

EDGE STATES FOR SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC OPERATORS

DAVID GONTIER

ABSTRACT. We present a general framework to study edge states for second order elliptic operators. We associate an integer valued index to some bulk materials, and we prove that for any junction between two such materials, localised states must appear at the boundary whenever the indices differ.

© 2020 by the author. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

The bulk-edge correspondence states that one can associate an integer valued index $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{Z}$ to some bulk materials (represented here by Schrödinger (PDE) or Hill's (ODE) operators). When the material is cut, edge states appear at the boundary whenever $\mathcal{I} \neq 0$. In addition, it is believed that any junction between a left and a right materials having indices \mathcal{I}_L and \mathcal{I}_R must also have edge states near the junction whenever $\mathcal{I}_L \neq \mathcal{I}_R$. We prove this fact in this paper.

Since the original works of Hatsugai [Hat93a, Hat93b], most studies on bulk-edge correspondence focused on tight-binding models (e.g. [GP13, ASBVB13]), set on half-spaces. In these tight-binding models, boundary conditions at the cut are quite simple to describe, and it turns out that the index is independent of these boundary conditions.

In the context of continuous models, it is unclear that one can define an index which is indeed independent of the chosen boundary conditions. In [Gon20], we proved that it was the case in a simple one-dimensional model for dislocations. We extend this work here, and give a general framework to define the edge index for different self-adjoint extensions of Schrödinger operators.

We consider two types of continuous models. In the first part, we study families of Hill's operator (ODE) set on \mathbb{C}^n , of the form

$$h_t := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_t, \quad \text{acting on } L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n),$$

where $t \mapsto V_t$ is a continuous periodic family of bounded potentials, with values in the set of $n \times n$ hermitian matrices. On the second part of the article, we study its PDE version, that is families of Schrödinger's operators of the form

$$H_t := -\Delta + V_t, \quad \text{acting on } L^2(\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)^{d-1}, \mathbb{C}).$$

Here, $\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)^{d-1}$ is a tube in \mathbb{R}^d . Projecting H_t in finite dimensional basis, we can think of the PDE case as the $n = \infty$ version of the ODE one.

In these models, we interpret the bulk-edge index as the intersection of Lagrangian planes on a *boundary space* \mathcal{H}_b . Roughly speaking, this space contains the values $(\psi(0), \psi'(0))$ of the admissible wave-functions ψ . In the context of Hill's operators, we will have $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$, while for Schrödinger operators, $\mathcal{H}_b = H^{3/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, where $\Gamma = \{0\} \times (0, 1)^{d-1}$ is the cut.

The link between edge states and Lagrangian planes was already mentioned e.g. in [ASBVB13] and [GP13] for discrete models (tight-binding approximation). Based

Date: June 10, 2021.

on the recent developments on Lagrangian planes and second order elliptic operator by Howard, Latushkin and Sukhtayev in a series on papers [HS16, HLS17, HLS18], we extend the picture to the continuous cases of Hill's and Schrödinger operators, and show that the presence of edge modes comes from the crossings of these planes. This framework also allows to treat both the ODE and PDE setting, as noticed by the some of the previous authors in [LS18], based on the seminal work of Booß-Bavnbek and Furutani on infinite dimensional Lagrangian planes [BBF98, BBZ13, Fur04].

Our main result can be stated as follows (here for the Hill's case). It extends the one in the previous work [Gon20] and [Dro18]. Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ be fixed, and let

$$V_t(x) := V(t, x) : \mathbb{T}^1 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n, \quad (1)$$

be a periodic family of matrix-valued bounded potentials (which are not necessarily periodic in x). Here, $\mathbb{T}^1 \approx [0, 1]$ is the one-dimensional torus, and \mathcal{S}_n denotes the set of $n \times n$ hermitian matrices. We assume that $t \mapsto V_t$ is continuous from \mathbb{T}^1 to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}_n)$. We consider the family of (bulk) Hill's operators

$$h_t := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_t \quad \text{acting on} \quad L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

For $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that E is in the gap of the family (h_t) if $E \notin \sigma(h_t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$. We also consider the family of (edge) Hill's operators

$$h_{D,t}^\sharp := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_t \quad \text{acting on} \quad L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n),$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $x = 0$. While E is not in the spectrum of the bulk operator $\sigma(h_t)$, it may belong to the spectrum of the bulk operator $h_{D,t}^\sharp$. In this case, the corresponding eigenstate is called an *edge mode*.

As t runs through $\mathbb{T}^1 \approx [0, 1]$, a spectral flow may appear for the family $h_{D,t}^\sharp$. We denote by $\text{Sf}(h_{D,t}^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1)$ the net number of eigenvalues of $h_{D,t}^\sharp$ going **downwards** in the gap where E lives. We define the bulk/edge index of (h_t) as this spectral flow:

$$\mathcal{I}(h_t, E) := \text{Sf}\left(h_{D,t}^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1\right).$$

Our main theorem is the following (see Theorem 30 for the proof in the Hill's case, and Theorem 40 for the one in the Schrödinger case).

Theorem 1 (Bulk-edge correspondence for junctions). *Let $t \mapsto V_{R,t}$ and $t \mapsto V_{L,t}$ be two continuous periodic families of bounded potentials on \mathbb{R} . Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be in the gap of both corresponding (bulk) Hill's operators $(h_{L,t})$ and $(h_{R,t})$. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any switch function, satisfying $\chi(x) = 1$ for $x < -X$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x > X$ for some $X > 0$ large enough, and let*

$$h_t^\chi := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_{L,t}(x)\chi(x) + V_{R,t}(x)(1 - \chi(x)).$$

Then

$$\text{Sf}(h_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1) = \mathcal{I}(h_{R,t}, E) - \mathcal{I}(h_{L,t}, E).$$

The operator h_t^χ is a domain wall operator. On the far left, we see the potential $V_{L,t}$, while on the far right, we see $V_{R,t}$, so this operator models a junction between a left potential and a right one.

The proofs in the Hill's and Schrödinger cases are quite different. The Hill's case being finite dimensional, we are able to describe precisely the spectral flow. We prove in particular that the bulk/edge index is independent of the chosen boundary conditions. We interpret this spectral flow as a Maslov index of some pair of Lagrangian planes, and as the winding number of some unitaries. This somehow generalises some results in [GP13] or [ASBVB13] for tight-binding models. The arguments we use are model independent, and can be generalised in many ways.

1.1. Plan of the paper. In Section 2, we recall some basic facts on symplectic spaces and self-adjoint extensions of operators. We then prove our results concerning Hill's operators in Section 3, and explain how to adapt the proofs for Schrödinger operators in Section 4. We discuss the role of the boundary space $\mathcal{H}_b = H^{3/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ in Appendix A.

1.2. Notation of the paper. We denote by $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and by $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ an open set, we denote by $L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ the usual Lebesgue space, and by $H^s(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ the Sobolev ones. The set $H_0^s(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ for the H^s norm.

Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be two Hilbert spaces. For a bounded operator $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$, its dual A^* is the map from $\mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ so that

$$\forall x_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1, \forall x_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \langle x_1, A^*x_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \langle Ax_1, x_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2}.$$

The operator A is *unitary* if $A^*A = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ and $AA^* = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.

For E a Banach space, we say that a map $t \mapsto v(t) \in E$ is continuously differentiable if $v'(t)$ is well-defined in E for all t (that is $\|v'(t)\|_E < \infty$), and if $t \mapsto v'(t)$ is continuous.

1.3. Acknowledgements. This work was funded by the CNRS international cooperation tool PICS.

2. FIRST FACTS AND NOTATIONS

2.1. Lagrangian planes in complex Hilbert spaces. Let us first recall some basic facts on symplectic Banach/Hilbert spaces. In the original work of Maslov [MBA72], popularised by Arnol'd [Arn67], the authors consider *real* Banach spaces E . Following the recent developments, we present the theory for complex Banach spaces.

2.1.1. Basics in symplectic spaces. Let E be a complex Banach space. A symplectic form on E is a non degenerate continuous sesquilinear form $\omega : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in E, \quad \omega(x, y) = -\overline{\omega(y, x)}.$$

For ℓ a vectorial subspace of E , we denote by

$$\ell^\circ := \{x \in E, \quad \forall y \in \ell, \quad \omega(x, y) = 0\}.$$

The space ℓ° is always closed. Such a subspace is called **isotropic** if $\ell \subset \ell^\circ$, **co-isotropic** if $\ell^\circ \subset \ell$, and **Lagrangian** if $\ell = \ell^\circ$. We also say that ℓ is a **Lagrangian plane** in the latter case. The set of all Lagrangian planes of E , sometime called the Lagrangian-Grassmanian, is denoted by $\Lambda(E)$.

Example 2 (In \mathbb{R}^{2n}). *In the real Hilbert space $E = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, the canonical symplectic form is given by (we write $\mathbf{x} = (x, x')$, $\mathbf{y} = (y, y')$, etc. the elements in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$)*

$$\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \langle x, y' \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n} - \langle x', y \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n},$$

When $n = 1$, the Lagrangian planes are all the one-dimensional vectorial subspaces of \mathbb{R}^2 . Conversely, if (\mathbb{R}^N, ω) is a symplectic space, then $N = 2n$ is even, and all Lagrangian planes are of dimension n .

Example 3 (In \mathbb{C}^{2n}). *Similarly, in the complex Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^{2n} , the canonical symplectic form is given by*

$$\forall \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n, \quad \omega(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) := \langle z_1, z_2' \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} - \langle z_1', z_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}.$$

When $n = 1$ for instance, the Lagrangian planes are the one-dimensional vectorial spaces $L = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathbf{z} = (z, z')$ satisfying the extra condition $\bar{z}z' \in \mathbb{R}$. Up to a phase, we may always assume $z \in \mathbb{R}$, in which case $z' \in \mathbb{R}$ as well. So the

Lagrangian planes are the one-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{C}^2 of the form $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbf{z})$ with $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Example 4 (In \mathbb{C}^N). Another example is given by the symplectic form

$$\forall \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^N, \quad \tilde{\omega}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) = i\langle \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^N}.$$

With this symplectic form, a vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is never isotropic, since $\tilde{\omega}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) = i\|\mathbf{z}\|^2 \neq 0$ for $\mathbf{z} \neq 0$. In particular, $(\mathbb{C}^N, \tilde{\omega})$ does not have Lagrangian subspaces.

We record the following result.

Lemma 5. If $\ell_1 \subset \ell_1^\circ$ and $\ell_2 \subset \ell_2^\circ$ are two isotropic subspaces with $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = E$, then

$$\ell_1 = \ell_1^\circ, \quad \ell_2 = \ell_2^\circ, \quad \text{are Lagrangians, and} \quad \ell_1 \oplus \ell_2 = E.$$

Proof. Since $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = E$, we have $\{0\} = \ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2^\circ$. In particular, $\ell_1 \cap \ell_2 \subset \ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2^\circ = \{0\}$ as well, so $\ell_1 \oplus \ell_2 = E$. Let $x \in \ell_1^\circ \subset E$, and write $x = x_1 + x_2$ with $x_1 \in \ell_1$ and $x_2 \in \ell_2$. Then, we have $x_2 \in \ell_1^\circ$, so $x_2 \in \ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2 \subset \ell_1^\circ \cap \ell_2^\circ = \{0\}$. This proves that $x = x_1 \in \ell_1$, hence $\ell_1^\circ = \ell_1$. The proof for ℓ_2 is similar. \square

2.1.2. *Lagrangian planes of Hilbert spaces and unitaries.* In the case where $E = \mathcal{H}_b$ is an Hilbert space, with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}$, for all $x \in \mathcal{H}_b$, the map

$$T_x : y \mapsto \omega(x, y)$$

is linear and bounded, so, by Riesz' representation theorem, there exists $v \in \mathcal{H}_b$ so that $T_x(y) = \langle v, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}$. We denote by $Jx := v$ this element. This defines an operator $J : \mathcal{H}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_b$, satisfying

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \omega(x, y) = \langle x, Jy \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}.$$

In particular, since ω is bounded, we have

$$\|Jy\|_{\mathcal{H}_b}^2 = \langle Jy, Jy \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = \omega(Jy, y) \leq C_\omega \|Jy\| \cdot \|y\|,$$

so J is bounded. In addition, from the relation $\omega(x, y) = -\overline{\omega(y, x)}$, we get that

$$\langle x, Jy \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = -\langle Jx, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}.$$

In other words, $J = -J^*$. Finally, since ω is not degenerate, we have $\text{Ker}(J) = \{0\}$.

