

ABSOLUTELY CONTINUOUS SPECTRUM FOR RANDOM SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS ON THE FIBONACCI AND SIMILAR TREE-STRIPS

CHRISTIAN SADEL

ABSTRACT. We will consider cross products of finite graphs with a class of trees that have arbitrarily but finitely long line segments, such as the Fibonacci tree. Such cross products are called tree-strips. We prove that for small disorder random Schrödinger operators on such tree-strips have purely absolutely continuous spectrum in a certain set.

1. INTRODUCTION

It will be most convenient to describe the trees considered in this work by a substitution rule given by a substitution matrix $(S_{pq})_{p,q=0}^L \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{(L+1) \times (L+1)}$ with positive integer entries. The trees are constructed starting from a root and the matrix gives the rule how to substitute a vertex by its children going to the next generation. Here, 'generation' describes the graph distance from the root, the 'children' of a vertex are all connected neighbors whose graph distance to the root is increased by one, the other neighbor will be called 'parent'.

The precise substitution rule is the following: Each vertex x of the tree has a label $l(x) \in \{0, \dots, L\}$, one starts with the root with a certain label, then each vertex of label p has exactly S_{pq} children of label q . The (isomorphy class of the) tree is then determined by the matrix S and the label of the root.

We will consider the trees for the substitution matrices $S^{K,L} = [S_{p,q}^{K,L}]_{p,q=0}^L$ with $S_{0,0}^{K,L} = K$, $S_{p,p+1}^{K,L} = 1$, $S_{L,0}^{K,L} = 1$, and all other entries 0, where $K \geq 1$ and $L \geq 1$ are integers,

$$S^{K,L} = \begin{pmatrix} K & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{e.g. for } L = 1, \quad S^{K,1} = \begin{pmatrix} K & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.1)$$

We denote the tree with root label $p \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ and substitution matrix $S^{K,L}$ by $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ and then define the forest $\mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ to be the disjoint, disconnected union of the $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$, i.e. $\mathbb{T}^{K,L} = \bigcup_{p=0}^L \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$. Another way to think of the tree $\mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ is to start with the rooted Bethe lattice where each vertex has $K + 1$ children (i.e. the root

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 82B44, Secondary 47B80, 60H25.

Key words and phrases. random Schrödinger operators, Anderson model, Fibonacci tree, extended states, absolutely continuous spectrum.

This research was supported by NSERC Discovery grant 92997-2010 RGPIN and by the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the EU 7th Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013, REA grant 291734.

has $K + 1$ neighbors and any other vertex has $K + 2$ neighbors) and then for each vertex one takes one of the $K + 1$ forward edges (going to the next generation) and puts L additional vertices on them (cf. Figure 1).




FIGURE 1. The tree $\mathbb{T}_0^{2,3}$, $K = 2$, $L = 3$. The open circles are vertices of label 0, the full filled circles are vertices of label 1, each vertex of label 1 is followed by one vertex of label 2 and one of label 3. These labels are indicated by different shadings of the circles.

The Fibonacci trees are the trees associated to the substitution matrix $S^{1,1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, i.e. each vertex x of the tree has either the label $l(x) = 0$ or $l(x) = 1$, each vertex with label 0 has a child with label 0 and one with label 1 and each child with label 1 has one child with label 0. So each vertex of label 1, except for possibly the root, has 2 neighbors (one parent and 1 child), and each vertex of label 0, except for possibly the root, has 3 neighbors (one parent and 2 children). (see Figure 2).

These trees are called Fibonacci trees for the following reason. Let $\#_n(\mathbb{T}_j^{1,1})$ denote the number of vertices in the n -th generation of the tree $\mathbb{T}_j^{1,1}$, the root being the first generation. Moreover, let f_n denote the n -th Fibonacci number starting with $f_1 = 1$, $f_2 = 1$. Then, one has $\#_n(\mathbb{T}_1^{1,1}) = f_n$ and $\#_n(\mathbb{T}_0^{1,1}) = f_{n+1}$.

By $d(x, y)$ we denote the graph distance of $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$, where $d(x, y) = \infty$ if x and y are elements of different connected components $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$.

A tree-strip is the cross product of a tree with a finite set $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$. On $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L} \times \mathcal{I}) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L}, \mathbb{C}^m) = \{u : \mathbb{T}^{K,L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m, \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}} \|u(x)\|^2 < \infty\}$ which is also canonically equivalent to $\bigoplus_{p=0}^L \ell^2(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}, \mathbb{C}^m)$ and $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$, we define the random operators

$$(H_\lambda u)(x) = \left(\sum_{y:d(x,y)=1} u(y) \right) + Au(x) + \lambda V(x)u(x). \quad (1.2)$$




FIGURE 2. Fibonacci tree $\mathbb{T}_1^{1,1}$. Vertices of label 1 are filled circles and vertices of label 0 are non-filled circles. The trees $\mathbb{T}_1^{1,L}$ look similar where each filled circle has to be replaced by a chain (line-segment) of L vertices.

Here, $A \in \text{Sym}(m)$ represents the 'free vertical operator' and the matrices $V(x) \in \text{Sym}(m)$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ are independent identically distributed random variables, distributed according to some probability measure ν on $\text{Sym}(m)$ and scaled by the coupling constant λ . $\text{Sym}(m)$ denotes the set of real symmetric $m \times m$ matrices. These operators might be either thought of to model one particle on the product $\mathbb{T}^{K,L} \times \mathcal{I}$ or to model one particle on $\mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ with internal degrees of freedom and random hopping between these internal degrees, described by A and $V(x)$. Clearly, $H_\lambda = \bigoplus_{p=0}^L H_\lambda^{(p)}$, where $H_\lambda^{(p)}$ is the restriction of H_λ to $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}, \mathbb{C}^m)$ and can be seen as random Schrödinger operator on the tree strip $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L} \times \mathcal{I}$.

If $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{G}$ is a finite graph, then $\mathbb{T}^{K,L} \times \mathbb{G}$ can be interpreted as the product graph where $(x, k), (y, j) \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L} \times \mathbb{G}$ are connected by an edge, if either $x = y$ and $k, j \in \mathbb{G}$ are connected by an edge, or $k = j$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ are connected by an edge. If A is chosen to be the adjacency matrix of \mathbb{G} and $V(x)$ diagonal with i.i.d. entries, then H_0 is the adjacency operator on this product graph and H_λ corresponds to the Anderson model on this product graph.

For the Anderson model on \mathbb{Z}^d or \mathbb{R}^d in any dimension d , Anderson localization is proved at spectral edges and for high disorder [FS, FMSS, DLS, SW, CKM, DK, Kl2, AM, Aiz, Wa, Klo]. It is also known to hold for one dimensional [GMP, KuS, CKM] and quasi-one dimensional models like strips [Lac, KLS] and finite dimensional trees [Breu], except if a built in symmetry prevents localization as e.g. in [SS]. In dimensions $d \geq 3$ the Anderson model is expected to have some absolutely continuous spectrum (short a.c. spectrum) for low disorder whereas for $d = 2$ one expects localization. These conjectures remain open problems. The existence of a.c. spectrum has only been proved for the Anderson model on trees and other tree-like graphs of infinite dimension with exponentially growing boundary [Kl3, Kl4, Kl6, ASW, FHS, FHS2, Hal, AW, K LW, K LW2, FHH, KS, Sad, Sha]. This work adds some more examples to this list. It appears that the hyperbolic nature of such graphs leads to conservation of a.c. spectrum and ballistic dynamical behavior [Kl5, KS2, AW2] and these results should hold for much more general hyperbolic graphs. Therefore, it may be worth it to further generalize the results and identify the technical problems occurring in this process. Also, a recent review emphasized the importance of trees of finite cone type [KLW3] and the trees $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ belong to this class. If a tree has an assigned root 0 then the n -th generation is the

set of vertices x with graph distance $d(x, 0) = n$. The cone of descendants of x is then defined as the set of vertices y , where the shortest path to the root goes through x , i.e. the set of y such that $d(0, y) = d(0, x) + d(x, y)$. The phrase 'finite cone type' refers to the fact, that there are only finitely many different (isomorphism classes of) cones of descendants. Using the isomorphism class of the cone as label, each tree of finite cone type can be associated to a substitution matrix, and each tree associated to a substitution matrix is a tree of finite cone type. For the case considered here, the trees $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ for $p \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ are exactly the different isomorphism classes of cones of descendants.

In my previous work [Sad] I already considered random Schrödinger operators on tree-strips of finite cone type. However, none of these trees $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ were covered there. One of the main assumptions needed in [Sad] was that every vertex has at least 2 children which played a significant role at various places. This means the trees could not have any line segment, that is a vertex or chain of vertices not being the root which has only two neighbors, one parent and one child. The trees $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ have line segments of length L . In some sense these are the simplest trees with that property. The main argument in [Sad] is adapted from [Kl3, KS] and uses a fixed point equation and the Implicit Function Theorem performed in some Banach spaces that are associated to supersymmetric functions. As we will see, for the tree-strips considered here this technique still works, but there are quite a few technical subtleties that are pointed out in this work. The Implicit Function Theorem has to be applied in a slightly different Banach space ($\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ instead of \mathcal{H}_∞^{L+1}). In general, \mathcal{H}_p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ is in some sense the intersection of a supersymmetric L^2 and L^∞ space. For the set up of the fixed point equation in [Sad] it was important to always have a product of at least two such functions which then is a L^2 and L^1 function, so that the Fourier transform is mapping them back to a L^2 and L^∞ function. The line segments in $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ lead to the fact that we do not have such products of functions so that a Fourier transform is just giving an L^2 but not necessarily an L^∞ function. The change of this Banach spaces also leads to adjustments in the inductive Proposition 6.3 and the final arguments giving a continuous extension of the Green's matrix to real energies which is given by certain integrals (cf. (6.6) and (6.7)). For this it is important that the terms inside the integral extend continuously in a supersymmetric L^1 , something that can still be achieved here. In former works [KS, Sad] these terms even extended in \mathcal{H}_1 , which is not anymore the case here. For the analysis of the Frechet derivative, compactness of a certain operator is needed which also demands some additional work in this case (cf. Proposition C.1). It relies on the identities mentioned in Appendix B. Some of the different used arguments need a stronger assumption on the distribution of the matrix valued potential $V(x)$, namely it has to be compactly supported. Another new aspect in this work is the use of the identity given in Proposition A.1 to obtain that a certain Frechet derivative is invertible. This method would not work for all the trees considered in [Sad] where an extremely technical described set of energies where the Frechet derivative is not invertible, had to be removed.

