau) \geq \text{const} \cdot \exp((C - C_1)\tau).$$

This contradicts weak\* convergence of functions  $\tau^3 |u|^2 B$  provided that  $C > C_1$ .

We have  $\log B - \log \tilde{B} = O(\tau)$ . (Here we again use that  $g \geq 0$ .) Then, from (16) we see that  $\log^+ |w| = O(\tau)$ . Consider plurisubharmonic function  $\frac{\log |w|}{\tau}$ . They are bounded from above in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  uniformly by  $\tau$ . By [HörI, Theorem 4.1.9], we have the following plurisubharmonic dichotomy: either  $\frac{\log |w|}{\tau} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow \infty} -\infty$  uniformly on each compact set in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$ ; or, up to subsequence, functions  $\frac{\log |w|}{\tau}$  converge in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_{t_1, t_2})$  as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ .

The first case is impossible. Indeed,  $|\log B_1| = O(\tau)$ . If  $\frac{\log |w|}{\tau} \rightarrow -\infty$  then  $\log(|w|^2 B_1) \rightarrow -\infty$  uniformly on compacts, then  $\tau^3 |w|^2 B_1 \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on compacts. Then  $\tau^3 |u|^2 B = \tau^3 |w|^2 B_1$  cannot converge weak\* to a constant-scale function, a contradiction to Proposition 4.3.

We thus may suppose, up to subsequence, that  $\frac{\log |w|}{\tau} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow \infty} f_1$  in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_{t_1, t_2})$  for some function  $f_1 \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_{t_1, t_2})$ . Let  $f_1^*$  be upper-semicontinuous regularization of  $f_1$  ([HörI, Theorems 4.1.11, 4.1.8]). Then  $f_1^*$  is plurisubharmonic and equals  $f_1$  almost everywhere in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$ .

Notice that  $\frac{d \log B_1}{\tau}$  is bounded in  $L^\infty$ -norm, uniformly by  $\tau$ . Then, by Arzela-Ascoli Theorem, we may, passing to further subsequence, assume that  $\frac{\log B_1}{\tau} \rightarrow f_2$  uniformly on compacts in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  for some continuous  $f_2$ . We are going to show that  $2f_1^* + f_2 = 0$  almost everywhere with respect to coordinates in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$ .

We first claim that  $2f_1^* + f_2 \leq 0$  almost everywhere. Indeed, otherwise, by F. Riesz and D. Egorov theorems, we may assume that, up to subsequence,  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \log(|u|^2 B)$  exists, is uniform and is greater or equal than some  $\delta > 0$  on a set  $E \subset \Omega_{t_1, t_2}$  of a positive measure. Then  $|u|^2 B \geq \exp(\tau\delta/2)$  on  $E$  for  $\tau$  large. This contradicts weak\* convergence from Proposition 4.3.

It remains to prove that  $2f_1^* + f_2 \geq 0$ . Suppose that  $2f_1^*(P_0) + f_2(P_0) < -\delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$  and for some  $P_0$ . Then  $2f_1^*(P) + f_2(P) < -\delta$  for  $P$  in some neighborhood  $U$  of  $P_0$  precompact in  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2}$ . Then, since  $f_2$  is continuous, by [HörI, Theorem 4.1.9(b)],

$$\overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\text{clos } U} \left( \frac{\log(|w|^2)}{\tau} + f_2 \right) \leq \sup_{\text{clos } U} (2f_1^* + f_2) < -\delta.$$

Since  $\frac{\log B_1}{\tau} \rightarrow f_2$  uniformly, we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\text{clos } U} \frac{\log(|w|^2 B_1)}{\tau} < -\delta.$$

Then, in  $U$ , we have  $|u|^2 B = |w|^2 B_1 \leq \exp(-\delta\tau) \rightarrow 0$ . This again contradicts weak\* convergence given by Proposition 4.3. Proof of Lemma is complete. ■

## 6 Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 5.1 does not provide any information on the behavior of functions  $u$  near  $\mathbb{H}$ . (In all the preceding arguments we had to assume that  $t$  is separated from zero to get

uniform estimates of reminders.) In Theorem 1.1, we do not cut  $\mathbb{H}$  from  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ . Thus, we need one more application of plurisubharmonic dichotomy.

Pick any  $t_1, t_2 \in (0, \bar{t})$  close enough one to another ( $t_1 < t_2$ ). Recall that  $\Omega_{t_1, t_2} = \mathcal{G}_{t_2} \setminus \text{clos } \mathcal{G}_{t_1}$ . Suppose that

$$\sup_{\eta \in (t_1, t_2)} \sup_{P \in \Omega_{t_1, t_2}} \frac{\log |\mathcal{S}(\eta, \tau_n, s_n) u_n(P)|}{\tau_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\infty. \quad (17)$$

