

If  $\hat{\Lambda}$  is diagonalizable, then it can be easily diagonalized in (5.289) by the substitution  $\mathbf{y} = \hat{C}\mathbf{y}^{[1]}$ , where  $\hat{C}^{-1}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{C}$  is diagonal.

So we can assume that  $\hat{\Lambda}$  is already diagonal. Now, a transformation of the form  $\mathbf{y} = (I + x^{-1}\hat{V})\mathbf{y}^{[1]}$  brings (5.289), up to terms of order  $\mathbf{y}/x^2$ , to an equation of the type

$$\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{f}_0(x) - \hat{\Lambda}\mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{x} \left( \hat{A} + \hat{V}\hat{\Lambda} - \hat{\Lambda}\hat{V} \right) \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{g}(x, \mathbf{y}) \quad (5.290)$$

Now we regard the map

$$\hat{\Lambda}\hat{V} := \hat{V}\hat{\Lambda} - \hat{\Lambda}\hat{V}$$

as a linear map on the space of matrices  $\hat{V}$ , or, which is the same, on  $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ . The equation

$$\hat{\Lambda}\hat{V} = \hat{X} \quad (5.291)$$

has a solution iff  $\hat{X}$  is not in the kernel of  $\hat{\Lambda}$ , which by definition, consists in all matrices such that  $\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Y} = 0$ , or, in other words, all matrices which commute with  $\hat{\Lambda}$ . Since the eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Lambda}$  are distinct, it is easy to check that  $\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Y} = 0$  implies  $\hat{Y}$  is diagonal. So, we can change the *off-diagonal* elements of  $\hat{A}$  at will, in particular we can choose them to be zero. By further transformations  $\mathbf{y} = (I + x^{-j}\hat{V})\mathbf{y}^{[1]}$ ,  $j = 2\dots m$ , we can diagonalize the coefficients of  $x^{-2}\mathbf{y}, \dots, x^{-m}\mathbf{y}$ .

So, we can assume all coefficients of  $x^{-j}\mathbf{y}$  up to any fixed  $m$  are diagonal. To show that we can actually assume the coefficients of  $x^{-j}\mathbf{y}$ ,  $j = 2\dots m$ , to be zero it is then enough to show that this is possible for a scalar equation

$$y' = f_0(x) - \Lambda y + \frac{1}{x}Ay + (A_2x^{-2} + \dots + A_mx^{-m})y + \mathbf{g}(x, y) \quad (5.292)$$

As usual, by subtracting terms, we can assume  $f_0(x) = O(x^{-M})$  for any choice of  $M$ , so for the purpose of this argument, we can see that we can safely assume  $f_0$  is absent.

$$y' = -\Lambda y + \frac{1}{x}Ay + (A_2x^{-2} + \dots + A_mx^{-m})y + \mathbf{g}(x, y) \quad (5.293)$$

Now, by substituting  $y = (1 + c_1/x + c_2/x^2 + \dots + c_m/x^m)y^{[1]}$  for suitable  $c_i$ , the new coefficients  $A_j^{[1]}$  vanish (check!).

### \*5.12 Appendix: The $C^*$ -algebra of staircase distributions, $\mathcal{D}'_{m,\nu}$

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the space of test functions (compactly supported  $C^\infty$  functions on  $(0, \infty)$ ) and  $\mathcal{D}(0, x)$  be the test functions on  $(0, x)$ .