For the Fibonacci tree one can explicitly calculate the spectrum for the adjacency operator (cf. Proposition 1.1), therefore the main theorem is less technical for this case.

Moreover, in [Sad, Theorem 1.2] some set of energies had to be excluded to get the almost sure a.c. spectrum. This set was given by a very technical condition

which was shown to remove a nowhere dense set in a certain case. In Lemma 5.2 we show that this condition is never satisfied for the trees considered here, hence we do not have to remove certain energies. The argument is based on an identity satisfied by the Green's functions and shown in Appendix A.

Considering (1.2), let us remark that there is an orthogonal matrix $O \in O(m)$ such that $O^\top A O$ is diagonal. Then $(\mathbf{1} \otimes O)$ is unitary and one obtains the equivalent family of operators

$$[(\mathbf{1} \otimes O)^* H_\lambda (\mathbf{1} \otimes O)] u(x) = \left(\sum_{y:d(x,y)=1} u(y) \right) + O^\top A O u(x) + \lambda O^\top V(x) O u(x).$$

Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume that A is a diagonal matrix and we will do so in the proofs. In particular, the non-random operator H_0 is unitarily equivalent to a direct sum of shifted adjacency operators on $\mathbb{T}^{K,L}$, $H_0 = \Delta \otimes \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1} \otimes A \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \Delta + a_j$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ where the a_j are the eigenvalues of A and Δ describes the adjacency operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L})$ given by

$$(\Delta v)(x) = \sum_{y:d(x,y)=1} v(y), \quad v \in \ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L}). \quad (1.3)$$

Our interest lies in the spectral type of H_λ . In order to state the main theorems we have to consider the adjacency operator first. From now on we have a fixed K, L and will omit these indices in many future defined quantities. The root of $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ will be called $0^{(p)}$. For $x \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ we let $|x\rangle \in \ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L})$ denote the element

$$\text{given by } |x\rangle(y) = \delta_{x,y} = \begin{cases} 1 & : x = y \\ 0 & : x \neq y \end{cases}.$$

For some operator H , $\langle x|H|y\rangle$ denotes the scalar product between $|x\rangle$ and $H|y\rangle$, where we use the physics convention that the scalar product is anti-linear in the first and linear in the second component. For $p \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ and $\text{Im}(z) > 0$ we define the Green's functions

$$\Gamma_z^{(p)} := \langle 0^{(p)} | (\Delta - z)^{-1} | 0^{(p)} \rangle. \quad (1.4)$$

For $E \in \mathbb{R}$ we further define $\Gamma_E^{(p)}$ by the limit

$$\Gamma_E^{(p)} := \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \Gamma_{E+i\eta}^{(p)} \quad \text{if the limit exists in } \mathbb{C}. \quad (1.5)$$

Let us define the following sets of energies $E \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$I_p^{K,L} := \{E \in \mathbb{R} : \Gamma_E^{(p)} \text{ exists, and } \text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(p)}) > 0\}. \quad (1.6)$$

Furthermore, for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ let Δ_d denote the $d \times d$ adjacency matrix for the finite line with d vertices and $d-1$ edges, i.e.

$$\Delta_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Mat}(d \times d, \mathbb{R}) \quad \text{with the convention } \Delta_1 = 0. \quad (1.7)$$

We set

$$\mathcal{E}_L := \bigcup_{d=1}^L \sigma(\Delta_d) \quad \text{and} \quad I_0^{K,L} := I_0^{K,L} \setminus \mathcal{E}_L \quad (1.8)$$

where $\sigma(\Delta_d)$ denotes the set of eigenvalues of the matrix Δ_d and therefore, \mathcal{E}_L is a finite set.

Proposition 1.1. *We have:*

- (i) For all $p \in \{0, \dots, L\}$, $I_p^{K,L} = I_0^{K,L}$. $I_0^{K,L}$ and $I^{K,L}$ are non-empty unions of finitely many open intervals and for all p , $\Gamma_E^{(p)}$ depends analytically on $E \in I_0^{K,L}$.
- (ii) The absolutely continuous spectrum of the adjacency operator Δ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}^{K,L})$ is given by the closure

$$\sigma_{ac}(\Delta) = \overline{I^{K,L}} = \overline{I_0^{K,L}}.$$

- (iii) For any fixed L and E_0 there is a K_0 such that for $K > K_0$ the closure of $I^{K,L}$ includes the interval $[-E_0, E_0]$, i.e.

$$[-E_0, E_0] \subset \overline{I^{K,L}} \quad \text{for all } K > K_0 = K_0(L, E_0). \quad (1.9)$$

- (iv) For the Fibonacci trees ($K = L = 1$) we have

$$I^{1,1} = \left(-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3}, 0\right) \cup \left(0, \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3}\right). \quad (1.10)$$

Letting $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_m$ be the eigenvalues of A , one obtains that the a.c. spectrum of H_0 is given by the union of the bands $\bigcup_{j=1}^m (\overline{I^{K,L}} + a_j)$. However, as in previous work using this method [KS, Sad] we have to restrict ourselves to the intersections of such bands and we need to assume that this intersection is not empty. Therefore, define

$$I_A^{K,L} := \bigcap_{j=1}^m I^{K,L} + a_j. \quad (1.11)$$

For the regular tree-strip, the technique with resonances does not have this weakness (cf. [Sha]) and in fact gives existence of a.c. spectrum in a set that corresponds to the ℓ^1 spectrum of the free operator (intersected with the real line¹). However, [Sha] needs a full random matrix potential $V(x)$ as e.g. from the GOE ensemble and therefore does not handle the Anderson model on tree-strips. Extending this method to a non regular tree or tree-strip such as the Fibonacci tree would be interesting in order to confirm that the ℓ^1 spectrum of the adjacency operator determines the mobility edge for small λ . Besides we will also need to assume that the random potential is almost surely bounded:

Assumptions. *The following assumptions turn out to be crucial for the results.*

- (V) The distribution ν of $V(x)$ is compactly supported in $\text{Sym}(m)$.
- (A) Assume that the eigenvalues of A are such that the set $I_A^{K,L}$ is not empty in which case it is a union of finitely many open intervals.
By Proposition 1.1 (iii) for any fixed L and A there is a K_0 such that for $K > K_0$, $I_A^{K,L}$ is not empty, so the condition is fulfilled.
In the Fibonacci case $K = L = 1$ this assumption reduces to

$$a_{\max} - a_{\min} < 3\sqrt{3},$$

¹The ℓ^1 spectrum of the adjacency operator is in general not a subset of the real line

where a_{\max} is the biggest and a_{\min} the smallest eigenvalue of A , and then

$$I_A^{1,1} = \left(-\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3} + a_{\max}, \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{3} + a_{\min} \right) \setminus \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}. \quad (1.12)$$

In order to consider the spectrum of H_λ we introduce the matrix-valued spectral measures at the vertices of the forest $\mathbb{T}^{K,L}$. For $x \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$, $j \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ let $|x, j\rangle$ denote the element in $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}^m)$ satisfying $|x, j\rangle(y) = \delta_{x,y} e_j$ where e_j is the j -th canonical basis vector in \mathbb{C}^m . Similar as before, $\langle x, j|H|y, k\rangle$ denotes the scalar product between $|x, j\rangle$ and $H|y, k\rangle$ with the convention that the scalar product is linear in the second and anti-linear in the first component. Then, for $x \in \mathbb{T}^{K,L}$ we define the random, positive matrix valued measure μ_x on \mathbb{R} by

$$\int f(E) d\mu_x(E) = [\langle x, j|f(H_\lambda)|x, k\rangle]_{j,k \in \mathcal{I}} \quad (1.13)$$

for all compactly supported, continuous functions f on \mathbb{R} .

