

BALLISTIC TRANSPORT FOR LIMIT-PERIODIC SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS IN ONE DIMENSION

GIORGIO YOUNG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider the transport properties of the class of limit-periodic continuum Schrödinger operators whose potentials are approximated exponentially quickly by a sequence of periodic functions. For such an operator H and $X_H(t)$ the Heisenberg evolution of the position operator, we show the limit of $\frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ exists and is nonzero for $\psi \neq 0$ belonging to a dense subspace of initial states which are sufficiently regular and of suitably rapid decrease. This is viewed as a particularly strong form of ballistic transport, and this is the first time it has been proven in a continuum almost periodic non-periodic setting. In particular, this statement implies that for the initial states considered, the second moment grows quadratically in time.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a bounded function $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we consider the Schrödinger operator H defined by the expression

$$H := -\frac{d}{dx^2} + V$$

with domain $\text{Dom}(H) = H^2(\mathbb{R})$, where $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ is the familiar Sobolev space of twice weakly differentiable functions with second derivative in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. H is a bounded-operator perturbation of $H_0 := -\frac{d}{dx^2}$, $\text{Dom}(H_0) = H^2(\mathbb{R})$, and is thus an unbounded self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

In this paper, we study the quantum evolution corresponding to H described by the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = H\psi, \quad \psi(0) = \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \tag{1.1}$$

for H a Schrödinger operator as defined above. Since H is self adjoint, one may use the functional calculus to define e^{-itH} , which forms a strongly continuous one-parameter unitary group, and find the solution $e^{-itH}\psi$ to (1.1). From this expression and the associated machinery, one can describe the dynamics of the equation.

We will be particularly interested in the transport properties of solutions to (1.1) for H in a particular class of limit-periodic operators. To be more precise, we will need to introduce some objects used to describe transport. The position operator X is the unbounded operator defined as

$$(X\psi)(x) = x\psi(x), \quad \text{Dom}(X) := \{\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : x\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})\},$$

and for a Schrödinger operator H , the Heisenberg evolution of the position operator X is defined as

$$X_H(t) := e^{itH} X e^{-itH}.$$

G.Y. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1745670.

For $p > 0$ and suitably localized states φ , the moments are defined by

$$|X|_\varphi^p(t) := \||X|^{p/2} e^{-itH} \varphi\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^p |(e^{-itH} \varphi)(x)|^2 dx,$$

and the transport exponents are

$$\beta_\varphi^+(p) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |X|_\varphi^p(t)}{p \log t}, \quad \beta_\varphi^-(p) := \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |X|_\varphi^p(t)}{p \log t},$$

measuring the growth of the moments in time on a power law scale.

In the continuum setting, ballistic transport is often described as quadratic growth of the second moment for a dense set of suitably localized and regular initial states. For the operators we consider, this will follow from our main theorem. Namely, we show

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} X_H(t) \psi = Q \psi, \quad Q \psi \neq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

for $\psi \neq 0$ in a subset of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ which contains the Schwartz functions. This condition is the strong form of ballistic transport referenced in the title; indeed, from (1.2), one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^2} |X|_\psi^2(t) = \|Q \psi\|^2 > 0,$$

which in turn implies $\beta_\psi^\pm(2) = 1$ for these ψ .

There is a relationship between transport properties and the spectral theory for Schrödinger operators. More qualitatively, the connection between spectral type and transport is seen through the RAGE theorem [7, 29]. More quantitative results illustrating this connection are also available. For example, it is known that Schrödinger operators with pure point spectrum satisfy

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^2} |X|_\varphi^2(t) = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

for all φ of compact support [31], which is described there as the absence of ballistic motion. Especially relevant to this paper are works of Guarneri, Combes and Last [6, 12, 13, 21]. In particular, the Guarneri-Combes-Last theorem [21] implies that, in one dimension and in the presence of absolutely continuous spectrum, there is transport in a quantitative sense. One may define the spectral measure corresponding to a state $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and a self adjoint operator H to be the unique positive finite Borel measure μ_φ on \mathbb{R} such that for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle \varphi, (H - z)^{-1} \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{x - z} d\mu_\varphi(x).$$

Then, the Guarneri-Combes-Last theorem implies that in one dimension, and for states φ whose spectral measures have a nonzero absolutely continuous part, an averaged ballistic lower bound holds: there exists a φ dependent constant C such that

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |X|_\varphi^2(t) dt \geq CT^2. \tag{1.4}$$

It is not yet known, however, whether in one dimension, μ_φ having a nonzero absolutely continuous part is enough to imply $\beta_\varphi^\pm(2) = 1$. We note this is known to be false in higher dimensions [14, 19], and work in higher dimensions often seeks to show averaged ballistic lower bounds of the form (1.4). Recent work in two dimensions shows such a lower bound holds for a dense set of initial states for the class of limit-periodic operators whose potentials are approximated exponentially quickly, and for certain class of quasi-periodic operators [17], both of which are known to have absolutely continuous

spectrum. Typically, showing the quantitative characterizations of transport beyond the scope of the Guarneri-Combes-Last theorem requires model dependent methods. To better contextualize our results, we will focus our discussion on non-time averaged results in one-dimensional, almost periodic models.

Given the relationship described above and the diverse spectral properties of almost periodic operators [30], it is perhaps not surprising that the transport properties for these operators is similarly varied. In [1, 8], strong ballistic transport is shown for periodic continuum Schrödinger operators and (block) Jacobi matrices respectively, both of which are well known to have absolutely continuous spectrum. Specifically, in [1], (1.2) is shown for a dense subspace of suitably regular and localized states ψ . Meanwhile in [8], the corresponding notion of strong ballistic transport in the discrete setting is shown to hold. Namely, they prove strong resolvent convergence of the operators $\frac{1}{t}X_H(t)$ to an operator with trivial kernel, and use this to show $\beta_\varphi^\pm(p) = 1$ for $p > 0$ and another dense set of φ . On the other hand, in [3, 4, 10, 32], certain quasi-periodic operators are shown to exhibit pure point spectrum, and in fact Anderson localization. As we noted above, pure point spectrum implies the absence of ballistic motion as described by (1.3).

However, ballistic transport is often hoped for in classes of one dimensional almost periodic operators which are known to have absolutely continuous spectrum. There have been a number of recent results showing ballistic transport for such operators, which we summarize briefly. The paper [9] is the main inspiration for our work. In that paper, Fillman shows that limit-periodic Jacobi matrices which are exponentially quickly approximated exhibit strong ballistic transport. There have also been results in the setting of quasi-periodic operators, particularly those with “small,” analytic potentials, which often have purely absolutely continuous spectrum. In Kachkovskiy’s work in the discrete setting [16], what is described there as “frequency-averaged strong ballistic transport” is shown for a large class of these operators; in particular, this implies strong ballistic transport along a subsequence of time scales and for almost every frequency. The works of Zhao [34, 35], in both the discrete and continuous setting show that for diophantine frequencies and small enough potentials, the second moment grows quadratically; a weaker notion of transport than that of [16] which, however, holds without passing to a subsequence of times and a full measure set.

Subsequently, a paper of Zhang and Zhao [33] explicitly linked the values of the transport exponents and absolutely continuous spectrum in the setting of discrete one frequency quasi-periodic operators. They find $\beta_\varphi^\pm(p) = 1$ for suitably localized states $\varphi \neq 0$ and almost every frequency whenever the operator has purely absolutely continuous spectrum. Finally, there is the recent work of Kachkovskiy and Ge [11], which proves a form of ballistic transport not quite as strong as the strong ballistic transport referenced above, but sufficient to deduce that the second moment grows at least linearly. Their results hold for a broad class of discrete quasi-periodic operators.

This paper contributes to the limit-periodic literature. We find this strong form of ballistic transport for a class of continuum limit-periodic operators known to have absolutely continuous spectrum. These results may be viewed as a continuous extension of the main result of [9], or as a one dimensional analog of [17][Theorem 1.2]. However, we note that the ballistic transport found in [17] is time averaged, and while our results hold for states of rapid enough decrease and sufficient regularity, the initial states considered there are further restricted.

To introduce our results, we define the class of limit-periodic operators considered. A limit-periodic operator is one with a potential that is a limit-periodic function, i.e. there is a sequence of p_n periodic functions V_n with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|V - V_n\|_\infty = 0.$$

where here and throughout the paper $\|V\|_\infty$ denotes the essential supremum of the function V . It is a standard fact for limit-periodic functions that the potentials can be chosen so that $p_{n+1}/p_n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define those operators whose potentials are approximated exponentially quickly by the above sequence, or are in “exponential class η ,” as follows.

Definition 1.1. Let $\eta > 0$. A limit-periodic Schrödinger operator H is said to be of exponential class η if there is a sequence of p_n periodic functions V_n such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\eta p_{n+1}} \|V_n - V\|_\infty = 0$$

where $p_{n+1}/p_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p_n \neq p_{n+1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say $H \in EC(\infty)$ if H is of exponential class η for any $\eta > 0$.

The class $EC(\infty)$ is well studied, beginning with work of Pastur and Tkachenko [24] and Chulaevskii [5]. Despite the varied spectral properties of limit-periodic operators generally, this class does behave similarly to periodic operators in important ways. In particular, like periodic operators, members of this class are known to have absolutely continuous spectrum [2, 5, 23, 24, 25]. However, the spectrum of operators in $EC(\infty)$ is also generically nowhere dense and perfect, i.e. a Cantor type set [2, 5, 23, 24, 25, 30]. As we have noted, the former of these properties is of particular interest given the thesis of this paper.

We are now ready to state our results precisely. We will make use of the following subspace of L^2 defined for a given $s > 0$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_s := \{\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s) : \psi' \in L^1(\mathbb{R}), \psi'' \in \text{Dom}(|X|^s)\}$$

where $\text{Dom}(|X|^s) := \{\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) : |x|^s \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})\}$. The subspace \mathcal{D}_s will allow us to optimize certain statements in terms of the regularity and decay of the initial states considered. Of course, \mathcal{D}_s contains the Schwartz functions, and is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. We prove the following.

