ANALYTICITY OF QUASINORMAL MODES IN THE KERR AND KERR-DE SITTER SPACETIMES

OLIVER L. PETERSEN AND ANDRÁS VASY

Abstract. We prove that quasinormal modes (or resonant states) for linear wave equations in the subextremal Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes are real analytic. The main novelty of this paper is the observation that the bicharacteristic flow associated to the linear wave equations for quasinormal modes with respect to a suitable Killing vector field has a stable radial point source/sink structure rather than merely a generalized normal source/sink structure. The analyticity then follows by a recent result in the microlocal analysis of radial points by Galkowski and Zworski. The results can then be recast with respect to the standard Killing vector field.

Contents

1. Introduction

When studying linear and nonlinear wave equations on black hole spacetimes, such as the Kerr spacetime and Kerr-de Sitter spacetime, quasinormal modes play a prominent role. Indeed, for linear equations, within certain limitations corresponding to trapped null-geodesics, solutions have an asymptotic expansion at timelike infinity in quasinormal modes. Such expansions, or the corresponding decay or lack thereof statements, have a long history which in the mathematics literature goes back to Sá Barreto and Zworski [SBZ97], Bony and Häfner [BH08], Dyatlov [Dya11, Dya12], Vasy [Vas13], Shlapentokh-Rothman [SR15], Hintz and Vasy [HV15] and Gajic and Warnick [GW20]. In the physics literature the importance of these has been clear even longer, going back to Regge and Wheeler [RW57], Vishveshwara [Vis70], Zerilli [Zer70], Whiting [Whi89], Kodama, Ishibashi and Seto [KIS00] and others. For nonlinear equations the non-decaying quasinormal modes

The first author is grateful for the support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – GZ: LI 3638/1-1, AOBJ: 660735 and the Stanford Mathematics Research Center. The second author is grateful for the support of the National Science Foundation under grant number DMS-1953987.

become an obstacle to solvability; for equations with gauge freedom, such as Einstein's equation, it is non-decaying modes that are not 'pure gauge' that play an analogous role [HV18].

Quasinormal modes are solutions of the homogeneous wave equation which are eigenfunctions of the covariant derivative along appropriate Killing vector fields. A key consideration for applications is that for similar covariant eigenfunctions as the forcing (right hand side of the wave equation), there should be a satisfactory Fredholm theory. In this case the covariant eigenvalues (resonances) form a discrete set, and the corresponding eigenspaces are finite dimensional. Since Fredholm theory is global, this necessitates working relative to Killing vector fields with suitable global behavior.

Recently Galkowski and Zworski [GZ] showed that quasinormal modes for non-rotating black holes are real analytic at the horizon; indeed they obtained a substantially stronger microlocal result. In this paper we generalize their result to the case of rotating black holes whose importance is underlined by their ubiquity. Our proof relies crucially on the ability to *locally* transform the rotating black hole quasimode problem to the non-rotating one, and thus being able to apply the result of [GZ]. This transformation is facilitated by locally considering analogues of quasinormal modes with respect to a different Killing vector field that is lightlike on the horizon; this change is very simple in the Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter case as we discuss below, but in fact works in general for non-degenerate Killing horizons under an additional condition, as is also described below. While these modes are with respect to a different Killing vector field, we can in fact relate these to the quasinormal modes with respect to the original globally well-behaved vector field to obtain the real analyticity result. Indeed, a key feature of the Kerr-de Sitter setting is the presence of two horizons, and the well-behaved Killing vector fields with respect to each of these horizons, while globally well-defined, are ill-behaved at the other horizon. Thus, it is of central importance for our approach to be able to work locally near a horizon to obtain the analyticity conclusions.

In the rest of the introduction we describe the precise results in the rotating black hole setting, as well as the generalization to non-degenerate Killing horizons. Then in Section 2 we discuss geometric aspects of these Killing horizons. In Section 3 we then prove our general local result. In Section 4 we use these local results to obtain a global result for joint modes of two Killing vector fields on Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes. Finally, in Section 5 we show how these results imply the real analyticity of the quasinormal modes on Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter spacetimes, with modes taken with respect to the standard Killing vector field.

1.1. **Kerr and Kerr-de Sitter spacetime.**

Fix three parameters $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m, \Lambda \geq 0$, such that the polynomial

$$\mu(r) := \left(r^2 + a^2\right)\left(1 - \frac{\Lambda r^2}{3}\right) - 2mr \tag{1}$$

has four distinct real roots $r_0 < r_C < r_e < r_c$ if $\Lambda > 0$ and two distinct real roots $r_C < r_e$ if $\Lambda = 0$. The latter condition is equivalent to $|a| < m$.

Assuming $\Lambda > 0$, the domain of outer communication in the sub-extermal *Kerr-de Sitter spacetime* is given (in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates) by the real analytic spacetime

$$M := \mathbb{R}_t \times (r_e, r_c)_r \times S^1_\phi \times (0, \pi)_\theta,$$

with real analytic metric

$$\begin{aligned} g = (r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta))\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}r^2}{\mu(r)} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta^2}{c(\theta)}\right) \\ + \frac{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)}{b^2\left(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)\right)}\left(a\mathrm{d}t - \left(r^2+a^2\right)\mathrm{d}\phi\right)^2 \\ - \frac{\mu(r)}{b^2\left(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)\right)}\left(\mathrm{d}t - a\sin^2(\theta)\mathrm{d}\phi\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$b := 1 + \frac{\Lambda a^2}{3}, \quad c(\theta) := 1 + \frac{\Lambda a^2}{3}\cos^2(\theta).$$

These coordinates are singular at the roots of $\mu(r)$. In order to define quasinormal modes, we need to extend this metric real analytically over the future event horizon and the future cosmological horizon, corresponding to the roots $r = r_e$ and $r = r_c$, respectively. This can be done, for instance, by the following coordinate change:

$$\begin{aligned} t_* &:= t + G(r), \\ \phi_* &:= \phi + \Psi(r), \end{aligned}$$

where G and Ψ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} G'(r) &= b\frac{r^2+a^2}{\mu(r)}\left(2\frac{r-r_e}{r_c-r_e} - 1\right), \\ \Psi'(r) &= b\frac{a}{\mu(r)}\left(2\frac{r-r_e}{r_c-r_e} - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that there are real analytic functions $f_e(r)$ and $f_c(r)$, such that

$$G'(r) = \begin{cases} -b\frac{r^2+a^2}{\mu(r)} + f_e(r) & \text{if } r \text{ is near } r_e, \\ b\frac{r^2+a^2}{\mu(r)} + f_c(r) & \text{if } r \text{ is near } r_c, \end{cases}$$

and similarly for $\Psi'(r)$. One checks that g extends to a real analytic spacetime metric g_* on

$$M_* := \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_C, \infty)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

see (24) for the precise form. The two real analytic lightlike hypersurfaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^+_e &:= \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times \{r_e\} \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset M_*, \\ \mathcal{H}^+_c &:= \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times \{r_c\} \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset M_*, \end{aligned}$$

are called the *future event horizon* and *future cosmological horizon*, respectively. Note that the real analytic Killing vector fields ∂_t and ∂_ϕ, in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates, extend to real analytic Killing vector fields ∂_{t_*} and ∂_{ϕ_*} on (M_*, g_*).

The domain of outer communication in the subextremal *Kerr spacetime* is defined analogously, by passing to the limit $\Lambda = 0$. This implies that $r_c = \infty$ and there is consequently no cosmological horizon in the Kerr spacetime, there is only the event horizon at $r = r_e$. See equation (25) for the precise form of the analytically extended Kerr metric.

We will consider wave equations on complex tensors. Fixing $r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U}$ denote the complex (r,s)-tensors on an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset M_*$ and let ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection acting on $\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U}$. We let $C^\infty(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$ and $C^\omega(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$ denote the smooth and real analytic complex tensor fields, respectively. Let P be a wave operator, i.e. is a linear differential operator with principal symbol given by the dual metric, i.e.

$$P = -g^{\alpha\beta}\nabla_\alpha\nabla_\beta + \text{lower order terms}.$$

More precisely, there are complex tensor fields

$$A : T^*\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U},$$
$$B : \mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U},$$

such that

$$P = \nabla^*\nabla + A \circ \nabla + B.$$

We consider solutions to wave equations $Pu = f$, where the coefficients A and B are invariant under the Killing vector fields ∂_{t_*} and ∂_{ϕ_*}. This is a natural assumption for geometric wave equations, where A and B are typically given by curvature expressions. Our first main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M_*, g_*) be the subextremal Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime, extended real analytically over the future event horizon (and future cosmological horizon if $\Lambda > 0$). Fix $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{U} := \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset M_*.$$

Assume that

- *A and B are real analytic in $\mathcal{U}$,*
- *$\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} A = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} A = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} B = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} B = 0$ in $\mathcal{U}$.*

If $u \in C^\infty(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$ satisfies

(i) $Pu \in C^\omega(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} u = -i\sigma u$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$,
(iii) $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} u = -iku$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

then $u \in C^\omega(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$.