Example 6. On \mathbb{C}^{2n} with the canonical symplectic form $\omega(x, y) = \langle x_1, y_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} - \langle x_2, y_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}$, we have

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0_n & \mathbb{I}_n \\ -\mathbb{I}_n & 0_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Later in the article, we will make the following Assumption A:

$$\textbf{Assumption A:} \quad J^2 = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_b}. \quad (2)$$

In this case, since J is bounded skew self-adjoint with $J^2 = -\mathbb{I}$, we can write

$$\mathcal{H}_b = \text{Ker}(J - i) \oplus \text{Ker}(J + i). \quad (3)$$

The hermitian form $-i\omega$ is positive definite on $\text{Ker}(J - i)$, negative definite on $\text{Ker}(J + i)$. We have

$$\forall x \in \text{Ker}(J - i), \quad \omega(x, x) = i\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_b}^2, \quad \forall y \in \text{Ker}(J + i), \quad \omega(y, y) = -i\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}_b}^2,$$

and finally

$$\forall x \in \text{Ker}(J - i), \quad \forall y \in \text{Ker}(J + i), \quad \omega(x, y) = 0. \quad (4)$$

The following result goes back to Leray in its seminar [Ler78] (see also [BBF98] and [BBZ13, Lemma 2 and 3]). We skip its proof for the sake of brevity.

Lemma 7. *If Assumption A holds, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Lagrangian planes ℓ of \mathcal{H}_b and the unitaries U from $\text{Ker}(J - i)$ to $\text{Ker}(J + i)$, with*

$$\ell = \{x + Ux, \quad x \in \text{Ker}(J - i)\}.$$

Corollary 8. *If $\dim \text{Ker}(J - i) \neq \dim \text{Ker}(J + i)$, then there are no Lagrangian planes. This happens for instance for the symplectic space $(\mathbb{C}^n, \tilde{\omega})$, with $\tilde{\omega}(z, z') = i\langle z, z' \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ (see Example 4), for which we have $Jz = iz$, so $\text{Ker}(J - i) = \mathbb{C}^n$ while $\text{Ker}(J + i) = \{0\}$.*

The next Lemma shows that the crossing of two Lagrangian planes can be read from their respective unitaries. It can be found *e.g.* in [BBZ13, Lemma 2]. Our definition slightly differs from the one in [BBZ13], since we put the adjoint on the left operator (this seems more natural for what follows).

Lemma 9. *Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 be two Lagrangian planes of $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, with corresponding unitaries U_1 and U_2 from $\text{Ker}(J - i)$ to $\text{Ker}(J + i)$. Then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\text{Ker}(U_2^*U_1 - \mathbb{I}_{\text{Ker}(J-i)}) \approx \ell_1 \cap \ell_2.$$

Proof. If $x^- \in \text{Ker}(J - i)$ is such that $U_2^*U_1x^- = x^-$, then we have $U_1x^- = U_2x^+$ in $\text{Ker}(J + i)$, so $x := x^- + U_1x^- = x^- + U_2x^-$ is in $\ell_1 \cap \ell_2$. Conversely, if $x \in \ell_1 \cap \ell_2$, then, writing $x = x^- + x^+$ shows that $U_1x^- = U_2x^-$, so $U_2^*U_1x^- = x^-$. \square

2.1.3. Another unitary. In Section 3.1 below, we will consider periodic paths of Lagrangians $\ell_1(t)$ and $\ell_2(t)$, and define the Maslov index of the pair (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) . When \mathcal{H}_b is finite dimensional, we will prove that it equals the winding number of the determinant of $U_2^*(t)U_1(t)$. Unfortunately, since U_1 and U_2 are not endomorphism, we cannot split $\det(U_2^*U_1)$ into $\det(U_1)/\det(U_2)$. In this section, we present another one-to-one correspondence between Lagrangian planes and some other unitaries (which will be endomorphisms). The results of this section are new to the best of our knowledge.

We now make the stronger assumption that \mathcal{H}_b is of the form $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2$, where \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 are two complex Hilbert spaces, and that, relative to this decomposition, J is of the form

$$\mathbf{Assumption B:} \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V^* \\ -V & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for some (fixed) unitary } V : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2. \quad (5)$$

It implies $J^2 = -\mathbb{I}$ as before. Furthermore, we can identify

$$\text{Ker}(J - i) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ iV \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_1, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ker}(J + i) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -iV \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_1.$$

Defining the maps $Q^\pm : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(K \pm i)$ by

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1, \quad Q_\pm(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \mp iVx \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with dual} \quad Q_\pm^* \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \mp ix \end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{2}x,$$

we see that, for all $x \in \mathcal{H}_1$,

$$\|Q^\pm x\|_{\mathcal{H}_b}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \pm iVx \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_b}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|Vx\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2,$$

so Q^\pm are unitaries. In particular, if U is a unitary from $\text{Ker}(J - i)$ to $\text{Ker}(J + i)$, then

$$\mathcal{U} := Q_+^* U Q_-$$

is a unitary from \mathcal{H}_1 to itself, so an endomorphism. In what follows, we use straight letters U for unitaries from $\text{Ker}(J-i) \rightarrow \text{Ker}(J+i)$, and curly letters \mathcal{U} for unitaries of \mathcal{H}_1 . We therefore proved the following.

Lemma 10. *If Assumption B holds, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Lagrangian planes ℓ of $(\mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2, \omega)$ and the unitaries \mathcal{U} of \mathcal{H}_1 , with*

$$\ell = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ iV \end{pmatrix} x + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -iV \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}x, \quad x \in \mathcal{H}_1 \right\}.$$

In addition, if ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 are two Lagrangian planes with corresponding unitaries \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 , then there is a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Ker}(\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \approx \ell_1 \cap \ell_2.$$

2.2. Self-adjoint extensions of Hill's operators. We now review some basic facts on self-adjoint operators (see *e.g.* [RS75, Chapter X.1] for complete introduction). We first recall some general definitions, and then focus on second order elliptic operators. We show the connection with symplectic spaces using the second Green's identity (see Lemma 11 below).

2.2.1. Self-adjoint operators. Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space, and let A with dense domain \mathcal{D}_A be any operator on \mathcal{H} . In the sequel, we sometime write (A, \mathcal{D}_A) . The **adjoint** of (A, \mathcal{D}_A) is denoted by (A^*, \mathcal{D}_{A^*}) .

For A a symmetric, hence closable, operator on \mathcal{H} , we denote by $(A_{\min}, \mathcal{D}_{\min})$ its closure. The adjoint of $(A_{\min}, \mathcal{D}_{\min})$ is denoted by $(A_{\max}, \mathcal{D}_{\max})$. Since A is symmetric, we have $A_{\min} \subset A_{\max}$ (A_{\max} is an extension of A_{\min}). The operator A_{\min} is self-adjoint iff $\mathcal{D}_{\min} = \mathcal{D}_{\max}$. Otherwise, any self-adjoint extension of A , if exists, is of the form $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ with

$$A_{\min} \subset \tilde{A} \subset A_{\max}, \quad \text{in the sense } \mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}.$$

In particular, once \mathcal{D}_{\min} and \mathcal{D}_{\max} have been identified, the self-adjoint extensions are simply given by domains $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\min} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}$, and the operator \tilde{A} acts on this domain via

$$\forall x \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}, \quad \tilde{A}x := A_{\max}x.$$

In what follows, we sometime write $(A_{\max}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ instead of $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ to insist that only the domain matters.

There are several ways to identify the self-adjoint extensions of A . The original proof by von Neumann [vN30] uses the Cayley transform. As noticed in [RS75, Chapter X.1] following [DS65], the connection with boundary values is not so clear which this approach. Another approach can be found *e.g.* in [BBF98, Section 3.1], where the authors give a correspondence between the self-adjoint extensions of A and the Lagrangian planes of the abstract space $\mathcal{D}_{\max}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}$, with the symplectic form

$$\forall [x], [y] \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}/\mathcal{D}_{\min}, \quad \omega([x], [y]) := \langle x, A_{\max}y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - \langle A_{\max}x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Again, the connection with boundary conditions is not so clear in this setting.

In what follows, we present the approach in [LS18] (see also [CJM15]), which is specific to second order elliptic operators. It uses the second Green's identity.

2.2.2. Self-adjoint extensions of Hill's operators on the semi line. We first present the theory in the case where $A = h$ is a second order ODE (Hill's operators). We postpone the analysis for general second order elliptic operator to Section 4 below.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ be a bounded potential with values in \mathcal{S}_n , the set of $n \times n$ hermitian matrices. We consider the Hill's operator

$$h := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V(x) \quad \text{acting on } \mathcal{H} := L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

The bulk operator h with core domain $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ is symmetric. Since the potential V is bounded, the operator h is essentially self-adjoint, with domain (see [Kat13, Chapter 4])

$$\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_{\min} = \mathcal{D}_{\max} = H^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

When restricting this operator to the half line, we obtain the edge operator

$$h^\sharp := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V(x) \quad \text{acting on} \quad \mathcal{H}^\sharp := L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

On the core $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n)$, it is symmetric, and its closure has domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp := H_0^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

The adjoint of $(h_{\min}^\sharp, \mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp)$ is the operator $(h_{\max}^\sharp, \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp)$ where $h_{\max}^\sharp := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V(x)$ has domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp := H^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

We have $\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp \subsetneq \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$, so h^\sharp is not essentially self-adjoint. This reflects the fact that some boundary conditions must be chosen at $x = 0$. The particularity of second order elliptic operator comes from the second Green's identity.

Lemma 11 (Green's formula). *For all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$,*

$$\langle \phi, h_{\max}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \langle \phi(0), \psi'(0) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} - \langle \phi'(0), \psi(0) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}.$$

This suggests to introduce the boundary space

$$\mathcal{H}_b := \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$$

with its canonical symplectic form ω defined in Example 3. We also introduce the map $\text{Tr} : \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_b$ defined by

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp, \quad \text{Tr}(\phi) := (\phi(0), \phi'(0)) \in \mathcal{H}_b. \quad (6)$$

With these notations, the second Green's identity reads

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp, \quad \langle \phi, h_{\max}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \omega(\text{Tr}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\psi)).$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_\sharp$ the graph norm of h^\sharp , that is

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp, \quad \|\phi\|_\sharp^2 := \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp}^2 + \|h_{\max}^\sharp \phi\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp}^2.$$

Recall that, by definition, a closed extension of h^\sharp has a domain which is closed for this norm.

Lemma 12. *The map $\text{Tr} : (\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp, \|\cdot\|_\sharp) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_b$ is well-defined, continuous and onto.*

Proof. Since V is bounded, the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_\sharp$ is equivalent to the usual $H^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n)$ norm on $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp = H^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n)$. The Sobolev embedding shows that $H^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n) \hookrightarrow C^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}^n)$ with continuous embedding. This implies that Tr is a bounded linear operator. Let $C, S \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R})$ be two compactly supported smooth functions with $C(0) = S'(0) = 1$ and $C'(0) = S(0) = 0$. Given an element $(u, u') \in \mathcal{H}_b$, we have $(u, u') = \text{Tr}(\psi)$ for $\psi(x) := uC(x) + u'S(x) \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$, so Tr is onto. \square

The next result shows that self-adjoint extensions of h^\sharp can be seen as Lagrangian planes of \mathcal{H}_b .

Theorem 13. *Let \mathcal{D}^\sharp be a domain satisfying $\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$, and let $\ell := \text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}^\sharp)$. The adjoint of $(h_{\max}^\sharp, \mathcal{D}^\sharp)$ is the operator $(h_{\max}^\sharp, (\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^*)$ with domain*

$$(\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^* := \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell^\circ).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{D}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}$ defines a self-adjoint extension of h^\sharp iff it is of the form

$$\mathcal{D}^\sharp := \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell), \quad \text{for some Lagrangian plane } \ell \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b).$$

Remark 14. *Since Tr is a continuous map, and since any subspace of the form ℓ° is closed in \mathcal{H}_b , we deduce that $(\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^* = \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell^\circ)$ is closed for the graph norm of \mathcal{H}^\sharp . Note that \mathcal{D}^\sharp is not required to be closed.*

Proof. The following proof only uses that Tr is onto. It will therefore be valid also for the Schrödinger PDE case (with the corresponding boundary space and Tr operator, see Section 4 below).

Since $\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp)^* = \mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp$, we have $\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp \subset (\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^* \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$ as well. Let $\phi \in (\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^* \subset \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$. By definition of the adjoint, and the second Green's identity, we have

$$\forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}^\sharp, \quad 0 = \langle \phi, h_{\max}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \omega(\text{Tr}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\psi)).$$

We deduce that $\text{Tr}(\phi) \in \ell^\circ$.

Conversely, let $(u, u') \in \ell^\circ \subset \mathcal{H}_b$ and let $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$ be such that $\text{Tr}(\psi_0) = (u, u')$. By definition of ℓ° and the second Green's identity, we get

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}^\sharp, \quad 0 = \omega(\text{Tr}(\psi_0), \text{Tr}(\phi)) = \langle \psi_0, h_{\max}^\sharp \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \psi_0, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp}.$$

In particular, the map $T_{\psi_0} : \mathcal{D}^\sharp \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$T_{\psi_0} : \phi \mapsto \langle \psi_0, h_{\max}^\sharp \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \psi_0, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp}$$

is bounded on \mathcal{D}^\sharp with $\|T_{\psi_0} \phi\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \leq \|h_{\max}^\sharp \psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp}$. So ψ_0 is in the adjoint domain $(\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^*$. This proves that $(u, u') = \text{Tr}(\psi_0) \in \text{Tr}((\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^*)$. Altogether, we proved that

$$\text{Tr}((\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^*) = \ell^\circ, \quad \text{hence} \quad (\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^* = \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell^\circ),$$

where we used in the last inequality that $(\mathcal{D}^\sharp)^*$ is closed for the graph norm of \mathcal{H}^\sharp . \square

In what follows, we denote by (h^\sharp, ℓ^\sharp) the self-adjoint extensions of h^\sharp with domain $\text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell^\sharp)$.