Theorem 1.2. *For each $R > 0$, there is a constant $\eta = \eta(R)$ such that if $H \in EC(\eta)$ and $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$, then for each $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$ with $s > 2$, there is a $Q\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, with*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} X_H(t)\psi = Q\psi. \tag{1.5}$$

Furthermore, $Q\psi \neq 0$ for $\psi \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^2} |X|_\psi^2(t) = \|Q\psi\|^2 \neq 0 \tag{1.6}$$

and $\beta_\psi^\pm(2) = 1$. In particular, if $H \in EC(\infty)$, (1.5), (1.6) and $\beta_\psi^\pm(2) = 1$ hold for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$, $s > 2$.

Before proceeding to the proofs of the above, we make some comments on the methodology and organization of the paper. The overall strategy of this paper is based on that of Fillman in the discrete setting [9]. However, in addition to the technical difficulties which arise naturally when dealing with unbounded operators, new arguments and techniques are required in key places. We briefly highlight a few of these difficulties here. As in [9], a critical step is to establish a quantitative version of the convergence result (1.2) for periodic operators; this is the content of our Theorem 3.1. This quantitative estimate is found by bounding a normed difference given by an integral over quasimomenta in the Brillouin zone, and in particular, partitioning the Brillouin zone into two time dependent sets; one “good” set on which we have decay in time for a quantity which appears in the integral, and another “bad” set which must have Lebesgue measure which decays in time at a sufficient rate. The estimate uniform in the quasimomenta needed to complete this step in [9] is found using the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the operators involved, which are finite

matrices for each quasimomentum. In our setting, the analogous operators are unbounded, and this step is performed by leveraging the regularity of the initial states considered to perform some resolvent manipulations and use the minmax theorem. Since this estimate is applied to a sequence of operators with uniformly bounded potentials, and we are interested in their limit, it is also important that the estimate depend on this uniform bound, rather than the individual potential; this is also more delicate in our setting. Furthermore, the estimate on the measure of the “bad” set in [9] takes advantage of an explicit finite product formula for a derivative. While in the continuum setting, there is a product formula, this product is over infinitely many terms in the infinite gap setting. To use the same technique, one must find a bound uniform in the energy for this same product with a term excluded, multiplied by a term which grows at least as quickly as the band lengths along a sequence of energies.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some estimates on the Hill discriminant for a periodic operator, culminating in the estimate on the Lebesgue measure of the “bad” set of quasimomenta. The quantitative version of the convergence result of [1] and some auxiliary uniform estimates mentioned above are in section 3. The control given by this theorem will allow us to extract the $Q\psi$ of Theorem 1.2 for a limit-periodic operator as a limit of the associated quantity for the periodic approximants, and show that $Q\psi \neq 0$; this argument is found in section 4. The appendix contains estimates on the expectation value of powers of the position operator with careful control of the constants.

2. PERIODIC OPERATORS AND HILL DISCRIMINANT ESTIMATES

In order to study limit-periodic Schrödinger operators, we must first introduce some of the Floquet-Bloch theory for periodic operators, which will also serve to fix our notation; [2, 20, 28] all serve as helpful references for what follows. Fundamental to this theory is the Floquet transform and direct integral decomposition. We take $\Gamma^* = \frac{2\pi}{p}\mathbb{Z}$ to be the dual lattice corresponding to the lattice $\Gamma = p\mathbb{Z}$, define the tori

$$\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\Gamma, \quad \mathbb{T}^* = \mathbb{R}/\Gamma^*$$

where we refer to $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ as the quasimomentum. When needed, we will fix as a fundamental domain or Brilluoin zone for Γ^* the Voronoi cell, $\mathcal{B} := \left(-\frac{\pi}{p}, \frac{\pi}{p}\right]$. Then, we define the constant fiber direct integral

$$L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^*, \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}; L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)\right) = \left\{ f : \mathbb{T}^* \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq); \int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)}^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} < \infty \right\}$$

as well as the Floquet transform:

$$U : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^*, \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}; L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)\right) =: \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}$$

given pointwise by

$$U\psi(k, q) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q + p\ell) \tag{2.1}$$

on Schwartz functions ψ , and extended to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ by boundedness. The Floquet transform is unitary.

Fix a p -periodic $V \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, the Floquet transform conjugates the Schrodinger operator $H = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V$ with domain $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ to a direct integral of the operators

$$H(k) = (D + k)^2 + V, \quad \text{Dom}(H(k)) = H^2(\mathbb{T})$$

where $D = -i\frac{d}{dx}$. Symbolically,

$$UHU^* = \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} H(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}.$$

Each of the $H(k)$ is a bounded-operator perturbation of the operator

$$H_0(k) := (D + k)^2, \quad \text{Dom}(H_0(k)) = H^2(\mathbb{T}),$$

and thus has a compact resolvent and admits the eigenfunction expansion

$$H(k) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(k) P_n(k)$$

where $E_n(k)$ are the eigenvalues of $H(k)$ listed in increasing order, and $P_n(k)$ project orthogonally onto the associated eigenspaces. For $k \in \mathcal{B}$, $H(k)$ and $H(-k)$ are antiunitarily equivalent, so that $E_n(k) = E_n(-k)$, and each $E_n(k)$ is analytic on $(0, \frac{\pi}{p})$ and continuous at the endpoints, with $(-1)^{n+1} \frac{dE_n}{dk} > 0$ on this interval.

Using the direct integral theory and the properties of the $E_n(k)$ outlined above, the spectrum of H can be shown to have a “band” structure:

$$\sigma(H) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} [\lambda_{2j}, \lambda_{2j+1}]$$

where $\lambda_{2j} < \lambda_{2j+1}$ and the intervals $[\lambda_{2j}, \lambda_{2j+1}]$ are referred to as “bands.” These bands are parametrized by the eigenvalues $E_n(k)$. Namely,

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{2j} = E_{j+1}(0), \lambda_{2j+1} = E_{j+1}\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right) & j \text{ even} \\ \lambda_{2j} = E_{j+1}\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right), \lambda_{2j+1} = E_{j+1}(0) & j \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

In the one dimensional setting, we have access to the discriminant, an important tool in the theory. For $u_1(z, x)$ and $u_2(z, x)$ the Neumann and Dirichlet solutions to the differential equation $-u'' + Vu = zu$; $u_1'(z, 0) = u_2(z, 0) = 0$ and $u_1(z, 0) = u_2'(z, 0) = 1$, the monodromy matrix is defined by

$$M(z) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(z, p) & u_2(z, p) \\ u_1'(z, p) & u_2'(z, p) \end{pmatrix}$$

where the derivatives in the above are taken with respect to x . Then the discriminant is defined as

$$\Delta(z) = \text{tr } M(z) = u_1(z, p) + u_2'(z, p).$$

Since $M(z)$ is a one step transfer matrix for the differential equation associated to H , eigenvalues for $H(k)$ correspond to eigenvalues e^{ikp} of the matrix $M(z)$. Since $\det(M(z)) = 1$, this yields

$$\Delta(E_n(k)) = 2 \cos(pk), \quad k \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right]. \quad (2.2)$$

Our results in this section will rely on an upper bound on the derivative of the discriminant on the spectrum, established in [15][Lemma 2.1]. As noted in that paper, such an estimate is likely well known, although we also could not find a reference. Since we require a cruder estimate with more assumptions on the potential than they do, we record the version of their statement which suffices for our work.

Lemma 2.1 ([15], Lemma 2.1). *Let V a p periodic potential with $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Then the corresponding discriminant Δ satisfies*

$$|\Delta'(\lambda)| \leq C_2 p^2 \exp(2C_2 R^{1/2} p) \quad (2.3)$$

for all $\lambda \in \sigma(H)$ where C_2 is a universal constant independent of p and R .

We will also need the following lemma, consisting of two estimates. The first provides a lower bound on the group velocity in a band, the second is a closely related lower bound on the difference of an eigenvalue E_n evaluated at different quasimomenta. Since both estimates will be useful in what follows, we state them separately.

Lemma 2.2. *Let V a p periodic potential with $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. For $k \in \mathcal{B}$ we have*

$$\left| \frac{dE_m}{dk} \right| \geq \frac{2|\sin(pk)|}{C_2 p} \exp(-2C_2 R^{1/2} p) \quad (2.4)$$

and for $k_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$|E_m(k_2) - E_m(k_1)| \geq \frac{\exp(-2C_2 R^{1/2} p)}{\pi C_2} (k_2 - k_1)^2. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. Differentiating (2.2) in k yields

$$\frac{dE_m}{dk} = \frac{-2p \sin(pk)}{\Delta'(E_m(k))}$$

and (2.4) follows from the symmetry $E_m(k) = E_m(-k)$ and Lemma 2.1.

To prove (2.5), we may exploit the same symmetry to assume $0 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{p}$. Thus, since $(-1)^{m+1} \frac{dE_m}{dk} \geq 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq \frac{\pi}{p}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |E_m(k_2) - E_m(k_1)| &= (-1)^{m+1} \int_{k_1}^{k_2} \frac{dE_m}{dk} dk \\ &= \int_{k_1}^{k_2} (-1)^m \frac{2p \sin(pk)}{\Delta'(E_m(k))} dk \\ &= \int_{k_1}^{k_2} \frac{2p \sin(pk)}{|\Delta'(E_m(k))|} dk \end{aligned}$$

since $(-1)^m \Delta'(E_m(k)) \geq 0$. Thus, by Lemma 2.1,

$$|E_m(k_2) - E_m(k_1)| \geq \frac{\exp(-2C_2 R^{1/2} p)}{C_2 p^2} \int_{k_1}^{k_2} 2p \sin(pk) dk.$$

We now show that for $u_1, u_2 \in [0, \pi]$, $\int_{u_1}^{u_2} \sin(u) du \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} (u_2 - u_1)^2$. For $u_1, u_2 \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ we have $\int_{u_1}^{u_2} \sin(u) du \geq \frac{1}{\pi} (u_2 - u_1)^2$ by integrating the inequality $\sin(u) \geq \frac{2}{\pi} u$; the same bound then holds for $u_1, u_2 \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$ by symmetry. Thus, for $0 \leq u_1 \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \leq u_2 \leq \pi$, we have

$$\int_{u_1}^{u_2} \sin(u) du \geq \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - u_1 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - u_2 \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} (u_2 - u_1)^2$$

where the final inequality can be seen by setting $u_1 = x + \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $u_2 = y + \frac{\pi}{2}$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and using $\frac{1}{2}(x - y)^2 \geq 0$.

