

# Hidden spectral symmetries and mode stability of subextremal Kerr(-dS) black holes

Marc Casals<sup>1,2</sup> and Rita Teixeira da Costa<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas (CBPF), Rio de Janeiro, CEP 22290-180, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland*

<sup>3</sup>*University of Cambridge, Center for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

October 11, 2021

## Abstract

We uncover hidden spectral symmetries of the Teukolsky equation in Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes, recently conjectured by Aminov, Grassi and Hatsuda (arXiv: 2006.06111 and arXiv: 2007.07906, 2020) in the zero cosmological constant case. Using these symmetries, we provide a new, simpler proof of mode stability for subextremal Kerr black holes. We also present a partial mode stability result for Kerr-de Sitter black holes.

## 1 Introduction

In General Relativity, a vacuum spacetime is a  $(1 + 3)$ -dimensional Lorentzian manifold solving the Einstein equations

$$\text{Ric}(g) = \Lambda g, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $g$  is the Lorentzian metric and  $\Lambda$  is the cosmological constant. Here, we will focus especially on the  $\Lambda \geq 0$  case. Of paramount importance are the Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter, black hole families of solutions to (1.1) with  $\Lambda = 0$  and  $\Lambda > 0$ , respectively. These are parametrized by their mass  $M > 0$  and a specific angular momentum  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  which is constrained in terms of  $M$  and  $\Lambda$ ; for instance, in the case  $\Lambda = 0$ , Kerr black holes verify the bound  $|a| \leq M$ .

As Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes are stationary spacetimes, they correspond to *equilibrium states* for (1.1), and one would like to determine whether they are *stable* or *unstable* equilibria [RW57]. A great deal of progress on the problem has been achieved for the spherically symmetric non-rotating ( $a = 0$ ) subfamily and perturbations thereof. In the  $\Lambda > 0$  case, Hintz and Vasy showed a full nonlinear stability statement when the black hole parameters are such that  $|a| \ll M, \Lambda$ . In the more nuanced  $\Lambda = 0$  setting, a complete picture of the nonlinear stability of the  $a = 0$  subfamily was only very recently established by Dafermos, Holzegel, Rodnianski and Taylor in [DHRT21]; see also [KS21] for some progress in the direction of an extension to  $|a| \ll M$  black holes.

Outside these special classes, stability of Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes has remained an open question. Nevertheless, the previous works, [DHRT21] in particular, lay out a clear roadmap for investigating it. The key step in the program is to understand the so-called Teukolsky equation with  $s = \pm 2$ , as it describes the dynamics of some *gauge-invariant* curvature components in the linearized Einstein equations around Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes. The Teukolsky equation was first obtained in the  $\Lambda = 0$  case by Teukolsky [Teu73], and later for  $\Lambda > 0$  in [Kha83]. For  $\Lambda \geq 0$ , writing  $\Xi = 1 + a^2\Lambda/3$ , this equation takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \square_g \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{s}{\rho^2 \Xi^2} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} \partial_r \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{2s}{\rho^2 \Xi} \left[ \Xi \frac{a}{2\Delta} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} + i \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} - \frac{ia^2 \Lambda}{3\Delta_\theta} \cos \theta \right] \partial_\phi \alpha^{[s]} \\ + \frac{2s}{\rho^2} \left[ \frac{(r^2 + a^2)}{2\Delta} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} - 2r - ia \frac{\cos \theta}{\Delta_\theta} \right] \partial_t \alpha^{[s]} \\ + \frac{s}{\rho^2 \Xi^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{a^2 \Lambda}{3} - \frac{6(3 + 2s)r^2}{\Lambda} - \Xi^2 s \frac{\cot^2 \theta}{\Delta_\theta} \right] \alpha^{[s]} = \frac{2\mu\Lambda}{3} \alpha^{[s]}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

in Boyer-Lindquist-type coordinates, where  $\Delta$  is a function of  $r$  given by

$$\Delta = (r^2 + a^2) \left( 1 - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3} \right) - 2Mr; \quad (1.3)$$

see already Sections 2.1 and 3.1 for the definitions of  $\Delta_\theta$  and  $\rho$ . In (1.2),  $\square_g$  is the covariant wave operator on the fixed Kerr(-de Sitter) metric. The parameter  $s$  is called a spin-weight and takes values in  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , and we let  $\mu \equiv 1$  if  $s = 0$  and  $\mu \equiv 0$  otherwise. Aside from the important case  $s = \pm 2$  concerning gravitational perturbations, (1.2) describes perturbations by conformal scalar fields if  $s = 0$ , by Dirac fields if  $s = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ , and it gives the dynamics of some gauge-invariant electromagnetic components in the linearized Maxwell equations if  $s = \pm 1$ .

If Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes are *nonlinearly stable*, the most basic statement we can hope to prove for (1.2) is that it is *modally stable*, i.e. that there are no separable solutions to (1.2) which are exponentially growing or bounded and non-decaying in time. By separable solution we mean a solution of the form

$$\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi) = e^{-i\omega t} e^{im\phi} S(\theta) \alpha(r), \quad (1.4)$$

where  $S$  and  $\alpha$  satisfy, respectively, an angular ODE and a radial ODE with suitable boundary conditions; note that  $\alpha^{[s]}$  is exponentially growing if  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$  and bounded, non-decaying in time if  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ . Our motivation for studying solutions as in (1.4) comes from Carter's result [Car68] that  $\square_g$ , and hence (1.2), is separable.

The only systematic way of establishing mode stability for a PDE is to find a conserved *coercive* energy. In a stationary spacetime such as Kerr(-de Sitter) we have an obvious candidate for such an energy: the conserved quantity associated to the stationary Killing field. This energy is coercive for non-rotating, i.e.  $a = 0$ , black holes, thus mode stability follows at once in such spacetimes. Perturbative arguments, relying on the celebrated redshift effect of Dafermos and Rodnianski [DR09], allow us to extend the  $a = 0$  mode stability result to the larger class of black holes which are very slowly rotating, i.e. where  $|a| \ll M$  [DR10] and, if  $\Lambda > 0$ ,  $|a| \ll M, \Lambda$  [Dya11b].

In the general  $a \neq 0$  case, this approach breaks down completely. The conserved energy associated to the Killing field is generally *non-coercive*. In the cases  $s = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2$  the non-coercivity goes by the name of superradiance. From the point of view of the black hole geometry, superradiance is a consequence of the fact that rotating black holes have ergoregions where the stationary field becomes spacelike. Under the separable ansatz (1.4), superradiance is captured by a simple condition on the frequency parameters  $\omega$  and  $m$ . For instance, take  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ : if  $\Lambda = 0$ , the superradiant condition reads

$$m \neq 0, \quad 0 < \frac{\omega}{m} < \frac{a}{r_+^2 + a^2}, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $r_+$  is the largest root of (1.3); if  $\Lambda > 0$ , it reads

$$m \neq 0, \quad \frac{a}{r_2^2 + a^2} < \frac{\omega}{m} < \frac{a}{r_1^2 + a^2}, \quad (1.6)$$

where  $r_2, r_1$  are, respectively, the largest and second largest roots of (1.3). Furthermore, the stabilizing effect of redshift is generally not strong enough to overcome superradiance.

Superradiance, therefore, emerges as an important obstacle in establishing mode stability and, indeed, black hole stability for general black hole parameters: there are several examples where superradiance leads to mode *instability*. Massive scalar fields on Kerr can produce a black hole bomb [Sh115a], and even milder modifications of the scalar potential can lead to non-decaying modes [Mos17b] in Kerr. For Kerr's  $\Lambda < 0$  cousin, Kerr-Anti de Sitter, superradiance may be even more damaging to its stability<sup>1</sup>: massive scalar fields also produce exponentially growing modes [Dol17] and even in the massless setting there is evidence of superradiant instabilities [CD04] for black holes which lie below the Hawking-Reall [HR00] bound.

In light of all these mode *instabilities*, it is remarkable that, in the  $\Lambda = 0$  case, mode *stability* holds for the *entire* Kerr black hole family, even in the endpoint case  $|a| = M$ . This is mostly to the credit of the pioneering work of Whiting [Whi89]. In 1989, Whiting proved mode stability for  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$  and  $|a| < M$  by demonstrating that such mode solutions (1.4) to (1.2) can be *injectively* mapped into mode

---

<sup>1</sup>It is important to note that there may be other factors at play when it comes to stability problems for solutions to (1.1) with  $\Lambda < 0$ . Indeed, even the trivial solution, Anti-de Sitter space, has been shown to be unstable under additional coupling to several matter models in spherical symmetry [Mos17a; Mos18].

solutions of a scalar wave equation on a new spacetime in which the stationary Killing field energy is coercive. His map consists of taking appropriate integral and differential transformations of the radial and angular functions, respectively, in (1.4). In fact, as Shlapentokh-Rothman showed in 2015 [Shl15b], Whiting’s integral radial transformation suffices to prove mode stability in the upper half-plane and even on the real axis for  $|a| < M$ , see also a different extension to the real axis in [AMPW17]. However, as the transformation is very sensitive to the change in the nature of singularities in the radial ODE, it breaks down at the endpoint case  $|a| = M$ . There, Whiting’s method requires a very different integral transformation, which was only very recently found by the second author [TdC20]. We emphasize that while Whiting’s approach to mode stability may be bypassed when considering  $|a| \ll M$  black holes, by the reasons described above, it was absolutely crucial to characterize solutions to the Teukolsky equation (2.1) in the *full subextremal range* of parameters  $|a| < M$  in the works [DRS16; SRTdC20; SRTdC], as no other approach to mode stability for general  $a$  was known.

Turning to the Kerr-de Sitter  $\Lambda > 0$  case, the picture is much less complete, and it remains an open problem to determine whether (1.2) is modally stable for general black hole parameters. The lack of a mode stability statement is one of the reasons why Hintz and Vasy’s work [HV18] on nonlinear stability of the Kerr-de Sitter family cannot be extended past the very slowly rotating  $|a| \ll M, \Lambda$  setting. This state of affairs is also somewhat surprising: the  $\Lambda > 0$  case is usually much better behaved than the  $\Lambda = 0$  case (compare, for instance, [DR10] and [Dya11a]), so naively one would expect mode stability to be easier to show in the former case. Yet, to employ Whiting’s method in Kerr-de Sitter one requires, much like in the  $|a| = M, \Lambda = 0$  case, a new radial integral transformation, as the nature of the singular points of the radial ODE is very different from the  $\Lambda = 0$  case. Attempts at finding such a transformation have been unsuccessful, see [Ume00] for a discussion, and no other mechanism of establishing mode stability has been put forth.

The goal of this paper is precisely to revisit mode stability for Kerr(-de Sitter) black holes. In the  $\Lambda = 0$  setting, we provide a new proof of the classical mode stability result

**Theorem 1.** *Fix  $M > 0$  and  $|a| < M$ , and let  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ . Then there are no non-trivial mode solutions (1.4) to (1.2) for  $\omega \neq 0$  with  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ .*

Our proof makes use of previously unknown symmetries of the point spectrum of the radial Teukolsky equation. Such symmetries were conjectured to exist by Aminov, Grassi and Hatsuda [AGH20; Hat20] by comparing the Teukolsky equation with quantization conditions for some supersymmetric gauge theories [IKO17], see also [BCGM21; BILT21]. To establish their conjecture, we rely on a Jaffé expansion for the radial Teukolsky ODE, see [Mar+95, Part B], a method usually attributed in the black hole community to Leaver’s seminal work on quasinormal modes [Lea85]. We note that, as we consider only  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ , we avoid the problematic features of Leaver’s method in the lower half-plane described in [GW19; GW20]. We also sketch an alternative proof via the so-called MST method of Mano, Suzuki and Tagasaki [MST96], see also [ST03].

In the  $\Lambda > 0$  or Kerr-de Sitter setting, we show that symmetries analogous to those for  $\Lambda = 0$  hold for the point spectrum of the radial Teukolsky ODE. These are once again inspired by the supersymmetric gauge theories of [IKO17]. For Kerr-de Sitter, rather than a Jaffé expansion, we rely on an expansion in hypergeometric polynomials which, despite being well-known in the classical texts on special ODEs, is to our knowledge new in the General Relativity literature. An alternative proof based on a variant of the MST method introduced in [STU99; STU00] is also sketched briefly. As for Kerr, making use of these novel symmetries, we are able to establish a partial mode stability result for Kerr-de Sitter:

**Theorem 2.** *Fix  $\Lambda > 0$ ,  $M > 0$  and  $|a| < 3/\Lambda$  so that (1.3) has four distinct real roots, labeled  $r_3 < r_0 < r_1 < r_2$ , and let  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ . Then there are no non-trivial mode solutions (1.4) to (1.2) with  $\omega$  such that*

$$\omega \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad m = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\omega}{m} \notin \left( \frac{2a}{a^2 + 3/\Lambda - (r_0 + r_1)^2}, \frac{2a}{a^2 + 3/\Lambda - (r_0 + r_2)^2} \right)$$


*nor such that*

$$\text{Im } \omega > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\omega| \notin |m| \left( 0, \frac{2a}{a^2 + 3/\Lambda - (r_0 + r_2)^2} \right).$$

*If  $|s| = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$ , in fact there are no non-trivial mode solutions (1.4) to (1.2) for any  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

Note that no smallness assumptions are made on the black hole specific angular momentum  $a$  nor on how close  $\omega$  is to the endpoints of the superradiant regime, given in (1.6) for real  $\omega$ . We also remark that the  $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$  limit of the proof of Theorem 2 yields precisely Theorem 1.

The case  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  is where Theorem 2 is most useful: it rules out *some* of the modes in the superradiant range (see Figure 1), where we know from energy conservation that unstable and non-decaying modes, if they exist, must lie. If  $s$  is a half-integer, no superradiance can occur, at least for  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ , but a different type of non-coercivity, associated to the negativity of the so-called Teukolsky–Starobinsky constants, cannot be ruled out for  $|s| > 2$ , see our previous work [CT21]. Thus, while the last sentence of Theorem 1 follows easily from energy considerations, these cannot be used to show mode stability on the real axis for half-integer spins beyond  $|s| = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$ .