Smooth tensor fields satisfying (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 and $Pu = 0$ are called *quasinormal modes*. For functions, these conditions are equivalent to assuming that

$$u(t_*, r, \theta, \phi_*) = e^{-i(\sigma t_* + k\phi_*)} v(r, \theta), \tag{2}$$

which is perhaps the more common way to express quasinormal modes.

Combining Theorem 1.1 with the Fredholm theory developed by the second author in [Vas13] and [Vasa] (see also [VZ00, Vasb]), we deduce our second main result, where we consider modes with respect to *only* the t_*-coordinate, as opposed to both the t_*- and ϕ_*-coordinates. For the Fredholm theory to go through in the case $\Lambda = 0$, we will need the induced operator on the modes to be a scattering operator with self-adjoint (i.e. real) scattering principal symbol near spatial infinity in the sense of Melrose [Mel94]. This amounts to making appropriate decay assumptions on A and B:

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M_*, g_*) be the subextremal Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime, extended real analytically over the future event horizon (and future cosmological horizon if $\Lambda > 0$). Assume that*

$$\left(1 - \frac{\Lambda a^2}{3}\right)^3 > 9m^2\Lambda. \tag{3}$$

Fix $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{U} := \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset M_*.$$

Assume that

- *A and B are real analytic in $\mathcal{U}$,*
- *$\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} A = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} A = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} B = \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} B = 0$ in $\mathcal{U}$.*

If $u \in C^\infty(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$ satisfies

(i) $Pu = 0$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} u = -i\sigma u$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$,

(iii) in case $\Lambda = 0$ *we also assume that* $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \geq 0$ *and*
- *if* $\operatorname{Im}\sigma > 0$*, then assume that* $A, B \in \mathcal{O}_\infty\left(r^{-\epsilon}\right)$ *and* $u|_{t_*=0} \in \mathcal{S}'$*,*
- *if* $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$*, then assume that* $P - P^* \in \mathcal{O}_\infty\left(r^{-1-\epsilon}\right)$ *and* $A, B \in \mathcal{O}_\infty(r^{-\epsilon})$ *and that* $u|_{t_*=0} \in r^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}L^2$*,*
- *if* $\sigma = 0$*, then assume that* $A \in \mathcal{O}_\infty\left(r^{-1-\epsilon}\right)$ *and* $B = \mathcal{O}_\infty\left(r^{-2-\epsilon}\right)$ *and* $u|_{t_*=0} \in \mathcal{S}'$*,*

for some $\epsilon > 0$*,*

then $u \in C^\omega(\mathcal{T}^s_r\mathcal{U})$*.*

Here we used the notation $\mathcal{S}'$ for tempered distributions and the notation $F \in \mathcal{O}_\infty(r^\alpha)$ for a complex tensor field F if and only if for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is a constant $C_k > 0$, such that

$$\left|\nabla^k F\right| \leq C_k r^{\alpha-k},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the positive definite norm on complex tensors induced from the Euclidean metric $\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2 g_{S^2}$. The notation $Q \in \mathcal{O}_\infty(r^\alpha)$ for a differential operator Q means that the coefficients of Q are in $\mathcal{O}_\infty(r^\alpha)$.

Remark 1.3. In the case when $\Lambda = 0$, one could weaken the assumptions on u, A and B at spatial infinity in various ways and still get a Fredholm problem following the arguments of [Vasa]. Indeed, the natural condition on $u|_{t_*=0}$ in the case $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ is formulated microlocally in terms of variable order Sobolev spaces, c.f. [Vasa, Prop. 5.28]. Moreover, the threshold growth $r^{\frac{1}{2}}$ could be adjusted depending on A and B, to allow for more general coefficients, see [Vasa, Sec. 5.4.8]. We restrict for simplicity to this setting.

The restriction $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \geq 0$ for Kerr spacetimes is due to the lack of a directly applicable Fredholm theory for the Fourier conjugated (in $-t_*$) operators in this case, though alternatives are still available for studying these resonances. For functions, the condition (ii) in Theorem 1.2 is equivalent to assuming that

$$u(t_*, r, \phi_*, \theta) = e^{-i\sigma t_*} w(r, \phi_*, \theta),$$

which should be compared with equation (2) above.

In the special case when $a = 0$, the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime simplifies to the Schwarzschild(-de Sitter) spacetime. In this case, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 can be immediately deduced from the framework developed by Galkowski-Zworski in [GZ] as follows: Wave equations for modes in the t_*-coordinate reduce in the coordinate system (t_*, r, ϕ_*, θ) to a Keldysh type operator, exactly of the type studied in [GZ]. Galkowski-Zworski prove in [GZ, Thm. 1] (generalizing [Zui17, Thm. 1.3]) the analytic hypoellipticity of such operators, thus proving the real analyticity of quasinormal modes when $a = 0$. In fact, if $a = 0$, the argument goes through without assuming that the coefficients A and B are invariant under ∂_{ϕ_*}. Due to the rotation in the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime when $a \neq 0$, this argument does not go through immediately. The key to be able to apply the analytic hypoellipticity theory by Galkowski-Zworski to the case $a \neq 0$ is the main new idea of this paper and is described in the next subsection.

1.2. **Non-degenerate Killing horizons.** By checking the formula (24) for the extended metric g_*, one observes that the Killing vector field

$$\partial_{t_*}$$

is *lightlike* at the horizons if and only if $a = 0$. This turns out to be exactly why the modes in the t_*-coordinate satisfy the useful Keldysh type equation if and only

if $a = 0$. In the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime, the Killing vector fields

$$\partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2}\partial_{\phi_*}, \tag{4}$$

$$\text{and } \partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_c^2 + a^2}\partial_{\phi_*} \text{ (if } \Lambda > 0), \tag{5}$$

are lightlike at the horizons $\mathcal{H}_e^+$ and $\mathcal{H}_c^+$ (if $\Lambda > 0$), respectively. We show that the mode solutions with respect to *these* Killing vector fields satisfy equations which are almost of Keldysh type. More precisely, the bicharacteristics associated to the mode equation will have the *radial point structure* assumed by Galkowski-Zworski in their analytic hypoellipticity result [GZ, Thm. 2]. Now, if u satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1.1, then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_e^2+a^2}\partial_{\phi_*}} u = -i\left(\sigma + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2}k\right)u, \tag{6}$$

and similarly with r_e replaced by r_c. This shows that u is a mode solution with respect to both Killing vector fields (4) and (5). The analytic hypoellipticity result by Galkowski-Zworski thus shows that u is real analytic near the horizons $\mathcal{H}_e^+$ and $\mathcal{H}_c^+$ (if $\Lambda > 0$). This is the main step in the proof of Theorem 1.1, the rest follows by standard propagation of real analyticity for wave equations and analytic hypoellipticity of elliptic equations.

In fact, this method is not specific to the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime, but turns out to work for any non-degenerate Killing horizon in any real analytic spacetime satisfying the dominant energy condition. The key is that the Killing vector field is *lightlike* at the horizon. Assume therefore that (M, g) is a real analytic Lorentzian manifold of dimension $n + 1 \geq 2$, with sign convention $(-, +, \ldots, +)$, with a real analytic lightlike hypersurface $\mathcal{H} \subset M$. We assume in particular that the metric g is real analytic.

Definition 1.4. A real analytic Killing vector field W on M, such that

$$W|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

is lightlike and tangent to $\mathcal{H}$, is called a *horizon Killing vector field* with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.

Let us next recall the dominant energy condition, which in particular is satisfied in vacuum spacetimes with a cosmological constant $\Lambda \geq 0$:

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathrm{T} := \mathrm{Ric} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Scal}g$ be the Einstein tensor. Then (M, g) satisfies the *dominant energy condition* if $-\mathrm{T}(X, \cdot)^\sharp$ is a future pointing causal vector (or the zero vector) for all future pointing causal vectors X.

Interestingly, the dominant energy condition has the following important consequence for horizon Killing fields:

Remark 1.6. We note in Lemma B.1 that if (M, g) satisfies the dominant energy condition, then there is a constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\nabla_W W|_{\mathcal{H}} = \kappa W|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

The constant κ is called the *surface gravity of* $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to W.

We are interested in the case when the surface gravity $\kappa \neq 0$:

Definition 1.7. We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *non-degenerate* with respect to W, if the surface gravity κ of $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to W is non-zero.