Before we go on, let us give some examples of Lagrangian planes and their corresponding unitaries \mathcal{U} for some usual self-adjoint extensions. Note that we have $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2$ with $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathbb{C}^n$, so the unitary $\mathcal{U} : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ is an element in $\text{U}(n)$.

Example 15 (Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions). *The Dirichlet extension of h^\sharp corresponds to the Lagrangian plane $\ell_D := \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^n$, and the Neumann one corresponds to $\ell_N := \mathbb{C}^n \times \{0\}$. To identify the corresponding unitary, we note that $(0, u') \in \ell_D$ can be written as*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i \end{pmatrix} \left(-\frac{i}{2}u'\right) + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i \end{pmatrix} \left(\frac{i}{2}u'\right)$$

Comparing with Lemma 10, this gives the unitary $\mathcal{U}_D := -\mathbb{I}_n \in \text{U}(n)$. The proof for Neumann boundary conditions is similar, and we find $\mathcal{U}_N := \mathbb{I}_n \in \text{U}(n)$.

Example 16 (Robin boundary conditions). *Consider Θ and Π two hermitian $n \times n$ matrices so that*

$$\Theta^* = \Theta, \quad \Pi^* = \Pi, \quad \Theta\Pi = \Pi\Theta, \quad \Theta \text{ or } \Pi \text{ is invertible.}$$

Let $\ell_{\Theta, \Pi}$ be the subspace

$$\ell_{\Theta, \Pi} := \{(\Theta x, \Pi x), x \in \mathbb{C}^n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_b.$$

We claim that $\ell_{\Theta, \Pi}$ is Lagrangian. First, we have

$$\omega((\Theta x, \Pi x), (\Theta y, \Pi y)) = \langle \Theta x, \Pi y \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} - \langle \Pi x, \Theta y \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} = 0,$$

so $\ell_{\Theta, \Pi} \subset \ell_{\Theta, \Pi}^\circ$. On the other hand, let $(z, z') \in \ell_{\Theta, \Pi}^\circ$. Assume that Θ is invertible (the proof when Π is invertible is similar). We have,

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \quad \langle z, \Pi x \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} = \langle z', \Theta x \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}, \quad \text{so} \quad \langle \Pi z - \Theta z', x \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} = 0.$$

We deduce that $\Pi z = \Theta z'$. In particular, setting $z_0 = \Theta^{-1}z$, we have $z = \Theta z_0$ and $z' = \Pi z_0$, so $(z, z') = (\Theta z_0, \Pi z_0) \in \ell_{\Theta, \Pi}$. This proves that $\ell_{\Theta, \Pi}$ is Lagrangian. We say that the corresponding self-adjoint extension has the (Θ, Π) -Robin boundary condition. To identify the corresponding unitary, we write

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Theta x \\ \Pi x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} (\Theta - i\Pi) x + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} (\Theta + i\Pi) x.$$

Identifying with Lemma 10, we recognise the unitary

$$\mathcal{U}_{\Theta, \Pi} := (\Theta + i\Pi)(\Theta - i\Pi)^{-1} \in \text{U}(n).$$

Note that the Dirichlet boundary condition corresponds to the pair $(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$ and the Neumann boundary condition corresponds to the pair $(\mathbb{I}_n, 0)$.

Example 17 (Dirac operator on the half-line). Let \mathcal{D}^\sharp be a Dirac operator of the form $\mathcal{D}^\sharp := -i\partial_x + V$ acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n)$. The operator \mathcal{D}^\sharp is symmetric on the core $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The first Green's identity shows that

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n), \quad \langle \phi, \mathcal{D}^\sharp \psi \rangle - \langle \mathcal{D}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle = -i\langle \phi(0), \psi(0) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}.$$

In this case, the boundary space is $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathbb{C}^n$, with the symplectic form $\tilde{\omega}(z_1, z_2) = i\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle$. A theorem similar to Theorem 13 holds. However, as noticed in Example 4, the symplectic space $(\mathcal{H}_b, \tilde{\omega})$ has no Lagrangian planes. We recover the classical result that \mathcal{D}^\sharp has no self-adjoint extensions on the half line.

2.3. The Lagrangian planes $\ell^\pm(E)$. In the previous section, we linked the boundary conditions at $x = 0$ with the Lagrangian planes of the boundary space \mathcal{H}_b . We now focus on the Cauchy solutions of $H\psi = E\psi$. Since we are also interested in the behaviour at $-\infty$, we introduce $\mathcal{H}^{\sharp, \pm} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^\pm)$ and the maximal domains

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm} := H^2(\mathbb{R}^\pm, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

The space $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp$ considered previously corresponds to $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm}$. We also denote by $\text{Tr}^\pm : \mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_b$ the corresponding boundary trace operator

$$\forall \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm}, \quad \text{Tr}^\pm(\psi) = (\psi(0), \psi'(0)).$$

Note that, due to the orientation of the line \mathbb{R} , the Green's identity on the left-side reads

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, -}, \quad \langle \phi, h_{\max}^{\sharp, -} \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\sharp, -}} - \langle h_{\max}^{\sharp, -} \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\sharp, -}} = -\omega(\text{Tr}^-(\phi), \text{Tr}^-(\psi)).$$

The following result, which is straightforward in the finite dimensional Hill's case, is an essential tool for the proof of the next theorem.

Lemma 18. Let $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}$ be the restriction operators from \mathcal{H} to $\mathcal{H}^{\sharp, \pm}$. Then

$$\mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}(\mathcal{D}).$$

In addition, for all $\psi \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $\text{Tr}^-(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^-}\psi) = \text{Tr}^+(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^+}\psi)$.

This lemma states that all elements in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm}$ can be extended to the whole line \mathbb{R} while keeping smoothness at the cut. It is linked to the existence of an extension operator. Conversely, we do not lose regularity when restricting a function to some domain. We leave the proof, as it is similar to the one of Lemma 12.

We now set

$$\mathcal{S}^\pm(E) := \text{Ker}(h_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm} - E) = \{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm}, \quad -\psi'' + V\psi = E\psi\}.$$

The solutions in $\mathcal{S}^\pm(E)$ can be seen as Cauchy solutions. In particular, elements ψ^\pm of $\mathcal{S}^\pm(E)$ can be reconstructed from their boundary values $\text{Tr}^\pm(\psi^\pm) \in \mathcal{H}_b$. We set

$$\ell^\pm(E) := \{\text{Tr}^\pm(\psi), \psi \in \mathcal{S}^\pm(E)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_b. \quad (7)$$

It is unclear at this point that any Cauchy solutions of $-\psi'' + V\psi = E$ is either in $\mathcal{S}^+(E)$ or $\mathcal{S}^-(E)$. For instance, one can have solutions which are not integrable at $\pm\infty$. This happens in particular when V is periodic and E is in the essential spectrum of the corresponding Hill's operator h . In this case, we expect all Cauchy solutions to be quasi-periodic. These solutions are not in $\mathcal{S}^+(E)$ nor in $\mathcal{S}^-(E)$.

On the other hand, these two spaces might cross. Actually, we have

Lemma 19. *For the bulk operator h , we have that for all $E \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\dim \text{Ker}(h - E) = \dim(\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^-(E)).$$

In particular, E is eigenvalue of h iff $\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^-(E) \neq \{0\}$.

Proof. A simple proof uses Cauchy's theorem. Let us give an alternating proof, which will also work in the next PDE setting.

If $\psi \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies $(h - E)\psi = 0$, then, by Lemma 18, its restrictions $\psi^\pm := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^\pm}\psi$ are in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^{\sharp, \pm}$. In addition, they satisfy $(h_{\max}^\sharp - E)\psi^\pm = 0$, so $\psi^\pm \in \mathcal{S}^\pm(E)$. Taking traces and using again Lemma 18 shows that $\text{Tr}^+(\psi^+) = \text{Tr}^-(\psi^-) \in \ell^+(E) \cap \ell^-(E)$.

Conversely, let $\psi^\pm \in \mathcal{S}^\pm(E)$ be such that $\text{Tr}^+(\psi^+) = \text{Tr}^-(\psi^-)$, and consider the function $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$\psi(x) := \begin{cases} \psi^+(x) & \text{for } x > 0, \\ \psi^-(x) & \text{for } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

It is unclear yet that ψ is regular enough (*i.e.* belongs to \mathcal{D}). For $f \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, (h - E)f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle \psi^+, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^+}(h - E)f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \langle \psi^-, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^-}(h - E)f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^-} \\ &= \langle \psi^+, (h_{\max}^\sharp - E)f^+ \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^+} + \langle \psi^-, (h_{\max}^\sharp - E)f^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^-} \\ &= \omega(\text{Tr}^+(\psi^+), \text{Tr}^+(f^+)) - \omega(\text{Tr}^-(\psi^-), \text{Tr}^-(f^-)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $T_\psi : f \mapsto \langle \psi, (h - E)f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded on \mathcal{D} . We deduce first that ψ is in the domain $\mathcal{D}^* = \mathcal{D}$, and that $(h - E)\psi = 0$. So ψ is an eigenvector for the eigenvalue E . \square

The previous result shows that one can detect eigenvalues as the crossings of $\ell^+(E)$ and $\ell^-(E)$. We now prove that, when E is in the resolvent set, we have instead $\ell^+(E) \oplus \ell^-(E) = \mathcal{H}_b$. Our proof only uses the fact that the bulk operator h is essentially self-adjoint.

Theorem 20. *For all $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(h)$, the sets $\ell^\pm(E)$ are Lagrangian planes of \mathcal{H}_b , and*

$$\mathcal{H}_b := \ell^+(E) \oplus \ell^-(E).$$

This shows for instance that there are as many Cauchy's solutions which decay to $+\infty$ as solutions which decay to $-\infty$ (here, they both form subspaces of dimension n). This is somehow reminiscent of the Weyl's criterion [Wey10] (see also [RS75, Theorem X.7]).

Proof. We first claim that for any $E \in \mathbb{R}$, $\ell^\pm(E)$ are isotropic spaces. Let $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}^+(E)$. By Green's identity, we have

$$\omega(\text{Tr}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\psi)) = \langle \phi, h_{\max}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle h_{\max}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \langle \phi, E\psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle E\phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = 0.$$

In the last equality, we used that E is real-valued. This proves that $\ell^+(E) \subset \ell^+(E)^\circ$. The proof for $\ell^-(E)$ is similar.

Let $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(h)$, so that the bulk operator $(h - E)$ is invertible. We have (recall that $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^n)$)

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^+ \oplus \mathcal{H}^-, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{H}^\pm := \left\{ \psi \in \mathcal{H}, \psi = 0 \text{ on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^\mp} \right\}.$$

Since $(h - E)$ is invertible with $\mathcal{D} = (h - E)^{-1}\mathcal{H}$, this gives a decomposition

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^+ \oplus \mathcal{D}^-, \quad \mathcal{D}^\pm := (h - E)^{-1}\mathcal{H}^\pm,$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_b = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}^+) + \text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}^-).$$

The elements $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^+$ are such that $(-\partial_{xx}^2 + V - E)\psi = f$, for some $f \in \mathcal{H}$ with support contained in \mathbb{R}^+ . In particular, its restriction $\psi^- := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^-}\psi$ is in $\mathcal{D}_{\max}^\#$ and satisfies $(h_{\max}^\# - E)\psi^- = 0$ on \mathbb{R}^- . So $\psi^- \in \mathcal{S}^-(E)$. Taking boundary traces show that

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}^+) \subset \ell^-(E), \quad \text{and, similarly,} \quad \text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}^-) \subset \ell^+(E).$$

In particular, we have $\mathcal{H}_b = \ell^+(E) + \ell^-(E)$. We conclude with Lemma 5. \square

Remark 21. *In the proof, we use that $h = -\partial_{xx}^2 + V$ is self-adjoint on the whole line, and deduce that $\ell^+(E)$ and $\ell^-(E)$ are both Lagrangian planes. Note however that $\ell^+(E)$ is independent of V on \mathbb{R}^- . So $\ell^+(E)$ is a Lagrangian plane whenever there exists an extension of V on \mathbb{R}^- for which the corresponding bulk operator has E in its resolvent set.*

At this point, we defined two types of Lagrangian planes for a given operator h . First, we defined the planes ℓ^\sharp representing the boundary conditions of a self-adjoint extension of the edge Hamiltonian h^\sharp . Then, we defined the planes $\ell^+(E)$ as the set of traces of $\text{Ker}(h_{\max}^\sharp - E)$. If $\text{Tr}(\psi) \in \ell^+(E) \cap \ell^\sharp$, then ψ is in the domain of h^\sharp , and satisfies $(h^\sharp - E)\psi = 0$. So ψ is an eigenvector for the eigenvalue E . This proves the following result (compare with Lemma 19).