But this would contradict Proposition 4.3 since  $\varphi(t, \eta, \theta)$  is bounded for  $\eta$  close enough to  $t$ . Similarly, (17) cannot stay true along a subsequence of indices  $n$ . Therefore, we may take  $\eta_n \in (t_1, t_2)$  for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$\sup_{P \in \Omega_{t_1, t_2}} \frac{\log |\mathcal{S}(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n) u_n(P)|}{\tau_n} \not\rightarrow -\infty \quad (18)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Recall that

$$\mathcal{S}(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n) u_n(P) = \int_{\mathbb{H}} u_n(z) K_{\eta_n}^{\tau_n}(z, P) d\mathcal{A}_2(z).$$

Form this, arguing as in proof of the first assertion of Lemma 3.2, we see that, for any compact set  $K \subset \mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$ ,

$$\sup_{P \in K} \frac{\log |\mathcal{S}(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n) u_n(P)|}{\tau_n}$$

is bounded from the above uniformly by  $n$ . (Recall that we require estimate  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, z \in \mathbb{H}} \|u_n\|_{L^1(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{H}}(z, 1))} < +\infty$  in Theorem 1.1.)

Now put  $v_n := \mathcal{S}(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n) u_n$ . Further, take any  $g \in C_0^\infty([t_1, t_2])$  strictly positive on  $(t_1, t_2)$ . Take  $B(P)$  as in Proposition 4.3 and put  $B_{2,n}(P) := B(P)/\mathcal{S}^2(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n)$  for  $P \in \Omega_{t_1, t_2}$ . (Notice that  $\mathcal{S}(\eta_n, \tau_n, s_n) \neq 0$  by the choice of  $\eta_n$ .) As above, apply dichotomy [HörI, Theorem 4.1.9] for plurisubharmonic functions  $\frac{\log |v_n|}{\tau_n}$  defined

at  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}}$  (with  $\mathbb{H}$  included!). The case of  $\frac{\log |v_n|}{\tau_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\infty$  uniformly on compacts is impossible due to (18). Thus, we may assume that, for some  $f_3 \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}})$ , we have  $\frac{\log |v_n|}{\tau_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} f_3$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}})$ , up to a subsequence of indices  $n$ . This  $f_3$  does not depend on the choice of  $t_1, t_2$  and  $g$  but only on (subsequence in)  $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and also on the choice of  $\eta_n$ .

By Lemma 5.1, we have  $\frac{\log B_{2,n}(P)}{\tau_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -2f_3$  in  $L_{\text{loc}}^1(\Omega_{t_1, t_2})$ . Thus, to recover  $df_3$  it is enough to find  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d \log B_{2,n}(P)}{\tau_n}$ . Observe that  $df_3$  does not depend neither on the choice of  $g(\cdot)$  nor on  $\eta_n$  but only on sequence  $\{u_n\}$  (or, more precisely, its subsequence). Take any  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ . We are going to find  $df_3$  on  $\Sigma_t$ .

Obviously,  $d_z f_3(h_{-it}(z, \theta)) = 0$  since  $B_{2,n}(h_{-it}(z, \theta))$  does not depend on  $z$ .

Further, by the formula for  $B$ ,

$$\inf_{\eta \in \text{supp } g} \left( -2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \right) \leq \tau_n^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log B_{2,n}(h_{-it}(z, \theta)) \leq \sup_{\eta \in \text{supp } g} \left( -2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \right)$$

since  $g$  is non-negative. Therefore,

$$\inf_{\eta \in \text{supp } g} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f_3(h_{-it}(z, \theta)) \leq \sup_{\eta \in \text{supp } g} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta).$$

Left- and right-hand side expressions in the latter inequality can be made arbitrarily close to  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \Big|_{\eta=t}$  by choosing  $g$  with support close enough to  $\{t\}$  whereas the

middle term is independent on  $g$ . The same argument concerns  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_3(h_{-it}(z, \theta))$ . We thus need to find  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \Big|_{\eta=t}$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) \Big|_{\eta=t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \varphi(t, t, \theta)$ .

As in proof of Lemma 3.4, we put  $Rz := \frac{z \sin(\theta/2) + \cos(\theta/2)}{-z \cos(\theta/2) + \sin(\theta/2)}$  ( $z \in \mathbb{H}$ ) and extend this isometry to  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  up to zeroes in denominator. Also, denote by  $iy(t, \eta)$  the point  $\arg \max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} |K_{\eta}(z, h_{-it}(i, \pi))|$ . (Then  $y(t, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}$  automatically.) We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \Big|_{y=y(t, \eta)} \Re \log K_{\eta}(iy, h_{-it}(i, \theta)) = 0. \quad (19)$$

Now,  $R^{-1}(iy(t, \eta)) = \arg \max_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \Re \log K_{\eta}(z, R^{-1}h_{-it}(i, \theta))$ . Then

$$\varphi(t, \eta, \theta) = \log |K_{\eta}(R^{-1}(iy(t, \eta)), R^{-1}h_{-it}(i, \theta))|.$$

