

# Delocalized spectra of Landau operators on helical surfaces

Yosuke Kubota<sup>\*1</sup>, Matthias Ludewig<sup>†2</sup>, and Guo Chuan Thiang<sup>‡3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, Shinshu University

<sup>1</sup>RIKEN iTHEMS

<sup>2</sup>Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Regensburg

<sup>3</sup>Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University

January 17, 2022

## Abstract

On a flat surface, the Landau operator, or quantum Hall Hamiltonian, has spectrum a discrete set of infinitely-degenerate Landau levels. We consider surfaces with asymptotically constant curvature away from a possibly non-compact submanifold, the helicoid being our main example. The Landau levels remain isolated, provided the spectrum is considered in an appropriate Hilbert module over the Roe algebra of the surface delocalized away from the submanifold. Delocalized coarse indices may then be assigned to them. As an application, we prove that Landau operators on helical surfaces have no spectral gaps above the lowest Landau level.

## Introduction

On the Euclidean plane, it is well known that the Laplacian twisted by a line bundle of nonzero constant curvature  $b$  times the volume form (also called a *Landau operator*), has spectrum  $(2N + 1)|b|$  comprising infinitely-degenerate and evenly-spaced isolated *Landau levels*. This is known as Landau quantization in the physics literature [15]. In the 1980s, with the discovery of the quantum Hall effect [27], it was realized that the Landau levels should be “topological” in some sense to account for the stability of the effect [25], and that this has some manifestation on the boundary of the planar material as “edge states” [6] whose energies which fill up the gaps between Landau levels. Mathematically, the “topological protection”

---

\*y kubota@shinshu-u.ac.jp

†matthias.ludewig@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de

‡guochuanthiang@bicmr.pku.edu.cn




Figure 1: [Left] A boundary-less helicoid is a minimal surface in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . [Right] A half-helicoid modelling a screw-dislocated surface. Its boundary is a helix winding around the dislocation axis.

of such spectral features of Landau operators should be the result of certain index theorems [1, 2].

So far, spectral analysis of Landau operators has mostly been limited to the *constant* curvature situation, both in the curvature of the  $U(1)$  line bundle (physically the magnetic field strength perpendicular to the surface) and in the underlying surface geometry. Thus one studied subsets of the Euclidean plane, the product cylinder  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ , the hyperbolic plane, etc., and applied constant magnetic fields. However, perfectly constant curvatures are merely idealizations, so the Landau level concept should be investigated in geometrically perturbed settings.

The stability of Landau levels (as essential spectra) against perturbations of a constant magnetic field vanishing at infinity, were considered in [10, 11]. A recent perspective [16, 17] is that the Euclidean/hyperbolic plane Landau level spectral projections, while infinitely-degenerate and thus not characterized by a Fredholm index, actually realize the *coarse* index [22] of an associated Dirac operator. This coarse geometric perspective, together with supersymmetry techniques, can account for small geometric perturbations very efficiently, see Section 2.3.

In physical practice, one has a surface embedded in Euclidean 3-space, and submits it to an externally applied magnetic field. An example of such a surface, which unfortunately does *not* have asymptotically constant curvature, is the helicoid (see Sec. 3.1). The (half-)helicoid models a screw-dislocated surface, as illustrated in Fig. 1. It is a physical heuristic, extrapolated from the Euclidean plane case, that *helically* propagating states binding to the screw dislocation axis will appear in the spectrum of Landau operators on such screw-dislocated surfaces. This idea has been investigated in related *discrete* models physically [20], and mathematically [13], the latter with newly-developed coarse geometry methods. The relation between [13] and the present work on continuum Landau operators is discussed in Section 4.3.

In a helicoid geometry, and also more generally, Landau levels are not spectrally

isolated, even inside the essential spectrum. This presents difficulties in defining their indices via spectral projections in the usual way. To overcome this, we develop a perspective of Landau operators as operators on Hilbert modules over Roe  $C^*$ -algebras (Sect. 2.1). Using the spectral theory of such operators, we are able to show that the helicoid Landau levels are isolated in the part of the spectrum “delocalized away from the screw dislocation axis” (Theorem 3.4). This allows for the construction of a *delocalized index* for the Landau levels, *without requiring them to be surrounded by a strict (essential) spectral gap*. Furthermore, we use a coarse Mayer–Vietoris principle to show that this index has a “dimensional reduction” to an index supported along the dislocation axis. The spectral implication is that a Landau operator on a helical surface is forbidden from having any spectral gaps above the lowest Landau level, with helical edge states filling up the gaps between the delocalized Landau levels (Theorem 4.1). Due to the coarse geometry techniques, this result is very robust against geometric perturbations, see Remark 4.3. We also explain how our analysis specializes to a more concrete one involving Fourier transform and spectral flow, under the assumption of translation invariance along the dislocation axis (Sect. 5).

## 1 Spectral supersymmetry

The notion of “spectral supersymmetry” (e.g. §5 of [24], [5]) was used by two of the authors to analyze the Landau levels of Euclidean and hyperbolic plane magnetic Laplacians in terms of Dirac operators and their coarse index theory. We shall abstract the notion to operators acting on Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules. For the geometrical and physical motivation, the reader may prefer to skip to Sect. 2 first (particularly Eq. (7)), before returning to this section.

### 1.1 Supercharges on Hilbert $C^*$ -modules

Let  $B$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra, and  $\mathcal{E}_+, \mathcal{E}_-$  be countably generated Hilbert  $B$ -modules. A regular operator  $D_+ : \mathcal{E}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_-$ , is a closed, densely defined  $B$ -linear operator such that  $D_- := D_+^* : \mathcal{E}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_+$  is densely defined (and closed), and  $1 + D_+^* D_+$  has dense range (a standard reference on regular operators on Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules is [14], Section 9).

The  $C^*$ -algebra of adjointable ( $B$ -linear) bounded (resp. compact) operators  $\mathcal{E}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_-$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}_+, \mathcal{E}_-)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_+, \mathcal{E}_-)$ ). When  $\mathcal{E}_+ = \mathcal{E}_- = \mathcal{E}$ , we simply write  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$  and  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E})$ . A complex number  $z$  is in the resolvent  $\rho(T)$  of a regular operator  $T$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  if  $(T - z)^{-1}$  exists in  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$ , and is in the spectrum  $\sigma(T)$  otherwise. We say that  $T$  has compact resolvent if  $(T - z)^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E})$  for any  $z \in \rho(T)$ .

For  $B = \mathbb{C}$ , these reduce to the usual notions of resolvent and spectrum of a closed densely defined operator on a Hilbert space.

*Remark 1.1* (Interior tensor product). Let  $A, B$  be  $C^*$ -algebras,  $\mathcal{E}$  be a Hilbert  $B$ -module,  $\mathcal{F}$  be a Hilbert  $A$ -module, and let  $\varpi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$  be a  $*$ -representation by  $A$ -linear operators. Then for a regular (self-adjoint) operator  $D$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ , we can construct

a regular (self-adjoint) operator  $\varpi(D) = D \otimes_{\varpi} 1$  on  $\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\varpi} \mathcal{F}$  ([14], Proposition 9.10), as the closure of  $\varpi(D)_0$  given by

$$\text{Dom}(\varpi(D)_0) = \text{Dom}(D) \otimes_{\varpi, \text{alg}} \mathcal{F}, \quad \varpi(D)_0 \cdot (x \otimes_{\varpi} y) = D \cdot x \otimes_{\varpi} y.$$

Note that if  $\varpi$  is injective, then  $D$  and  $\varpi(D)$  have the same spectrum. Indeed, the spectrum of  $D$  and  $\varpi(D)$  is the same thing as the Gelfand–Naimark spectrum of the abelian  $C^*$ -algebras  $\phi_D(C_0(\mathbb{R}))$  and  $\phi_{\varpi(D)}(C_0(\mathbb{R}))$  respectively, where for a self-adjoint operator  $T$  on a Hilbert module  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\phi_T : C_0(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E})$  denotes the continuous functional calculus of  $T$  (see Theorem 10.9 of [14]). The injectivity of  $\varpi$  implies that  $\varpi : \phi_D(C_0(\mathbb{R})) \rightarrow \phi_{\varpi(D)}(C_0(\mathbb{R}))$  is isomorphic.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $D_+ : \mathcal{E}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_-$  be a regular operator. Then  $\sigma(D_+^* D_+) \setminus \{0\} = \sigma(D_+ D_+^*) \setminus \{0\}$ .*

*Proof.* When  $B = \mathbb{C}$ , this is a standard fact in functional analysis (Lemma 2.1 of [10], Theorem 2.9 of [18], Corollary 5.6 of [24]). For general  $B$ , let  $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$  be a faithful  $*$ -representation. Following Remark 1.1, the interior tensor products

$$D_{\pm} \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{E}_{\pm} \otimes_{\pi} \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\mp} \otimes_{\pi} \mathcal{H}$$

are closed operators between Hilbert spaces. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} (D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}})^* (D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}}) &= D_+^* D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}} \\ (D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}}) (D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}})^* &= D_+ D_+^* \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned}$$

hold. Moreover, we have  $\sigma(D_+^* D_+ \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}}) = \sigma(D_+^* D_+)$  and  $\sigma(D_+ D_+^* \otimes_{\pi} 1_{\mathcal{H}}) = \sigma(D_+ D_+^*)$  by injectivity of  $\pi$ . This reduces the problem to the case of Hilbert space operators.  $\square$

Suppose  $D$  is an odd self-adjoint regular operator on a graded Hilbert  $B$ -module  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_-$ , i.e., there is a regular operator  $D_+ : \mathcal{E}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_-$  such that

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_- \\ D_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad D^2 = \begin{pmatrix} D_+^* D_+ & 0 \\ 0 & D_+ D_+^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Definition 1.3.** An (*abstract*) *supercharge* on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$  is a triple  $(D_{\pm}, H_{\pm}, \theta_{\pm})$ , where  $D$  is an odd self-adjoint regular operator on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$  with compact resolvent,

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_+ & 0 \\ 0 & H_- \end{pmatrix}$$

is an even and positive regular operator on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ , and  $\theta_{\pm}$  are bounded self-adjoint operators on  $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}$  such that

$$D^2 = \begin{pmatrix} D_+^* D_+ & 0 \\ 0 & D_+ D_+^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} H_+ + \theta_+ & 0 \\ 0 & H_- + \theta_- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, we say that  $(D_{\pm}, H_{\pm}, \theta_{\pm})$  is *flat* if  $H_+ = H_-$ , and has *constant shift parameters* if  $\theta_{\pm} = b_{\pm} \cdot 1$  for  $b_{\pm} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

## 1.2 Generalized Fredholm index of supercharges

For a  $C^*$ -algebra  $B$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_B := \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} B$  be the *standard Hilbert  $B$ -module*, where  $\mathcal{H}$  denotes the infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space. There is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2)$$

The  $C^*$ -algebras  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)$  and  $B$  are Morita equivalent with a preferred Morita equivalence given by  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , hence we have a canonical isomorphism  $K_0(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)) \cong K_0(B)$ .

Let  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_+ \oplus \mathcal{E}_-$  be a graded Hilbert  $B$ -module and let  $(D_{\pm}, H_{\pm}, \theta_{\pm})$  be an abstract supercharge on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ . Despite the symmetry of the nonzero spectrum expressed in Theorem 1.2, an asymmetry can arise between the two graded components of the kernel of  $D$ , which can be measured by a generalized Fredholm index as follows.

By the Kasparov stabilization theorem [12], there is a unitary

$$U_{\pm}: \mathcal{H}_B \oplus \mathcal{E}_{\pm} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B.$$

By the assumption of  $D$  having compact resolvent, the bounded transform

$$F := U_-(1_{\mathcal{H}_B} \oplus D_+(1 + D_+^* D_+)^{-1/2})U_+^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$$

has  $\pi(F) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)$  being unitary, hence

$$\text{Ind}(D) := \partial[\pi(F)] \in K_0(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)) \cong K_0(B) \quad (3)$$

is defined, with  $\partial$  the boundary map for the extension (2). This  $\text{Ind}(D)$  is defined independently of the choice of  $U_{\pm}$  at the  $K$ -theory level.