All horizons in subextremal Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetimes are non-degenerate with surface gravity proportional to μ' at the horizons, where μ was defined in (1). As in the previous subsection, we fix $r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and consider linear wave operators on complex (r,s)-tensors $\mathcal{T}^s_r M$ and write

$$P = \nabla^* \nabla + A \circ \nabla + B$$

with complex tensor fields

$$A : T^*M \otimes \mathcal{T}^s_r M \to \mathcal{T}^s_r M,$$
$$B : \mathcal{T}^s_r M \to \mathcal{T}^s_r M.$$

Our third main result in this paper is the following theorem:

Theorem 1.8. *Assume that*

- (M, g) *is a real analytic Lorentzian manifold satisfying the dominant energy condition,*
- $\mathcal{H} \subset M$ *is a real analytic lightlike hypersurface,*
- W *is a real analytic horizon Killing vector field with respect to* $\mathcal{H}$*,*
- $\mathcal{H}$ *is non-degenerate with respect to* W*,*
- A *and* B *are real analytic and* $\mathcal{L}_W A = 0$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_W B = 0$ *on* M*.*

If $u \in C^\infty(T^s_r M)$ *satisfies*

(i) $Pu \in C^\omega(\mathcal{T}^s_r M)$*,*

(ii) $\mathcal{L}_W u = -i\sigma u$ *for some* $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$*,*

then there is an open subset $\mathcal{U} \supset \mathcal{H}$*, such that* $u \in C^\omega(T^s_r \mathcal{U})$*.*

Note that all assumptions in Theorem 1.8 are local. As explained above, we will apply Theorem 1.8 with

$$W = \partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2}\partial_{\phi_*},$$

and with

$$W = \partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_c^2 + a^2}\partial_{\phi_*},$$

if $\Lambda > 0$, which will prove the main step in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, namely the real analyticity near the horizons.

Remark 1.9. The dominant energy condition actually only enters in Lemma B.1 in order to prove that

$$\mathrm{Ric}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) = 0, \tag{7}$$

for all $X \in T\mathcal{H}$, which in turn implies that the surface gravity κ is constant. We could thus weaken the assumptions in Theorem 1.8 by assuming (7) or that the surface gravity is constant, in place of the dominant energy condition.

Our methods require the existence of a horizon Killing vector field. This allows to reduce the wave equation for the modes to the useful (almost) Keldysh form. Surprisingly, a horizon Killing vector field is quite often guaranteed to exist in vacuum spacetimes with horizons. Proving the existence of a horizon Killing vector field has been the central tool in various black hole uniqueness results for the subextremal Kerr spacetime. This line of argument was pioneered by Hawking, who showed that stationary real analytic vacuum black holes with a non-degenerate event horizon necessarily admit a horizon Killing vector field [Haw72, HE73]. This result was later generalized to higher dimensional analytic vacuum black holes by Hollands-Ishibashi-Wald [HIW07] and Moncrief-Isenberg [MI08].

There is an analogous problem for compact (also called cosmological) Cauchy horizons in vacuum spacetimes. A conjecture by Moncrief and Isenberg [MI83] states that any compact Cauchy horizon in a vacuum spacetime admits a horizon Killing vector field. The existence of a horizon Killing vector field in that

setting would prove that vacuum spacetimes with compact Cauchy horizons are non-generic, which would support the Strong Cosmic Censorship Conjecture in cosmology. During the last decades, Moncrief and Isenberg have made important progress on their conjecture, assuming that the spacetime metric is real analytic [MI83, IM85, MI20].

Remarkably, the existence of a horizon Killing vector field does often not even rely on the real analyticity of the spacetime metric. Alexakis, Ionescu and Klainerman proved in [AIK10a] (see also [IK13]) an analogue of Hawking's theorem, showing the existence of a horizon Killing vector field in a neighbourhood of any bifurcate horizon in *smooth* vacuum spacetimes, as opposed to real analytic. This result has been central in their approach to prove uniqueness of subextremal Kerr black holes [AIK10b, AIK14] in the smooth setting. For compact Cauchy horizons in smooth vacuum spacetimes, as opposed to real analytic, a horizon Killing vector field has been shown to exist by Petersen in [Petb], assuming that the surface gravity is a non-zero constant (extending [FRW99, Peta, PR]).

Though the above mentioned results mainly concern vacuum spacetimes without cosmological constant, one expects them to extend to the case of positive cosmological constant and electro-vacuum spacetimes as well (c.f. [Rác00]). In conclusion, studying wave equations close to non-degenerate horizons (bifurcate or constant non-zero surface gravity), one might in quite wide generality be able to pass to modes with respect to the horizon Killing vector field and analyze the (almost) Keldysh type equation they are known to satisfy by the arguments in this paper.

2. Suitable coordinates near non-degenerate Killing horizons

The first step towards proving Theorem 1.8 is to define appropriate coordinates near the lightlike hypersurface $\mathcal{H}$:

Proposition 2.1. *Assume the same as in Theorem 1.8. Then, for any $p \in \mathcal{H}$, there is a real analytic coordinate system $(x_0, \dots, x_n)$, defined on an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \ni p$, such that*

- $\partial_{x_0} = W|_{\mathcal{U}}$,
- *x_1 is a defining function for $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{H}$ (i.e. $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{H} = x_1^{-1}(0)$ and $\mathrm{d}x_1|_{\mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{H}} \neq 0$),*
- *the metric g expressed in these coordinates satisfies*

$$g|_{x_1=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{22}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g_{2n}|_{x_1=0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & g_{n2}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g_{nn}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_{22}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g_{2n}|_{x_1=0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{n2}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g_{nn}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

is positive definite and

$$\partial_1 g_{00}|_{x_1=0} = -2\kappa,$$

where κ is the (constant nonzero) surface gravity.

Remark 2.2. These coordinates are essentially the *Gaussian null coordinates* introduced by Moncrief-Isenberg in [MI83], with the extra condition that ∂_0 is the horizon Killing vector field restricted to an open neighborhood. (This is precisely what is obtained *a posteriori* after the construction of the horizon Killing vector field in [MI83].)

Example 2.3. The simplest example of a spacetime satisfying all our assumptions is $M = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, equipped with the real analytic Misner metric

$$g = 2\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_0 + x_1\mathrm{d}x_0^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{n}(\mathrm{d}x^j)^2,$$

where $\mathcal{H} = \{x_1 = 0\}$, $W = \partial_0$ and surface gravity $\kappa = -\frac{1}{2}$.

Example 2.4. In fact, even in the subextremal Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime, one can easily choose coordinates which almost satisfy the conditions in Proposition 2.1, with one (insignificant) difference. To define these, it will be convenient to introduce an intermediate coordinate system, which will only be defined near one of the horizons. Let us start with the event horizon. In terms of Boyer-Lindquist coordinates, define

$$\tilde{t}_* := t + \tilde{G}(r),$$
$$\tilde{\phi}_* := \phi + \tilde{\Psi}(r),$$

where $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}$ satisfy

$$\tilde{G}'(r) = -b\frac{r^2 + a^2}{\mu(r)},$$
$$\tilde{\Psi}'(r) = -b\frac{a}{\mu(r)},$$

near $r = r_e$. This commonly used analytic coordinate system $(\tilde{t}_*, r, \tilde{\phi}_*, \theta)$ is defined near the future event horizon. If $\Lambda = 0$, it coincides with (t_*, r, ϕ_*, θ) and is defined on all of M_*. However, if $\Lambda > 0$ it differs from (t_*, r, ϕ_*, θ) and is singular at the cosmological horizon. Choose now the coordinates

$$x_0 = \tilde{t}_*,$$
$$x_1 = r_e - r,$$
$$x_2 = \tilde{\phi}_* - \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2}\tilde{t}_*,$$
$$x_3 = \theta,$$

from which we get

$$\partial_{x_0} = \partial_{\tilde{t}_*} + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2}\partial_{\tilde{\phi}_*}.$$

Defining

$$\psi(x_3) := b\frac{r_e^2 + a^2}{r_e^2 + a^2\cos^2(x_3)},$$

one easily computes that the metric g_* at the event horizon is given by

$$\psi g_*|_{x_1=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{*22}|_{x_1=0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & g_{*33}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

in these coordinates, where $g_{*22}|_{x_1=0}, g_{*33}|_{x_1=0} > 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\partial_1(\psi g_{*00})|_{x_1=0} = -2\kappa,$$

where the surface gravity κ is given by

$$\kappa = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu'(r_e)}{b} < 0.$$

These coordinates coincide with the coordinates in Proposition 2.1, up to the multiplication by the positive conformal factor ψ. Since conformal changes of the geometry only reparametrize the lightlike geodesics, ψ is irrelevant for the analysis.