The latter, by (2), is

$$\Re \log \left( \frac{-c \cdot iy(t, \eta) + d}{c \cdot iy(t, \eta) + d} \cdot \frac{c \cdot i(t+1) + d}{c \cdot i(t-1) + d} \right) + \Re \log K_{\eta}(iy(t, \eta), h_{-it}(i, \pi))$$

with  $c = -\cos(\theta/2)$ ,  $d = -\sin(\theta/2)$  (recall that  $Z(h_{-it}(i, \pi)) = i(1+t)$ ,  $\tilde{Z}(h_{-it}(i, \pi)) = i(t-1)$ ). We have  $\Re \log \left( \frac{-c \cdot iy(t, \eta) + d}{c \cdot iy(t, \eta) + d} \right) = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \left( \frac{\sin^2(\theta/2) + (1+t)^2 \cdot \cos^2(\theta/2)}{\sin^2(\theta/2) + (1-t)^2 \cdot \cos^2(\theta/2)} \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \left( \frac{2 + 2t \cdot (1 + \cos \theta) + t^2 \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 - 2t \cdot (1 + \cos \theta) + t^2 \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(This does not depend on  $\eta$ .) Also, by (19),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\eta=t} \varphi(t, \eta, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log \left( \frac{2 + (t^2 + 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 + (t^2 - 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{\eta=t} \Re \log K_{\eta}(i, h_{-it}(i, \pi)) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log \left( \frac{2 + (t^2 + 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 + (t^2 - 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right) + \frac{1}{t-2} - \frac{1}{t+2} - c_t \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{y=1} \frac{-t^2 + (y-1)^2}{2y} = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \log \left( \frac{2 + (t^2 + 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 + (t^2 - 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all the computations, we see that

$$\frac{d \log |u_n|}{\tau_n} = \frac{d \log |v_n|}{\tau_n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \cdot d \log \left( \frac{2 + (t^2 + 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)}{2 + (t^2 - 2t) \cdot (1 + \cos \theta)} \right) \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}),$$

the latter function being defined in horocyclic coordinates in  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{t}} \setminus \mathbb{H}$ .

De Rham current  $\mathcal{Z}_u$  given by nodal set of analytic function  $u$  is  $\frac{i}{\pi} \bar{\partial} \partial \log |u|$  in the sense of distributions. This is just Lelong–Poincaré formula ([Ch], [LG]). Operators  $\bar{\partial}$ ,  $\partial$  here are given by the complex structure in  $\mathbb{H}^{\mathbb{C}}$  defined in Section 2. This concludes the proof of our main Theorem 1.1. ■

## References

- [Bou79] L. Boutet de Monvel, *Convergence dans le domaine complexe des séries de fonctions propres*, Journées équations aux dérivées partielles (1979), article no. 3.
- [BW59] F. Bruhat, H. Whitney, *Quelques propriétés fondamentales des ensembles analytiques-rels*, Comment. Math. Helv. **33** (1959), 132–160.
- [Ch] E.M. Chirka, *Complex Analytic Sets*, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, 1989 (translated from Russian).
- [D21] M. Dubashinskiy, *Infinite ascension limit: Horocyclic chaos*, Journal of Geometry and Physics, **161** (2021), 104053.
- [DLMF] F.W.J. Olver, A.B. Olde Daalhuis, D.W. Lozier, B.I. Schneider, R.F. Boisvert, C.W. Clark, B.R. Miller, B.V. Saunders, H.S. Cohl, and M.A. McClain, eds., *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*, <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.1.4 of 2021-01-15.
- [Fay77] J.D. Fay, *Fourier coefficients of the resolvent for a Fuchsian group*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal), **293/294** (1977), 143–203.
- [Furst73] H. Furstenberg, *The unique ergodicity of the horocycle flow*, Lecture Notes in Math. **318** (1973), Springer, 95–115.
- [HörI] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators I: Distribution theory and Fourier analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1990.
- [LG] P. Lelong, L. Gruman, *Entire Functions of Several Complex Variables*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1986.
- [Leb13] G. Lebeau, *The complex Poisson kernel on a compact analytic Riemannian manifold*, preprint (2013).
- [Ma75] B. Marcus, *Unique ergodicity of the horocycle flow: variable negative curvature case*, Israel J. Math. **21**, No. 2–3 (1975), 133–144.
- [Sage] W. A. Stein et al., *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 7.5.1)*, The Sage Development Team, <http://www.sagemath.org>, 2017.

- 
- [St14] M. Stenzel, *On the analytic continuation of the Poisson kernel*, *Manuscripta Math.* **144** (2014), 253–276.
- [Takh] L.A. Takhtajan, *Quantum Mechanics for Mathematicians*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **95**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [TrII] F. Trèves, *Introduction to Pseudodifferential and Fourier Integral Operators. Volume 2: Fourier integral operators*, Plenum Press, New York, 1980.
- [Zw] M. Zworski, *Semiclassical Analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **138**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [Ze92] S. Zelditch, *On a “quantum chaos” theorem of R. Schrader and M. Taylor*, *Journal of Functional Analysis* **109**, No. 1 (1992), 1–21.
- [Ze07] S. Zelditch, *Complex zeros of real ergodic eigenfunctions*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **167** (2007), 419–443.
- [Ze11] S. Zelditch, *Pluri-potential theory on Grauert tubes of real analytic Riemannian manifolds, I*, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math* **84**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2012.