

ON THE BROWN MEASURE OF $x + iy$, WITH x, y SELFADJOINT AND y FREE POISSON

FRANZ LEHNER, ALEXANDRU NICA, KAMIL SZPOJANKOWSKI, AND PING ZHONG

ABSTRACT. Let x, y be freely independent selfadjoint elements in a W^* -probability space, where y has free Poisson distribution of parameter p . We pursue a methodology for computing the absolutely continuous part of the Brown measure of $x + iy$, which relies on the matrix-valued subordination function Ω of the Hermitization of $x + iy$, and on the fact that Ω has an explicitly described left inverse H . Our main point is that the Brown measure of $x + iy$ becomes more approachable when it is reparametrized via a certain change of variable $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, with \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M} open subsets of \mathbb{C} , where \mathcal{D} and h are defined in terms of the aforementioned left inverse H , and $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M})$ contains the support of the Brown measure. More precisely, we find (with some conditions on the distribution of x , which have to be imposed for certain values of the parameter p) the following formula:

$$f(s + it) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\frac{2}{t} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{2}{t} - \frac{2\beta}{t^2} \right], \quad s + it \in \mathcal{M},$$

where f is the density of the absolutely continuous part of the Brown measure and the functions $\alpha, \beta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the real and respectively the imaginary part of h^{-1} .

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of Brown measure, introduced by L.G. Brown in [10], serves as a replacement for the notion of spectral measure which can be considered for non-normal elements in a W^* -probability space. The study of this notion became popular starting with the early 2000's, when it was found that Brown measures can be explicitly computed in special cases described in free probabilistic terms. In some of these special cases, the Brown measure was also found to be the correct predictor for the limit eigenvalue distribution of the corresponding non-Hermitian matrix models. A more detailed review of how the Brown measure is defined and some references to the relevant research literature are given in Section 2.1 below.

Explicit computations of Brown measures are known to be challenging, but the research literature of the last few years has created a gallery of interesting examples where such explicit computations can be carried through. There are two main lines of approach that have been developed towards this purpose. One of these lines (cf. [3, 4, 5, 17, 23]) relies on matrix-valued constructions encoding the non-normal element whose Brown measure is being studied, followed by an analysis of subordination functions for some matrix-valued Cauchy transforms which appear in this way. The other line (cf. [12, 15, 16, 18, 11]) pursues an analysis of partial differential equations which arise in connection with free additive and free multiplicative Brownian motions.

Date: Tuesday 30th December, 2025, 02:35UTC.

FL: This research was funded in part by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) grant I 6232-N BOOMER (WEAVE).

AN: research supported by a Discovery Grant from NSERC, Canada.

KSz: This research was funded in part by National Science Centre, Poland WEAVE-UNISONO grant BOOMER 2022/04/Y/ST1/00008.

PZ: supported in part by NSF grant LEAPS-MPS-2516951 and NSF CAREER Award DMS-2516950.

To put things into perspective, we mention that the first explicit computations of Brown measures in free probabilistic setting were in connection to products $x \cdot y$ where x, y are selfadjoint and freely independent cf. [13, 7]. For same kind of x and y , Brown measures of elements $x + iy$ were also tackled in subsequent work – we mention here the work in [4, 8, 23], where y is the imaginary part of a circular (or more generally elliptic) element free from x , and the one in [15], where y is semicircular.

The present paper, too, considers elements of the form $x + iy$ where x and y are self-adjoint and freely independent. Throughout the paper we assume that y has free Poisson distribution with parameter p , i.e., all its free cumulants of y are equal to p . For such x and y , our main point is that the Brown measure of $x + iy$ is more approachable when it is studied via a certain reparametrization $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, with \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M} open subsets of \mathbb{C} such that the closure $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M})$ contains the support of the Brown measure, and where \mathcal{D}, h are defined by using subordination. This approach is primarily following the first of the two lines mentioned above, via subordination, but also uses some ideas inspired from the PDE approach in [15].

The next subsections present what one might call “a general methodology” underlying our approach. While our discussion is focused on the case when y has free Poisson distribution, we do hope this general methodology will turn out to apply to more examples of elements of the form $x + iy$, including (on a didactical level) the case when y has semicircular distribution.

To be precise, Subsections 1.1-1.3 below outline the main steps of the said general methodology. Throughout these subsections we fix:

- a W^* -probability space (\mathcal{A}, φ) where φ is a faithful trace;
- two selfadjoint elements $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ which are freely independent and where y has free Poisson distribution with parameter $p \in (0, \infty)$.

Our element of interest is $a := x + iy \in \mathcal{A}$. The main result of the paper, concerning the Brown measure of a , is Theorem 1.8 stated in Section 1.3.

1.1. Hermitization, subordination, and the function H .

We consider the W^* -algebra $M_2(\mathcal{A})$ and selfadjoint elements $X, Y, A \in M_2(\mathcal{A})$ defined as

$$(1.1) \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \\ x & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & iy \\ -iy & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a \\ a^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} = X + Y.$$

The matrix A is known as the *hermitization* of the element a .

An easily verified basic fact in matrix-valued free probability is that when one considers the conditional expectation $E : M_2(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C})$ defined by

$$E \left(\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(a_{11}) & \varphi(a_{12}) \\ \varphi(a_{21}) & \varphi(a_{22}) \end{bmatrix},$$

the free independence of x and y in (\mathcal{A}, φ) entails that X, Y from (1.1) are freely independent in the $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ -valued non-commutative probability space $(M_2(\mathcal{A}), E)$. A further, non-trivial, consequence of the latter free independence is that the matrix-valued Cauchy transform of A is subordinated to the one of X . We use standard notation for such Cauchy transforms:

- We denote by \mathbb{H}_2^+ the matrix upper half plane
 $\mathbb{H}_2^+ := \{B \in M_2(\mathbb{C}) \mid \text{Im}(B) \text{ is positive definite and invertible}\},$
and by \mathbb{H}_2^- the lower half plane $\mathbb{H}_2^- := \{-B \mid B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+\}.$
- For $M = M^* \in M_2(\mathcal{A})$ (which could in particular be any of X, Y, A from (1.1)), the Cauchy transform of M is the function $G_M : \mathbb{H}_2^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2^-$ defined by

$$G_M(B) = E((B - M)^{-1}), \quad B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+.$$

In reference to the above notation, the matrix-valued subordination of $A = X + Y$ with respect to X (cf. [22, 2]) is provided by a self-map $\Omega : \mathbb{H}_2^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2^+$ such that

$$G_{X+Y}(B) = G_X(\Omega(B)), \quad \forall B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+.$$

With inspiration from ideas that previously appeared, in the selfadjoint case, in the work of Biane [6], we will take advantage of the fact that the subordination function Ω has a tractable left inverse. For our purposes it is in fact convenient to introduce this left inverse in a self-contained way, as explained in the next proposition.

Proposition and Definition 1.1. *Consider the framework and notation introduced above. We define a function $H : \mathbb{H}_2^+ \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C})$ by putting:*

$$(1.2) \quad H(B) = B + p(J - G_X(B))^{-1}, \quad B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+,$$

where J is the Pauli matrix

$$(1.3) \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then H is well-defined, and one has that $H(\Omega(B)) = B$, $\forall B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$. In words: H is a left inverse for the subordination function Ω of $X + Y$ with respect to X .

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is given in Section 3 below. As we will see there, the formula used to define H in (1.2) is based on the explicit rational formula for the $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ -valued R -transform of Y .

1.2. Definition of the reparametrization $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

Towards describing the reparametrization h announced earlier in the introduction we use matrices $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$ of the form

$$B(\lambda, \zeta) = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & \zeta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

and for such a matrix we let $H_{11}(\lambda, \zeta)$ and $H_{12}(\lambda, \zeta)$ denote the $(1, 1)$ -entry and respectively $(1, 2)$ -entry of $H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$. We next record some special properties of H_{11} .

Proposition 1.2. *Fix a $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Then:*

1^o *There exists a probability measure ρ on \mathbb{R} , depending on λ , such that H_{11} an integral representation*

$$H_{11}(\lambda, \zeta) = \lambda + p \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\rho(t), \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

2^o $\operatorname{Re} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta) = 0$, $\forall \delta \in (0, \infty)$.

3^o *The map*

$$(1.4) \quad \delta \mapsto \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta)}{\delta}$$

is continuous and strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, and has $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta)}{\delta} = 1$.

Proposition 1.2 will be restated and proved in Section 3.1 below. Right now let us accept this proposition and observe that, as implied by its part 3^o, the map (1.4) is sure to also have a limit when $\delta \rightarrow 0$. We use this in order to define the desired pieces of structure $\mathcal{D}, h, \mathcal{M}$ appearing in our reparametrization, as follows.

Definition 1.3. In the same framework as above.

1° We let

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{D} := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta)}{\delta} < 0 \right\}.$$

Then 3° in Proposition 1.2 implies that \mathcal{D} is an open set in \mathbb{C} .

2° Fix $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$. The properties of the function indicated in (1.4) ensure that there exists a number $\delta_0(\lambda) \in (0, \infty)$, uniquely determined, such that $\frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta_0(\lambda))}{\delta_0(\lambda)} = 0$. In view of Proposition 1.2.2°, this number can be equivalently described by its property that

$$(1.6) \quad H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta_0(\lambda)) = 0.$$

We define

$$(1.7) \quad h(\lambda) := H_{12}(\lambda, i\delta_0(\lambda)).$$

3° We put $\mathcal{M} := h(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$.

Remark 1.4.