**Figure 1:** The non-superradiant (blank) and superradiant (shaded) regions of separation parameters for a subextremal Kerr-de Sitter black hole with  $\Lambda = 1/9$ . Theorem 3.11 rules out the existence of superradiant modes which lie in the orange shaded region between the dashed and full lines.

The remainder of this paper is organized into two sections. Section 2 addresses the case  $\Lambda = 0$  and gives a new proof of Theorem 1. Section 3 addresses the case  $\Lambda > 0$  and contains the proof of Theorem 2.

**Acknowledgments.** M.C. acknowledges partial financial support by CNPq (Brazil), process number 314824/2020-0. R.TdC. acknowledges support from EPSRC (United Kingdom), grant EP/L016516/1, and thanks André Guerra for his enthusiasm for this project and many useful discussions, as well as Mihalis Dafermos for useful suggestions and Igor Rodnianski for insightful comments.

## 2 Subextremal Kerr black holes

### 2.1 Geometry of the exterior

In this section, we recall, for the benefit of the reader, some of the basic geometric properties of subextremal Kerr black holes, see for instance [Cha83] or [DR13, Section 5.1] for more details. Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| < M$ , and let

$$r_{\pm} := M \pm \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}.$$

The subextremal Kerr black hole exterior is a manifold covered globally (modulo the usual degeneration of polar coordinates) by so-called Boyer–Lindquist coordinates  $(t, r, \theta, \phi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (r_+, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2$  [BL67], and endowed with the Lorentzian metric

$$g = -\frac{\Delta}{\rho^2}(dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi)^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + \rho^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\rho^2} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi)^2,$$

where we have

$$\rho^2 := r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta, \quad \Delta := r^2 - 2Mr + a^2 = (r - r_+)(r - r_-).$$

Finally, we will also find it convenient to work with a rescaling of the Boyer–Lindquist  $r$ , the tortoise coordinate  $r^* = r^*(r)$  defined by

$$\frac{dr^*}{dr} = \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta}, \quad r^*(3M) = 0.$$

We remark that, throughout this section, we take  $'$  to denote a derivative with respect to  $r^*$ .

## 2.2 The Teukolsky equation and its separability

Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| \leq M$  and  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ . The Teukolsky equation [Teu73] is

$$\begin{aligned} \square_g \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{2s}{\rho^2} (r - M) \partial_r \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{2s}{\rho^2} \left[ \frac{a(r - M)}{\Delta} + i \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \right] \partial_\phi \alpha^{[s]} \\ + \frac{2s}{\rho^2} \left( \frac{(r - M)(r^2 + a^2)}{\Delta} - 2r - ia \cos \theta \right) \partial_t \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{1}{\rho^2} (s - s^2 \cot^2 \theta) \alpha^{[s]} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

in Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, writing  $\square_g$  for the covariant wave operator on the Kerr metric  $g$ . Here,  $\alpha^{[s]}$  is a smooth,  $s$ -spin weighted function on the subextremal Kerr black hole exterior, see [DHR19, Section 2.2.1] for a precise definition.

As Teukolsky noted in his paper [Teu73], by analogy with the wave equation case [Car68], the Teukolsky equation (2.1) is separable, i.e. it admits separable solutions:

$$\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi) = e^{-i\omega t} e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a\omega}(\theta) \Delta^{-\frac{s+1}{2}} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a\omega}(r), \quad (2.2)$$

for  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a separation constant  $\lambda$ . Plugging (2.2) into (2.1), we find that  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a\omega}$  and  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a\omega}$  each satisfy ODEs, which are introduced in the next two subsections.

### 2.2.1 The angular ODE and its eigenvalues

Let  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$  be fixed. Consider (2.2) and replace  $a\omega$  by a parameter  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ . The angular ODE verified by  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}$  is

$$\frac{1}{\sin \theta} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left( \sin \theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \right) S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}(\theta) - \left( \frac{(m + s \cos \theta)^2}{\sin^2 \theta} - \nu^2 \cos^2 \theta + 2\nu s \cos \theta \right) S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}(\theta) + \lambda S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}(\theta) = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

We are interested in solutions of (2.3) with boundary conditions which ensure that, when  $\nu$  is taken to be  $a\omega$ , (2.2) is a smooth  $s$ -spin weighted function on the subextremal Kerr exterior. We quote from [TdC20, Proposition 2.1] a characterization of such solutions, based on the classical references [MS54], [HW74, Section III] and [Ste75, Pages 72–74].

**Lemma 2.1** (Smooth spin-weighted solutions of the angular ODE). *Fix  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , let  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and assume  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ . Consider the angular ODE (2.3) with the boundary condition that  $e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}$  is a non-trivial smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted function on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , see the precise definition in [TdC20, Definition 2.2].*

**The case  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ .** *For each  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ , there are countably many such solutions to (2.3) each corresponding to a real value of  $\lambda$ . We index the solutions and eigenvalues by a discrete  $l$ :  $S_{ml}^{[s],\nu}$  solves (2.3) with eigenvalue  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu}$  and induces a complete orthonormal basis,  $\{e^{im\phi} S_{ml}^{[s],\nu}\}_{ml}$ , of the space of smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted functions on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  endowed with  $L^2(\sin \theta d\theta)$  norm. The index  $l$  is chosen so that  $l - \max\{|s|, |m|\} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , and so that  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],0} = l(l+1) - s^2$  for  $\nu = 0$  and  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu}$  varies smoothly with  $\nu$ . The eigenvalues also have the property that  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu} = \lambda_{ml}^{[-s],\nu}$ .*

**The case  $\nu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ .** *Fix some  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu_0} \in \mathbb{R}$  can be analytically continued to  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$  except for finitely many branch points (with no finite accumulation point), located away from the real axis, and branch cuts emanating from these. We define  $\lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu}$ , for  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , as a global multivalued complex function of  $\nu$  such that  $\lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu_0} = \lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu_0}$  and  $S_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu}$  as a solution to (2.3) with  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu}$ . The eigenvalues are independent of sign  $s$  and satisfy*

$$\operatorname{Im} \nu > 0 \implies \operatorname{Im} \left( \bar{\nu} \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu} \right) < 0. \quad (2.4)$$

The reader will find a proof of (2.4) in the positive cosmological setting in Lemma 3.1 below.

**Remark 2.2.** *We note that here and throughout the section,  $\lambda$  denotes a complex number with no restrictions whereas  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\nu}$  and  $\lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu}$  denote one of the eigenvalues identified in Lemma 2.1.*

## 2.2.2 The radial ODE and its boundary conditions

Fix  $M > 0$ . For  $|a| \leq M$ ,  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , the radial ODE verified by  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  in (2.2) is, for  $r \in (r_+, \infty)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \frac{d^2}{dr^2} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r) + \frac{[\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am - is(r - M)]^2}{\Delta} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r) \\ + \left( \frac{M^2 - a^2}{\Delta} + 4is\omega r - \lambda - a^2\omega^2 + 2am\omega \right) R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Let us introduce the notation

$$\eta := i \frac{\omega - m\omega_-}{2\kappa_-}, \quad \xi := -i \frac{\omega - m\omega_+}{2\kappa_+}, \quad \omega_{\pm} := \frac{a}{2Mr_{\pm}}, \quad \kappa_{\pm} = \frac{r_+ - r_-}{4Mr_{\pm}}. \quad (2.6)$$

For  $j = \pm$ , the quantities  $\omega_j$  and  $\kappa_j$  are, respectively, the angular velocity and the surface gravity of the horizon at  $r = r_j$ . As before, we are interested in studying (2.5) under boundary conditions which ensure that (2.2) is an admissible function. Based on the classical theory of regular and irregular singularities for ODEs, see [Olv73, Chapters 5 and 7], we will consider the following boundary conditions:

**Definition 2.3.** Assume  $\omega \neq 0$ . We say a solution,  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$ , to (2.5) is

- *ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$*  if the following are holomorphic in  $r$  for  $r \in [r_+, 2r_+ - r_-)$ :
  - $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)(r - r_+)^{-\xi + \frac{s-1}{2}}$  if either  $\text{Re } \omega \neq m\omega_+$  or  $s \leq 0$ , and
  - $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)(r - r_+)^{-\frac{s+1}{2}}$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_+$  and  $s \geq 0$ ;
- *outgoing at  $\mathcal{I}^+$*  if  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  is holomorphic for  $r > r_+$  and such that  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)e^{-i\omega r}r^{-2iM\omega+s} = o(1)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 2.2.3 Precise definition of mode solution

We are finally ready to define mode solution precisely:

**Definition 2.4.** Fix  $M > 0$  and  $|a| < M$ . Take  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ . Let  $\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  be a solution to (2.1) which is given by (2.2). We say that  $\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  is a mode solution if

1.  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\nu}$  for some  $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq \max\{|m|, |s|\}}$  and  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , making  $e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  a non-trivial smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted function on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  solves the angular ODE (2.3);
2.  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  solves the radial ODE (2.5) with ingoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{I}^+$ .

**Remark 2.5.** Let  $\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  be given by (2.2) where  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],(a\omega)}$  and  $\lambda$  are one of the functions and eigenvalues identified in Lemma 2.1. If  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$ , then  $\Delta^s \alpha^{[s]}$  is regular at  $r = r_+$  [TdC20, Lemma 2.7]. If, furthermore,  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  is outgoing at  $\mathcal{I}^+$ , then  $\alpha^{[s]}$  has finite (weighted, see e.g. [DHR19]) energy on suitable spacelike hypersurfaces, see [Shl15b, Appendix D]. Hence, mode solutions are solutions to (2.1) which are separable, regular and finite energy with respect to the algebraically special frame in which the Teukolsky equation is derived.

## 2.3 Some hidden spectral symmetries

Consider the radial ODE

$$\left[ z(z-1) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} - \Lambda_3^2 z(z-1) - m_3 \Lambda_3 (2z-1) + \left( E + \frac{1}{4} \right) - \frac{m_1 m_2}{z} - \frac{[(m_1 + m_2)^2 - 1]}{4z(z-1)} \right] y(z) = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $m_1, m_2, m_3, E, \Lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ . It is easy to see that (2.5) may be cast in this form:

**Lemma 2.6.** *The radial ODE (2.5) may be rewritten as (2.7) if we choose  $z := \frac{r-r_-}{r_+-r_-}$  and we identify*

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &:= s - \xi - \eta = s + 2iM\omega, & m_2 &:= \eta - \xi = i \frac{2M^2\omega - am}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} = \frac{i}{2} \left( \frac{\omega - m\omega_+}{\kappa_+} + \frac{\omega - m\omega_-}{\kappa_-} \right), \\ m_3 &:= -s - \xi - \eta = -s + 2iM\omega, \\ \Lambda_3 &:= 2i\omega\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}, & E &:= -\lambda - a^2\omega^2 - s^2 + 8M^2\omega^2 - \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Furthermore, we can frame boundary conditions in terms of the new parameters:  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  if  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)(r-r_+)^{\frac{1}{4}[m_1(1-\text{sign}s)+m_2+m_3(1+\text{sign}s)-2]}$  is analytic in  $r$  for  $r \in [r_+, 2r_+ - r_-)$  and outgoing at  $\mathcal{I}^+$  if  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  is analytic for  $r > r_+$  and  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)e^{-\Lambda_3 r/(r_+-r_-)}r^{-m_3} = o(1)$ .

The choices of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are not canonical: both these boundary conditions and the ODE (2.7) are invariant by an exchange of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ .

*Proof.* We note the identities

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am - is(r - M) \\ &= \omega\Delta + \frac{2Mr_+\omega - am}{2} + \frac{2Mr_-\omega - am}{2} + (r - M)(2M\omega - is) \\ &= \omega\Delta - i \left[ \frac{1}{2}(\eta - \xi)(r_+ - r_-) + \frac{1}{2}(2Mi\omega + s)(r_+ - r_-) + (r - r_+)(2Mi\omega + s) \right], \\ &[\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am - is(r - M)]^2 \\ &= \omega^2\Delta^2 - \frac{(\eta - \xi + 2Mi\omega + s)^2(r_+ - r_-)^2}{4} - (\eta - \xi)(2Mi\omega + s)(r - r_+)(r_+ - r_-) \\ &\quad - \Delta \left[ (2Mi\omega + s)^2 + i\omega(\eta - \xi)(r_+ - r_-) + 2i\omega(2Mi\omega - s + 2s)(r - M) \right] \\ &= \omega^2\Delta^2 - 2i\omega(2Mi\omega - s)\Delta(r - M) - \frac{(\eta - \xi + 2Mi\omega + s)^2(r_+ - r_-)^2}{4} \\ &\quad - (\eta - \xi)(2Mi\omega + s)(r - r_+)(r_+ - r_-) - \Delta \left[ 2am\omega - 8M^2\omega^2 + s^2 + 4si\omega r \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The potential in (2.5) can thus be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{[\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am - is(r - M)]^2 + M^2 - a^2}{\Delta} + 4is\omega r - \lambda - a^2\omega^2 + 2am\omega \\ &= \omega^2\Delta - 2i\omega(2Mi\omega - s)(r - M) - \frac{[(\eta - \xi + 2Mi\omega + s)^2 - 1](r_+ - r_-)^2}{4\Delta} \\ &\quad - \frac{(\eta - \xi)(2Mi\omega + s)(r - r_+)(r_+ - r_-)}{\Delta} - \lambda - s^2 + 8M^2\omega^2 - a^2\omega^2, \end{aligned}$$

from where we may now read off the appropriate values of  $m_1, m_2, m_3, \Lambda_3, E$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** *The observation in Lemma 2.6 is due to Aminov, Grassi and Hatsuda [AGH20; Hat20], who realized that there is a parallel between the Teukolsky equation on subextremal Kerr black holes and the  $SU(2)$  Seiberg–Witten theory with three fundamental hypermultiplets in supersymmetric quantum chromodynamics (SQCD) [IKO17]. The connection to SQCD serves merely as a motivation for us to write (2.7) and (2.8), as the theory plays no role in our proof.*

Next, we give a characterization of the point spectrum of (2.7), in the space of solutions with suitable boundary conditions, by a Jaffé expansion [Jaf34], also known in the black hole community as Leaver's method [Lea85].