However, it is of course natural to construct the coordinates in Proposition 2.1 without a conformal factor. This would here correspond to changing x_1 to $\tilde{x}_1$ by solving the geodesic equation

$$\nabla_{\partial_{\tilde{x}_1}}\partial_{\tilde{x}_1} = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{x}_1}|_{x_1=0} = \psi\partial_{x_1}|_{x_1=0},$$

and changing the remaining coordinates x_j to $\tilde{x}_j$ by demanding that

$$[\partial_{\tilde{x}_1}, \partial_{\tilde{x}_j}] = 0, \quad \partial_{\tilde{x}_j}|_{x_1=0} = \partial_{x_j}|_{x_1=0}.$$

In this new coordinate system, we get precisely the conditions in Proposition 2.1. One analogously constructs similar coordinates near the cosmological horizon.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let first $(x_0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ be real analytic coordinates in an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{H}$ of p, such that

$$\partial_0 = W|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

Now let L be the unique lightlike real analytic vector field (transversal to $\mathcal{H}$) along $\mathcal{V}$ such that

$$g(L, L)|_{\mathcal{V}} = g(L, \partial_j)|_{\mathcal{V}} = 0, \quad g(L, \partial_0)|_{\mathcal{V}} = 1 \tag{11}$$

for $j = 2, \dots, n$. Define now the real analytic coordinate x_1 in an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ of p, such that $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{H}$, by solving the geodesic equation in direction of L, i.e. we solve

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\partial_1}\partial_1 &= 0, \\ \partial_1|_{\mathcal{V}} &= L \end{aligned}$$

and set $x_1 = 0$ at $\mathcal{H}$. It follows that x_1 is a defining function for $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{H}$. We also extend the other coordinates to $\mathcal{U}$ by demanding that

$$[\partial_1, \partial_0] = [\partial_1, \partial_j] = 0$$

in $\mathcal{U}$, for $j = 2, \dots, n$. [1]

We now show that $\partial_0 = W|_{\mathcal{U}}$. Recall first that $\partial_0|_{x_1=0} = W|_{x_1=0}$. By uniqueness of ODE, it suffices to show that $[\partial_1, W|_{\mathcal{U}}] = 0$. This is equivalent to W leaving the integral curves of ∂_1 invariant. Since W is a Killing vector field and the integral curves of ∂_1 are geodesics, it thus suffices to prove that the initial velocity $\partial_1|_{x_1=0}$ of the geodesics are invariant under W, i.e. that

$$[W, \partial_1]|_{x_1=0} = (\nabla_W\partial_1 - \nabla_{\partial_1}W)\,|_{x_1=0} = 0.$$

Since $W|_{x_1=0} = \partial_0|_{x_1=0}$, it follows that $\nabla_W\partial_1|_{x_1=0} = \nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_1|_{x_1=0}$ and since $[\partial_0, \partial_1]|_{x_1=0} = 0$, it suffices to prove that $\nabla_{\partial_1}W|_{x_1=0} = \nabla_{\partial_1}\partial_0|_{x_1=0}$. Using that W is a Killing vector field, we observe that for all $j = 0, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\nabla_{\partial_1}W, \partial_j) &= -g(\nabla_{\partial_j}W, \partial_1)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -g(\nabla_{\partial_j}\partial_0, \partial_1)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -g(\nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_j, \partial_1)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -\partial_0 g(\partial_j, \partial_1)|_{x_1=0} + g(\partial_j, \nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_1)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= g(\nabla_{\partial_1}\partial_0, \partial_j)|_{x_1=0}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $g(\partial_j, \partial_1)|_{x_1=0}$ is constant by (11). This shows that $\nabla_{\partial_1}\partial_0 = \nabla_{\partial_1}W|_{x_1=0}$. Taken together, this shows our claim that $\partial_0 = W|_{\mathcal{U}}$.

[1] The Jacobi identity implies that

$$[\partial_1, [\partial_j, \partial_k]] = [\partial_1, [\partial_j, \partial_0]] = 0$$

in $\mathcal{U}$, for $j, k = 2, \dots, n$. Since $[\partial_j, \partial_k]|_{x_1=0} = [\partial_j, \partial_0]|_{x_1=0} = 0$, uniqueness of ODE shows that $[\partial_j, \partial_k] = 0$ in $\mathcal{U}$ as well. Hence the resulting set of functions $(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is indeed a real analytic coordinate system.

It is now clear that the metric has the form (8) at $x_1 = 0$ and that the part (9) is positive definite. The final computation is where Remark 1.6 comes in:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1 g_{00}|_{x_1=0} &= 2g(\nabla_{\partial_1}\partial_0, \partial_0)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= 2\partial_0 g(\partial_1, \partial_0)|_{x_1=0} - 2g(\partial_1, \nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_0)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -2g(\partial_1, \nabla_W W)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -2\kappa g(\partial_1, W)|_{x_1=0} \\ &= -2\kappa.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

3. Real analyticity near general horizons

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.8. In order to explain the idea, let us start by discussing the following example:

Example 3.1. The d'Alembert operator in Example 2.3 is given by

$$\Box = \partial_1 \left(x_1\partial_1 - 2\partial_0\right) - \sum_{j=2}^{n} \partial_j^2.$$

The condition (ii) in Theorem 1.8 is that

$$u(x_0, \ldots, x_n) = e^{-i\sigma x_0} v(x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Such a mode solution to $\Box u = 0$ must satisfy the reduced equation

$$\partial_1(x_1\partial_1 v) - \sum_{j=2}^{n} \partial_j^2 v + 2i\sigma v = 0.$$

This is a Keldysh type equation on the quotient space

$$\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\!\sim\, = \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and [GZ, Thm. 1] implies that v and hence u is real analytic.

The proof of Theorem 1.8 is a generalization of the argument in Example 3.1:

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Shrinking $\mathcal{U}$ if necessary, we can write the coordinates from Proposition 2.1 as

$$(x_0, \ldots, x_n) : \mathcal{U} \to (-\epsilon, \epsilon)_{x_0} \times (-\delta, \delta)_{x_1} \times K_{x_2,\ldots,x_n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1},$$

where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is an open relatively compact subset and $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ are sufficiently small. Since

$$\partial_0 = W|_{\mathcal{U}}$$

is a Killing vector field, we would like to eventually reduce P in the x_0-direction. For this, we first set

$$\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{U}/\!\sim,$$

where $p \sim q$ if and only if

$$(x_1(p), \ldots, x_n(p)) = (x_1(q), \ldots, x_n(q)),$$

i.e. only $x_0(p)$ and $x_0(q)$ may differ. The induced coordinates on the quotient space are

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) : \mathcal{V} \to (-\delta, \delta)_{x_1} \times K_{x_2,\ldots,x_n},$$

i.e. we have "dropped" the x_0-coordinate.

The complex (r, s)-tensors on $\mathcal{U}$ are complex linear combinations of basis elements of the form

$$e_{\mathrm{I}} := \partial_{i_0} \otimes \ldots \otimes \partial_{i_r} \otimes \mathrm{d}x_{j_0} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathrm{d}x_{j_s},$$

where $\mathrm{I} := (i_1, \dots, i_r, j_1, \dots, j_s)$, and we of course have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial_0} e_{\mathrm{I}} = 0.$$

Let us define $f := Pu$ and write

$$u = \sum_{\mathrm{I}} u_{\mathrm{I}} e_{\mathrm{I}}, \quad f = \sum_{\mathrm{I}} f_{\mathrm{I}} e_{\mathrm{I}}.$$

Since $\partial_0 = W|_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a Killing vector field, we note that

$$[\mathcal{L}_{\partial_0}, \nabla] = 0,$$

and by the assumption in Theorem 1.8, we know that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial_0} A = \mathcal{L}_W A = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\partial_0} B = \mathcal{L}_W B = 0.$$

It thus follows that the wave equation $Pu = f$, restricted to the subset $\mathcal{U}$, can be written as a linear system of scalar wave equations

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{n} -g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u_{\mathrm{I}} + \sum_{\gamma=0}^{n}\sum_{J} \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I},\gamma}\partial_\gamma u_{\mathrm{J}} + \sum_{\mathrm{J}} \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I}} u_{\mathrm{J}} = f_{\mathrm{I}}, \tag{12}$$

for each $\mathrm{I} := (i_1, \dots, i_r, j_1, \dots, j_s)$, where the coefficients

$$g^{\alpha\beta}, \quad \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I},\gamma}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I}}$$

are *independent* of x_0. By the mode condition (ii), we note that

$$\partial_0 u_{\mathrm{I}} = -i\sigma u_{\mathrm{I}}, \quad \partial_0 f_{\mathrm{I}} = -i\sigma f_{\mathrm{I}},$$

which implies that

$$u_{\mathrm{I}} = e^{-i\sigma x_0} u_{\mathrm{I}}|_{x_0=0}, \quad f_{\mathrm{I}} = e^{-i\sigma x_0} f_{\mathrm{I}}|_{x_0=0}.$$

Inserting this into (12) gives a new system of equations

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} -g^{ij}\partial_i\partial_j u_{\mathrm{I}}|_{x_0=0} + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\sum_{J} \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I},k}\partial_k u_{\mathrm{J}}|_{x_0=0} + \sum_{\mathrm{J}} \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I}} u_{\mathrm{J}}|_{x_0=0} = f_{\mathrm{I}}|_{x_0=0},$$

where the new coefficients $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I},k}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{I}}$ are independent of x_0. Note also that the sums now exclude derivatives in x_0. We have thus shown that the equation $Pu = f$ is equivalent to a system of equations

$$\hat{P}u|_{x_0=0} = f|_{x_0=0}$$

on the quotient space

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}/\!\sim,$$

where the principal symbol of $\hat{P}$ is given by

$$\mathrm{p}(x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} g(x_1, \dots, x_n)^{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \mathrm{Id}, \tag{13}$$

for any $(x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi^1, \dots, \xi^n) \in T^*\mathcal{V}$, where Id is the identity matrix.