1° Part 2° of the preceding definition introduces, at the same time with h , a function $\delta_0 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. The function δ_0 will play a significant role in what follows. We record here that the relations defining δ_0 and h can be consolidated in the formula

$$(1.8) \quad H \begin{pmatrix} i\delta_0(\lambda) & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & i\delta_0(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & h(\lambda) \\ \bar{h}(\lambda) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{D}.$$

2° In order to fix the ideas of how \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{M} may look like, Figure 1 shows them in the case when $p = 1$ and x has symmetric Bernoulli distribution. This example is worked out in full detail in Section 1.4 below.

1.3. Properties of $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, and the main theorem.

Proposition 1.5.

- 1° \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{M} are open subsets of \mathbb{C} .
- 2° δ_0 and h are differentiable on \mathcal{D} .
- 3° h is injective (hence a bijection from \mathcal{D} onto \mathcal{M}).
- 4° The function h^{-1} is differentiable on \mathcal{M}

The above proposition summarizes properties of δ_0 and h , which are proved in different sections of this paper: 1° part concerning \mathcal{D} being open is proved in Section 3 and claim about \mathcal{M} being open is proved in section 6 (see Corollary 5.7), 2° is proved in Section 3, proof of 3° is contained in section 6 (see Proposition 5.6), 4° is proved in Section 5.

Assumption 1.6. We make the following assumption

$$\operatorname{spec}(x) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(\mathcal{D}).$$

Remark 1.7. In Section 4 below we will show that Assumption 1.6 is always satisfied when the parameter p of our free Poisson element y is such that $p > 1$. For $p \leq 1$, Section 4 describes some sufficient conditions which, imposed on the distribution of x , ensure that Assumption 1.6 holds.




FIGURE 1. The sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{M} in the case when $p = 1$ and x has symmetric Bernoulli distribution. One gets $\mathcal{D} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : 1 + |\lambda|^2 > |1 - \lambda(\lambda - i)|^2\}$, or, in \mathbb{R}^2 -coordinates:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (\alpha^2 + (1 - \beta)\beta + 1)^2 + (\alpha(\beta - 1) + \alpha\beta)^2 - \alpha^2 - \beta^2 - 1 < 0\}.$$

$$\text{Then } \mathcal{M} = \{(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 4(s^2 - 1)t^3 + 2(s^2 + 1)(s^2 - 1)^2 t^2 + (s^2 - 1)^4 + (s^4 - s^2 + 1)t^4 < 0\}$$

Theorem 1.8. *Consider the framework and notation introduced above (where, in particular, $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is as in Definition 1.3). Then the support of the Brown measure of $x + iy$ is contained in $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M})$, and the density f of the Brown measure at a point $s + it \in \mathcal{M}$ is given by the equation*

$$(1.9) \quad f(s, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\frac{2}{t} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{2}{s} - \frac{2\beta}{s^2} \right],$$

where $\alpha + i\beta = h^{-1}(s + it)$.

1.4. A worked example: x symmetric Bernoulli, y standard free Poisson.

As announced in Remark 1.4 above, we now present what the methodology described in the preceding subsections will concretely amount to, in the special case when the element x has symmetric Bernoulli distribution $\mu_x = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_1 + \delta_{-1})$, and the parameter p of the free Poisson element y is equal to 1. More precisely, we carry out the following computations:

- 1^o Explicit formulas of the left inverse $H(B)$;
- 2^o An algebraic description of the domain \mathcal{D} ;
- 3^o Explicit formulas of the functions h and δ_0 ;
- 4^o An implicit algebraic equation for the support of the Brown measure;
- 5^o An implicit algebraic equation for the spectrum, which is thus shown to coincide with the support of the Brown measure.

1° Due to the special choice for the distribution of x , the Cauchy transform of the matrix $X \in M_2(\mathcal{A})$ from Equation (1.1) comes to

$$G_X(B) = \frac{1}{2} \left((B - K)^{-1} + (B + K)^{-1} \right), \quad B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+,$$

where we denoted $K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. This follows from general fact $G_X(B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (B - tK)^{-1} d\mu_x(t)$, (see [2, p.29]). The function H introduced in Definition 1.1 will thus take here the form

$$H(B) = B + \left(J - \frac{1}{2} \left((B - K)^{-1} + (B + K)^{-1} \right) \right)^{-1}, \quad B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+.$$

2° For $B = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & i\delta \end{bmatrix}$, the explicit formula for the $(1, 1)$ -entry $H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta)$ of $H(B)$ comes out as follows:

$$H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta) = i\delta \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2 + \lambda\bar{\lambda} + 1}{\delta^4 + \delta^2(\lambda(2\bar{\lambda} + i) - i\bar{\lambda} + 3) + (-1 + \lambda(\lambda - i))(-1 + \bar{\lambda}(\bar{\lambda} + i))} \right)$$

Thus, we have

$$(1.10) \quad \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta)}{\delta} = 1 - \frac{\delta^2 + \lambda\bar{\lambda} + 1}{\delta^4 + \delta^2(\lambda(2\bar{\lambda} + i) - i\bar{\lambda} + 3) + (-1 + \lambda(\lambda - i))(-1 + \bar{\lambda}(\bar{\lambda} + i))}.$$

Going next to the definition of \mathcal{D} in Equation (1.5), we see that the $\delta \rightarrow 0$ limit considered there is found, in this particular case, by simply substituting $\delta = 0$ on the right-hand side of (1.10). This gives

$$\mathcal{D} = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : 1 - \frac{|\lambda|^2 + 1}{(1 - \lambda(\lambda - i))(1 - \bar{\lambda}(\bar{\lambda} + i))} < 0 \},$$

which is precisely the domain shown in Figure 1(A) above.

3° Our next goal is to determine the function h . First we have to determine $\delta_0(\lambda)$, that is, we need to find the solution to the equation

$$1 - \frac{\delta^2 + \lambda\bar{\lambda} + 1}{\delta^4 + \delta^2(\lambda(2\bar{\lambda} + i) - i\bar{\lambda} + 3) + (-1 + \lambda(\lambda - i))(-1 + \bar{\lambda}(\bar{\lambda} + i))} = 0.$$

The latter equation can be re-written as an algebraic equation of degree 4 in δ . Among its four solutions, only one maps the imaginary axis to the real axis (which is a necessary property of the mapping δ_0) and we obtain

$$\delta_0(\lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{\sqrt{3\lambda^2 + 10\lambda\bar{\lambda} + 3\bar{\lambda}^2 + 4} - 2\lambda\bar{\lambda} - i\lambda + i\bar{\lambda} - 2}}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Since $h(\lambda)$ is the $(1, 2)$ -entry in $H \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\delta_0(\lambda) & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & i\delta_0(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \right)$, substituting the above $\delta_0(\lambda)$ into the explicit formula for H gives

$$h(\lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{(3\lambda + \bar{\lambda})(\lambda + 3\bar{\lambda}) + 4} + \lambda(2\lambda - i) + \bar{\lambda}(-2\bar{\lambda} + i)}{2(\lambda + \bar{\lambda} - i)}.$$

4° Based on the above we find the equation of the boundary of $\mathcal{M} = h(\mathcal{D})$ which comes out as shown in the caption of Figure 1. We repeat Figure 1(b), by also showing the eigenvalues of a sample of a random matrix model, confirming the heuristically expected

result that Brown measure is approximated by eigenvalues of non-normal matrices. Here we took matrices of size $N \times N$ with $N = 2000$ and X_N diagonal with half eigenvalues -1 and half 1 and Y_N being the Wishart random matrix that is $Y_N = \frac{1}{N} G_N G_N^*$ where G_N is a GUE matrix and calculate the eigenvalues of $X_N + iY_N$.




FIGURE 2. The blue line represents the boundary of \mathcal{M} . The red dots are the eigenvalues of the matrix approximation $X_N + iY_n$.

To get the explicit formula for the density one has to invert $h(\alpha + i\beta) = s + it$, that is write α and β as functions of s and t

We see that

$$h(\alpha + i\beta) = \frac{\sqrt{4\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 1} + 4i\alpha\beta + \beta}{2\alpha - i}.$$

Separating real and imaginary part we arrive at the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} s = \frac{2\alpha(\sqrt{4\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 1} - \beta)}{4\alpha^2 + 1} \\ t = \frac{\sqrt{4\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 1} + 8\alpha^2\beta + \beta}{4\alpha^2 + 1}. \end{cases}$$

Solving this system we obtain

$$\alpha = \frac{st}{2(1-s^2)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{s^2 + t^2 - 1}{2t}.$$

From Theorem 1.8 we obtain that for $s + it \in \mathcal{M}$ the density of the Brown measure of the element $x + iy$ is given by

$$f(s, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{1-s^2}{t^2} + \frac{(1+s^2)t}{2(1-s^2)^2} - 1 \right).$$




FIGURE 3. Density of the Brown measure of $x+iy$. Observe that the density has unbounded limits at ± 1 ; this matches how eigenvalues were concentrated around those points in Figure 2.

5° We conclude by showing that in the present example the support of the Brown measure coincides with the spectrum. Indeed using resolvent estimates from [19] one can compute the outer boundary of the spectrum of $x+iy$ and show that it is equal to the boundary of the support of the Brown measure. More precisely, given arbitrary (not necessarily selfadjoint) $*$ -free random variables a_1 and a_2 , denote by $f(\zeta_1) = M_{a_1}(\zeta_1)$ and $g(\zeta_2) = M_{a_2}(\zeta_2)$ their moment generating functions. Pick numbers ζ_1, ζ_2 in the respective domains of convergence such that $\zeta_1 f(\zeta_1) = \zeta_2 g(\zeta_2) \neq 0$. Then the resolvent of $a_1 + a_2$ at

$$(1.11) \quad z = \frac{1}{\zeta_1} + \frac{1}{\zeta_2} - \frac{1}{\zeta_1 f(\zeta_1)}$$

can be written as

$$(1.12) \quad z - a_1 - a_2 = \frac{g(\zeta_2)}{\zeta_1} (1 - \zeta_1 a_1) \left(1 - \frac{\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1) \dot{a}_2(\zeta_2)}{f(\zeta_1) g(\zeta_2)} \right) (1 - \zeta_2 a_2)$$

where $\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1) = (1 - \zeta_1 a_1)^{-1} - f(\zeta_1)$ and $\dot{a}_2(\zeta_2) = (1 - \zeta_2 a_2)^{-1} - g(\zeta_2)$ are the centered resolvents of a_1 and a_2 . Then [19, Proposition 4.2] provides the following criteria:

- (i) if $\|\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1)\|_2 \|\dot{a}_2(\zeta_2)\|_2 < |f(\zeta_1)g(\zeta_2)|$ then $z \notin \text{spec}(a_1 + a_2)$
- (ii) if $\|\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1)\|_2 \|\dot{a}_2(\zeta_2)\|_2 = |f(\zeta_1)g(\zeta_2)|$ then $z \in \text{bd}(\text{spec}(a_1 + a_2))$ unless (1.11) has a solution satisfying (i).

