Distilling the topology of the Hofstadter model through a diffraction experiment
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In two and three spatial dimensions, the transverse response experienced by a charged particle on a lattice in a uniform magnetic field is proportional to a topological invariant, the first Chern number, characterizing the energy bands of the underlying Hofstadter Hamiltonian. In four dimensions, the transverse response is also quantized, and controlled by the second Chern number. These remarkable features solely arise from the magnetic translational symmetry. Here we show that the symmetries of the two-, three- and four-dimensional Hofstadter Hamiltonians may be encrypted in optical diffraction gratings, such that simple photonic experiments allow one to extract the first and the second Chern numbers of the whole energy spectra. This result is particularly remarkable in three and four dimensions, where complete topological characterizations have not yet been achieved experimentally. Side-by-side to the theoretical analysis, in this work we present the experimental study of optical gratings analogues of the two- and three-dimensional Hofstadter analogues.

Exposing an electronic crystal to a magnetic field radically alters its physical properties. A celebrated example is the integer quantum Hall effect (IQHE), where a perpendicular magnetic field converts a two-dimensional (2D) metal into a Chern insulator [1]. This physics is captured by the fractal spectrum (or “butterfly”) of the Hofstadter model [2], which features smooth bands characterized by integer topological invariants named Chern numbers. The transverse conductance in each energy gap, depicted in Fig. 1(a), is given by the sum of the Chern numbers of the occupied bands [3, 4], which ensures their robustness against local perturbations, such as interactions or disorder [5]. The physics becomes notably richer in higher spatial dimensions. A 3D metal exposed to a magnetic field was shown to exhibit quantized transverse conductivities in various 2D planes, determined by a triad of total first Chern numbers [6–17]. In 4D, the response of the system to an external electromagnetic field is governed by a more complex invariant called second Chern number [18–32].

Currently, very strong synthetic magnetic fields can be engineered in a variety of quantum simulators [33–35], allowing for the observation of the 2D and 4D IQHE in various atomic [27, 36, 37], photonic [28, 38, 39] and acoustic [31, 40] platforms. On the other hand, the 3D case was recently observed in a solid-state ZrTe5 crystal [41]. In general, traditional transport measurements in artificial platforms proved feasible [42], but not straightforward. As such, strong efforts are presently being undertaken to develop new methods for the characterization of the underlying topology [37, 38, 43–48].

In this work, we show that the topology of the 2D, 3D and 4D IQHE can be probed through table-top optical experiments. Indeed, the peculiar translational symmetry of the Hofstadter Hamiltonian can be encoded in periodic phase gratings (diffraction gratings) dynamically generated by a spatial light modulator (SLM), and the magnetic flux piercing the lattice may be controlled by adjusting their spatial period. As we will show, the diffraction pattern produced by the grating bears close analogies to the Wannier diagram resulting from the underlying Hofstadter model [49], and the slopes of the various lines directly yield the Chern numbers of the corresponding spectral gaps. This approach allows us to image all the main spectral gaps for a wide range of magnetic fluxes, thus achieving a complete and intuitive topological characterization of the IQHE in 2D, 3D and 4D.

I. LORENTZ VS. DENSITY RESPONSES

The Chern numbers of the 2D IQHE can be measured through the response of a system to (synthetic) electromagnetic fields.

One class of such experiments measures the Lorentz-type response to a weak force. This is realized, for example, by preparing a localized wavefunction and reading
Figure 1.  (a) Energy spectrum of the 2D Hofstadter model, with equal hopping amplitudes $t_x = t_z$. The Hall conductivities of the gaps are encoded in the color scale. (b) The Wannier diagram shows the integrated density of states below the gaps. The size of the dots is proportional to the amplitude of the gaps. (c) Experimental setup. A spatial light modulator (SLM) generates a grating with characteristic function $\chi_\phi(x) = \text{sign}[\cos(2\pi\phi x) + d]$, whose diffraction figure is collected by a camera, placed in the focal plane of a lens. (d) Experimental diffraction diagram, obtained by stacking a collection of diffraction figures for increasing values of $\phi$.

II. 2D HOFSTADTER MODEL

Let us consider spinless fermions on a square lattice in the $xz$ plane, subject to a magnetic flux $\phi = p/q$ per plaquette, with integers $p$ and $q$ (we set $e = h = a = 1$, where $a$ is the lattice spacing). In the Landau gauge with periodic boundary conditions in the $z$-direction, the eigenvalue problem reduces to the Harper equation [63], which reads

$$[E_{n\mathbf{k}} + 2t_z \cos(2\pi \phi x + k_z)] u_{n\mathbf{k}}(x) = -t_x \left[ e^{ik_x} u_{n\mathbf{k}}(x + 1) + e^{-ik_x} u_{n\mathbf{k}}(x - 1) \right],$$

(1)

where $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(x)$ is the Bloch function for the $n^{th}$ band, with quasi-momentum $\mathbf{k}$ in the reduced Brillouin zone (RBZ).
$k_z \in [0, 2\pi/q]$ and $k_z \in [0, 2\pi]$.