Theorem 1.2. *Let the assumptions (A) and (V) be satisfied. Moreover, for $p \neq 0$ let $1_0^{(p)}$ be the first vertex (smallest distance to root) with label 0, i.e. $1_0^{(p)}$ is the unique vertex with $d(0^{(p)}, 1_0^{(p)}) = L - p + 1$. Then, there is an open neighborhood U of $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 such that the following holds:*

- (i) *The spectrum of H_λ is almost surely purely absolutely continuous in $U_\lambda = \{E : (\lambda, E) \in U\}$.*
- (ii) *For every $x \in \mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with $p = 1, \dots, L$ and $d(x, 0^{(p)}) > L - p$, the density of the absolutely continuous average spectral measure $\mathbb{E}(\mu_x)$ in U_λ depends continuously on $(\lambda, E) \in U$. The condition $d(x, 0^{(p)}) > L - p$ means that either $x = 1_0^{(p)}$ or that x is a descendant of $1_0^{(p)}$ in $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$, $p \neq 0$.*
- (iii) *The density of $\mathbb{E}(\mu_{0^{(0)}})$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mu_{1_0^{(p)}})$ for $p = 1, \dots, L$ are positive definite in U_λ . This implies that H_λ and also all the parts $H_\lambda^{(p)}$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L} \times \mathcal{I})$ have spectrum in U_λ with positive probability.*

Remark 1.3. *Except for the removal of \mathcal{E}_L , the set $I_A^{K,L}$ here corresponds to $I_{A,S} = I_{A,S^{K,L}}$ in [Sad]. The handling of the line segments requires to exclude the finitely many energies in \mathcal{E}_L . In [Sad] we also needed to remove some more energies defined by a very technical condition to get some smaller set $\hat{I}_{A,S}$. This set occurred because the main argument is based on the Implicit Function Theorem and one needs a certain Frechet derivative to be invertible. Here, this Frechet derivative will always be invertible for all $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ by Lemma 5.2 which relies on the identity given in Proposition 2.1. This identity holds more general for the Green's functions on trees of finite cone type as shown in Appendix A. Using this identity and essentially the same line of arguments as in Lemma 5.2, one can actually show that $I_{A,S} = \hat{I}_{A,S}$ as defined in [Sad] for any substitution matrix $S \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{k \times k}$ that has at least one positive entry on the diagonal and where the determinants of all diagonal minors of $-S$ are non-positive. Here a diagonal minor of a square matrix is a matrix obtained by deleting finitely many rows and the **same** columns, i.e. one deletes the i_1, \dots, i_l row and column to get a $(k-l) \times (k-l)$ matrix. The 1×1 diagonal minors are exactly the diagonal elements. For 2×2 substitution matrices this condition simply means that there is one positive diagonal element and the determinant is negative.*

The important objects we work with are the matrix Green's functions given by

$$G_\lambda^{[x]}(z) := [\langle x, j | (H - z)^{-1} | x, k \rangle]_{j,k \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m} \quad (1.14)$$

for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$. The most important ingredient to obtain Theorem 1.2 is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Under assumptions (V) and (A) there exists an open neighborhood U of $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 such that for all vertices $x \in \mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and all $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with $d(0^{(p)}, x) > L - p$ the functions*

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda, E, \eta) &\mapsto \mathbb{E} \left(G_\lambda^{[x]}(E + i\eta) \right), \\ (\lambda, E, \eta) &\mapsto \mathbb{E} \left(\left| G_\lambda^{[x]}(E + i\eta) \right|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

defined for $\eta > 0$, have continuous extensions to $U \times [0, \infty)$.

Let us show now that Theorem 1.4 implies Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Part (ii) follows immediately as $\mathbb{E}(G_\lambda^{[x]}(z))$ is the Stieltjes transform of $\mathbb{E}(\mu_x)$ and hence $\mathbb{E}(\mu_x)(dE) = * - \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \mathbb{E}(G_{\lambda, E+i\eta}) dE$. Here $* - \lim$ denotes a limit in the weak $*$ topology on bounded measures. For part (iii) we remark that for $\lambda = 0$ one can explicitly calculate the matrix Green's functions and see that for energies $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ the limit of the imaginary parts are positive definite (cf. Remark 2.2). By continuity around $\lambda = 0$ this remains true for a possibly smaller neighborhood $U \supset \{0\} \times I_A^{K,L}$.

To get (i) note that for any compact interval $[a, b] \subset U_\lambda$ one has by Fatou's lemma

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\liminf_{\text{Im}(z) \downarrow 0} \int_a^b \text{Tr}(|G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)|^2) dE \right) \leq \liminf_{\text{Im}(z) \downarrow 0} \int_a^b \mathbb{E} \left(\text{Tr}(|G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)|^2) \right) dE < \infty$$

Thus,

$$\liminf_{\text{Im}(z) \downarrow 0} \int_a^b \text{Tr} \left(\left| G_\lambda^{[x]}(z) \right|^2 \right) dE < \infty \quad \text{with probability one.} \quad (1.15)$$

As $G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)$ is the Stieltjes transform of μ_x this implies that, almost surely, μ_x is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure in $(a, b) \subset U_\lambda$ and the density is a positive matrix valued L^2 function for all $x \in \mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and all $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with $d(0^{(p)}, x) > L - p$. (cf. [Kl6, Theorem 4.1] and [Kel, Theorem 2.6]). This gives the almost sure pure a.c. spectrum on any interval (a, b) with closure in U_λ as the cyclic spaces of the vectors $|x, j\rangle$ for those x span $\ell^3(\mathbb{T}^{K,L} \times \mathcal{I})$. Writing U_λ as a countable union of such closed compact intervals $[a, b]$ one realizes by taking the intersection of the corresponding sets in the probability space that with probability one the spectrum of H_λ is purely absolutely continuous in U_λ . \square

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 the Green's functions $\Gamma_z^{(p)}$ are considered in more detail and Proposition 1.1 is proved. In Section 3 we consider the recursion of the forward Green's matrices that lead to a fixed point equation. Then, in Section 4, we introduce the important Banach spaces in which this fixed point equation has to be analyzed and in Section 5 we investigate the Fréchet derivative.

Finally, in Section 6 we conclude to obtain Theorem 1.4. Appendices A, B and C state some general facts that are used along the way.

2. THE UNPERTURBED GREEN'S FUNCTIONS

The main goal of this section is to prove Proposition 1.1. Some of the statements are consequences of more general considerations as done in [Kel, KLW].

Recall that we denoted the Green's functions at the roots 0_p by $\Gamma_z^{(p)}$ for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$ and for $z = E \in I_p^{K,L}$ it also denotes the limit for $\text{Im}(z) \downarrow 0$ if it exists (cf. (1.4), (1.5)). Let us also define the spectral measures $\nu^{(p)}$ by

$$\int f(x) d\nu^{(p)}(x) = \langle 0^{(p)} | f(\Delta) | 0^{(p)} \rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

As $z \mapsto \Gamma_z^{(p)}$ is the Stieltjes transform of the measure $\nu^{(p)}$ the absolutely continuous part is the closure of $I_p^{K,L}$. Now for any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ we can take the path to the root and cut off the trees connected to this path, which are all equivalent to one of the $\mathbb{T}_q^{K,L}$. Then, using an induction argument (induction over distance to root) as done in [Kel, Prop. 2.9] or alternatively using [FLSSS, Lemma 2.2] one finds

$$\sigma_{ac}(\Delta) = \bigcup_{p=0}^L \overline{I_p^{K,L}}. \quad (2.2)$$

Note that when cutting the connections to the root in $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ then for $0 < p < L$ we get $\mathbb{T}_{p+1}^{K,L}$, for $p = L$ we get $\mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and for $p = 0$ we get the union of K times $\mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and one $\mathbb{T}_1^{K,L}$. Therefore, the standard recursion relations for the Green's functions that can be obtained from the resolvent identity (cf. [ASW, FHS, Kl3, KLW, Kel]) are given by

$$\Gamma_z^{(0)} = \frac{-1}{z + K\Gamma_z^{(0)} + \Gamma_z^{(1)}}, \quad \Gamma_z^{(p)} = \frac{-1}{z + \Gamma_z^{(p+1)}}, \quad \Gamma_z^{(L)} = \frac{-1}{z + \Gamma_z^{(0)}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $p = 1, \dots, L-1$. By an hyperbolic contraction argument as in [KLW, Kel] one obtains that for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$, these equations combined with the restriction $\text{Im}(\Gamma_z^{(p)}) > 0$, $p = 0, 1, \dots, L$ determine the Green's functions uniquely.

The right hand sides of the last two equations in (2.3) can be seen as Möbius actions $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & z \end{pmatrix} \cdot \Gamma = \frac{-1}{\Gamma+z}$. Defining the polynomials $c_0(z) = 0$, $c_1(z) = 1$ and iteratively $c_{k+1}(z) = z c_k(z) - c_{k-1}(z)$ one obtains by induction

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & z \end{pmatrix}^k = \begin{pmatrix} -c_{k-1}(z) & -c_k(z) \\ c_k(z) & c_{k+1}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad (2.4)$$

$$c_k(z) = \frac{c_+(z)^k - c_-(z)^k}{c_+(z) - c_-(z)} \quad \text{where} \quad c_{\pm}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \left(z \pm \sqrt{z^2 - 4} \right). \quad (2.5)$$

Here one can choose any of the two roots for $\sqrt{z^2 - 4}$, changing the root switches $c_+(z)$ and $c_-(z)$ but does not change $c_k(z)$. As the determinant of these matrices are always one, we also find

$$c_k^2(z) - c_{k-1}(z)c_{k+1}(z) = 1. \quad (2.6)$$

It can be seen from the recursion relations defining $c_k(z)$ that $c_k(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $k-1$ with real coefficients and it is even if k is odd and odd if k is even.

Now, (2.3) and (2.4) lead to

$$\Gamma_z^{(0)} \left[z + K\Gamma_z^{(0)} + \begin{pmatrix} -c_{L-1}(z) & -c_L(z) \\ c_L(z) & c_{L+1}(z) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \Gamma_z^{(0)} \right] + 1 = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

which using $zc_L - c_{L-1} = c_{L+1}$ can be rewritten as

$$Kc_L(z)(\Gamma_z^{(0)})^3 + (K+1)c_{L+1}(z)(\Gamma_z^{(0)})^2 + zc_{L+1}(z)\Gamma_z^{(0)} + c_{L+1}(z) = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

Using the uniqueness of solutions in the upper half plane we see that $I_0^{K,L}$ is given by the set of real energies E such that the cubic equation with real coefficients

$$Kc_L(E)x^3 + (K+1)c_{L+1}(E)x^2 + Ec_{L+1}(E)x + c_{L+1}(E) = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

has a solution x with a positive imaginary part and $\Gamma_E^{(0)}$ is that solution.