That is, the region

$$\left\{ z = \frac{1}{\zeta_1} + \frac{1}{\zeta_2} - \frac{1}{\zeta_1 f(\zeta_1)} \mid \|\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1)\|_2 \|\dot{a}_2(\zeta_2)\|_2 < |f(\zeta_1)g(\zeta_2)| \right\}$$

is part of the resolvent set of $a_1 + a_2$ and its boundary is part of the curve

$$\left\{ z = \frac{1}{\zeta_1} + \frac{1}{\zeta_2} - \frac{1}{\zeta_1 f(\zeta_1)} \mid \|\dot{a}_1(\zeta_1)\|_2 \|\dot{a}_2(\zeta_2)\|_2 = |f(\zeta_1)g(\zeta_2)| \right\}$$

and contained in the spectrum of $a_1 + a_2$.

Carrying out the calculations for $a_1 = x$ and $a_2 = iy$ one arrives at the following algebraic equation for the boundary of the spectrum of $x + iy$:

$$(1.13) \quad s^8 + 2s^6t^2 + s^4t^4 - 4s^6 - 2s^4t^2 - s^2t^4 + 4s^2t^3 + 6s^4 - 2s^2t^2 + s^4 - 4t^3 - 4s^2 + 2t^2 + 1 = 0.$$

It coincides with the boundary of the region \mathcal{M} from Fig. 1 and thus the support of the Brown measure fills the full spectrum.

Remark 1.9. The plane algebraic curve described by the equation (1.13) has genus 1, i.e., it is an elliptic curve. It follows that it is birationally equivalent to a cubic equation [21] and therefore has a rational parametrization in terms of the Weierstrass elliptic function \wp and its derivative [20].

1.5. Comments around some technical aspects of the paper.

The explicit description of the density requires several technical steps not described above.

- Taking advantage of the explicit form of the left inverse H , we extend Ω to a neighborhood of $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & z \\ \bar{z} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ for every $z \in \mathcal{M}$. This step relies on the Inverse Function Theorem, which in turn means that we need to prove that some Jacobians are nonzero.
- The above implies that we can extend the Cauchy transform of $X + Y$ and for $z \in \mathcal{M}$ have

$$G_{X+Y} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & z \\ \bar{z} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = G_X \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\delta_0(\lambda) & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & i\delta_0(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

with $z = h(\lambda)$ and $\delta_0(\lambda) > 0$.

- Relations between L_{x+iy} and the operator valued Cauchy transform, and the above regularity of G_{X+Y} allow us to show that the function

$$(s, t, \varepsilon) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s + it, \varepsilon)$$

extends to a real analytic function in some neighborhood of $(s, t, 0)$ for $s + it \in \mathcal{M}$.

- In order to conclude that the Brown measure is supported inside $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M})$ we extend δ_0 and h beyond $\text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ and show that h is holomorphic there.

1.6. Organization of the paper.

Besides this introduction, the paper has 5 other sections:

- In Section 2 we present background.
- Section 3 provides the details of the function H_{11} and properties of δ_0 and h inside and outside \mathcal{D} .
- In Section 4 we discuss Assumption 1.6.
- In Section 5 we study positivity of the Jacobians inside and outside the domain \mathcal{D} .
- In Section 6 we show real analyticity of L_{x+iy} and prove the main Theorem 1.8, deriving the formula for the density of the Brown measure.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Brown measure.

Let (\mathcal{A}, φ) be a W^* -probability space, and let $a \in \mathcal{A}$. The Fuglede-Kadison determinant $\Delta(a)$ is defined by

$$\log \Delta(a) = \varphi(\log(|a|)),$$

where $|a| = \sqrt{a^*a}$ by functional calculus. Brown showed in [10] that the function $z \mapsto \log \Delta(z - a)$ is a subharmonic function on the complex plane \mathbb{C} . The Brown measure of a is the unique probability measure μ_a on \mathbb{C} determined by the identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} \log |z - \lambda| d\mu_a(\lambda) = \log \Delta(z - a).$$

We denote the logarithmic moment by

$$L_a(z) = \varphi(\log(|z - a|)),$$

and its regularization by

$$L_a(z, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \varphi(\log(|z - a|^2 + \varepsilon^2)).$$

The Brown measure can be calculated, in distributional sense, by

$$\mu_a = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} L_a(z).$$

The regularized Brown measure of a with parameter ε is calculated as

$$\mu_{a, \varepsilon} = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} L_a(z, \varepsilon).$$

It is known that $\mu_{a, \varepsilon} \rightarrow \mu_a$ weakly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The reader is referred to [10, 14, 3] for details.

2.2. Matrix valued subordination.

We will rely on results from [22, 2] concerning the existence and properties of subordination functions in the operator-valued setting (cf. Theorem 2.2 of [2]). We apply these results in the framework described in Subsection 1.1; recall that X and Y are free with amalgamation over the algebra $M_2(\mathbb{C})$.

In this framework, there exists a Fréchet-analytic map

$$\Omega: \mathbb{H}_2^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_2^+$$

such that:

- (1) $\text{Im } \Omega(B) \geq \text{Im } B$ for all $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$;
- (2) $G_{X+Y}(B) = G_X(\Omega(B))$ for all $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$.

In the next subsection, we study the subordination function Ω and its left inverse in greater detail, focusing on the special case where Y is a free Poisson random variable with parameter $p > 0$.

2.3. Free Poisson elements – the subordination function and its left inverse.

Lemma 2.1. *Let y be a free Poisson random variable with rate $\theta = 1$ and jump size $p > 0$.*

1° *The operator-valued free cumulants of Y are given by*

$$(2.1) \quad \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(YB, \dots, YB, Y) = p(JB)^{n-1}J, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } B \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$$

where J is the Pauli matrix (1.3).

2° *The R-transform of Y is rational $R_Y(B) = p(J - B)^{-1}$ and has an immediate analytic continuation to $\mathbb{H}_2^+ \cup \mathbb{H}_2^-$.*

Proof. 1° We write $Y = Y_o J$ with $Y_o := \begin{bmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{bmatrix}$, and we note that Y_o commutes with every matrix in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$. So then $\kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(YB, \dots, YB, Y) = \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o(JB), \dots, Y_o(JB), Y_o J)$, where we observe that on the right-hand side all the occurrences of the matrix $JB \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$ can be pulled towards left until they become pre-factors. For example, in order to pull out the first two occurrences of JB we go as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o(JB), Y_o(JB), \dots) &= \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}((JB)Y_o, (JB)Y_o, \dots) \\ &= (JB) \cdot \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o, (JB)Y_o, \dots) \quad (\text{left module property of } \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}) \\ &= (JB) \cdot \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o(JB), Y_o, \dots) \quad (\text{balancing property of } \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}) \\ &= (JB) \cdot \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}((JB)Y_o, Y_o, \dots) \\ &= (JB)^2 \cdot \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o, Y_o, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

The outcome of pulling all the JB factors to the left is that

$$(2.2) \quad \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(YB, \dots, YB, Y) = (JB)^{n-1} \cdot \kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o, \dots, Y_o, Y_o) \cdot J.$$

On the other hand, the special form of Y_o immediately implies that

$$\kappa_n^{\mathcal{B}}(Y_o, \dots, Y_o, Y_o) = \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_n(y) & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa_n(y) \end{bmatrix} = \kappa_n(y) I_2 = pI_2, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and substituting this into (2.2) gives the required formula (2.1).

2° For $\|B\| < 1$ we have

$$R_Y(B) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \kappa_{n+1}^{\mathcal{B}}(Yb, \dots, YB, Y) = \sum_{n \geq 0} p(JB)^n J = p(J - B)^{-1}.$$

Note that for B such that $\text{Im } B < 0$ we have $\text{Im}(J - B)^{-1} > 0$ and the map $B \mapsto (J - B)^{-1}$ is a 2×2 matrix-valued analytic function of $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^-$. By the uniqueness of analytic extension, we have $R_Y(B) = p(J - B)^{-1}$ for any $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^-$. An analogous argument holds for $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$. \square

Using the above, and the fact that Ω is analytic it is easy to show that the mapping $B \mapsto B - R_Y(G_{X+Y}(B))$ satisfies the requirements for subordination as described in Sub-section 2.2 hence we get the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose y is a free Poisson element. For any $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$ we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \Omega(B) = B - R_Y(G_{X+Y}(B)).$$

For $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$ and $p > 0$ we define

$$(2.4) \quad H(B) = B + R_Y(G_X(B)) = B + p(J - G_X(B))^{-1}.$$

\square

Lemma 2.3. *The identity*

$$(2.5) \quad H(\Omega(B)) = B$$

holds for arbitrary $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$.

