Localization landscape for Dirac fermions
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In the theory of Anderson localization, a landscape function predicts where wave functions localize in a disordered medium, without requiring the solution of an eigenvalue problem. It is known how to construct the localization landscape for the scalar wave equation in a random potential, or equivalently for the Schrödinger equation of spinless electrons. Here we generalize the concept to the Dirac equation, which includes the effects of spin-orbit coupling and allows to study quantum localization in graphene or in topological insulators and superconductors. The landscape function \( u(r) \) is defined on a lattice as a solution of the differential equation \( \nabla \cdot \nabla u(r) = 1 \), where \( \nabla \cdot \nabla \) is the Ostrowsky comparison matrix of the Dirac Hamiltonian. Random Hamiltonians with the same (positive definite) comparison matrix have localized states at the same positions, defining an equivalence class for Anderson localization. This provides for a mapping between the Hermitian and non-Hermitian Anderson model.

Introduction — The localization landscape is a new tool in the study of Anderson localization, pioneered in 2012 by Filoche and Mayboroda [1], which has since stimulated much computational and conceptual progress [2–10]. The “landscape” of a Hamiltonian \( H \) is a function \( u(r) \) that provides an upper bound for eigenstates \( \psi \) at energy \( E > 0 \):

\[
|\psi(r)|/|\psi|_{\text{max}} \leq E \, u(r), \quad |\psi|_{\text{max}} = \max_{r} |\psi(r)|.
\]

This inequality implies that a localized state is confined to spatial regions where \( u \gtrsim 1/E \). Extensive numerical simulations [8] confirm the expectation that higher and higher peaks in \( u \) identify the location of states at smaller and smaller \( E \).

Such a predictive power would be unremarkable for particles confined to potential wells (deeper and deeper wells trap particles at lower and lower energies). But Anderson localization happens because of wave interference in a random “white noise” potential, and inspection of the potential landscape \( V(r) \) gives no information on the localization landscape \( u(r) \).

Filoche and Mayboroda considered the localization of scalar waves, or equivalently of spinless electrons, governed by the Schrödinger Hamiltonian \( H = -\nabla^2 + V \). They used the maximum principle for elliptic partial differential equations to derive [1] that the inequality [1] holds if \( V > 0 \) and \( u \) is the solution of

\[
[-\nabla^2 + V(r)]u(r) = 1.
\]

Our objective here is to generalize this to spinful electrons, to include the effects of spin-orbit coupling and study localization of Dirac fermions.

Construction of the landscape function — Our key innovation is to use Ostrowsky’s comparison matrix [11–14] as a general framework for the construction of a localization landscape on a lattice. By definition, the comparison matrix \( \nabla^{\text{H}} \) of a complex matrix \( H \) has elements

\[
\nabla^{\text{H}}_{nm} = \begin{cases} |H_{nn}| & \text{if } n = m, \\ -|H_{nm}| & \text{if } n \neq m. \end{cases}
\]

In our context the index \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \) labels both the discrete space coordinates as well as any internal (spinor) degrees of freedom. The comparison theorem [11] states that if the comparison matrix is positive-definite, then

\[
|H^{-1}| \leq \nabla^{\text{H}}^{-1},
\]

where both the absolute value and the inequality is taken elementwise.

We apply Eq. (4) to an eigenstate \( \Psi \) of \( H \) at energy \( E \),

\[
|E^{-1}\Psi| = |(H^{-1}\Psi)| \leq \sum_m |(H^{-1})_{nm}| |\Psi_m| \\
\leq |\Psi|_{\text{max}} \sum_m (\nabla^{\text{H}}^{-1})_{nm},
\]

with \( |\Psi|_{\text{max}} = \max_n |\Psi_n| \). We thus arrive at the desired inequality

\[
|\Psi_n|/|\Psi|_{\text{max}} \leq |E| \sum_m (\nabla^{\text{H}}^{-1})_{nm} = |E| \, u_n.
\]