Thus, by the change of variables $pk \mapsto k$,

$$2 \int_{k_1}^{k_2} \sin(pk) p dk \geq \frac{p^2}{\pi} (k_2 - k_1)^2,$$

and (2.5) follows. \square

Remark. Exploiting the relationship $\rho(E) = \left| \frac{dE_n}{dk} \right|^{-1}$, where $\rho(E)$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the density of states measure with respect to Lebesgue measure, and $E = E_n(k)$ [2], (2.5) provides a Hölder estimate for the density of states measure. Such estimates are mentioned in the literature [2, 22], however, critically for this paper, the estimate above provides a Hölder constant with explicit dependence on the period.

The latter of these estimates allows us to find a bound on the measure of the set of quasimomenta for which the eigenvalues corresponding to different bands can be nearby. This will be used to prove the main result of the next section.

Lemma 2.3. *Define the set*

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon := \{k \in \mathcal{B} : \exists n, m \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq m \text{ s.t. } |E_m(k) - E_n(k)| \leq \epsilon\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\text{Leb}(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon) \leq 4\sqrt{C_2\pi} \exp\left(C_2 R^{1/2} p\right) \cdot \sqrt{\epsilon} \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Since for each m , $E_m(k) = E_m(-k)$, excluding $k = \pi/p$, \mathcal{B}_ϵ is symmetric. Thus,

$$\text{Leb}(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon) = 2\text{Leb}\left(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \cap \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right]\right),$$

since $\text{Leb}(\{\pi/p\}) = 0$. Using that bands do not overlap, we find

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \cap \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right] \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} B_\ell$$

where we define

$$B_\ell := \left\{ k \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right] : |E_\ell(k) - E_\ell(0)| \leq \epsilon \right\} \cup \left\{ k \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right] : \left| E_\ell(k) - E_\ell\left(\frac{\pi}{p}\right) \right| \leq \epsilon \right\}.$$

By (2.5), we have

$$B_\ell \subseteq \left(\sqrt{C_2\pi} \exp\left(C_2 R^{1/2} p\right) \left([0, \sqrt{\epsilon}] \cup \left[\frac{\pi}{p} - \sqrt{\epsilon}, \frac{\pi}{p}\right] \right) \right) \cap \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right].$$

for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\text{Leb}\left(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon \cap \left[0, \frac{\pi}{p}\right]\right) \leq 2\sqrt{C_2\pi} \exp\left(C_2 R^{1/2} p\right) \cdot \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

from which (2.6) follows. \square

3. AN ESTIMATE ON THE RATE OF CONVERGENCE OF $\frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi$ FOR PERIODIC H

In this section, H will denote a p periodic Schrödinger operator with bounded potential on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Theorem 2.3 of [1] shows that for these operators and $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(X)$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} X_H(t)\psi = U^* \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k)(D+k)P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \right) U\psi = U^* \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{dE_n(k)}{dk} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \right) U\psi.$$

Critically for our purposes in this paper, the proof in [1] relies on uniform boundedness of the difference and uses density of truncated eigenfunction expansions to show convergence, and thus does not provide a quantitative estimate on the speed of convergence. The main result of this section is then to provide such an estimate. We will denote

$$Q_H\psi = U^* \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{dE_n(k)}{dk} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \right) U\psi.$$

In the theorem below, we establish a power law in time upper bound on the difference $\frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi - Q_H\psi$. Since we will be examining sequences of periodic operators with increasing periods and seeking information on their limit, it is important that we record precisely how the constants which appear in this bound depend on the period.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $R > 0$, $s > 2$ and $p \geq \pi$. If H is a p -periodic Schrödinger operator with $\|V\|_{\infty} \leq R$, and $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$, then*

$$\left\| Q_H\psi - \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r)\psi dr \right\| \leq C_1 M_3 p^{3/2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} C_2 R^{1/2} p\right) t^{-1/5} \quad (3.1)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(R)$, and $M_3 = M_3(\psi)$ are constants.

Remark. We make the assumption $p \geq \pi$ here and in some of the statements which follow because it simplifies some of our estimates, here the right hand side of (3.1); a similar bound holds for small p . Since we will be examining a sequence of potentials with periods tending to infinity, this assumption poses no issues.

Using the equality [1, 26] for $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(X)$

$$X_H(t)\psi = X\psi + \int_0^t D(r)\psi dr \quad (3.2)$$

where $D(r) = e^{irH} D e^{-irH}$, the following corollary follows immediately.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $R > 0$, $s > 2$ and $p \geq \pi$. If H is a p -periodic Schrödinger operator with $\|V\|_{\infty} \leq R$, and $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$, then*

$$\left\| Q_H\psi - \frac{1}{t} X_H(t)\psi \right\| \leq t^{-1} \|X\psi\| + C_1 M_3 p^{3/2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} C_2 R^{1/2} p\right) t^{-1/5}. \quad (3.3)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(R)$, and $M_3 = M_3(\psi)$ are constants.

We will need a series of bounds uniform in the quasimomentum, the first of which is below. Its proof involves a comparison using the minmax theorem; we note here that the eigenvalues of $H_0(0)$ on $[0, p]$ are $\left\{ \frac{(2\ell\pi)^2}{p^2} \right\}_{\ell=0}^{\infty}$, while those for $H_0(\frac{\pi}{p})$ are $\left\{ \frac{((2\ell+1)\pi)^2}{p^2} \right\}_{\ell=0}^{\infty}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $R > 0$ and suppose $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Then, the operator*

$$(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}(D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1} : L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)$$

is bounded uniformly in k : there is an $M_1 = M_1(R)$ such that

$$\|(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}(D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\|^2 \leq M_1. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. For $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{T})$, we have by self-adjointness

$$\|(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}\varphi\|^2 = \langle \varphi, (H(k) + 2R)\varphi \rangle \leq \langle \varphi, (H_0(k) + 3R)\varphi \rangle = \|H_0(k)^{1/2}\varphi\|^2 + 3R\|\varphi\|^2.$$

For $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$, we take $\varphi_n \in H^2(\mathbb{T})$, with $\|\varphi_n - \varphi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T})} \rightarrow 0$. Then, by the above bound, the sequence $(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}\varphi_n$ is Cauchy in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$. Since $(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}$ with domain $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ is closed, $(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}\varphi_n \rightarrow (H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}\varphi$. Thus, we may conclude the same bound for $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$,

$$\|(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}\varphi\|^2 \leq \|H_0(k)^{1/2}\varphi\|^2 + 3R\|\varphi\|^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Using (3.5) with $\varphi = (D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi$ for $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2}H_0(k)^{1/2}(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 \\ \leq \|H_0(k)^{1/2}(D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 + 3R\|(D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 \\ = \|H_0(k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 + 3R\|H_0(k)^{1/2}(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality on the first term yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_0(k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\| &\leq \|\psi\| + \|(V + 2R)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\| \\ &\leq \|\psi\| + 3R\|(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\| \end{aligned}$$

For the second, $(H(k) + 2R)^{-1} : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathbb{T})$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_0(k)^{1/2}(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 &= \langle (H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi, H_0(k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi \rangle \\ &= \langle (H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi, \psi \rangle - \langle (H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi, (V + 2R)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi \rangle \\ &\leq \|(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|\|\psi\| - R\|(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\psi\|^2 \\ &\leq \|(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\|\|\psi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz and since $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Noting that by the min-max principle,

$$\|(H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\text{dist}(\sigma(H(k)), -2R)} = \frac{1}{E_1(k) + 2R} \leq \frac{1}{E_1(0) + 2R} \leq \frac{1}{R}$$

we may put these estimates together and conclude (3.4) with $M_1(R) = \frac{1}{R} + 16$. \square

Remark. The extension of the bound (3.5) from $H^2(\mathbb{T})$ to $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ would also follow from the theory of quadratic forms [18], [27]; indeed, relative boundedness of a self-adjoint operator yields relative boundedness of the associated closed quadratic form, which has a representation in terms of the positive square root of the operator.

Before proving Lemma 3.6, our final bound uniform in the quasimomentum needed to prove Theorem 3.1, we prove the auxiliary lemmas Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5. The first is a simple pointwise estimate for functions in $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$, $s > 0$, which will allow us to relax the assumptions on the regularity and decay of our initial states in many of the statements which follow. The second

will allow us to manipulate an explicitly defined representative for $U\psi(k, q)$ for these initial states. We will use the Sobolev norms defined by

$$\|\psi\|_{H^n(\mathbb{R})}^2 = \|\hat{\psi}\|^2 + \|k^n \hat{\psi}\|^2 = \|\psi\|^2 + \|\psi^{(n)}\|^2$$

for $n = 1, 2$, where $\hat{\psi}$ denotes the Fourier transform of ψ , and $\psi^{(n)}$ denotes the n 'th weak derivative.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$ for $s > 0$. Then, there is a constant C with $|\psi(x)| \leq \frac{C}{1+|x|^{s/2}}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. By the definition of $\text{Dom}(|X|^s)$, we have for $\psi \in \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + |t|^{2s}) |\psi(t)|^2 dt < \infty$. Thus, there exists an $N > 0$ such that for $|x| \geq N$

$$(1 + |x|^{2s}) \int_{|t| \geq |x|} |\psi(t)|^2 dt \leq \int_{|t| \geq |x|} (1 + |t|^{2s}) |\psi(t)|^2 dt \leq 1$$

and we may bound the tails of $\|\psi\|^2$ as

$$\int_{|t| \geq |x|} |\psi(t)|^2 dt \leq \frac{1}{1 + |x|^{2s}}. \quad (3.6)$$

We now use that $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ to make this estimate a pointwise one. Indeed, by the fundamental theorem of calculus and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have for $x \geq N$,

$$|\psi(x)|^2 = -2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_x^\infty \overline{\psi(t)} \psi'(t) dt \right) \leq 2 \left(\int_x^\infty |\psi'(t)|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_x^\infty |\psi(t)|^2 dt \right)^{1/2}$$

since $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ implies $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \psi(x) = 0$. So, bounding the right hand side with (3.6), we have

$$|\psi(x)|^2 \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{1 + x^s} \|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$$

for $x \geq N$. Thus, by a similar computation for $x \leq -N$ and taking a square root, we have for $|x| \geq N$,

$$|\psi(x)| \leq \frac{2^{5/4} \|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2}}{1 + |x|^{s/2}}.$$

The lemma then follows by taking $C = \max\{2^{5/4} \|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2}, (1 + N^{s/2}) \sup_{|x| < N} |\psi(x)|\}$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R})$, the series $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell)$ is absolutely convergent for a.e. $q \in \mathbb{T}$ and all $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ and*

$$U\psi(k, q) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \quad (3.7)$$

in $\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^\oplus L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}$. Furthermore, for $s > 2$, $\text{Dom}(|X|^s) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$, and for $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$, this series is absolutely uniformly convergent for all $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ and $q \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. Let $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then by the monotone convergence theorem and an affine change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi(q+p\ell)| dq &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p |\psi(q+p\ell)| dq = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi(q)| dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(q)| dq < \infty \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

so that $\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell)$ converges absolutely for all k and a.e. q .

