ABSENCE OF POINT SPECTRUM FOR THE SELF-DUAL EXTENDED HARPER’S MODEL
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Abstract. We give a simple proof of absence of point spectrum for the self-dual extended Harper’s model. We get a sharp result which improves that of [1] in the isotropic self-dual regime.

1. Introduction

We study the extended Harper’s model on $l^2(Z)$:

$$H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta} u_n = c_\lambda (\theta + n\alpha) u_{n+1} + c_\lambda (\theta + (n-1)\alpha) u_{n-1} + v(\theta + n\alpha) u_n,$$

where $c_\lambda (\theta) = \lambda_1 e^{-2\pi i (\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 e^{2\pi i (\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})}$ and $v(\theta) = 2 \cos 2\pi \theta$. $\tilde{c}_\lambda (\theta) = c_\lambda (\theta)$ for $\theta \in T$ and its analytic extension when $\theta \notin T$. We refer to $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ as coupling constants, $\theta \in T = [0, 1]$ as the phase and $\alpha$ as the frequency.

In [2] the authors partitioned the parameter space into the following three regions.

Region I: $0 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \leq 1, \ 0 < \lambda_2 \leq 1$,
Region II: $0 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_2, \ 1 \leq \lambda_2$,
Region III: $\max\{1, \lambda_2\} \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3, \ \lambda_2 > 0$.

According to the action of the duality transformation $\sigma : \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \to \hat{\lambda} = (\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2}, \frac{1}{\lambda_2}, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2})$, we have the following observation [2]:

Observation 1.1. $\sigma$ is a bijective map on $0 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3, \ 0 < \lambda_2$.

(i) $\sigma(I^0) = II^0, \ \sigma(III^0) = \sigma(II^0)$
Theorem 1.3. Letting \( \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 1, 0 < \lambda_2 \leq 1 \), \( L_{II} := \{ 0 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \leq 1, \lambda_2 = 1 \} \), and \( L_{III} := \{ 1 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 \} \), \( \sigma(L_1) = L_{III} \) and \( \sigma(L_{II}) = L_{II} \).

As \( \sigma \) bijectively maps III \( \cup L_{II} \) onto itself, the literature refers to III \( \cup L_{II} \) as the self-dual regime. We further divide III into III\( _{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \) (isotropic self-dual regime) and III\( _{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \) (anisotropic self-dual regime).

A complete understanding of the spectral properties of the extended Harper’s model for a.e. \( \theta \) has been established:

**Theorem 1.2.** \( I \) The following Lebesgue decomposition of the spectrum of \( H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \) holds for a.e. \( \theta \):

- For all Diophantine \( \alpha \), for Region I, \( H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \) has pure point spectrum.
- For all irrational \( \alpha \), for Regions II, III\( _{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \), \( H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \) has purely absolutely continuous spectrum.
- For all irrational \( \alpha \), for Region III\( _{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \), \( H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \) has purely singular continuous spectrum.

As pointed out in \( I \), the main missing link between \( [2, 3] \) and Theorem 1.2 is the following hypothesis:

**Observation 2.1.** (e.g. \( I \)) The function \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) has at most two zeros. Necessary conditions for real roots are \( \lambda \in \text{III}\( _{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \) or \( \lambda \in \text{III}\( _{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \cap \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 \} \). Moreover,
for \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \), \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) has real roots determined by

\begin{equation}
2\lambda_3 \cos 2\pi(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2}) = -\lambda_2,
\end{equation}

and giving rise to a double root at \( \theta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \) if \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \cap \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 \} \).

- for \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1\neq\lambda_3} \cap \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 \} \), \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) has only one simple real root at \( \theta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \).

**Remark 2.1.** By the definition of the duality transformation \( \sigma \), Observation 2.1 implies that \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) has singular point if and only if \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1=\lambda_3} \) or \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1\neq\lambda_3} \cap \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 1 \} \).

It will be clear in Section 4 that presence of singularities of \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) indeed simplifies the proof of empty point spectrum of \( H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \).