This is where the information about the metric g in Proposition 2.1 becomes useful. We claim that first that

$$\{\mathrm{p} = 0\} \cap \{x_1 = 0\} = \mathcal{N}^*\{x_1 = 0\}, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1 = 0\}$ denotes the conormal bundle of the horizon $\{x_1 = 0\}$. In order to compute the components g^{ij}, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we first need to invert the *full* matrix of metric components. By Proposition 2.1, we conclude that

$$g^{\alpha\beta}|_{\mathcal{U}\cap\{x_1=0\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g^{22}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{2n}|_{x_1=0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & g^{n2}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{nn}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix} \tag{15}$$

for $\alpha, \beta = 0, \dots, n$. The components appearing in (13) are given, at $x_1 = 0$, by

$$g^{ij}|_{x_1=0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & g^{22}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{2n}|_{x_1=0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & g^{n2}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{nn}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} g^{22}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{2n}|_{x_1=0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g^{n2}|_{x_1=0} & \dots & g^{nn}|_{x_1=0} \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive definite by Proposition 2.1, we have proven (14).

By standard *microlocal* analytic hypoellipticity at elliptic points in $T^*\mathcal{V}$, we hence conclude that u_{I} is microlocally real analytic everywhere at $x_1 = 0$ except potentially at the conormal bundle $\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1 = 0\}$, i.e. the analytic wave front set at $x_1 = 0$ is contained in the conormal bundle. We will show the real analyticity at the conormal bundle by applying [GZ, Thm. 2], which requires a computation of the Hamiltonian vector field H_{p} at $\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1 = 0\}$. For this, we first compute $\partial_1 \mathrm{p}|_{\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1=0\}}$. At an arbitrary point

$$q := (0, x_2, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{N}^*\{x_1 = 0\},$$

using (15) and Proposition 2.1, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 \mathrm{p}|_q &= \partial_1 g^{11}|_q (\xi_1)^2 \mathrm{Id} \\ &= -\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{n} g^{\alpha 1} (\partial_1 g_{\alpha\beta}) g^{\beta 1}|_q (\xi_1)^2 \mathrm{Id} \\ &= -\partial_1 g_{00}|_q (\xi_1)^2 \mathrm{Id} \\ &= 2\kappa(\xi_1)^2 \mathrm{Id}. \end{aligned}$$

We may now compute the Hamiltonian vector field as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathrm{p}}|_q &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\partial_{\xi_j} \mathrm{p}) \partial_j|_q - (\partial_j \mathrm{p}) \partial_{\xi_j}|_q \\ &= -(\partial_1 \mathrm{p}) \partial_{\xi_1}|_q \\ &= -2\kappa(\xi_1)^2 \partial_{\xi_1}|_q, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $\kappa \neq 0$. In particular

$$\mathrm{d}\mathrm{p}|_{\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1=0\}\setminus\{0\}} \neq 0$$

and

$$H_{\mathrm{p}}|_{\mathcal{N}^*\{x_1=0\}\setminus\{0\}} \parallel \xi \cdot \partial_\xi,$$

which means that the assumptions in [GZ, Thm. 2] are satisfied. Note here that [GZ, Thm. 2] is only proven for scalar valued wave equations, but the argument goes through line by line for systems of equations with the same assumptions on

the principal symbol. Hence [GZ, Thm. 2] implies that $u_{\mathrm{I}}|_{t_*=0}$ is microlocally real analytic also at the conormal bundle. It follows that $u_{\mathrm{I}}|_{t_*=0}$ is real analytic in an open subset containing $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Consequently, u_{I} and therefore u is real analytic in an open neighborhood containing p, which completes the proof. □

4. Joint quasinormal modes

We continue by proving the next main result of this paper:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us for simplicity restrict in this proof to the case of complex functions, as opposed to complex tensor fields of higher rank. This will make the proof more transparent and avoid the technical details involved with working with system of equations. All such technicalities are already present in the proof of Theorem 1.8 above. We thus consider functions of the form

$$u(t_*, r, \phi_*, \theta) = e^{-i(\sigma t_* + k\phi_*)} v(r, \theta),$$

which are smooth on

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset M_*.$$

We aim to prove that u is real analytic on $\mathcal{U}$.

Step 1: Real analyticity near the horizons. Given a point

$$p := \{0\} \times \{r_e\} \times \{q\} \in \mathcal{H}_e^+,$$

for a $q \in S^2$, we claim that Theorem 1.8 implies that there is an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}_q \subset M_*$ around q, such that $u|_{\mathcal{V}_q}$ is real analytic. For this, we need to check the assumptions of Theorem 1.8. The dominant energy condition is clearly satisfied, since the Kerr(-de Sitter) spacetime is vacuum with a non-negative cosmological constant. It follows that from (24) that

$$W := \partial_{t_*} + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2} \partial_{\phi_*}$$

is a horizon Killing vector. Finally, the surface gravity of $\mathcal{H}_e^+$ is proportional to $\mu'(r_e)$, as can easily be checked. Since we have assumed that r_e is a simple real root, we conclude that the surface gravity is non-zero. Hence $\mathcal{H}_e^+$ is non-degenerate with respect to W. Moreover, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_W u &= \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{t_*}} u + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2} \mathcal{L}_{\partial_{\phi_*}} u \\ &= -i\sigma u - i \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2} k u \\ &= -i \left(\sigma + \frac{a}{r_e^2 + a^2} k \right) u, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that u is a mode with respect to W. One similarly checks that

$$\mathcal{L}_W A = 0, \quad \mathcal{L}_W B = 0.$$

Theorem 1.8 can thus be applied to prove the claim. By taking the union of all such $\mathcal{V}_q$ for $q \in S^2$, it follows that there is an open subset $\mathcal{V} \subset M_*$ with

$$\{0\} \times \{r_e\} \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset \mathcal{V},$$

such that $u|_{\mathcal{V}}$ is real analytic. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\mathcal{V} = (-\epsilon, \epsilon)_{t_*} \times (r_e - \epsilon, r_e + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Now, this implies that $e^{-ik\phi_*} v(r, \theta)$ is real analytic on

$$(r_e - \epsilon, r_e + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

which in turn means that $u(t_*, r, \phi_*, \theta) = e^{-i(\sigma t_* + k\phi_*)} v(r, \theta)$ is real analytic on the open subset

$$\mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - \epsilon, r_e + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

One similarly shows that u is real analytic on the open subset

$$\mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_c - \epsilon, r_c + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

in case $\Lambda > 0$, shrinking ϵ if necessary.

Step 2: Real analyticity in the domain of outer communication. We now prove real analyticity of u in the open subset

$$\mathcal{W} := \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e, r_c)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

(Recall that $r_c = \infty$ in the Kerr spacetime). The Boyer-Lindquist coordinates (t, r, ϕ, θ) are defined on this set and are convenient to work with. Since

$$\partial_t = \partial_{t_*}|_{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \partial_\phi = \partial_{\phi_*}|_{\mathcal{W}},$$

the conditions (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 imply that

$$u(t, r, \phi, \theta) = e^{-i(\sigma t + k\phi)} w(r, \theta),$$

so we can equally well consider the modes with respect to the Boyer-Lindquist coordinates. The dual metric G of g in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates is

$$\begin{aligned}(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta))G = \mu(r)\partial_r^2 + c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)}\left(a\sin^2(\theta)\partial_t + \partial_\phi\right)^2 \\ - \frac{b^2}{\mu(r)}\left((r^2 + a^2)\partial_t + a\partial_\phi\right)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

We begin by proving real analyticity of w in the open subset

$$(r_e, r_c)_r \times (0, \pi)_\theta$$

i.e. we leave out the north and the south pole of $S^2_{\phi,\theta}$ for the moment. Since we have assumed that the coefficients of P are independent of t and ϕ, the function w satisfies an induced equation on $(r_e, r_c)_r \times (0, \pi)_\theta$, with principal part given by

$$\frac{1}{r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)}\left(\mu(r)\partial_r^2 + c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2\right). \tag{17}$$

Since $\mu(r), c(\theta) > 0$ in this set, the induced equation for w is elliptic with real analytic coefficients. Standard analytic hypoellipticity therefore implies that w is real analytic in $(r_e, r_c)_r \times (0, \pi)_\theta$ and hence u is real analytic in

$$\mathbb{R}_t \times (r_e, r_c)_r \times S^1_\phi \times (0, \pi)_\theta.$$

We now turn to show that u is also real analytic at the north and south poles of $S^2_{\phi,\theta}$, i.e. at the limits $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$, still with $r \in (r_e, r_c)$. Note that the expression (17) does not extend smoothly to those points. We now write

$$u(t, r, \phi, \theta) = e^{-i\sigma t} z(r, \phi, \theta),$$

i.e. the idea is to show real analyticity of

$$z(r, \phi, \theta) := e^{-ik\phi} w(r, \theta),$$

which is smooth in

$$(r_e, r_c)_r \times S^2_{\phi,\theta}.$$

Since the coefficients of P are independent of t, we get an induced equation for z with principal part

$$\mu(r)\partial_r^2 + c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)}\partial_\phi^2 - \frac{b^2}{\mu(r)}a^2\partial_\phi^2. \tag{18}$$