For a fixed $M \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\psi_M := \chi_{[p(1-M), pM]} \psi$. Let g_ϵ be a smooth mollifier with $g_\epsilon * \psi_M \rightarrow \psi_M$ as $\epsilon \searrow 0$ in $L^m(\mathbb{R})$ for $1 \leq m < \infty$. Since $g_\epsilon * \psi_M =: \psi_M^\epsilon \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$U\psi_M^\epsilon(k, q) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi_M^\epsilon(q+p\ell).$$

By the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{T}^*} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| U\psi_M^\epsilon(k, q) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi_M(q+p\ell) \right| dq &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi_M^\epsilon(q+p\ell) - \psi_M(q+p\ell)| dq \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p |\psi_M^\epsilon(q+p\ell) - \psi_M(q+p\ell)| dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_M^\epsilon(x) - \psi_M(x)| dx \end{aligned}$$

again by the monotone convergence theorem and changing variables. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{T}^*} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| U\psi_M^\epsilon(k, q) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi_M(q+p\ell) \right| dq \\ \leq \limsup_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi_M^\epsilon(x) - \psi_M(x)| dx = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

by L^1 convergence of $\psi_M^\epsilon \rightarrow \psi_M$. By L^2 convergence of ψ_M^ϵ and unitarity of U ,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} U\psi_M^\epsilon = U\psi_M$$

in $\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^\oplus L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}$. Thus, there exists a set $Z \subset \mathbb{T}^*$ with $\text{Leb}(Z) = 0$ and such that along a subsequence,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} U\psi_M^\epsilon(k, \cdot) = U\psi_M(k, \cdot) \quad (3.10)$$

for each $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$ as an $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ limit. For a fixed $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$, we may combine (3.9) and (3.10) to pass to a further subsequence and find

$$U\psi_M(k, q) = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} U\psi_M^\epsilon(k, q) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi_M(q+p\ell)$$

for a.e. $q \in \mathbb{T}$. Thus, $U\psi_M = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi_M(q+p\ell)$ in $\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^\oplus L^2(\mathbb{T}, d) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}$. Finally, we note that $\psi_M \rightarrow \psi$ in L^2 , so that by unitarity of U , $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} U\psi_M = U\psi$. Thus, again passing to a subsequence and removing another set Z' of measure 0 from \mathbb{T}^* , we may compute for $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus (Z \cup Z')$ fixed,

$$U\psi(k, q) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} U\psi_M(k, q) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\ell=-M}^M e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell)$$

for a.e. $q \in \mathbb{T}$, where the final equality is by the almost everywhere convergence of the sum. Thus, we have (3.7).

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for $\psi \in \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(q)| dq &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(q)|(1 + |q|^s)(1 + |q|^s)^{-1} dq \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi(q)|^2 (1 + |q|^s)^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{(1 + |q|^s)^2} dq \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

which is finite by our choice of s . Thus, $\text{Dom}(|X|^s) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$. For $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$, using Lemma 3.4, we have

$$|\psi(q + p\ell)| \leq \frac{C}{1 + |q + p\ell|^{s/2}} \leq CM_\ell \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$M_\ell = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1 + |p\ell|^{s/2}}, & \ell \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{1 + |p(\ell+1)|^{s/2}}, & \ell \leq -1 \end{cases}$$

and absolute uniform convergence follows. \square

We now prove our last lemma before the main result of this section. The purpose of this lemma is to give an $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^*, \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}; L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq))$ estimate for quantities appearing in the proof of Theorem 3.1, allowing the separation of an integral over \mathbb{T}^* into one over a set on which we have a good time dependent estimate of the integrand, and another on a set whose measure decays in time by Lemma 2.3. We note that by the inclusion $D(X^s) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$ proven above, the lemma below is valid for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $R > 0$, $s > 2$, $p \geq \pi$ and suppose $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Let $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\psi' \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $\psi'' \in D(X^s)$. Then for a set $Z \subset \mathbb{T}^*$ with $\text{Leb}(Z) = 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z} \|(H(k) + 2R)U\psi(k, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)}^2 \leq (1 + 3R)^2 M_2 \quad (3.12)$$

where $M_2 = M_2(\psi)$ is a constant.

Proof. For $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ and $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{T})$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|(H(k) + 2R)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)} &\leq \|H_0(k)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)} + \|(V + 2R)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)} \\ &\leq (1 + 3R)(\|H_0(k)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)} + \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, it will suffice to find a uniform bound on $\|H_0(k)U\psi(k, \cdot)\|$ and $\|U\psi(k, \cdot)\|$.

Fix $s > 2$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists a set $Z \subset \mathbb{T}^*$ with $\text{Leb}(Z) = 0$ and such that for $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$,

$$H_0(k)U\psi(k, \cdot) = H_0(k) \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(\cdot + p\ell)} \psi(\cdot + p\ell).$$

We now compute the necessary weak derivatives to show $H_0(k)U\psi(k, q) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q + p\ell)} \psi''(q + p\ell)$ for these quasimomenta. Fix $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$, then, for $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q + p\ell)} \psi(q + p\ell) \right) \varphi'(q) dq = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p e^{-ik(q + p\ell)} \psi(q + p\ell) \varphi'(q) dq$$

by the dominated convergence theorem with dominating function $\max |\varphi'| \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi(q + p\ell)|$, which is integrable for $\psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ by the computation of (3.8). Then, an integration by parts yields equality of the above with

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \varphi(q) dq \\ & + \varphi(0) \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ikp(\ell+1)} \psi(p(\ell+1)) - e^{-ikp\ell} \psi(p\ell) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the first sum is absolutely convergent for each $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ and a.e. $q \in \mathbb{T}$ for $\psi' \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ by the same reasoning used in (3.8); namely

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \int_0^p e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \varphi(q) dq \right| \leq \max |\varphi| (\|\psi'\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + |k| \|\psi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}),$$

and the second sum telescopes, and in fact equals 0, since for $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \psi(x) = 0$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \right) \varphi'(q) dq \\ & = - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \varphi(q) dq \\ & = - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \right) \varphi(q) dq \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi, \psi' \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ again justifies the use of the dominated convergence theorem.

Then, by the logic of (3.8) again,

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}),$$

and, as a weak derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dq} U\psi(k, q) & = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell) \\ & = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} ike^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi(q+p\ell), \end{aligned}$$

since both sums converge for a.e. q and all k by Lemma 3.5. So, for $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$ we have

$$(D+k)U\psi(k, q) = -i \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell).$$

Since $\psi'' \in D(X^s) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$, we may repeat the previous computation, to find

$$D(D+k)\psi = - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi''(q+p\ell) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} ke^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi'(q+p\ell).$$

Thus, we may conclude

$$H_0(k)U\psi(k, q) = - \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-ik(q+p\ell)} \psi''(q+p\ell)$$

for $k \in \mathbb{T}^* \setminus Z$. Using this expression, we may bound $|H_0(k)U\psi(k, q)|^2$ pointwise for a.e. q as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |H_0(k)U\psi(k, q)|^2 &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi''(q + p\ell) \overline{\psi''(q + pm)} e^{-ikp(\ell - m)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi''(q + p\ell)| |\psi''(q + pm)| \end{aligned}$$

and by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |H_0(k)U\psi(k, q)|^2 dq &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^p |\psi''(q + p\ell)| |\psi''(q + pm)| dq \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_0^p |\psi''(q + p\ell)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_0^p |\psi''(q + pm)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_{pm}^{p(m+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For the N of Lemma 3.4 corresponding to $\psi'' \in \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$ and since $p \geq \pi$, we have for $|\ell| \geq N + 1$

$$\int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \leq \frac{1}{1 + p^{2s} |\ell|^{2s}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + |\ell|^{2s}}$$

by (3.6), so that

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \leq \sum_{\ell = -(N+1)}^{N+1} \left(\int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{|\ell| \geq N+1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 + |\ell|^s}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_{p\ell}^{p(\ell+1)} |\psi''(q)|^2 dq \right)^{1/2} \leq (2N + 3) \|\psi''\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \sum_{|\ell| \geq N+1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 + |\ell|^s}$$

where we emphasize that N only depends only on ψ . By the same argument, for the N' corresponding to ψ ,

$$\|U\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \leq (2N' + 3) \|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \sum_{|\ell| \geq N'+1} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1 + |\ell|^s}$$

and (3.12) follows from (3.13). □

We now have everything we require to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By unitarity of U , it will suffice to bound the norm of

$$U \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r) \psi dr \right) - U Q_H \psi$$

in $L^2 \left(\mathbb{T}^*, \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}; L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq) \right)$.