**Notation 2.8.** *Let  $m_1, m_2, m_3, E, \Lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ . Define  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)$  to be the unique (up to rescaling) solution to*

$$\left[ z(z-1) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} - \Lambda_3^2 z(z-1) - m_3 \Lambda_3 (2z-1) + E + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{m_1 m_2}{z} - \frac{[(m_1 + m_2)^2 - 1]}{4z(z-1)} \right] R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z) = 0,$$

previously given as (2.7), with boundary conditions

- $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)(z-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2-1)}$  is holomorphic in  $z$  for  $z \in [1, 2)$ ,

- $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)$  is holomorphic in  $z > 1$  and  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)e^{-\Lambda_3 z} z^{-m_3} = o(1)$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ ,

under the assumptions<sup>2</sup> that  $\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_2) \leq 0$  if  $\operatorname{Im}(m_1 + m_2) = 0$ , and that we have  $\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_3), \operatorname{Re} \Lambda_3 \leq 0$  with  $m_1 + m_3, \Lambda_3 \neq 0$ .

Likewise,  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)$ , for  $i \neq j \neq k$  are defined by replacing  $m_1$  with  $m_i$ ,  $m_2$  with  $m_j$  and  $m_3$  with  $m_k$  everywhere in the above definition.

**Proposition 2.9** (Point spectrum). *Fix a triple  $(i, j, k)$  with  $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and distinct. Let  $m_i, m_j, m_k, E, \Lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}$  be such that  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k)}^{E, \Lambda_3}(z)$  may be defined, see Notation 2.8. Then  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k)}^{E, \Lambda_3}$  is nontrivial if and only if the continued fraction condition*

$$0 = A_0^{(0)} + \frac{-A_0^{(+1)} A_1^{(-1)}}{A_1^{(0)} + \frac{-A_1^{(+1)} A_2^{(-1)}}{A_2^{(0)} + \frac{-A_2^{(+1)} A_3^{(-1)}}{\dots}}} \quad (2.9)$$

holds, where the coefficients  $A_n^{(0)}$  and  $A_n^{(\pm 1)}$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n-1}^{(+1)} A_n^{(-1)} &= n \{ [n - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m})][n(n - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m})) + \sigma_2(\mathbf{m})] + \sigma_3(\mathbf{m}) \}, \\ A_n^{(0)} &= -2n^2 + 2(2\Lambda_3 - 1)n + E - \frac{3}{4} + \Lambda_3 + (2n + 1 - \Lambda_3)\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - \sigma_2(\mathbf{m}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

and where  $\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) := m_1 + m_2 + m_3$ ,  $\sigma_2(\mathbf{m}) := m_1 m_2 + m_1 m_3 + m_2 m_3$  and  $\sigma_3(\mathbf{m}) := m_1 m_2 m_3$  are symmetric polynomials in  $\mathbf{m} = (m_i, m_j, m_k)$ .

*Proof.* Our proof is based on [Mar+95, Part B, Chapter 3.2]. Suppose  $\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_2) \leq 0$  if  $\operatorname{Im}(m_1 + m_2) = 0$ , and that we have  $\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_3), \operatorname{Re} \Lambda_3 \leq 0$  with  $m_1 + m_3, \Lambda_3 \neq 0$ . Consider the following ansatz for a solution to (2.7):

$$R(z) = e^{\Lambda_3(z-1)} z^{\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2+2m_3-1)} (z-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2-1)} v(z); \quad (2.11)$$

$$v(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n v_n(z), \quad v_n(z) := \left( \frac{z-1}{z} \right)^n, \quad (2.12)$$

for some coefficients  $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ . Here,  $v(z)$  solves

$$\left[ z(z-1) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + (B_1 z(z-1) + B_2(z-1) + B_3) \frac{d}{dz} + B_4 \frac{z-1}{z} + B_5 \right] v(z) = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

where the coefficients  $B_1, \dots, B_5$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= 2\Lambda_3, & B_2 &= 2m_3, & B_3 &= 1 - m_1 - m_2, & B_4 &= (m_1 + m_3 - 1)(m_3 + m_2 - 1), \\ B_5 &= -1 + (m_1 + m_2 + m_3) - (m_1 m_2 + m_1 m_3 + m_2 m_3) - (-1 + m_1 + m_2 + m_3)\Lambda_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Now recall (2.12); we have the following identities for  $v_n$ :

$$\frac{d}{dz} v_n = n(v_{n+1} - 2v_n + v_{n-1}), \quad (z-1) \frac{d}{dz} v_n = n(v_n - v_{n+1}), \quad z(z-1) \frac{d}{dz} v_n = n v_n.$$

Hence, the coefficients  $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  in (2.12) satisfy a three-term recurrence formula

$$A_0^{(+1)} b_1 + A_0^{(0)} b_0 = 0; \quad A_n^{(+1)} b_{n+1} + A_n^{(0)} b_n + A_n^{(-1)} b_{n-1} = 0, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (2.15)$$

which can be solved through (2.9) with respect to the recurrence coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n+1}^{(-1)} &= n(n+1) + (B_3 - B_2)n + B_4, & A_{n-1}^{(+1)} &= (n-1)n + B_3 n, \\ A_n^{(0)} &= -2n^2 + (B_1 + B_2 - 2B_3)n + B_5. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Notice that these assumptions ensure that the boundary conditions specify the solutions uniquely up to rescaling. For instance, if  $m_1 + m_2 \neq 0$ , as  $z \rightarrow 1$ , a linearly independent solution would be such that  $R(z)(z-1)^{-\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2+1)}$  is holomorphic in  $z \in [1, 2)$ , and this does not satisfy the boundary condition above. Indeed,  $(z-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2+1)}(z-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2-1)} = (z-1)^{m_1+m_2}$  is not holomorphic for  $z \in [1, 2)$  if we require that  $\operatorname{Im}(m_1 + m_2) \neq 0$  or if  $\operatorname{Im}(m_1 + m_2) = 0, \operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_2) \leq 0$ .



From (2.14), we can already compute (2.10).

A large- $n$  asymptotic analysis of the recurrence relation (2.15) yields two linearly-independent behaviors: writing  $C_0 := \sqrt{-B_1} = \sqrt{-(m_1 + m_3)}$ , either

$$\frac{b_{n+1}}{b_n} = 1 + \frac{C_0}{n^{1/2}} + O(n^{-1}),$$

or we have

$$\frac{b_{n+1}}{b_n} = \frac{-A_{n+1}^{(-1)}}{A_{n+1}^{(0)} - \frac{A_{n+1}^{(+1)}A_{n+2}^{(-1)}}{A_{n+2}^{(0)} - \frac{A_{n+2}^{(+1)}A_{n+3}^{(-1)}}{\dots}}} = 1 - \frac{C_0}{n^{1/2}} + O(n^{-1}),$$

in which case (2.9) also holds. Since  $\operatorname{Re} C_0 > 0$  (recall that  $-\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_3) \geq 0$  by assumption), only in the latter case does  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n$  converge. Thus, if (2.9) holds, (2.11) and (2.12) yield a representation of  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3)}^{E, \Lambda}(z)$ . By analyticity, the converse is also true.

This concludes the proof for  $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3)$ . The argument can be repeated for any other permutation and, since (2.10) are invariant for such permutations, it yields exactly the same continued fraction condition (2.9).  $\square$

From the point of view of the Teukolsky equation, Proposition 2.9 is the statement that its point spectrum, under suitable boundary conditions, is invariant under exchanges  $m_i \leftrightarrow m_j$ . The precise statement we will use is:

**Corollary 2.10** (Hidden spectral symmetries). *Let  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| < M$ ,  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\omega \neq 0$  satisfy  $\operatorname{Im} \omega \geq 0$ . If  $\operatorname{Re} \omega \neq m\omega_+$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *there is a nontrivial solution to the radial ODE (2.5) which is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing at  $\mathcal{I}^+$ , i.e. which satisfies the boundary conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} R_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)(r - r_+)^{-\xi + \frac{s-1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } r \rightarrow r_+, \\ R_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)e^{-i\omega r}r^{-2iM\omega+s} & \text{ smooth in } 1/r \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty; \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) *( $m_1 \leftrightarrow m_3$  followed by  $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$  symmetry) there is a nontrivial solution to a radial ODE equal to (2.5) but where  $s$  is replaced by  $-s$ , which satisfies the boundary conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)(r - r_+)^{-\xi - \frac{s+1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } r \rightarrow r_+, \\ \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)e^{-i\omega r}r^{-2iM\omega-s} & \text{ smooth in } 1/r \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty; \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) *( $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$  symmetry) there is a nontrivial solution to the radial ODE*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \frac{d^2}{dr^2} \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega} - \left[ \lambda + 2am\omega \frac{r - r_-}{r_+ - r_-} + \omega^2 \left( \Delta + 2M^2 \frac{r - r_-}{r_+ - r_-} - a^2 + 4M^2 \frac{r - r_-}{r - r_+} \right) \right] \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega} \\ + \Delta \left( \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d}{dr} \left[ \frac{\Delta}{r^2 + a^2} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \frac{r^2 + a^2}{\Delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega} \\ - \left[ \frac{a^2 \Delta + 2Mr(r^2 - a^2)}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} + \frac{r - r_+}{r - r_-} s^2 \right] \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

*satisfying the boundary conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)(r - r_+)^{2iM\omega - \frac{1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } r \rightarrow r_+, \\ \tilde{R}_{m, \lambda}^{[s], a, \omega}(r)e^{-i\omega r}r^{\xi - \eta} & \text{ smooth in } 1/r \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

*If  $\operatorname{Re} \omega = m\omega_+$ , then (i) and (iii) are equivalent if  $s \leq 0$  and, if  $s \geq 0$ , (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.*

*Proof.* The conclusion follows from Proposition 2.9 after setting  $z(r_+ - r_-) = r - r_-$  and rewriting the ODE (2.16) and the boundary conditions in terms of  $(m_1, m_2, m_3, E, \Lambda_3)$ .  $\square$

A few remarks concerning the above symmetries are in order.

**Remark 2.11** (Spin-reversal symmetry). *Note that the exchange  $m_1 \leftrightarrow m_3$  corresponds to the map  $s \mapsto -s$ . This is still the case if  $\lambda$  is taken to be one of the angular eigenvalues given by Lemma 2.1, as the latter are independent of the sign of  $s$ . Thus, Corollary 2.10(ii), reflects the fact that, a mode solution with spin  $-s$  exists if and only if a mode solution with respect to the same frequency and black hole parameters exists with spin  $+s$ . The latter is a well-known statement in the literature, see e.g. [Whi89], and we refer the reader to [TdC20, Lemma 2.19] for a proof.*

**Remark 2.12** (Whiting's transformation). *Let  $\tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  be a solution to (2.16); setting*

$$\tilde{u} = (r^2 + a^2)^{1/2} / \Delta^{1/2} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}, \quad (2.18)$$

*we find that the ODE for the  $\tilde{u}$  quantity is  $\tilde{u}'' + \tilde{V}\tilde{u} = 0$ , where we recall that prime denotes a derivative with respect to the tortoise coordinate  $r^*$  and where*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V} = & \frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} \left[ -\lambda - 2am\omega \frac{r - r_-}{r_+ - r_-} + \omega^2 \left( \Delta + 2M^2 \frac{r - r_-}{r_+ - r_-} - a^2 + 4M^2 \frac{r - r_-}{r - r_+} \right) \right] \\ & - \frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} \left[ \frac{a^2 \Delta + 2Mr(r^2 - a^2)}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} + \frac{r - r_+}{r - r_-} s^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

*as noted recently by Hatsuda [Hat20]. Under the assumption  $|a| < M$ , it has been known for some time that this ODE has the same (empty) point spectrum as (2.5) for  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$  and  $\omega \neq 0$ : indeed, this is exactly the ODE obtained by Whiting's (injective) radial transformation in the seminal mode stability paper [Whi89] for  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$  which is also used to show mode stability for  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$  [Shl15b], see also [AMPW17] and [TdC20, Section 3.2].*

**Remark 2.13** (The extremal limit). *Lemma 2.6 clearly fails to hold for  $|a| = M$ , as the variable  $z$  and the parameter  $m_2$  are not well-defined in this case. The latter degeneration is remedied if we exchange  $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$ , as from (2.8) we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 = s + 2iM\omega, \quad m_2 \Lambda_3 = -2\omega(2M^2\omega - am), \quad m_3 = -s + 2iM\omega, \\ \Lambda_3^2 = 0, \quad E = -\lambda - s^2 + 7M^2\omega^2 - \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

*The former degeneration is also cured if we take  $z = \frac{z - \tilde{r}_+}{\tilde{r}_+ - M}$  for some  $\tilde{r}_+ > r_+ = r_- = M$ .*

*Let  $\tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  be a solution to (2.7) under these conditions and let  $'$  denote a derivative with respect to a modified  $r^*$  variable defined by*

$$\frac{dr^*}{dr} = \frac{r^2 + \tilde{r}_+ r_-}{(r - r_-)(r - \tilde{r}_+)}$$

*and an initial condition. Then, the rescaling*

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{(r^2 + \tilde{r}_+ r_-)^{1/2}}{[(r - r_-)(r - \tilde{r}_+)]^{1/2}} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} \quad (2.20)$$

*solves the ODE  $u'' + \tilde{V}u = 0$ , where*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V} = & \frac{(r - \tilde{r}_+)(r - M)}{(r^2 + M\tilde{r}_+)^2} \left[ -\lambda - 2am\omega \frac{2r - \tilde{r}_+ - M}{\tilde{r}_+ - M} \right] \\ & + \frac{M^2(r - M)}{(\tilde{r}_+ - M)(r^2 + M\tilde{r}_+)^2} \omega^2 (4(r - \tilde{r}_+)^2 + 4(r - M)^2 + 3(\tilde{r}_+ - M)(r - \tilde{r}_+)) \\ & - \frac{(r - \tilde{r}_+)(r - M)}{(r^2 + M\tilde{r}_+)^2} \left[ \frac{M\tilde{r}_+(r - \tilde{r}_+)(r - M) + (\tilde{r}_+ + M)r(r^2 - M\tilde{r}_+)}{(r^2 + M\tilde{r}_+)^2} + \frac{r - \tilde{r}_+}{r - M} s^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