The energy spectrum as a function of the magnetic flux $\phi$, shown in Fig. 1(a), is the famous Hofstadter butterfly, which displays an intriguing fractal structure. At zero temperature, the Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}$ equals the sum of the Chern numbers of the $r$ occupied bands [3]:

$$\nu = \sum_{n\leq r} \int_{RBZ} \Omega_n^{xz} d^2k/2\pi,$$

(2)

defined in terms of the Berry curvature of the $n$th band $\Omega_n^{xz} = i \langle [\partial_k u_{nk}|\partial_k u_{nk}] - \partial_k u_{nk}|\partial_k u_{nk} \rangle$. Alternatively, the Hall conductivity can also be derived from the Streda-Widom formula $\nu = \partial_\phi N$ [60], where $N \equiv r/q$ denotes the integrated density of states below the $r$th energy gap. This formula is very general, and holds true also for incompressible fractional Chern insulator phases [64], where the Hall conductivity is directly proportional to the many-body Chern number. For the 2D Hofstadter model, the Streda-Widom formula leads to the celebrated Diophantine equation

$$r = p\nu + qs,$$

(3)

which has a unique integer solution $\nu$ for a set of integers $p, q, r, s$, assuming $p$ and $q$ are coprime, $0 < r < q$ and $|\nu| < q/2$. As shown by Dana, Avron and Zak [62], the Diophantine equation can also be derived from the properties of the magnetic translation operators. Their elegant proof, which we review in Appendix C, only requires the periodicity of the wavefunction together with the Bragg condition for diffraction.

The dimensional reduction of the Hofstadter model has been realized in various quantum simulators [38, 53, 54]. However, changing the magnetic flux $\phi$ in these experiments is not straightforward, requiring etching a different wave-guide structure onto a physical substrate, or adjusting the period of a super-lattice, which requires multiple optical lattice beams to be realigned. Here, instead, we take advantage of the relation between the Bragg condition and the Diophantine equation to recover the Hofstadter butterfly through a 1D diffraction experiment. In our optical setup, the magnetic flux corresponds to the Bragg condition for diffraction.

In a first experiment, we write on a SLM a 1D diffraction grating generated by the characteristic function

$$\chi_\phi(x) = \text{sign}[\cos(2\pi\phi x) + d].$$

(4)

A complete description of our experimental setup is provided in Appendix A. The diffraction figure collected out of this structure contains a series of sharp Bragg peaks, as shown in Fig. 1(c). The relative intensity of the peaks can be controlled by tuning the dimensionless constant $d$. We set $d = 0.25$ to ensure the best visibility of the main orders of diffraction. The position of the peaks can be derived from the Fourier transform of the grating (explicitly computed in Appendix B), and is simply given by the Bragg condition

$$k/(2\pi) = \phi\nu + s,$$

(5)

with $\nu$ and $s$ integer numbers. The latter requires that diffraction peaks are spaced by integer multiples of the RBZ. The Bragg condition is therefore a direct analogue of the Diophantine equation (3) and reflects the fact that the topological essence of the model is encoded into the onsite term of the Harper equation (1). Figure 1(d) depicts the diffraction diagram, obtained by arranging side-by-side the diffraction figures generated by the grating for increasing values of $\phi$. The slopes of the lines forming the diagram correspond to the values of $\nu$, and the diffraction diagram is in a 1-to-1 correspondence with the Wannier diagram obtained from the density of states shown in Fig. 1(b). We have also investigated the effects of structural disorder or different characteristic functions $\chi$ on the diffraction diagram, and found that its main features are robust, as expected for topological properties. This will be presented in detail in Sec. V.

Finally, we verified that our results hold equally well for gratings generated by smooth functions, such as the one obtained replacing the singular sign$(x)$ by $\tanh(x/x_0)$ in Eq. (4). We did not observe significant differences in the Wannier diagrams and one can therefore relate the slopes of the Wannier diagrams to the Chern numbers, even though the latter are (strictly speaking) ill-defined in the limit of singular generating functions [65].