Lemma 22. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(h)$, and consider a self-adjoint extension (h^\sharp, ℓ^\sharp) of the edge operator. Then*

$$\dim \text{Ker}(h^\sharp - E) = \dim(\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^\sharp).$$

If Assumption B holds, we can introduce $\mathcal{U}^+(E)$ and \mathcal{U}^\sharp the unitaries corresponding to the Lagrangian planes $\ell^+(E)$ and ℓ^\sharp respectively, and we have

$$\dim \text{Ker}(h^\sharp - E) = \dim(\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^\sharp) = \dim((\mathcal{U}^\sharp)^*\mathcal{U}^+(E) - 1).$$

For instance, the self-adjoint extension $(h^\sharp, \ell^+(E))$ has the energy E as eigenvalue of multiplicity n .

3. FAMILIES OF HILL'S OPERATORS

In the previous section, we exhibit the relationships between self-adjoint extensions, Lagrangian planes, and unitaries. We now consider periodic families of these objects, namely h_t^\sharp , ℓ_t^\sharp and \mathcal{U}_t^\sharp . For each such family, we define an index, namely a *spectral flow* across E for the family h_t^\sharp , a *Maslov index* for the bifamily $(\ell_t^+(E), \ell_t^\sharp)$ and a *spectral flow* across 1 for the family $(\mathcal{U}_t^\sharp)^*\mathcal{U}_t^+(E)$. All these objects are defined in the following sections, and we prove that they all coincide.

All these indices can be defined for *continuous* families. However, since the proofs are simpler in the continuously differentiable case, we restrict ourselves to this case. All these indices depends only on the homotopy class of the corresponding loops, so similar results hold in the continuous case.

3.1. Families of Lagrangians, and Maslov index. We first define the Maslov index of two families of Lagrangian spaces. This index originates from the work of Maslov in [MBA72, Arn67]. In these works, the index was defined for finite dimensional real symplectic spaces (namely \mathbb{R}^{2n} in Example 2). A modern approach can be found in [Fur04], where the infinite dimensional case is studied as well. Here, we present a simple version of the theory, which is enough for our purpose.

Let (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) be a symplectic Hilbert space (not necessarily finite dimensional). We define a topology on $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$ by setting

$$\forall \ell_1, \ell_2 \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b), \quad \text{dist}(\ell_1, \ell_2) := \|P_1 - P_2\|_{\text{op}},$$

where P_1 and P_2 are the orthogonal projectors on ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 respectively. A family $\ell(t)$ in $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$ is said to be continuous, continuously differentiable, etc. if the corresponding family of projectors $P(t)$ is so in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_b)$.

3.1.1. Definition with quadratic crossing forms. Consider two continuously differentiable families $\mathbb{T}^1 \mapsto \ell_1(t)$ and $\mathbb{T}^1 \mapsto \ell_2(t)$. Let $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ be such that $\ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*) \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$. We define the sesquilinear form b on $\ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*)$ by

$$\forall x, y \in \ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*), \quad b(x, y) := \omega(x, P_1'(t^*)y) - \omega(x, P_2'(t^*)y). \quad (8)$$

Lemma 23. *The sesquilinear form b is hermitian, that is $b(x, y) = \overline{b(y, x)}$.*

Proof. Let $P_t := P_1(t)$. First, since $\text{Ran } P_1(t) = \ell_1(t)$ is isotropic for all t , we have

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{T}^1, \quad \omega(P_t(x), P_t(y)) = 0.$$

Differentiating gives

$$\omega(P_t(x), P_t'(y)) = -\omega(P_t'(x), P_t(y)) = \overline{\omega(P_t(y), P_t'(x))}.$$

Taking $t = t^*$ and $x, y \in \ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*)$, so that $P_{t^*}(x) = x$ and $P_{t^*}(y) = y$ gives

$$\forall x, y \in \ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*), \quad \omega(x, P_t'(y)) = \overline{\omega(y, P_t'(x))}.$$

A similar equality holds for $P_t = P_2(t)$, which proves that b is hermitian. \square

In particular, all eigenvalues of b are real-valued. We say that t^* is a **regular crossing** if $\ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2(t^*)$ is finite dimensional (say of dimension $k \in \mathbb{N}$), and if all its eigenvalues (μ_1, \dots, μ_k) are non null (so the corresponding quadratic form is non degenerate). For such crossings, we set

$$\text{deg}(t^*) = \sum_{j=1}^k \text{sgn}(\mu_j).$$

The pair (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) is regular if all crossings are regular. For such pair, the Maslov index is defined by

$$\boxed{\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) := \sum_{t^* \text{ regular crossing}} \text{deg}(t^*) \in \mathbb{Z}.}$$

It is clear from the definition that $\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) = -\text{Mas}(\ell_2, \ell_1, \mathbb{T}^1)$. This definition does not require Assumptions A (nor B).

3.1.2. *Definition with the unitaries U .* In the case where Assumption A holds, we can relate the Maslov index to a spectral flow. Consider two continuously differentiable loops of Lagrangian $\ell_1(t)$ and $\ell_2(t)$ from $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$ to $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$. Let $U_1(t)$ and $U_2(t)$ be the corresponding unitaries from $\text{Ker}(J - i)$ to $\text{Ker}(J + i)$. Then U_1 and U_2 are continuously differentiable for the operator norm topology. From Lemma 9, we have that for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$,

$$\dim \text{Ker} (U_2^* U_1 - \mathbb{I}_{\text{ker}(J-i)}) = \dim (\ell_1(t) \cap \ell_2(t)).$$

In particular, if all crossings are regular, then $\dim(\ell_1 \cap \ell_2) = \text{Ker}(U_2^* U_1 - 1)$ is always finite dimensional. Let $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ be such that the kernel is non empty, of dimension $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By usual perturbation theory for operators [Kat13], we deduce that there are k continuously differentiable branches of eigenvalues of the unitary $U_2^* U_1$ crossing 1 around t^* . More specifically, we have the following.

Lemma 24. *Let $U(t)$ be a periodic continuously differentiable family of unitaries, and let $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that, for all $t \in (t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$,*

$$t \neq t^* \implies 1 \notin \sigma(U(t)), \quad \text{while} \quad \dim \text{Ker}(U(t^*) - 1) = k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, there is $\delta > 0$ and k continuously differentiable functions $(\theta_j(t))$ from $t \in (t^ - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$ to $\mathbb{S}^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| = 1\}$, so that*

$$\sigma(U(t)) \cap B(1, \eta) = \{\theta_1(t), \dots, \theta_k(t)\} \cap B(1, \eta).$$

The functions θ_j are the branches of eigenvalues of U . We say that t^* is a regular crossing if $k := \dim \text{Ker}(U(t^*) - 1) < \infty$, and if $\theta'_j(t^*) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. Note that since θ_j has values in \mathbb{S}^1 , we have $\theta'_j(t^*) \in i\mathbb{R}$. The degree of t^* is

$$\text{deg}(t^*) := \sum_{j=1}^k \text{sgn}(-i\theta'_j(t^*)).$$

This is the net number of eigenvalues crossing 1 in \mathbb{S}^1 in the positive (counterclockwise) direction. Finally, if all crossing are regular, the **spectral flow** of U across 1 is

$$\boxed{\text{Sf}(U, 1, \mathbb{T}^1) := \sum_{t^* \text{ regular crossing}} \text{deg}(t^*) \in \mathbb{Z}.}$$

Lemma 25. *Let $\ell_1(t)$ and $\ell_2(t)$ be two continuously differentiable families of Lagrangians in $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, and let $U_1(t)$ and $U_2(t)$ be the corresponding unitaries. Then $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ is a regular crossing of (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) iff it is a regular crossing of $U_2^* U_1$. If all crossings are regular, then,*

$$\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Sf}(U_2^* U_1, 1, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

Proof. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that only ℓ_1 depends on t . The proof is similar in the general case.

Let t^* be a regular crossing point, and let

$$k := \dim (\ell_1(t^*) \cap \ell_2) = \dim \text{Ker}(U_2^*(t^*)U_1(t^*) - 1).$$

Let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_k$ be the branches of eigenvalues crossing 1 at $t = t^*$, as in Lemma 24, and let $x_1^-(t), \dots, x_k^-(t)$ be a corresponding continuously differentiable set of orthonormal eigenfunctions in $\text{Ker}(J - i)$. First, we have, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, and all $t \in (t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$,

$$\langle x_i^-, [U_2^* U_1 - \theta_j] x_j^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = 0.$$

Differentiating and evaluating at $t = t^*$ shows that

$$\langle x_i^-, \partial_t [U_2^* U_1 - \theta_j] x_j^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} + \langle [U_2^*(t^*)U_1 - 1]^* x_i, (\partial_t x_j^-) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = 0.$$

At $t = t^*$, we have $U_2^* U_1 x_i^- = x_i^-$, so $U_1^* U_2 x_i^- = x_i^-$ as well, and the last term vanishes. We get the Hellman-Feynman equation

$$\delta_{ij} \theta'_j(t^*) = \langle U_2 x_i^-, (\partial_t U_1) x_j^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} \Big|_{t=t^*} = \langle U_1 x_i^-, (\partial_t U_1) x_j^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} \Big|_{t=t^*}.$$

On the other hand, we set $x_j(t) := x_j^-(t) + U_1(t) x_j^-(t)$ in ℓ_1 . Since $x_j \in \ell_1$ for all t , we have $P_1 x_j = x_j$ for all t . Differentiating gives

$$(\partial_t P_1) x_j + P_1 (\partial_t x_j) = (\partial_t x_j).$$

Since $P_1 (\partial_t x_j) \in \ell_1$, which is Lagrangian, we obtain

$$\omega(x_i, (\partial_t P_1) x_j) = \omega(x_i, \partial_t x_j). \quad (9)$$

In addition, we have from $x_j(t) := x_j^-(t) + U_1(t) x_j^-(t)$ that

$$\partial_t x_j = [1 + U_1] (\partial_t x_j^-) + (\partial_t U_1) x_j^-.$$

Since $x_j^- \in \text{Ker}(J - i)$ for all t , we have $(\partial_t x_j^-) \in \text{Ker}(J - i)$ as well, and the first term is in ℓ_1 . On the other hand, $(\partial_t U_1) x_j^-$ is in $\text{Ker}(J + i)$. Together with (4), this gives

$$\omega(x_i, (\partial_t P_1) x_j) = \omega(x_i, \partial_t x_j) = \omega(x_i, (\partial_t U_1) x_j^-) = \omega(U_1 x_i^-, (\partial_t U_1) x_j^-).$$

Using that $\omega(x, y) = \langle x, Jy \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}$ and that $(\partial_t U_1) x_j^- \in \text{Ker}(J + i)$, we obtain, at $t = t^*$, and recalling the definition of b in (8),

$$b(x_i, x_j) = -i \langle U_1 x_i^-, (\partial_t U_1) x_j^- \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = \delta_{ij} (-i) \theta'_j(t^*).$$

The sesquilinear form b is therefore diagonal in the (x_1, \dots, x_k) basis, with corresponding eigenvalues $(-i\theta'_j)$. The proof follows. \square

3.1.3. Definition with the unitary \mathcal{U} . In the case where the stronger Assumption B in (5) is also satisfied, one has a similar result with the unitaries \mathcal{U} instead of U . We state it without proof, as it is similar to the previous one.

Lemma 26. *Assume $(\mathcal{H}_b = \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2, \omega)$ satisfies Assumption 5. Let $\ell_1(t)$ and $\ell_2(t)$ be two continuously differentiable families of Lagrangians in $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, and let $\mathcal{U}_1(t)$ and $\mathcal{U}_2(t)$ be the corresponding unitaries of \mathcal{H}_1 . Then $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ is a regular crossing of (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) if it is a regular crossing of $\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1$. If all crossings are regular, then,*

$$\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Sf}(\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1, 1, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

The importance of this lemma comes from the fact that, in the finite dimensional case ($\mathcal{H}_1 \approx \mathbb{C}^n$), the spectral flow of a periodic family $\mathcal{U}(t) \in \text{U}(n)$ across 1 (or any other point in \mathbb{S}^1) equals the winding number of $\det \mathcal{U}(t)$:

$$\text{Sf}(\mathcal{U}, z \in \mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Winding}(\det(\mathcal{U}), \mathbb{T}^1).$$

In our case where $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1$, we have $\det(\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1) = \det(\mathcal{U}_1) / \det(\mathcal{U}_2)$, hence

$$\text{Winding}(\det(\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1), \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Winding}(\mathcal{U}_1, \mathbb{T}^1) - \text{Winding}(\mathcal{U}_2, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

We obtain the following result.