*as noted by Hatsuda [Hat20]. The second author has shown earlier that this ODE has the same (empty) point spectrum as (2.5) with  $|a| = M$  when  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$  and  $\omega \neq 0, m\omega_+$  by means of an (injective) radial transformation [TdC20, Section 3.1]. Thus, we fully expect that an analogue of Proposition 2.9 is possible in the extremal  $|a| = M$  Kerr case. The additional difficulty one must contend with in the proof is that swapping certain masses changes the nature of the singularities in the ODE: for instance, (2.21) is of reduced confluent Heun type whereas (2.5), in the case  $|a| = M$ , is of doubly confluent Heun type. We refer the reader to [TdC20] or the book [Mar+95] for a precise definition of reduced and doubly confluent Heun ODEs and further details.*

## 2.4 Proof of mode stability

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1, alternative to those of the literature [Whi89; Shl15b; AMPW17; TdC20], which relies on the hidden symmetries uncovered in Proposition 2.9 and Corollary 2.10. To be precise, we prove

**Theorem 2.14.** *Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| < M$ ,  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $(\omega, \lambda)$  such that we have either*

$$\text{Im } \omega > 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}(\lambda\bar{\omega}) \leq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

*If  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  is a solution to (2.5) with respect to these parameters which is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing at  $\mathcal{I}^+$ , then  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} \equiv 0$ .*

**Remark 2.15.** *Note that, by Lemma 2.1, it is clear that the conditions on  $\lambda$  which we impose here are verified by the angular eigenvalues associated to mode solutions. Hence, Theorem 2.14 implies, and is stronger than, Theorem 1.*

*Proof of Theorem 2.14.* Take  $|a| < M$ , let  $\tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  be a solution to (2.16) with boundary conditions (2.17) and define  $\tilde{u}$  by (2.18). Now consider the microlocal energy current associated to the stationary Killing field on Kerr:

$$Q^T[\tilde{u}] := \text{Im}(\overline{\omega\tilde{u}\tilde{u}'}) \Rightarrow -(Q^T[u])' = \text{Im } \omega |\tilde{u}'|^2 + \text{Im}(\overline{\omega\tilde{V}}) |\tilde{u}|^2, \quad (2.22)$$

where prime again denotes a derivative with respect to  $r^*$ . Note that (2.19) is real if  $\omega$  is real, that the coefficient of  $\lambda$  in (2.19) and the  $(\omega, m, \lambda)$ -independent part of  $\tilde{V}$  are non-positive. Thus, from (2.22) and our assumptions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \text{Im } \omega > 0, \quad 0 &\geq \text{Im } \omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( |\tilde{u}'|^2 + |\omega|^2 \frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} |\tilde{u}|^2 \right) dr^*; \\ \text{if } \omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \quad &\frac{r_+ - r_-}{r_+} \omega^2 |\tilde{u}(-\infty)|^2 + \omega^2 |\tilde{u}(+\infty)|^2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

By a direct argument if  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$  or, if  $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , by unique continuation for solutions to ODEs with the prescribed boundary conditions, see e.g. [Shl15b, Lemma 5.1] and [TdC20, Lemma 4.1], (2.23) implies that  $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$  and so  $\tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r) \equiv 0$ . By Corollary 2.10, using case (i) if  $s \leq 0$  and case (ii) if  $s \geq 0$ , we must also have that  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r) \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

## 2.5 Epilogue: mass symmetries within the MST method

In this section, we provide an alternative proof of Corollary 2.10 which is based not on Jaffé expansions of Proposition 2.9 but on the matching of (confluent) hypergeometric expansions. In the study of quasinormal modes, this method was first introduced by Mano, Suzuki and Tagasaki [MST96], and is thus known as the MST method. In the exposition below we follow the review [ST03].

Let us fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| < M$ ,  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\omega \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\text{Re } \omega \geq 0$  and  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ , and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , assuming additionally that  $s \leq 0$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_+$ . To aid the reader, we write the MST quantities  $\epsilon$ ,  $\tau$  and  $\kappa$  in [ST03] in terms of the quantities identified in (2.8) and vice-versa:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &:= 2M\omega = -i \frac{m_1 + m_3}{2}, \quad \tau := \frac{2M^2\omega - am}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} = -im_2, \quad \kappa := \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}}{M} = -i \frac{\Lambda_3}{\epsilon}, \\ \epsilon_+ &:= \frac{\epsilon + \tau}{2} = -\frac{i}{4}(m_1 + 2m_2 + m_3), \quad m_1 = s + i\epsilon, \quad m_3 = -s + i\epsilon, \quad s = \frac{m_1 - m_3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Within the MST formalism, existence of a non-trivial solution to (2.5) with outgoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{I}^+$  and ingoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  is, by [ST03, Equations (165), (167) and (168)] and the properties of the Gamma function, equivalent to the condition<sup>3</sup>

$$\frac{B}{\Gamma(\nu + 1 + m_3)} \left( \frac{A_\nu C_\nu}{D_\nu} - ie^{-i\pi\nu} \frac{A_{-\nu-1} C_{-\nu-1}}{D_{-\nu-1}} \right) = 0, \quad (2.24)$$

<sup>3</sup>When comparing to the references given, the reader may find that the factor  $\Gamma(1 - m_1 - m_2)$  is missing from the denominator of (2.24). This is because

$$1 - m_1 - m_2 = 1 - s + 2i \frac{am - 2Mr_+ \text{Re } \omega}{r_+ - r_-} + \frac{4Mr_+}{r_+ - r_-} \text{Im } \omega$$

cannot be a negative integer under our assumptions, so that  $|\Gamma(1 - m_1 - m_2)| < \infty$ .

where we have used the shorthand notation

$$\begin{aligned}
A_\nu &:= (-2i\Lambda_3)^{-\nu} \frac{\Gamma(2\nu + 2)}{\Gamma(\nu + 1 + m_1)\Gamma(\nu + 1 + m_2)\Gamma(\nu + 1 + m_3)}, \\
B &:= e^{\Lambda_3} (-2i\Lambda_3)^{(m_3 - m_1)/2} 2^{(m_1 - m_3)/2}, \\
C_\nu &:= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n \Gamma(n + 2\nu + 1)}{n!} \frac{b_n^\nu}{\Gamma(1 + N - m_1)\Gamma(1 + N - m_2)\Gamma(1 + N - m_3)}, \\
D_\nu &:= \sum_{n=-\infty}^0 \frac{(-1)^n}{(-n)!(2\nu + 2)_n} \frac{b_n^\nu}{\Gamma(1 + N + m_1)\Gamma(1 + N + m_2)\Gamma(1 + N + m_3)},
\end{aligned}$$

writing  $N := n + \nu$  and where the coefficients  $b_n^\nu$ , obtained from the  $a_n^\nu$  coefficients of [ST03, Equation (120)] through  $b_n^\nu := \Gamma(1 + m_1 + N)\Gamma(1 + m_2 + N)\Gamma(1 - m_3 + N)a_n^\nu$ , satisfy the following recursive relation, c.f. [ST03, Equations (123, 124)]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_n^\nu b_{n+1}^\nu + \beta_n^\nu b_n^\nu + \gamma_n b_{n-1}^\nu &= 0, \\
\alpha_n^\nu &:= \frac{\Lambda_3}{(1 + N)(3 + 2N)}, \quad \gamma_n^\nu := -\frac{\Lambda_3 \left( \prod_{j=1}^3 (N^2 - m_j^2) \right)}{N(-1 + 2N)}, \\
\beta_n^\nu &:= \frac{1}{4} + E + N(N + 1) + \Lambda_3 \frac{m_1 m_2 m_3}{N(1 + N)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the parameter  $\nu$  is the so-called renormalized angular momentum parameter and its value is chosen to ensure that the continued fraction equation

$$\frac{\alpha_{n-1}^\nu \gamma_n^\nu}{\left( \beta_n^\nu - \frac{\alpha_n^\nu \gamma_{n+1}^\nu}{\beta_{n+1}^\nu - \dots} \right) \left( \beta_{n-1}^\nu - \frac{\alpha_{n-2}^\nu \gamma_{n-1}^\nu}{\beta_{n-2}^\nu - \dots} \right)} = 1 \tag{2.25}$$

holds for an arbitrary choice of  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , c.f. [ST03, Equation (133)], and that  $1 + \nu + m_3$  is not a non-positive integer. Indeed, these two conditions are not mutually exclusive: the condition (2.25) is invariant by translation in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , i.e. if  $\nu = \nu_0$  satisfies (2.25) then so does  $\nu = \nu_0 + k$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Noting that  $B \neq 0$ , this choice of  $\nu$  ensures that (2.24) is equivalent to

$$\frac{A_\nu C_\nu}{D_\nu} - i e^{-i\pi\nu} \frac{A_{-\nu-1} C_{-\nu-1}}{D_{-\nu-1}} = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Clearly,  $\alpha_n^\nu$ ,  $\beta_n^\nu$  and  $\gamma_n^\nu$  are all separately invariant under the map  $(m_1, m_2, m_3) \mapsto (m_i, m_j, m_k)$  with  $i \neq j \neq k$ , and so  $b_n^\nu$  and  $\nu$  must also be preserved. Consequently, the same is true for  $A_\nu$ ,  $C_\nu$  and  $D_\nu$ . Hence, we conclude that the condition (2.26) is invariant under the map  $(m_1, m_2, m_3) \mapsto (m_i, m_j, m_k)$  with  $i \neq j \neq k$ . By using the fact that (2.5) and the boundary conditions are invariant under taking at once  $\text{Re } \omega \mapsto -\text{Re } \omega$ ,  $m \mapsto -m$  and complex conjugation, we arrive at the same conclusion for  $\text{Re } \omega \leq 0$ . The statement of Corollary 2.10 then follows easily from exploiting these symmetries.

### 3 Subextremal Kerr-de Sitter black holes

#### 3.1 Geometry of the exterior

In this section, we recall for the benefit of the reader some of the basic geometric properties of subextremal Kerr-de Sitter black holes, see for instance [Dya11b, Section 1] for more details.

Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $\Lambda > 0$  and  $|a| < 3/\Lambda$  satisfying

$$27M^4 + L^4(-1 + \Xi)\Xi^4 + L^2M^2(-2 + \Xi)(-32 + \Xi(32 + \Xi)) < 0 \tag{3.1}$$

where here and throughout the section we use the notation

$$L^2 := \frac{3}{\Lambda}, \quad \Xi := 1 + \frac{a^2}{L^2}, \tag{3.2}$$

Then, the following quartic function

$$\Delta := (r^2 + a^2) \left( 1 - \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right) - 2Mr = -\frac{1}{L^2} (r - r_2)(r - r_1)(r - r_0)(r - r_3). \tag{3.3}$$

has four distinct real roots, denoted  $0 < r_0 < r_1 < r_2$  and  $r_3 = -r_2 - r_1 - r_0 < 0$ .

The subextremal Kerr black hole exterior is a manifold covered globally (modulo the usual degeneration of polar coordinates) by so-called Chambers–Moss coordinates  $(t, r, \theta, \phi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (r_1, r_2) \times \mathbb{S}^2$  [CM94] and endowed with the Lorentzian metric

$$g = -\frac{\Delta}{\Xi^2 \rho^2} (dt - a \sin^2 \theta d\phi)^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta} dr^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{\Delta_\theta} d\theta^2 + \frac{\Delta_\theta \sin^2 \theta}{\Xi^2 \rho^2} (adt - (r^2 + a^2)d\phi)^2,$$

where we have

$$\rho^2 := r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta, \quad \Delta_\theta = \sin^2 \theta + \Xi \cos^2 \theta.$$

Finally, we will also find it convenient to work with a rescaling of the Chambers–Moss  $r$ , the tortoise coordinate  $r^* = r^*(r)$  defined by

$$\frac{dr^*}{dr} = \frac{\Xi(r^2 + a^2)}{\Delta},$$

and an initial condition. Note that we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow r_1} r^*(r) = -\infty, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow r_2} r^*(r) = +\infty.$$

Furthermore, we remark that in this section derivatives denoted by  $'$  will be assumed to be taken with respect to  $r^*$ , unless otherwise stated.

### 3.2 The Teukolsky equation and its separability

Fix  $M > 0$ , and  $|a|, L > 0$  subextremal Kerr-de Sitter parameters. For  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , the Teukolsky equation in Kerr-de Sitter [Kha83] is

$$\begin{aligned} \square_g \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{s}{\rho^2 \Xi^2} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} \partial_r \alpha^{[s]} + \frac{2s}{\rho^2 \Xi} \left[ \Xi \frac{a}{2\Delta} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} + i \frac{\cos \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} - \frac{ia^2}{L^2 \Delta_\theta} \cos \theta \right] \partial_\phi \alpha^{[s]} \\ + \frac{2s}{\rho^2} \left( \frac{(r^2 + a^2)}{2\Delta} \frac{d\Delta}{dr} - 2r - ia \frac{\cos \theta}{\Delta_\theta} \right) \partial_t \alpha^{[s]} \\ + \frac{s}{\rho^2 \Xi^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{a^2}{L^2} - \frac{2(3+2s)r^2}{L^2} - \Xi^2 s \frac{\cot^2 \theta}{\Delta_\theta} \right] \alpha^{[s]} = \frac{2\mu}{L^2} \alpha^{[s]}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

in Chambers–Moss coordinates, writing  $\square_g$  for the covariant wave operator in the Kerr-de Sitter metric. Here,  $\alpha^{[s]}$  is a smooth,  $s$ -spin weighted function on the exterior,  $\mathcal{R}$ , of the Kerr-de Sitter black hole. The role of the parameter  $\mu$  is, if  $s = 0$ , to distinguish between the massless wave equation, corresponding to  $\mu = 0$ , and the conformal Klein–Gordon equation, corresponding to  $\mu = 1$ ; if  $s \neq 0$ , we always take  $\mu = 0$ .