### III. 3D HOFSTADTER MODEL

The Hofstadter model is generalized to three spatial dimensions by considering a magnetic field having components along the three vectors spanning the cubic lattice [8, 9, 13–15]. Here we consider the particular case of a magnetic field $B = (0, \phi_y, \phi_z)$, where $\phi_y = p_y/q_y$ ($\phi_z = p_z/q_z$) is the magnetic flux through the $xz$ ($xy$) plane. In the 3D analogue of the Landau gauge, the Harper equation reads

$$[E_{nk} + 2t_y \cos(2\pi\phi_z x + k_y) + 2t_z \cos(2\pi\phi_y x - k_z)] u_{nk}(x) = -t_x [e^{ikx} u_{nk}(x + 1) + e^{-ikx} u_{nk}(x - 1)].$$

(6)

This eigenvalue problem has $Q$ solutions, $Q$ being the least common multiple of $q_y$ and $q_z$, and the RBZ is defined by $0 < k_z \leq 2\pi/Q$, $0 < k_y, k_z \leq 2\pi$. The separation among the $Q$ energy bands depends on the relative amplitudes of the hopping, and in the limit $t_x \gg t_y, t_z$ the system exhibits the maximum number of $Q - 1$ gaps [8].
These gaps are characterized by a triad of first Chern numbers \((\nu_x, \nu_y, \nu_z)\). These invariants appear in the quantization of the transverse conductivity in the planes defined by the unit vector of the cubic lattice. In our case, one finds \(\sigma^{xy} = \nu_z, \sigma^{xz} = -\nu_y\) and \(\sigma^{yz} = \nu_x = 0\). The integrated density of states is related to the rational gaps and the color is associated with the value of \(\Gamma\). (d) Experimental diffraction diagram generated by \(\psi(x)\), with \(d = 0.25\) and \(\phi_z/\phi_y \approx 3/5\). We set \(q_y = 147\) and \(q_z = 250\), and let \(p_y = p_z = P\) change from 0 to \(q_y\).

These gaps are characterized by a triad of first Chern numbers \((\nu_x, \nu_y, \nu_z)\). These invariants appear in the quantization of the transverse conductivity in the planes defined by the unit vector of the cubic lattice. In our case, one finds \(\sigma^{xy} = \nu_z, \sigma^{xz} = -\nu_y\) and \(\sigma^{yz} = \nu_x = 0\). The integrated density of states is related to the rational fluxes by a 3D version of the Diophantine equation \([8, 9]\): \[ N \equiv r/Q = \phi_y \nu_y + \phi_z \nu_z + s, \] where \(s\) and \(\nu_\alpha\) (\(\alpha = \{y, z\}\)) are integers. As in the 2D case, this relation arises directly from the magnetic translational symmetry of the system (see Appendix D). The 3D Diophantine equation admits a unique solution for every set \(r, p_y, p_z, q_y, q_z\), for \(q_y\) and \(q_z\) coprime integers, \(0 < r < Q\), \(|\nu_y| < q_y/2\) and \(|\nu_z| < q_z/2\). The transverse conductivity in the different planes can therefore be computed with the help of the generalized Streda-Widom formula \(\sigma_{ij} = \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_{\phi_k} N\).

We now study the Hofstadter butterfly and the Wannier diagram resulting from the 3D quantum Hall lattice. There are many ways one can change the magnetic field, for example: i) changing its orientation with respect to the unit cell while keeping its amplitude fixed \([13]\), ii) changing its amplitude while keeping its orientation fixed \([8, 14]\). Here we adopt the second strategy, choosing the magnetic fluxes as \(\phi_y = m_y P/Q\) and \(\phi_z = m_z P/Q\). The Diophantine equation \((7)\) then reads

\[ N = s + \Gamma P/Q, \] where we have introduced a “combined” first Chern number \(\Gamma = \nu_y m_y + \nu_z m_z\). Figures 2(a) and 2(b) show the Hofstadter butterfly generated for \(t_x = 2t_y = 2t_z\) and a constant ratio between the fluxes \(\phi_z/\phi_y \approx 3/5\). In the two panels, the color of the gaps corresponds to the values of \(\nu_x\) and \(\nu_z\), respectively. Figure 2(c) shows the Wannier diagram of the 3D Hofstadter model derived from the integrated density of states (here the colors of the points correspond to the values of \(\Gamma\)). As an optical topological probe, we arranged a second experiment where we write on the SLM a 1D diffraction grating generated by the characteristic function

\[ \psi(x) = \text{sign}[\cos(2\pi \phi_y x) + \cos(2\pi \phi_z x) + d]. \] As in the 2D case, we set the constant \(d = 0.25\) to improve the visibility of the main diffraction orders. The
peaks are centered at \( k = 2\pi [\phi_x \nu_x + \phi_y \nu_y + s] \). Again, the translational symmetry of \( \psi(x) \) ensures that the position of the Bragg peaks obeys the Diophantine equation \( (7) \). We reconstruct the Wannier diffraction diagram by arranging side-by-side the diffraction figures generated by the grating for different values of \( \phi_y \). The slopes of the lines forming the diagram correspond to the values of \( \Gamma \) [see Fig. 2(d)]. Also for the 3D case, we found an excellent agreement between the diffraction diagram and the Wannier diagram [see Fig. 2(c)], proving that the diffraction pattern properly reflects the topological properties of the 3D Hofstadter model.