We use the identity $P_n(k)(D+k)P_n(k) = \frac{dE_n(k)}{dk}P_n(k)$ for almost every $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ [1] to compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| U \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r)\psi dr \right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{dE_n(k)}{dk} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi \right) \right\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| U \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r)\psi dr \right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k)(D+k)P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi \right) \right\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t UD(r)U^*U\psi dr \right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k)(D+k)P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi \right) \right\|^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

We now show

$$UD(r)U^*U\psi = \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} e^{irH(k)}(D+k)e^{-irH(k)} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi \tag{3.15}$$

as follows: Since

$$Ue^{\pm irH}U^* = \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} e^{\pm irH(k)} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}, \quad UDU^* = \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} (D+k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|},$$

it will suffice to verify $\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} e^{-isH(k)} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi$ is in the domain of $\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} (D+k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}$ for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s \subset H^2(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed, by expanding $U\psi$ in terms of the eigenbasis, we compute

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} e^{-irH(k)} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi = \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U\psi,$$

and we must check that the integrand in the expression above is in $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ for a.e. k , and is square integrable in k after UDU^* has been applied. In fact the integrand will be in $H^2(\mathbb{T})$ for a.e. k ; since $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, and $\inf \sigma(H) \geq -R$, we may commute the projections with the resolvent and use boundedness of the resolvent to see

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (H(k) + 2R) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U\psi(k, \cdot) \\
 &= (H(k) + 2R) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R)^{-1} U(H + 2R)\psi(k, \cdot) \\
 &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U(H + 2R)\psi(k, \cdot)
 \end{aligned}$$

from which we may compute for $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| (H(k) + 2R) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|P_n(k)U(H + 2R)\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \\
 &= \|U(H + 2R)\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, integrating the above over \mathbb{T}^* ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \left\| (H(k) + 2R) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} = \|(H + 2R)\psi\|^2 < \infty$$

by unitarity of U and since $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$. This implies that

$$(H(k) + 2R) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)$$

for a.e $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$, and by relative $H(k) + 2R$ boundedness of the Laplacian,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \in H^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)$$

for a.e. $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$. Finally, by the same logic we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (D + k) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 &\leq \|(D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1/2}\|^2 \\ &\cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|P_n(k) U (H + 2R)^{1/2} \psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and integrating we see

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \left\| (D + k) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-irE_n(k)} P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 < \infty$$

for C a constant. Thus, (3.15) is verified.

We now use (3.15) and expand the final expression in (3.14) in terms of eigenprojections twice to find equality with

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} e^{iE_m(k)r} P_m(k) (D + k) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-iE_n(k)r} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} dr U \psi \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k) (D + k) P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U \psi \right) \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ again, we may justify interchanging the infinite sum and unbounded operator $(D + k)$ for each k as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (D + k) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-iE_n(k)s} P_n(k) U \psi &= (D + k)(H(k) + 2R)^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-iE_n(k)s} P_n(k) U (H + 2R) \psi \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-iE_n(k)s} (D + k) P_n(k) U \psi \end{aligned}$$

using boundedness of $(D+k)(H(k)+2R)^{-1}$. Thus, passing the projections $P_m(k)$ through the sum in n , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} e^{iE_m(k)r} P_m(k) (D+k) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-iE_n(k)r} P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} dr U \psi \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^*}^{\oplus} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k) (D+k) P_n(k) \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} U \psi \right) \right\|^2 \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{i(E_m(k)-E_n(k))r} P_m(k) (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi dr \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(k) (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi \right) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\| P_m(k) \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{i(E_m(k)-E_n(k))r} dr (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}
 \end{aligned}$$

by cancellation and the orthogonality of the projections $P_m(k)$. We begin by bounding the integrand above pointwise in k and m . For $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$, let $v_\ell(k)$ be the basis of normalized eigenfunctions of $H(k)$, i.e. for $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)$, $P_\ell(k)\varphi = \langle \varphi, v_\ell(k) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)} v_\ell(k)$. Then, defining the shorthand

$$f_{m,n} = f_{m,n}(t, k) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{i(E_m(k)-E_n(k))r} dr$$

in the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left\| P_m(k) \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 = \left| \left\langle \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot), v_m(k) \right\rangle \right|^2 \\
 &= \left| \left\langle (H(k)+2R)^{-1/2} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (H(k)+2R)^{1/2} (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot), v_m(k) \right\rangle \right|^2 \\
 &= \left| \left\langle \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (H(k)+2R)^{1/2} (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot), \frac{1}{\sqrt{E_m(k)+2R}} v_m(k) \right\rangle \right|^2
 \end{aligned}$$

using that $(H(k)+2R)^{-1/2}$ is self-adjoint, and each $v_\ell(k)$ is an eigenfunction in the last line. Thus,

$$\left\| P_m(k) \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (D+k) P_n(k) U \psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2$$

$$\leq \left\| \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (H(k) + 2R)^{1/2} (D + k) P_n(k) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Then, since

$$\|(H(k) + 2R)^{1/2} (D + k) (H(k) + 2R)^{-1}\|^2 \leq M_1$$

by Lemma 3.3, we may insert a factor of $(H(k) + 2R)^{-1} (H(k) + 2R) = I$ to find

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} (H(k) + 2R)^{1/2} (D + k) P_n(k) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 &\leq M_1 \left\| \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} f_{m,n} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \\ &= M_1 \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \|f_{m,n} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

by orthogonality of the projections $P_n(k)$. In summary, we thus far have shown

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r) \psi dr \right) - Q_H \psi \right\|^2 \\ &\leq M_1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^*} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \left\| f_{m,n} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

As in [9], before integrating the right hand side of (3.16) in k , we will now partition the Brillouin zone into the sets of "good" and "bad" $k \in \mathcal{B}$. Using the notation of Lemma 2.3, we define

$$B_t := \mathcal{B}_{\epsilon_t}, \quad \epsilon_t := \frac{1}{C_2 \pi} t^{-4/5}.$$

Then, for $k \in G_t := \mathcal{B} \setminus B_t$, computing the integral defining $f_{m,n}$, we have

$$|f_{m,n}| \leq \frac{2}{t |E_m(k) - E_n(k)|}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \|f_{m,n} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{t^2} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \frac{\|P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2}{|E_m(k) - E_n(k)|^2} \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{t^2 \epsilon_t^2} \frac{\|(H(k) + 2R) U\psi(k, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)}^2}{E_m(k) + 2R} \end{aligned}$$

by Parseval's identity.

Instead, for $k \in B_t$, now using $\left| \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{i(E_m(k) - E_n(k))r} dr \right| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq m}}^{\infty} \|f_{m,n} P_n(k) (H(k) + 2R) U \psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \\ & \leq \frac{\|(H(k) + 2R) U \psi(k, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}, dq)}^2}{E_m(k) + 2R}. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing once again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r) \psi dr \right) - Q_H \psi \right\|^2 & \leq M_1 \int_{B_t} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|(H(k) + 2R) U \psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 dk}{E_m(k) + 2R} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \\ & \quad + \frac{4M_1}{t^2 \epsilon_t^2} \int_{G_t} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|(H(k) + 2R) U \psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 dk}{E_m(k) + 2R} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}^*|}, \end{aligned}$$

which after an application of Lemma 3.6 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r) \psi dr \right) - Q_H \psi \right\|^2 & \leq (1 + 3R)^2 M_1 M_2 \int_{B_t} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \\ & \quad + \frac{4(1 + 3R)^2 M_1 M_2}{t^2 \epsilon_t^2} \int_{G_t} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}^*|} \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Before summing in m and integrating in k , we find an upper bound on $1/(E_m(k) + 2R)$ which is uniform in $k \in \mathbb{T}^*$ and summable in m . Since $(-1)^{n+1} \frac{dE_n}{dk} > 0$ on $(0, \frac{\pi}{p})$ and $E_n(k) = E_n(-k)$, we have for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_{2n-1}(k) + 2R \geq E_{2n-1}(0) + 2R \geq \frac{4(n-1)^2 \pi^2}{p^2} + R \geq \frac{\pi^2}{p^2} (4(n-1)^2 + R)$$

by the min-max principle and since $p \geq \pi$. Similarly,

$$E_{2n}(k) + 2R \geq E_{2n}(\pi/p) + 2R \geq \frac{(2n-1)^2 \pi^2}{p^2} + R \geq \frac{\pi^2}{p^2} ((2n-1)^2 + R),$$

so that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E_m(k) + 2R} \leq \frac{p^2}{\pi^2} A, \quad \text{for } A = A(R) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4(n-1)^2 + R} + \frac{1}{(2n-1)^2 + R} \right)$$

By Lemma 2.3

$$\text{Leb}(B_t) \leq 4\sqrt{C_2 \pi} \exp(C_2 R^{1/2} p) \sqrt{\epsilon_t} = 4 \exp(C_2 R^{1/2} p) t^{-2/5}.$$

With these facts in hand, and defining $M = M(R) := 4(1 + 3R)^2 M_1 A$, we may bound the integrals in (3.17) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t D(r) \psi dr \right) - Q_H \psi \right\|^2 & \leq \frac{p^2}{\pi^2} M \cdot M_2 \left(\frac{p}{2\pi} \text{Leb}(B_t) + \frac{1}{\epsilon_t^2 t^2} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{p^2}{\pi^2} M \cdot M_2 \left(\frac{2p}{\pi} \exp(C_2 R^{1/2} p) + C_2^2 \pi^2 \right) t^{-2/5}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{M \cdot M_2}{\pi^2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi} + C_2^2 \pi^2 \right) p^3 \exp(C_2 R^{1/2} p) t^{-2/5}$$

since $p \geq \pi$. The result then follows from taking a square root and setting $M_3 = M_2^{1/2}$ and $C_1 = \frac{M^{1/2}}{\pi} \left(\frac{2}{\pi} + C_2^2 \pi^2 \right)^{1/2}$. \square

4. PROOF OF BALLISTIC TRANSPORT

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.2. First, we must prove some final lemmas. The first is an elementary propagation estimate, which we record below.