Lemma 27. *In the case where $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ with its canonical symplectic form, we have*

$$\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) = \mathcal{I}(\ell_1, \mathbb{T}^1) - \mathcal{I}(\ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1),$$

where, for a periodic continuous family $\ell(t)$ in $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, with corresponding unitary $\mathcal{U}(t) \in \text{U}(n)$, we set

$$\boxed{\mathcal{I}(\ell, \mathbb{T}^1) := \text{Winding}(\det \mathcal{U}, \mathbb{T}^1) \in \mathbb{Z}.}$$

In the infinite dimensional case, such a splitting is not valid. This gives some complications (see Section 4). In order to have a unified definition with the next Section, we recall that, in Example 15, we proved that Dirichlet boundary conditions corresponds to the Lagrangian plane $\ell_D = -\mathbb{I}_d$. So, setting $\ell_D := \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^n$, we have the alternative definition

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Mas}(\ell, \ell_D, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Sf}(\mathcal{U}, -1, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

3.2. Families of Hill's operators, spectral flow. We now focus on a periodic family of Hill's operator h_t . Let $\mathbb{T}^1 \mapsto V_t$ be a periodic family of potentials satisfying (1), and set

$$h_t := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_t(x).$$

We assume that $t \mapsto V_t$ is continuously differentiable as a map from \mathbb{T}^1 to the Banach space $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}_n)$. Since \mathbb{T}^1 is compact, $V(t, x)$ is uniformly bounded. In particular, as in Section 2.2.2, the operator h_t is essentially self-adjoint with fixed domain $\mathcal{D} = H^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{C}^n)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$.

The **spectrum** of the family $(h_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1}$ is the set

$$\sigma(h_t, \mathbb{T}^1) := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1} \sigma(h_t).$$

It is the compact union of all spectra of (h_t) for $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$. Since $t \mapsto \sigma(h_t)$ is continuous, $\sigma(h_t, \mathbb{T}^1)$ is a closed set in \mathbb{R} . The complement of $\sigma(h_t, \mathbb{T}^1)$ is the **resolvent set** of the family $(h_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1}$.

We now consider a corresponding family of edge self-adjoint operators, of the form $(h_t^\sharp, \ell_t^\sharp)$. We say that this family is continuous, continuously differentiable, etc. if the corresponding family of Lagrangian planes ℓ_t^\sharp is (in $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$).

Fix $E \in \mathbb{R}$ in the resolvent set of $(h_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1}$. As t varies in \mathbb{T}^1 , the spectrum of the bulk operator h_t stays away from E . However, for the edge operators $(h_t^\sharp, \ell_t^\sharp)$, some eigenvalues may touch the energy E . If $t^* \in \mathbb{T}^1$ is such that $\dim \text{Ker} (h_{t^*}^\sharp - E) = k \in \mathbb{N}$, then, as in Lemma 24, we can find $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and k continuously differentiable branches of eigenvalues $\lambda_j(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ so that, for $t \in (t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$,

$$\sigma(h_t^\sharp) \cap B(E, \eta) = \{\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_k(t)\} \cap B(E, \eta).$$

At $t = t^*$, we have $\lambda_1(t^*) = \dots = \lambda_k(t^*) = E$. The crossing t^* is regular if $\lambda'_j(t^*) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. For such a crossing, we set

$$\text{deg}(t^*) = \sum_{j=1}^k \text{sgn}(\lambda'_j(t^*)).$$

We say that the energy E is a **regular energy** if all crossings at E are regular. For such an energy, we define the **spectral flow** of (h_t^\sharp) across E as the net number of eigenvalues crossing E downwards:

$$\boxed{\text{Sf}(h_t^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1) := - \sum_{t^* \text{ regular crossing}} \text{deg}(t^*) \in \mathbb{Z}.}$$

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 28. *Let $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be any interval in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(h_t, \mathbb{T}^1)$. Then*

- *almost all E in (a, b) is a regular energy for $(h_t^\sharp, \ell_t^\sharp)$;*
- *for any regular energy E in (a, b) , we have*

$$\text{Sf}(h_t^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Mas}(\ell_t^+(E), \ell_t^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1) = \mathcal{I}(\ell_t^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1) - \mathcal{I}(\ell_t^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

Proof. The first part comes from Sard's lemma, and can be proved as in [Gon20, Lemma III.18].

Fix E is regular energy, let t^* be a crossing point so that $\dim \text{Ker} (h_{t^*}^\sharp - E) = k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ be the corresponding branches of eigenvalues. The idea of the proof is to follow the two families of branches $(t, \lambda_j(t))$ and (t, E) , describing respectively ℓ_t^\sharp and $\ell_t^+(E)$.

For the first branch, let $\psi_1(t), \dots, \psi_k(t)$ be a continuously differentiable family or \mathcal{H}^\sharp -orthonormal eigenvectors in $\mathcal{D}_t^\sharp := \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell_t^\sharp)$, so that $h_t^\sharp \psi_j(t) = \lambda_k(t) \psi_j(t)$, and let

$$u_j := \text{Tr}(\psi_j), \quad \text{so that} \quad \ell_{t^*}^+(E) \cap \ell_{t^*}^\sharp = \text{Vect}(u_1(t^*), \dots, u_k(t^*)).$$

We have, for all $t \in (t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$, that (recall that $h_t^* \subset h_{t, \max}^*$)

$$\langle \psi_i(t), (h_{t, \max}^\sharp - \lambda_j(t)) \psi_j(t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = 0.$$

Differentiating the first equation and evaluating at $t = t^*$ gives

$$\langle \psi_i, \partial_t (h_{t, \max}^\sharp - \lambda_j) \psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \Big|_{t=t^*} + \langle \psi_i, (h_{t^*, \max}^\sharp - E) (\partial_t \psi_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \Big|_{t=t^*} = 0$$

For the last term, we put the operator $(h_{t^*, \max}^\sharp - E)$ on the other side using the second Green's identity. Since $(h_{t^*, \max}^\sharp - E) \psi_i = 0$, we get

$$\langle \psi_i, (h_{t^*, \max}^\sharp - E) (\partial_t \psi_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \Big|_{t=t^*} = \omega(u_i, \partial_t u_j) \Big|_{t=t^*} = \omega(u_i, (\partial_t P_{t^*}^\sharp) u_j) \Big|_{t=t^*}.$$

For the last equality, we introduced P_t^\sharp the projection on ℓ_t^\sharp , and used an equality similar to (9). This gives our first identity

$$\delta_{ij} \lambda_j'(t^*) = \langle \psi_i, \partial_t (h_{t, \max}^\sharp) \psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \Big|_{t=t^*} + \omega(u_i, \partial_t (P_t^\sharp) u_j) \Big|_{t=t^*}.$$

Remark 29. In the case where the domain $\ell_t^\sharp = \ell^{\sharp}$ is independent of t , we recover the Hellman-Feynman identity $\langle \psi_i, \partial_t (h_t^\sharp - \lambda_j) \psi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} \Big|_{t=t^*} = 0$.

For the second branch, let $(\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_k(t))$ be a smooth family of linearly independent functions in $\mathcal{S}^+(t, E)$, and so that, at $t = t^*$, $\phi_j(t^*) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}^+} \psi_j(t^*)$. We set

$$v_j = \text{Tr}(\phi_j), \quad \text{so, at } t = t^*, \quad v_j(t^*) = u_j(t^*).$$

This time, we have, for all $t \in (t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon)$,

$$\langle \phi_i, (h_{t, \max}^\sharp - E) \phi_j \rangle = 0.$$

Differentiating and evaluating at $t = t^*$ gives as before

$$\langle \phi_i, \partial_t (h_{t^*, \max}^\sharp) \phi_j \rangle = -\omega(v_i, \partial_t v_j) = -\omega(v_i, (\partial_t P_t^+) v_j) = -\omega(u_i, (\partial_t P_t^+) u_j)$$

Gathering the two identities shows that

$$\delta_{ij} \lambda_j'(t^*) = -\omega(u_i, (\partial_t P_t^+) u_j) \Big|_{t=t^*} + \omega(u_i, \partial_t (P_t^\sharp) u_j) \Big|_{t=t^*}.$$

We recognise the sesquilinear form b defined in (8). This form is therefore diagonal in the (u_1, \dots, u_j) basis, and its eigenvalues are the $-\lambda_j'(t^*)$. The result follows. \square

While our proofs are valid only for continuously differentiable families, they can be extended to the continuous case. Indeed, it is well-known that the spectral flow, the Maslov index, and the winding number only depends only on the homotopy class of the corresponding families.

For instance, the spectral flow is independent of the energy E in the gap (a, b) . So all indices are independent of E in the gap, and Theorem 28 also holds for non-regular $E \in (a, b)$ (with the corresponding continuous versions for the definitions of the indices).

3.3. Applications. Let us give two applications of the previous theory. The first one shows that a spectral flow must appear when modifying Robin boundary conditions. The second one concerns the important case of junctions between two materials.

3.3.1. Robin boundary conditions. In the case $n = 1$, consider a fixed (independent of t) bounded potential $V_t(x) = V(x)$. We consider the self-adjoint Robin operator $h_t^\sharp = -\partial_{xx}^2 + V$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$, with the t -dependent domain

$$\mathcal{D}_t := \{ \psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad \cos(\pi t)\psi(0) - \sin(\pi t)\psi'(0) = 0 \}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_{t+1} = \mathcal{D}_t$, so H_t^\sharp is indeed periodic in t . For $t = 0$, we recover Dirichlet boundary condition, and for $t = \frac{1}{2}$, we recover Neumann boundary conditions, so Robin boundary conditions somehow interpolates between these two cases. The Lagrangian plane of $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$ corresponding to the extension \mathcal{D}_t is

$$\ell_t^\sharp = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\pi t) \\ \cos(\pi t) \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}.$$

It is of the form $\ell_t^\sharp \{ (\Theta x, \Pi x), x \in \mathbb{C} \}$ for $\Theta = \sin(\pi t)$ and $\Pi = \cos(\pi t)$. So, by the results of Example 16, the corresponding unitary $\mathcal{U}(t) \in \text{U}(1) \approx \mathbb{S}^1$, is

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = \frac{\sin(\pi t) + i \cos(\pi t)}{\sin(\pi t) - i \cos(\pi t)} = e^{2i\pi t}.$$

We see that $\mathcal{U}(t)$ winds once positively around \mathbb{S}^1 as t runs through \mathbb{T}^1 , that is

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell_t^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1) = 1.$$

Using Theorem 28, and the fact that $\ell_t^+(E)$ is independent of t , we obtain

$$\text{Sf} \left(h_t^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = -1.$$

We deduce that there is a spectral flow of exactly 1 eigenvalue going upwards in all spectral gaps of h . This includes the lower gap $(-\infty, \inf \sigma(h))$.

3.3.2. Junction between two materials. We now consider a junction between a left and a right potentials $V_{L,t}$ and $V_{R,t}$, where $t \mapsto V_{L,t}$ and $t \mapsto V_{R,t}$ are two periodic continuously differentiable families of potentials in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S}_n)$. Take χ a bounded switch function, satisfying, for some $X > 0$ large enough,

$$\forall x \leq -X, \quad \chi(x) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \geq X, \quad \chi(x) = 0.$$

We consider the domain wall Hill's operator

$$h_t^\chi := -\partial_{xx}^2 + V_{L,t}(x)\chi(x) + V_{R,t}(x)(1 - \chi(x)).$$

Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be in the resolvent set of the bulk operators $h_{R,t}$ and $h_{L,t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$. Again, some eigenvalues of h_t^χ might cross E as t goes from 0 to 1, and we can define a corresponding spectral flow $\text{Sf}(h_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1)$.

Theorem 30 (Bulk-edge correspondence for junctions). *With the previous notation, let $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{ \sigma(h_{R,t}, \mathbb{T}^1) \cup \sigma(h_{L,t}, \mathbb{T}^1) \}$. Then,*

- almost all $E \in (a, b)$ is a regular energy for h_t^χ ;
- for any such regular energy, we have

$$\text{Sf}(h_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Mas} \left(\ell_{R,t}^+(E), \ell_{L,t}^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \mathcal{I}(\ell_{R,t}^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1) - \mathcal{I}(\ell_{L,t}^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1).$$

The right-hand side is independent of the switch χ .

Remark 31. Applying this theorem with $V_L = V_R$ shows that, for E in a gap of all operators h_t (so that there is no spectral flow), we have

$$0 = \text{Mas}(\ell_t^+(E), \ell_t^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1) = \mathcal{I}(\ell_t^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1) - \mathcal{I}(\ell_t^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1).$$

So $\mathcal{I}(\ell_t^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1) = \mathcal{I}(\ell_t^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1)$. This means that we can drop the upper-script \pm in Theorem 30. The common integer $\mathcal{I}(\ell_t^\pm(E), \mathbb{T}^1)$ is the usual bulk/edge index.

Proof. The following proof uses the theory developed in the previous sections. We give a different proof in the Schrödinger case (see Theorem 40 below).