IV. 4D HOFSTADTER MODEL

A. 4D decoupled Hofstadter model

The simplest model exhibiting the 4D IQHE is obtained by superposing two copies of the Hofstadter model, with a magnetic tensor having two non-zero components \( B_{xz} = \phi_x \) and \( B_{yw} = \phi_y \) [23, 25, 56]. The corresponding Hamiltonian leads to the following Harper equation:

\[
E_{nk} \psi_{nk}(x, y) = 2t_z \cos(2\pi \phi_x x + k_z) + 2t_w \cos(2\pi \phi_y y + k_w) \psi_{nk}(x, y) - t_x e^{i k_x \nu_x} \psi_{nk}(x + 1, y) + e^{-i k_x \nu_x} \psi_{nk}(x - 1, y) - t_y e^{i k_y \nu_y} \psi_{nk}(x, y + 1) + e^{-i k_y \nu_y} \psi_{nk}(x, y - 1).
\]

In this “minimal” 4D model, as the planes having non-zero Berry curvatures are fully decoupled, the second Chern number \( C_2 \) is simply the product of the two first Chern numbers \( \nu_x \) and \( \nu_y \). We will show that our approach also applies in the case in which the planes are coupled and the second Chern number is not factorizable.

After invoking the two commuting magnetic translation symmetries of the system along \( x \) and \( y \), one is led to two independent Diophantine equations, which may be multiplied to obtain

\[
\mathcal{A} = (\nu_x \phi_x + s_x)(\nu_y \phi_y + s_y),
\]

where \( \mathcal{A} \) is the fraction of filled bands in the system at zero temperature. As familiar from the Gedankenexperiment proposed by Laughlin [66], changing the magnetic flux across the system effectively induces a “density-response” which alters the band-filling in a way that is proportional to the Chern numbers. In particular, the first total Chern numbers \( \nu_x \) and \( \nu_y \) are given by \( \nu_{\alpha} = (1/s_{\beta}) \partial_{\phi_{\beta}} \mathcal{A} \big|_{\phi_{\beta} = 0} \) and the second total Chern number is \( C_2 = \partial_{\phi_x} \partial_{\phi_y} \mathcal{A} = \nu_x \nu_y \). In a third experimental realization, we would suggest to write on the SLM a 2D diffraction grating generated by the characteristic function

\[
\xi(x, y) = \text{sign}[\cos(2\pi \phi_x) + \cos(2\pi \phi_y) + d],
\]

where we set \( \phi_x = \phi_y = \phi \). The diffraction pattern generated by the grating defined above exhibits a series of bright spots placed at \( k = 2\pi \{(\nu_x s_x, \nu_y s_y)\} \) [see Fig. 3]. As in the previous experiments, a constant offset \( d \) may be added to reinforce the visibility of the main spectral gaps. After stacking the 2D diffraction figures generated for different values of \( \phi \) in a 3D plot, a Wannier diffraction diagram is obtained, where the coordinates of the points are given by two Diophantine equations, and the area under each line is given by Eq. (11) [see Fig. 3].

B. 4D coupled Hofstadter model

Until now we focused on the simplest version of a 4D decoupled Hofstadter model, where the second Chern number could be factorized as a product of two first Chern numbers. More generally, let us consider the characteristic function

\[
\Psi(x) = \text{sign}[\cos(2\pi \phi_1 x) + \cos(2\pi \phi_2 (\epsilon x + y))],
\]

with \( \epsilon \) being either 0 (yielding the decoupled model) or 1 (yielding the coupled model introduced in Ref. [67], where the factorization of the second Chern number no longer holds). This function is invariant under discrete translations, with crystal vectors \( \mathbf{a}_1 = (q_1, 0, 0) \) and \( \mathbf{a}_2 = (q_2, 0, 0) \). The reciprocal vectors are therefore \( \mathbf{b}_1 = \frac{2\pi}{q_1} (1, 0) \) and \( \mathbf{b}_2 = \frac{2\pi}{q_2} (\epsilon, 1) \), so that \( \mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}_2 = 2\pi \delta_{ij} \).

The edges of the RBZ are quasi-momenta of the form

\[
k = r_1 \mathbf{b}_1 + r_2 \mathbf{b}_2,
\]

where \( r_1 = p_1 \nu_1 + q_1 s_1 \) and \( r_2 = p_2 \nu_2 + q_2 s_2 \). This gives

\[
\frac{k}{2\pi} = \left( \frac{r_1}{q_1} + \epsilon \frac{r_2}{q_2}, \frac{r_2}{q_2} \right).
\]

The second Chern number is given by

\[
C_2 = \frac{\partial^2 \left( \frac{r_1 r_2}{q_1 q_2} \right)}{\partial \phi_1 \partial \phi_2} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_1 \partial \phi_2} \left[ \left( \frac{k_x}{2\pi} - \epsilon \frac{k_y}{2\pi} \right) \frac{k_y}{2\pi} \right] = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_1 \partial \phi_2} \left[ \frac{k_x}{2\pi} - \epsilon \frac{k_y}{2\pi} \right] \left( \frac{k_x}{2\pi} - \epsilon \frac{k_y}{2\pi} \right).
\]

In this more general framework, it is always possible to relate the second Chern number to the position of the diffraction peaks, even though the second Chern number does not factorize.