Lemma 4.1. *For $H_i = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_i$, and $V_i \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\|e^{itH_1} - e^{itH_2}\| \leq |t| \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$. Using strong differentiability of $(I - e^{-itH_1} e^{itH_2})\varphi$, we have by the fundamental theorem of calculus and unitarity of e^{itH_i} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(e^{itH_1} - e^{itH_2})\varphi\| &= \left\| \int_0^t e^{-irH_1} (V_1 - V_2) e^{irH_2} \varphi dr \right\| \\ &\leq \left| \int_0^t \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty \|\varphi\| dr \right| \\ &= |t| \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty \|\varphi\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, the result follows by approximation. \square

We will also require the following estimate showing that the difference of the Heisenberg evolution of the position operator for two Schrödinger operators with bounded potentials can diverge at most quadratically in time. As we will soon see, the presence of the normed difference of the two potentials on the right hand side of the estimate is critical to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.2. *Let H_i be as in the above, and suppose $V_1 - V_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Then, for $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap D(X^2)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\|X_{H_1}(t)\psi - X_{H_2}(t)\psi\| \leq \Gamma(|t|^{1/2} + t^2) \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty^{1/2}$$

for $\Gamma = \Gamma(R, \psi)$ a constant.

Proof. Let

$$\eta_\psi(t) := X_{H_1}(t)\psi - X_{H_2}(t)\psi$$

for $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap D(X^2)$.

We define $F_\epsilon(x) = \frac{x}{1+\epsilon|x|}$ and

$$\eta_\psi^\epsilon := e^{itH_1} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH_1} \psi - e^{itH_2} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH_2} \psi,$$

which we will estimate above for each $\epsilon > 0$ and take $\epsilon \searrow 0$.

We note that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{itH_i} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH_i} \psi - e^{itH_i} X e^{-itH_i} \psi\|^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (F_\epsilon(x) - x)^2 |(e^{-itH_i} \psi)(x)|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\epsilon^2 x^4}{(1 + \epsilon|x|)^2} |(e^{-itH_i} \psi)(x)|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $\epsilon \leq 1$, the integrand is bounded above by $x^4 |(e^{-itH_i}\psi)(x)|^2$, which is integrable for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by [26][Theorem 2.2]. Thus,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \|e^{itH_i} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH_i} \psi - e^{itH_i} X e^{-itH_i} \psi\| = 0$$

by the dominated convergence theorem. In particular, $\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \eta_\psi^\epsilon(t) = \eta_\psi(t)$.

We find by the triangle inequality and Lemma 4.1,

$$\|\eta_\psi^\epsilon(t)\| \leq |t| \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty \|F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH_1} \psi\| + \|F_\epsilon(X) (e^{-itH_1} - e^{-itH_2}) \psi\|.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and that $F_\epsilon(X)$ is a bounded self-adjoint operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_\epsilon(X) (e^{-itH_1} - e^{-itH_2}) \psi\|^2 &\leq \|e^{-itH_1} - e^{-itH_2}\| \|\psi\| \cdot \|F_\epsilon(X)^2 (e^{-itH_1} - e^{-itH_2}) \psi\| \\ &\leq |t| \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty \|\psi\| (\|F_\epsilon(X)^2 e^{-itH_1} \psi\| + \|F_\epsilon(X)^2 e^{-itH_2} \psi\|) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.1. Thus, taking $\epsilon \searrow 0$ and using the monotone convergence theorem for the terms on the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta_\psi(t)\| &\leq |t| \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty \|X e^{-itH_1} \psi\| \\ &\quad + |t|^{1/2} \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty^{1/2} \|\psi\|^{1/2} (\|X^2 e^{-itH_1} \psi\| + \|X^2 e^{-itH_2} \psi\|)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Gamma (|t|^{1/2} + t^2) \|V_1 - V_2\|_\infty^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma(R, \psi)$ is a constant by Theorems 5.1 and 5.2. \square

Before proving Theorem 1.2, we prove a final lemma, which provides a lower bound on the Floquet transform $U_{p_n} \psi$ integrated over a subset of $\mathcal{B}_n := \left(-\frac{\pi}{p_n}, \frac{\pi}{p_n}\right]$ for large enough periods p_n . To emphasize n dependence, we denote U_{p_n} the operator of (2.1) with $p = p_n$, and $\mathbb{T}_n := \mathbb{R}/p_n\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{T}_n^* := \mathbb{R}/\frac{2\pi}{p_n}\mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(|X|^s)$ for $s > 2$ and define the set $S_n := \left[-\frac{3\pi}{4p_n}, -\frac{\pi}{4p_n}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\pi}{4p_n}, \frac{3\pi}{4p_n}\right]$. Then, there exists an $N_0(\psi)$ so that for $n \geq N_0(\psi)$,*

$$\int_{S_n} \|U_{p_n} \psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \geq \frac{1}{8} \|\psi\|^2. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, there is a set $Z_n \subset \mathbb{T}_n^*$ with $\text{Leb}(Z_n) = 0$ and such that for a given $k \in \mathbb{T}_n^* \setminus Z_n$,

$$U_{p_n} \psi(k, q) = e^{-ikq} (\psi(q) + e^{ikp_n} \psi(q - p_n)) + \sum_{\ell \notin \{0, -1\}} e^{-ik(q+p_n\ell)} \psi(q + p_n\ell);$$

for a.e. q . We will use the first two terms in the above to estimate the integral in (4.2) from below. Of course, for these k and q ,

$$|U_{p_n} \psi(k, q) - e^{-ikq} (\psi(q) + e^{ikp_n} \psi(q - p_n))| \leq \sum_{\ell \notin \{0, -1\}} |\psi(q + p_n\ell)|$$

and by (3.11)

$$|\psi(q + p_n\ell)| \leq \frac{C}{p_n} \left(\frac{1}{|\ell|^{s/2}} + \frac{1}{|\ell + 1|^{s/2}} \right)$$

for $\ell \notin \{0, -1\}$. Thus, since $p_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{T}_n^* \setminus Z_n} \|U_{p_n} \psi(k, q) - e^{-ikq}(\psi(q) + e^{ikp_n} \psi(q - p_n))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_n, dq)}^2 = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

By Fubini's theorem and the change of variables $p_n k \mapsto k$, for $S := p_n S_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S_n} \|\psi(q) + e^{ikp_n} \psi(q - p_n)\|_{\mathbb{T}_n^*}^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_n} \int_S |\psi(q) + e^{ik} \psi(q - p_n)|^2 \frac{dk}{2\pi} dq \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_n} \int_S |\psi(q)|^2 + |\psi(q - p_n)|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(\overline{\psi(q)} e^{ik} \psi(q - p_n)) \frac{dk}{2\pi} dq \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{T}_n} |\psi(q)|^2 + |\psi(q - p_n)|^2 dq, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\int_S \operatorname{Re}(\overline{\psi(q)} e^{ik} \psi(q - p_n)) dk = \operatorname{Re} \left(\overline{\psi(q)} \psi(q - p_n) \int_S e^{ik} dk \right) = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{S_n} \|\psi(q) + e^{ikp_n} \psi(q - p_n)\|_{\mathbb{T}_n^*}^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{-p_n}^{p_n} |\psi(q)|^2 dq. \quad (4.4)$$

Since $p_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-p_n}^{p_n} |\psi(q)|^2 dq = \|\psi\|^2$, and we may use the triangle inequality to combine (4.3) and (4.4) to find (4.2). \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2. The proof will largely follow the path laid out by Fillman in [9]. Indeed, to extract the limit $Q\psi$ in Theorem 1.2, we define

$$Q_n \psi := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} X_{H_n}(t) \psi, \quad (4.5)$$

for $H_n = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_n$ where V_n approximate V exponentially quickly, and show $Q_n \psi$ has a limit denoted $Q\psi$. This limit serves as the candidate limit for $\frac{1}{t} X_H(t)$, namely we show that $Q\psi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_H(t) \psi$. Finally, to conclude $Q\psi \neq 0$, we show $Q_n \psi \rightarrow Q\psi$ faster than $\|Q_n \psi\|$ can tend to 0.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Fix $s > 2$ and a V such that $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$ and $V \in EC(\eta)$ with $\eta > 12\kappa C_2 R^{1/2}$ for a constant $\kappa \geq 9/2$. Let V_n with $V_n(\cdot + p_n) = V_n(\cdot)$ be such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\eta p_n} \|V_n - V\|_\infty = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

By enlarging R if necessary, we may assume $\|V_n\|_\infty \leq R$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$. Defining $H_n = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_n$ with domain $H^2(\mathbb{R})$, we denote $Q_n \psi$ as in (4.5) where the limit exists for $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \operatorname{Dom}(X) \subset \mathcal{D}_s$ by [1], or indeed by our Theorem 3.1.

We find a limit for the $Q_n \psi$ using a telescoping sum; namely we show that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|Q_{n+1} \psi - Q_n \psi\| < \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

To this end, we set

$$t_n = C_1^5 p_{n+1}^{15/2} \exp\left(5\kappa C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right).$$

Since $p_n \rightarrow \infty$, we may take $p_n \geq \pi$ throughout what follows. Then, denoting by $D_n(t) = e^{itH_n} D e^{-itH_n}$, we have by Theorem 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| Q_{n+1}\psi - \frac{1}{t_n} \int_0^{t_n} D_{n+1}(r)\psi dr \right\| &\leq C_1 M_3 p_{n+1}^{3/2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) t_n^{-1/5} \\ &= M_3 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - 2\kappa) C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| Q_n\psi - \frac{1}{t_n} \int_0^{t_n} D_n(r)\psi dr \right\| &\leq C_1 M_3 p_n^{3/2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} C_2 R^{1/2} p_n\right) t_n^{-1/5} \\ &\leq M_3 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - 2\kappa) C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

using that $p_{n+1} > p_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We find an $N_0(R)$ large enough to ensure $t_n \geq 1$ for $n \geq N_0(R)$. Then, by (3.2) and Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t_n} \left\| \int_0^{t_n} D_n(r)\psi - D_{n+1}(r)\psi dr \right\| &\leq \Gamma(1/\sqrt{t_n} + t_n) \|V_n - V_{n+1}\|_\infty^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2\Gamma t_n \|V_n - V_{n+1}\|_\infty^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

for $n \geq N_0(R)$.