Proof. Using $G_{X+Y}(B) = G_X(\Omega(B))$ we can rewrite (2.3) as

$$\Omega(B) = B - R_Y(G_X(\Omega(B)))$$

and the required result follows for $B \in \mathbb{H}_2^+$. \square

3. PROPERTIES OF THE FUNCTIONS δ_0 AND h

3.1. Proof of Proposition 1.2.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$ be a unit vector. Then there exists a constant C , a Borel measure ρ on \mathbb{R} , depending on λ and the vector v , such that*

$$(3.1) \quad p \cdot \langle (J - G_X(B(\lambda, \zeta)))^{-1}v, v \rangle = C + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{\zeta - t} + \frac{t}{1+t^2} \right) d\rho(t),$$

where ρ satisfying the growth condition $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+t^2} d\rho(t) < \infty$.

Proof. Let $\eta_v = \langle Av, v \rangle$ be the vector state on $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ induced by v . We define a function f_v on \mathbb{C} such that

$$f_v(\zeta) = \eta_v((J - G_X(B(\lambda, \zeta)))^{-1}) = \langle (J - G_X(B(\lambda, \zeta)))^{-1}v, v \rangle.$$

Denote by $G_{X,ij}(B)$ the (ij) -th entry of $G_X(B)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (J - G_X(B))^{-1} &= \begin{bmatrix} -G_{X,11}(B) & i - G_{X,12}(B) \\ -i - G_{X,21}(B) & -G_{X,22}(B) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det(\lambda, \zeta)} \begin{bmatrix} -G_{X,22}(B) & -i + G_{X,12}(B) \\ i + G_{X,21}(B) & -G_{X,11}(B) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\det(\lambda, \zeta) = G_{X,11}(B) \cdot G_{X,22}(B) + (i - G_{X,12}(B))(i + G_{X,21}(B)).$$

We note that $\text{Im } G_X(B) < 0$ and hence $\text{Im}(J - G_X(B))^{-1} < 0$. It follows that

$$\text{Im } f_v(\zeta) = \text{Im}(\eta_v((J - G_X(B))^{-1})) < 0.$$

Note that each entry $G_{X,ij}$ is a holomorphic function of ζ defined on \mathbb{C}^+ . Hence, the function $\zeta \mapsto f_v(\zeta)$ is a holomorphic function defined on \mathbb{C}^+ taking values on \mathbb{C}^- .

We can check directly that $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} G_{ij}(B(\lambda, \zeta)) = 0$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Hence,

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} \det(\lambda, \zeta) = -1.$$

In addition,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_v(i\varepsilon)}{i\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_v((J - G_X(B(\lambda, i\varepsilon)))^{-1})}{i\varepsilon} = 0.$$

By Nevanlinna integral representation theorem, there exist a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and a Borel measure on \mathbb{R} such that (3.1) holds. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. We note that

$$G_{X,11}(B(\lambda, i\delta)) = G_{X,22}(B(\lambda, i\delta)) = -i\delta\tau((|\lambda - x|^2 + \delta^2)^{-1}),$$

and $G_{X,21}(B(\lambda, i\delta)) = \overline{G_{X,12}(B(\lambda, i\delta))}$. It follows that $\text{Re } H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\delta)) = 0$ for any $\delta \in (0, \infty)$.

By choosing the unit vector $v = [1 \ 0]^T$, we have

$$H_{11}(B(\lambda, \zeta)) = \lambda + p \cdot [(J - G_X(B(\lambda, \zeta)))^{-1}]_{11} = \lambda - \frac{p \cdot G_{X,22}(B(\lambda, \zeta))}{\det(\lambda, \zeta)}.$$

Note that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty} i\varepsilon \cdot G_X(B(\lambda, i\varepsilon)) = 1$. By applying Lemma 3.1 and Nevanlinna integral representation theorem, there exists a probability measure ρ such that

$$H_{11}(B(\lambda, \zeta)) = \lambda + p \cdot \langle (J - G_X(B(\lambda, \zeta)))^{-1}v, v \rangle = \lambda + p \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\zeta - t} d\rho(t).$$

For $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\delta))}{\delta} = 1 - p \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\delta^2 + t^2} d\rho(t)$$

which is a strictly increasing function of $\delta \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\delta))}{\delta} = 1.$$

□

3.2. Extension of δ_0 and h .

Following Proposition 1.2 and Definition 1.3, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists a unique $\delta_0(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(\lambda, i\delta_0(\lambda))}{\delta_0(\lambda)} = 0.$$

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}$, we set $\delta_0(\lambda) = 0$.

Proposition 3.2. *The function $\lambda \mapsto \delta_0(\lambda)$ is continuous on \mathbb{C} . Moreover, it is differentiable in the open set \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. Recall that \mathcal{D} is an open set and for $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$ the value $\delta_0(\lambda)$ is uniquely determined by (3.2). By Proposition 1.2 and the implicit function theorem, the function $\lambda \mapsto \delta_0(\lambda)$ is differentiable throughout the domain \mathcal{D} .

Suppose λ is on the boundary of the set \mathcal{D} and $\{\lambda_n\}$ is a sequence of complex numbers in \mathcal{D} and $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$. We claim that

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_0(\lambda_n) = \delta_0(\lambda) = 0.$$

Suppose this is not true. Dropping to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\delta_0(\lambda_n) > \varepsilon_0$. Then by the monotonicity result in Proposition 1.2, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda_n, i\delta_0(\lambda_n)))}{\delta_0(\lambda_n)} > \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda_n, i\varepsilon_0))}{\varepsilon_0}.$$

By the definition of H in (1.2), since $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{11}(B(\lambda_n, i\varepsilon_0)) = H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\varepsilon_0)).$$

Then (3.4) and Proposition (1.2) imply that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\varepsilon))}{\varepsilon} < \frac{\operatorname{Im} H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\varepsilon_0))}{\varepsilon_0} \leq 0.$$

This contradicts to our assumption that λ is on the boundary of \mathcal{D} . This shows δ_0 is a continuous function in \mathbb{C} . □

Proposition 3.3. *Under Assumption 1.6 the function h is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ and, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, h can be written as*

$$h(\lambda) = \lambda - \frac{p}{i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)}$$

where $G_{\mu_x}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\lambda - u} d\mu_x(u)$. Moreover, h is injective and Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$.

Proof. By Assumption 1.6 for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ we have $\lambda \notin \text{spec}(x)$. Note that $\delta_0(\lambda) = 0$. We have

$$G_X \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & G_{\mu_x}(\bar{\lambda}) \\ G_{\mu_x}(\lambda) & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Recall that $H(b) = b + p(J - G_X(b))^{-1}$ where $J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Hence,

$$h(\lambda) = H_{12} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \lambda - \frac{p}{i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)}.$$

We note that since $\lambda \notin \text{spec}(x)$ we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \det(J - G_X(B(\lambda, i\delta))) = \det(J - G_X(B(\lambda, 0))) = -|i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)|^2,$$

and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im } H_{11}(B(\lambda, i\delta))}{\delta} = 1 - \frac{p \cdot \varphi[(|\lambda - x|^2)^{-1}]}{|i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)|^2}$$

By the definition of \mathcal{D} for $\lambda \notin \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\lambda - u|^2} d\mu_x(u)}{|i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)|^2} \leq \frac{1}{p}.$$

Suppose $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\lambda_1) - h(\lambda_2) &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) + p \frac{G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_1) - G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_2)}{(i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_1))(i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_2))} \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)p \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_1 - u)(\lambda_2 - u)} d\mu_x(u)}{(i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_1))(i + G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_2))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_1 - u)(\lambda_2 - u)} d\mu_x(u) \right|^2 \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\lambda_1 - u|^2} d\mu_x(u) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\lambda_2 - u|^2} d\mu_x(u) \right),$$

and the inequality is strict unless μ_x is concentrated in a single point. By combining with inequality (3.5), we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_1 - u)(\lambda_2 - u)} d\mu_x(u)}{(-i - G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_1))(-i - G_{\mu_x}(\lambda_2))} \right| < \frac{1}{p}.$$

Therefore, we have $h(\lambda_1) \neq h(\lambda_2)$. The above estimation also shows that $|h(\lambda_1) - h(\lambda_2)| < 2|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$. \square

3.3. H is the bilateral inverse of Ω .

The following result is an analogue of [1, Lemma 4.2].

Proposition 3.4. *Given $B = B(\lambda, \zeta) = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & \zeta \end{bmatrix}$ with $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+$, if $\text{Im } H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) > 0$, then $\text{Im } H(B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon)) > 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, for such B ,*

$$(3.6) \quad \Omega_1(H(B)) = B.$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad G_{X+Y}(H(B)) = G_X(B),$$

Proof. For λ fixed, under the assumption that $\operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) > 0$, we will first show that

$$(3.8) \quad \operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon)) > 0$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Let v be a unit vector in \mathbb{C}^2 . By (3.1) in Lemma 3.1, there exist a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and a Borel measure ρ of such that

$$\langle H(B(\lambda, \zeta))v, v \rangle = \langle B(\lambda, \zeta)v, v \rangle + C + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{\zeta - t} + \frac{t}{1+t^2} \right) d\rho(t).$$

Note that $\operatorname{Im}(\langle B(\lambda, \zeta)v, v \rangle) = \operatorname{Im} \zeta$. Hence,

$$\operatorname{Im} \langle H(B(\lambda, \zeta_1 + i\varepsilon))v, v \rangle = \zeta_2 \left(1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\zeta_2^2 + (\zeta_1 - t)^2} d\rho(t) \right).$$

Hence, the map $\zeta_2 \mapsto \frac{\operatorname{Im}(\langle H(B(\lambda, \zeta_1 + i\varepsilon))v, v \rangle)}{\zeta_2}$ is an increasing function on $(0, \infty)$. Since this is true for any vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$, it follows that if $\operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) > 0$, we then must also have $\operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon)) > 0$.