It is clear by geometric arguments that this differential operator extends real analytically to $(r_e, r_c) \times S^2_{\phi,\theta}$, but let us check this explicitly for completeness. Since $\mu(r) > 0$ for $r \in (r_e, r_c)$, we only need to consider the term

$$\begin{aligned} c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)}\partial_\phi^2 &= \left(c(\theta) - \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)}\right)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)}\left(\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta)}\partial_\phi^2 + \partial_\theta^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c(\theta)}\left(c(\theta)^2 - b^2\right)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)}G_{S^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{c(\theta)}\left(\left(b - \frac{\Lambda a^2}{3}\sin^2(\theta)\right)^2 - b^2\right)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)}G_{S^2} \\ &= h(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \frac{b^2}{c(\theta)}G_{S^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for some function h, which extends real analytically to S^2 and where G_{S^2} is the dual metric to the standard metric on S^2. Since both $\sin^2(\theta)\partial_\theta^2$ and G_{S^2} extend real analytically to S^2, so does (18), as claimed. We can use this computation to observe that equation (18) is simply

$$\mu(r)\partial_r^2 + bG_{S^2}$$

at the north and the south pole of S^2, i.e. at the limits $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$. Since $\mu(r) > 0$ for $r \in (r_e, r_c)$ and $b > 0$, we conclude that (18) is in fact elliptic at the north and south pole. Again, standard real analytic hypoellipticity implies that z, and therefore u, is real analytic also at the north and the south pole if $r \in (r_e, r_c)$. To sum up, we now know that u is real analytic in the domain of outer communication and slightly beyond the horizons, i.e. in a region of the form

$$\mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - \epsilon, r_c + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

Step 3: The region beyond the horizons. It remains to prove real analyticity in the regions beyond the horizons (only the event horizon if $\Lambda = 0$). Consider first the region

$$\mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_e - c_1, r_e)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

beyond the event horizon. We may use Boyer-Lindquist coordinates also here. Let us again consider

$$z(r, \phi, \theta) := e^{-ik\phi}w(r, \theta),$$

which by assumption is smooth in

$$(r_e - c_1, r_e)_r \times S^2_{\phi,\theta}.$$

In this set, we have $\mu(r) < 0$. Again, the coefficients of P are independent of t and the principal part of the induced equation for z can be read off from (18) to be

$$-|\mu(r)|\partial_r^2 + c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \left(\frac{b^2}{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)} + \frac{b^2}{|\mu(r)|}a^2\right)\partial_\phi^2.$$

The operator

$$c(\theta)\partial_\theta^2 + \left(\frac{b^2}{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)} + \frac{b^2}{|\mu(r)|}a^2\right)\partial_\phi^2.$$

is elliptic on

$$S^2_{\phi,\theta},$$

for all $r \in (r_e - c_1, r_e)$. The induced equation for z is thus a linear wave operator on the globally hyperbolic manifold

$$(r_e - c_1, r_e)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

with real analytic coefficients. Moreover, the induced initial data

$$\left(z|_{r=r_e-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}, \partial_r z|_{r=r_e-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}\right)$$

at the Cauchy hypersurface $\{r = r_e - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\}$ are real analytic, by **Step 1**. The Cauchy-Kovalevskaya theorem and standard uniqueness theory for the Cauchy problem shows that z is real analytic in

$$(r_e - c_1, r_e)_r \times S^2_{\phi,\theta},$$

and hence u is real analytic in

$$\mathbb{R}_t \times (r_e - c_1, r_e)_r \times S^2_{\phi,\theta},$$

One similarly treats the subset

$$\mathbb{R}_t \times (r_c, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi,\theta},$$

in case $\Lambda > 0$. This finishes the proof. □

5. Standard quasinormal modes

We finish by proving our last main result:

Proof of Theorem 1.2. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, let us for simplicity restrict to the case of complex functions, as opposed to complex tensors of higher rank. This will again make the proof more transparent and avoid technical details that are completely analogous to the corresponding part of the proof of Theorem 1.8. As before, we write

$$u(t_*, r, \phi_*, \theta) = e^{-i\sigma t_*} z(r, \phi_*, \theta), \tag{19}$$

where z is smooth in

$$(r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

By assumption (ii) in Theorem 1.2, and since the coefficients of P are independent of t_*, it follows that z satisfies a reduced equation

$$\hat{P} z = 0, \tag{20}$$

in

$$(r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

The idea of the proof is to decompose z into angular modes

$$z(r, \phi_*, \theta) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik\phi_*} v_k(r, \theta), \tag{21}$$

where each summand

$$e^{-ik\phi_*} v_k(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-ik\phi_*} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{iks} z(r, s, \theta) ds$$

is smooth on $(r_e - c_1, r_c + c_2)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}$ and then use the Fredholm theory developed in [Vas13] and [Vasa] (the latter is only needed if $\Lambda = 0$) to deduce that in fact

$$z(r, \phi_*, \theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{-ik_j\phi_*} v_{k_j}(r, \theta) \tag{22}$$

is a *finite* sum. Now, since each summand satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, they are real analytic. Consequently the finite sum is real analytic, which will complete the proof.

The remainder of the proof is therefore a verification that the Fredholm theory can be applied. One first easily checks that (3) is equivalent to the condition that there is a $r \in (r_e, r_c)$, such that

$$\mu(r) > a^2.$$

As shown in [Vas13, Sec. 6.3], this means that the t_*-reduced equation (20) is (classically) non-trapping.

Let us start with the case $\Lambda > 0$. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\mathcal{Y}^s := \bar{H}^s\left((r_e - \epsilon, r_c + \epsilon)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}\right),$$

i.e. the *extendible* distributions of Sobolev degree s, for some small $\epsilon > 0$, and

$$\mathcal{X}^s := \{u \in \mathcal{Y}^s \mid \hat{P}u \in \mathcal{X}^{s-1}\}.$$

We claim that there is an $s \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\hat{P} : \mathcal{X}^s \to \mathcal{Y}^{s-1}$$

is a Fredholm operator. Indeed, this follows essentially by [Vas13, Thm. 1.2]. The only difference is that we here use the compact spacelike hypersurfaces

$$\{r_e - \epsilon\} \times S^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \{r_c + \epsilon\} \times S^2$$

in place of the complex absorption used in [Vas13]. The proof of [Vas13, Thm. 1.2] can easily be adapted to this case as described in [Vas13, Rmk. 2.6] (c.f. also [HV15, Sec. 2A3] and [Zwo16]). Now, this means in particular that

$$\ker(\hat{P}) \subset \mathcal{Y}^s$$

is finite dimensional. Since the summands in (21) are smooth linearly independent elements in $\ker(\hat{P})$, it follows that all but finitely many terms have to vanish and we have proven (22). Theorem 1.1 hence applies to show that z is real analytic, completing the proof when $\Lambda > 0$.

In the case when $\Lambda = 0$, we have $r_c = \infty$ and the cosmological horizon is replaced by an asymptotically Euclidean end. For the analysis near the event horizon, the methods based on [Vas13] described above can be applied without changes. However, the analysis near the asymptotically Euclidean end cannot be based on [Vas13], we instead need to use a slight generalization of [Vasa, Prop. 5.28]. Let us therefore briefly recall how the Fredholm problem was set up in [Vasa, Prop. 5.28]. We begin by bordifying the space

$$(r_e - c_1, \infty)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta},$$

at $r = \infty$ by introducing $x := \frac{1}{r}$, i.e. we radially compactify spacelike infinity. We thus write

$$\mathcal{V} := \left[0, \frac{1}{r_e - c_1}\right)_x \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}^3},$$

where $\overline{\mathbb{R}^3}$ is the radially compactified $\mathbb{R}^3$. On these spaces, we define

$$\mathcal{Y}^{s,l}_{sc} := \{u|_{\mathcal{V}} \mid u \in H^{s,l}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^3})\},$$

where s, l are variable order differential and decay orders (as $x \to 0$), which we will choose below. We refer to [Vasa, Sec. 5.3.9] for the definition of variable order weighted Sobolev spaces $H^{s,l}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^3})$. Note that near the spacelike hypersurface $\{x = \frac{1}{r_e - c_1}\}$, $\mathcal{Y}^{s,l}_{sc}$ is similar to $\mathcal{Y}^s$ introduced above. Analogous to above, define

$$\mathcal{X}^{s,l}_{sc} := \{u \in \mathcal{Y}^{s,l}_{sc} \mid \hat{P}u \in \mathcal{Y}^{s-1,l+1}_{sc}\}$$

and consider

$$\hat{P} : \mathcal{X}^{s,l}_{sc} \to \mathcal{Y}^{s-1,l+1}_{sc}. \tag{23}$$

The characteristic set of $\hat{P}$ has two components, one close to the event horizon and a scattering characteristic set at $x = 0$, in particular, the characteristic set at fiber infinity near $x = 0$ is empty. By the decay assumptions on A and B, the scattering principal symbol of $\hat{P}$ at $x = 0$ is given by

$$\mathrm{p}|_{x=0}(\xi) = |\xi|^2 \,\mathrm{Id} - \sigma^2,$$

for the *fixed* σ with $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \geq 0$, and any