Let us denote by $\ell_{\chi,t}^\pm(x_0, E)$ the Lagrangian planes obtained with the potential

$$V_t^\chi(x) := V_{L,t}(x)\chi(x) + V_{R,t}(x)(1 - \chi(x)),$$

and when the real line \mathbb{R} is cut at the location $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 19, we have

$$\forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \dim \text{Ker}(h_t^\chi - E) = \dim(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0, E) \cap \ell_{\chi,t}^-(x_0, E)).$$

Adapting the proof of Theorem 28 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sf}(h_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1) &= \text{Mas}(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0, E), \ell_{\chi,t}^-(x_0, E), \mathbb{T}^1) \\ &= \mathcal{I}(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0, E), \mathbb{T}^1) - \mathcal{I}(\ell_{\chi,t}^-(x_0, E), \mathbb{T}^1). \end{aligned}$$

Since V is uniformly (hence locally) bounded, all Cauchy solutions to $-\psi'' + V\psi = E\psi$ are well defined and continuously differentiable on the whole line \mathbb{R} . This implies that the maps $x_0 \mapsto \ell_{\chi,t}^\pm(x_0, E)$ are also continuous. In particular, since the index M depends only on the homotopy class of the loops, we have

$$M(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0, E), \mathbb{T}^1) = M(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0 = X, E), \mathbb{T}^1).$$

The last quantity only involves the half space $\{x \geq X\}$. On this half space, we have $V_t^\chi(x) = V_{R,t}(x)$, so

$$M(\ell_{\chi,t}^+(x_0 = X, E), \mathbb{T}^1) = M(\ell_{R,t}^+(X, E), \mathbb{T}^1) = M(\ell_{R,t}^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1).$$

The proof that $M(\ell_{\chi,t}^-(x_0, E), \mathbb{T}^1) = M(\ell_{L,t}^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1)$ is similar, and the result follows. \square

4. THE INFINITE DIMENSIONAL CASE

In this section, we explain how to modify the previous proofs to handle the infinite dimensional setting, by which we mean the PDE Schrödinger case. We chose to put this section separately, since it introduces some technical details, and since the results are slightly different.

4.1. Schrödinger operators on a tube. We now consider systems defined on a d -dimensional cylinder of the form

$$\Omega := \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here and in what follows, $\Gamma = (0, 1)^{d-1}$ is the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit open square. A point in Ω is denoted by $\mathbf{x} = (x, \mathbf{y})$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \Gamma$.

Let $V : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a *real-valued* potential, which we assume to be bounded on Ω . We consider bulk Schrödinger operator H of the form

$$H := -\Delta + V, \quad \text{acting on } \mathcal{H} := L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}).$$

The case of general second order elliptic operators, and with values in \mathbb{C}^n , can be treated similarly. Again, we do not assume here that V is periodic, but only that V is bounded.

The operator H with core domain $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is symmetric, and we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min} = H_0^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\max} = H^2(\Omega, \mathbb{C}).$$

This time, the bulk operator is not self-adjoint, and indeed, boundary conditions must be chosen on the boundary $\partial\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \partial\Gamma$.

4.1.1. *The bulk Schrödinger operators.* Let us explain in detail how we choose the boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \partial\Gamma$ for the bulk operator. First, we see V as a perturbation of $-\Delta$, so, once the domain of $-\Delta$ has been chosen, the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + V$ will have the same domain (see for instance [Kat13, Chapter 5.4.3]).

We have $\Omega = \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma$, so

$$\mathcal{H} := L^2(\Omega) = L^2(\mathbb{R}) \otimes L^2(\Gamma),$$

and, with respect to this decomposition,

$$-\Delta = (-\partial_{xx}^2) \otimes (-\Delta_\Gamma).$$

The operator $-\partial_{xx}^2$ is essentially self-adjoint on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, so $-\Delta$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)$ whenever $-\Delta_\Gamma$ is so on $L^2(\Gamma)$. In what follows, we fix one such extension. We consider here the periodic realisation of $-\Delta_\Gamma$, but the proofs are similar for other choices, such as the Dirichlet extension, the Neumann one, or the quasi-periodic one. So we see $\Gamma = (0, 1)^{d-1} \approx \mathbb{T}^{d-1}$ as the $(d-1)$ -torus, and we consider the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma, \text{per}} := H^2(\mathbb{T}^{d-1}).$$

The operator $(-\Delta_{\Gamma, \text{per}}, \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma, \text{per}})$ is self-adjoint. It is compact resolvent, diagonal in the Fourier basis, and admits a spectral decomposition of the form

$$-\Delta_{\Gamma, \text{per}} := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} 4\pi|\mathbf{k}|^2 |e_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle \langle e_{\mathbf{k}}|, \quad \text{with} \quad e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}) := e^{i2\pi\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{y}}.$$

The corresponding operator $-\Delta_{\text{per}} := (-\partial_{xx}^2) \otimes (-\Delta_{\Gamma, \text{per}})$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)$, with domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{per}} := \overline{H^2(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma, \text{per}}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\max}}.$$

The subscript "per" only refers to periodicity in the last $(d-1)$ dimensions. The elements in \mathcal{H} can be written in the partial Fourier form

$$f(x, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{k}}(x) e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{with} \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} \|f_{\mathbf{k}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 < \infty. \quad (10)$$

We have $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{per}}$ if $\|(-\Delta_{\text{per}})f\|_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ as well, where

$$\|(-\Delta_{\text{per}})f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} \left(\|f_{\mathbf{k}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + (4\pi|\mathbf{k}|^2)^2 \|f_{\mathbf{k}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \right) < \infty.$$

4.1.2. *Edge Schrödinger operators on a tube.* We now define the edge Schrödinger operator

$$H^\sharp := -\Delta + V \quad \text{acting on} \quad L^2(\Omega^+, \mathbb{C}), \quad \text{where} \quad \Omega^+ := \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Gamma.$$

This operator acts on the right half tube. We sometime write $H^{\sharp,+}$ for H^\sharp and define $H^{\sharp,-}$ for the corresponding operator on the left half tube $\Omega^- := \mathbb{R}^- \times \Gamma$. The operator H^\sharp with core domain $C_0^\infty(\Omega^+)$ is symmetric, and we have,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\min}^\sharp = H_0^2(\Omega^+, \mathbb{R}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\max}^\sharp = H^2(\Omega^+, \mathbb{R}).$$

Again, we need to specify the boundary conditions. On the boundary $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \partial\Gamma$, we keep the same boundary conditions as for the bulk one. In other words, writing

$$\mathcal{H}^\sharp := L^2(\Omega^+) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^+) \otimes L^2(\Gamma),$$

and setting

$$-\Delta_{\text{per},\min}^{\sharp} := (-\partial_{xx}^2)_{\min}^{\sharp} \otimes (-\Delta_{\Gamma,\text{per}}) \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta_{\text{per},\max}^{\sharp} := (-\partial_{xx}^2)_{\max}^{\sharp} \otimes (-\Delta_{\Gamma,\text{per}}),$$

we only look for self-adjoint extensions $(-\Delta^{\sharp})$ of the Laplacian satisfying

$$-\Delta_{\text{per},\min}^{\sharp} \subset -\Delta^{\sharp} \subset -\Delta_{\text{per},\max}^{\sharp}.$$

We are only looking at the self-adjoint domains contained in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{per},\max}^{\sharp}$. We identify this last domain in the next Lemma (compare with Lemma 18).

Lemma 32. *A function is in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{per},\max}^{\sharp}$ iff it is the restriction to Ω^+ of an element in the bulk domain \mathcal{D}_{per} .*

Proof. This follows from the fact that there is an extension operator $H^2(\Omega^+) \rightarrow H^2(\Omega)$ which can be constructed with reflection operators, see *e.g.* [GT15, Theorem 7.25] or [LM12, Theorem 8.1]. These reflection operators keep the periodic properties at the boundary $\mathbb{R} \times \partial\Gamma$. \square

In our case of periodic boundary conditions, we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{per},\min}^{\sharp} = H_0^2(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T}^{d-1}, \mathbb{C}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\text{per},\max}^{\sharp} = H^2(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T}^{d-1}, \mathbb{C}).$$

4.2. Trace maps, and the boundary space \mathcal{H}'_b . In order to express the second Green's identity in this setting, we recall some basic facts on the Dirichlet and Neumann trace operators.

4.2.1. Boundary Sobolev-like spaces. We will need the boundary Hilbert spaces $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)$. To define them, we note that $(-\Delta_{\Gamma,\text{per}})$ is positive. For $0 \leq s \leq 2$, and for functions $f, g \in \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma,\text{per}}$, we set

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle (-\Delta_{\Gamma,\text{per}})^{s/2} f, (-\Delta_{\Gamma,\text{per}})^{s/2} g \right\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

The Hilbert space $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma,\text{per}}$ for the corresponding norm. The $\frac{1}{2}$ factor is here so that $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma) = L^2(\Gamma)$. In terms of Fourier coefficients, we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H^s(\Gamma)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} \overline{f_{\mathbf{k}}} g_{\mathbf{k}} (1 + (4\pi|\mathbf{k}|^2)^s).$$

Finally, for $0 \leq s \leq 2$, we define $H_{\text{per}}^{-s}(\Gamma)$ as the dual of $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)$ for the $L^2(\Gamma)$ -inner product. It is also an Hilbert space with corresponding inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{-s}(\Gamma)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} \overline{f_{\mathbf{k}}} g_{\mathbf{k}} (1 + (4\pi|\mathbf{k}|^2)^s)^{-1}.$$

It is classical that, for $-2 \leq s' \leq s \leq 2$, we have $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma) \hookrightarrow H_{\text{per}}^{s'}(\Gamma)$ with compact embedding, and that $H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)$ is dense in $H_{\text{per}}^{s'}(\Gamma)$. For $s < 0$, the subscript "per" can be dropped, since it equals the usual $H^s(\Gamma)$ Sobolev space.

Remark 33. *Should we choose the Dirichlet Laplacian $-\Delta_{\Gamma,D}$, instead of the periodic ones, we would obtain the usual $H_0^s(\Gamma)$ Sobolev spaces for $s > 0$, and the subscript 0 can be dropped for $s \leq 0$.*

4.2.2. *Dirichlet and Neumann trace operators.* For $\psi \in C^\infty(\Omega^+)$, we introduce the functions $\gamma^D\psi$ and $\gamma^N\psi$ defined on Γ by

$$\forall \mathbf{y} \in \Gamma, \quad (\gamma^D\psi)(\mathbf{y}) := \psi(x=0, \mathbf{y}), \quad (\gamma^N\psi)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial_x\psi(x=0, \mathbf{y}).$$

Our definition differs from the usual one $\gamma^N\psi = -\partial_x\psi(0, \cdot)$, where the minus sign comes from the outward normal direction of Γ from the Ω^+ perspective. Our definition without the minus sign matches the one of the previous section.

It is classical that γ^D can be extended from $H^2(\Omega^+)$ to $H^{3/2}(\Gamma)$ and that γ^N can be extended from $H^2(\Omega^+)$ to $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, and that these extensions are onto (see for instance [LM12, Theorem 8.3]). This suggests to introduce the boundary space

$$\mathcal{H}_b := H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}(\Gamma) \times H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma),$$

and the boundary trace operator

$$\text{Tr} : \mathcal{D}_{\text{per}, \max}^\sharp \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \text{Tr}(\psi) := (\gamma^D\psi, \gamma^N\psi).$$

The counterpart of Lemma 12 is the following.

Lemma 34. *The map $\text{Tr} : (\mathcal{D}_{\text{per}, \max}^\sharp, \|\cdot\|_\sharp)$ to \mathcal{H}_b is well-defined, continuous and onto.*

In other terms, we do not lose the surjectivity of Tr by restricting all domains to be periodic in the last $(d-1)$ -direction.

Proof. The fact that Tr is well-defined and continuous follows from the fact that $\|\cdot\|_\sharp$ is equivalent to the usual $H^2(\Omega^+)$ norm, together with the continuity of the trace maps. To prove that Tr is onto, one can adapt the proof of [LM12, Theorem 8.3]. We provide here an alternative proof.

An element $f \in H_{\text{per}}^s(\Gamma)$ is of the form

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{k}} e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} (1 + (4\pi|\mathbf{k}|^2)^s) |f_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 < \infty.$$

Let $f \in H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}(\Gamma)$ and $f' \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ with respective coefficients $(f_{\mathbf{k}})$ and $(f'_{\mathbf{k}})$. Consider also a smooth cut-off function $\chi(x)$ with $\chi(x) = 1$ for $0 \leq x < 1/2$, $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x > 2$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \chi^2 = 1$. We set $\chi_{\mathbf{0}} = \chi$, and for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\chi_{\mathbf{k}}(x) := \chi(x|\mathbf{k}|^{1/2}).$$

For all \mathbf{k} , the function $\chi_{\mathbf{k}}$ is smooth, compactly supported, with $\chi_{\mathbf{k}}(x) = 1$ for all $x < 1/2|\mathbf{k}|$. In addition, we have the scalings

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} |\chi_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} |\chi'_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = |\mathbf{k}|, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} |\chi''_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = |\mathbf{k}|^3.$$

Finally, we consider the function defined on Ω^+ by

$$\Psi(x, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} (f_{\mathbf{k}} + x f'_{\mathbf{k}}) \chi_{\mathbf{k}}(x) e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}).$$

The function Ψ is compactly supported and, we check that $\text{Tr}(\Psi) = (f, f')$. It remains to check that Ψ is in $H^2(\Omega^+)$. We have

$$\int_{\Omega^+} \|\Delta\Psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} (|f_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 |\mathbf{k}|^4 |\chi_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |f_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 |\chi''_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 + |f'_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 |\chi'_{\mathbf{k}}|^2).$$

Thanks to our scaling, we deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega^+} \|\Delta\Psi\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} |f_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \cdot |\mathbf{k}|^3 + \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} |f'_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 |\mathbf{k}| \lesssim \|f\|_{H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}}^2 + \|f'\|_{H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}}^2.$$

The result follows. \square

We can now state the second Green's identity in the PDE case.