The elements \( u_n \) of the landscape function are determined by a set of linear equations with coefficients given by the comparison matrix:

\[
\nabla^{\text{H}} u = 1 \iff \sum_m \nabla^{\text{H}}_{nm} u_m = 1, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots \, N.
\]

As a sanity check, we make contact with the original landscape function [11] for the Schrödinger Hamiltonian \( H_S = p^2/2m + V \), with \( V > 0 \). The Laplacian is discretized in terms of nearest-neighbor hoppings on a lattice. For each dimension

\[
p^2 \mapsto (\hbar/a)^2(2 - 2 \cos ka) \Rightarrow (H_S)_{nm} = t_0(2\delta_{nm} - \delta_{n-1,m} - \delta_{n+1,m}) + V_0\delta_{nm},
\]

with lattice constant \( a \) and hopping matrix element \( t_0 = \hbar^2/2ma^2 \). The comparison matrix \( \nabla^{\text{H}} \) is equal to \( H_S \) and is positive-definite, so that Eq. (7) is a discretized version of the original landscape equation \( \nabla^{\text{H}} u = 1 \).

Rashba Hamiltonian — Our first novel application is to introduce spin-orbit coupling of the Rashba form,

\[
H_R = H_S + \frac{1}{2}\{\lambda, p_x\}\sigma_y - \frac{1}{2}\{\lambda, p_y\}\sigma_x.
\]
(The anticommutator \( \{ \cdots \} \) enforces Hermiticity when \( \lambda \) is spatially dependent.) The comparison matrix is now no longer equal to the Hamiltonian, in 1D one has

\[
(H_R)_{ij} = (H_S)_{ij} - \frac{\hbar}{4a} |\lambda_i + \lambda_j| (\delta_{i-1,j} + \delta_{i+1,j}) \sigma_z. \tag{10}
\]

The \( i, j \) indices label the spatial positions, the spinor indices are implicit in the Pauli matrix.

As a test, to isolate the effect of spin-orbit coupling, we place all the disorder in the Rashba strength \( \lambda_n \), which fluctuates randomly from site to site, uniformly in the interval \( (\lambda - \delta \lambda, \lambda + \delta \lambda) \). The electrostatic potential is a constant offset \( V_0 \), chosen sufficiently large that \( H_R \) is positive-definite \([17]\). Examples in 1D and in 2D are shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The highest peaks in the landscape function match well with the lowest eigenfunctions.

**Dirac Hamiltonian** — We next turn to Dirac fermions, first in 1D. The Dirac Hamiltonian

\[
H_D = v_F p_x \sigma_x + V \sigma_0 + \mu \sigma_z \tag{11}
\]

contains a scalar potential \( V \) proportional to the \( 2 \times 2 \) unit matrix \( \sigma_0 \) and a staggered potential \( \mu \) proportional to \( \sigma_z \), acting on the two-component wave function \( \Psi = (\psi_A, \psi_B) \). This would apply to a graphene nanoribbon on a substrate such as hexagonal boron nitride, which differentiates between the two carbon atoms in the unit cell without causing intervalley scattering \([18]\).

The symmetric discretization \( \partial_x \Psi \mapsto (1/2a) [\Psi(x+a) - \Psi(x-a)] \) suffers from fermion doubling \([19, 20]\) — it corresponds to a \( \sin k a \) dispersion with a second species of massless Dirac fermions at the edge of the Brillouin zone \( (k = \pi/a) \). To avoid this, and restrict ourselves to a single valley, we use a staggered-fermion discretization

\[
\frac{1}{\delta V} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} V_i + \mu_i & \delta_{ij} \\ -t_1 (\delta_{ij} + \delta_{i+1,j}) \\ -t_1 (\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i+1,j}) \\ V_i - \mu_i \delta_{ij} \end{array} \right]. \tag{14}
\]

We take random \( V(x) \in (-\delta V, \delta V) \) and \( \mu(x) \in (-\delta \mu, \delta \mu) \), chosen independently and uniformly at each lattice site. A constant offset \( V_0 \) is added to \( V \) in order to ensure a positive-definite comparison matrix \( H_D \). As shown in Fig. 3, the landscape function computed from \( H_D \) again accurately identifies the locations of the low-lying eigenfunctions. Notice in particular how the landscape function pinpoints the emergence of an exceptionally low level near \( x = 50 \).