Summing (4.8), (4.9), we find,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| Q_n\psi - \frac{1}{t_n} \int_0^{t_n} D_n(r)\psi dr \right\| + \left\| Q_{n+1}\psi - \frac{1}{t_n} \int_0^{t_n} D_{n+1}(r)\psi dr \right\| \\ &\leq 2M_3 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - 2\kappa) C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \leq 2M_3 \exp\left(-4C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $\kappa \geq 9/2$.

By (4.6), for n large, we have $\|V_n - V_{n+1}\|_\infty^{1/2} \leq e^{-\frac{\eta}{2} p_{n+1}}$. So, by enlarging $N_0(R)$ if necessary, (4.10) yields for $n \geq N_0(R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t_n} \left\| \int_0^{t_n} D_n(r)\psi - D_{n+1}(r)\psi dr \right\| &\leq 2\Gamma t_n e^{-\frac{\eta}{2} p_{n+1}} \leq 2\Gamma t_n \exp\left(-6\kappa C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \\ &= 2\Gamma C_1^5 p_{n+1}^{15/2} \exp\left(-\kappa C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

since $\eta > 12\kappa C_2 R^{1/2}$. Increasing $N_0(R)$ again, we may take

$$2C_1^5 p_{n+1}^{15/2} \exp\left(-\kappa C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2}{3}\kappa C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right)$$

so that for $n \geq N_0(R)$,

$$\frac{1}{t_n} \left\| \int_0^{t_n} D_n(r)\psi - D_{n+1}(r)\psi dr \right\| \leq \Gamma \exp\left(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+1}\right)$$

since $\kappa \geq 9/2$.

Thus, for $A(\psi, R) = A := \Gamma + 2M_3$ and $n \geq N_0(R)$, we have

$$\|Q_n\psi - Q_{n+1}\psi\| \leq A \exp\left(-3C_2R^{1/2}p_{n+1}\right)$$

and iterating the inequality $p_{n+1} \geq 2p_n$ in the above, we find

$$\|Q_n\psi - Q_{n+1}\psi\| \leq A \exp\left(-3C_2R^{1/2}2^n p_0\right) \quad (4.11)$$

from which (4.7) follows.

Thus, for each $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n\psi$ exists, and we define $Q\psi$ to be the limit. We now show that for these ψ , $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi = Q\psi$. Using the triangle inequality, we have for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi - Q\psi \right\| \leq \frac{1}{t} \|X_H(t)\psi - X_{H_n}\psi\| + \left\| \frac{1}{t}X_{H_n}\psi - Q_n\psi \right\| + \|Q_n\psi - Q\psi\|.$$

Taking t_n as in the above, for $t_{n-1} \leq t < t_n$, we have by Lemma 4.2

$$\frac{1}{t} \|X_H(t)\psi - X_{H_n}\psi\| \leq \Gamma(1/\sqrt{t_{n-1}} + t_n) \|V - V_n\|_\infty^{1/2}$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by (4.6), and thus as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

To bound the second term, we may use Corollary 3.2 to find

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{t}X_{H_n}(t)\psi - Q_n\psi \right\| &\leq t_{n-1}^{-1} \|X\psi\| + C_1 M_3 p_n^{3/2} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}C_2R^{1/2}p_n\right) t_{n-1}^{-1/5} \\ &= t_{n-1}^{-1} \|X\psi\| + M_3 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}(1-2\kappa)C_2R^{1/2}p_n\right) \end{aligned}$$

which, for our choice of κ , clearly tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and thus as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Lastly, by definition of $Q\psi$, $\|Q_n\psi - Q\psi\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and we may conclude that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t}X_H(t)\psi = Q\psi.$$

Finally, we show that for $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_s$ with $\psi \neq 0$, $\|Q\psi\| > 0$. The first step is to find a quantitative lower bound on $Q_n\psi$. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and S_n defined as in Lemma 4.3, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_n\psi\|^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}_n^*} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{dE_m(k)}{dk} P_m(k) U_{p_n}\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \\ &\geq \int_{S_n} \left\| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{dE_m(k)}{dk} P_m(k) U_{p_n}\psi(k, \cdot) \right\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \\ &= \int_{S_n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{dE_m(k)}{dk} \right|^2 \|P_m(k) U_{p_n}\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \\ &\geq \frac{2 \exp(-4C_2R^{1/2}p_n)}{C_2^2 p_n^2} \int_{S_n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|P_m(k) U_{p_n}\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \\ &= \frac{2 \exp(-4C_2R^{1/2}p_n)}{C_2^2 p_n^2} \int_{S_n} \|U_{p_n}\psi(k, \cdot)\|^2 \frac{dk}{|\mathbb{T}_n^*|} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.2 and Parseval's identity. Using Lemma 4.3, we have for $n \geq N_1(\psi)$

$$\|Q_n \psi\|^2 \geq \frac{\exp(-4C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)}{4C_2^2 p_n^2} \|\psi\|^2.$$

Now we find a bound for $\|Q_n \psi - Q\psi\|$. Using (4.11) and $p_{\ell+1} \geq 2p_\ell$ for each ℓ , we may estimate for a given $n \geq N_0(R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_n \psi - Q\psi\| &\leq \sum_{\ell=n}^{\infty} \|Q_\ell \psi - Q_{\ell+1} \psi\| \leq \Lambda \sum_{\ell=n}^{\infty} \exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_{\ell+1}) \\ &= \Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_{n+\ell}) \leq \Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} 2^\ell p_n) \\ &\leq \Lambda \frac{\exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)}{1 - \exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)} \end{aligned}$$

where we have estimated by a much larger geometric series.

Finally, putting these two estimates together, we have for $n \geq N := \max\{N_0, N_1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q\psi\| &\geq \|Q_n \psi\| - \|(Q - Q_n)\psi\| \\ &\geq \frac{\exp(-2C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)}{2C_2 p_n} \|\psi\| - \Lambda(\psi, R) \frac{\exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)}{1 - \exp(-3C_2 R^{1/2} p_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

By comparing the exponents in the two terms above, it is clear that we may find an $n \geq N$ large enough such that the right hand side of the above is greater than 0. Thus, $Q\psi \neq 0$. \square

5. APPENDIX

As we have seen throughout this paper, our results often require a careful accounting of the dependencies of constants which appear in our bounds. In particular, since we push estimates on a sequence of uniformly bounded potentials through to the limit, it is important to ensure that various constants depend only on this uniform bound, rather than on the potential in the sequence.

The two results of this section, which are upper bounds on the norm of the position and squared position operator applied to solutions of (1.1), are in this vein. The theorems, listed below, are essentially the main results of [26]. However, since we must take extra care in the dependencies of the constants which appear in their estimates, we include statements tailored to our setting as well as proofs where necessary.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose there is an $R > 0$ with $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Then, for $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{Dom}(X)$,*

$$\|Xe^{-iHt}\psi\| \leq \alpha(1 + |t|)(\|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|X\psi\|^2)^{1/2} \quad (5.1)$$

for a constant $\alpha(R) = \alpha$.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose there is an $R > 0$ with $\|V\|_\infty \leq R$. Then, for $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap D(X^2)$,*

$$\|X^2 e^{-iHt}\psi\| \leq \beta(1 + t^2)(\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|X^2\psi\|^2)^{1/2} \quad (5.2)$$

for a constant $\beta(R) = \beta$.

More precisely, Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 correspond to Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 of [26], respectively. However, in that paper, the dependencies critical in our work are not recorded. We note also that those authors work in the more general setting of H_0 form bounded or H_0 operator bounded

potentials with relative bound less than 1, while we deal with bounded potentials; indeed the sequence of potentials in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is uniformly bounded. The proof of Theorem 5.1 amounts to a careful accounting of the constants in the proof of [26][Theorem 2.1]; indeed, in our setting, we may take $a = 0$ and $b = R$ in their proof.

Instead, the proof of the statement analogous to Theorem 5.2 in [26] is formal, and although the rigorous proof follows a similar technique to the one of their Theorem 2.1, we provide a rigorous version of the proof below for completeness.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Since we will reduce position estimates to momentum estimates, we begin by recording a pair of estimates of the latter type. For $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\|H_0^{1/2} e^{-itH} \psi\|^2 \leq \|(H_0 + V + R)^{1/2} e^{-itH} \psi\|^2 \leq \|H_0^{1/2} \psi\|^2 + 2R\|\psi\|^2$$

where we have used that

$$\langle e^{-itH} \psi, (H_0 + V) e^{-itH} \psi \rangle = \langle e^{-itH} \psi, e^{-itH} (H_0 + V) \psi \rangle = \langle \psi, (H_0 + V) \psi \rangle.$$

In particular,

$$\|H_0^{1/2} e^{-itH} \psi\|^2 \leq (1 + 2R)\|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^2. \quad (5.3)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|H_0 e^{-itH} \psi\| \leq \|(H_0 + V) e^{-itH} \psi\| + \|V e^{-itH} \psi\| \leq \|H_0 \psi\| + 2R\|\psi\|$$

and

$$\|H_0 e^{-itH} \psi\| \leq \sqrt{2}(1 + 2R)\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (5.4)$$

We now define $F_\epsilon(y) = \frac{y^4}{1+\epsilon y^4}$ and take $F_\epsilon(X(t)) := e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH}$. Our first task is to compute the strong derivative $\frac{d}{dt} F_\epsilon(X(t)) \psi$, for $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$. Fix $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-i(t+h)H} \psi - e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi &= e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-i(t+h)H} \psi - e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi \\ &\quad + e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi - e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi. \end{aligned}$$

We examine the difference quotient of each term individually. For the first, using unitarity of e^{-itH} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|1/h(e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-i(t+h)H} - e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH}) \psi + i e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} H \psi\| \\ &= \|F_\epsilon(X) \frac{1}{h}(e^{-i(t+h)H} - e^{-itH}) \psi + i e^{-itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} H \psi\| \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $h \rightarrow 0$ for $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R})$ by strong continuity of e^{itH} and since $\text{Dom}(H) = H^2(\mathbb{R})$. For the second term, we note that a quick computation shows that $F_\epsilon(X)(H^2(\mathbb{R})) \subseteq H^2(\mathbb{R})$, and we may compute again

$$\begin{aligned} &\|1/h(e^{i(t+h)H} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi - e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi) - i H e^{itH} F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi\| \\ &\leq \|1/h(e^{ihH} - I) F_\epsilon(X) \psi - i H F_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH} \psi\| \end{aligned}$$

which again tends to 0 as h does. Thus, as a map from $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $F_\epsilon(X(t))$ is strongly differentiable with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} F_\epsilon(X(t)) &= i[H, F_\epsilon(X(t))] = i e^{itH} [H_0, F_\epsilon(X)] e^{-itH} \\ &= G_\epsilon(X(t)) D(t) + D(t) G_\epsilon(X(t)) \end{aligned}$$

where $G_\epsilon(y) = \partial_y F_\epsilon(y) = \frac{4y^3}{(1+\epsilon y^4)^2}$, and $G_\epsilon(X(t)) = e^{itH} G_\epsilon(X) e^{-itH}$, $D(t) = -e^{itH} i \frac{d}{dx} e^{-itH}$ as before.