Lemma 35 (Second Green's formula). *For all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp$,*

$$\langle \phi, H_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle H_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \langle \gamma^D \phi, \gamma^N \psi \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \langle \gamma^N \phi, \gamma^D \psi \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Introducing the symplectic form ω on \mathcal{H}_b , defined by

$$\forall (f, f'), (g, g') \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \omega'((f, f'), (g, g')) := \langle f, g' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \langle f', g \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)},$$

the second Green's identity simply reads

$$\langle \phi, H_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} - \langle H_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\sharp} = \omega(\text{Tr}(\phi), \text{Tr}(\psi)).$$

Remark 36. *The symplectic Hilbert space (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) does not satisfy Assumption A in (2). Introducing the map $A : H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}(\Gamma)$ so that*

$$\forall f \in H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}(\Gamma), \forall g \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma), \quad \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} = \langle f, Ag \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}} = \langle A^* f, g \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}},$$

we have $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A^ \\ -A & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, but the operators A and A^* are compact (hence J as well, and $J^2 \neq -\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_b}$). In particular, we cannot consider the unitaries U nor \mathcal{U} . Such situation was considered in [BBZ13]. We present below in Appendix A a new approach which allows the use of unitaries as in the previous section. The "more natural" symplectic space $H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ appears at this point.*

Now that our functional spaces and operators have been identified, all our previous results for Hill's operators (Section 2) hold in the Schrödinger case. Indeed, these ones never used finite dimensional arguments. More specifically, we have the following.

Theorem 37.

- For $\mathcal{D}^\sharp \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp$, the operator $(H^\sharp, \mathcal{D}^\sharp)$ is self-adjoint iff

$$\mathcal{D}^\sharp := \text{Tr}^{-1}(\ell), \quad \text{for a Lagrangian plane } \ell \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b).$$

- If $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(H_{\text{per}})$, then the sets

$$\ell^\pm(E) := \text{Tr} [\text{Ker} (H_{\text{per,max}}^{\sharp,\pm} - E)]$$

are Lagrangian planes of $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, and $\ell^+(E) \oplus \ell^-(E) = \mathcal{H}_b$.

- For all $E \in \mathbb{R}$ (not necessarily in the resolvent set), we have

$$\dim \text{Ker} (H_{\text{per}} - E) = \dim (\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^-(E)).$$

- If $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(H_{\text{per}})$, then,

$$\dim \text{Ker} (H^\sharp - E) = \dim (\ell^+(E) \cap \ell^\sharp).$$

Again, for $\ell^\sharp \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$, we denote by (H^\sharp, ℓ^\sharp) the self-adjoint extensions of H^\sharp corresponding to this Lagrangian plane.

In the finite dimensional Hill's case, for any such extension $(h^{\sharp,+}, \ell^\sharp)$ and $(h^{\sharp,-}, \ell^\sharp)$ with the same Lagrangian plane ℓ^\sharp , we have

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(h) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(h^{\sharp,+}) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(h^{\sharp,-}).$$

In some sense, boundary conditions are finite dimensional (hence compact) perturbations. In the Schrödinger case, we always have

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H) \subset \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H^{\sharp,+}) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H^{\sharp,-}),$$

which comes from the fact that Weyl sequences for H can only escape to $\pm\infty$. However, the inclusion may be strict. For instance, for $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(H)$, the extension $(H^{\sharp,+}, \ell^+(E))$ has the energy E as an eigenvalue of infinite multiplicity. So $E \in \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H^{\sharp,+})$. The corresponding Weyl sequences localise near the cut.

This makes bulk-boundary correspondence more subtle in the Schrödinger case: different self-adjoint extensions may give different results. For the usual extensions however, we prove that the result are independent of the choice (see the proof of Theorem 40 below).

4.2.3. *Families of Schrödinger operators.* We now consider a family of Schrödinger operators of the form

$$H_t := -\Delta_{\text{per}} + V_t, \quad \text{acting on } \mathcal{H}.$$

Again, we assume that $t \mapsto V_t$ is continuously differentiable from \mathbb{T}^1 to $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$. We also consider a family of (self-adjoint extensions of) edge operators $(H_t^\sharp, \ell_t^\sharp)$.

Let $E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(H_t)$. We say that E is a **regular energy** if, for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$, the energy E is not in the essential spectrum of H_t^\sharp . In particular, this implies $\dim \text{Ker}(H_t^\sharp - E) = \dim(\ell_t^+(E) \cap \ell_t^\sharp) < \infty$. In addition, we require all corresponding crossings to be regular.

Noticing that the definition of the Maslov index in Section 3.1 does not require Assumption A, we can apply the first part of the proof of Theorem 28 to the Schrödinger case, and we obtain the following.

Theorem 38. *Let $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$,*

$$(a, b) \cap \sigma(H_t) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad (a, b) \cap \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_t^\sharp) = \emptyset.$$

Then,

- *almost any $E \in (a, b)$ is a regular energy;*
- *for such a regular energy, we have*

$$\text{Sf}(H_t^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Mas}(\ell^+(t), \ell_t^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1)$$

Unfortunately, since the symplectic space (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) does not satisfy Assumption A, we can not yet relate the last index as a spectral flow of unitaries. We prove in Appendix A the following.

Lemma 39. *The Lagrangian planes of \mathcal{H}_b are in one-to-one correspondence with the unitaries of $L^2(\Gamma)$. In addition, if $(\ell_1(t), \ell_2(t))$ is regular with corresponding unitaries \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 , then*

$$\text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Sf}(\mathcal{U}_2^* \mathcal{U}_1, 1, \mathbb{T}^1).$$

However, since \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 are now unitaries in the infinite dimensional space $L^2(\Gamma)$, we can no longer use the fact that the spectral flow is the winding number of the determinant. It is unclear that we can split this index has a contribution of ℓ_1 minus a contribution of ℓ_2 . This will however be the case for junctions, as we prove in the next section.

4.3. **Junctions for Schrödinger operators.** Let us consider the two families of potentials $V_{L,t}$ and $V_{R,t}$, continuously differentiable from \mathbb{T}^1 to $L^\infty(\Omega)$. For $\chi : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a bounded switch function with $\chi(x, \mathbf{y}) = 1$ for $x < -X$ and $\chi(x, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $x > X$, we set

$$H_t^\chi := -\Delta_{\text{per}} + V_t^\chi(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{with} \quad V_t^\chi := V_{L,t}\chi + V_{R,t}(1 - \chi).$$

As in Section 3.3.2, H_t^χ models a junction between a left and right potential.

We denote by $H_{L,t}$ and $H_{R,t}$ the corresponding Hamiltonians. Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be in the resolvent set of both $H_{L,t}$ and $H_{R,t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$, so that the Lagrangian planes

$\ell_{L,t}^\pm(E)$ and $\ell_{R,t}^\pm(E)$ are all well-defined. We also set $\ell_D^\# := \{0\} \times H_{\text{per}}^{1/2} \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}_b)$ the Lagrangian plane corresponding to Dirichlet boundary conditions, and we set

$$\mathcal{I} \left(\ell_{L/R,t}^\pm(E), \mathbb{T}^1 \right) := \text{Mas} \left(\ell_{L/R,t}^\pm(E), \ell_D^\#, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \text{Sf} \left(H_{L/R,t}^{\#, \pm}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right).$$

This defines an integer-valued index for the Lagrangian planes of the form $\ell_t^\pm(E)$ (which is our bulk/edge index).

Theorem 40 (Junctions in the Schrödinger case). *Let $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$,*

$$(a, b) \cap (\sigma(H_{t,R}) \cup \sigma(H_{t,L})) = \emptyset.$$

Then, for all $E \in (a, b)$, we have

$$\text{Sf} \left(H_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \text{Mas} \left(\ell_R^+(E), \ell_L^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \mathcal{I} \left(\ell_R^+(E), \mathbb{T}^1 \right) - \mathcal{I} \left(\ell_L^-(E), \mathbb{T}^1 \right).$$

This number is independent of χ and of E in the gap.

Reasoning as in Remark 31, we see that the upper-scripts \pm may be dropped in the last line.

Proof. Let us prove first the result for $\chi_0(x) = \mathbf{1}(x < 0)$. We set for simplicity $H_t := -\Delta_{\text{per}} + V_t^{\chi_0}$ acting on $L^2(\Omega)$, and $H_{D,t}$ the corresponding operator acting on $L^2(\Omega) \approx L^2(\Omega^- \cup \Omega^+)$, and with Dirichlet boundary conditions at $\{0\} \times \Gamma$. Since V_t is uniformly bounded, the operators H_t and $H_{D,t}$ are uniformly bounded from below. Consider $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Sigma < \inf_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1} \inf \sigma(H_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma < \inf_{t \in \mathbb{T}^1} \inf \sigma(H_{D,t}).$$

We set $R_t := (H_t - \Sigma)^{-1}$ and $R_{D,t} := (H_{D,t} - \Sigma)^{-1}$, which are both bounded operators. It is a standard result (see for instance [RS80, Theorem XI.79]) that, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R_t^m - R_{D,t}^m$ is a compact (even trace-class) operator. In particular, for all $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$, we have

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_t) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_{D,t}).$$

Let (a, b) denote an essential gap of these operators, and let $E \in (a, b)$ be a regular energy for both operators. Using spectral theory, we have

$$\text{Sf} \left(H_t, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = -\text{Sf} \left(R_t^m, (\Sigma - E)^{-m}, \mathbb{T}^1 \right)$$

and similarly for $H_{D,t}$. Introducing

$$R_t^m(s) := R_t + s(R_{D,t}^m - R_t^m),$$

we see that $s \mapsto R_t^m(s)$ is a continuous family of operators connecting R_t and $R_{D,t}$. Since for all $s \in [0, 1]$, $R_t^m(s)$ is a compact perturbation of R_t , the essential gap does not close as s varies. We deduce that these two spectral flows are equal (see for instance [Wat16, Theorem 4.2.3]). So

$$\text{Sf} \left(R_t^m, (\Sigma - E)^{-m}, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \text{Sf} \left(R_{D,t}^m, (\Sigma - E)^{-m}, \mathbb{T}^1 \right),$$

which gives

$$\text{Sf} \left(H_t, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \text{Sf} \left(H_{D,t}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right).$$

Now, since $H_{D,t} = H_t^{\#, +} \oplus H_t^{\#, -}$, we see that E is an eigenvalue of $H_{D,t}$ iff it is an eigenvalue of either $H_t^{\#, +}$ or $H_t^{\#, -}$. Actually, we have

$$\text{Sf} \left(H_{D,t}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = \text{Sf} \left(H_t^{\#, +}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) + \text{Sf} \left(H_t^{\#, -}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right).$$

so, recalling that $\chi_0(x) = \mathbf{1}(x < 0)$, so that $\ell_{L/R, \chi_0, t}^\pm = \ell_{L/R, t}^\pm$ we get as wanted

$$\text{Sf} \left(H_t^{\chi_0}, E, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) = M \left(\ell_t^+, \mathbb{T}^1 \right) - M \left(\ell_t^-, \mathbb{T}^1 \right).$$

The minus sign comes from the Green's identity on the Ω^- region.

For a general switch function χ , the function $\chi - \chi_0$ is compactly supported. In particular,

$$H_t^\chi - H_t^{\chi_0} = (V_{L,t} - V_{R,t})(\chi - \chi_0),$$

is a compact perturbation of $H_t^{\chi_0}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{T}_1$. Again, by robustness of the spectral flow with respect to compact perturbation, we obtain that $\text{Sf}(H_t^\chi, E, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Sf}(H_t^{\chi_0}, E, \mathbb{T}^1)$. \square

As we see from our proof, the main ingredient is the fact that the difference of resolvent $(\Sigma - H)^{-1} - (\Sigma - H_D)^{-1}$ is compact. Since this holds also for Neumann boundary conditions instead of Dirichlet, the result is also valid with Neumann boundary conditions. In particular, we must have

$$\text{Mas}(\ell^+(E), \ell_N^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1) = \text{Mas}(\ell^+(E), \ell_D^\sharp, \mathbb{T}^1) + k,$$

for some fixed constant $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and for all families of potentials (V_t) . Taking V_t independent of t shows that $k = 0$. So we have:

Corollary 41. *Let H_t be a family of Schrödinger operators, and let $H_{D,t}^\sharp$ and $H_{N,t}^\sharp$ be the corresponding Dirichlet and Neumann extensions on the semi-tube Ω^+ . Then, for all E in the gap of (H_t) , we have*

$$\text{Sf}\left(H_{D,t}^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1\right) = \text{Sf}\left(H_{N,t}^\sharp, E, \mathbb{T}^1\right).$$

As noticed in the discussion following 37, such an equality cannot hold for *all* self-adjoint extensions of H_t^\sharp , since the essential spectrum may not be conserved.

APPENDIX A. EMBEDDING OF SYMPLECTIC SPACES, AND UNITARIES.