Furthermore, if zero is isolated in the spectrum of  $D$ , the kernel of  $D^2$  (thus also of  $D$ ) is obtainable by continuous functional calculus. This kernel is then a projective submodule of  $\mathcal{E}$  which splits into a positively-graded component and a negatively-graded component, and we may write ([7], Proposition 4.8.10 (c))

$$\text{Ind}(D) = [U_+ P_0(D_+^* D_+) U_+^*] - [U_- P_0(D_+ D_+^*) U_-^*] \in K_0(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)) \cong K_0(B), \quad (4)$$

where  $P_0(\cdot)$  denotes the kernel projection. When  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is an isolated eigenvalue, we also write  $P_{\lambda}(\cdot)$  for the  $\lambda$ -eigenprojection.

Observe that if an abstract supercharge has strictly positive shift parameters  $\theta_+$  and  $\theta_-$ , then  $D$  is invertible and its index necessarily vanishes. On the other hand, if only one of  $\theta_+, \theta_-$  is strictly positive while the other is a non-positive constant, we have the following.

**Proposition 1.4.** *Let  $(D_{\pm}, H_{\pm}, \theta_{\pm})$  be an abstract supercharge over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ , such that  $\text{Ind}(D) \neq 0$ . Assume that  $\theta_+ = b_+ \cdot 1$  and  $\theta_- \geq b_- \cdot 1$  for some constants  $b_+ \leq 0$  and  $b_- > 0$  (resp.  $\theta_+ \geq b_+ \cdot 1$  and  $\theta_- = b_- \cdot 1$  for some  $b_+ > 0$  and  $b_- \leq 0$ ). Then the bottom of  $\sigma(H_+)$  (resp.  $\sigma(H_-)$ ) is an isolated point  $-b_+$  (resp.  $-b_-$ ) called the lowest Landau level (LLL), and*

$$[P_{-b_+}(H_+)] = \text{Ind}(D) \quad \text{resp.} \quad [P_{-b_-}(H_-)] = -\text{Ind}(D)$$

in  $K_0(B)$ .

*Proof.* Consider the first case,  $\theta_+ = b_+ \cdot 1 \leq 0$  and  $\theta_- \geq b_- \cdot 1 > 0$ . On the right hand side of Eq. (1), the bottom-left piece,  $H_- + \theta_- = H_- + b_-$ , is strictly positive with the interval  $(0, b_-)$  a spectral gap. Thus

$$P_0(D_+ D_+^*) = P_0(H_- + b_-) = 0.$$

By Theorem 1.2, the top-left piece in Eq. (1),  $H_+ + b_+$ , also has  $(0, b_-)$  as a spectral gap. It is furthermore a non-negative operator as it is (a piece of) the square of the operator  $D$ . Thus the kernel of  $H_+ + b_+$  must be spectrally isolated, and

$$P_0(D_+^* D_+) = P_0(H_+ + b_+) = P_{-b_+}(H_+).$$

Consequently we get

$$\begin{aligned} [U_+ P_{-b_+}(H_+) U_+^*] &= [U_+ P_0(D_+^* D_+) U_+^*] \\ &= [U_+ P_0(D_+^* D_+) U_+^*] - [U_- P_0(D_+ D_+^*) U_-^*] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Eq. (4)}}{=} \text{Ind}(D) \in K_0(B), \end{aligned}$$

which is non-zero by assumption.

Similarly, for  $\theta_+ \geq b_+ \cdot 1 > 0$  and  $\theta_- = b_- \leq 0$ , the top-left piece in Eq. (1) is strictly positive with gap  $(0, b_+)$ . Then for the bottom-right piece, we deduce that the kernel is isolated, with *negatively*-graded spectral projection  $P_0(H_- + b_-) = P_{-b_-}(H_-)$  representing  $-\text{Ind}(D)$ .  $\square$

If  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is such that  $I \cap \sigma(\cdot)$  is separated in the spectrum of a self-adjoint regular operator, the corresponding spectral projection, denoted  $P_I(\cdot)$ , is a regular projection obtainable by continuous functional calculus.

**Proposition 1.5.** *Let  $(D_\pm, H_\pm, \theta_\pm)$  be an abstract supercharge over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $I \subset (0, \infty)$  be a compact interval such that  $I \cap \sigma(D_+^* D_+)$  is isolated in  $\sigma(D_+^* D_+)$ . Then  $U_+ P_I(D_+^* D_+) U_+^*$  and  $U_- P_I(D_+ D_+^*) U_-^*$  define the same class in  $K_0(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)) \cong K_0(B)$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.2,  $I \cap \sigma(D_+ D_+^*)$  is also isolated in  $\sigma(D_+ D_+^*)$ . Set  $p := U_+ P_I(D_+^* D_+) U_+^*$ ,  $q := U_- P_I(D_+ D_+^*) U_-^*$ , and

$$T := U_- D_+ P_I(D_+^* D_+) U_+^* = U_- P_I(D_+ D_+^*) D_+ U_+^*.$$

Then, by the assumption of  $D$  having compact resolvent,  $p, q$  are projections in  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ . Moreover, since  $D_+ : p\mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow q\mathcal{H}_B$  is bounded and invertible, we have  $T = Tp = qT$ , and that  $T^*T + (1 - p)$ ,  $TT^* + (1 - q)$  are invertible on  $\mathcal{H}_B$ . Hence

$$v := T(T^*T + (1 - p))^{-1/2} = (TT^* + (1 - q))^{-1/2}T$$

is a partial isometry implementing the Murray–von Neumann equivalence between  $v^*v = T^*(TT^* + (1 - q))^{-1}T = p$  and  $vv^* = T(T^*T + (1 - p))^{-1}T^* = q$ .  $\square$

The following ‘‘bootstrap’’ result is motivated by the idea of *shape invariance* in supersymmetric quantum mechanics [5].

**Proposition 1.6.** *Let  $(D_{n,\pm}, H_{n,\pm}, \theta_{n,\pm}), n \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of abstract supercharges over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_n$  with constant shift parameters  $\theta_{n,\pm} = b_{\pm} \cdot 1$ . Assume that*

1.  $\mathcal{E}_{n+1,+} = \mathcal{E}_{n,-}$  and  $H_{n+1,+} = H_{n,-}$  hold for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
2.  $b_- > 0$ , and  $\Delta := b_- - b_+ > 0$ .

*Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the spectrum of  $H_{n,\pm}$  is contained in the discrete set  $\Delta \cdot \mathbb{N} - b_+$  of abstract Landau levels. The  $m$ -th Landau level  $\Delta \cdot m - b_+$  attained in  $\sigma(H_{n,+})$  iff  $-b_+$  is attained in  $\sigma(H_{n+m,+})$ .*

*Suppose further, that*

3.  $\text{Ind}(D_n) \neq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\sigma(H_{n,\pm}) = \Delta \cdot \mathbb{N} - b_+$ , and the  $K_0(B)$  class of the spectral projection for  $\Delta \cdot m - b_+$  equals  $\text{Ind}(D_{n+m})$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Example 1.7.* If  $(D_{\pm}, H_{\pm} = H, b_{\pm})$  is a flat abstract supercharge with constant shift parameters  $b_{\pm}$ , where  $b_- > 0$  and  $\Delta := b_- - b_+ > 0$ , then the sequence  $(D_{n,\pm}, H_{n,\pm}, \theta_{n,\pm}) = (D_{\pm}, H, b_{\pm})$  satisfies the assumptions 1-2 of Prop. 1.5.

*Proof.* From the spectral supersymmetry, Theorem 1.2, we have the following equality of subsets of  $[0, \infty)$ ,

$$\sigma(H_{n,+} + b_+) \setminus \{0\} = \sigma(H_{n,-} + b_-) = \sigma(H_{n+1,+} + b_+) + \Delta. \quad (5)$$

Thus  $H_{n,+} + b_+$  has  $(0, \Delta)$  as a spectral gap. By the same argument applied to  $H_{n+1,\pm}$ , we also have that  $H_{n+1,+} + b_+$  has  $(0, \Delta)$  as a spectral gap. This, together with Eq. (5), implies that  $H_{n,+} + b_+$  has  $(\Delta, 2\Delta)$  as a spectral gap. By an inductive argument, we deduce that  $\sigma(H_{n,+} + b_+) \subset \Delta\mathbb{N}$ , with  $\Delta \cdot m$  attained iff 0 is attained in  $\sigma(H_{n+m,+})$ .

With the assumption  $0 \neq \text{Ind}(D_n)$ , zero cannot be missing in the spectrum, and we conclude that  $\sigma(H_{n,+} + b_+) = \Delta\mathbb{N}$ . By Prop. 1.5, for  $m \geq 1$ , the  $\Delta \cdot m$  spectral projections for  $H_{n,+} + b_+$  and  $H_{n,-} + b_-$  are Murray-von Neumann equivalent. Since  $H_{n,-} = H_{n+1,+}$ , this can be reformulated as the statement that the  $\Delta \cdot m - b_+$  spectral projection for  $H_{n,+}$  is equivalent to the  $\Delta \cdot (m-1) - b_+$  spectral projection for  $H_{n+1,+}$ , and also to the  $-b_+$  spectral projection of  $H_{n+m,+}$  by iterating  $m$  times. Note that the non-trivial index implies  $b_+ \leq 0$ , and Prop. 1.4 applies to give  $\text{Ind}(D_{n+m}) = [U_+ P_{-b_+}(H_{n+m,+}) U_+^*] = [U_+ P_{\Delta \cdot m - b_+}(H_{n,+}) U_+^*] \in K_0(B)$ .  $\square$

*Remark 1.8.* In the case where  $b_+ > 0$  and  $b_+ - b_- > 0$ , the same proof shows that  $\sigma(H_{n,\pm}) = \Delta \cdot \mathbb{N} - b_-$ , and the  $\Delta \cdot m - b_-$  spectral projection of  $H_{n,-}$  is equivalent to  $-\text{Ind}(D_{n+m})$  in  $K_0(B)$ .

## 2 Landau and Dirac operators on curved surfaces

Let  $M$  be a complete noncompact Riemannian spin surface, with metric tensor  $g$ , volume form  $\omega$ , and scalar curvature function  $R$ . Note that  $H^2(M) = 0$  so complex

line bundles over  $M$  are trivializable. The spin Dirac operator on  $M$  is an odd operator on the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded spinor bundle  $S = S^+ \oplus S^-$ . We may twist  $S$  by a (trivializable) Hermitian line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  with connection  $A$ , whose curvature may be written as  $dA = \Theta \cdot \omega$  for some scalar function  $\Theta$ .

Let  $C_b^\infty(M)$  denote the (real-valued) bounded smooth functions on  $M$ , and

$$C_b^\infty(M) := \{V \in C_b^\infty(M) : \|dV\|, \|d^*dV\| < \infty\}. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $d$  is the exterior derivative,  $d^*$  is the codifferential, and  $\|\cdot\|$  refers to the supremum norm. *Throughout this paper, we will assume that  $R, \Theta \in C_b^\infty(M)$ .*

Write  $D_\Theta = D_\Theta^{(M)}$  for the Dirac operator on  $M$  twisted by a line bundle with connection  $A$ . The *magnetic Laplacian* is

$$H_\Theta = H_\Theta^{(M)} = (d - iA)^*(d - iA),$$

also called the *Landau operator* in physics. It describes the motion of an electron on  $M$  subject to a magnetic field of strength  $\Theta$ . We will often drop the superscript  $(M)$  when there is no confusion about the manifold in question.