$$\xi \in {}^{sc}T^*_{\{x=0\}}\mathcal{V}.$$

If $\operatorname{Im}\sigma > 0$ it follows that $\sigma^2 \notin [0,\infty)$, which implies that $\hat{P}$ is *elliptic* as set up in (23) and consequently a Fredholm operator for any order s, l. However, in case $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, there is a scattering characteristic set at $x = 0$, given by all $\xi \in {}^{sc}T^*_{\{x=0\}}\mathcal{V}$ with $|\xi| = |\sigma|$. As shown in [Vasa, p. 311–314], the sets

$$L_\pm = \left\{(y,\xi) \in {}^{sc}T^*_{\{x=0\}}\mathcal{V} \mid y = c\xi, |\xi|^2 = \sigma^2, \pm c > 0\right\},$$

act as a source and a sink, respectively, for the Hamiltonian flow. It is also shown that (23) is a Fredholm operator (c.f. [Vasa, Prop. 5.28]), if l is chosen such that either

$$l|_{L_+} < -\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } l|_{L_-} > -\frac{1}{2}$$

or the other way around (with L_+ and L_- swapped). The decay assumption on $u|_{t_*=0}$ in Theorem 1.2 ensures that $z|_{t_*=0} \in \mathcal{X}^{s,l}_{sc}$, and therefore each summand in (21), is in $\ker(\hat{P})$ as set up in (23). We have thus proven (22), for the case when $\Lambda = 0$ and $\sigma \neq 0$ (and $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \geq 0$).

The case which remains is when $\Lambda = \sigma = 0$. The structure of the operator $\hat{P}$ now changes drastically near $x = 0$ and is more naturally thought of as a b-operator in the sense of Melrose [Mel93], see also [GH08, GH09]. We follow [Vasa, Sec. 5.6] for the Fredholm theory. Concretely, we note that the fast decay assumptions on A and B ensure that

$$x^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} x^{-2} \hat{P} x^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$$

is a b-operator with normal operator

$$-(x\partial_x)^2 + \Delta_h + \frac{(n-2)^2}{4}$$

at $x = 0$. Choose a smooth function $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, such that $f(x) = x$ for $x \leq \epsilon$ and $f(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 2\epsilon$ and define

$$L := f(x)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} f(x)^{-2} \hat{P} f(x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}},$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that the component of the characteristic set of $\hat{P}$ away from $x = 0$ is unaffected by this conjugation. We now define the spaces

$$\mathcal{Y}^{s,l}_b := \{u|_{\mathcal{V}} \mid u \in H^{s,l}_b(\overline{\mathbb{R}^3})\},$$

where $H^{s,l}_b(\overline{\mathbb{R}^3})$ is defined in [Vasa, p. 353] and

$$\mathcal{X}^{s,l}_b := \left\{u \in \mathcal{Y}^{s,l}_b \mid Lu \in \mathcal{Y}^{s-1,l}_b\right\}.$$

By combining the discussion on [Vasa, p. 361] (c.f. also [Vasa, Thm. 5.11]) with the theory near the event horizon described above, we know that

$$L : \mathcal{X}^{s,l}_b \to \mathcal{Y}^{s-1,l}_b$$

is a Fredholm for all $s, l \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$l^2 - \frac{(n-2)^2}{4}$$

is not an L^2 eigenvalue of Δ on the 2-sphere. Since the set of L^2-eigenvalues is discrete, we can choose l arbitrarily large and still have a Fredholm operator. It follows that the kernel of L is finite dimensional. Now, the kernel of $\hat{P}$ and the kernel of L are related just by a multiplication with $f(x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ and we have thus proven the $\ker(\hat{P})$ is finite dimensional and consequently (22). This finishes the proof. □

Appendix A. The analytic extension of the spacetime metric

The metric on the Kerr-de Sitter spacetime, extended to M_* over the future event horizon $\{r = r_e\}$ and future cosmological horizon $\{r = r_c\}$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_* = &-\frac{4(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta))}{(r - r_0)(r - r_C)(r_c - r_e)^2}\mathrm{d}r^2 \\ &+ \frac{2}{b}\left(2\frac{r - r_e}{r_c - r_e} - 1\right)(\mathrm{d}t_* - a\sin^2(\theta)\mathrm{d}\phi_*)\mathrm{d}r \\ &- \frac{\mu(r)}{b^2\left(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)\right)}\left(\mathrm{d}t_* - a\sin^2(\theta)\mathrm{d}\phi_*\right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{c(\theta)\sin^2(\theta)}{b^2\left(r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)\right)}\left(a\mathrm{d}t_* - \left(r^2 + a^2\right)\mathrm{d}\phi_*\right)^2 \\ &+ (r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta))\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta^2}{c(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

In the case when $\Lambda = 0$, we get the Kerr spacetime extended over the event horizon $\{r = r_e\}$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_* = &-2(\mathrm{d}t_* - a\sin^2(\theta)\mathrm{d}\phi_*)\mathrm{d}r \\ &- \frac{\mu(r)}{r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)}\left(\mathrm{d}t_* - a\sin^2(\theta)\mathrm{d}\phi_*\right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{\sin^2(\theta)}{r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta)}\left(a\mathrm{d}t_* - \left(r^2 + a^2\right)\mathrm{d}\phi_*\right)^2 \\ &+ (r^2 + a^2\cos^2(\theta))\mathrm{d}\theta^2. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We note that both metrics are real analytic in

$$M_* = \mathbb{R}_{t_*} \times (r_C, \infty)_r \times S^2_{\phi_*,\theta}.$$

Appendix B. Surface gravity of a Killing horizon

Let us verify the claim in Remark 1.6 about the surface gravity of a Killing horizon:

Lemma B.1. *Consider a smooth spacetime (M, g) satisfying the dominant energy condition, with a smooth lightlike hypersurface $\mathcal{H} \subset M$. If W is a a smooth Killing vector field on M such that $W|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is lightlike and tangent to $\mathcal{H}$, then there this a constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$\nabla_W W|_{\mathcal{H}} = \kappa W|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Proof. Using that $W|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is lightlike and tangent to $\mathcal{H}$, we compute that for all vector fields X, Y, tangent to $\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\nabla_X W, Y)|_{\mathcal{H}} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_W g(X, Y)|_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{1}{2}\left(g(\nabla_X W, Y)|_{\mathcal{H}} - g(\nabla_Y W, X)|_{\mathcal{H}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(Xg(W, Y)|_{\mathcal{H}} - Yg(W, X)|_{\mathcal{H}} - g(W, [X, Y])|_{\mathcal{H}}\right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

since also $[X, Y]$ is tangent to $\mathcal{H}$. Hence $\nabla_X W$ is tangent to $\mathcal{H}$ and lightlike, meaning that there is a one-form ω on $\mathcal{H}$, such that

$$\nabla_X W|_{\mathcal{H}} = \omega(X)W|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

The assertion in the lemma is thus that $\omega(W|_{\mathcal{H}})$ is constant. Since W is a Killing vector field, with $W|_{\mathcal{H}}$ tangent to $\mathcal{H}$, it is immediate that

$$\mathcal{L}_W \omega|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0.$$

For any $X \in T\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X(\omega(W|_{\mathcal{H}})) &= \mathrm{d}\omega(X, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) + W|_{\mathcal{H}}\omega(X) + \omega([X, W|_{\mathcal{H}}]) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\omega(X, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) + \mathcal{L}_{W|_{\mathcal{H}}}\omega(X) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\omega(X, W|_{\mathcal{H}}). \end{aligned}$$

It thus remains to show that $\mathrm{d}\omega(X, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) = 0$, for all $X \in T\mathcal{H}$. This is where the dominant energy condition comes in. For this, we first note that for all $X, Y \in T\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(X,Y)W|_{\mathcal{H}} &= \nabla_X\nabla_Y W|_{\mathcal{H}} - \nabla_Y\nabla_X W|_{\mathcal{H}} - \nabla_{[X,Y]}W|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \nabla_X(\omega(Y)W|_{\mathcal{H}}) - \nabla_Y(\omega(X)W|_{\mathcal{H}}) - \omega([X,Y])W|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= X(\omega(Y))W|_{\mathcal{H}} + \omega(Y)\omega(X) - Y(\omega(X))W|_{\mathcal{H}} - \omega(X)\omega(Y) \\ &\quad - \omega([X,Y])W|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathrm{d}\omega(X,Y)W|_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $e_1 := W|_{\mathcal{H}}, e_2, \ldots, e_n$ be local frame of $T\mathcal{H}$ and let e_0 be the unique locally defined vector field along $\mathcal{H}$, transversal to $\mathcal{H}$, such that

$$g(e_0, e_1)|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1, \quad g(e_0, e_j)|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0,$$

for $j = 0, 2, \ldots, n$. Since $g(W, e_j)|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0$ for all $j = 0, 2, \ldots, n$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ric}(W,W)|_{\mathcal{H}} &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{n} g^{\alpha\beta} R\left(e_\alpha, W, W, e_\beta\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{i,j=2}^{n} g^{ij} R\left(e_i, W, W, e_j\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{i,j=2}^{n} g^{ij} \mathrm{d}\omega(e_i, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) g(W, e_j)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the notation $\mathrm{T} := \mathrm{Ric} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Scal}g$, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, \cdot)^\sharp, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) &= \mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= \mathrm{Ric}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Scal}g(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, W|_{\mathcal{H}}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, \cdot)^\sharp$ is tangent to $\mathcal{H}$. By the dominant energy condition, we also know that $\mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, \cdot)^\sharp$ is causal. Since the only causal direction tangent to $\mathcal{H}$ is the lightlike direction (spanned by $W|_{\mathcal{H}}$), we conclude that $\mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, \cdot)^\sharp$ is lightlike. This implies that for every $X \in T\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= g(\mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, \cdot)^\sharp, X) \\ &= \mathrm{T}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) \\ &= \mathrm{Ric}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Scal}g(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) \\ &= \mathrm{Ric}(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X). \end{aligned}$$