As noticed in Remark 36, the symplectic form (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) does not satisfy Assumption A. In order to use the results of Section 2.1.3, we embed this space in a larger one. In this appendix, we denote by $\mathcal{H}'_b := H_{\text{per}}^{3/2}(\Gamma) \times H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ the previous space, and reserve the notation \mathcal{H}_b for the larger space.

A.1. **The boundary space \mathcal{H}_b .** There are several possibilities, one can choose

$$\mathcal{H}_b := H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{-1/2}(\Gamma), \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{H}_b = L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma).$$

While the first choice seems more natural in the context of boundary conditions (in particular, Robin boundary conditions are best described in this space), we emphasise that the two choices are equivalent. For the ease of notation, we consider the second choice $\mathcal{H}_b = L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$. We explain at the end of the section what happens in the second case, and why the two choices are equivalent.

We therefore set $\mathcal{H}_b := L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma)$, together with the symplectic form ω defined by

$$\forall (f, f'), (g, g') \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \omega((f, f'), (g, g')) = \langle f, g' \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)} - \langle f', g \rangle_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

We have $\mathcal{H}'_b \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_b$ with continuous (compact) embedding. In addition, \mathcal{H}'_b is dense in \mathcal{H}_b , and

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}'_b \subset \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \omega'(x, y) = \omega(x, y).$$

Theorem 42. *Let (\mathcal{H}', ω') and (\mathcal{H}, ω) be two symplectic Hilbert spaces, with $\mathcal{H}' \subset \mathcal{H}$ with continuous embedding, \mathcal{H}' dense in \mathcal{H} and $\omega' = \omega$ on $\mathcal{H}' \times \mathcal{H}'$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Lagrangian planes of \mathcal{H}' and the ones of \mathcal{H} . More specifically,*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell' \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}') &\quad \text{iff} \quad \ell' = \ell \cap \mathcal{H}' \text{ for some } \ell \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}), \\ \ell \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}), &\quad \text{iff} \quad \ell = \overline{\ell'}^{\mathcal{H}} \text{ for some } \ell' \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H}'). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if $(\ell'_1(t), \ell'_2(t))$ is a periodic path of Lagrangian in \mathcal{H}' , with corresponding path $(\ell_1(t), \ell_2(t))$ in \mathcal{H} , we have

$$\text{Mas}'(\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \mathbb{T}_1) = \text{Mas}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \mathbb{T}_1).$$

Proof. Let ℓ' be a any sub-vectorial space of \mathcal{H}' , and let $\ell := \overline{\ell'}^{\mathcal{H}}$, so that $\ell' = \ell \cap \mathcal{H}'$. First, for all $x' \in (\ell')^\circ$, we have

$$\forall y' \in \ell', \quad \omega(x', y') = \omega'(x', y') = 0, \quad \text{hence, by density,} \quad \forall y \in \ell, \quad \omega(x', y) = 0.$$

We deduce that $(\ell')^\circ \subset \ell^\circ$, hence $\overline{(\ell')^\circ}^{\mathcal{H}} \subset \ell^\circ$ and $(\ell')^\circ \subset \ell^\circ \cap \mathcal{H}'$. On the other hand, if $x \in \ell^\circ \cap \mathcal{H}'$, then we have

$$\forall y' \in \ell' \subset \ell, \quad 0 = \omega(x, y') = \omega'(x, y'),$$

so $x \in \ell^\circ$. We therefore proved

$$\ell = \overline{\ell'}^{\mathcal{H}} \iff \ell^\circ = \overline{(\ell')^\circ}^{\mathcal{H}}.$$

In particular, ℓ is a Lagrangian plane of \mathcal{H} iff ℓ' is a Lagrangian plane of \mathcal{H}' .

If ℓ'_1 and ℓ'_2 are Lagrangian planes of \mathcal{H}' , with corresponding planes ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 in \mathcal{H} , then by density of \mathcal{H}' in \mathcal{H} , we have

$$\dim(\ell'_1 \cap \ell'_2) = \dim(\ell_1 \cap \ell_2).$$

In the case where this dimension is finite, we even have $\ell'_1 \cap \ell'_2 = \ell_1 \cap \ell_2$, since finite dimensional subspaces are always closed. As the Maslov index only involves these finite dimensional spaces, the equality of the Maslov index follows. \square

The advantage of \mathcal{H}_b over \mathcal{H}'_b is that, in the space \mathcal{H}_b , we have

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{I}_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ -\mathbb{I}_{L^2(\Gamma)} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which satisfies Assumptions A and B. We obtain for instance the following.

Theorem 43. *The self-adjoint extensions of H^\sharp are in one-to-one correspondence with the Lagrangian planes of (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) which are in one-to-one correspondence with the unitaries \mathcal{U} of $L^2(\Gamma)$. The correspondence is given by*

$$\mathcal{D}^\sharp := \left\{ \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{per}, \max}^\sharp, \quad \text{Tr}(\psi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i \end{pmatrix} f + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}f, \quad \text{for some } f \in L^2(\Gamma) \right\}$$

We emphasise that the trace map Tr is not onto on \mathcal{H}_b , so some $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$ may not be attained.

A.2. The other choice of boundary space. Let us explain what happens in the case where we choose $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b := H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, with symplectic form

$$\forall (f, f'), (g, g') \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \quad \widetilde{\omega}((f, f'), (g, g')) := \langle f, g' \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}, H^{-1/2}} - \langle f', g \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}}.$$

One can again apply Theorem 42, and deduce that there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}'_b)$ and $\Lambda(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b)$. Let us prove that this last space also satisfies Assumption B.

Let V be the map $V : H_{\text{per}}^{1/2} \rightarrow H^{-1/2}$ be such that for all $f \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ and all $g \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}, H^{-1/2}} = \langle f, V^*g \rangle_{H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}} + \langle Vf, g \rangle_{H^{-1/2}}. \quad (11)$$

We can check that V is well-defined and unitary. This time, we have $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V^* \\ -V & 0 \end{pmatrix}$,

so $(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \widetilde{\omega})$ also satisfies Assumption B. The previous theorem in this framework

states that the self-adjoint extensions of H^\sharp are in one-to-one correspondence the unitaries \mathcal{U} of $H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ with

$$\mathcal{D}^\sharp := \left\{ \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{per,max}}^\sharp, \quad \text{Tr}(\psi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ iV \end{pmatrix} f + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -iV \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{U}}f, \quad \text{for some } f \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \right\}.$$

In order to see the connection between the two approaches using (\mathcal{H}_b, ω) and $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b, \tilde{\omega})$, we introduce the maps $V_1 : H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma)$, and $V_2 : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, defined by

$$\text{for } f(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{k}} e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}), \quad (V_{1,2}f)(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{k}} (1 + 2\pi|\mathbf{k}|)^{1/2} e_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{y}).$$

Then R_1 is a unitary from $H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ and $L^2(\Gamma)$, and R_2 is a unitary from $L^2(\Gamma)$ to $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$. Note that the map V defined in (11) is $V = R_2 R_1$. So the map $R : \mathcal{H}_b \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$ defined by

$$\forall (f, f') \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad R(f, f') := (R_1^* f, R_2 f) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$$

is a unitary. In addition, we have

$$\forall (f, f'), (g, g') \in \mathcal{H}_b, \quad \omega((f, f'), (g, g')) = \tilde{\omega}(R(f, f'), R(g, g')).$$

We deduce that ℓ is a Lagrangian plane of \mathcal{H}_b iff $\tilde{\ell} := R\ell$ is a Lagrangian plane of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b$. In addition, \mathcal{U} is a unitary of $\mathcal{H}_1 = L^2(\Gamma)$ iff $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} := R_1^* \mathcal{U} R_1$ is a unitary of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 = H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. This proves that the two approaches are equivalent.

Example 44 (Robin boundary conditions). *Let $\Theta : H_{\text{per}}^{1/2} \rightarrow H^{-1/2}$ be an invertible operator, symmetric in the sense*

$$\forall f \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma), \forall g \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma), \quad \langle f, \Theta^* g \rangle_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} = \langle \Theta f, g \rangle_{H^{-1/2}}.$$

Then we can check that

$$\ell_\Theta := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} f \\ \Theta f \end{pmatrix}, \quad f \in H_{\text{per}}^{1/2} \right\}$$

is a Lagrangian plane. The corresponding self-adjoint extension has the Θ -Robin conditions. To identify the corresponding unitary, we write that

$$\begin{pmatrix} f \\ \Theta f \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ iV \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} (f - iV^* \Theta f) + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -iV \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} (f + iV^* \Theta f).$$

We recognise the unitary $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ of $H_{\text{per}}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}} := (\mathbb{I} - iV^* \Theta)^{-1} (\mathbb{I} + iV^* \Theta). \quad (\text{Cayley transform of } V^* \Theta).$$

REFERENCES

- [Arn67] V. ARNOL'D, *Characteristic class entering in quantization conditions*, Funct. Anal. Appl., 1 (1967), pp. 1–13.
- [ASBVB13] J. AVILA, H. SCHULZ-BALDES, AND C. VILLEGAS-BLAS, *Topological invariants of edge states for periodic two-dimensional models*, Math. Phys., Analysis and Geometry, 16 (2013), pp. 137–170.
- [BBF98] B. BOOSS-BAVNBEK AND K. FURUTANI, *The Maslov index: a functional analytical definition and the spectral flow formula*, Tokyo J. Math., 21 (1998), pp. 1–34.
- [BBZ13] B. BOOSS-BAVNBEK AND C. ZHU, *The Maslov index in weak symplectic functional analysis*, Annals of Global Analysis and Geometry, 44 (2013), pp. 283–318.
- [CJM15] G. COX, C. K. JONES, AND J. L. MARZUOLA, *A Morse index theorem for elliptic operators on bounded domains*, Commun. Partial Differential Equations, 40 (2015), pp. 1467–1497.
- [Dro18] A. DROUOT, *The bulk-edge correspondence for continuous dislocated systems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10603, (2018).
- [DS65] N. DUNFORD AND J. T. SCHWARTZ, *Linear operators. Part II. Spectral theory*, vol. 2, 1965.

- [Fur04] K. FURUTANI, *Fredholm–Lagrangian–Grassmannian and the Maslov index*, J. Geometry and Physics, 51 (2004), pp. 269–331.
- [Gon20] D. GONTIER, *Edge states in ordinary differential equations for dislocations*, J. Math. Phys., 61 (2020).
- [GP13] G. GRAF AND M. PORTA, *Bulk-edge correspondence for two-dimensional topological insulators*, Comm. Math. Phys., 324 (2013), pp. 851–895.
- [GT15] D. GILBARG AND N. S. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer, 2015.
- [Hat93a] Y. HATSUGAI, *Chern number and edge states in the integer quantum Hall effect*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 71 (1993), p. 3697.
- [Hat93b] ———, *Edge states in the integer quantum Hall effect and the Riemann surface of the Bloch function*, Phys. Rev. B, 48 (1993), p. 11851.
- [HLS17] P. HOWARD, Y. LATUSHKIN, AND A. SUKHTAYEV, *The Maslov index for Lagrangian pairs on \mathbb{R}^{2n}* , J. Math. Anal. Appl., 451 (2017), pp. 794–821.
- [HLS18] ———, *The Maslov and Morse indices for system of Schrödinger operators on \mathbb{R}* , Indiana University mathematics journal, 67 (2018).
- [HS16] P. HOWARD AND A. SUKHTAYEV, *The Maslov and Morse indices for Schrödinger operators on $[0, 1]$* , Journal of Differential Equations, 260 (2016), pp. 4499–4549.
- [Kat13] T. KATO, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, vol. 132, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Ler78] J. LERAY, *Analyse Lagrangienne et mécanique quantique*, Séminaire Jean Leray, (1978), pp. 1–313.
- [LM12] J. LIONS AND E. MAGENES, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications*, vol. 1, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [LS18] Y. LATUSHKIN AND S. SUKHTAIEV, *The Maslov index and the spectra of second order elliptic operators*, Advances in Mathematics, 329 (2018), pp. 422–486.
- [MBA72] V. MASLOV, V. BOUSLAEV, AND V. ARNOL'D, *Théorie des perturbations et méthodes asymptotiques*, Dunod, 1972.
- [RS75] M. REED AND B. SIMON, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, vol. II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, vol. 2, Elsevier, 1975.
- [RS80] M. REED AND B. SIMON, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, vol. III, Scattering theory*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 2 (1980), pp. 0273–0979.
- [vN30] J. VON NEUMANN, *Allgemeine eigenwerttheorie hermitescher funktionaloperatoren*, Mathematische Annalen, 102 (1930), pp. 49–131.
- [Wat16] N. WATERSTRAAT, *Fredholm operators and spectral flow*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.02009, (2016).
- [Wey10] H. WEYL, *Über gewöhnliche differentialgleichungen mit singularitäten und die zugehörigen entwicklungen willkürlicher funktionen*, Mathematische Annalen, 68 (1910), pp. 220–269.

CEREMADE, UNIVERSITY OF PARIS-DAUPHINE, PSL UNIVERSITY, 75016 PARIS, FRANCE
 Email address: gontier@ceremade.dauphine.fr