For the 2D Dirac equation we consider a chiral \( p \)-wave superconductor, with Bogoliubov-De Gennes Hamiltonian \([23]\)

\[
H_{BDG} = \Delta (p_x \sigma_x + p_y \sigma_y) + (V + p^2/2m) \sigma_z. \tag{15}
\]

The Pauli matrices act on the electron-hole degree of freedom of a Bogoliubov quasiparticle, and the Hamiltonian is constrained by particle-hole symmetry: \( \sigma_z H_{BDG} \sigma_x = -H_{BDG} \). (A scalar offset \( \propto \sigma_0 \) is thus forbidden.)
pair potential $\Delta$ opens a gap in the spectrum in the entire Brillouin zone, provided that the electrostatic potential $V$ is nonzero. The gap-closing transition at $V = 0$ is a topological phase transition \[24\].

We take a uniform real $\Delta$ (no vortices) and a disordered $V(x,y)$, fluctuating randomly from site to site in the interval $[V - \delta V, V + \delta V]$. Positive $V$ ensures we do not cross the gap-closing transition, so we will not be introducing Majorana zero-modes \[25\] (the levels are Andreev bound states). Unlike in the case of graphene we do not expect the eigenstates \[29\] of $H$ and $\delta H$ to appear at $E_n = 0$. This works from site to site shifts the energy levels around, but the states remain localized at the same positions. More generally, one could try to vary the coefficients over the complex plane, preserving the norm. This would produce a non-Hermitian eigenvalue problem, and one might wonder whether the whole approach breaks down. It does not, as we will now demonstrate.

The non-Hermitian Anderson Hamiltonian \[26, 27\]

\[ H = -\nabla^2 + V_1(r) + iV_2(r) \]  \tag{16} 

has been studied in the context of a random laser \[28\]: a disordered optical lattice with randomly varying absorption and amplification rates, described by a complex dielectric function $V_1 + iV_2$. On a $d$-dimensional square lattice (lattice constant $a$), the discretization of $-\nabla^2 \to a^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^d (2 - 2 \cos k_i a)$ produces a spectral band width of $W_0 = 4d/a^2$.

The Hermitian Hamiltonian

\[ H_{\text{eff}} = -\nabla^2 + V_{\text{eff}}, \quad V_{\text{eff}} = |\frac{i}{2}W_0 + V_1 + iV_2| - \frac{i}{2}W_0, \]  \tag{17} 

is positive-definite if $V_{\text{eff}}(r) > 0$ for all $r$. The transformation from complex $V$ to real $V_{\text{eff}}$ does not change the landscape function, because $H = H_{\text{eff}}$. The localization landscapes are therefore the same and we would expect the eigenstates \[29\] of $H$ and $H_{\text{eff}}$ to appear at the same positions, provided that $V_{\text{eff}} > 0$. This works out, as shown in Fig. 5.

Conclusion and outlook — We have shown that the comparison matrix $H$ provides a route to the landscape function for Hamiltonians that are not of the Schr"{o}dinger form $H = -\nabla^2 + V$. We have explored Hamiltonians...
for massive or massless Dirac fermions, with or without superconducting pairing. The broad generality of the approach is highlighted by the application to the non-

Hermitian Anderson Hamiltonian.

The localization landscape can be used as a tool to quickly and efficiently find low-lying localized states in a disordered medium, since the landscape function $u(r)$ is obtained from a single differential equation $\nabla^2 u = 1$. These applications have been demonstrated for the Schrödinger Hamiltonian $[8]$, and we anticipate similar applications for the Dirac Hamiltonian in the context of graphene or of topological insulators.

The comparison matrix offers a conceptual insight as well: Since equimodular Hamiltonians have the same comparison matrix, they form an equivalence class that localizes at the same spatial positions. This notion is distinct from the familiar notion of “universality classes” of Anderson localization [30], which refers to ensemble-averaged properties. The equivalence class, instead, refers to sample-specific properties.