We remark that for ε sufficiently large, by the inverse function theorem we have $\Omega[H(B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon))] = B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon)$. We note that the set $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) > 0\}$ is an open set. Moreover, each entry of $H(B(\lambda, \delta))$ is a holomorphic function of ζ in the entire upper half plane \mathbb{C}^+ . By the identity principle for analytic functions, we conclude that

$$\Omega[H(B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon))] = B(\lambda, \zeta + i\varepsilon)$$

for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$. In particular, $\Omega(H(B)) = B$ for $B = B(\lambda, \zeta)$. Thus $\operatorname{Im} H(B(\lambda, \zeta)) > 0$ implies

$$G_{X+Y}(H(B)) = G_X(\Omega(H(B))) = G_X(B).$$

□

Corollary 3.5. *The image of the subordination function Ω can be described as follows*

$$\Omega(\{B(z, i\varepsilon) : z \in \mathbb{C}, \varepsilon > 0\}) = \{B(\lambda, i\delta) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \delta > \delta_0(\lambda)\}.$$

4. DISCUSSION OF THE TECHNICAL ASSUMPTIONS

In this section we discuss the Assumption 1.6, that $\operatorname{spec}(x) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, and we show that it is satisfied in a number of examples.

Notation and Remark 4.1. Consider some numbers $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \in (0, \infty)$. It will be convenient to express the upcoming formulas in terms of the following functions:

$$(4.1) \quad S = S(\alpha, \beta, \delta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\alpha - t}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t),$$

$$(4.2) \quad T = T(\alpha, \beta, \delta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t),$$

$$(4.3) \quad D = D(\alpha, \beta, \delta) := \delta^2 T^2 + S^2 + (1 - \beta T)^2.$$

An easy calculation shows that the Cauchy transform of X at $B = B(\alpha + i\beta, i\delta) = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \alpha + i\beta \\ \alpha - i\beta & i\delta \end{bmatrix}$ is

$$G_X \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \alpha + i\beta \\ \alpha - i\beta & i\delta \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} -i\delta T & S + i\beta T \\ S - i\beta T & -i\delta T \end{bmatrix},$$

with the further consequence that

$$\begin{aligned} (J - G_X(B))^{-1} &= \begin{bmatrix} i\delta T & -S + i(1 - \beta T) \\ -S - i(1 - \beta T) & i\delta T \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= -\frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} i\delta T & S - i(1 - \beta T) \\ S + i(1 - \beta T) & i\delta T \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $H(B) = B + p(J - G_X(B))^{-1}$, we thus get

$$(4.4) \quad H(B) = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta(1 - p\frac{T}{D}) & \alpha - p\frac{S}{D} + i\left(\beta + p\frac{1-\beta T}{D}\right) \\ \alpha - p\frac{S}{D} - i\left(\beta + p\frac{1-\beta T}{D}\right) & i\delta(1 - p\frac{T}{D}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Remark 4.2. Some further observations related to the above.

1° Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, the definition provided by Equation (1.5) of the fact that $\alpha + i\beta \in \mathcal{D}$ now amounts to $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{D(\alpha, \beta, \delta)} > \frac{1}{p}$.

2° When $\beta = 0$ we have

$$S(\alpha, 0, \delta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\alpha - t}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t), \quad T(\alpha, 0, \delta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t).$$

Observe that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$(4.5) \quad S(\alpha, 0, \delta)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha - t)^2}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(\alpha - t)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu_x(t) \leq 1 \cdot T(\alpha, 0, \delta).$$

We thus record the inequality

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{S(\alpha, 0, \delta)^2}{T(\alpha, 0, \delta)} \leq 1,$$

where we also note that (4.6) holds with equality if and only if μ_x is concentrated at a point.

We now take on the topic of the section and we first give a simple sufficient condition for Assumption 1.6 to hold, in the case when μ_x is purely discrete.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that μ_x is purely discrete, with at least two atoms, and y is free Poisson element with parameter $p > 0$. If $\max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\mu_x(\{t\}) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} < p$ then $\text{spec}(x) \subset \mathcal{D}$. In particular if $p > 1$, then Assumption 1.6 is satisfied for any discrete measure μ_x with at least two atoms.*

Proof. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow t} (z - t) G_{\mu_x}(z) = \mu_x(\{t\}).$$

Taking $z = t + \delta i$ we can write

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta i (S(t, 0, \delta) - \delta T(t, 0, \delta) i) = \mu_x(\{t\}).$$

This shows that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta S(t, 0, \delta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta^2 T(t, 0, \delta) = \mu_x(\{t\}).$$

Take the point $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ which is an atom of μ_x . We need to show that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T}{D} > \frac{1}{p}$. From (4.7) we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \delta T(\alpha, 0, \delta) = +\infty.$$

Hence we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{S(\alpha, 0, \delta)^2}{T(\alpha, 0, \delta)} = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\delta^2 S(\alpha, 0, \delta)^2}{\delta^2 T(\alpha, 0, \delta)} = 0.$$

Since $\mu_x(\{\alpha\}) \in (0, 1)$, we then have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{p \cdot T(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{D(\alpha, \beta, \delta)} = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} p \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{T(t, 0, \delta)} + \frac{S(t, 0, \delta)^2}{T(t, 0, \delta)} + \delta^2 T(t, 0, \delta)} \right) = \frac{p}{\mu_x(\{\alpha\})} > 1,$$

by our assumption. \square

Remark 4.4. For $p < 1$, one has $\mu_y(\{0\}) = 1 - p$. So, for such p : by analogy to the selfadjoint case, one might expect that if μ_x has an atom $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\mu_x(\{\alpha\}) + (1 - p) > 1$ (that is, with $\mu_x(\{\alpha\}) > p$), then the Brown measure μ_{x+iy} has an atom at α , of mass $\mu_x(\{\alpha\}) - p$. We will study this question in another project.

On the other hand, if $p > \max_t \{\mu_x(\{t\}) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ then we expect that μ_{x+iy} has no atom. We will clarify this in later section.

The next proposition gives a sufficient condition on measure μ_x under which $\text{spec}(x) \subset \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ for $p \leq 1$. We require that a stronger inequality than Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (4.6) to hold uniformly at any point in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that $\max_t \{\mu_x(\{t\}) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} < p$ and for any $\alpha \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, there exist $\varepsilon_0(\alpha) \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(4.8) \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{S(\alpha, 0, \delta)^2}{T(\alpha, 0, \delta)} < p - \varepsilon_0(\alpha)$$

in some neighborhood of α , then $\text{spec}(x) \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$.

Remark 4.6. Observe that because of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (4.5) inequality (4.8) is satisfied for any μ_x whenever $p > 1$.

Proof. The arguments of the proof of Proposition 4.3 imply that all atoms of μ_x are contained in \mathcal{D} .

With notations from (4.1) and (4.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu_x}(t + \delta i) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{t + \delta i - x} d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(t - x)}{(t - x)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu(x) - \delta i \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(t - x)^2 + \delta^2} d\mu(x) \\ &= S(t, 0, \delta) - \delta T(t, 0, \delta)i. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 1.2 guarantees that the limit

$$(4.9) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T(t, 0, \delta)}{1 + S(t, 0, \delta)^2 + (\delta T(t, 0, \delta))^2}$$

exists.

We denote

$$R(t) := \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{S(t, 0, \delta)^2}{T(t, 0, \delta)}.$$

Suppose now $t_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$. Then by assumption (4.8) there is an open interval $(t_1, t_2) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ containing t_0 and we have $R(t) < 1 - \varepsilon_0(t_0)$ for $t \in (t_1, t_2)$. To show that $\text{spec}(x) \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, it suffices to prove that $\mu_x((t_1, t_2)) = 0$.

Note that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{T(t, 0, \delta)} = \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(t-x)^2} d\mu(x)} \in [0, \infty).$$

By the definition of \mathcal{D} for any $t \in (t_1, t_2)$, since $t \notin \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{T(t, 0, \delta)}{1 + S(t, 0, \delta)^2 + (\delta T(t, 0, \delta))^2} \leq \frac{1}{p},$$

which can be rewritten as

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{T(t, 0, \delta)} + \frac{S(t, 0, \delta)^2}{T(t, 0, \delta)} + \delta^2 T(t, 0, \delta)} \leq \frac{1}{p}.$$

By Proposition 4.3 there is no atom in the open set (t_1, t_2) .

Since $(t_1, t_2) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$, then (t_1, t_2) does not contain any atom of μ_x . Hence by (4.7), $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^2 T(t, 0, \delta) = 0$. Then by (4.10) and a simple calculation, we then have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(t-x)^2} d\mu(x) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} T(t, 0, \delta) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0(t_0)}.$$

Integrating over the interval (t_1, t_2) we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(t-x)^2} d\mu(x) dt \leq \frac{t_2 - t_1}{\varepsilon_0(t_0)} < \infty.$$

Restricting the second integral to (t_1, t_2) and changing the order of the integration, we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{(t-x)^2} dt \right) d\mu(x) < \infty.$$

This forces that $\mu((t_1, t_2)) = 0$. We then conclude that $t_0 \notin \text{spec}(x)$. Therefore, $\text{spec}(x) \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *If $\text{spec}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ then (4.8) is satisfied and the boundary of the domain \mathcal{D} is*

$$(4.11) \quad \text{bd}(\mathcal{D}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{T}{(1 - \beta T)^2 + (S)^2 + (\delta T)^2} = \frac{1}{p} \right\}$$

Proof. If $\alpha + i\beta \in (\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{spec}(x)) \subset (\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D}))$, then the function $\frac{T(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{D(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}$ is continuous in some neighborhood of $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$. It is clear that (4.11) holds in this case. \square

5. NON-VANISHING JACOBIANS

In this section, we consider the mapping H on matrices of the form $B(\alpha + i\beta, i\delta) = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \alpha + i\beta \\ \alpha - i\beta & i\delta \end{bmatrix}$ where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$. As discussed before, the image of H has the same structure: the $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ entries coincide and are purely imaginary with positive imaginary part, while the $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 1)$ entries are complex conjugates of each other.