We may now finally express this in terms of our above chosen local frame and any $X \in T\mathcal{H}$ to get

$$0 = \mathrm{Ric}(X, W)|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{n} g^{\alpha\beta} R\left(e_\alpha, X, W, e_\beta\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= R\left(W, X, W, e_0\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} + R\left(e_0, X, W, W\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{i,j=2}^{n} g^{ij} R\left(e_i, X, W, e_j\right)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \mathrm{d}\omega(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) g(W, e_0) + \sum_{i,j=2}^{n} g^{ij} \mathrm{d}\omega(e_i, X) g(W, e_j)|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \mathrm{d}\omega(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X).
\end{aligned}
$$

We therefore conclude that $\mathrm{d}\omega(W|_{\mathcal{H}}, X) = 0$ for all $X \in T\mathcal{H}$, which concludes the proof. □

References

[AIK10a] Spyros Alexakis, Alexandru D. Ionescu, and Sergiu Klainerman, *Hawking's local rigidity theorem without analyticity*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **20** (2010), no. 4, 845–869.

[AIK10b] ———, *Uniqueness of smooth stationary black holes in vacuum: small perturbations of the Kerr spaces*, Comm. Math. Phys. **299** (2010), no. 1, 89–127.

[AIK14] ———, *Rigidity of stationary black holes with small angular momentum on the horizon*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), no. 14, 2603–2615.

[BH08] Jean-François Bony and Dietrich Häfner, *Decay and non-decay of the local energy for the wave equation on the de Sitter-Schwarzschild metric*, Comm. Math. Phys. **282** (2008), no. 3, 697–719.

[Dya12] Semyon Dyatlov, *Asymptotic distribution of quasi-normal modes for Kerr-de Sitter black holes*, Ann. Henri Poincare **13** (2012), 1101–1166.

[Dya11] ———, *Quasi-normal modes and exponential energy decay for the Kerr-de Sitter black hole*, Comm. Math. Phys. **306** (2011), no. 1, 119–163.

[FRW99] Helmut Friedrich, István Rácz, and Robert M. Wald, *On the rigidity theorem for spacetimes with a stationary event horizon or a compact Cauchy horizon*, Comm. Math. Phys. **204** (1999), no. 3, 691–707.

[GW20] Dejan Gajic and Claude Warnick, *A model problem for quasinormal ringdown of asymptotically flat or extremal black holes*, J. Math. Phys. **61** (2020), no. 10.

[GZ] Jeffrey Galkowski and Maciej Zworski, *Analytic hypoellipticity of Keldysh operators*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. To appear. (arXiv: 2003.08106).

[GH08] Colin Guillarmou and Andrew Hassell, *Resolvent at low energy and Riesz transform for Schrödinger operators on asymptotically conic manifolds. I*, Math. Ann. **341** (2008), no. 4, 859–896.

[GH09] ———, *Resolvent at low energy and Riesz transform for Schrödinger operators on asymptotically conic manifolds. II*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **59** (2009), no. 4, 1553–1610.

[Haw72] Stephen W. Hawking, *Black holes in general relativity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **25** (1972), 152–166.

[HE73] Stephen W. Hawking and George F. R. Ellis, *The large scale structure of space-time*, Cambridge University Press, London-New York, 1973. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, No. 1.

[HV15] Peter Hintz and András Vasy, *Semilinear wave equations on asymptotically de Sitter, Kerr–de Sitter and Minkowski spacetimes*, Anal. PDE **8** (2015), no. 8, 1807–1890.

[HV18] Peter Hintz and András Vasy, *The global non-linear stability of the Kerr–de Sitter family of black holes*, Acta Math. **220** (2018), no. 1, 1–206.

[HIW07] Stefan Hollands, Akihiro Ishibashi, and Robert M. Wald, *A higher dimensional stationary rotating black hole must be axisymmetric*, Comm. Math. Phys. **271** (2007), no. 3, 699–722.

[IK13] Alexandru D. Ionescu and Sergiu Klainerman, *On the local extension of Killing vector-fields in Ricci flat manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (2013), no. 2, 563–593.

[IM85] James Isenberg and Vincent Moncrief, *Symmetries of cosmological Cauchy horizons with exceptional orbits*, J. Math. Phys. **26** (1985), no. 5, 1024–1027.

[KIS00] Hideo Kodama, Akihiro Ishibashi, and Osamu Seto, *Brane world cosmology: gauge-invariant formalism for perturbation*, Phys. Rev. D (3) **62** (2000), no. 6.

[Mel93] Richard B. Melrose, *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*, Research Notes in Mathematics, vol. 4, A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1993.

[Mel94] ———, *Spectral and scattering theory for the Laplacian on asymptotically Euclidian spaces*, Spectral and scattering theory (Sanda, 1992), Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., vol. 161, Dekker, New York, 1994, pp. 85–130.

[MI83] Vincent Moncrief and James Isenberg, *Symmetries of cosmological Cauchy horizons*, Comm. Math. Phys. **89** (1983), no. 3, 387–413.

[MI08] ———, *Symmetries of higher dimensional black holes*, Classical Quantum Gravity **25** (2008), no. 19, 195015, 37.

[MI20] ———, *Symmetries of cosmological Cauchy horizons with non-closed orbits*, Comm. Math. Phys. **374** (2020), no. 1, 145–186.

[Peta] Oliver L. Petersen, *Wave equations with initial data on compact Cauchy horizons*, Anal. PDE. To appear. (arXiv: 1802.10057).

[Petb] ———, *Extension of Killing vector fields beyond compact Cauchy horizons*, Preprint: arXiv:1903.09135.

[PR] Oliver L. Petersen and István Rácz, *Symmetries of vacuum spacetimes with a compact Cauchy horizon of constant non-zero surface gravity*, Preprint: arXiv: 1809.02580.

[Rác00] István Rácz, *On further generalization of the rigidity theorem for spacetimes with a stationary event horizon or a compact Cauchy horizon*, Classical Quantum Gravity **17** (2000), no. 1, 153–178.

[RW57] Tullio Regge and John A. Wheeler, *Stability of a Schwarzschild Singularity*, Phys. Rev. **108** (1957), 1063–1069.

[SBZ97] Antônio Sá Barreto and Maciej Zworski, *Distribution of resonances for spherical black holes*, Math. Res. Lett. **4** (1997), no. 1, 103–121.

[SR15] Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman, *Quantitative mode stability for the wave equation on the Kerr spacetime*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **16** (2015), no. 1, 289–345.

[Vas13] András Vasy, *Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and Kerr-de Sitter spaces (with an appendix by Semyon Dyatlov)*, Invent. Math. **194** (2013), no. 2, 381–513.

[Vasa] ———, *A Minicourse on Microlocal Analysis for Wave Propagation*, Asymptotic Analysis in General Relativity (Thierry and Häfner Daudé Dietrich and Nicolas, ed.), London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018, pp. 219–374.

[Vasb] ———, *Limiting absorption principle on Riemannian scattering (asymptotically conic) spaces, a Lagrangian approach*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations. To appear. (arXiv: 1905.12587).

[VZ00] András Vasy and Maciej Zworski, *Semiclassical estimates in asymptotically Euclidean scattering*, Comm. Math. Phys. **212** (2000), no. 1, 205–217.

[Vis70] C. V. Vishveshwara, *Stability of the Schwarzschild Metric*, Phys. Rev. D **1** (1970), 2870–2879.

[Whi89] Bernard F. Whiting, *Mode stability of the Kerr black hole*, J. Math. Phys. **30** (1989), no. 6, 1301–1305.

[Zer70] Frank J. Zerilli, *Effective Potential for Even-Parity Regge–Wheeler Gravitational Perturbation Equations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **24** (1970), 737–738.

[Zwo16] Maciej Zworski, *Resonances for asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds: Vasy's method revisited*, J. Spectr. Theory **6** (2016), no. 4, 1087–1114.

[Zui17] Claude Zuily, *Real analyticity of radiation patterns on asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds*, Appl. Math. Res. Express. AMRX **2** (2017), 386–401.

Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, CA 94305-2125, USA
Email address: oliverlp@stanford.edu

Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, CA 94305-2125, USA
Email address: andras@math.stanford.edu