The operators  $H_\Theta, D_\Theta$  are essentially self-adjoint on the smooth compactly supported sections ([23], [7] §10.2), and we use the same symbols for their closures to self-adjoint operators. They are related by the Lichnerowicz–Weitzenböck formula, which may be written as (Prop. 2.1 of [16])

$$D_\Theta^2 = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} - \Theta + \frac{R}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}} + \Theta + \frac{R}{4} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (7)$$

Equivalent forms of (7) are

$$D_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} H_\Theta - \Theta & 0 \\ 0 & H_{\Theta + \frac{R}{2}} + \Theta + \frac{R}{2} \end{pmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

$$D_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} H_{\Theta - \frac{R}{2}} - \Theta + \frac{R}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & H_\Theta + \Theta \end{pmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

In these formulae, we have implicitly used an identification of the trivializable line bundles on which the operators are acting, but the choice does not matter up to gauge-equivalence.

*Remark 2.1.* If  $H^1(M) = 0$ , then all choices of connection  $A$  with the same curvature  $\Theta \cdot \omega$  are gauge-equivalent, so there is no ambiguity in writing  $D_\Theta, H_\Theta$ . Otherwise, there may be a moduli space of gauge-inequivalent  $A$  on  $\mathcal{L}$  with the same curvature (corresponding to addition of “Aharonov–Bohm fluxes”). This ambiguity occurs, and is accounted for, in Section 5.1.

## 2.1 Landau and Dirac operators on Hilbert $C^*$ -modules over Roe algebras

Equations (8) and (9) are concrete versions the supercharge relation defined in Eq. (1). When  $R \equiv 0$  and  $\Theta = b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , this expresses the well-known observation



that the twisted Dirac operator on the Euclidean plane is a supercharge for (two shifted copies of) the Landau operator. Then the ‘‘ladder operator trick’’ (cf. Prop. 1.6) immediately shows that Landau operator’s spectrum is  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ .

For general  $M$ , it is natural to think of the Dirac and Landau operators as acting on certain Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules over the Roe  $C^*$ -algebra  $C^*(M)$ , in order to understand the Landau levels through generalized Fredholm indices (cf. [16] for  $M = \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $M = \mathbb{H}$ ). Here,  $C^*(M)$  is defined to be the  $C^*$ -algebra closure of the  $*$ -algebra  $\mathbb{C}[M]$  of finite-propagation, locally compact operators on  $L^2(M)$ . The  $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ -functional calculus of  $D_\Theta$  and  $H_\Theta$  land in  $M_2(C^*(M))$  and  $C^*(M)$  respectively (Prop. 3.6 of [22]), and the relevant Hilbert  $C^*(M)$ -modules are constructed as follows.

Let  $\phi_{D_\Theta} : C_0(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M_2(C^*(M)) = \mathcal{B}(C^*(M)^{\oplus 2})$  be the  $*$ -homomorphism defined by  $\phi_{D_\Theta}(\varphi) := \varphi(D_\Theta)$ . This is an odd homomorphism when  $C_0(\mathbb{R})$  is given the even-odd grading, and  $M_2(C^*(M))$  is given the diagonal-off-diagonal grading. Following Trout [26] §3, we define the unbounded operator  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta$  as the interior tensor product  $x \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} 1$  in the sense of Remark 1.1, where  $x$  denotes the identity function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . More explicitly, the operator  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta$  acts on the Hilbert  $C^*(M)$ -submodule

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta := C_0(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} C^*(M)^{\oplus 2} = \overline{\phi_{D_\Theta}(C_0(\mathbb{R})) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}} \subset C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}, \quad (10)$$

and a core for this operator is  $\phi_{D_\Theta}(C_c(\mathbb{R})) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}$ , on which it acts as

$$\mathcal{D}_\Theta(\phi_{D_\Theta}(\varphi) \cdot T) := \phi_{D_\Theta}(x\varphi) \cdot T.$$

This is closable, and its closure  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta$  is regular and self-adjoint.

Similarly, the Landau operator  $H_\Theta$  defines a  $*$ -homomorphism  $\phi_{H_\Theta} : C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \rightarrow C^*(M)$  via  $\phi_{H_\Theta}(\varphi) := \varphi(H_\Theta)$ . On the Hilbert  $C^*(M)$ -submodule

$$\mathcal{E}_\Theta := \overline{\phi_{H_\Theta}(C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})) \cdot C^*(M)} \subset C^*(M), \quad (11)$$

we have the regular positive operator  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\Theta(\phi_{H_\Theta}(\varphi) \cdot T) := \phi_{H_\Theta}(x\varphi) \cdot T \quad (12)$$

on the core  $\phi_{H_\Theta}(C_c(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})) \cdot C^*(M) \subset \text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)$ .

*Remark 2.2.* As is stated in [26], Theorem 3.2, the functional calculi  $\varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta), \varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ , are all compact operators on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$ . This is seen from

$$\varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta) = \varphi(x) \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} 1 \in \mathcal{K}(C_0(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}). \quad (13)$$

Indeed, for a  $*$ -homomorphism  $\varpi : B \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$  of  $C^*$ -algebras (where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a Hilbert  $A$ -module) and a Hilbert  $B$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$ , we have  $T \otimes_{\varpi} 1 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\varpi} \mathcal{F})$  for any  $T \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E})$  ([14], Proposition 4.7).

**Lemma 2.3.** *For  $\Theta, R \in C_b^\infty(M)$ , we have  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta = \mathcal{E}_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} \oplus \mathcal{E}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}}$ .*

*Proof.* The Hilbert module  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$  is defined through  $D_\Theta$  in Eq. (10), while the Hilbert module  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$  is defined through  $H_\Theta$ . We have to relate these definitions. To this end, set  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta := \mathcal{E}_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} \oplus \mathcal{E}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}}$  and

$$\tilde{H}_\Theta := \begin{pmatrix} H_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\theta} := \begin{pmatrix} -\Theta + \frac{R}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta + \frac{R}{4} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have to show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$ . Note that  $D_\Theta^2 = \tilde{H}_\Theta + \tilde{\theta}$  by Eq. (7). Since the functions  $(x^2 + 1)^{-1} \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$  and  $(x + 1)^{-1} \in C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  are strictly positive, the spaces  $(x^2 + 1)^{-1} \cdot C_0(\mathbb{R}) \subset C_0(\mathbb{R})$  and  $(x + 1)^{-1} \cdot C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \subset C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  are dense. (Indeed,  $C_c(\mathbb{R}) \subset C_0(\mathbb{R})$  is dense, and for  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R})$ , we have  $f = (x^2 + 1)^{-1} \cdot (f \cdot (x^2 + 1))$ ; the argument for  $C_0(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  is similar.) Therefore, the submodules

$$\phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1}) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2} \subset \hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta, \quad \phi_{\tilde{H}_\Theta}((x + 1)^{-1}) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$$

are dense. The operator  $(\tilde{H}_\Theta + 1)(D_\Theta^2 + 1)^{-1} = 1 - \tilde{\theta}\phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1})$  is bounded, with the inverse  $(D_\Theta^2 + 1)(\tilde{H}_\Theta + 1)^{-1}$  being bounded as well, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1}) &= (D_\Theta^2 + 1)^{-1} = (\tilde{H}_\Theta + 1)^{-1}(\tilde{H}_\Theta + 1)(D_\Theta^2 + 1)^{-1} \\ &= \phi_{\tilde{H}_\Theta}((x + 1)^{-1}) \cdot (1 - \tilde{\theta} \cdot \phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

implies that

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta = \overline{\phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1}) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}} = \overline{\phi_{\tilde{H}_\Theta}((x + 1)^{-1}) C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}} = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta. \quad \square$$

The proof of Lemma 2.3 also shows that  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta^2$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}} \end{pmatrix}$  have the common core

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta^0 := \phi_{D_\Theta}((x^2 + 1)^{-1}) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2} = \phi_{\tilde{H}_\Theta}((x + 1)^{-1}) \cdot C^*(M)^{\oplus 2},$$

and hence the difference

$$\tilde{\vartheta} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \vartheta_- \end{pmatrix} := \mathcal{D}_\Theta^2 - \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

is a densely-defined symmetric operator on  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta^0$ . We will relate this  $\vartheta_\pm$  with the curvature operators  $\mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$  in Lemma 2.5.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $V, \Theta \in C_b^\infty(M)$  be real-valued. Left multiplication with  $V$  acting on  $C^*(M)$  preserves the submodule  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$ , and acts as a bounded operator on it.*

*Proof.* For any  $\xi \in C^*(M)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} V\phi_{H_\Theta}((x + 1)^{-1})\xi &= V \cdot (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} \cdot \xi \\ &= [V, (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}]\xi + (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}V\xi \\ &= -(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}[V, H_\Theta](H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}\xi + (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}V\xi \\ &= (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}(-[V, H_\Theta](H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} + V)\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

It is clear that  $V\xi \in C^*(M)$ . We will show that  $[V, H_\Theta](H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}\xi \in C^*(M)$ , which implies that the right hand side of Eq. (15) is in  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$ . Indeed, by using the equalities  $\alpha^* \circ \beta = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \beta^* \circ \alpha$  for any compactly supported 1-forms  $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega_c^1(M)$ ,  $[d^*, V] = -([d, V])^* = -(dV)^*$ , and

$$d^*d(fg) = d^*d(f) \cdot g - 2\langle df, dg \rangle + f \cdot d^*d(g)$$

for any  $f, g \in C_c^\infty(M)$ , we get  $[d^*d, V] = d^*d(V) - 2(dV)^* \circ d$ . Hence  $[H_\Theta, V]$  is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} [H_\Theta, V] &= [(d - iA)^*(d - iA), V] \\ &= [d^*d, V] - i([d^*, V] \circ A - A^* \circ [d, V]) \\ &= d^*d(V) - 2(dV)^* \circ d - i(-(dV)^* \circ A - A^* \circ (dV)) \\ &= d^*d(V) - 2(dV)^* \circ (d - iA). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption,  $V \in C_b^\infty(M)$  (see Eq. (6)), so  $\|dV\| < \infty, \|d^*dV\| < \infty$ . Also, the operator  $(d - iA)(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}$  is bounded, so  $[H_\Theta, V](H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}$  is well-defined as a bounded operator. Moreover, upon identifying 1-forms with functions in a trivialization, the terms  $d^*d(V)$  and  $(dV)^*$  are bounded multiplication operators and  $(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}, (d - iA)(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} \in C^*(M)$ , thus  $[H_\Theta, V](H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}$  is also in  $C^*(M)$ .  $\square$

We apply the interior tensor product (Remark 1.1) to  $B = C^*(M)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} = L^2(M)$ , and the standard \*-representation

$$\pi: C^*(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(L^2(M)).$$

Then  $\pi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta)$ ,  $\pi(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta)$  and  $\pi(\tilde{\vartheta}_\pm)$  are self-adjoint operators on

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta \otimes_\pi L^2(M) = C_0(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} C^*(M)^{\oplus 2} \otimes_\pi L^2(M) \cong L^2(M)^{\oplus 2},$$

where the isomorphism is given by  $\varphi \otimes_{\phi_{D_\Theta}} K \otimes_\pi \xi \mapsto \varphi(D_\Theta) \cdot K \cdot \xi$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *We have  $\pi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta) = D_\Theta$  and  $\pi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta) = H_\Theta$ . Therefore, the spectrum of  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  and  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta$  as regular operators on  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$ , coincide with that of  $H_\Theta$  and  $D_\Theta$  respectively. Moreover, the differences  $\vartheta_\pm$  defined in Eq. (14) coincide with  $\mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$ , acting on  $\mathcal{E}_{\Theta \pm \frac{R}{4}}$  as in Lemma 2.4.*

*Proof.* As proved in Proposition 3.1 of [26], for  $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$  the functional calculus  $\varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta) \in \mathcal{K}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta)$  coincides with the restriction of  $\phi_{D_\Theta}(\varphi)$  to the  $C^*$ -submodule  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta$  of  $C^*(M)^{\oplus 2}$  (cf. Eq. (13)). Hence we have  $\varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta) \otimes_\pi 1_{L^2(M)} = \phi_{D_\Theta}(\varphi)$  on the dense subspace  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\Theta \otimes_{\text{alg}, \pi} L^2(M)$  of  $L^2(M)^{\oplus 2}$ , thus

$$\varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta \otimes_\pi 1) = \varphi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta) \otimes_\pi 1_{L^2(M)} = \phi_{D_\Theta}(\varphi)$$

for any  $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ . Since a self-adjoint operator can be reconstructed from its  $C_0$ -functional calculus, we get  $\mathcal{D}_\Theta \otimes_\pi 1 = D_\Theta$ .