By analogy with the wave equation case [Car68], the Teukolsky equation (3.4) in Kerr-de Sitter backgrounds is separable, i.e. it admits separable solutions:

$$\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi) = e^{-i\omega t} e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(\theta) (r - r_3)^{-1} \Delta^{-\frac{s+1}{2}} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r), \quad (3.5)$$

for  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a separation constant  $\lambda$ . Plugging (3.5) into (3.4), we find that  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}$  and  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}$  each satisfy ODEs, which are introduced in the next two subsections.

#### 3.2.1 The angular ODE and its eigenvalues

Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  be fixed. Consider (3.5) and replace  $a\omega$  by a parameter  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ . The angular ODE verified by  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left( \Delta_\theta \sin \theta \frac{d}{d\theta} \right) S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) - 2(\Xi - 1) \cos^2 \theta \left[ (\mu + 2s^2) + \frac{\Xi^2}{\Delta_\theta} m\nu \right] S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\nu}(\theta) + \lambda S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) \\ - \left[ \frac{(\Xi m + s \cos \theta (\Xi - 2(\Xi - 1) \sin^2 \theta))^2}{\sin^2 \theta \Delta_\theta} - \Xi^2 \nu^2 \frac{\Xi \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta_\theta} + 2\nu s \cos \theta \frac{\Xi^2}{\Delta_\theta} \right] S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

We are interested in solutions of (3.6) with boundary conditions which ensure that, when  $\nu$  is taken to be  $a\omega$ , (3.5) is a smooth  $s$ -spin weighted function on  $\mathcal{R}$ , which can be defined similarly to the Kerr case of the previous section. By analogy with the Kerr case of Lemma 2.1, we have:

**Lemma 3.1** (Smooth spin-weighted solutions of the angular ODE). *Fix  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , let  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and assume  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ . Consider the angular ODE (2.3) with the boundary condition that  $e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  is a non-trivial smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted function on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , i.e.  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta)(1 + \cos\theta)^{-\frac{|m-s|}{2}}$  is holomorphic in  $\theta \in (0, \pi]$ , and  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta)(1 - \cos\theta)^{-\frac{|m+s|}{2}}$  is holomorphic in  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ .*

**The case  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ .** *For each  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ , there are countably many such solutions to (3.6) each corresponding to a real value of  $\lambda$ . We index the solutions and eigenvalues by a discrete  $l$ :  $S_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  solves (3.6) with eigenvalue  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  and induces a complete orthonormal basis,  $\{e^{im\phi} S_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}\}_{ml}$ , of the space of smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted functions on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  endowed with  $L^2(\sin\theta d\theta)$  norm. The index  $l$  is chosen so that  $l - \max\{|s|, |m|\} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , and so that  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,0} = l(l+1) - s^2$  for  $\nu = 0$  and  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  varies smoothly with  $\nu$ . The eigenvalues also have the property that  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu} = \lambda_{ml}^{[-s],\Xi,\nu}$ .*

**The case  $\nu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ .** *Fix some  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu_0} \in \mathbb{R}$  can be analytically continued to  $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$  except for finitely many branch points (with no finite accumulation point), located away from the real axis, and branch cuts emanating from these. We define  $\lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$ , for  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , as a global multivalued complex function of  $\nu$  such that  $\lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu_0} = \lambda_{ml}^{[s],\Xi,\nu_0}$  and  $S_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  as a solution to (3.6) with  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$ . The eigenvalues are independent of sign  $s$  and satisfy*

$$\text{Im } \nu > 0 \implies \text{Im} \left( \bar{\nu} \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu} \right) < 0. \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof.* Follows by adapting the arguments in [TdC20, Proposition 2.1]. For instance, (3.7) can be obtained by multiplying the angular ODE (3.6) by  $\sin\theta \nu S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$ , integrating by parts and taking the real part:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text{Im}(\lambda \bar{\nu})}{-\text{Im } \nu} \int_0^\pi \left| S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) \right|^2 \sin\theta d\theta \\ &= \int_0^\pi \left( \Delta_\theta \left| \frac{dS_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}}{d\theta} \right|^2 + 2(\Xi - 1) \cos^2\theta (\mu + 2s^2) \left| S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) \right|^2 \right) \sin\theta d\theta \\ & \quad + \int_0^\pi \frac{1}{\Delta_\theta} \left( \frac{(\Xi m + s \cos\theta (\Xi - 2(\Xi - 1) \sin^2\theta))^2}{\sin^2\theta} + \Xi^3 |\nu|^2 \cos^2\theta \right) \left| S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}(\theta) \right|^2 \sin\theta d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where the right hand side is clearly non-negative if  $\text{Im } \nu > 0$ . In fact, it is only zero if  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,\nu} \equiv 0$ . As trivial functions are not in the scope of the lemma, we obtain (3.7).  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *We note that, as before,  $\lambda$  denotes a complex number with no restrictions whereas  $\lambda$  denotes one of the eigenvalues identified in Lemma 3.1.*

### 3.2.2 The radial ODE and its boundary conditions

Our starting point is the radial Teukolsky ODE, usually written in terms of  $\alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega} := \Delta^{-\frac{s+1}{2}} (r - r_3) R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta^{-s} \frac{d}{dr} \left( \Delta^{1+s} \frac{d}{dr} \right) \alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} + \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ \Xi^2 (\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am)^2 - is\Xi (\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am) \frac{d\Delta}{dr} \right] \alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega} \\ & + \left[ 4is\omega\Xi r - \frac{2}{L^2} (\mu + 3s + 2s^2) r^2 + s \left( 1 - \frac{a^2}{L^2} \right) - \lambda + 2\Xi^2 am\omega - a^2 \Xi^2 \omega^2 \right] \alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

for  $r \in (r_1, r_2)$ . This equation has a regular singularity at  $r = \infty$  and singularities at each of the roots of  $\Delta$ , which are also regular if the Kerr-de Sitter parameters are subextremal. In this paper, we will consider the radial ODE in terms of the variable  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}$  introduced in (3.5), where (3.8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta \frac{d^2}{dr^2} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} + \frac{2\Delta}{r - r_3} \frac{d}{dr} R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} + \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ \Xi (\omega(r^2 + a^2) - am) - \frac{1}{2} is \frac{d\Delta}{dr} \right]^2 R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega} \\ & + \left[ \frac{M^2 - \left( 1 - \frac{a^2}{L^2} \right) a^2}{\Delta} + 4is\omega\Xi r - \frac{2(\mu - 1 + 2s^2)}{L^2} r^2 - \lambda - a^2 \omega^2 \Xi^2 + 2am\omega\Xi \right] R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

As noted in [STU98], if either  $\mu = 0$  and  $s \neq 0$  or  $\mu = 1$  and  $s \neq 0$ , equation (3.9) has singularities only at the roots of  $\Delta$ :  $r = \infty$  is a regular point of the ODE. Thus, from this point onwards, **we take  $\mu \equiv 1$  if  $s = 0$  and  $\mu \equiv 0$  otherwise.**

Let us here introduce the notation

$$\eta_j := (-1)^j \frac{i(\omega - m\omega_j)}{2\kappa_j}, \quad \omega_j := \frac{a}{r_j^2 + a^2}, \quad \kappa_j := \frac{1}{2L^2\Xi(r_j^2 + a^2)} \left| \prod_{j'=0, j' \neq j}^3 (r_j - r_{j'}) \right|, \quad (3.10)$$

for  $j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ . Note that we have  $\sum_{j=0}^3 \eta_j = 0$ . The quantities  $\omega_j$  and  $\kappa_j$  are, respectively, the angular velocity and the surface gravity of the horizon at  $r = r_j$ .

Based on the classical theory of regular singularities for ODEs, see [Olv73, Chapter 5], we can consider the following boundary conditions for (3.9):

**Definition 3.3.** *We say that a solution,  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)$ , to (3.9) is*

- *ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  if the following are holomorphic for  $r \in [r_1, r_1 + \min\{r_2 - r_1, r_1 - r_0\})$ :*

- $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)(r - r_1)^{-\eta_1 + \frac{s-1}{2}}$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_1$  or  $s \leq 0$ , and
- $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)(r - r_1)^{-\eta_1 - \frac{s+1}{2}}$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_1$  and  $s \geq 0$ ;

- *outgoing at  $\mathcal{H}_c^+$  if the following are holomorphic for  $r \in (r_1, r_2]$ :*

- $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)(r - r_2)^{\eta_2 - \frac{s+1}{2}}$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_2$  or  $s \geq 0$ , and
- $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)(r - r_2)^{\eta_2 + \frac{s-1}{2}}$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_2$  and  $s \leq 0$ .

### 3.2.3 Precise definition of mode solution

We are finally ready to define mode solution precisely:

**Definition 3.4.** *Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $L > 0$  and  $|a| < L$  satisfying (3.1). Take  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ . Let  $\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  be a solution to (3.4) which is given by (3.5). We say that  $\alpha^{[s]}(t, r, \theta, \phi)$  is a mode solution if*

1.  $\lambda = \lambda_{ml\nu_0}^{[s],\Xi,\nu}$  for some  $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq \max\{|m|, |s|\}}$  and  $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , making  $e^{im\phi} S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a\omega}$  a non-trivial smooth  $s$ -spin-weighted function on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $S_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a\omega}$  is a normalized solution to the angular ODE (3.6);
2.  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(r)$  solves the radial ODE (3.9) with ingoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}_c^+$ .

We note that Remark 2.5 still applies here, *mutatis mutandis*.

## 3.3 Some hidden spectral symmetries

For  $z_2 > 1$ , consider the radial ODE

$$\begin{aligned} & z(z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} y(z) + \frac{(4E-1)z_2+1}{4} y(z) \\ & - \frac{1}{(z-z_2)} \left[ \frac{1}{4} z(z-1)((m_3+m_4)^2-1) - m_3 m_4 (z-z_2) \left( z - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] y(z) \\ & - \frac{1}{z(z-1)} \left[ m_1 m_2 \left( \frac{z}{2} - z_2 \right) (z-1) + \frac{1}{4} (z-z_2)((m_1+m_2)^2-1) \right] y(z) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where  $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, E \in \mathbb{C}$ . The radial ODE (3.9) may also be cast in this form:

**Lemma 3.5.** *The radial ODE (3.9) may be written as (3.11) if we let*

$$z := z_\infty \frac{r-r_0}{r-r_3}, \quad z_\infty := \frac{r_1-r_3}{r_1-r_0}, \quad z_2 := z_\infty \frac{r_2-r_0}{r_2-r_3}, \quad (3.12)$$

and choose the parameters in (3.11) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= s - \eta_1 - \eta_0, & m_2 &= \eta_0 - \eta_1, & m_3 &= -s - \eta_1 - \eta_0, & m_4 &= \eta_0 + \eta_1 + 2\eta_2, \\ Ez_2 &= \frac{1}{4}(1 + z_2) + (\eta_0 + \eta_1)^2 z_2 - (\eta_1^2 + \eta_0\eta_1 + \eta_1\eta_2 - \eta_0\eta_2) + \frac{L^2(\lambda - 2\Xi^2 a m \omega + a^2 \Xi^2 \omega^2)}{(r_2 - r_3)(r_1 - r_0)} \\ &+ \frac{r_0^2 + r_1^2 + 2r_0 r_2 + 2r_2(r_1 + r_2)}{2(r_2 - r_3)(r_1 - r_0)} s^2 - \frac{r_1(r_2 - r_3) + r_3(r_0 + r_1)}{(r_1 - r_0)(r_2 - r_3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Furthermore, the boundary conditions in Definition 3.3 can be recast in terms of the new parameters, noting that

$$\begin{aligned} -\eta_1 + \frac{s-1}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_2 - 1), & -\eta_1 - \frac{s+1}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_3 + m_2 - 1), \\ \eta_2 - \frac{s+1}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_3 + m_4 - 1), & \eta_2 + \frac{s-1}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_4 - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The choices of  $m_1, m_2, m_3$  and  $m_4$  are not canonical: both these boundary conditions and the ODE (3.11) are invariant by the exchange of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , and by the exchange of  $m_3$  and  $m_4$ .

*Proof.* Under the Möbius transformation (3.12), the singularities of (3.8) transform as follows

$$r = r_0 \Rightarrow z = 0, \quad r = r_1 \Rightarrow z = 1, \quad r = r_3 \Rightarrow z = \infty, \quad r = r_2 \Rightarrow z = z_2, \quad r = \infty \Rightarrow z = z_\infty.$$

Note that  $z_2 < z_\infty$  as  $r_3 < r_0$ , and furthermore  $z_2 > 1$ , since

$$(z_2 - 1)(r_1 - r_0)(r_2 - r_3) = (r_0 - r_3)(r_2 - r_1) > 0.$$

The result then follows by direct computations, which have been independently obtained in the literature in [STU98; STU99], see also [Hat21].  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** As for Lemma 2.6 in the Kerr case, the observation in Lemma 3.5 comes from comparing the Teukolsky equation in subextremal Kerr-de Sitter black holes and the  $SU(2)$  Seiberg–Witten theory, but now with four fundamental hypermultiplets, in supersymmetric quantum chromodynamics [IKO17].

**Remark 3.7.** Taking the  $L \rightarrow \infty$  limit of Lemma 3.5 yields Lemma 2.6. For further details about the confluence process which turns Heun equations into confluent Heun equations, we refer the reader to the classical books [Mar+95; Sla00] and references therein.

Next, we give a characterization of the point spectrum of (3.11), in the space of solutions with suitable boundary conditions. Though other methods such as Jaffé-type expansions are sometimes considered in the literature, see [YUF10], we find it convenient to replace the Jaffé polynomials of Proposition 2.9 with hypergeometric polynomials.