Fixing $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap D(X^2)$, we use the above to find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle = 2 \langle G_\epsilon(X(t))\psi, D(t)\psi \rangle$$

where we note that $G_\epsilon(y) = 4F_\epsilon(y)^{1/2} \frac{y}{(1+\epsilon y^4)^{3/2}}$ and so, setting $g_\epsilon(y) = \frac{y^2}{(1+\epsilon y^4)^3}$, we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle \leq 8 \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(X(t))\psi \rangle^{1/2} \langle D(t)\psi, g_\epsilon(X(t))D(t)\psi \rangle^{1/2}. \quad (5.5)$$

We note that since $g_\epsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, for $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, $g_\epsilon(X)Df = Dg_\epsilon(X)f + i(\partial_x g_\epsilon)(X)f$ by the product rule. Thus, since $e^{-itH} : H^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathbb{R}) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\langle D(t)\psi, g_\epsilon(X(t))D(t)\psi \rangle = \langle D(t)\psi, D(t)g_\epsilon(X(t))\psi \rangle + i \langle D(t)\psi, (\partial_x g_\epsilon)(X(t))\psi \rangle$$

and so by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again

$$\langle D(t)\psi, g_\epsilon(X(t))D(t)\psi \rangle \leq \left(\|H_0^{1/2} e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 + \|H_0 e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\|g_\epsilon(X) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 + \|(\partial_x g_\epsilon(X)) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial_y g_\epsilon(y)}{2F_\epsilon(y)^{1/4}} \right| &= \left| \frac{(1+\epsilon y^4)^{1/4}}{2y} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{2y-10\epsilon y^5}{(1+\epsilon y^4)^4} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1-5\epsilon y^4}{(1+\epsilon y^4)^{15/4}} \right| \leq \frac{1+5\epsilon y^4}{1+\epsilon y^4} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{5\epsilon y^4}{1+\epsilon y^4} \leq 6; \end{aligned}$$

yielding $\partial_y g_\epsilon(y)^2 \leq 144F_\epsilon(y)^{1/2}$. Thus,

$$\|(\partial_x g_\epsilon(X)) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 \leq 144 \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(X(t))^{1/2}\psi \rangle$$

We also have $g_\epsilon(y)^2 \leq F_\epsilon(y)$, which implies

$$\|g_\epsilon(X) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 \leq \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(X(t))\psi \rangle,$$

so that

$$\|(\partial_x g_\epsilon(X)) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 + \|g_\epsilon(X) e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 \leq 288 \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle,$$

by the elementary inequality $(y + \sqrt{y}) \leq 2(1 + y)$.

The inequality (5.4) and the form bound (5.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_0^{1/2} e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 + \|H_0 e^{-iHt}\psi\|^2 &\leq (1+2R)\|\psi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}^2 + 2(1+2R)^2\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 \\ &\leq 4(1+2R)^2\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities to estimate (5.5), we have, with $A(R) = 2^{19/4}\sqrt{3}(1+2R)^{1/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle &\leq 8 \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(X(t))\psi \rangle^{1/2} \langle D(t)\psi, g_\epsilon(X(t))D(t)\psi \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\leq A(R)\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(X(t))\psi \rangle^{1/2} \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle^{1/4} \\ &\leq A(R)\|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle^{3/4} \end{aligned}$$

and integrating the inequality yields

$$\langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)))\psi \rangle^{1/4} \leq \langle \psi, (F_\epsilon(X(t)) + 1)\psi \rangle^{1/4} \leq \langle \psi, F_\epsilon(0)\psi \rangle^{1/4} + \frac{A(R)}{4} \|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} |t|.$$

Taking $\epsilon \searrow 0$ in the above inequality and using the monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$\|X^2 e^{-itH} \psi\|^{1/2} \leq \|X^2 \psi\|^{1/2} + \frac{A(R)}{4} \|\psi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} |t|.$$

Squaring and applying some elementary inequalities, (5.2) follows. \square

REFERENCES

1. J. Asch and A. Knauf, *Motion in periodic potentials*, Nonlinearity **11** (1998), no. 1, 175–200.
2. J. Avron and B. Simon, *Almost periodic schrödinger operators*, Commun. Math. Phys. **82** (1981), 101–120.
3. J. Bourgain, *Anderson localization for quasi-periodic lattice schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^d , d arbitrary*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **17** (2007), 682–706.
4. J. Bourgain, Goldstein M., and Schlag W., *Anderson localization for schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^2 with quasi-periodic potential*, Acta. Math. **188** (2002), 41–86.
5. V. Chulaevskii, *Perturbations of a schrödinger operator with periodic potential (russian)*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **36** (1981), 203–204.
6. J.M. Combes, *Connections between quantum dynamics and spectral properties of time-evolution operators.*, Differential equations with applications to mathematical physics, Mathematics in Science and Engineering **192** (1993), 59–68.
7. D. Damanik, *Schrödinger operators with dynamically defined potentials*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **37** (2017), 1681–1764.
8. D. Damanik, M. Lukic, and W. Yessen, *Quantum dynamics of periodic and limit-periodic jacobi and block jacobi matrices with applications to some quantum many body problems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **337** (2015), 1535–1561.
9. J. Fillman, *Ballistic transport for limit-periodic jacobi matrices with applications to quantum many-body problems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **350** (2017), 1275–1297.
10. J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, and P. Wittwer, *Localization for a class of one dimensional quasi-periodic schrödinger operators*, Commun. Math. Phys. **132** (1990), 5–25.
11. L. Ge and I. Kachkovskiy, *Ballistic transport for one-dimensional quasiperiodic schrödinger operators*, preprint (2020).
12. I. Guarneri, *Spectral properties of quantum diffusion on discrete lattices.*, Europhysics Lett. **10** (1989), 95–100.
13. ———, *On an estimate concerning quantum diffusion in the presence of a fractional spectrum.*, Europhysics Lett. **21** (1993), 729–733.
14. Bellissard J. and Schulz-Baldes H., *Subdiffusive quantum transport for 3d-hamiltonians with absolutely continuous spectra*, J. Stat. Phys. **99** (2000), 587–594.
15. J.Fillman and M. Lukić, *Spectral homogeneity of limit-periodic schrödinger operators*, Journal of Spectral Theory **7** (2017), no. 2, 387–406.
16. I. Kachkovskiy, *On transport properties of isotropic quasiperiodic xy spin chains.*, Commun. Math. Phys. **345** (2016), 659–673.
17. Y. Karpeshina, Y. Lee, R. Shterenberg, and G. Stolz, *Ballistic transport for the schrödinger operator with limit-periodic or quasi-periodic potential in dimension two*, Commun. Math. Phys. **354** (2017), 85–113.

18. T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995.
19. A. Kiselev and Y. Last, *Solutions, spectrum, and dynamics for schrödinger operators on infinite domains*, Duke Math. J. **99** (2000), 125–150.
20. P. Kuchment, *An overview of periodic elliptic operators*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **53** (2016), 343–414.
21. Y. Last, *Quantum dynamics and decompositions of singular continuous spectra*, J. Funct. Anal. **154** (1996), 406–445.
22. J. Moser, *An example of a schrodinger equation with almost periodic potential and nowhere dense spectrum*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **56** (1981), 198–224.
23. L. Pastur and A. Figotin, *Spectra of random and almost-periodic operators*, A Series of Comprehensive Studies in Mathematics, vol. 297, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.
24. L.A Pastur and V.A Tkachenko, *On the spectral theory of the one-dimensional schrödinger operator with limit-periodic potential (russian).*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **279** (1984), 1050–1053.
25. ———, *Spectral theory of a class of one-dimensional schrodinger operators with limit-periodic potentials (russian).*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obshch. **51** (1988), 114–168.
26. C. Radin and B.Simon, *Invariant domains for the time-dependent schrödinger equation*, Journal of Differential Equations **29** (1978), no. 2, 289–296.
27. M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, ii: Fourier analysis, self-adjointness*, Academic Press, Cambridge, 1975.
28. ———, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, iv: Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, Cambridge, 1978.
29. ———, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, iii: Scattering theory*, Academic Press, Cambridge, 1979.
30. B. Simon, *Almost periodic schrödinger operators: A review.*, Advances in applied mathematics **3** (1982), 463–490.
31. B. Simon, *Absence of ballistic motion*, Commun. Math. Phys. **149** (1990), 209–212.
32. Ya. G. . Sinai, *Anderson localization for one-dimensional difference schrödinger operator with quasiperiodic potential*, J. Stat. Phys. **46** (1987), 861–909.
33. Z. Zhang and Z. Zhao, *Ballistic transport and absolute continuity of one-frequency schrödinger operators.*, Commun. Math. Phys. **351** (2017), 877–921.
34. Z. Zhao, *Ballistic motion in one-dimensional quasi-periodic discrete schrödinger equation.*, Commun. Math. Phys. **347** (2016), 511–549.
35. ———, *Ballistic transport in one-dimensional quasi-periodic continuous schrödinger equation.*, Journal of Differential Equations **262** (2017), 4523–4566.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA
 Email address: gfy@rice.edu