With this characterization we have now established everything to prove Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Using equations (2.3) in the limits $\text{Im}(z) \rightarrow 0$ we see that

$$I_0^{K,L} \subset I_1^{K,L} \subset \dots \subset I_L^{K,L} \subset I_0^{K,L}, \quad \text{hence } I_p^{K,L} = I_0^{K,L}. \quad (2.10)$$

For the inclusion $I_0^{K,L} \subset I_1^{K,L}$ note that the first equation of (2.3) gives $\Gamma_z^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2K} \left(-\Gamma_z^{(1)} - z + \sqrt{(\Gamma_z^{(1)} + z)^2 - 4K} \right)$ where we have to take the square root with the positive imaginary part (the other one will have a negative imaginary part). Hence for $E \in I_1^{K,L}$ we have a limit for $\Gamma_{E+i\eta}^{(0)}$ for $\eta \downarrow 0$ with non-negative imaginary part. As $\text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(1)}) > 0$ we find $\text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(0)}) > 0$ for $E \in I_1^{K,L}$.

By the characterization of $I_0^{K,L}$ as in (2.9) one sees that $I_0^{K,L}$ is in fact the set of energies E where the discriminant $D = D(E)$ of (2.9) is negative,

$$D = c_{L+1}^2 \left(18K(K+1)Ec_L c_{L+1} + (K+1)^2 E^2 c_{L+1}^2 - 4KE^3 c_L c_{L+1} - 27K^2 c_L^2 - 4(K+1)^3 c_{L+1}^2 \right). \quad (2.11)$$

If $c_{L+1}(E) = 0$ then the term inside the parenthesis for D is negative coming from the term $-27K^2 c_L^2(E)$, using (2.6), $c_L(E) \neq 0$. By induction one also gets that $c_{L+1}(E)$ is the characteristic polynomial $\det(E\mathbf{1} - \Delta_L)$ for the matrix Δ_L as in (1.7), so it has real roots and in a neighborhood of these roots, $D < 0$. Therefore, $I_0^{K,L}$ is not empty. Moreover, as $D(E)$ is a polynomial in E , $I_0^{K,L}$ and $I^{K,L} \setminus \mathcal{E}_L$ are unions of finitely many open intervals. As there is a solution formula for cubic equations we also find that $\Gamma_E^{(0)}$ and by (2.3) all $\Gamma_E^{(p)}$ are analytic in $E \in I_0^{K,L}$. This finishes part (i).

As $I^{K,L}$ has only finitely many points removed from $I_0^{K,L}$, we have

$$\overline{I^{K,L}} = \overline{I_0^{K,L}} = \bigcup_{p=0}^L \overline{I_p^{K,L}} = \sigma_{ac}(\Delta) \quad (2.12)$$

giving part (ii).

To get part (iii) note that we find an open neighborhood \mathcal{O} of these zeros, such that for fixed L , all $E \in \mathcal{O}$ and all $K > 0$,

$$18K(K+1)Ec_L c_{L+1} + (K+1)^2 E^2 c_{L+1}^2 - 4KE^3 c_L c_{L+1} - 27K^2 c_L^2 < 0. \quad (2.13)$$

In particular, if $E \in \mathcal{O}$ and $c_{L+1}(E) \neq 0$ then for all K we find $D(E) < 0$. In the compact set $[-E_0, E_0] \setminus \mathcal{O}$, $c_{L+1}^2(E)$ attains a minimum value bigger than zero and c_L and c_{L+1} are bounded. The highest power in K appearing inside the parenthesis on the right hand side of (2.11) is the negative term $-4(K+1)^3 c_{L+1}^2$. Therefore, we find $K_0 = K_0(L, E_0)$, such that $D(E) < 0$ for all $E \in [-E_0, E_0] \setminus \mathcal{O}$ and $K > K_0$. In this case we obtain $[-E_0, E_0] \subset I_0^{K,L}$ finishing part (iii).

For part (iv) note that for $K = L = 1$ using $c_1(E) = 1$, $c_2(E) = E$ we find $D = 4E^4 - 27E^2 = E^2(4E^2 - 27)$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{0\}$ giving

$$I^{1,1} = I_0^{1,1} = \left(-\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2}; \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.14)$$

□

For our further analysis we will also need the following property.

Proposition 2.1. *For $E \in I^{K,L}$ one has*

$$K \left| \Gamma_E^{(0)} \right|^2 + \left| \Gamma_E^{(0)} \Gamma_E^{(1)} \cdots \Gamma_E^{(L)} \right|^2 = 1. \quad (2.15)$$

Proof. Equation (2.15) can be rewritten as

$$\det \left[\mathbf{1} - \begin{pmatrix} \left| \Gamma_E^{(0)} \right|^2 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \left| \Gamma_E^{(L)} \right|^2 \end{pmatrix} S^{K,L} \right] = 0 \quad (2.16)$$

which is an identity shown for the more general case of trees of finite cone type in Proposition A.1 in Appendix A. □

Remark 2.2. *As $I_A^{K,L} = \bigcap_{j=1}^m (I^{K,L} + a_j)$ we get for $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ that $E - a_j \in I^{K,L}$ for all eigenvalues a_j of A . In particular $\Gamma_{E-a_j}^{(p)}$ exists and $\text{Im}(\Gamma_{E-a_j}^{(p)}) > 0$.*

3. RECURSION FOR MATRIX GREEN'S FUNCTIONS

A key identity for the analysis of Schrödinger operators on trees and tree-strips are the well known identities like (2.3) for forward matrix Green's functions that can be obtained from the resolvent identity. Let \mathbb{T}_x be some tree that has a vertex x and let $\mathcal{N}(x)$ be the set of neighboring points in \mathbb{T}_x . If H_λ is given as in (1.2) on $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}_x \times \mathcal{I})$ with $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ then the Green's matrix $(G_{x,\lambda,z})_{jk} = \langle x, j | (H_\lambda - z)^{-1} | x, k \rangle$ satisfies

$$G_{x,\lambda,z} = - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{N}(x)} G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|x)} + z - A - \lambda V(x) \right)^{-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here and in many equations below the upper index $(y|x)$ indicates that we look at the vertex y and remove the branch of the tree that is emanating from y and going through x . This means we let $\mathbb{T}_x^{(y|x)}$ denote the tree with vertex y where the branch going from y to x is removed (i.e. the tree of vertices x' satisfying $d(x, x') = d(x, y) + d(y, x')$). Furthermore, $H_\lambda^{(y|x)}$ is the operator H_λ restricted to $\ell^2(\mathbb{T}_x^{(y|x)} \times \mathcal{I})$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions and $(G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|x)})_{jk} = \langle y, j | (H_\lambda^{(y|x)} - z)^{-1} | y, k \rangle$.

$z)^{-1}|y, k\rangle$. This equation is valid in any tree, in particular it is valid in subtrees when certain branches were cut.

Now if a tree $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ has an assigned root $0 \in \tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ and we set $\mathbb{T}_x := \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^{(x|0)}$ to be the tree where we disconnect the branch at x going through the root then for $y \in \mathbb{T}_x$ one finds $\mathbb{T}_x^{(y|x)} = \mathbb{T}_y$. The corresponding Green's matrices are $G_{x,\lambda,z} = G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)}$ and $G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|x)} = G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|0)}$ for $y \neq x, y \in \mathbb{T}_x$ and they only depend on the matrix potential on the branches at x or y , respectively, that go away from the root. Therefore we call them *forward* matrix Green's functions. Then, (3.1) becomes

$$G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)} = - \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{N}(x)} G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|0)} + z - A - \lambda V(x) \right)^{-1} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(x)$ is the set of neighbors of x in the tree $\mathbb{T}_x = \tilde{\mathbb{T}}^{(x|0)}$, i.e. the set of forward neighbors (or children).

In the case studied in this paper we consider the trees $(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L})_x = (\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L})^{(x|0^{(p)})}$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$. Now if $l(x)$ is the label of x , then, $(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L})_x \cong \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ and the distribution of $G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0^{(p)})}$ (for $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$) only depends on λ, z and the label $l(x)$. Moreover, the different $G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|0^{(p)})}$ occurring on the right hand side are independent and they are independent of $V(x)$. Therefore one might want to work with some averaged quantities. However, the occurring inverse on the right hand side of (3.2) prevents one from getting something useful by just applying the expectation to this equation. The key idea is now to represent the operation $G \mapsto -G^{-1}$ as a linear operator in some function space. More precisely, as in [KS, KS2, Sad] we associate to symmetric $m \times m$ matrices G with positive imaginary part the following functions: Let $\text{Sym}^+(m)$ denote the real, positive semi-definite matrices, i.e. $M \in \text{Sym}^+(m) \Leftrightarrow M \in \text{Sym}(m), M \geq 0$, and for $\text{Re}(G) \in \text{Sym}(m), \text{Im}(G) \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ we define the bounded functions

$$\zeta_G : \text{Sym}^+(m) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \zeta_G(M) = e^{\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}(GM)} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\xi_G : (\text{Sym}^+(m))^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \xi_G(M_+, M_-) = \zeta_G(M_+) \bar{\zeta}_G(M_-) = e^{\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}(GM_+) - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}(GM_-)} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that if $\text{Im}(G) > 0$ then ζ_G, ξ_G and all its derivatives are exponentially decaying. A supersymmetric Fourier transform T and $\mathcal{T} = T \otimes T$ as defined in [KS, KS2, Sad] gives for $\text{Im}(G) > 0$ that $T\zeta_G = \zeta_{-G^{-1}}$ and $\mathcal{T}\xi_G = \xi_{-G^{-1}}$. For the convenience of the reader these operators and all important Banach spaces as used in previous works will be defined precisely in the next section.