### 3. Lemmas

**Lemma 3.1.** For \( \lambda \in \Pi_{\lambda_1\neq\lambda_3} \cap \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 1 \} \), when \( \lambda_3 > \lambda_1 \), we have

\[
\frac{c_\lambda(\theta)}{|c_\lambda(\theta)|} = e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2}) + f(\theta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{c_\lambda(\theta)}{|c_\lambda(\theta)|} = e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2}) - f(\theta)},
\]

for a real analytic function \( f(\theta) \) on \( \mathbb{T} \) with \( \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) d\theta = 0 \).

**Proof.** By the definition of \( c_\lambda(\theta) \) we have

\begin{align}
c_\lambda(\theta) &= \frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} + \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} \\
&= \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} (e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_+)(e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_-),
\end{align}

where \( y_\pm = \frac{-1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 4\lambda_1\lambda_3}}{2\lambda_1} \). Note that

\begin{align}
y_+ &= \overline{y_-} \quad \text{with} \quad |y_+| = |y_-| = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_1}} > 1, \quad \text{when} \quad 1 \leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_3}, \\
y_+, y_- &\in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{with} \quad |y_+| > |y_-| = \frac{2\lambda_3}{\lambda_1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\lambda_1\lambda_3}} > 1, \quad \text{when} \quad \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 1 > 2\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_3}.
\end{align}

Note that

\[
\frac{c_\lambda(\theta)}{|c_\lambda(\theta)|} = \sqrt{\frac{c_\lambda(\theta)}{c_\lambda(\theta)}} = e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} \sqrt{\frac{e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_+}{e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_-}},
\]

By \( \mathbb{R} \), we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{T}} \text{arg} \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_+}{e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_-} \right) d\theta = 0,
\]

and

\[
\left| \frac{e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_+}{e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_-} \right| = 1.
\]

Thus there exists a real analytic function \( g(\theta) \) on \( \mathbb{T} \) such that

\[
\frac{e^{2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_+}{e^{-2\pi i(\theta + \frac{\alpha}{2})} - y_-} = e^{ig(\theta)},
\]

with \( \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(\theta) d\theta = 0 \). Taking \( f(\theta) = g(\theta)/2 \) yields the desired the result.
Lemma 3.2. There is a subsequence \( \{ \frac{p_n}{q_m} \} \) of the continued fraction approximants of \( \alpha \) so that for any analytic function \( f \) on \( T \) with \( \int_T f(\theta) d\theta = 0 \), we have

\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} f(x) + f(x + \alpha) + \cdots + f(x + q_m \alpha - \alpha) = 0
\]

uniformly in \( x \in T \).

Proof. Suppose \( f \) is analytic on \( |\text{Im}\theta| \leq \delta_0 \), then \( |\hat{f}(n)| \leq ce^{-2\pi \delta_0 |n|} \) for some constant \( c > 0 \).

Case 1. If \( \beta(\alpha) = 0 \), then by solving the cohomological equation we get \( f(x) = h(x + \alpha) - h(x) \) for some analytic \( h(x) \). Then

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} (f(x) + f(x + \alpha) + \cdots + f(x + q_m \alpha - \alpha)) = \lim_{m \to \infty} (h(x + q_m \alpha) - h(x)) = 0
\]

uniformly in \( x \).

Case 2. If \( \beta(\alpha) > 0 \), choose a sequence \( m_l \) such that \( q_{m_l + 1} \geq \frac{e^{2\pi q_{m_l}}}{q_{m_l}} \). Then

\[
|f(x) + f(x + \alpha) + \cdots + f(x + q_{m_l} \alpha - \alpha)| \\
= |\sum_{|n| \geq 1} \hat{f}(n)(1 + e^{2\pi i n \alpha} + \cdots + e^{2\pi i (q_{m_l} - 1) \alpha}) e^{2\pi i n x}| \\
= |\sum_{|n| \geq 1} \hat{f}(n) \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i n q_{m_l} \alpha}}{1 - e^{2\pi i n \theta}} e^{2\pi i n x}| \\
\leq \sum_{1 \leq |n| \leq q_{m_l} - 1} c \left| \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i n q_{m_l} \alpha}}{1 - e^{2\pi i n \theta}} \right| + \sum_{|n| \geq q_{m_l}} c e^{-2\pi \delta_0 |n|} q_{m_l} \\
\leq c \frac{q_{m_l}^3}{q_{m_l + 1}} + cq_{m_l} e^{-2\pi \delta_0 q_{m_l}} \to 0 \text{ as } l \to \infty
\]

uniformly in \( x \). \( \square \)

4. CONSEQUENCE OF POINT SPECTRUM

This part follows from [1]. We present the material here for completeness and readers’ convenience.