The same argument also shows  $\pi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta) = H_\Theta$ . Finally, the function  $\mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$  acting as bounded operators on  $\mathcal{E}_{\Theta \mp \frac{R}{4}}$  as in Lemma 2.4, satisfies  $\pi(\mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}) = \mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$  (where the right hand side is the multiplication operator on  $L^2(M)$ ), and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\mathcal{D}_\Theta^2) - \pi \begin{pmatrix} -\Theta + \frac{R}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta + \frac{R}{4} \end{pmatrix} &= D_\Theta^2 - \begin{pmatrix} -\Theta + \frac{R}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta + \frac{R}{4} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \tilde{H}_\Theta = \pi \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{\Theta - \frac{R}{4}} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{4}} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

By injectivity of  $\pi$ , we get  $\vartheta_\pm = \mp\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$ . □

Replacing  $\Theta$  by  $\Theta + \frac{R}{4}$  in Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, we arrive at the following relation between Dirac and Landau operators viewed as Hilbert  $C^*(M)$ -module operators.

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $D_\pm := (\mathcal{D}_{\Theta \pm \frac{R}{4}})_\pm$ ,  $H_+ := \mathcal{H}_\Theta$ ,  $H_- := \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{2}}$ ,  $\theta_+ := -\Theta$  and  $\theta_- := \Theta + \frac{R}{2}$ . Then, the data  $(D_\pm, H_\pm, \theta_\pm)$  determine an abstract supercharge over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\Theta \pm \frac{R}{4}}$  (Definition 1.3).*

## 2.2 Supercharges over delocalized Roe algebra

Let  $N$  be a submanifold of  $M$ . Then the localized Roe algebra  $C_M^*(N)$  is the  $C^*$ -algebra closure of the set of finite-propagation, locally compact operators on  $L^2(M)$  that are supported on some finite  $r$ -neighborhood of  $N$ . It is a closed ideal of  $C^*(M)$ . Let

$$\varpi: C^*(M) \rightarrow C^*(M)/C_M^*(N)$$

denote the quotient  $*$ -homomorphism, and recall the construction in Remark 1.1.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta$  be the Landau operator on the Hilbert  $C^*(M)$ -module  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$ , as defined in Eq. (11) and (12). Let  $V \in C_b^\infty(M)$  be a real-valued function on  $M$  such that  $V(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\text{dist}(x, N) \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V$ , where  $V$  acts on  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$  as in Lemma 2.4, is also a self-adjoint regular operator on  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta$ , and*

$$\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V) = \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)$$

*holds as regular operators on  $\mathcal{E}_\Theta \otimes_{\varpi} C^*(M)/C_M^*(N)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $V \in C_b^\infty(M)$ , by Lemma 2.4, the sum  $\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V$  is well-defined, and is again a self-adjoint operator. By Remark 1.1,  $\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)$  and  $\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V)$  share the core

$$\text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V) \otimes_{\varpi, \text{alg}} C^*(M)/C_M^*(N) = \text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_\Theta) \otimes_{\varpi, \text{alg}} C^*(M)/C_M^*(N).$$

By definition of  $\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V)$ , for any  $T \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)$  and  $X \in C^*(M)/C_M^*(N)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta + V)(T \otimes_{\varpi} X) &= \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta T + V \cdot T) \cdot X \\ &= \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta T)X + \varpi(V \cdot T)X \\ &= \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)(T \otimes_{\varpi} X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varpi(V \cdot T) = 0$  comes from  $V \cdot T \in C_M^*(N)$ . This finishes the proof. □

For  $D$  a Dirac operator on (the even-dimensional spin) manifold  $M$ , the index  $\text{Ind}(D)$  in the sense of Eq. (3) is the same thing as the *coarse index* [22], which is an element of  $K_0(C^*(M))$ . Specifically, there is a *coarse assembly map* [8],

$$\mu_M : K_0(M) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M)),$$

which when applied to the  $K$ -homology class of  $D$  gives its coarse index  $\text{Ind}(D)$ .

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $M$  be a complete Riemannian spin surface and let  $N \subset M$  be a submanifold such that any  $r$ -neighborhood of  $N$  is a proper subset of  $M$ . Assume that the scalar curvature  $R$  and the magnetic field  $\Theta = b + \Theta_{\text{pert}}$  satisfy  $R(x) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\Theta_{\text{pert}}(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\text{dist}(x, N) \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant. We define*

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_n := \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\Theta + \frac{(2n+1)R}{4}} \otimes_{\varpi} C^*(M)/C_M^*(N)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &= \varpi \left( \mathcal{D}_{\Theta + \frac{(2n+1)R}{4}} \right), \\ H_{n,+} &= \varpi \left( \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{nR}{2}} \right), \\ H_{n,-} &= \varpi \left( \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{(n+1)R}{2}} \right), \\ \theta_{n,\pm} &= \mp b \cdot 1. \end{aligned}$$

If furthermore  $\varpi_* \text{Ind}(D) \neq 0$ , then  $(D_{n,\pm}, H_{n,\pm}, \theta_{n,\pm})$  is a sequence of abstract supercharges over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_n$  satisfying the assumptions of Prop. 1.6.

*Proof.* First, suppose  $b > 0$ . The basic relation Eq. (8) in this perturbed setting is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Theta + \frac{(2n+1)R}{4}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{nR}{2}} - (b + \Theta_{\text{pert}} - \frac{(2n+1)R}{4}) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{(2n+1)R}{2}} + (b + \Theta_{\text{pert}} + \frac{(2n+1)R}{2}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.7,

$$\varpi \left( \mathcal{D}_{\Theta + \frac{(2n+1)R}{4}} \right)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \varpi(\mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{nR}{2}}) - b & 0 \\ 0 & \varpi(\mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{(n+1)R}{2}}) + b \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} H_{n,+} - b & 0 \\ 0 & H_{n,-} + b \end{pmatrix}.$$

This shows that  $(D_{n,\pm}, H_{n,\pm}, \mp b)$  is a sequence of abstract supercharges over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_n$ . Furthermore, the assumptions 1-2 of Prop. 1.6 are satisfied. As for assumption 3, the coarse index  $\text{Ind}(D_\Theta)$  does not depend on  $\Theta$ , hence  $\text{Ind}(D_n) = \text{Ind}(D)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and similarly for the image under  $\varpi_*$ .

For  $b < 0$ , we use the basic relation Eq. (9) instead, to get a sequence of abstract supercharges satisfying the assumptions of Prop. 1.6 with the sign change described in Remark 1.8.  $\square$

*Remark 2.9.* Even if  $R$  vanishes as  $\text{dist}(x, N) \rightarrow \infty$ , there is no guarantee that the “quotient supercharge” becomes flat, e.g.  $H_{0,+} = \varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta) \neq \varpi(\mathcal{H}_{\Theta + \frac{R}{2}}) = H_{0,-}$ . This is because changing a field strength from  $\Theta$  to  $\Theta + \frac{R}{2}$  requires changing the connection 1-form  $A$ , and so  $H_{\Theta + \frac{R}{2}} - H_\Theta$  is not simply a  $C_b^\infty(M)$  function. The best we can do is to construct a sequence of quotient supercharges as in Theorem 2.8.

## 2.3 Indices of Landau levels

### 2.3.1 Constant field: isolated lowest Landau level

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $M$  be a noncompact complete Riemannian spin surface. For constant magnetic field strength,  $\Theta = b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , with*

$$|b| > -\frac{1}{2} \inf_{x \in M} R(x), \quad (16)$$

*the bottom of  $\sigma(H_b)$  is an isolated point  $|b|$ , the lowest Landau level (LLL). Furthermore, if  $\text{Ind}(D) \neq 0$  holds, then the class of the spectral projection for the LLL is nontrivial in  $K_0(C^*(M))$ , with a sign change when  $b$  changes sign.*

*Proof.* Set  $\kappa := \inf_{x \in M} R(x)$ . First suppose  $b = |b| > -\frac{\kappa}{2}$ . Cor. 2.6 says that  $(D_\pm, H_\pm, \theta_\pm)$  with  $D_\pm = (\mathcal{D}_b)_\pm$ ,  $H_+ = \mathcal{H}_b$ ,  $H_- = \mathcal{H}_{b+\frac{R}{2}}$ ,  $\theta_+ = -b$  and  $\theta_- = b + \frac{R}{2} > 0$  is an abstract supercharge over  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{b+\frac{R}{4}}$ . Hence Prop. 1.4 applies to give  $b$  as the LLL of  $H_+$ , which is also that of  $H_b$  by Lemma 2.5. The  $b < 0$  case is similar.  $\square$

*Example 2.11.* When  $M$  is the Euclidean or hyperbolic plane, the coarse Baum–Connes conjecture is verified, so that  $\text{Ind}(D)$  is a generator of  $K_0(C^*(M)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ . Prop. 1.4 says that the LLL spectral projection realizes this index class, as was found in [16].

*Remark 2.12.* For connected  $M$ , if the LLL spectral projection is non-trivial in  $K_0(C^*(M))$ , it must be infinitely-degenerate (and is said to be a *flat band* of essential spectrum), due to Lemma 2.13 below. Furthermore, this flatness is independent of the scalar curvature  $R$ , beyond the constraint (16) needed to spectrally isolate  $|b|$ .

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $M$  be a connected, noncompact, complete Riemannian manifold. If  $P \in C^*(M)$  is a finite-rank projection, then  $[P] = 0$  in  $K_0(C^*(M))$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, suppose  $P = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  is a rank-1 projection onto the span of  $\psi \in L^2(M)$ . Let  $(\psi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of compactly supported functions such that  $\psi_n \rightarrow \psi$  in  $L^2(M)$ . Then  $P_n = |\psi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|$  has finite propagation and is compact, hence contained in  $C^*(M)$ . Moreover, we have  $P_n \rightarrow P$  in operator norm, hence also  $P \in C^*(M)$ .

Now, let  $K \subset M$  be any compact subset. Then each  $P_n$  has support near  $K$  (i.e., support within a ball of finite radius around  $K$ , not necessarily uniformly in  $n$ ). Therefore each  $P_n$  and consequently also  $P$  is contained in the localized Roe algebra at  $K$ ,  $C_M^*(K) \subset C^*(M)$ . Hence the  $K$ -theory class  $[P] \in K_0(C^*(M))$  is contained in the image of the map  $K_0(C_M^*(K)) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M))$ .

However, this map is the zero map: As  $M$  is geodesically complete, for each point  $x \in M$ , there exists a *line* starting at  $x$ , i.e., a geodesic  $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma(0) = x$  such that the Riemannian distance  $d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |t - s|$  for all  $t, s \geq 0$ . Consequently,  $\gamma$  provides an isometric embedding of  $[0, \infty)$  into  $M$ ; let  $L$  denote its image. Therefore, the inclusion map  $C_M^*(K) \rightarrow C^*(M)$  factors through  $C_M^*(K \cup L) \cong C^*(K \cup L)$ . But  $K \cup L$  is a flasque metric space, hence the  $K$ -theory of its Roe algebra is trivial. Consequently, the map  $K_0(C_M^*(K)) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M))$  factors through zero.  $\square$

*Remark 2.14.* The localized Roe algebra  $C_M^*(K)$  is the ideal of compact operators  $\mathcal{K}$ , see pp. 22 of [22]. It may be shown, by a more abstract argument, that  $K_0(C_M^*(K)) = K_0(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M))$  is the zero map, see pp. 23 of [22].