This structural preservation allows us to view H as a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^+$ to itself, we denote this mapping by \widehat{H} .

Recall the definitions of S and T in (4.1) and (4.2). It is useful to record derivatives of S and T with respect to α, β, δ .

Proposition 5.1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial S}{\partial \alpha} &= T - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha - t)^2}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t), \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} &= -2\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\alpha - t}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t) \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta} &= -2\delta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\alpha - t}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t), \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} &= -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\alpha - t}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t), \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} &= -2\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t) \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} &= -2\delta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{((\alpha - t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu_x(t).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\beta}{\delta} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta}$ likewise $\frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\beta}{\delta} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta}$.

5.1. Jacobian inside the domain.

Recall that for $B = B(\alpha + i\beta, i\delta)$, we have

$$H(B) = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta \left(1 - p \frac{T}{D}\right) & \alpha - p \frac{S}{D} + i \left(\beta + p \frac{1 - \beta T}{D}\right) \\ \alpha - p \frac{S}{D} - i \left(\beta + p \frac{1 - \beta T}{D}\right) & i\delta \left(1 - p \frac{T}{D}\right) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $D = D(\alpha, \beta, \delta) = \delta^2 T^2 + S^2 + (1 - \beta T)^2$.

Proposition 5.2. *For any $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ denote*

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) &= H_{12} \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \alpha + i\beta \\ \alpha - i\beta & i\delta \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ \widehat{H}_{11}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) &= H_{11} \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\delta & \alpha + i\beta \\ \alpha - i\beta & i\delta \end{bmatrix} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Consider the mapping

$$\widehat{H} : \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \delta \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re} \left(\widehat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) \right) \\ \operatorname{Im} \left(\widehat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) \right) \\ \operatorname{Im} \left(\widehat{H}_{11}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) \right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $\alpha + i\beta \in \mathcal{D}$ fix $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\alpha + i\beta) > 0$ we have

$$\det(J_{\widehat{H}}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0)) > 0.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\widehat{H}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha - p \frac{S}{(1 - \beta T)^2 + S^2 + (\delta T)^2} \\ \beta + p \frac{1 - \beta T}{(1 - \beta T)^2 + S^2 + (\delta T)^2} \\ \delta - p \frac{\delta T}{(1 - \beta T)^2 + S^2 + (\delta T)^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha - \frac{pS}{D} \\ \beta + \frac{p(1 - \beta T)}{D} \\ \delta - \frac{p\delta T}{D} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\lambda = \alpha + \beta i$ belongs to \mathcal{D} our choice of $\delta_0(\lambda) > 0$ implies that $\frac{T}{D} = \frac{T(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\lambda))}{D(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\lambda))} = \frac{1}{p}$.

Before we write the Jacobian let us first simplify some of its entries. We calculate first the derivative of the first component with respect to α .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \operatorname{Re}(\hat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta))}{\partial \alpha} &= 1 - p \frac{\frac{\partial S}{\partial \alpha}}{D} + p \frac{S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha}}{D^2} \\ &= 1 - p \frac{T}{D} + 2p \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-x)^2}{((\alpha-x)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(x)}{D} + p \frac{S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha}}{D^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Where in the last equality we used Proposition 5.1. As we observed $1 - p \frac{T}{D} = 0$, hence finally we get

$$\frac{\partial \hat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{\partial \alpha} = 2p \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-x)^2}{((\alpha-x)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(x)}{D} + p \frac{S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha}}{D^2}.$$

Now we calculate the derivative of second component with respect to β

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \operatorname{Im}(\hat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta))}{\partial \beta} &= 1 + p \frac{(-T - \beta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta})D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta}(1 - \beta T)}{D^2} \\ &= -p \frac{\beta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta}}{D} - p \frac{\frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta}(1 - \beta T)}{D^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the derivative of the third component with respect to δ we get

$$\frac{\partial \operatorname{Im} \hat{H}_{11}(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{\partial \delta} = 1 - p \frac{T}{D} - p \delta \frac{\frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} T}{D^2} = -p \delta \frac{\frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} T}{D^2}.$$

It is important to note that from Proposition 5.1 an elementary calculation gives that

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\beta}{\delta} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} = -2T.$$

We are now ready to calculate the Jacobian. Since all the entries are multiplied by p , we can take out the factor of p^3 from the determinant, and hence we need to show positivity of the determinant of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{D} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-x)^2}{((\alpha-x)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(x) + \frac{S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha}}{D^2} & -\frac{D \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} - S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta}}{D^2} & -\frac{D \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta} - S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta}}{D^2} \\ -\beta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} D - (1 - \beta T) \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & -\beta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} (1 - \beta T) & -\beta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} (1 - \beta T) \\ -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} & -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Observe that the row operation $r_2 := r_2 - \frac{\beta}{\delta} r_3$ gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{D} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-x)^2}{((\alpha-x)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(x) + \frac{S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha}}{D^2} & -\frac{D \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} - S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta}}{D^2} & -\frac{D \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta} - S \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta}}{D^2} \\ -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} & -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} \\ -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} & -\delta \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} D - T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Next using second row we eliminate all derivatives of D in the first and the third row, namely we perform $r_1 := r_1 + Sr_2$ and $r_3 := r_3 + \delta Tr_2$, hence we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{D} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-x)^2}{((\alpha-x)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(x) & -\frac{1}{D} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} & -\frac{1}{D} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta} \\ -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \beta} & -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} \\ -\frac{\delta}{D} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} & -\frac{\delta}{D} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \beta} & -\frac{\delta}{D} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Next we will use relations between $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}$ applied to S and T found in Proposition 5.1 and similar properties when these two partial derivatives are applied to D from (5.1). Performing the column operation $c_2 := c_2 - \frac{\beta}{\delta} c_3$ gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{2}{D} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(\alpha-t)^2}{((\alpha-t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} d\mu(t) & 0 & -\frac{1}{D} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \delta} \\ -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{2T}{D^2} & -\frac{1}{D^2} \frac{\partial D}{\partial \delta} \\ -\frac{\delta}{D} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \alpha} & 0 & -\frac{\delta}{D} \frac{\partial T}{\partial \delta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Expanding along the second column the result follows after writing explicit formulas for the derivatives from Proposition 5.1 and using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the space $L^2 \left(\frac{d\mu_x(t)}{((\alpha-t)^2 + \beta^2 + \delta^2)^2} \right)$. \square

5.2. The Jacobian outside the domain \mathcal{D} .

As we discussed under Assumption 1.6 mapping H is well defined at matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ \bar{\lambda} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. In this subsection we show that the Jacobian h at such point is positive, which shows that H is locally invertible.

Proposition 5.3. *With notations as in Proposition 5.2, if $\alpha + i\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ we have*

$$(5.2) \quad \det(J_{\hat{H}}(\alpha, \beta, 0)) > 0.$$

Proof. We recall that $\delta_0(\alpha + i\beta) = 0$ outside the domain \mathcal{D} .

The Jacobian matrix of \hat{H} valued at $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$ is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial \text{Im}(\hat{H}_{11}(\alpha, \beta, \delta))}{\partial \delta} \Big|_{(\alpha, \beta, 0)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The upper left 2×2 matrix is the Jacobian matrix of the function h . In Proposition 3.3 we showed that h is analytic and injective on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ hence its Jacobian is nonzero. Moreover, Proposition 1.2 implies that $\frac{\partial \text{Im}(\hat{H}_{11}(\alpha, \beta, \delta))}{\partial \delta} \Big|_{(\alpha, \beta, 0)} > 0$. We conclude that $\det(J_{\hat{H}}(\alpha, \beta, 0)) > 0$. \square

5.3. Consequences for h .

In this subsection we study the consequences of the positivity of the Jacobian of the mapping H .

Corollary 5.4. *The Jacobian J_h of h is strictly positive inside the domain \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. Let us denote $\widehat{H}(\alpha, \beta, \delta) = (\widehat{H}_1(\alpha, \beta, \delta), \widehat{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \delta), \widehat{H}_3(\alpha, \beta, \delta))$. In this section we will view h as a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, and we have by the definition of h that

$$h(\alpha, \beta) = (\widehat{H}_1(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\alpha, \beta)), \widehat{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\alpha, \beta))).$$

Direct calculation of the Jacobian matrix of h gives

$$(5.3) \quad J_h = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \beta} \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \beta} \end{bmatrix}$$

From the definition of δ_0 we have

$$H_3(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\alpha, \beta)) = 0.$$

Differentiating this equation with respect to α (for the first equation) and β (for the second equation) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \alpha} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \beta} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \alpha} &= -\frac{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha}}{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}}, \\ \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial \beta} &= -\frac{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta}}{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into Jacobian (5.3) and factoring out the denominator $\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}$ we get

$$J_h = \frac{1}{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} - \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \beta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} - \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta} \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} - \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \beta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} - \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta} \end{bmatrix}$$

A direct calculation of the determinant (note that the factor $\frac{1}{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}}$ when calculating the determinant get squared) of the above matrix shows that out of 8 summands two cancel, namely $\pm \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta}$. The remaining 6 summands are directly related to the determinant of 3×3 Jacobian, namely we have

$$\det(J_h) = \frac{1}{\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}} \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \delta} \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \delta} \\ \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \alpha} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \beta} & \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\delta \mapsto \frac{H_3(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}{\delta}$ is monotone and non-negative for $\delta \geq \delta_0(\alpha, \beta)$, then $\delta \mapsto H_3(\alpha, \beta, \delta)$ is monotone as a product of two monotone, non-negative functions. So $\frac{\partial H_3}{\partial \delta}$ and the determinant of 3×3 matrix is positive from Proposition 5.2. \square

Corollary 5.5. *By the Inverse Function Theorem we conclude that h^{-1} is differentiable on \mathcal{M} .*

Another consequence of the 3×3 Jacobian being positive is injectivity of h .