**Notation 3.8.** Let  $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, E \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $z_2 > 1$ . Define  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z)$  to be the unique (up to rescaling) solution to

$$\begin{aligned} z(z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z) &+ \frac{(4E-1)z_2+1}{4} R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z) \\ &- \frac{1}{(z-z_2)} \left[ \frac{1}{4} z(z-1)((m_3+m_4)^2-1) - m_3 m_4 (z-z_2) \left( z - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z) \\ &- \frac{1}{z(z-1)} \left[ m_1 m_2 \left( \frac{z}{2} - z_2 \right) (z-1) + \frac{1}{4} (z-z_2)((m_1+m_2)^2-1) \right] R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

given before as (3.11), with boundary conditions

- $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z)(z-1)^{\frac{1}{2}(m_1+m_2-1)}$  is holomorphic in  $z \in [1, 2)$ ,
- $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z)(z-z_2)^{\frac{1}{2}(m_3+m_4-1)}$  is holomorphic in  $z \in (1, z_2]$ ,

under the assumptions<sup>4</sup> that  $\operatorname{Re}(m_1 + m_2 - 1) < 0$  if  $\operatorname{Im}(m_1 + m_2) = 0$ , and  $\operatorname{Re}(m_3 + m_4 - 1) < 0$  if  $\operatorname{Im}(m_3 + m_4) = 0$ .

Likewise,  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)}^E(z)$ , for  $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$  are defined by replacing  $m_1$  with  $m_i$ ,  $m_2$  with  $m_j$ ,  $m_3$  with  $m_k$  and  $m_4$  with  $m_l$ , everywhere in the above definition.

<sup>4</sup>We once again note that these assumptions ensure that the boundary conditions specify the solutions uniquely up to rescaling, and refer the reader to the analogous footnote in Section 2.3 for further details.



**Proposition 3.9** (Point spectrum). *Fix a triple  $(i, j, k, l)$  with  $i, j, k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, l\}$  and distinct. Let  $m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l, E, \Lambda_3 \in \mathbb{C}$  be such that  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)}^E(z)$  may be defined, see Notation 3.8. Then  $R_{(m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)}^E$  is nontrivial if and only if the continued fraction condition*

$$0 = A_0^{(0)} + \frac{-A_0^{(+1)} A_1^{(-1)}}{A_1^{(0)} + \frac{-A_1^{(+1)} A_2^{(-1)}}{A_2^{(0)} + \frac{-A_2^{(+1)} A_3^{(-1)}}{\dots}}} \quad (3.14)$$

holds, where the coefficients  $A_n^{(0)}$  and  $A_n^{(\pm 1)}$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n-1}^{(+1)} A_n^{(-1)} &= \frac{n^2(n - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m}))^2 \left[ \sigma_1(\mathbf{m})\sigma_3(\mathbf{m}) - 4\sigma_4(\mathbf{m}) + (\sigma_2(\mathbf{m}) + (n - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m}))n)^2 \right]}{(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)^2 [(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)^2 - 1]} \\ &\quad + \frac{n(n - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m})) \left[ \sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) (\sigma_2(\mathbf{m})\sigma_3(\mathbf{m}) - \sigma_1(\mathbf{m})\sigma_4(\mathbf{m})) - \sigma_3(\mathbf{m})^2 \right]}{(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)^2 [(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)^2 - 1]}, \\ A_n^{(0)} &= \frac{[\sigma_1(\mathbf{m})^3 - 4\sigma_1(\mathbf{m})\sigma_2(\mathbf{m}) + 8\sigma_3(\mathbf{m})]\sigma_1(\mathbf{m})}{8(-2 + \sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)} + \frac{(4E + 1)z_2 + 1}{4(z_2 - 1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{(z_2 + 1)(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n - 2)(\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) - 2n)}{8(z_2 - 1)} - \frac{z_2[\sigma_1(\mathbf{m})^2 - 2\sigma_2(\mathbf{m})]}{4(z_2 - 1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

and where  $\sigma_1(\mathbf{m}) := m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4$ ,  $\sigma_2(\mathbf{m}) := m_1m_2 + m_1m_3 + m_1m_4 + m_2m_3 + m_2m_4 + m_3m_4$ ,  $\sigma_3(\mathbf{m}) := m_1m_2m_3 + m_1m_2m_4 + m_2m_3m_4$ , and  $\sigma_4(\mathbf{m}) := m_1m_2m_3m_4$  are symmetric polynomials in  $\mathbf{m} = (m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)$ .

*Proof.* Our proof is loosely based on a modification of [Mar+95, Part A, Chapter 4] for Heun functions. Let us briefly reproduce the important points. For  $z_2 > 1$ , we begin by considering the Heun operator

$$\mathcal{L} := z(z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + [\gamma(z-1)(z-z_2) + \delta z(z-z_2) + \epsilon z(z-1)] \frac{d}{dz} + \alpha\beta z - q,$$

where  $\epsilon + \delta - 1 = \alpha + \beta - \gamma$ . We assume  $\gamma, \delta, \epsilon \neq 0$ . Let us introduce the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &:= (z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + [\delta(z-z_2) + \epsilon(z-1)] \frac{d}{dz} = t(t-1) \frac{d^2}{dt^2} + [\delta(t-1) + \epsilon t] \frac{d}{dt}, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_2 &:= (z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d}{dz} = (z_2-1)\Lambda_2, \quad \Lambda_2 := t(t-1) \frac{d}{dt}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t := \frac{z-1}{z_2-1}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{L}$  may be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = z\Lambda_1 + \gamma\tilde{\Lambda}_2 + \alpha\beta z - q = (z_2-1) \left[ t\Lambda_1 + \gamma\Lambda_2 + \alpha\beta t - \frac{q - \alpha\beta - \Lambda_1}{z_2-1} \right].$$

Let us introduce the hypergeometric functions

$$f_\nu(z) := {}_2F_1 \left( -\nu + \frac{\omega_H}{2} - \frac{1}{2}, \nu + \frac{\omega_H}{2} + \frac{1}{2}; \delta; \frac{z-1}{z_2-1} \right) = {}_2F_1 \left( -\nu + \frac{\omega_H}{2} - \frac{1}{2}, \nu + \frac{\omega_H}{2} + \frac{1}{2}; \delta; t \right),$$

for  $\omega_H := \delta + \epsilon - 1 = \alpha + \beta - \gamma$ . The functions  $f_\nu$  then satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 f_\nu &= \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) f_\nu, \\ \frac{\mathcal{L} f_\nu}{z_2-1} &= \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) t f_\nu + \gamma\Lambda_2 f_\nu + \alpha\beta t - \frac{q - \alpha\beta - \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right)}{z_2-1} f_\nu \\ &= \tilde{A}_\nu^{(+1)} f_{\nu+1} + \tilde{A}_\nu^{(0)} f_\nu + \tilde{A}_\nu^{(-1)} f_{\nu-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients  $\tilde{A}_\nu^{(\pm 1)}$  and  $\tilde{A}_\nu^{(0)}$  are given by

$$\tilde{A}_\nu^{(+1)} = -\frac{\left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} + \alpha \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} + \beta \right) \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2} + \delta \right)}{2(2\nu+1)(\nu+1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}_\nu^{(0)} &= \frac{(1 - \omega_H)(\delta - \epsilon)[(\alpha - \beta)^2 - (\gamma - 1)^2]}{32\nu(\nu + 1)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{z_2 - 1}\right) \nu(\nu + 1) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}[\gamma(\delta - \epsilon) + \epsilon(1 - \omega_H) + 2\alpha\beta] - \frac{q - \alpha\beta}{z_2 - 1} - \frac{1}{4(z_2 - 1)}(\omega_H^2 - 1), \\
\tilde{A}_\nu^{(-1)} &= -\frac{(\nu + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\omega_H}{2})(\nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} - \alpha)(\nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} - \beta)(\nu + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\omega_H}{2} - \delta)}{2\nu(2\nu + 1)}, \\
\tilde{A}_{\nu-1}^{(+1)}\tilde{A}_\nu^{(-1)} &= \frac{\left[\nu^2 - \frac{(\omega_H - 1)^2}{4}\right] \left[\nu^2 - \frac{(\omega_H + 1}{2} - \alpha)^2\right] \left[\nu^2 - \frac{(\omega_H + 1}{2} - \beta)^2\right] \left[\nu^2 - \frac{(\omega_H + 1}{2} - \delta)^2\right]}{4(2\nu + 1)\nu^2(2\nu - 1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

If  $g$  solves  $\mathcal{L}g = 0$ , then it can be expanded as a series

$$y(z) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} b_n f_N(z), \quad N := \nu + n, \quad A_n^{(+1)}b_{n+1} + A_n^{(0)}b_n + A_n^{(-1)}b_{n-1} = 0, \tag{3.17}$$

where we have  $A_n^{(+1)} := \tilde{A}_{N+1}^{(-1)}$ ,  $A_n^{(-1)} := \tilde{A}_{N-1}^{(+1)}$  and  $A_n^{(0)} = \tilde{A}_N^{(0)}$ . One can check that, if  $\nu = (\omega_H - 1)/2$ , then  $b_n = 0$  for  $n < 0$  and each  $f_N$  is bounded for  $z \in [1, z_2]$ . Furthermore, a large  $n$  asymptotic analysis of the recursion relation following [Gau67, Theorem 2.3(b)] shows that either

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_{n+1}f_{N+1}}{b_n f_N} = 1 + \frac{2}{z_2 - 1} (1 + \sqrt{z_2}) > 1$$

and so the expansion does not converge up to  $z = z_2$ , or

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_{n+1}f_{N+1}}{b_n f_N} = 1 - \frac{2}{z_2 - 1} (\sqrt{z_2} - 1) < 1$$

in which case it does converge and (3.14) holds. Thus, if (3.14) holds, then  $y$  in (3.17) is a solution to  $\mathcal{L}y = 0$  which is bounded for  $z \in [1, z_2]$ .

The Heun operator we are interested in studying is that associated to (3.11). For instance, take  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z)$  and define

$$g_\pm(z) := z^{\mp \frac{1}{2}(m_1 - m_2 \pm 1)}(z - 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}(m_1 + m_2 + 1)}(z - z_2)^{-\frac{1}{2}(m_3 + m_4 + 1)}(z - z_\infty)^{-\frac{3}{2}(s+1)} R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z);$$

then  $g_\pm(z)$  solves a Heun ODE with parameters

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma &= 1 \pm (m_1 - m_2), \quad \delta = 1 - m_1 - m_2, \quad \epsilon = 1 - m_3 - m_4, \quad \omega_H = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^4 m_j, \\
\alpha &= 1 - m_1 \frac{1 \mp 1}{2} - m_2 \frac{1 \pm 1}{2} - m_3, \quad \beta = 1 - m_1 \frac{1 \mp 1}{2} - m_2 \frac{1 \pm 1}{2} - m_4, \\
\gamma(\delta - \epsilon) + \epsilon(1 - \omega_H) + 2\alpha\beta &= 2 - \sum_{j=1}^4 m_j^2 + 2m_2(m_2 - 1)(1 \pm 1) + 2m_1(m_1 - 1)(1 \mp 1), \\
4q - 4\alpha\beta + \omega_H^2 - 1 &= -2 + \sum_{j=1}^4 m_j^2 + [2m_2(m_2 - 1)(1 \pm 1) + 2m_1(m_1 - 1)(1 \mp 1) + 1](z_2 - 1) - 4Ez_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

By plugging (3.18) into (3.16), and choosing  $\nu = \frac{\omega_H - 1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^4 m_j$ , we obtain a representation of  $R_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)}^E(z)$  which is, of course, unique (up to rescaling). This proves the result for  $(m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l) = (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4)$ ; the same argument can be repeated for other permutations of the masses, since our choice of  $\nu$  and (3.15) are invariant under such permutations.  $\square$

From the point of view of the Teukolsky equation, Proposition 3.9 is the statement that its point spectrum, in the space of solutions with appropriate boundary conditions, is invariant under exchanges  $m_i \leftrightarrow m_j$ . The precise statement we will use is:

**Corollary 3.10** (Hidden spectral symmetries). *Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $L > 0$  and  $|a| < L$  satisfying (3.1). Let  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfy  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ . If  $\text{Re } \omega \neq m\omega_1, m\omega_2$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *there is a nontrivial solution to the radial ODE (3.9) which is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing at  $\mathcal{H}_c^+$ , i.e. which satisfies the boundary conditions*

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{m, \lambda}^{[s], \Xi, a, \omega}(z)(z - 1)^{-\eta_1 + \frac{s-1}{2}} &\text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow 1, \\
R_{m, \lambda}^{[s], \Xi, a, \omega}(z)(z - z_2)^{\eta_2 - \frac{s+1}{2}} &\text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow z_2;
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) ( $m_1 \leftrightarrow m_3$  followed by  $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$  symmetry) there is a nontrivial solution to the radial ODE equal to (3.9) but where  $s$  is replaced by  $-s$ , which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z)(z-1)^{-\eta_1-\frac{s+1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow 1, \\ \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z)(z-z_2)^{\eta_2+\frac{s-1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow z_2; \end{aligned}$$

(iii) ( $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$  symmetry) there is a nontrivial solution to the radial ODE

$$\begin{aligned} z(z-1)(z-z_2) \frac{d^2}{dz^2} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z) + \frac{L^2(\lambda - 2a\Xi^2 m\omega + a^2\Xi^2\omega^2)}{(r_1-r_0)(r_2-r_3)} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z) \\ + \frac{1}{(r_1-r_0)(r_2-r_3)z} \left[ s^2(r_1+r_2)^2 \left( z - \frac{(r_2-r_0)(r_1-r_3)}{r_1^2+2r_2r_1+r_2^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2}z(r_0+r_1)^2 \right] \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(z) \\ + \frac{z}{(z_2-z)} \left[ (z-1)\eta_2^2 + 2(z_2-1)\eta_0\eta_2 + \frac{(z_2-1)^2}{(z-1)}\eta_0^2 - \frac{1}{4}(z-1) \right] \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z) \\ + \frac{z}{(z-1)} \left[ 2(z_2-1)\eta_0\eta_1 + (z_2-z)\eta_1^2 - \frac{(z_2-z)}{4z^2} - 2(z-1)\eta_1\eta_2 \right] \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

satisfying the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z)(z-1)^{-\eta_0-\eta_1-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow 1, \\ \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],\Xi,a,\omega}(z)(z-z_2)^{\eta_0+\eta_2-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{ smooth as } z \rightarrow z_2; \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

If  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_1$ , then (i) and (iii) are equivalent if  $s \leq 0$  and, if  $s \geq 0$ , (ii) and (iii) are equivalent. In turn, if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_2$ , then (i) and (iii) are equivalent if  $s \geq 0$  and, if  $s \leq 0$ , (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.