V. ROBUSTNESS AGAINST DISORDER

In presence of structural disorder, topological systems are known to be robust as long as the perturbation is much smaller than the corresponding spectral gap. Here
we probe, both numerically and experimentally, the robustness of the Wannier diffraction diagram corresponding to the 2D Hofstadter model. Figures 4 (a)-(c) show the energy spectra of the 2D Hofstadter model, in presence of a disorder potential $V_{\text{dis}} = t_z \xi(x)$, where $\xi(x)$ represents random numbers ranging in $[-\Delta, \Delta]$, $\Delta$ denoting the disorder strength. The on-site disorder has been optically implemented by slightly altering the 1D characteristic function:

$$\chi_{\text{dis}}(x) = \text{sign}\left[\cos(2\pi\phi x) + d + \xi(x)\right],$$

with $d = 0.25$.

Experimental diagrams obtained for the different disorder strengths are plotted in Figs. 4 (d)-(f). Each plot in Fig. 4 results from an average over 10 realizations in presence of the picked level of disorder. It is evident that diffraction orders associated with small spectral gaps are rapidly washed away, while the 1st-order Bragg peaks, which are associated with the largest gaps of the spectrum, remain visible even for the largest disorder (i.e. $\Delta = 1$). This proves that the main properties of the Wannier diffraction diagram are robust against disorder, as expected for topological features.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we showed that the topological properties of crystal electrons in presence of a constant magnetic field in 2, 3 and 4 spatial dimensions solely depend on the translational symmetry of the effective magnetic lattices. By means of a compact and intuitive genuinely-optical architecture, we succeeded in extracting the topological invariants of the 2D and 3D Hofstadter Hamiltonians from the diffraction figures generated by photonic gratings that reflect the essential symmetries of the original model. Remarkably, our approach enables to use a single experiment to fully characterize the topology of all significant energy gaps at once, in contrast to other methods which typically rely on populating a subset of states. This is especially notable for 3D and 4D, where multiple topological invariants are required for each gap and where complete topological characterizations have not yet been achieved in experiments. In the future, it will be interesting to further generalize our method to probe even higher-dimensional extensions or other classes of topological models. In 4D, for example, a non-zero second Chern number may arise in systems featuring time-reversal symmetry, e.g. with spin-dependent gauge fields, in which all first Chern numbers vanish \cite{20, 21, 23, 26}. In our implementation, the role of spin may be played by the polarization degree of freedom of the light beam.
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Figure 4. (a)-(c) Hofstadter spectra in presence of spatial (on-site) disorder, with $t_x = t_z = 1$. Energy values (in units of the hopping $t_x$) have been divided in bins of amplitude $\delta_E = 0.05$, and each bin is coloured according to the fraction of states whose energy falls within the range $[E - \delta_E/2, E + \delta_E/2]$ (see Legend). (d)-(f) Experimental Wannier diffraction diagrams. Plots in each panel result from an average over 10 realizations with disorder. Different disorder strengths are probed: $\Delta = 0.4$ (panels (a),(d)), $\Delta = 0.7$ (panels (b),(e)), $\Delta = 1$ (panels (c),(f)).

Appendix A: Details of the experimental setup

The experiment has been realized by studying the far-field diffraction patterns of a He-Ne laser beam (operating wavelength: $\lambda = 632.8$ nm) impinging on a spatial light modulator (SLM). The SLM is a liquid-crystal (LC) device where the extraordinary refractive index has an inhomogeneous distribution that can be controlled and dynamically changed with a computer. This is achieved by means of an array of $1920 \times 1152$ pixels (of side 9.2 $\mu$m), each one consisting of an electrode whose voltage independently tunes the local out-of-plane orientation of the LCs below it. This allows to manipulate the spatial phase distribution of the impinging beam, e.g. to display the desired transmission functions, as long as the beam is polarized along the extra-ordinary axis of the LCs.