Proposition 5.6. *h is injective on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{bd}(\mathcal{D})$, where $\text{bd}(\mathcal{D})$ denotes the boundary of \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. Similarly as we defined function \widehat{H} , we define $\widehat{\Omega}$. For any $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ denote

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Omega}_{12}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \varepsilon) &= \Omega_{12} \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\varepsilon & \lambda_1 + i\lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 - i\lambda_2 & i\varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ \widehat{\Omega}_{11}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \varepsilon) &= \Omega_{11} \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\varepsilon & \lambda_1 + i\lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 - i\lambda_2 & i\varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \right)\end{aligned}$$

Consider the mapping

$$\widehat{\Omega} : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ \varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(\widehat{\Omega}_{12}(x, y, \varepsilon)) \\ \operatorname{Im}(\widehat{\Omega}_{12}(x, y, \varepsilon)) \\ \operatorname{Im}(\widehat{\Omega}_{11}(x, y, \varepsilon)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then Corollary 3.5 says that $\widehat{\Omega}$ is a diffeomorphism from $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$ onto the set

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \delta \end{pmatrix} : \delta > \delta_0(\alpha + i\beta) \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty).$$

For $\alpha + i\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{bd}(\mathcal{D})$ note that $\widehat{H}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\alpha + i\beta)) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then Proposition 5.2 and

Proposition 5.3 imply that $\widehat{\Omega}$ can be continuously extended as the right inverse function of \widehat{H} in some neighborhood of $(x, y, 0)$ such that

$$\widehat{H}(\widehat{\Omega}(x, y, 0)) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $x + iy = h(\alpha + i\beta)$. Note that \widehat{H} is defined for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\delta > 0$. It follows that we also have

$$\widehat{\Omega}(\widehat{H}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\alpha + i\beta))) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \delta_0(\alpha + i\beta) \end{pmatrix}$$

provided that $\alpha + i\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{bd}(\mathcal{D})$.

We now claim that h is injective on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{bd}(\mathcal{D})$. Suppose that $h(\alpha_1 + i\beta_1) = h(\alpha_2 + i\beta_2) = x + iy$. Then we have

$$\widehat{H}(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \delta_0(\alpha_1 + i\beta_1)) = \widehat{H}(\alpha_2, \beta_2, \delta_0(\alpha_2 + i\beta_2)) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Applying $\widehat{\Omega}$ on both sides, we deduce that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. \square

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{M} = h(\mathcal{D})$ be the image of \mathcal{D} under the map h . The sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{M} are open subsets of \mathbb{C} . The function h is a diffeomorphism from \mathcal{D} onto \mathcal{M} .*

Proof. We infer from assertion 3° in Proposition 1.2 that \mathcal{D} is an open set in \mathbb{C} . From Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 5.6 we know that h is differentiable and injective. By Brouwer's invariance of domain theorem [9, Corollary 19.8], it implies that \mathcal{M} is also open. Moreover, by Corollary 5.4, the inverse of h is also differentiable. Hence h is a diffeomorphism from \mathcal{D} onto \mathcal{M} . \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

For $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta \in \mathcal{D}$, we let $z = s + it = h(\lambda) \in \mathcal{M}$, and thus have:

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} s = \operatorname{Re}(\widehat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\lambda))) = \alpha - \frac{pS}{D} = \alpha - \frac{S}{T}, \\ t = \operatorname{Im}(\widehat{H}_{12}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_0(\lambda))) = \beta + p\frac{1-\beta T}{D} = \frac{1}{T}, \end{cases}$$

where we used the identity $\frac{T}{D} = \frac{1}{p}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}$. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

$$L_a(z) = \varphi(\log(|z - a|^2)) = 2 \log \Delta(z - a)$$

and

$$L_a(z, \varepsilon) = \varphi(\log(|z - a|^2 + \varepsilon^2)).$$

Following Lemma 2.2 and (4.4), we have

$$(6.2) \quad \Omega \begin{pmatrix} [i\varepsilon & z] \\ [\bar{z} & i\varepsilon] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta(z, \varepsilon) & \lambda(z, \varepsilon) \\ \bar{\lambda}(z, \varepsilon) & i\delta(z, \varepsilon) \end{bmatrix},$$

where we denote $\lambda = \lambda(z, \varepsilon)$ and $\delta = \delta(z, \varepsilon)$ to emphasize that λ and δ are functions of $(z, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{C} \times (0, \infty)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Using the notations from (6.2), for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we have*

- (1) $\delta(z, \varepsilon) > \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\delta(z, \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = 1$; and
- (2) $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(z, \varepsilon) = z - p \cdot i$.

Moreover, the following limit exists

$$(6.3) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_1^t \delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1} - \frac{1}{1+t}) du \right)$$

and the limit is a real analytic function of z .

Proof. Recall that $H(\Omega(b)) = b$ for any $b \in \mathbb{H}^+(M_2(\mathbb{C}))$, and for $B = B(\alpha + i\beta, i\delta)$ we have

$$H(B) = B - \frac{p}{D} \begin{bmatrix} i\delta T & S - i(1 - \beta T) \\ S + i(1 - \beta T) & i\delta T \end{bmatrix},$$

where $D = D(\alpha, \beta, \delta) = \delta^2 T^2 + S^2 + (1 - \beta T)^2$. From the definitions of S and T in (4.1) and (4.2), we can check that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} i\delta T & S - i(1 - \beta T) \\ S + i(1 - \beta T) & i\delta T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then (1) and (2) follow from Corollary 3.5.

By (2), we may assume that $\|\lambda(z, u) - x\| \leq M$ for some $M > 0$. We then have

$$\delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) < \frac{1}{\delta(z, u)} < \frac{1}{u},$$

and

$$\frac{\delta(z, u)}{M^2 + \delta(z, u)^2} < \delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}).$$

Hence,

$$\delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) > \frac{u}{M^2 + u^2}$$

provided that $\delta(z, u) > u > M$. Note that $\frac{1}{1+u} - \frac{u}{M^2+u^2}$ is integrable on $[1, \infty)$. It follows that the limit (6.3) exists. Moreover, the integrand in (6.3) is a real analytic function of z . We conclude that the limit is also a real analytic function of z . \square

Lemma 6.2. *For $z = s + it \in \mathcal{M}$, The map*

$$(s, t, \varepsilon) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s + it, \varepsilon)$$

extends to a real analytic function in some neighborhood of $(s, t, 0)$. Moreover,

$$L_{x+iy}(z, 0) = \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{1+t} - \delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) \right) du.$$

Proof. Following Corollary 3.5, we have

$$\Omega \begin{pmatrix} i\varepsilon & z \\ \bar{z} & i\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} i\delta(z, \varepsilon) & \lambda(z, \varepsilon) \\ \bar{\lambda}(z, \varepsilon) & i\delta(z, \varepsilon) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The subordination relation gives $G_{X+Y} \begin{pmatrix} i\varepsilon & z \\ \bar{z} & i\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} = G_X \begin{pmatrix} i\delta(z, \varepsilon) & \lambda(z, \varepsilon) \\ \bar{\lambda}(z, \varepsilon) & i\delta(z, \varepsilon) \end{pmatrix}$. By comparing (1, 1)-entry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} &= \varepsilon \varphi((|z - x - iy|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1}) \\ &= \text{Im} \left(G_{X+Y, 11} \begin{pmatrix} i\varepsilon & z \\ \bar{z} & i\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= \text{Im} \left(G_{X, 11} \begin{pmatrix} i\delta(z, \varepsilon) & \lambda(z, \varepsilon) \\ \bar{\lambda}(z, \varepsilon) & i\delta(z, \varepsilon) \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ (6.4) \quad &= \delta(z, \varepsilon) \varphi((|\lambda(z, \varepsilon) - x|^2 + \delta(z, \varepsilon)^2)^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By integrating with respect to ε from (6.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon + t) - L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon) \\ &= \int_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon+t} u \varphi((|z - x - iy|^2 + u^2)^{-1}) du \\ &= \int_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon+t} \delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) du. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} L_{x+iy}(z, t) - \log(1+t) = 0$. By (6.3) in Lemma 6.1, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{x+iy}(z, 0) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_\varepsilon^1 \left(\delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) - \frac{1}{1+t} \right) du \\ &\quad + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_1^t \left(\delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) - \frac{1}{1+u} \right) du \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \delta(z, u) = \delta_0(h^{-1}(z))$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \lambda(z, u) = h^{-1}(z)$. For $z \in h(\mathcal{D})$, by Proposition 5.2, the Jacobian matrix of the map $(s, t, \varepsilon) \mapsto (\alpha, \beta, \delta)$ has positive determinant in some neighborhood of $(s, t, 0)$. Therefore for $z \in h(\mathcal{D})$, by Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 3.5, we deduce that the limit

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_\varepsilon^1 \delta(z, u) \varphi((|\lambda(z, u) - x|^2 + \delta(z, u)^2)^{-1}) du$$

exists and the limit is a real analytic function of z . This together with (6.3) guarantee that the map $(s, t, \varepsilon) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s + it, \varepsilon)$ extends to a real analytic function in some neighborhood of $(x, y, 0)$. \square

Proposition 6.3. *For $s_o + it_o \in \mathcal{M}$, the function $(s, t) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s + it)$ is real analytic in some neighborhood of (s_o, t_o) . Moreover,*