Using these linear operators, (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\zeta_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)}} = T \left(\zeta_{z-A-\lambda V(x)} \prod_{y \in \mathcal{N}(x)} \zeta_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|0)}} \right), \quad \xi_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)}} = \mathcal{T} \left(\xi_{z-A-\lambda V(x)} \prod_{y \in \mathcal{N}(x)} \xi_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(y|0)}} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

For $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}$ we take some $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with label $l(x) = p$ let $0 = 0^{(q)}$ and define

$$\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(p)} := \mathbb{E}(\zeta_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)}}), \quad \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(p)} := \mathbb{E}(\xi_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|0)}}). \quad (3.6)$$

Then, taking expectations in (3.5) gives for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$, $1 \leq p \leq L - 1$

$$\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} = TB_{\lambda,z} \left((\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^K \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(1)} \right), \quad \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(p)} = TB_{\lambda,z} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(p+1)}, \quad \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(L)} = TB_{\lambda,z} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\xi_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} = \mathcal{T}B_{\lambda,z} \left((\xi_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^K \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(1)} \right), \quad \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(p)} = \mathcal{T}B_{\lambda,z} \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(p+1)}, \quad \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(L)} = \mathcal{T}B_{\lambda,z} \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} \quad (3.8)$$

where $B_{\lambda,z}$ or $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda,z}$ are the multiplication operators defined by

$$B_{\lambda,z} f(M) = \mathbb{E}(\zeta_{z-A-\lambda V(x)}(M)) f(M) \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\lambda,z} g(M_+, M_-) = \mathbb{E}(\xi_{z-A-\lambda V(x)}(M_+, M_-)) g(M_+, M_-). \quad (3.10)$$

Recall that we assume without loss of generality that $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is diagonal. Therefore, in the free case $\lambda = 0$ one obtains

$$\zeta_{0,z}^{(p)} = \zeta_{A_z^{(p)}}^{(p)}, \quad \xi_{0,z}^{(p)} = \xi_{A_z^{(p)}}^{(p)}, \quad \text{where } A_z^{(p)} := \text{diag}(\Gamma_{z-a_1}^{(p)}, \Gamma_{z-a_2}^{(p)}, \dots, \Gamma_{z-a_m}^{(p)}). \quad (3.11)$$

For $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ the point-wise limits

$$\zeta_{0,E}^{(p)} := \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \zeta_{0,E+i\eta}^{(p)} = \zeta_{A_E^{(p)}}^{(p)}, \quad \xi_{0,E}^{(p)} := \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \xi_{0,E+i\eta}^{(p)} = \xi_{A_E^{(p)}}^{(p)} \quad (3.12)$$

exist for $p \in \{0, \dots, L\}$, where

$$A_E^{(p)} = \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} A_{E+i\eta}^{(p)}, \quad [A_E^{(p)}]_{jk} = \delta_{jk} \Gamma_{E-a_j}^{(p)} \quad (3.13)$$

are diagonal $m \times m$ matrices with strictly positive imaginary part. The important point is to understand equations (3.7) and (3.8) as fixed point equations in appropriate Banach spaces.

4. THE PROPER BANACH SPACES

Let us first briefly introduce the important Banach spaces as in [KS, KS2, Sad] and for the readers convenience we will list all important notation and definitions from previous works in the next definition. In particular we will also give the precise definitions of the operators T and \mathcal{T} mentioned above. All proofs and arguments are omitted as [Sad, Section 3] uses the exact same notations and has the statements in more detail. We will also skip to mention the connection to supersymmetry and how these spaces naturally evolve from this formalism. For a supersymmetric background see [Sad, Appendix B] or [KS]. As above we set $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Definition 4.1.

- (a) $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{I}) = \{a : a \subset \mathcal{I}\}$ denotes the set of all subsets of \mathcal{I}
- (b) \mathcal{P} denotes the set of pairs (\bar{a}, a) of subsets of \mathcal{I} with the same cardinality, $\mathcal{P} := \{(\bar{a}, a) : \bar{a}, a \subset \mathcal{I}, |\bar{a}| = |a|\}$
- (c) $n = n(m)$ will be the smallest integer such that $n \geq \frac{m}{2}$
- (d) With $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n)$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in (\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{I}))^n$ define

$$\mathcal{P}^n := \{(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}) \in (\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{I}))^n \times (\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{I}))^n : (\bar{a}_l, a_l) \in \mathcal{P}\}. \quad (4.1)$$

We also let $|\mathbf{a}| := |a_1| + |a_2| + \dots + |a_n|$ and $\mathbf{a}^c := (a_1^c, \dots, a_n^c)$ with $a_j^c = \mathcal{I} \setminus a_j$.

- (e) For functions on $(\text{Sym}^+(m))$ let $\partial_{j,k}$ denote the derivative with respect to the j, k - entry of M , $\partial_{j,k} f(M) = \frac{\partial}{\partial M_{j,k}} f(M)$ (by symmetry, $\partial_{j,k} = \partial_{k,j}$) and let $\tilde{\partial}_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{j,k}$ for $j \neq k$ and $\tilde{\partial}_{j,j} = \partial_{j,j}$.

- (f) For $(\bar{a}, a) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $a = \{k_1, \dots, k_c\}$, $k_1 < k_2 \dots < k_c$; $\bar{a} = \{\bar{k}_1, \dots, \bar{k}_c\}$, $\bar{k}_1 < \bar{k}_2 < \dots < \bar{k}_c$, define

$$\partial_{\bar{a}, a} := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\partial}_{\bar{k}_1, k_1} & \cdots & \tilde{\partial}_{\bar{k}_1, k_c} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tilde{\partial}_{\bar{k}_c, k_1} & \cdots & \tilde{\partial}_{\bar{k}_c, k_c} \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_{\bar{a}, a} := \det(\partial_{\bar{a}, a}) \quad (4.2)$$

with the convention that $D_{\emptyset, \emptyset}$ is the identity operator.

- (g) For $(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{P}^n$, $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_1)$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, let $D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}} := \prod_{\ell=1}^n D_{\bar{a}_\ell, a_\ell}$. There is a function $\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}', \mathbf{b}') \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ such that

$$D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}}(fg) = \sum_{(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}), (\bar{\mathbf{b}}', \mathbf{b}') \in \mathcal{P}^n} \text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}', \mathbf{b}') (D_{\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}} g) (D_{\bar{\mathbf{b}}', \mathbf{b}'} f). \quad (4.3)$$

- (h) For $f \in C^\infty(\text{Sym}^+(m))$, $g \in C^\infty((\text{Sym}^+(m))^2)$ and $p \geq 1$ we introduce the norms $\|f\|_p$ and $\|g\|_p$ by

$$\|f\|_p^2 := \sum_{(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{P}^n} 4^{|\mathbf{a}|} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n}} |D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}} f(\varphi \varphi^\top)|^p d^{2mn} \varphi \right]^{2/p} \quad (4.4)$$

where φ denotes a $m \times 2n$ matrix, $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n}$, and

$$\|g\|_p^2 := \sum_{(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}), (\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{P}^n} 4^{|\mathbf{a}| + |\mathbf{b}|} \quad (4.5)$$

$$\left[\int_{(\mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n})^2} \left| D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}}^{(+)} D_{\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{b}}^{(-)} g(\varphi_+ \varphi_+^\top, \varphi_- \varphi_-^\top) \right|^p d^{2mn} \varphi_+ d^{2mn} \varphi_- \right]^{2/p}. \quad (4.6)$$

Here, $D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}}^{(\pm)}$ denotes the operator $D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}}$ with respect to the entry $M_\pm = \varphi_\pm \varphi_\pm^\top$. Note that the map $\mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n} \ni \varphi \mapsto \varphi \varphi^\top \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$ is surjective as $n \geq 2m$. We also define the corresponding norms $\|f\|_\infty$ and $\|g\|_\infty$ using the limit $p \rightarrow \infty$ which are given by the sums of the corresponding suprema.

- (i) Let $\text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$ denote the complex symmetric, $m \times m$ matrices and for $B \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$ with strictly positive imaginary part (i.e., $\text{Im} B > 0$), let $\mathcal{PE}(B)$ denote the vector space spanned by functions of the form $f(M) = p(M) \zeta_B(M)$, where $p(M)$ is a polynomial in the entries of $M \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$. Clearly, due to the exponential decay in ζ_B one has $\|f\|_p < \infty$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$.
- (j) Define $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ as the smallest vector space containing all vector spaces $\mathcal{PE}(B)$ for all $B \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$ with $\text{Im}(B) > 0$.
- (k) For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, let \mathcal{L}^p be the completion of $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ with respect to the norm $\|f\|_p$. We furthermore set $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2$, define $\|f\|_{2,p} := \|f\|_2 + \|f\|_p$ and let \mathcal{H}_p be the completion of $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ w.r.t. to $\|\cdot\|_{2,p}$.
- (l) For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ let $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^p$ be the completion of $\mathcal{PE}(m) \otimes \mathcal{PE}(m)$ w.r.t. $\|g\|_p$, set $\mathcal{K} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^2$ and $\|g\|_{2,p} := \|g\|_2 + \|g\|_p$, and let \mathcal{K}_p be the completion of $\mathcal{PE}(m) \otimes \mathcal{PE}(m)$ w.r.t. $\|g\|_{2,p}$. In fact, $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ as Hilbert space tensor product.
- (m) Let $\mathcal{I} \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{I})^n$ be given by $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \dots, \mathcal{I})$.
- (n) The supersymmetric Fourier transform T is given by

$$Tf(\varphi' \varphi'^\top) := \frac{(-1)^{mn}}{\pi^{mn}} \int e^{\pm i \text{Tr}(\varphi' \varphi'^\top)} D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}} f(\varphi \varphi^\top) d^{2mn} \varphi. \quad (4.7)$$

Note that the sign of \pm does not matter by the symmetry $\varphi \rightarrow -\varphi$. $\mathcal{T} = T \otimes T$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}g(\varphi'_+ \varphi'^{\top}_+, \varphi'_- \varphi'^{\top}_-) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^{2mn}} \int e^{\pm i \text{Tr}(\varphi'_+ \varphi'^{\top}_+ \pm \varphi'_- \varphi'^{\top}_-)} D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}}^+ D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}}^- g(\varphi_+ \varphi_+^{\top}, \varphi_- \varphi_-^{\top}) d^{2mn} \varphi_+ d^{2mn} \varphi_- \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where $D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}}^{\pm}$ denotes the operator $D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}}$ with respect to the entry $M_{\pm} = \varphi_{\pm} \varphi_{\pm}^{\top}$.