Assuming a plane-wave incident wave-front, when imaging the diffracted light on the focal plane of a converging lens, one accesses the Fourier transform of the chosen transmission function. For instance, the transmission function $\chi(x) = \text{sign} \{ \cos(2\pi p/q x) + d \}$ was implemented by displaying the phase pattern $g(x) = \frac{\pi}{2} (3 + \chi(x))/2$. Since the input beam polarization can be not perfectly aligned with the extraordinary axis of the liquid crystals, we added to $g(x)$ the blazing function $\frac{2\pi y}{\Lambda}$ mod $2\pi$, with $\Lambda$ chosen to be small enough to spatially separate the light diffracted by the SLM from the 0th (unmodulated) diffraction order in the Fourier plane (in our experiment, a convenient choice was $\Lambda = 150$ pixels).

We displayed the pattern associated with $\chi(x)$ choosing $q = 353$ and varying $p$ from 0 to $q$. The corresponding lattice step size was chosen equal to $n_x = 4$ pixels, thus building a grating consisting of 480 sites. The Fourier-transforming lens had focal length $f = 30$ cm. These parameters were chosen to avoid overlap of diffracted light spots, and to image all the Brillouin zone on the camera sensor. In the experiment, the effective lattice length $L$, to be considered for simulating numerically the diffrac-
tion pattern, was determined by the transverse width of the beam. Assuming an input Gaussian beam of transverse intensity proportional to \( \exp(-2r^2/w^2) \), we measured a beam waist \( w = 1.72 \pm 0.05 \text{ mm} \). This implies that we were illuminating a portion of the SLM corresponding to \( \approx 100 \) lattice sites. Numerical simulations of the diffraction of a plane-wave impinging on a finite lattice of \( L = 100 \) sites reproduces with good approximation the intensity patterns detected experimentally (see next section).

**Appendix B: Analytic expression of the diffraction figure for the 2D Hofstadter experiment**

Let us consider a grating \( S_L \) made up of \( L \) sites, whose periodicity is modulated by the square pulse \( \chi(x) \) defined in Eq. (4), and let us define \( d \equiv \sin(\delta/2) \). The diffracted field results

\[
f(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{x=0}^{L-1} \chi(x) e^{ikx},
\]

(\( B1 \))

where we restrict the choice of \( \delta \) to the range \( [0, \pi] \). Since the system is finite, \( k \) takes discrete values: \( k \equiv 2\pi l/L \), with \( l \in [-L/2, L/2] \).

In order to explicitly evaluate Eq. (B1), we replace \( \chi(x) \) with its Fourier series. The real \( (A_n) \) and the imaginary \( (B_n) \) part of the Fourier coefficients are given by

\[
A_n = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dx \chi(x) \cos(n\Omega x),
B_n = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dx \chi(x) \sin(n\Omega x),
\]

(\( B2 \))

where \( \Omega \equiv 2\pi/T = 2\pi p/q = 2\pi\phi \) is the frequency of the square pulse and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Performing these integrals we obtain:

\[
A_0 = \frac{\delta}{\pi}, \quad A_n = \frac{2(-1)^{n+1} \sin[n(\pi/2 - \delta)]}{\pi n}, \quad B_n = 0.
\]

(\( B3 \))

The constant \( \delta \) controls the number of visible lines in the Wannier diffraction diagram. In order to resolve a large number of peaks, we choose \( \delta \) so that the visibility of the 6th diffraction peak is maximized. Since the first maximum of \( A_0(\delta) \) occurs at \( \delta \sim 0.5 \), we pick \( d = \sin(\delta/2) \sim 0.25 \). The Fourier expansion of \( \chi(x) \) reads

\[
\chi(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n \cos(2\pi n x) = \sum_{n=1}^q \tilde{A}_n \cos(2\pi n x), \quad (B4)
\]

where \( \tilde{A}_n = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{n+q} \). To reach the last equality, we used the periodicity of the function to fold the Fourier spectrum over a range of \( q \) harmonics. It becomes clear now that each harmonic component of the pulse corresponds to one eigenvalue of the Harper equation (1) in the limit of vanishing \( t_z \), multiplied by a coefficient \( \tilde{A}_n \) which modulates relative intensities. Inserting Eq. (B4) in Eq. (B1), we find

\[
f(k) = \sum_{x=0}^{L-1} \sum_{n=1}^q \tilde{A}_n e^{[ik+\Omega x]x} + e^{[ik-\Omega x]x}.
\]

(\( B5 \))

The two summations can be swapped (since they both converge to finite quantities), so we can first evaluate the one over \( x \):

\[
\zeta_{\pm} \equiv \sum_{x=0}^{L-1} e^{[ik \pm \Omega x]x} = \frac{1 - e^{\pm 2\pi \phi L}}{1 - e^{\pm 2\pi (\frac{k}{L} \pm \phi)}}, \quad (B6)
\]

where we used \( k \equiv 2\pi l/L \). Therefore, the explicit expression of the Fourier expansion of the field reads

\[
f(l) = f_0(l) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^{n+1} \sin[n(\pi(\pi/2 - \delta))]}{2\pi n L \sqrt{L}} (\zeta_+ + \zeta_-) \quad (B7)
\]

where \( f_0(l) \equiv \frac{2 \delta}{\pi} \frac{1 - e^{i \sin(2\pi \phi L)}}{1 - e^{i \pi \delta \phi}} \).