*Proof.* The conclusion follows from Proposition 3.9 after applying Lemma 3.5 and rewriting the ODE (3.19) and the boundary conditions in terms of  $(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, E)$ .  $\square$

We note that Remark 2.11 for the Kerr case also applies in the Kerr-de Sitter case considered above, *mutatis mutandis*.

### 3.4 A partial mode stability result

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 2. To be precise, we prove

**Theorem 3.11.** Fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| \leq 3/\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda > 0$  satisfying (3.1),  $\frac{1}{2}s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m-s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $(\omega, \lambda)$  such that one of the following holds:

- $\text{Im } \omega > 0$ ,  $\text{Im}(\lambda\bar{\omega}) \leq 0$  and  $|\omega| \notin |m| \left( 0, \frac{\omega_2/\kappa_2 + \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_2 + 1/\kappa_0} \right) \subsetneq |m|(0, \omega_1)$ ;
- $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and, if  $|s| \neq \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$ , additionally  $m = 0$  or  $\frac{\omega}{m} \notin \left( \frac{\omega_1/\kappa_1 - \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_1 - 1/\kappa_0}, \frac{\omega_2/\kappa_2 + \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_2 + 1/\kappa_0} \right) \subsetneq (\omega_2, \omega_1)$ .

If  $\alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(r)$  is a solution to (3.9) with respect to these parameters which is ingoing at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  and outgoing at  $\mathcal{H}_c^+$ , then  $\alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} \equiv 0$ .

**Remark 3.12.** Note that, by Lemma 3.1, it is clear that the conditions on  $\lambda$  which we impose here are verified by the angular eigenvalues associated to mode solutions. Hence, Theorem 3.11 implies, and is stronger than, Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 3.11.* The proof follows two steps. First, we analyze the original radial ODE (3.9) and identify superradiant frequencies, for which the solutions considered in the statement may exist. Then, we attempt to rule out some of these solutions by making use of the hidden symmetries uncovered by Proposition 3.9 and Corollary 3.10.

*Step 1: superradiance.* Let  $\alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$  be a solution to (3.9) with outgoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}_c^+$  and ingoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}^+$ , see Definition 3.3. Let  $u(r) = (r^2 + a^2)^{1/2} \Delta^{s/2} \alpha_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}$ , then  $u$  solves  $u'' + Vu = 0$ , where

$$V = \frac{(r^2 + a^2)^2 \omega^2}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} + \frac{2am\omega[\Delta - (r^2 + a^2)]}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} + \frac{a^2 m^2}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} - \frac{\Delta(\lambda + a^2\Xi^2\omega^2)}{(r^2 + a^2)^2\Xi^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^4 \Xi^2} [a^2 \Delta + 2Mr(r^2 - a^2)] - \frac{\Delta}{(r^2 + a^2)^2 \Xi^2} \left[ \left( \frac{4r^2}{L^2} + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{d\Delta}{dr} \right)^2 \right) s^2 + \frac{2(\mu - 1)r^2}{L^2} \right] \\
& - \frac{is}{\Xi(r^2 + a^2)} \left[ \left( \omega - \frac{am}{r^2 + a^2} \right) \frac{d\Delta}{dr} + \frac{4\omega r \Delta}{r^2 + a^2} \right]. \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the following currents associated with the stationary Killing field in Kerr-de Sitter:

$$Q^T[u] := \text{Im}(\bar{\omega} u u') \Rightarrow -(Q^T[u])' = \text{Im} \omega |u'|^2 + \text{Im}(\bar{\omega} V) |u|^2. \tag{3.22}$$

Suppose  $s = 0$  and  $\mu = 1$ . In the potential (3.21), both the coefficient of  $\lambda$  and the  $(\omega, m, \lambda)$  independent part are non-positive, and the potential is real if  $\omega$  is real. Thus, taking into account the boundary conditions on  $u$ , we deduce the identities

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{if } \text{Im} \omega > 0, \quad 0 \geq \text{Im} \omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( |u'|^2 + \frac{((r^2 + a^2)^2 - a^2 \Delta) |\omega|^2 - a^2 m^2}{(r^2 + a^2)^2} |u|^2 \right) dr^*; \\
& \text{if } \text{Im} \omega = 0, \quad 0 = \omega(\omega - m\omega_1) |u(-\infty)|^2 + \omega(\omega - m\omega_2) |u(+\infty)|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

If  $\text{Im} \omega > 0$ , unless the superradiant condition

$$|\omega|^2 < m^2 \omega_1^2 \Leftrightarrow 0 < (\text{Im} \omega)^2 < m^2 \omega_1^2 - (\text{Re} \omega)^2,$$

holds, we may infer directly from (3.23) that  $u \equiv 0$ , which establishes the result we seek for  $s = 0$ .

If  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  we cannot argue just from (3.23). As in the Kerr case, we need to appeal to unique continuation for ODEs such as (3.8) to deduce that, unless the superradiant condition

$$m \neq 0, \quad \omega_2 < \frac{\omega}{m} < \omega_1, \tag{3.24}$$

holds, we may infer that  $u \equiv 0$ , thus concluding the proof for  $s = 0$ . In fact, the conclusion can be shown to hold more generally for  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 2}$  by appealing to the Teukolsky–Starobinsky identities, see [TM93]. By the same method, one may deduce that if  $|s| \leq 2$  is half-integer, the energy identity implies that in fact  $u \equiv 0$  holds independently of  $\omega$ . However, for if  $|s| > 2$ , for integer and half-integer spins alike, the energy identity may fail to be coercive even for frequencies not in (3.24), as our paper [CT21] suggests.

*Step 2: the  $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_3$  symmetry.* Let  $\tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(z)$  be a solution to (3.19) with boundary conditions given by (3.20), and define  $\tilde{u} := [z(z-1)(z_2-z)]^{-1/2} \tilde{R}_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega}(z)$ . Exceptionally in this step, we take prime to denote a derivative with respect to  $z^*$ , a coordinate defined in terms of  $z$  through

$$dz^* = \frac{1}{z(z-1)(z_2-z)} dz \implies z^*(z=1) = -\infty, \quad z^*(z=z_2) = +\infty,$$

together with a choice of initial condition. With this notation,  $\tilde{u}$  solves  $\tilde{u}'' + \tilde{V} \tilde{u} = 0$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V} = & - \frac{z(z-1)(z_2-z)L^2(\lambda + \Xi^2 a^2 \omega^2 - 2a\Xi m\omega)}{(r_1 - r_0)(r_2 - r_3)} - z(z-1)(z_2-z) \left( z - \frac{1}{2} \right) \\
& - (z-1)(z_2-z) \left[ \frac{s^2(r_1+r_2)^2}{(r_1-r_0)(r_2-r_3)} \left( z - \frac{(r_2-r_0)(r_1-r_3)}{r_1^2 + 2r_2r_1 + r_2^2} \right) + \frac{z(r_0+r_1)^2}{2(r_1-r_0)(r_2-r_3)} \right] \\
& - z^2 [\eta_2^2(z-1)^2 + 2(z_2-1)\eta_0\eta_2(z-1) + (z_2-1)^2\eta_0^2] \\
& - z^2 [2(z_2-1)\eta_0\eta_1(z_2-z) + \eta_1^2(z_2-z)^2 - 2\eta_1\eta_2(z-1)(z_2-z)].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

The microlocal energy current associated with the stationary Killing field in Kerr-de Sitter gives the following identity for  $\tilde{u}$ :

$$Q^T[\tilde{u}] := \text{Im}(\bar{\omega} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}') \Rightarrow -(Q^T[\tilde{u}])' = \text{Im} \omega |\tilde{u}'|^2 + \text{Im}(\bar{\omega} \tilde{V}) |\tilde{u}|^2. \tag{3.26}$$

When  $\text{Im} \omega > 0$ , by the boundary conditions on  $\tilde{u}$ , we have

$$Q^T[\tilde{u}](-\infty) = Q^T[\tilde{u}](+\infty) = 0.$$

Furthermore, since the  $\lambda$  coefficient and the  $(\omega, m, \lambda)$ -independent part of (3.25) are non-positive, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Im}(\bar{\omega}\tilde{V})}{z \text{Im } \omega} &\geq z \left[ \hat{\eta}_2^2 (z-1)^2 + 2(z_2-1)\hat{\eta}_0\hat{\eta}_2(z-1) + (z_2-1)^2\hat{\eta}_0^2 \right] - \frac{(z-1)(z_2-z)L^2\Xi^2 a^2}{(r_1-r_0)(r_2-r_3)} |\omega|^2 \\ &\quad + z \left[ 2(z_2-1)\hat{\eta}_0\hat{\eta}_1(z_2-z) + \hat{\eta}_1^2(z_2-z)^2 - 2\hat{\eta}_1\hat{\eta}_2(z-1)(z_2-z) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where we have used the notation  $\hat{\eta}_i\hat{\eta}_j = \frac{(-1)^{i+j}}{4\kappa_i\kappa_j} [|\omega|^2 - m^2\omega_i\omega_j]$ . One can verify that unless we have

$$\frac{|\omega|^2}{m^2} < \left( \frac{\omega_2/\kappa_2 + \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_2 + 1/\kappa_0} \right)^2, \quad (3.28)$$

the right hand side of (3.27) is non-negative for  $z \in [1, z_2]$  in the full subextremal range of parameters. In this case, we deduce directly from (3.26) that  $\tilde{u} = 0$  and then, using Corollary 3.10(i) if  $s \leq 0$  or Corollary 3.10(ii) if  $s \geq 0$ , we conclude that  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} \equiv 0$ .

Now consider  $\text{Im } \omega = 0$ . The potential (3.25) is real and so, from (3.26) and the boundary conditions on  $\tilde{u}$ , we obtain

$$\omega \left[ (\omega - m\omega_1) - (\omega - m\omega_0) \frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_0} \right] |\tilde{u}(-\infty)|^2 + \omega \left[ (\omega - m\omega_2) + (\omega - m\omega_0) \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_0} \right] |\tilde{u}(+\infty)|^2 = 0.$$

(Note that the factors of  $\omega$  outside the square brackets can be replaced by any linear combination of  $\omega$  and  $m$ , and so we need not impose  $\omega \neq 0$  in what follows.) Thus, unless we have

$$m \neq 0, \quad \frac{\omega_1/\kappa_1 - \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_1 - 1/\kappa_0} < \frac{\omega}{m} < \frac{\omega_2/\kappa_2 + \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_2 + 1/\kappa_0}, \quad (3.29)$$

we may infer, as before, by a unique continuation argument, that  $\tilde{u} \equiv 0$ . As in the case  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$ , it then follows from Corollary 3.10 that  $R_{m,\lambda}^{[s],a,\omega} \equiv 0$ .

Finally, we use the Vieta formula  $\sum_{i \neq j} r_i r_j = a^2 - L^2$  to rewrite the factors appearing in conditions (3.28) and (3.29):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega_1/\kappa_1 - \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_1 - 1/\kappa_0} &= \frac{2a}{L^2\Xi - (r_0 + r_1)^2} = \omega_2 + \frac{2a\kappa_2}{(r_2 - r_3)} \left( 1 - \frac{(r_0 + r_1)^2}{L^2\Xi} \right)^{-1} > \omega_2, \\ \frac{\omega_2/\kappa_2 + \omega_0/\kappa_0}{1/\kappa_2 + 1/\kappa_0} &= \frac{2a}{L^2\Xi - (r_0 + r_2)^2} = \omega_1 - \frac{2a\kappa_1}{(r_1 - r_3)} \left( 1 - \frac{(r_0 + r_2)^2}{L^2\Xi} \right)^{-1} < \omega_1, \end{aligned}$$

as long as  $a \neq 0$ , since  $(r_0 + r_1)^2, (r_0 + r_2)^2 < L^2\Xi$ .  $\square$

### 3.5 Epilogue: mass symmetries within the MST method

In this section, we provide an alternative proof of Corollary 3.10 based not on hypergeometric polynomial expansions of Proposition 3.9 but on the matching of hypergeometric expansions. In the study of quasinormal modes on Kerr-de Sitter, this method was first introduced by Suzuki, Tagasuki and Umetsu [STU99; STU00], but it is known as the MST method after the work [MST96] in Kerr.