Suppose \( \{ u_n \} \) is an \( L^2(Z) \) solution to \( H_{\lambda_1,\theta} u = EU \), where \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \). This means

\[
(4.1) \quad c_{\lambda}(\theta + n\alpha)u_{n+1} + \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(\theta + (n - 1)\alpha)u_{n-1} + 2\cos(2\pi(\theta + n\alpha))u_n = EU_n.
\]

Let \( u(x) = \sum_{n \in Z} u_n e^{2\pi i n x} \in L^2(T) \). Multiplying (4.1) by \( e^{2\pi i n x} \) and then summing over \( n \), we get

\[
(4.2) \quad e^{2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x)u(x + \alpha) + e^{-2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x - \alpha)u(x - \alpha) + 2\cos 2\pi x u(x) = \frac{E}{\lambda_2} u(x),
\]

where \( \tilde{\lambda} = (\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2^2}, 1, \frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2^2}) \). If we multiply (4.1) by \( e^{-2\pi i n x} \) and sum over \( n \), we get

\[
(4.3) \quad e^{-2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x)u(-x - \alpha) + e^{2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x - \alpha)u(-x + \alpha) + 2\cos 2\pi x u(-x) = \frac{E}{\lambda_2} u(-x).
\]

Thus writing (4.2), (4.3) in terms of matrices, we get

\[
(4.4) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{\tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x)} & \left( \frac{E}{\lambda_2^2} - 2\cos 2\pi x \right) \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x) \\
\left( \frac{E}{\lambda_2^2} - 2\cos 2\pi x \right) \tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x) & \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_{\lambda}(x)}
\end{pmatrix} \\
\begin{pmatrix}
u(x) & u(x) \\
e^{-2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} u(x)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
u(x + \alpha) & u(x + \alpha) \\
e^{-2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} u(x + \alpha) & e^{2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} u(x + \alpha)
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
u(x) & u(x) \\
e^{-2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} u(x) & e^{2\pi i \tilde{\theta}} u(x)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
Let $M_\theta(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ be defined by

$$M_\theta(x) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi i \theta} u(x) & e^{2\pi i \theta} u(-x) \\ e^{-2\pi i \theta} u(x - \alpha) & e^{2\pi i \theta} u(-(x - \alpha)) \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Let

$A_{\lambda, E/\lambda_2}(x) = \frac{1}{c_\lambda(x)} \begin{pmatrix} E & -2 \cos 2\pi x \\ c_\lambda(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

be the transfer matrix associated to $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}$ and

$R_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i \theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i \theta} \end{pmatrix}$

be the constant rotation matrix. Then (4.4) becomes

(4.5)

Taking determinant, we get:

$$A_{\lambda, E}(x) M_\theta(x) = M_\theta(x + \alpha) R_\theta.$$ 

Taking determinant, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** [1] If $\theta$ is $\alpha$-irrational, then

(4.6)

$$|\det M_\theta(x)| = \frac{b}{|c_\lambda(x)|}$$

for some constant $b > 0$ and $a.e. x \in \mathbb{T}$.

5. **Regions $\text{III}_{\lambda_1 = \lambda_3}$ AND $\text{III}_{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \cap \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 1\}$**

We will show the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.1.** If $\theta$ is $\alpha$-irrational, then for $\lambda \in \text{III}_{\lambda_1 = \lambda_3}$ or $\lambda \in \text{III}_{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \cap \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 1\}$, $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}$ has no point spectrum.

**Proof.** According to Remark 2.1, we have $c_\lambda(x_0) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$. Note that presence of singularity implies $\frac{1}{c_\lambda(x)} \notin L^1(\mathbb{T})$. Thus by (4.6), $\det M_\theta(x) \notin L^1(\mathbb{T})$. This contradicts with $M_\theta(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$.

6. **Regions $\text{III}_{\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3} \cap \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 1\}$**

Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_3 > \lambda_1$. Fix $\theta$. Denote $\det M_\theta(x) = g(x)$ for simplicity.

**Lemma 6.1.** If $\theta$ is $\alpha$-irrational, then $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}$ has no point spectrum in the anisotropic self-dual region.