As an outlook to future research, it would be interesting to extend the approach from wave functions to energy levels. This has been recently demonstrated for the Schrödinger Hamiltonian $[8]$, where the peak height of the localization function predicts the energy of the localized state. The correlation between peak heights and energy levels evident in Fig. 1 suggests that the comparison matrix has this predictive power as well. Another direction to investigate is to see if the comparison matrix would make it possible to incorporate spin degrees of freedom in the many-body localization landscape introduced recently [31].
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The discretization (8) is appropriate near the bottom of the band at $p = 0$. Near the top of the band at $p = \pi/a$ a different discretization produces a different landscape function, as discussed by M. L. Lyra, S. Mayboroda, and M. Filoche, Dual landscapes in Anderson localization on discrete lattices, EPL 109, 47001 (2015).

A sufficient condition for the comparison inequality (4) is derived by Ostrowski [14]. Here we give an alternative derivation, to make the paper self-contained.

In the most general case the matrix $H$ is a complex matrix, not necessarily Hermitian. We will initially assume that the diagonal elements $H_{nn}$ are real $\geq 0$ and relax that assumption at the end.

Decompose $H = \lambda \mathbb{1} - L$, with $\lambda > \max_n H_{nn}$, so that the diagonal elements of $L$ are all positive. If we denote by $|L|$ the elementwise absolute value of the matrix $L$, one has

$$\lambda \mathbb{1} - |L| = H,$$

under the assumption that $H_{nn} \geq 0$.

Consider the Euclidean propagator $e^{-Ht}$ for $t \geq 0$, and start from the inequality

$$|\sum_m (e^{-Ht})_{nm} \Psi_m| \leq \sum_m |(e^{-Ht})_{nm}| |\Psi_m|.$$  \tag{A2}

We expand $e^{-Ht}$ in a Taylor series,

$$|\sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^p}{p!} (L^p)_{nm}|$$

$$\leq e^{-\lambda t} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^p}{p!} |L|^p_{nm} = e^{-\lambda t} (e^{L^0})_{nm} = (e^{-Ht})_{nm}.$$  \tag{A3}

Substitution into Eq. (A2) gives

$$|\sum_m (e^{-Ht})_{nm} \Psi_m| \leq \sum_m (e^{-Ht})_{nm} |\Psi_m|.$$  \tag{A4}

This may also be written more compactly as

$$|e^{-Ht}| \leq e^{-\vec{H} t},$$  \tag{A5}

with the understanding that the absolute value and inequality is taken elementwise.
If we now assume that all eigenvalues of $H$ have a positive real part, then we may integrate both $e^{-Ht}$ and $e^{-\bar{H}t}$ over $t$ from 0 to $\infty$. On the one hand we have,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-Ht} \, dt = H^{-1}, \quad \text{(A6)}$$

and on the other hand, in view of Eq. (A5), we have

$$\left| \int_0^\infty e^{-Ht} \, dt \right| \leq \int_0^\infty |e^{-Ht}| \, dt \leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\bar{H}t} \, dt = \bar{H}^{-1}. \quad \text{(A7)}$$

We thus arrive at the desired comparison inequality (A8),

$$|H^{-1}| \leq \bar{H}^{-1}. \quad \text{(A8)}$$

The assumption that $H_{nn}$ is real $\geq 0$ can be removed by multiplying $H$ with the diagonal matrix

$$D_{nm} = \delta_{nm} e^{-i \arg H_{nn}} \quad \text{(A9)}$$

(setting $D_{nn} = 1$ if $H_{nn} = 0$). This matrix multiplication changes neither the comparison matrix, $\bar{D}H = \bar{H}$, nor the absolute value of the inverse, $|(D^{-1})H^{-1}| = |H^{-1}D^{-1}| = |H^{-1}|$, hence Eq. (A8) still holds. Only the assumption of positive-definite $\bar{H}$ remains.