Roughly speaking, \mathcal{L}^p , $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^p$ are the supersymmetric analogs of L^p spaces, \mathcal{H}_p and \mathcal{K}_p resemble $L^2 \cap L^p$ and the operators T and \mathcal{T} have the role of the Fourier transform. One might think that $\mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{L}^2 \cap \mathcal{L}^p$ as a set which is equivalent to saying that $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ is dense w.r.t. the $\|\cdot\|_{2,p}$ norm in $\mathcal{L}^2 \cap \mathcal{L}^p$. Unfortunately, we were not able to prove this. The spaces \mathcal{L}^p , $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^p$ have not been used in former papers, but some technical difficulties in this paper requires the use of \mathcal{L}^{∞} and \mathcal{L}^1 in Section 6 for proving Theorem 1.4.

One finds (cf. [Sad, eq. (B.22)], [KS, eq. (2.37)])

$$D_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}}(Tf) = \frac{2^{mn}}{4^{|\bar{\mathbf{a}}|}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) \mathcal{F}(D_{\mathbf{a}^c, \bar{\mathbf{a}}^c} f) \quad \text{for all } (\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{P}^n, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\mathcal{F}f(\varphi \varphi^{\top})$ denotes the Fourier transform w.r.t. to φ in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n} \cong \mathbb{R}^{2mn}$ and $\text{sgn}(\mathbf{a}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}) \in \{-1, 1\}$ is some sign.

Using the fact that the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}f(\varphi \varphi^{\top})$ maps $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ to $\mathcal{PE}(m)$ and continuously $L^1(d\varphi)$ to $L^{\infty}(d\varphi)$ and $L^2(d\varphi)$ to $L^2(d\varphi)$ we find the following (cf. [Sad, Lemma 2.6, Lemma 3.3]).

Lemma 4.2.

- (i) \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space and T extends to a unitary operator on \mathcal{H} . It also defines a bounded linear operator from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_{∞} and from \mathcal{L}^1 to \mathcal{L}^{∞} .
- (ii) \mathcal{K} is a Hilbert space and \mathcal{T} is unitary on \mathcal{K} . It also defines a bounded linear operator from \mathcal{K}_1 to \mathcal{K}_{∞} and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^1$ to $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{\infty}$.
- (iii) For any $B \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$, $\text{Im}(B) > 0$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ we find that $\mathcal{PE}(B)$ is dense in \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}_p .
- (iv) For any $B, C \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$, $\text{Im}(B) > 0$, $\text{Im}(C) > 0$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ we find that $\mathcal{PE}(B) \otimes \mathcal{PE}(C)$ is dense in \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}_p .

From (4.9) and [Sad, equ. (B.26)] one obtains

$$T^2 = \text{id}, \quad \mathcal{T}^2 = \text{id}, \quad T\zeta_G = \zeta_{-G^{-1}}, \quad \mathcal{T}\xi_G = \xi_{-G^{-1}}. \quad (4.10)$$

We need to get back to G and $|G|^2$ from the functions ζ_G and ξ_G . Therefore we define

$$\mathbf{D} := \left(\frac{(-1)^{mn+j+k}}{2\pi^{mn}} D_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}}^{n-1} D_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \{k\}, \mathcal{I} \setminus \{j\}} \right)_{j, k \in \mathcal{I}} \quad (4.11)$$

which is a $m \times m$ matrix of differential operators. Then for $G \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$, $\text{Im}(G) > 0$ one finds

$$G^{-1} = i \int \mathbf{D} \zeta_G(\varphi \varphi^{\top}) d^{2mn} \varphi, \quad G = -i \int \mathbf{D} T \zeta_G(\varphi \varphi^{\top}) d^{2mn} \varphi. \quad (4.12)$$

As $\xi_G(M_+, M_-) = \zeta_G(M_+) \overline{\zeta_G(M_-)}$, Fubini leads to

$$|G|^2 = G^* G = \int \mathbf{D}^{(-)} \mathbf{D}^{(+)} \mathcal{T} \xi_G(\varphi_+ \varphi_+^{\top}, \varphi_- \varphi_-^{\top}) d^{2mn} \varphi_+ d^{2mn} \varphi_- \quad (4.13)$$

where $\mathbf{D}^{(\pm)}$ is the operator \mathbf{D} with respect to the entries $M_{\pm} = \varphi_{\pm} \varphi_{\pm}^{\top}$.

Equation (4.12) can either be obtained using a super symmetric formalism or by realizing that $D_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{I}}\zeta_G = (\frac{i}{2})^m \det(G)\zeta_G$ and $(-1)^{j+k}D_{\mathcal{I}\setminus\{k\},\mathcal{I}\setminus\{j\}}\zeta_G = (\frac{i}{2})^{m-1}G^{j,k}$, where $G^{j,k}$ is the cofactor of the j,k element of G . Moreover, using the Gaussian integral identity as in (B.1), one has

$$\int \zeta_G(\varphi\varphi^\top) d^{2mn}\varphi = \frac{(2\pi)^{mn}}{(-i)^{mn}(\det(G))^n}. \quad (4.14)$$

Combining all these facts with Kramer's rule, $(G^{-1})_{jk} = \frac{G^{j,k}}{\det(G)}$, one obtains the first equation in (4.12). The second one follows from the first one and $T\zeta_G = \zeta_{-G^{-1}}$.

Now we can turn back to the analysis of the recursion equations (3.7) and (3.8). For simplified notations, let us introduce

$$\vec{\zeta}_{\lambda,z} = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} \\ \vdots \\ \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(L)} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\xi}_{\lambda,z} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(0)} \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(L)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.15)$$

Using Hölder's inequality, Dominated Convergence and the exponential decay of the functions ζ_G, ξ_G for $\text{Im } G > 0$ as well as for $\vec{\zeta}_{0,E}$ and $\vec{\xi}_{0,E}$ for $E \in I_A^{K,L}$, one obtains the following completely analogue to [Sad, Proposition 4.1 and 4.2].

Proposition 4.3. *We have:*

- (i) *For $\eta = \text{Im } z \geq 0$ the operator $B_{\lambda,z}$ is a bounded operator on \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}_1 . The map*

$$F : (\lambda, E, \eta, f_0, f_1, \dots, f_L) \mapsto TB_{\lambda,E+i\eta}((f_0^K f_1), f_2, f_3, \dots, f_L, f_0) \quad (4.16)$$

is a continuous map from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ to $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$. Here $TB_{\lambda,z}$ applied to a vector of functions means that we apply it to every function, $TB_{\lambda,z}(\tilde{f}_0, \dots, \tilde{f}_L) = (TB_{\lambda,z}\tilde{f}_0, \dots, TB_{\lambda,z}\tilde{f}_L)$.

Analogously, for $\eta = \text{Im } z \geq 0$ the operator $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda,z}$ is a bounded operator on \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}_1 and the map

$$Q : (\lambda, E, \eta, g_0, g_1, \dots, g_L) \mapsto \mathcal{T}\mathcal{B}_{\lambda,E+i\eta}((g_0^K g_1), g_2, \dots, g_L, g_0) \quad (4.17)$$

is a continuous map from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$ to $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$.

- (ii) *$\vec{\zeta}_{\lambda,z} \in \mathcal{H}_\infty^{L+1} \subset \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$, $\vec{\xi}_{\lambda,z} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^{L+1} \subset \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z = E + i\eta$ with $\eta > 0$. The maps $(\lambda, E, \eta) \rightarrow \vec{\zeta}_{\lambda,E+i\eta}$ and $(\lambda, E, \eta) \rightarrow \vec{\xi}_{\lambda,E+i\eta}$ are continuous from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)$ to $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ and to $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$, respectively.*
- (iii) *If $E \in I_A^{K,L}$, then $\vec{\zeta}_{0,E} \in (\mathcal{PE}(m))^{L+1} \subset \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$, $\vec{\xi}_{0,E} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$ and*

$$\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \vec{\zeta}_{0,E+i\eta} = \vec{\zeta}_{0,E} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L, \quad \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \vec{\xi}_{0,E+i\eta} = \vec{\xi}_{0,E} \text{ in } \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L. \quad (4.18)$$

- (iv) *The equalities (3.7) and (3.8) can be rewritten as fixed point equations in $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}_\infty$ and $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}_\infty$, respectively,*

$$\vec{\zeta}_{\lambda,z} = F(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{\zeta}_{\lambda,z}), \quad \vec{\xi}_{\lambda,z} = Q(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{\xi}_{\lambda,z}), \quad (4.19)$$

valid for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z = E + i\eta$ with $\eta > 0$, and also valid for $\lambda = 0$ and $z = E$ with $E \in I_A^{K,L}$.

Remark 4.4. *One of the differences between this work and [Sad] is that for fixed (λ, E, η) the maps F and Q are operators on $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ and $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$, respectively, but not on \mathcal{H}_∞^{L+1} or \mathcal{K}_∞^{L+1} . We can not use the space \mathcal{H}_∞^{L+1} as for $\eta = 0$ and $f_p \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ we can not show that $B_{\lambda, E} f_p$ is in \mathcal{H}_1 so that T would map it back to \mathcal{H}_∞ . We can only say that one lands in \mathcal{H} after applying T . This in turn comes from the fact that there is only one factor and not a product of more than one function after $B_{\lambda, z}$ in the last L entries which resembles the fact that vertices of label $1, \dots, L$ do have only one child in $\mathbb{T}^{K, L}$. Recall that in [Sad] every vertex had to have at least two children.*

The other difference is that we do not need the smaller spaces $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{(0)}, \mathcal{K}_\infty^{(0)}$ introduced in [Sad] to avoid some further assumption (but one could work in the spaces $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{(0)} \times (\mathcal{H}^{(0)})^L, \mathcal{K}_\infty^{(0)} \times (\mathcal{K}^{(0)})^L$ if one wanted to).