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{\partial L_{x+iy}}{\partial s}(s_o + it_o) = \frac{2(\alpha_o - s_o)}{t_o} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial L_{x+iy}}{\partial t}(s_o + it_o) = \frac{2\beta_o}{t_o},$$

where we denoted $h^{-1}(s_o + it_o) =: \alpha_o + i\beta_o$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from Lemma 6.2. By the subordination relation

$$\Omega \left(\begin{bmatrix} i\varepsilon & s + it \\ s - it & i\varepsilon \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} i\delta_\varepsilon & \alpha_\varepsilon + i\beta_\varepsilon \\ \alpha_\varepsilon - i\beta_\varepsilon & i\delta_\varepsilon \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_\varepsilon = \delta_0(x + iy) > 0$, and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\alpha_\varepsilon + i\beta_\varepsilon) = \alpha + i\beta$. Denote $\lambda_\varepsilon = \alpha_\varepsilon + i\beta_\varepsilon$, recall that the subordination relation implies that

$$\varphi((z - x - iy)^*(|z - x - iy|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1}) = \varphi((\lambda_\varepsilon - x)^*(|\lambda_\varepsilon - x|^2 + \delta_\varepsilon^2)^{-1}).$$

For $z = s + it$, by the regularity result in Lemma 6.2, we are allowed to flip the derivative and the limit in the following calculation: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s + it)}{\partial z} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon) \right) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon) \right) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi((z - x - iy)^*(|z - x - iy|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1}) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi((\lambda_\varepsilon - x)^*(|\lambda_\varepsilon - x|^2 + \delta_\varepsilon^2)^{-1}) \\ &= \varphi((\lambda - x)^*(|\lambda - x|^2 + \delta_0(\lambda)^2)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta = h^{-1}(s + it)$ and $\delta_0(\lambda) > 0$, and similarly

$$\frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s + it)}{\partial \bar{z}} = \varphi((\lambda - x)(|\lambda - x|^2 + \delta_0(\lambda)^2)^{-1}).$$

Hence, using equation (6.1) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s + it)}{\partial s} = 2S = 2(\alpha - s)T = \frac{2(\alpha - s)}{t},$$

and

$$\frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s + it)}{\partial t} = 2\beta T = \frac{2\beta}{t}.$$

□

Theorem 6.4. *The Brown measure of $x + iy$ is supported on $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M})$. The density of the Brown measure of $x + iy$ at $s + it \in \mathcal{M}$ is given by the equation*

$$(6.6) \quad f(s, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\frac{2}{t} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{2}{t} - \frac{2\beta}{t^2} \right],$$

where $\alpha + i\beta = h^{-1}(s + it)$.

Proof. By Proposition 6.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \right) L_{x+iy}(s+it) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \frac{2(\alpha-s)}{t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{2\beta}{t} \\ &= \frac{2}{t} \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{2}{t} - \frac{2\beta}{t^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 6.5. *If Assumption 1.6 holds, then $\mu_{x+iy}(h(\{\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}\mathcal{D}\})) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{cl}(\mathcal{D})$ and $z = h(\lambda)$. Recall that by (5.2) the determinant $\det(J_{\widehat{H}}(\alpha, \beta, 0)) > 0$ and the map \widehat{H} is locally invertible in some neighborhood of $(\alpha, \beta, 0)$. Note that $\lambda \notin \text{spec}(x)$ and hence $\lambda - x$ is invertible. We apply the same argument as for Lemma 6.2, and deduce that the map

$$(s, t, \varepsilon) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s+it, \varepsilon)$$

extends to a real analytic function in some neighborhood of $(s, t, 0)$, where $s+it = h(\alpha+i\beta)$. Consequently, the map $(s, t) \mapsto L_{x+iy}(s+it)$ is a real analytic function in some neighborhood of (x, y) .

Hence we can exchange the order of taking derivative and the limit. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s+it)}{\partial z} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon) \right) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} L_{x+iy}(z, \varepsilon) \right) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi((z - x - iy)^*(|z - x - iy|^2 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1}) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi((\lambda_\varepsilon - x)^*(|\lambda_\varepsilon - x|^2 + \delta_\varepsilon^2)^{-1}) \\ &= \varphi((\lambda - x)^*(|\lambda - x|^2 + \delta^2)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = \alpha + i\beta = h^{-1}(s+it)$ and

$$\frac{\partial L_{x+iy}(s+it)}{\partial \bar{z}} = \varphi((\lambda - x)(|\lambda - x|^2 + \delta^2)^{-1}).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.3, the function h is holomorphic at λ and locally invertible at $z = h(\lambda) = \lambda + \frac{1}{-i - G_{\mu_x}(\lambda)}$. Hence, h^{-1} is holomorphic at z and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \varphi((h^{-1}(z) - x)^{-1}) = 0.$$

That is,

$$\frac{\partial^2 L_{x+iy}(s+it)}{\partial \bar{z} \partial z} = 0.$$

Therefore $z \notin \text{supp}(\mu_{x+iy})$. □

REFERENCES

1. Serban T. Belinschi and M. Capitaine, *Spectral properties of polynomials in independent Wigner and deterministic matrices*, J. Funct. Anal. **273** (2017), no. 12, 3901–3963. MR 3711884
2. Serban T. Belinschi, Tobias Mai, and Roland Speicher, *Analytic subordination theory of operator-valued free additive convolution and the solution of a general random matrix problem*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **732** (2017), 21–53. MR 3717087
3. Serban T. Belinschi, Piotr Śniady, and Roland Speicher, *Eigenvalues of non-Hermitian random matrices and Brown measure of non-normal operators: Hermitian reduction and linearization method*, Linear Algebra Appl. **537** (2018), 48–83. MR 3716236
4. Serban T. Belinschi, Zhi Yin, and Ping Zhong, *The Brown measure of a sum of two free random variables, one of which is triangular elliptic*, Adv. Math. **441** (2024), Paper No. 109562, 62. MR 4710866
5. Hari Bercovici and Ping Zhong, *The Brown measure of a sum of two free nonselfadjoint random variables, one of which is R-diagonal*, 2022, arXiv:2209.12379.
6. Philippe Biane, *On the free convolution with a semi-circular distribution*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **46** (1997), no. 3, 705–718. MR 1488333
7. Philippe Biane and Franz Lehner, *Computation of some examples of Brown's spectral measure in free probability*, Colloq. Math. **90** (2001), no. 2, 181–211. MR 1876844
8. Charles Bordenave, Pietro Caputo, and Djalil Chafaï, *Spectrum of markov generators on sparse random graphs*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **67** (2014), no. 4, 621–669.
9. Glen E. Bredon, *Topology and geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
10. Lawrence G. Brown, *Lidskii's theorem in the type II case*, Geometric methods in operator algebras (Kyoto, 1983), Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., vol. 123, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1986, pp. 1–35. MR 866489
11. Nizar Demni and Tarek Hamdi, *Support of the Brown measure of the product of a free unitary Brownian motion by a free self-adjoint projection*, J. Funct. Anal. **282** (2022), no. 6, Paper No. 109362, 36. MR 4362855
12. Bruce K. Driver, Brian Hall, and Todd Kemp, *The Brown measure of the free multiplicative Brownian motion*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **184** (2022), no. 1-2, 209–273. MR 4498510
13. Uffe Haagerup and Flemming Larsen, *Brown's spectral distribution measure for R-diagonal elements in finite von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **176** (2000), no. 2, 331–367. MR 1784419
14. Uffe Haagerup and Hanne Schultz, *Brown measures of unbounded operators affiliated with a finite von Neumann algebra*, Math. Scand. **100** (2007), no. 2, 209–263. MR 2339369
15. Brian C. Hall and Ching-Wei Ho, *The Brown measure of the sum of a self-adjoint element and an imaginary multiple of a semicircular element*, Lett. Math. Phys. **112** (2022), no. 2, Paper No. 19, 61. MR 4392479
16. ———, *The Brown measure of a family of free multiplicative Brownian motions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **186** (2023), no. 3-4, 1081–1166. MR 4603401
17. J. William Helton, Tobias Mai, and Roland Speicher, *Applications of realizations (aka linearizations) to free probability*, J. Funct. Anal. **274** (2018), no. 1, 1–79. MR 3718048
18. Ching-Wei Ho and Ping Zhong, *Brown measures of free circular and multiplicative Brownian motions with self-adjoint and unitary initial conditions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **25** (2023), no. 6, 2163–2227. MR 4592867
19. Franz Lehner, *On the computation of spectra in free probability*, J. Funct. Anal. **183** (2001), no. 2, 451–471. MR 2002f:46126
20. Adrian Rice and Ezra Brown, *Why ellipses are not elliptic curves*, Math. Mag. **85** (2012), no. 3, 163–176. MR 2924153
21. Mark van Hoeij, *An algorithm for computing the Weierstrass normal form*, ISSAC'95 Proceedings, 1995, pp. 90–95.
22. Dan Voiculescu, *The coalgebra of the free difference quotient and free probability*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), no. 2, 79–106. MR 1744647
23. Ping Zhong, *Brown measure of the sum of an elliptic operator and a free random variable in a finite von Neumann algebra*, 2021, arXiv:2108.09844, to appear in Amer. J. Math. (2025).

FRANZ LEHNER: INSTITUT FÜR DISKRETE MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT GRAZ, STEYR-ERGASSE 30, A-8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

Email address: lehner@math.tugraz.at

ALEXANDRU NICÀ: DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, ONTARIO, CANADA.

Email address: anica@uwaterloo.ca

KAMIL SZPOJANKOWSKI: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, UL. ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSZAWA, POLAND, AND FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, WARSAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, POLAND.

Email address: kszpojankowski@impan.pl, kamil.szpojankowski@pw.edu.pl

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TX 77004, USA

Email address: pzhong@central.uh.edu