For \( L \rightarrow \infty \), each term in Eq. (B7) is a sum of two Dirac delta-like contributions: \( \zeta_{\pm} \sim \delta \left( \frac{k}{L} \pm n \phi \right) \), with \( \phi = p/q \). For finite \( L \), there are two possible scenarios: \( L \) may or may not be a multiple of \( q \). When \( L \) is a multiple of \( q \), namely \( L = zq \) (with integer \( z \)), we find the same result as in the infinite case and \( f_n(l) \neq 0 \) only when \( l/L = \pm nq/p = \pm znp \). Since the main contribution to the diffracted field comes from the first harmonic \( n = 1 \), the brightest peaks appear at \( l = \pm zp \). When \( L \) is not a multiple of \( q \), we find non-zero diffracted field for many more values of \( l \), which contribute to creating the fractal spectrum typical of quasi-crystals. Nevertheless, the brightest peaks still appear at \( l = \pm zp \), with \( z = \text{Floor}[L/q] \).

**Appendix C: Diophantine equation in 2D**

Here we demonstrate how the 2D Diophantine equation may be derived from the magnetic translational symmetry of the lattice Hamiltonian [62, 68]. Let us consider spinless fermions on a square lattice under the action of a constant magnetic field with a magnetic flux \( \phi = p/q \) per plaquette. In the Landau gauge, the Hamiltonian reads

\[
H = \sum_{m,n} -t_x e^{i \phi m} c_{m+1,n} c_{m,n} - t_x e^{-2\pi i \phi m} c_{m,n+1} c_{m,n} + \text{h.c.}.
\]

(C1)

In presence of a non-zero magnetic flux, this Hamiltonian is no longer commuting with the lattice translation operator \( T_z \). This motivates the introduction of the \text{“magnetic}
translation operators”

\[ M_x = \sum_{m,n} c_{m+1,n}^\dagger c_{m,n}, \]
\[ M_z = \sum_{m,n} e^{-2\pi i\phi_m} c_{m,n+1}^\dagger c_{m,n}. \quad (C2) \]

These operators commute with the Hamiltonian, but not with each other: \( M_x M_z = e^{-2\pi i\phi} M_z M_x \). However, \((M_x)^q\) commutes with \( M_z \), so that \( \{H,(M_x)^q,M_z\} \) form a “complete set of commuting operators”. Therefore, one has to consider a magnetic unit cell of at least \( q \) sites in the \( x \)-direction in order to apply the Bloch theorem. Let us first focus on the ground band, which we assume to be non-degenerate. The eigenstates of the Hamiltonian within this band are Bloch states of the form \([69]\)

\[ \psi_k(m,n) = e^{-i(k_x m + k_z n)} e^{2\pi i\phi_m} u_k(m), \quad (C3) \]

where \( k_x \) and \( k_z \) are varying in a RBZ, defined by \( 0 < k_x \leq 2\pi/q \) and \( 0 < k_z \leq 2\pi \), \( u_{k_x,k_z}(m+q) = u_{k_x,k_z}(m) \) and we omit the band index and take the lattice spacings equal to one for simplicity. Since \( M_x \) and \( M_z \) commute with the Hamiltonian, \( \psi_k \) can be simultaneously eigenvectors of both \( M_x \) and \( M_z \) (i.e., \( \psi_k, M_x \psi_k, M_z \psi_k, \) and \( M_x M_z \psi_k \) all have the same energy \( \epsilon_k \)). Such Bloch states satisfy the relations

\[ (M_x)^q \psi_k(m,n) = \psi_k(m+q,n) = e^{ik_z q} \psi_k(m,n), \]
\[ M_z \psi_k(m,n) = e^{-2\pi i\phi_m} \psi_k(m,n+1) = e^{ik_x} \psi_k(m,n), \quad (C4) \]

as required for the Bloch theorem.

This expression has still some residual degrees of freedom originating from the momentum-space periodicity of \( u_k \). Indeed, \( M_x \) is a standard translation operator, so that \( u_{k_x+2\pi/q,k_z} = u_{k_x,k_z} \) (omitting the spatial indices). Along the other direction, instead, \( M_z \) is not a standard translation operator, so that Bloch theorem does not apply and there is some extra freedom:

\[ u_{k_x,k_z+2\pi} = e^{i\zeta(k)} u_{k_x,k_z}. \]

This implies

\[ e^{i\zeta(k)} u_{k_x,k_z} = u_{k_x,k_z+2\pi} = u_{k_x,2\pi/q,k_z+2\pi} = e^{i\zeta(k_x+2\pi/q,k_z)} u_{k_x}, \quad (C5) \]

so that \( \zeta(k_x+2\pi/q,k_z) = \zeta(k) + 2\pi C_1 \), with \( C_1 \) an integer number. The simplest function satisfying this condition is \( \zeta(k) = k_z q C_1 \), and \( 2\pi C_1 \) is the phase acquired as the wavefunction is parallely-transported around the whole RBZ, and therefore \( C_1 \) may be readily identified as the Chern number of the ground band.