5. SPECTRUM OF FRECHET DERIVATIVES

It is now time to introduce some more notations to properly describe the spectrum of the Frechet derivatives. These notations were also used in [Sad]. By $\Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ we denote the set of upper triangular matrices with non-negative integer entries. For $J \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ and $E \in I_A^{K, L}$ we define

$$\theta_{J, E}^{(p)} := \prod_{\substack{j, k \in \{1, \dots, m\} \\ j \leq k}} \left[\Gamma_{E-a_j}^{(p)} \Gamma_{E-a_k}^{(q)} \right]^{J_{jk}} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad p = 0, 1, \dots, L, \quad \text{and} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J, E} := \text{diag}(\theta_{J, E}^{(0)}, \dots, \theta_{J, E}^{(L)}) = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{J, E}^{(0)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \theta_{J, E}^{(L)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.2)$$

With the help of these matrices we will express the spectrum of the important Frechet derivatives. The following lemma corresponds to [Sad, Lemma 5.1 and 5.2].

Lemma 5.1. *We have:*

- (i) *The map F as in (4.16) is continuous and Frechet-differentiable w.r.t. $\vec{f} = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_L) \in \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$. For $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}_\infty^{L+1}$ the Frechet derivative $F_{\vec{f}}$ extends naturally to a bounded operator on \mathcal{H}^{L+1} which we will also denote as $F_{\vec{f}}$. Similarly, the map Q is Frechet-differentiable w.r.t. $\vec{g} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$. The derivative $Q_{\vec{g}}$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$ and for $\vec{g} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty^{L+1}$ it extends naturally to a bounded operator on \mathcal{K}^L .*
- (ii) *For $E \in I_A^{K, L}$ let $C_E = F_{\vec{f}}(0, E, 0, \vec{\zeta}_{0, E})$ and $\mathcal{C}_E = Q_{\vec{g}}(0, E, 0, \vec{\zeta}_{0, E})$. Then $C_E^{2(L+1)}$ is a compact operator on $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ and \mathcal{H}^{L+1} and $\mathcal{C}_E^{2(L+1)}$ is a compact operator on $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$ and \mathcal{K}^{L+1} .*
- (iii) *The spectrum of C_E as an operator on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}^{L+1} is given by the eigenvalues of the matrices $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J, E} S^{K, L}$ for $J \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ and the accumulation point 0. Thus, denoting the spectrum of C_E on \mathcal{H}^{L+1} by $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(C_E)$ one obtains*

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(C_E) = \bigcup_{J \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)} \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J, E} S^{K, L}) \cup \{0\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Similarly, denoting the spectrum of \mathcal{C}_E on \mathcal{K}^{L+1} by $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}_E)$ one finds

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}_E) = \bigcup_{J, J' \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)} \sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J',E}^* S^{K,L}) \cup \{0\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E}$ are the matrices as defined in (5.2).

- (iv) The spectra of C_E and \mathcal{C}_E as operators on $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ and $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$, respectively, (denoted by $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L}(C_E)$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L}(\mathcal{C}_E)$), are the same as their spectra as operators on \mathcal{H}^{L+1} and \mathcal{K}^{L+1} , respectively,

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L}(C_E) = \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(C_E), \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L}(\mathcal{C}_E) = \sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}_E). \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. For the proof we will mostly just consider the function F and operator C_E . The corresponding statements for Q and \mathcal{C}_E are proved analogously.

- (i) The derivative $F_{\vec{f}}$ can be written as a $(L+1) \times (L+1)$ matrix of operators and we obtain formally

$$F_{\vec{f}} = \begin{pmatrix} KTB_{\lambda,z} \mathcal{M}(f_0^{K-1} f_1) & TB_{\lambda,z} \mathcal{M}(f_0^K) & & & \\ 0 & 0 & TB_{\lambda,z} & & \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & & TB_{\lambda,z} \\ TB_{\lambda,z} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.6)$$

where $\mathcal{M}(f)$ denotes the multiplication operator that multiplies a function with f . For $f_0, g_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ and $f_1, g_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ one finds $B_{\lambda,z} f_0^{K-1} f_1 g_0, B_{\lambda,z} f_0^K g_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and by Lemma 4.2 $F_{\vec{f}}$ defines a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$. Thus, F is Frechet-differentiable. Similarly, if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$, then $F_{\vec{f}}$ defines also a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{H}^{L+1} .

To get (ii) note that $\vec{\zeta}_{0,E} \in (\mathcal{PE}(m))^2$, and $B_{0,E} = \mathcal{M}(e^{\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}((E-A)M)})$. For simplicity, let us simply write B for $B_{0,E}$, M_1 for $\mathcal{M}((\zeta_{0,E}^{(0)})^{K-1} \zeta_{0,E}^{(1)})$ and M_2 for $\mathcal{M}((\zeta_{0,E}^{(0)})^K)$, then

$$C_E = KTB \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & & & \\ & \mathbf{0} & & \end{pmatrix} + TB \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_0 & & & \\ \vdots & & 1 & & \\ 0 & & & \ddots & \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.7)$$

Now taking C_E^{L+1} , each of the occurring non-zero terms has at least one factor M_0 or M_1 in it. Therefore, each term occurring in $C_E^{2(L+1)}$ has at least two terms M_j , $j = 0, 1$ with some TB in between. Considering the structure of C_E , these terms in between M_j 's either come from $(C_E)_{00}(C_E)_{0j} = TBM_1 TBM_j$, $j = 0, 1$, or $(C_E)_{01}(C_E)_{12}(C_E)_{23} \cdots (C_E)_{L-1,L}(C_E)_{L,0}(C_E)_{0,j} = TBM_1 (TB)^{L+1} M_j$ for $j = 0, 1$. Hence, each appearing term in $C_E^{2(L+1)}$ includes either a term $M_i TBM_j$ or $M_i (TB)^{L+1} M_j$. We claim that we can use Proposition C.1 (ii) to obtain that these operators are compact. As $B = \mathcal{M}(\zeta_{E-A})$ this means that we need to check that the L matrices $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_L$ are invertible, where \mathcal{A}_j is a $m_j \times m_j$ matrix with a

tri-diagonal block structure of $m \times m$ blocks given by

$$\mathcal{A}_j = \begin{pmatrix} A - E & \mathbf{1} & & & \\ & \mathbf{1} & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{1} & A - E \\ & & & & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{A}_1 = A - E. \quad (5.8)$$

For $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ one finds for each eigenvalue a_j of A that $E - a_j \in I^{K,L}$. In particular, $E - a_j \notin \mathcal{E}_L$ as defined in (1.8) which yields invertibility of $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_L$ as can be easily seen when assuming that A is diagonal. Similar considerations can be done for the operator \mathcal{C}_E using Proposition C.1 (iii).

Part (iii) is the exact same calculation as in [Sad]. For the reader's convenience let us point out the main ideas. Define the $(L+1) \times (L+1)$ matrix $\zeta_{0,E} = \text{diag}(\zeta_{0,E}^{(0)}, \dots, \zeta_{0,E}^{(L)})$, let $D \in \text{Sym}(m)$ and $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{L+1}$ and start with the identity

$$C_E(\zeta_{tD} \zeta_{0,E} \vec{v}) = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_{B_0} & & & \\ & \zeta_{B_1} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \zeta_{B_L} \end{pmatrix} S^{K,L} \vec{v} \quad (5.9)$$

where for small t ,

$$B_0 = - \left(E - A + tD + KA_E^{(0)} + A_E^{(1)} \right)^{-1} = A_E^{(0)} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t^k (A_E^{(0)} D)^k A_E^{(0)} \quad (5.10)$$

$$B_p = - \left(E - A + tD + A_E^{(p+1)} \right)^{-1} = A_E^{(p)} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t^k (A_E^{(p)} D)^k A_E^{(p)} \quad (5.11)$$

with $1 \leq p \leq L$ and the convention $A_E^{(L+1)} = A_E^{(0)}$. Here we use $\zeta_A \zeta_B = \zeta_{A+B}$ and $T\zeta_A = \zeta_{-A-1}$ as well as the recursion equations satisfied by the free Green's function for $\lambda = 0$. This gives

$$C_E(\zeta_{tD} \zeta_{0,E} \vec{v}) = \zeta_{0,E} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{diag} \left(\left[\zeta_{t^k (A_E^{(p)} D)^k A_E^{(p)}} \right]_{p=0, \dots, L} \right) S^{K,L} \vec{v}. \quad (5.12)$$

A further expansion of the exponential functions ζ_{tD} and $\zeta_{t^k \dots}$ in powers of t and varying the matrix D leads to

$$C_E([\text{Tr}(DM)]^k \zeta_{0,E}(M) \vec{v}) = \quad (5.13)$$

$$\zeta_{0,E}(M) \text{diag} \left(\left[(\text{Tr}(A_E^{(p)} D A_E^{(p)} M))^k \right]_{p=0, \dots, L} \right) S^{K,L} \vec{v} + P_{k,D,E}(M) \vec{v}$$

where $P_{k,D,E}(M)$ is a matrix of polynomials of degree less than k . Mapping the map $P(M) = [\text{Tr}(DM)]^k$ to $\hat{P}(M) = [\text{Tr}(A_E^{(p)} D A_E^{(p)} M)]^k$ defines a linear map on the set of homogeneous polynomials in entries of M of order k . Using the diagonal structure of $A_E^{(p)}$ one realizes that these linear maps (for all k) are also represented by $P_J(M) \mapsto \theta_{J,E}^{(p)} P_J(M)$ for $J \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$, where $P_J(M) = \prod_{j,k} (M_{jk})^{J_{jk}}$. Thus,

$$C_E(P_J \zeta_{0,E} \vec{v}) = P_J \zeta_{0,E} \theta_{J,E} S \vec{v} + \zeta_{0,E} P_{J,E} \vec{v} \quad (5.14)$$

where $p_{J,E}$ is a matrix of polynomials of degree less than the one of P_J .