### 2.3.2 Constant field and flat surface: isolated higher Landau levels

**Proposition 2.15.** *Let  $M$  be a noncompact complete Riemannian spin surface. Suppose  $M$  has vanishing scalar curvature,  $R = 0$ , i.e.  $M$  is either  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ , or  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Then once  $b \neq 0$ , the Landau operator  $H_b^{(M)}$  has spectrum the Landau levels  $(2\mathbb{N}+1)|b|$ . Furthermore, the class of the  $(2n+1)|b|$  spectral projection in  $K_0(C^*(M))$  is independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* First, suppose  $b > 0$ . Let  $(D_\pm, H_\pm, \theta_\pm) = ((\mathcal{D}_b)_\pm, \mathcal{H}_b, \mp b)$  be the abstract supercharge given in Cor. 2.6. The sequence  $(D_{n,\pm}, H_{n,\pm}, \theta_{n,\pm}) := (D_\pm, H_\pm, \mp b)$  satisfies the assumptions 1-2 of Prop. 1.6. Thus for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma(H_{n,+}) \subset (2b) \cdot \mathbb{N} + b = (2\mathbb{N} + 1)b$ . Furthermore, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(2m + 1)b$  is attained in  $\sigma(H_{n,+}) = \sigma(H_+)$  iff  $b$  is attained in  $\sigma(H_{n+m,+}) = \sigma(H_+)$ . Together with Lemma 2.5, this shows that the non-empty set  $\sigma(H_b) = \sigma(\mathcal{H}_b) = \sigma(H_+)$  must be the entire set  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)b$ . Prop. 1.6 also gives shows that each eigenprojection represents the same class  $\text{Ind}(D)$  in  $K_0(C^*(M))$ . The  $b < 0$  case is similar (see Remark 1.8).  $\square$

*Example 2.16.* For  $M$  the Euclidean plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$  are the famous *Landau levels* of  $H_b^{(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ . Each Landau level spectral projection represents a generator of  $K_0(C^*(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Example 2.17.* For  $M$  the cylinder  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  with product metric, we may modify the connection  $A$  by a flat connection with holonomy  $e^{ik}$  around  $S^1$ , but the resulting Landau operator spectrum remains  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ , independent of such choices. Although these Landau levels are “trivial” due to  $K_0(C^*(S^1 \times \mathbb{R})) = 0$ , we can think of  $H_b^{(\mathbb{R}^2)}$  as a lift to the universal cover, and the indices in  $K_0(C^*(\mathbb{R}^2))$  as the non-trivial “higher” indices for the Landau levels of  $H_b^{(S^1 \times \mathbb{R})}$ .

*Remark 2.18.* In [16], a similar result was obtained for  $M$  the hyperbolic plane, which has constant negative curvature. In this case, only finitely many Landau levels are isolated, with the precise number dependent on the size of  $|b|$  (see [4]).

### 2.3.3 Asymptotically constant field and asymptotically flat surface: essentially isolated Landau levels

Now assume that the magnetic field and scalar curvature are only asymptotically constant and asymptotically zero on  $M$ . By this, we mean that  $R, \Theta \in C_b^\infty(M)$  satisfy

$$\Theta = b + \Theta_{\text{pert}}, \quad R = R_{\text{pert}}, \quad \Theta_{\text{pert}}, R_{\text{pert}} \in C_0^\infty(M),$$

where  $C_0^\infty(M)$  denotes the smooth functions on  $M$  vanishing at infinity.

**Proposition 2.19.** *Let  $M$  be a noncompact complete Riemannian spin surface, which has scalar curvature  $R \in C_b^\infty(M)$  satisfying  $R = R_{\text{pert}} \in C_0^\infty(M)$ . Suppose*

the magnetic field  $\Theta \in C_b^\infty(M)$  has the form  $\Theta = b + \Theta_{\text{pert}}$ , with  $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\Theta_{\text{pert}} \in C_0^\infty(M)$ . Then  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\Theta) \subset (2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ , where  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}$  denotes the essential spectrum. If the Dirac coarse index  $\text{Ind}(D)$  is non-zero, then  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\Theta) = (2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume  $b > 0$ . The assumptions of Theorem 2.8 are satisfied by taking  $N$  to be a point. Note that  $C_M^*(N)$  is then isomorphic to the compact operators on  $L^2(M)$ , with  $K_0$ -group the integers. The inclusion  $K_0(C_M^*(N)) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M))$  is the zero map by Lemma 2.13, so  $\varpi_* : K_0(C^*(M)) \rightarrow K_0(C^*(M)/C_M^*(N))$  is injective, thus  $\varpi_* \text{Ind}(D)$  remains nonzero. Hence Prop. 1.6 may be applied, and we deduce that  $\sigma(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta)) = (2\mathbb{N} + 1)b$ . This is the spectrum of  $H_\Theta$  modulo compacts, namely, the essential spectrum of  $H_\Theta$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.20.* Prop. 2.19 recovers as a special case, the stability result with respect to  $\Theta_{\text{pert}}$  for  $M$  the Euclidean plane [11]. For the hyperbolic plane, a corresponding stability result [10] for the (finitely-many) hyperbolic Landau levels can be deduced with a modified bootstrap method as detailed in [16]. The stability of the Landau levels against *metric* perturbations  $R_{\text{pert}} \neq 0$  appears to be a new result.

### 3 Landau operators on helical surfaces

An instructive example of an  $M$  with  $R \notin C_0^\infty(M)$  is the helicoid  $X_c$ , which will occupy us for the rest of this paper.

#### 3.1 Embedded helicoids

The *helicoid*  $X_c$  with non-zero twisting parameter  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  is defined as the 2D submanifold of Euclidean  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ,

$$X_c = \{(r \cos c\phi, r \sin c\phi, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (r, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^2\},$$

oriented by  $dr \wedge d\phi$ , see Fig. 1. When  $c > 0$  (resp.  $c < 0$ ), the helicoid is right-handed (resp. left-handed).

While  $X_c$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , it is not isometric to a Euclidean plane, but only conformal to it. In *isothermal coordinates*  $(\rho, \phi)$  defined by

$$\rho = \frac{\sinh^{-1}(cr)}{c}, \quad \text{or} \quad r = \frac{\sinh(c\rho)}{c},$$

the metric tensor is

$$g_{\rho\rho} = g_{\phi\phi} = \cosh^2(c\rho), \quad g_{\rho\phi} = 0 = g_{\phi\rho}.$$

The volume form and scalar curvature are

$$\omega_c = \cosh^2(c\rho) d\rho \wedge d\phi, \quad R_c(\rho, \phi) = R_c(\rho) = -\frac{2c^2}{\cosh^4(c\rho)}.$$

Note that as  $c \rightarrow 0$ , the coordinate transformation reduces to  $\rho = r$ , and the above formulae become those of the Euclidean  $x$ - $z$  plane. We also have  $R_c \in C_b^\infty(X_c)$ .



### 3.1.1 Helicoid Landau operator for constant external field

On Euclidean  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , let  $B = b dx \wedge dy$  be the Faraday 2-form for an externally applied magnetic field along the  $z$ -direction with strength  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b \neq 0$ . Its restriction to  $X_c$  is easily computed to be

$$B|_{X_c}(r, \phi) = bcr dr \wedge d\phi = \underbrace{\frac{bcr}{\sqrt{1+c^2r^2}}}_{\Theta_B(r, \phi)} \omega_c = \underbrace{b \tanh(c\rho)}_{\Theta_B(\rho, \phi)} \omega_c. \quad (17)$$

Here, the scalar function  $\Theta_B$  is the *intrinsic* field strength on the helicoid, measured against the volume form  $\omega_c$  on  $X_c$ . Note that  $\Theta_B \in C_b^\infty(X_c)$ .

As  $\rho \rightarrow \pm\infty$ , the field strength becomes intrinsically constant,  $\Theta_B \rightarrow \pm b \cdot \text{sgn}(c)$ , whereas at  $\rho = 0$ , we have  $\Theta_B \rightarrow 0$ . Despite  $B$  being a constant field on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\Theta_B$  is far from constant on  $X_c$ , and is more like a “domain-wall” magnetic field.

## 3.2 Half-helicoid and screw dislocation

Let  $\mathring{\mathbb{R}}^2$  be the plane with a small disk of small radius  $r_0 > 0$  removed. The *half-helicoid*,

$$\begin{aligned} X_c^+ &:= \{(r \cos(c\phi), r \sin(c\phi), \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \geq r_0, \phi \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \{(r, \phi) \in X_c : r \geq r_0\}, \end{aligned}$$

is a universal cover of  $\mathring{\mathbb{R}}^2$ , embedded as a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *It models a surface with a screw dislocation along the  $z$ -axis*, see Fig. 1. The boundary  $\partial X_c^+$  is a helix parametrized by  $\phi$ .

### 3.2.1 Landau operator on screw dislocated surface

In the dislocation-free setting, we would have a family of parallel horizontal planes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , on which the constant external field  $B$  is also intrinsically constant (meaning that its restriction to the planes is a constant multiple of the volume form). These Euclidean planes’ Landau operator  $H_b^{(\mathbb{R}^2)}$  will have spectrum  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ , by Prop. 2.15. In physics language, such a “stacking” of 2D quantum Hall systems gives rise to a *weak* topological insulator in 3D.

On the screw dislocated surface  $X_c^+$ , the restriction of  $B$  is no longer intrinsically constant, but is instead given by Eq. (17),

$$\Theta_B(\rho, \phi) = b \tanh(c\rho), \quad \rho \geq \rho_0.$$

Consequently, we should study the Landau operator  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c^+)}$ , with the *non-constant* intrinsic field strength  $\Theta_B$ , rather than  $H_b^{(X_c^+)}$ .

**Definition 3.1.** The screw-dislocated Landau operator is the operator  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c^+)}$  on the half-helicoid  $X_c^+$ , made self-adjoint with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions.

### 3.2.2 Auxiliary “bulk” Landau operator on $X_c$ .

Note that  $\Theta_B$  is an *odd* extension of  $\Theta_B|_{X_c^+}$  to a function on  $X_c$ . It is actually more useful to consider as a fictitious field strength on  $X_c$ , a smooth *even* extension  $\Theta_{B,\text{ev}} \in C_b^\infty(X_c)$  of  $\Theta_B|_{X_c^+}$ , meaning that

$$\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}(\rho, \phi) = b \tanh(c|\rho|), \quad |\rho| > \rho_0, \quad (18)$$

because then the limits as  $\rho \rightarrow \pm\infty$  are both equal to  $b \cdot \text{sgn}(c)$ . The extension in the  $|\rho| < \rho_0$  region can be chosen arbitrarily. We shall think of  $H_{\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}}^{(X_c)}$  as the fictitious “bulk Landau operator” on the full helicoid  $X_c$ . Via a kind of *bulk-boundary correspondence*, we will be able to relate the spectrum of  $H_{\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}}^{(X_c)}$  with that of  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c^+)}$ .

### 3.3 Delocalized index for helicoid Landau operators

Because  $\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}$  and  $R_c$  are *not* asymptotically constant, we do not have isolated Landau levels even when considered inside the essential spectrum of  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c)}$  (Prop. 2.19 does not apply). Nevertheless, we at least have  $R_c$  vanishing away from the helix  $\partial X_c^+$ , and the field strength  $\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}$  can be considered a “horizontal perturbation” of the constant  $\text{sgn}(c) \cdot b$  in the following sense.

**Definition 3.2.** A *horizontally perturbed* field strength  $\Theta \in C_b^\infty(X_c)$  is one which differs from a constant by a  $\Theta_{\text{pert}}$  with  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \pm\infty} \Theta_{\text{pert}}(\rho, \phi) = 0$ .