**Proof.** Taking determinant in (4.5), we get:

$$\frac{\tilde{c}_\lambda(x - \alpha)}{c_\lambda(x)} g(x) = g(x + \alpha).$$

This implies

(6.1)

$$g(x + k\alpha) = \frac{\tilde{c}_\lambda(x + k\alpha - 2\alpha) \cdots \tilde{c}_\lambda(x) \tilde{c}_\lambda(x - \alpha)}{c_\lambda(x + k\alpha - \alpha) \cdots c_\lambda(x + \alpha) c_\lambda(x)} g(x).$$

Taking $k = q_m$, as in Lemma 3.2, on one hand, since $g(x)$ is an $L^1$ function, as the determinant of an $L^2$ matrix, and $\lim_{t \to \infty} \|q_m\alpha\|_T = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \|g(x + q_m\alpha) - g(x)\|_{L^1} = 0.$$
By (6.1), this implies

\begin{equation}
0 = \lim_{l \to \infty} \|g(x + q_m \alpha) - g(x)\|_{L^1} = \lim_{l \to \infty} \int \left| 1 - \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q_m-1} \hat{c}_\lambda(x + j \alpha)}{\prod_{j=0}^{q_m-1} c_\lambda(x + j \alpha)} \right| \cdot |g(x)| \, dx.
\end{equation}

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1

\begin{equation}
\lim_{l \to \infty} \int \left| 1 - \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q_m-1} \hat{c}_\lambda(x + j \alpha)}{\prod_{j=0}^{q_m-1} c_\lambda(x + j \alpha)} \right| \cdot |g(x)| \, dx
= \lim_{l \to \infty} \int \left| 1 - \frac{|c\lambda(x - \alpha)}{|c\lambda(x + q_m \alpha - \alpha)} e^{-i(\Sigma_{j=0}^{q_m-1} f(x+j\alpha) + \Sigma_{j=0}^{q_m-1} f(x+j\alpha))} e^{4\pi i q_m x} e^{2\pi i q_m (q_m - 1) \alpha} \right| \cdot |g(x)| \, dx
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} \left( \int \left| 1 - e^{4\pi i q_m x + 2\pi i q_m^2 \alpha} \right| |g(x)| \, dx \right)

\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} (I_1 - I_2).
\end{equation}

Combining the fact \( \|q_m \alpha\|_\mathbb{T} \to 0 \) with Lemma 6.2, we get pointwise convergence,

\begin{equation}
\frac{|c\lambda(x - \alpha)}{|c\lambda(x + q_m \alpha - \alpha)} e^{-i(\Sigma_{j=0}^{q_m-1} f(x+j\alpha) + \Sigma_{j=0}^{q_m-1} f(x+j\alpha))} e^{2\pi i q_m \alpha} \to 1 \text{ as } l \to \infty.
\end{equation}

Then by dominated convergence theorem, we get \( \lim_{l \to \infty} I_2 = 0 \). Then (6.3) implies that for any small constant \( \delta > 0 \),

\begin{equation}
\lim_{l \to \infty} \|g(x + q_m \alpha) - g(x)\|_{L^1}
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} I_1
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} \int_{\|2q_m x + q_m^2 \alpha\| \geq \delta} 4\delta |g(x)| \, dx,
\end{equation}

where \( \|\{x : \|2q_m x + q_m^2 \alpha\| \geq \delta\| \triangleq |F_{m, \delta}| = 1 - 2\delta \). Thus

\begin{equation}
\lim_{l \to \infty} \|g(x + q_m \alpha) - g(x)\|_{L^1}
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} (4\delta \|g\|_{L^1} - 4\delta \int_{F_{m, \delta}} |g(x)| \, dx)
\geq \liminf_{l \to \infty} (4\delta \|g\|_{L^1} - 8\delta^2 \|g\|_{L^\infty}).
\end{equation}

By (4.6) \( |g(x)| = \frac{b}{\text{const}} \) for some constant \( b > 0 \), thus \( \|g\|_{L^1}, \|g\|_{L^\infty} \) are positive finite numbers, so one can choose \( \delta \sim 0 \) such that \( 4\delta \|g\|_{L^1} - 8\delta^2 \|g\|_{L^\infty} \) is strictly positive. This contradicts with (6.2).
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