Let us fix  $M > 0$ ,  $|a| < M$ ,  $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m - s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\omega \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\text{Re } \omega \geq 0$  and  $\text{Im } \omega \geq 0$ , and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , assuming additionally that  $s \leq 0$  if  $\text{Re } \omega = m\omega_+$ . To aid the reader, we write the MST quantities  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\omega_H$  and  $v$  in [STU99; STU00] in terms of the quantities identified in (3.13):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &:= 1 \pm (m_1 - m_2), \quad \gamma := 1 - m_1 - m_2, \quad \epsilon := 1 - m_3 - m_4, \quad \omega_H := 1 - m_1(1 \mp 1) - m_2(1 \pm 1), \\ \sigma_- &:= 1 - m_1 \frac{1 \mp 1}{2} - m_2 \frac{1 \pm 1}{2} - m_3, \quad \sigma_+ := 1 - m_1 \frac{1 \mp 1}{2} - m_2 \frac{1 \pm 1}{2} - m_4, \\ v &:= -1 + z_2 - 4Ez_2 - [(\gamma - \delta)\epsilon + 2\sigma_+\sigma_- + \delta(1 - \omega_H) + (\omega_H^2 - 1)(1 - z_2)], \quad z_r := 1 - x_r = z_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

Note that, in the notation of [STU99], we have taken the minus sign for the exponent at  $x = 0$  and the plus sign for the exponent at  $x = x_r$ , i.e.  $A_3 = A_{3+}$ ; the latter choice is different from the choice made in [STU00] but it is consistent with the boundary conditions we consider. We also allow the sign of the exponent at  $x = -1$  to be either plus or minus, which corresponds to the two choices in (3.30). Within the MST formalism, existence of a non-trivial solution to (3.9) with outgoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{I}^+$  and

ingoing boundary conditions at  $\mathcal{H}^+$  is, by [STU00, Equation 3.8a] and [STU99, Equation 3.29], equivalent to the condition

$$\frac{B}{A} \left( \frac{C_\nu}{D_\nu} + \frac{C_{-\nu-1}}{D_{-\nu-1}} \right) = 0, \quad (3.31)$$

where we have used the shorthand notation

$$A := \prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma(1 + m_j), \quad B := z_2^{-m_1(1\mp 1)/4 - m_2(1\pm 1)/4} \Gamma(1 - m_1 - m_2) \Gamma \left( 1 + m_3 - m_1 \frac{1 \mp 1}{2} - m_2 \frac{1 \pm 1}{2} \right),$$

$$C_\nu := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n \Gamma(N + \nu + 1)}{n!} \frac{b_n^\nu}{\prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma(1 + N - m_j)}, \quad D_\nu := \sum_{n=-\infty}^0 \frac{b_n^\nu}{\prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma(1 + N + m_j)},$$

writing  $N := n + \nu$  and where the coefficients  $b_n^\nu$ , obtained from the  $a_n^\nu$  coefficients of [STU99, Equation 3.1] through  $b_n^\nu = \Gamma(1 + m_1 + N) \Gamma(1 + m_2 + N) \Gamma(1 - m_3 + N) \Gamma(1 - m_4 + N) a_n^\nu$ , satisfy the following recursive relation, c.f. [STU99, Equation 3.2]:

$$\alpha_n^\nu b_{n+1}^\nu + \beta_n^\nu b_n^\nu + \gamma_n^\nu b_{n-1}^\nu = 0,$$

$$\alpha_n^\nu := \frac{1}{2(1+N)(3+2N)}, \quad \gamma_n^\nu := \frac{\left( \prod_{j=1}^4 (N^2 - m_j^2) \right)}{2N(-1+2N)}, \quad \beta_n^\nu := \left( E - \frac{1}{4} \right) z_2 + \frac{1}{4}.$$

Furthermore, the parameter  $\nu$  is the so-called renormalized angular momentum parameter and its value is chosen to ensure that the continued fraction equation

$$\frac{\alpha_{n-1}^\nu \gamma_n^\nu}{\left( \beta_n^\nu - \frac{\alpha_n^\nu \gamma_{n+1}^\nu}{\beta_{n+1}^\nu - \dots} \right) \left( \beta_{n-1}^\nu - \frac{\alpha_{n-2}^\nu \gamma_{n-1}^\nu}{\beta_{n-2}^\nu - \dots} \right)} = 1 \quad (3.32)$$

holds for an arbitrary choice of  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , c.f. [STU99, Equation 3.6]. Noting that  $B \neq 0$ , this choice ensures that (3.31) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{A} \left( \frac{C_\nu}{D_\nu} + \frac{C_{-\nu-1}}{D_{-\nu-1}} \right) = 0. \quad (3.33)$$

Clearly,  $\alpha_n^\nu$ ,  $\beta_n^\nu$  and  $\gamma_n^\nu$  are all separately invariant under the map  $(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \mapsto (m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)$  with  $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$ , and so  $b_n^\nu$  and  $\nu$  must also be preserved. Consequently, the same is true for  $C_\nu$  and  $D_\nu$ ; furthermore,  $A$  is clearly also preserved. Hence, we conclude that the condition (2.26) is invariant under the map  $(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \mapsto (m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l)$  with  $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$ . By using the fact that (3.9) and the boundary conditions are invariant under taking at once  $\text{Re } \omega \mapsto -\text{Re } \omega$ ,  $m \mapsto -m$  and complex conjugation, we arrive at the same conclusion for  $\text{Re } \omega \leq 0$ . The statement of Corollary 3.10 then follows easily from exploiting these symmetries.

## References

- [AGH20] Gleb Aminov, Alba Grassi, and Yasuyuki Hatsuda. “Black Hole Quasinormal Modes and Seiberg-Witten Theory” (2020). arXiv: 2006.06111.
- [AMPW17] Lars Andersson, Siyuan Ma, Claudio Paganini, and Bernard F. Whiting. “Mode stability on the real axis”. *J. Math. Phys.* 58.7 (2017).
- [BCGM21] Massimo Bianchi, Dario Consoli, Alfredo Grillo, and Josè Francisco Morales. “QNMs of branes, BHs and fuzzballs from Quantum SW geometries” (2021). arXiv: 2105.04245.
- [BILT21] G. Bonelli, C. Iossa, D. Panea Lichtig, and A. Tanzini. “Exact solution of Kerr black hole perturbations via CFT<sub>2</sub> and instanton counting” (2021). arXiv: 2105.04483.
- [BL67] Robert H. Boyer and Richard W. Lindquist. “Maximal Analytic Extension of the Kerr Metric”. *J. Math. Phys.* 8.2 (1967).
- [Car68] Brandon Carter. “Hamilton-Jacobi and Schrödinger Separable Solutions of Einstein’s Equations”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 10.4 (1968).
- [CD04] Vitor Cardoso and Óscar J.C. Dias. “Small Kerr–anti-de Sitter black holes are unstable”. *Phys. Rev. D - Part. Fields, Gravit. Cosmol.* 70.8 (2004). arXiv: 0405006 [hep-th].

- [Cha83] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar. *The Mathematical Theory of Black Holes*. New York: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, 1983.
- [CM94] Chris M. Chambers and Ian G. Moss. “Stability of the Cauchy horizon in Kerr–de Sitter spacetimes”. *Class. Quantum Gravity* 11.4 (1994).
- [CT21] Marc Casals and Rita Teixeira da Costa. “The Teukolsky–Starobinsky constants: facts and fictions” (2021). arXiv: 2102.06734.
- [DHR19] Mihalis Dafermos, Gustav Holzegel, and Igor Rodnianski. “Boundedness and Decay for the Teukolsky Equation on Kerr Spacetimes I: The Case  $|a| \ll M$ ”. *Ann. PDE* 5.2 (2019). arXiv: 1711.07944.
- [DHRT21] Mihalis Dafermos, Gustav Holzegel, Igor Rodnianski, and Martin Taylor. “The non-linear stability of the Schwarzschild family of black holes” (2021). arXiv: 2104.08222.
- [Dol17] Dominic Dold. “Unstable Mode Solutions to the Klein–Gordon Equation in Kerr-anti-de Sitter Spacetimes”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 350.2 (2017). arXiv: 1509.04971.
- [DR09] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “The red-shift effect and radiation decay on black hole spacetimes”. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 62.7 (2009). arXiv: 0512119 [gr-qc].
- [DR10] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “Decay for solutions of the wave equation on Kerr exterior spacetimes I-II: The cases  $|a| \ll M$  or axisymmetry” (2010). arXiv: 1010.5132.
- [DR13] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “Lectures on black holes and linear waves”. *Evolution equations. Clay Mathematics Proceedings, vol. 17*. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, 2013. arXiv: 0811.0354.
- [DRS16] Mihalis Dafermos, Igor Rodnianski, and Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. “Decay for solutions of the wave equation on Kerr exterior spacetimes III: The full subextremal case  $|a| < M$ ”. *Ann. Math.* 183.3 (2016). arXiv: 1402.7034.
- [Dya11a] Semyon Dyatlov. “Exponential energy decay for Kerr-de Sitter black holes beyond event horizons”. *Math. Res. Lett.* 18.5 (2011).
- [Dya11b] Semyon Dyatlov. “Quasi-Normal Modes and Exponential Energy Decay for the Kerr-de Sitter Black Hole”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 306.1 (2011).
- [Gau67] Walter Gautschi. “Computational Aspects of Three-Term Recurrence Relations”. *SIAM Rev.* 9.1 (1967).
- [GW19] Dejan Gajic and Claude Warnick. “Quasinormal modes in extremal Reissner-Nordström spacetimes” (2019). arXiv: 1910.08479.
- [GW20] Dejan Gajic and Claude Warnick. “A model problem for quasinormal ringdown of asymptotically flat or extremal black holes”. *J. Math. Phys.* 61.10 (2020). arXiv: 1910.08481.
- [Hat20] Yasuyuki Hatsuda. “An alternative to the Teukolsky equation” (2020). arXiv: 2007.07906.
- [Hat21] Yasuyuki Hatsuda. “Quasinormal modes of Kerr-de Sitter black holes via the Heun function”. *Class. Quantum Gravity* 38.2 (2021). arXiv: 2006.08957.
- [HR00] S. W. Hawking and H. S. Reall. “Charged and rotating AdS black holes and their CFT duals”. *Phys. Rev. D - Part. Fields, Gravit. Cosmol.* 61.2 (2000). arXiv: 9908109 [hep-th].
- [HV18] Peter Hintz and András Vasy. “The global non-linear stability of the Kerr–de Sitter family of black holes”. *Acta Math.* 220.1 (2018). arXiv: 1606.04014.
- [HW74] J. B. Hartle and D. C. Wilkins. “Analytic properties of the Teukolsky equation”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 38.1 (1974).
- [IKO17] Katsushi Ito, Shoichi Kanno, and Takafumi Okubo. “Quantum periods and prepotential in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SU(2) SQCD”. *J. High Energy Phys.* 2017.8 (2017). arXiv: 1705.09120.
- [Jaf34] George Jaffé. “Zur Theorie des Wasserstoffmoleküliions”. *Zeitschrift für Phys.* 87.7-8 (1934).
- [Kha83] U. Khanal. “Rotating black hole in asymptotic de Sitter space: Perturbation of the space-time with spin fields”. *Phys. Rev. D* 28.6 (1983).
- [KS21] Sergiu Klainerman and Jeremie Szeftel. “Kerr stability for small angular momentum” (2021). arXiv: 2104.11857.
- [Lea85] E. W. Leaver. “An Analytic Representation for the Quasi-Normal Modes of Kerr Black Holes”. *Proc. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 402.1823 (1985).
- [Mar+95] Pascal Maroni, Anne Duval, Gerhard Wolf, Felix Arscott, S. Yu. Slavyanov, and Dieter Schmidt. *Heun’s Differential Equations*. Ed. by A. Ronveaux. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [Mos17a] Georgios Moschidis. “A proof of the instability of AdS for the Einstein–null dust system with an inner mirror”. *Anal. & PDE* (2017). arXiv: 1704.08681.
- [Mos17b] Georgios Moschidis. “Superradiant instabilities for short-range non-negative potentials on Kerr spacetimes and applications”. *J. Funct. Anal.* 273.8 (2017). arXiv: 1608.02041.
- [Mos18] Georgios Moschidis. “A proof of the instability of AdS for the Einstein–massless Vlasov system” (2018). arXiv: 1812.04268.

- [MS54] Josef Meixner and Friedrich W. Schäfke. *Mathieusche Funktionen und Sphäroidfunktionen*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1954.
- [MST96] S. Mano, Hisao Suzuki, and E. Takasugi. “Analytic Solutions of the Teukolsky Equation and Their Low Frequency Expansions”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 95.6 (1996).
- [Olv73] Frank W. J. Olver. *Introduction to asymptotics and special functions*. Academic Press, 1973.
- [RW57] Tullio Regge and John A. Wheeler. “Stability of a Schwarzschild Singularity”. *Phys. Rev.* 108.4 (1957).
- [Shl15a] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. “Mode stabilities and instabilities for scalar fields on Kerr exterior spacetimes”. PhD thesis. 2015.
- [Shl15b] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. “Quantitative Mode Stability for the Wave Equation on the Kerr Spacetime”. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 16 (2015). arXiv: 1302.6902.
- [Sla00] S. Yu. Slavyanov. *Special Functions: A Unified Theory Based on Singularities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [SRTdC] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman and Rita Teixeira da Costa. “Boundedness and decay for the Teukolsky equation on Kerr in the full subextremal range  $|a| < M$ : physical space analysis”. In preparation.
- [SRTdC20] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman and Rita Teixeira da Costa. “Boundedness and decay for the Teukolsky equation on Kerr in the full subextremal range  $|a| < M$ : frequency space analysis” (2020). arXiv: 2007.07211.
- [ST03] Misao Sasaki and Hideyuki Tagoshi. “Analytic Black Hole Perturbation Approach to Gravitational Radiation”. *Living Rev. Relativ.* 6.1 (2003).
- [Ste75] J. M. Stewart. “On the Stability of Kerr’s Space-Time”. *Proc. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 344.1636 (1975).
- [STU00] Hisao Suzuki, Eiichi Takasugi, and Hiroshi Umetsu. “Absorption rate of the Kerr-de Sitter black hole and the Kerr-Newman-de Sitter black hole”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 103.4 (2000).
- [STU98] Hisao Suzuki, Eiichi Takasugi, and Hiroshi Umetsu. “Perturbations of Kerr-de Sitter black holes and Heun’s equations”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 100.3 (1998). arXiv: 9805064 [gr-qc].
- [STU99] Hisao Suzuki, Eiichi Takasugi, and Hiroshi Umetsu. “Analytic solutions of the Teukolsky equation in Kerr-de Sitter and Kerr-Newman-de Sitter geometries”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 102.2 (1999). arXiv: 9905040 [gr-qc].
- [TdC20] Rita Teixeira da Costa. “Mode stability for the Teukolsky equation on extremal and subextremal Kerr spacetimes”. *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2020). arXiv: 1910.02854.
- [Teu73] Saul A. Teukolsky. “Perturbations of a Rotating Black Hole. I. Fundamental Equations for Gravitational, Electromagnetic, and Neutrino-Field Perturbations”. *Astrophys. J.* 185 (1973).
- [TM93] Takashi Tachizawa and Kei-ichi Maeda. “Superradiance in the Kerr-de Sitter space-time”. *Phys. Lett. A* 172.5 (1993).
- [Ume00] Hiroshi Umetsu. “A conserved energy integral for perturbation equations in the Kerr-de Sitter geometry”. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 104.4 (2000).
- [Whi89] Bernard F. Whiting. “Mode stability of the Kerr black hole”. *J. Math. Phys.* 30.6 (1989).
- [YUF10] Shijun Yoshida, Nami Uchikata, and Toshifumi Futamase. “Quasinormal modes of Kerr-de Sitter black holes”. *Phys. Rev. D - Part. Fields, Gravit. Cosmol.* 81.4 (2010).