We will apply Theorem 2.8 and Prop. 1.6 to  $M = X_c$  and  $N = \partial X_c^+$ . Thus, we analyze the localization exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+) \longrightarrow C^*(X_c) \xrightarrow{\varpi} C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (19)$$

The  $K$ -theory long exact sequence for (19) is

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \rightarrow \underbrace{K_0(C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+))}_0 \rightarrow \underbrace{K_0(C^*(X_c))}_{\mathbb{Z}} \xrightarrow{\varpi_*} K_0(C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \\ \rightarrow \underbrace{K_1(C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+))}_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \underbrace{K_0(C^*(X_c))}_0 \rightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

so that  $K_0(C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ . Here we used a general result that  $K_\bullet(C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \cong K_\bullet(C^*(\partial X_c^+))$ , and the observation that the helix  $\partial X_c^+$  is isometric to a Euclidean line. We also used the fact that  $K_0(C^*(X_c)) \cong K_0(X_c) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ , which follows from the coarse Baum–Connes conjecture being verified for  $X_c$ , since it is non-positively curved and simply-connected (Corollary 7.4 of [8]). Moreover, since the Dirac operator  $D$  on  $X_c$  represents the generator of  $K_0(X_c)$ , its coarse index  $\text{Ind}(D)$  is also a generator of  $K_0(C^*(X_c)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ . By the injectivity of  $\varpi_*$  obtained by the above exact sequence, we have verified that:

**Lemma 3.3.** *The quotient coarse index  $\varpi_*(\text{Ind}(D))$  of the helicoid Dirac operator is non-zero in  $K_0(C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+))$ .*

We now determine the spectrum of the helicoid Landau operator considered in the quotient Roe algebra  $C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)$ , generalizing Prop. 2.19.

**Theorem 3.4.** *For a horizontally perturbed field  $\Theta = b + \Theta_{\text{pert}}$ ,  $b \neq 0$ , the spectrum of  $\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})$  is  $(2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ . Moreover, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the class*

$$\left[ P_{(2n+1)|b|}(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})) \right] \in K_0(C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+))$$

*coincides, up to a possible sign, with the nonzero class  $\varpi_* \text{Ind}(D)$ , where  $\text{Ind}(D) \in K_0(C^*(X_c))$  is the coarse index of the Dirac operator on  $X_c$ .*

*Proof.* The helicoid curvature  $R_c$  and a horizontally perturbed field  $\Theta$  satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.8, for  $N = \partial X_c^+$ . This, together with Lemma 3.3, means that Prop. 1.6 applies, and the result follows immediately.  $\square$

*Remark 3.5.* Theorem 3.4 applies, in particular, to  $H_{\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}}^{(X_c)}$ . It makes precise the idea that the Landau levels  $(2n + 1)|b|$  still have a well-defined “delocalized index”  $[\varpi(P_{(2n+1)|b|}(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)}))]$ , despite these spectral values generally not being isolated in the full (or even essential) spectrum. In passing to the quotient algebra via  $\varpi$ , we have “discarded the spectral data localized near  $\partial X_c^+$ ”.

The projection  $P_{(2n+1)|b|}(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)}))$  of Theorem 3.4 can be obtained by continuous functional calculus as follows. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\varphi_n \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$  be a bump function for the  $n$ -th Landau level, in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n((2n + 1)|b|) &= 1, \\ \text{supp}(\varphi_n) &\subset ((2n - 1)|b|, (2n + 3)|b|). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Observe that  $\varphi_n$  may fail to be idempotent only within the gaps between the  $n$ -th Landau level and the adjacent ones. Since  $\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})$  only has spectrum at the Landau levels, we may write

$$P_{(2n+1)|b|}(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})) = \varphi_n(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)}))$$

for any choice of bump function above. Note that without passing to the quotient, the operator  $\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{X_c}) \in C^*(X_c)$  is not yet a projection, due to the possibly non-trivial support of  $\varphi_n^2 - \varphi_n$  in  $\sigma(H_\Theta^{X_c})$ . Rather, we have

$$\varpi(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{X_c})) = \varphi_n(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})) = P_{(2n+1)|b|}(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_\Theta^{(X_c)})) \in C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+). \quad (21)$$

## 4 Gaplessness of screw-dislocated Landau operator

The bulk helicoid Landau operator  $H_{\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}}^{(X_c)}$  will be related to the screw-dislocated Landau operator  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c^+)}$  (Definition 3.1) through a coarse Mayer–Vietoris sequence.

For ease of notation, we will simply write  $\Theta$  for  $\Theta_{B,\text{ev}}$  on the helicoid  $X_c$ , and also  $\Theta = \Theta_B = \Theta_B|_{X_c^+}$  on the half-helicoid  $X_c^+$ .

## 4.1 Coarse Mayer–Vietoris

Consider the partition  $X_c = X_c^+ \cup X_c^-$  where  $X_c^+$  is our half-helicoid surface and

$$X_c^- = \{(\rho, \phi) \in X_c : \rho \leq \rho_0\}.$$

The intersection  $X_c^+ \cap X_c^- = \partial X_c^+ = -\partial X_c^-$  is the helix  $\{\rho = \rho_0\}$ . The coarse Mayer–Vietoris (MV) sequence [9] for this (coarsely excisive) partition has boundary map

$$\partial_{\text{MV}} : K_0(C^*(X_c)) \xrightarrow{\cong} K_1(C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)), \quad (22)$$

which can be computed to be an isomorphism  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , as follows. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3 of [16], we just need the information that  $K_0(C^*(X_c)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $K_1(C^*(X_c)) \cong 0$  (Baum–Connes),  $K_0(C^*(\partial X_c^+)) \cong 0$ ,  $K_1(C^*(\partial X_c^+)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$  (isometry of  $\partial X_c^+$  with  $\mathbb{R}$ ), and the observation that the reflection  $\rho \mapsto -\rho$  induces an isomorphism  $K_\bullet(C^*(X_c^+)) \cong K_\bullet(C^*(X_c^-))$ ,  $\bullet = 0, 1$ .

The restriction map  $r : C^*(X_c) \rightarrow C^*(X_c^+)$  is a homomorphism up to terms in  $C^*(X_c^+)$  localized near the boundary  $\partial X_c^+$ . Thus we have a restriction morphism  $\tilde{r}$  to the quotient Roe algebra,

$$\tilde{r} : C^*(X_c) \rightarrow C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+),$$

which actually factors through  $\varpi$  (defined in Eq. (19)),

$$\tilde{r} : C^*(X_c) \xrightarrow{\varpi} C^*(X_c)/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+) \xrightarrow{\hat{r}} C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+). \quad (23)$$

There is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+) \rightarrow C^*(X_c^+) \xrightarrow{q} C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+) \rightarrow 0,$$

whose long exact sequence has a connecting map

$$\delta : K_0(C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \rightarrow K_1(C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \cong K_1(C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)). \quad (24)$$

This connecting map and the MV boundary map are related (Prop. 1.3 of [16]), by

$$\partial_{\text{MV}} = \delta \circ \tilde{r}_*. \quad (25)$$

Let  $\varphi_n$  be a bump function for the  $n$ -th Landau level, as in Eq. (20). The operators  $\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(X_c^+)})$  and  $r(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(X_c)}))$  are both elements of  $C^*(X_c^+)$ , and their difference is contained in the localized Roe algebra  $C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)$  (Lemma 1.7 of [16]). So by passing to quotients, we have an equality

$$\begin{aligned} q\left(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(X_c^+)})\right) &= \tilde{r}\left(\underbrace{\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(X_c)})}_{\text{non-projection}}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(23)}{=} \hat{r}\left(\underbrace{\varpi(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(X_c)}))}_{\text{projection by Eq. (21)}}\right) \in C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+) \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce that the left hand side is in fact a projection. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta[q(\varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}))] &= \delta \left[ \tilde{r} \left( \varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}) \right) \right] \\
&= \delta \left( \hat{r}_* \circ \varpi_* [\varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)})] \right) \\
&= \delta \circ \hat{r}_* \left[ P_{(2n+1)|b|} \left( \varpi(\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}) \right) \right] && \text{(Eq. (21))} \\
&= \pm \delta \circ \hat{r}_* \circ \varpi_*(\text{Ind}(D)) && \text{(Theorem 3.4)} \\
&= \pm \delta \circ \tilde{r}_*(\text{Ind}(D)) \\
&= \pm \partial_{\text{MV}}(\text{Ind}(D)) && \text{(Eq. (25))} \\
&\neq 0 \in K_1(C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)) && \text{(Eq. (22)), (26)}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is due to  $\text{Ind}(D)$  being a generator of  $K_0(C^*(X_c))$ .

## 4.2 Gap-filling argument

Now  $\varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)})$  cannot be a projection, otherwise exactness of the long exact sequence (i.e.  $\delta \circ q_* = 0$ ) will lead to the contradiction

$$0 = \delta \circ q_*[\varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)})] \stackrel{\text{Eq. (26)}}{\neq} 0.$$

Thus  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}$  must have some spectrum in the support of  $\varphi_n^2 - \varphi_n$ .

Consider the  $n = 0$  case first. The support of  $\varphi_0^2 - \varphi_0$  can be chosen to lie below the semibounded spectrum of  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}$ , and inside any subinterval of  $(|b|, 3|b|)$ , so spectra must appear in the latter subinterval. By varying the choice of subinterval, we see that the *entire* interval  $(|b|, 3|b|)$  must be filled with spectra of  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}$ , to successfully prevent  $\varphi_0(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)})$  from being a projection. This shows gap-filling for the interval between the 0-th and 1-st Landau levels.

For  $n \geq 1$ , consider  $\tilde{\varphi}_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \varphi_k$ , with the  $\varphi_k$  chosen to have disjoint supports. Then  $\varpi(\tilde{\varphi}_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}))$  is a direct sum of projections. By adding to  $\tilde{\varphi}_n$  a suitable supplementary function  $\psi_n$  supported within  $(|b|, (2n+1)|b|)$ , we can arrange for  $\tilde{\varphi}_n + \psi_n$  to have value 1 on the interval  $[|b|, (2n+1)|b|]$ . This extra  $\psi_n$  is supported away from the Landau levels, so  $\varpi(\psi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)})) = \psi_n(\varpi(\mathcal{H}_{\Theta}^{(X_c)})) = 0$  by Theorem 3.4. Thus  $\varpi((\tilde{\varphi}_n + \psi_n)(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)})) = \varpi(\tilde{\varphi}_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}))$  is left intact. Its  $K$ -theory class is again non-trivial (by additivity under direct sums), and we derive the same contradiction forbidding  $\tilde{\varphi}_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)})$  from being a projection. Now we deduce that the gap between the  $n$ -th and  $(n+1)$ -th Landau levels must be completely filled with spectra of  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}$ . By induction, we deduce our main result (restoring the subscript in  $\Theta_B$ ):

**Theorem 4.1.** *The screw-dislocated Landau operator  $H_{\Theta_B}^{(X_c^+)}$  (Definition, 3.1) has no gaps in its spectrum above the LLL  $|b|$ .*

*Remark 4.2.* The  $K_1$ -class  $\delta[q(\varphi_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}))]$ , which obstructs the existence of spectral gaps for  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}$ , has a more refined interpretation using the methods of [17] Section 6. Technically, this interpretation requires a polynomial growth condition, which is satisfied by helicoids. In brief, let  $X_c^{+, \uparrow} = \{(\rho, \phi) \in X_c^+ : \phi \geq 0\}$  be the upper-half of  $X_c^+$ , and  $X_c^{+, \downarrow}$  be the lower-half. Then there is a well-defined integer-valued map, Definition 4.6 of [17],

$$\theta_{X_c^{+, \uparrow}} : K_1(C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad [u] \mapsto \text{Index } T_u,$$

where  $T_u$  is the compression of the unitary  $u \in M_n(C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)^+)$  to  $X_c^{+, \uparrow}$ . When  $\theta_{X_c^{+, \uparrow}}$  is applied to the obstruction class  $\delta[q(\tilde{\varphi}_n(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}))]$ , the resulting integer has an interpretation as a quantized current channel flowing from  $X_c^{+, \uparrow}$  to  $X_c^{+, \downarrow}$ , provided by the generalized eigenstates of  $H_{\Theta}^{X_c^+}$  with energies lying within the gap between the  $n$ -th and  $(n+1)$ -th Landau levels. This channel receives no contribution from the “very delocalized” Landau levels, and may therefore be thought of as arising from gap-filling “helical edge states” localized near the boundary helix  $\partial X_c^+$ .