There is yet another additional gauge freedom arising from the non-commutativity of the magnetic translation operators. Since

\[ M_x M_z \psi_k = e^{2\pi i\phi} M_z M_x \psi_k = e^{i(k_x+2\pi\phi)} M_z \psi_k \quad (C6) \]

and \( M_z^2 \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi} = e^{i(k_x+2\pi\phi)} \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi\phi} \), we find that \( M_x \psi_k \) and \( \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi\phi} \) must represent the same state, up to a phase factor:

\[ M_x \psi_k = e^{i\eta(k)} \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi\phi}. \quad (C7) \]

This leads to

\[ e^{i\eta(k)} \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi\phi} = M_x \psi_k \]
\[ = M_z \psi_{k_x+2\pi/q,k_z} \]
\[ = e^{i\eta(k_x+2\pi/q,k_z)} \psi_{k_x+2\pi/q,k_z+2\pi\phi} \]
\[ = e^{i\eta(k_x+2\pi/q,k_z)} \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi\phi}. \]

Proceeding as above, one finds that the simplest functional form for the phase factor is \( \eta(k) = k_z q S_1 \), with \( S_1 \) an integer number.

To derive the Diophantine equation, let us now consider a translation by a whole magnetic cell (along its extended direction), which gives

\[ (M_x)^q \psi_k = e^{i k_z q} q S_1 \psi_{k_x,k_z+2\pi} = e^{i k_z q} q (q S_1 + p C_1) \psi_{k_x,k_z}, \quad (C9) \]

where in the last step we have used the fact that the translation by a whole magnetic cell generated by \((M_x)^q\) results in a simple phase factor \( e^{i k_z q} \). This finally leads to the Diophantine equation for the ground band:

\[ p C_1 + q S_1 = 1. \quad (C10) \]

This equation has a unique solution provided that \( p \) and \( q \) are coprime and \( |C_1| < q/2 \). Considering now multiple bands, the same treatment as above may be performed for each band, obtaining \( p C_i + q S_i = 1 \). Let us now recall that the \( i \)th Chern number is linked to the Hall conductivities of the neighboring gaps by \( C_i = \nu_i - \nu_{i-1} \), and let us assume similarly that \( S_i = s_i - s_{i-1} \), with \( \nu_0 = s_0 = 0 \). Summing the equations over all the gaps, one readily obtains the usual Diophantine equation

\[ \sum_{i=1}^r p C_i + q S_i = r, \quad (C11) \]

where \( \nu_r = \sum_{i=1}^r C_i \) is the Hall conductivity. Again, the solution is unique provided that \( |\nu_r| < q/2 \).

**Appendix D: Diophantine equation in 3D**

By closely following the steps of the previous section, here we derive the 3D Diophantine equation Eq. (7) from the magnetic translation symmetry of the 3D Hofstadter model \([68]\).

First, we set the following periodic boundary conditions on the Bloch functions:

\[ u_{k_x+2\pi/Q,k_y,k_z} = u_{k_x}, \quad (D1) \]
\[ u_{k_x,k_y+2\pi,k_z} = e^{i k_y \sigma_y} u_{k_x}, \]
\[ u_{k_x,k_y+2\pi,k_z} = e^{i k_y \sigma_y} u_{k_x}, \]

where we refer to the band Chern numbers as \( \sigma_x \), and we omit the band index and set the lattice spacings equal to one again.
Applying the 3D magnetic translation operator \( M_z \) to \( u_k \), we obtain
\[
M_z u_k = e^{i\phi} u_k , \quad (D1)
\]
By reiterating this application \( Q \) times and invoking the boundary conditions \((D1)\), one is led to
\[
e^{i\phi} u_k = e^{i\phi}(\sigma_y y + \sigma_z z + SQ) u_k , \quad (D3)
\]
where we set \( \phi_y = m_y P/Q \) and \( \phi_z = m_z P/Q \). Equation \((D3)\) is satisfied if
\[
\sigma_y y y + \sigma_z z + SQ = 1. \quad (D4)
\]
The 3D Diophantine equation
\[
\nu^{(r)} y y y + \nu^{(r)} z + s^{(r)} Q = r \quad (D5)
\]
is obtained from Eq. \((D4)\), by recalling \( \nu^{(r)} = \nu - \nu^{(r-1)} \).
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