*Remark 4.3.* Much like the hyperbolic plane case analyzed in [16], the coarse geometry methods mean that the gaplessness result in Theorem 4.1 is very robust:

- The position  $\rho_0$  of the boundary helix is arbitrary. More generally, the geometry of the boundary  $\partial X_c^+$  can be significantly adjusted, as long as the coarse MV calculations remain intact. In particular, no  $\phi$ -translation symmetry is required of  $\partial X_c^+$ .
- The Dirichlet/Neumann boundary condition on  $\partial X_c^+$  can be generalized considerably, see Remark 1.8 of [16].
- The externally applied field  $B$  can be horizontally perturbed from a constant.
- A bounded confining potential which decays away from  $\partial X_c^+$  can be added, and treated as a perturbation in the same way as  $\Theta_{\text{pert}}$  was.
- The embedding of the helical surface  $X_c^+$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  can also be modified, as long as the resulting curvature and intrinsic field strength induced on  $X_c^+$  can be treated as a horizontal perturbation. In particular, the “twisting rate” parameter  $c \neq 0$  can be changed without destroying the gaplessness.

### 4.3 Comparison with a discrete model approach

The construction of a delocalized coarse index in §3.3 and the gap-filling argument of this section are parallel to the proof of the *bulk–dislocation correspondence* for *discrete* models of 3-dimensional topological insulators given by the first author [13]. That work dealt with a 3-dimensional discrete Hamiltonian operator  $H$  representing a so-called weak topological phase, acting on a lattice with screw dislocation (in other words, a certain discretization of the helical surface). More precisely, consider a periodic 3-dimensional type A topological insulator having non-trivial weak

topology in the  $xy$ -direction. If a screw dislocation is inserted along the  $z$ -axis into the configuration of atoms of the same material, then the spectral gap is filled by localized states near the  $z$ -axis.

This is proved in a similar way as Theorem 4.1. Indeed, in the “layered” case where  $H$  is the direct sum of countably infinite copies of a 2-dimensional topological insulator (thought of being stacked on top of one another), the corresponding screw-dislocated Hamiltonian, denoted by  $\tilde{H}$ , is viewed as an operator on the (discretized) half helicoid  $X_c^+$ . This  $\tilde{H}$  determines a self-adjoint element of  $C^*(X_c^+)$ , and its image in  $C^*(X_c^+)/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)$  has a spectral gap, as does  $H$ . A similar coarse Mayer–Vietoris argument as Eq. (26) shows that the connecting map (24) is non-trivial on a weak topological insulator invariant.

Although the ideas of our gap-filling argument and [13] are similar, there are some essential differences. First, [13] takes 3-dimensional (discrete model) Hamiltonians as input. Indeed, a 3-dimensional gapped Hamiltonian which is not layered (due to interaction terms between different layers) may be homotopic to a layered one. The gap-filling argument is applicable to such Hamiltonians as well. On the other hand, in the continuum setting, the direct sum of infinite layers of 2-dimensional Landau operators is not a continuum Hamiltonian on a 3-dimensional manifold.

Second, the lifting argument of operators, which is a central ingredient in [13], does not appear in this paper. Rather than starting from the operator  $H_\Theta^{(X_c)}$  on the helicoid, [13] first considers a Hamiltonian on (discretized)  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and then lifts it onto the (discretized) helicoid  $X_c^+$  modulo the  $z$ -axis. This lifting argument is realized at the Roe algebra level, by the  $*$ -homomorphism

$$s: C^*(|\mathbb{R}^2|) \rightarrow C^*(X_c^+)^{\mathbb{Z}}/C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)^{\mathbb{Z}},$$

which we called the codimension 2 transfer map.

## 5 Fourier transform approach

*Under a  $\phi$ -invariance assumption*, which is rather restrictive from the physical viewpoint, Theorem 4.1 can also be understood from a more functional analytic viewpoint, in terms of the spectral flow of catenoid Landau operators.

In the first instance, we now need to restrict to horizontally perturbed field strengths  $\Theta = b + \Theta_{\text{pert}}$  which are  $\phi$ -invariant, and work in the *Landau gauge*. The latter means that the connection 1-form  $A$  with curvature  $\Theta \cdot \omega_c$  has the form

$$A(\rho, \phi) = a_\phi(\rho) d\phi, \quad a_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}).$$

Explicitly, we take

$$a_\phi(\rho) = \int_0^\rho \Theta(\rho') \cosh^2(c\rho') d\rho'.$$

In this gauge, the helicoid Landau operator  $H_\Theta^{(X_c)} = (d - iA)^*(d - iA)$  is translation invariant in  $\phi$ .

## 5.1 Reduction to loop of catenoid Landau operators

Let  $\tau_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  denote the action of  $\mathbb{Z}$  on  $X_c$  by the deck transformations  $\tau_n : \phi \mapsto \phi + 2n\pi/|c|$ . The quotient of  $X_c$  by this action is the *catenoid*  $Y_c$ . Similarly the quotient of  $X_c^+$  is the half-catenoid  $Y_c^+$ , and the quotient of the boundary helix  $\partial X_c^+$  is a circle  $\partial Y_c^+$ .

The Fourier transform of  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}$ , with respect to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -action  $\tau$ , is a family of *catenoid* Landau operators labeled by the character  $e^{ik} : n \mapsto e^{ink}$ ,

$$H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)} \cong \int_{e^{ik} \in \mathbb{U}(1) = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}}^{\oplus} H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}). \quad (27)$$

As in Bloch–Floquet theory,  $H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})$  denotes the operator  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}$  acting on functions of  $X_c$  subject to quasiperiodic boundary conditions  $f(\phi + \frac{2\pi}{|c|}) = e^{ik} f(\phi)$ , with inner product given by that on a fundamental domain

$$U_c := \{(\rho, \phi) \in X_c \mid 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi/|c|\}. \quad (28)$$

Such an  $f$  can be viewed as a function on  $Y_c$ , but twisted by a flat line bundle with holonomy  $e^{ik}$ . To identify the Hilbert spaces  $L^2(Y_c; e^{ik})$  at each  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , we use the (singular) gauge transforms

$$\begin{aligned} u_k : L^2(Y_c; e^{ik}) &\rightarrow L^2(U_c) \\ u_k(f)(\rho, \phi) &= e^{-ik|c|\phi/2\pi} f(\rho, \phi). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$u_k H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}) u_k^* = \left( d - i \left( A - \frac{k|c|}{2\pi} d\phi \right) \right)^* \left( d - i \left( A - \frac{k|c|}{2\pi} d\phi \right) \right). \quad (29)$$

This identification will be used implicitly later on.

**Proposition 5.1.** *For  $\phi$ -invariant bounded magnetic fields  $\Theta(\rho, \phi) = \Theta(\rho)$ , the helicoid Landau Hamiltonian  $H_{\Theta}^{(X_c)}$  (in Landau gauge) depends norm-resolvent continuously on  $\Theta$ . Under the indentifications Eq. (29), the catenoid Landau Hamiltonians  $H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})$  depend norm-resolvent continuously on  $\Theta$  and  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, given any such  $\Theta$ , the resolvent difference*

$$(H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik'}) + 1)^{-1} - (H_{\Theta}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}) + 1)^{-1}$$

*is compact, for all  $k, k' \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Theta = \Theta(\rho)$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant magnetic field. We start with the helicoid case. The connection form in Landau gauge is  $A(\rho) = a_{\phi}(\rho)d\phi$ , with  $a_{\phi}(\rho) = \int_0^{\rho} \Theta(\rho') \cosh^2(c\rho') d\rho'$ . Note that  $a_{\phi}$  is not generally bounded. Nevertheless, write  $\nu^{-1} = \cosh(c\rho)$  for the conformal factor, and  $\theta = \|\Theta\|_{\infty}$  for the supremum-norm of  $\Theta$ . Calculate

$$|\nu a_{\phi}(\rho)| \leq \frac{1}{\cosh(c\rho)} \int_0^{\rho} \theta \cosh^2(c\rho') d\rho' = \frac{\theta}{2 \cosh(c\rho)} \left( \rho + \frac{\sinh(2c\rho)}{2c} \right).$$



Since the function of  $\rho$  on the right hand side is bounded, we see that  $\nu a_\phi$  is bounded by some multiple of  $\theta$ .

Recall that  $H_\Theta = -\nu^2(\partial_{\phi,A}^2 + \partial_{\rho,A}^2)$ . On  $C_c^\infty(X_c)$ , the conformally scaled partial derivative,  $-i\nu\partial_\phi$ , is symmetric with respect to the inner product on  $L^2(X_c)$ , and so is its covariant version  $-i\nu\partial_{\phi,A}$  in the Landau gauge. In contrast, the covariant derivative  $-i\nu\partial_\rho = -i\nu\partial_{\rho,A}$  is not symmetric (observe that  $\partial_\rho = \partial_{\rho,A}$  in the Landau gauge). However, the quadratic term  $-\nu^2\partial_\rho^2$  is positive-definite, as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f | -\nu^2\partial_\rho^2 f \rangle_{L^2(X_c)} &= - \int \overline{f(\rho, \phi)} \operatorname{sech}^2(c\rho) \partial_\rho^2 f(\rho, \phi) \cosh^2(c\rho) d\rho d\phi \\ &= - \int \overline{f(\rho, \phi)} \partial_\rho^2 f(\rho, \phi) d\rho d\phi \\ &= \int \overline{\partial_\rho f(\rho, \phi)} \partial_\rho f(\rho, \phi) d\rho d\phi \\ &= \int |\partial_\rho f(\rho, \phi)|^2 d\rho d\phi \geq 0, \quad f \in C_c^\infty(X_c). \end{aligned}$$

So, for  $f \in C_c^\infty(X_c)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| -i\nu\partial_{\phi,A} f \|_{L^2(X_c)}^2 &= \langle f | \nu^2\partial_{\phi,A}^2 f \rangle_{L^2(X_c)} \\ &\leq \langle f | H_\Theta f \rangle_{L^2(X_c)} \\ &\leq \langle f | (H_\Theta + 1) f \rangle_{L^2(X_c)} \\ &= \| (H_\Theta + 1)^{1/2} f \|_{L^2(X_c)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the bounded operator  $\nu\partial_{\phi,A}(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1/2}$ , hence also  $\nu\partial_{\phi,A}(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}$ , can be constructed uniquely, with norm at most 1.

Now consider two such magnetic fields  $\Theta'$ ,  $\Theta$  and respective Landau gauge connections  $A'$ ,  $A$ . The difference of the Landau Hamiltonians, on their common core  $C_c^\infty(X_c)$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\Theta'} - H_\Theta &= -\nu^2((\partial_\phi - ia'_\phi)^2 - (\partial_\phi - ia_\phi)^2) \\ &= -\nu^2(-2i(a'_\phi - a_\phi)\partial_\phi - ((a'_\phi)^2 - a_\phi^2)) \\ &= \nu^2(2i(a'_\phi - a_\phi)\partial_{\phi,A} + (a'_\phi - a_\phi)^2) \\ &= 2i(\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi))\nu\partial_{\phi,A} + (\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the resolvent difference is

$$\begin{aligned} (H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} - (H_{\Theta'} + 1)^{-1} &= (H_{\Theta'} + 1)^{-1}(H_{\Theta'} - H_\Theta)(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} \\ &= 2i(H_{\Theta'} + 1)^{-1}(\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi))\nu\partial_{\phi,A}(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1} \\ &\quad + (H_{\Theta'} + 1)^{-1}(\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi))^2(H_\Theta + 1)^{-1}, \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

not just formally, but on all of  $L^2(X_c)$  by the earlier discussion. Now if  $\Theta' - \Theta$  is small in sup-norm, then so is  $\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi)$ , and we conclude that the resolvent difference is likewise small.

For the catenoid case, with the identification Eq. (29), there is an additional bounded term  $\frac{k|c|}{2\pi} d\phi$  in the connection form  $a_\phi$ . This extra term does not spoil the boundedness of  $\nu a_\phi$ . All the arguments leading to Eq. (30) hold in the same way, with  $H_\Theta, H_{\Theta'}$  now referring to  $H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}), H_{\Theta'}^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik'})$ . So if  $\Theta', \Theta$  are close in sup-norm and  $k', k$  are close, then  $\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi)$  is small, and the resolvent difference is again small. In particular, if  $\Theta' = \Theta$ , then  $\nu(a'_\phi - a_\phi) = \nu(k' - k)\frac{|c|}{2\pi}$  vanishes at infinity. Since  $(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}) + 1)^{-1}$  is locally compact, the resolvent difference, Eq. (30), is actually compact.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $\Theta$  be a  $\phi$ -invariant bounded magnetic field. Under the Fourier transform (27), the operator  $\varphi(H_\Theta^{(X_c)})$  becomes a continuous loop*

$$\widehat{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathbf{U}(1) \ni e^{ik} \mapsto \varphi\left(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})\right) \in C^*(Y_c).$$

*Proof.* Due to Prop. 5.1, for  $k \in [0, 2\pi]$ , the path  $k \mapsto u_k H_\Theta^{Y_c}(e^{ik}) u_k^*$  is norm-resolvent continuous, and so  $k \mapsto u_k(\varphi_n^2 - \varphi_n)(H_\Theta^{Y_c}(e^{ik})) u_k^* \in C^*(Y_c)$  is norm-continuous. Conjugate by the continuous path of unitaries  $k \mapsto u_k^*$  (in the multiplier algebra of  $C^*(Y_c)$ ), so the endpoint operators are identified, and then we obtain a continuous loop.  $\square$

Let

$$\varpi' : \mathcal{B}(L^2(Y_c)) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c)) := \mathcal{B}(L^2(Y_c))/\mathcal{K}(L^2(Y_c))$$

be the quotient map to the Calkin algebra.

**Lemma 5.3.** *For any horizontally perturbed field  $\Theta$ , and any bump function  $\varphi_n$  for the  $n$ -th Landau level (Eq. (20)), the family  $\{\varpi'(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})))\}_{e^{ik} \in \mathbf{U}(1) = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}}$  defines a projection in  $C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c))$ .*

*Proof.* First, note that  $\Theta_{\text{pert}}$  and  $R_c$  are  $C_0^\infty(Y_c)$  functions, so Prop. 2.19 applies. Namely,  $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})) \subset (2\mathbb{N} + 1)|b|$ , so that it does not meet the support of  $\varphi_n^2 - \varphi_n$ . Therefore, each  $(\varphi_n^2 - \varphi_n)(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik}))$  is at most finite-rank. Thus, each  $\varpi'(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})))$  is a projection in  $\mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c))$ , with continuous dependence on  $e^{ik}$  due to Corollary 5.2. Thus we obtain a projection

$$\{\varpi'(\varphi_n(H_\Theta^{(Y_c)}(e^{ik})))\}_{e^{ik} \in \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} \in C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c)). \quad (31)$$

$\square$

## 5.2 Invariant Roe algebras

In the  $\phi$ -invariant setting, we only need to work in the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -invariant Roe algebra  $C^*(X_c)^\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *We have isomorphisms*

$$C^*(X_c)^{\mathbb{Z}} \cong C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes C^*(Y_c) \cong C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes C^*(Y_c), \quad (32)$$

where  $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z})$  denotes the reduced group  $C^*$ -algebra for  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* The second isomorphism in Eq. (32) comes from the Fourier transform  $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \cong C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ , while the first isomorphism arises from the decomposition  $L^2(X_c) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes L^2(Y_c)$ , as follows. With the fundamental domain  $U_c$  as in Eq. (28), write  $\Pi_n$  for the projection onto  $L^2(U_c + 2n\pi/|c|)$ . Since the subspaces  $\Pi_n L^2(X_c)$  are identified by shift unitaries  $S^n$ , we get unitary isomorphisms

$$L^2(X_c) \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Pi_n L^2(X_c) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes L^2(U_c).$$

A  $\mathbb{Z}$ -invariant locally compact operator  $T \in B(L^2(X_c))$  with finite propagation is decomposed into an infinite sum

$$T = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Pi_{m+n} T \Pi_m \right) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} S^n \otimes T_n \in B(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes L^2(U_c)),$$

where  $T_n := S^{-n} \Pi_n T \Pi_0 \in B(L^2(U_c))$ . This says that we have the tensor product decomposition  $\mathbb{C}[X_c] \cong \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[U_c]$  compatible with  $L^2(X_c) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes L^2(U_c)$ , where  $\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset B(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}))$  denotes the group algebra of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . By taking the  $C^*$ -algebra closure, we obtain

$$C^*(X_c)^{\mathbb{Z}} \cong C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes C^*(U_c) \cong C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes C^*(Y_c). \quad \square$$

The isomorphism Eq. (32) also applies to the localized Roe algebras,

$$C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)^{\mathbb{Z}} \cong C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes C_{Y_c}^*(\partial Y_c^+) = C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{K}(L^2(Y_c)).$$

This says that  $C^*(X_c)^{\mathbb{Z}}/C_{X_c}^*(\partial X_c^+)^{\mathbb{Z}}$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c))$  on which  $\varpi'$  given in Eq. (31) coincides with  $\varpi$  given in Eq. (19).

The isomorphism

$$\partial: K_0(C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(L^2(Y_c))) \rightarrow K_1(C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{K}(L^2(Y_c))) \cong \mathbb{Z}$$

is given by the spectral flow of self-adjoint Fredholm operators [19]. Hence the spectral gap filling at  $\mu \in ((2n-1)|b|, (2n+1)|b|)$ , proved in Theorem 4.1, is now understood as the spectral flow of catenoid Landau operators across  $\mu$ , and the number of eigenvalues crossing  $\mu$  is measured by the  $K_0$ -class of the spectral projection  $\sum_{2k+1 < \mu} \varpi'(\varphi_k(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)})$ ). Eq. (26) shows that

$$\partial \left[ \sum_{2k+1 < \mu} \varpi'(\varphi_k(H_{\Theta}^{(X_c^+)}) \right] = \pm n \in K_1(C(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \otimes \mathcal{K}(L^2(Y_c))) \cong \mathbb{Z},$$

since  $\partial_{\text{MV}}(\text{Ind}(D))$  is a generator of  $K_1(C_{X_c^+}^*(\partial X_c^+)^{\mathbb{Z}})$ .

## Acknowledgements

Y.K. acknowledges support from RIKEN iTHEMS and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 19K14544, JP17H06461 and JPMJCR19T2. M.L. acknowledges support from SFB 1085 “Higher invariants” of the DFG. G.C.T. acknowledges support from Australian Research Council DP200100729.

## Data Availability

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

## References

- [1] Avron, J.E., Seiler, R., Simon, B.: Charge deficiency, charge transport and comparison of dimensions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **159** 399–422 (1994)
- [2] Bellissard, J., van Elst, A., Schulz-Baldes, H.: The noncommutative geometry of the quantum Hall effect. *J. Math. Phys.* **35** 5373 (1994)
- [3] Cheeger, J., Gromov, M., Taylor, M.: Finite propagation speed, kernel estimates for functions of the Laplace operator, and the geometry of complete Riemannian manifolds. *J. Diff. Geom.* **17** 15–54 (1982)
- [4] Comtet, A., Houston, J.: Effective action on the hyperbolic plane in a constant external field. *J. Math. Phys.* **26**(1) 185–191 (1985)
- [5] Cooper, F., Khare, A., Sukhatme, U.: Supersymmetry and quantum mechanics. *Phys. Reports* **251**(5–6) 267–385 (1995)
- [6] Halperin, B.I.: Quantized Hall conductance, current-carrying edge states, and the existence of extended states in a two-dimensional disordered potential. *Phys. Rev. B* **25** 2185 (1982)
- [7] Higson, N., Roe, J.: *Analytic K-homology*, Oxford Math. Monogr., Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2000
- [8] Higson, N., Roe, J.: On the coarse Baum–Connes conjecture. In: Ferry, S., Ranicki, A., Rosenberg, J. (Eds.), *Novikov Conjectures, Index Theorems, and Rigidity* (London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Series, pp. 227–254), Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995
- [9] Higson, N., Roe, J., Yu, G.: A coarse Mayer–Vietoris principle. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **114** 85–97 (1993)
- [10] Inahama, Y., Shirai, S.: The essential spectrum of Schrödinger operators with asymptotically constant magnetic fields on the Poincaré upper-half plane. *J. Math. Phys.* **44**(1) 89–106 (2003)
- [11] Iwatsuka, A.: The essential spectrum of two-dimensional Schrödinger operators with perturbed constant magnetic fields. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **23**(3) 475–480 (1983)

- [12] Kasparov, G.G.: Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules: Theorems of Stinespring and Voiculescu. *J. Operator Theory* **4**(1) 133–150 (1980)
- [13] Kubota, Y.: The bulk-dislocation correspondence for weak topological insulators on screw-dislocated lattices. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54** 364001 (2021)
- [14] Lance, E.C.: Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules, A toolkit for operator algebraists. London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Series 210, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995
- [15] Landau, L.D.: Diamagnetism of Metals. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **64**(9-10) 629–637 (1930)
- [16] Ludewig, M., Thiang, G.C.: Gaplessness of Landau Hamiltonians on hyperbolic half-planes via coarse geometry. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **386** 87–106 (2021)
- [17] Ludewig, M., Thiang, G.C.: Cobordism invariance of topological edge-following states. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* (to appear), arXiv:2001.08339
- [18] Möller, M.: On the Essential Spectrum of a Class of Operators in Hilbert Space. *Math. Nachr.* **194** 185–196 (1998)
- [19] Phillips, J.: Self-adjoint Fredholm operators and spectral flow. *Canad. Math. Bull.* **39** (4) 460–467 (1996)
- [20] Ran, Y., Zhang, Y., Vishwanath, A.: One-dimensional topologically protected modes in topological insulators with lattice dislocations. *Nature Phys.* **5** 298–303 (2009)
- [21] Reed, M., Simon, B.: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol. 1*, Acad. Press, San Diego, 1980
- [22] Roe, J.: *Index Theory, Coarse Geometry, and Topology of Manifolds*. CBMS Regional Conf. Series in Math., vol 90, 1996
- [23] Shubin, M.: Essential Self-Adjointness for Semi-bounded Magnetic Schrödinger Operators on Non-compact Manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.* **186** 92–116 (2001)
- [24] Thaller, B.: *The Dirac Equation*. Texts Monogr. Phys. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1992
- [25] Thouless, D.J., Kohmoto, M., Nightingale, M.P., den Nijs, M.: Quantized Hall Conductance in a Two-Dimensional Periodic Potential. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** 405 (1982)
- [26] Trout, J.: On graded K-theory, elliptic operators and the functional calculus. *Illinois J. Math.* **44**(2) 294–309 (2000)
- [27] von Klitzing, K., Dorda, G., Pepper, M.: New Method for High-Accuracy Determination of the Fine-Structure Constant Based on Quantized Hall Resistance. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** 494 (1980)