Let $f_{J,k} = P_J \zeta_{0,E} \vec{e}_k$ with $(\vec{e}_k)_{k=0, \dots, L}$ being the standard basis in \mathbb{R}^{L+1} . Using the functions $f_{J,k}$ ordered in some way with increasing degree of the polynomial P_J , the operator C_E can be represented as an infinite block triangular matrix,

where the $(L+1) \times (L+1)$ blocks along the diagonal are given by the matrices $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} S^{K,L}$. Using the fact that $C_E^{2(L+1)}$ is compact and the density of the span of these functions in \mathcal{H}^{L+1} , [Sad, Proposition A.1] immediately implies (5.3).

For the operator \mathcal{C}_E we start with a similar calculation as (5.9), replacing ζ_{tD} by $\zeta_{tD} \otimes \bar{\zeta}_{tD'}(M_+, M_-) = \zeta_{tD}(M_+) \bar{\zeta}_{tD'}(M_-)$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{0,E}$ by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E}(M_+, M_-) = \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{0,E}(M_+) \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{0,E}(M_-)$, then one obtains similar to (5.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_E([\mathrm{Tr}(DM_+ - \overline{D'}M_-)]^k \boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E}(M_+, M_-) \vec{v}) = \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E} \mathrm{diag} \left([(g^{(p)}(M_+, M_-))^k]_{p=0, \dots, L} \right) S^{K,L} \vec{v} + \tilde{P}_{k,D,E}(M_+, M_-) \vec{v} \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where $g^{(p)}(M_+, M_-) = \mathrm{Tr}(A_E^{(p)} D A_E^{(p)} M_+ - \overline{A_E^{(p)} D' A_E^{(p)}} M_-)$, and $\tilde{P}_{k,D,E}(M_+, M_-)$ is a matrix of polynomial of degree less than k in the entries of M_+ and M_- . Using $P_J \otimes P_{J'}(M_+, M_-) = P_J(M_+) P_{J'}(M_-)$ this leads to

$$\mathcal{C}_E(P_J \otimes P_{J'} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E} \vec{v}) = P_J \otimes P_{J'} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J',E}^* S^{K,L} \vec{v} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{0,E} \tilde{p}_{J,J',E} \vec{v} \quad (5.16)$$

where $\tilde{p}_{J,J',E}(M_+, M_-)$ is a matrix of polynomials of degree less than the one of $P_J(M_+) P_{J'}(M_-) = P_J \otimes P_{J'}(M_+, M_-)$. Now we follow the same line of arguments as for the spectrum of \mathcal{C}_E .

For (iv) note that $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L}(\mathcal{C}_E) \subset \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{C}_E)$ by compactness of $C_E^{2(L+1)}$ in $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L \subset \mathcal{H}^{L+1}$. Equality follows as one finds eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} S^{K,L}$ in \mathcal{H}_∞^{L+1} by considering the finite dimensional subspaces \mathbb{V}_c spanned by $f_{J,k}$ with $\|J\|_1 \leq c$ (where $\|J\|_1 = \sum_{j,k} |J_{j,k}|$) that are left invariant by \mathcal{C}_E . \square

The following result will ensure that we can use the Implicit Function Theorem.

Lemma 5.2. *For $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ and any $J, J' \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ we find*

$$\det(\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J',E}^* S^{K,L}) \neq 0. \quad (5.17)$$

This means, the matrices $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J',E}^ S$ do not have an eigenvalue 1. In particular, noting $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{0},E} = \mathbf{1}$, this implies*

$$1 \notin \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{C}_E) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \notin \sigma_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}_E). \quad (5.18)$$

Proof. For $J, J' \in \Delta(m, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ and $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ define

$$f(J, J', E) = \det(\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J,E} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{J',E}^* S^{K,L}) = 1 - K \theta_{J,E}^{(0)} \left(\theta_{J',E}^{(0)} \right)^* - \prod_{p=0}^L \theta_{J,E}^{(p)} \left(\theta_{J',E}^{(p)} \right)^*.$$

For $J = J' = \mathbf{0}$ we have $f(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, E) = \det(\mathbf{1} - S^{K,L}) = -K \neq 0$. Now let $\|J\|_1$ denote the norm given by the sum of the absolute values of all entries of J . Next, we consider the case $\|J\|_1 + \|J'\|_1 = 1$, i.e. one of these matrices is zero and the other has one entry. Both cases are completely analogous so let us just consider $J' = \mathbf{0}$, $\|J\|_1 = 1$. Then by (5.1) one has

$$\theta_{J,E}^{(q)} = \Gamma_{E-b_1}^{(q)} \Gamma_{E-b_2}^{(q)} \quad (5.19)$$

for some $b_1, b_2 \in \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$. Using (2.15) in Proposition 2.1 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we find

$$\begin{aligned} K \left| \theta_{J,E}^{(0)} \right| + \prod_{p=0}^L \left| \theta_{J,E}^{(p)} \right| &= K \left| \Gamma_{E-b_1}^{(0)} \right| \left| \Gamma_{E-b_2}^{(0)} \right| + \left(\prod_{p=0}^L \left| \Gamma_{E-b_1}^{(p)} \right| \right) \left(\prod_{p=0}^L \left| \Gamma_{E-b_2}^{(p)} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \prod_{k=1}^2 \sqrt{K \left| \Gamma_{E-b_k}^{(0)} \right|^2 + \prod_{p=0}^L \left| \Gamma_{E-b_k}^{(p)} \right|^2} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Since $\theta_{J,E}^{(0)}$ is the product of two factors with positive imaginary part, it can not be a positive real number, hence $|f(J, \mathbf{0}, E)| > 1 - |\theta_{J,E}^{(0)}| - \prod_{p=0}^L |\theta_{J,E}^{(p)}| \geq 0$, so $f(J, \mathbf{0}, E)$ can not be zero in this case.

Finally, consider $\|J\|_1 + \|J'\|_1 \geq 2$. We may assume without loss of generality that $J \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then

$$\theta_{J,E}^{(p)} \left(\theta_{J',E}^{(p)} \right)^* = \Gamma_{E-b_1}^{(p)} \Gamma_{E-b_2}^{(p)} \cdot X^{(p)} \quad (5.21)$$

where $X^{(p)}$ itself is a product of an even number of factors (at least 2) $\Gamma_{E-b}^{(p)}$ or complex conjugates. By (2.15) and the fact that for $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ and $b \in \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ none of the imaginary parts of $\Gamma_{E-b}^{(p)}$ can be zero, we find $|\Gamma_{E-b}^{(0)}| < 1$ and $\prod_{p=0}^L |\Gamma_{E-b}^{(p)}| < 1$ leading to $|X^{(0)}| < 1$ and $\prod_{p=0}^L |X^{(p)}| < 1$. Using this and Cauchy-Schwartz as in (5.19) we find

$$K \left| \theta_{J,E}^{(0)} \left(\theta_{J',E}^{(0)} \right)^* \right| + \prod_{p=0}^L \left| \theta_{J,E}^{(p)} \left(\theta_{J',E}^{(p)} \right)^* \right| < 1 \quad (5.22)$$

which immediately implies $|f(J, J', E)| > 0$. Hence, in any case, $f(J, J', E)$ will not be zero. \square

6. CONCLUSIONS

The most important ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.4 is the following.

Proposition 6.1. *There exists an open set $U_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L} \subset U_1$, such that the maps*

$$(\lambda, E, \eta) \in U_1 \times (0, \infty) \mapsto \vec{\zeta}_{\lambda, E+i\eta} \in \mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L \quad (6.1)$$

$$(\lambda, E, \eta) \in U_1 \times (0, \infty) \mapsto \vec{\xi}_{\lambda, E+i\eta} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L \quad (6.2)$$

have continuous extensions to maps from $U_1 \times [0, \infty)$ to $\mathcal{H}_\infty \times \mathcal{H}^L$ and $\mathcal{K}_\infty \times \mathcal{K}^L$, respectively, that satisfy (4.19).

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2 we can use the Implicit Function Theorem on Banach Spaces as stated in [Kl6, Appendix B] for the functions $\hat{F}(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{f}) = F(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{f}) - \vec{f}$ and $\hat{Q}(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{g}) = Q(\lambda, E, \eta, \vec{g}) - \vec{g}$ at the points $(0, E, 0, \vec{\zeta}_{0,E})$ and $(0, E, 0, \vec{\xi}_{0,E})$ with $E \in I_A^{K,L}$. Uniqueness of the continuous implicit function and the continuity properties of $\vec{\zeta}_{\lambda, E+i\eta}$ and $\vec{\xi}_{\lambda, E+i\eta}$ as stated in Proposition 4.3 give the continuous extensions. \square

For $\eta = \text{Im}(z) > 0$ let us define general averaged quantities $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = \mathbb{E} \zeta_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}}$ and $\xi_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = \mathbb{E} \xi_{G_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}}$ where as in Section 3 the upper index $(x|y)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$

indicates that we consider the Green's function at x for the operator $H_\lambda^{(x|y)}$ which is the restriction of H_λ to the subtree $(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L})^{(x|y)}$ that is obtained by removing the branch at x going through y . If x is a child or descendant of y then $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(l(x))}$ and $\xi_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = \xi_{\lambda,z}^{(l(x))}$, where $l(x)$ is the label of x . But if y is a descendant of x then we get different quantities. In the following arguments it will often be used implicitly that $B_{\lambda,z}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda,z}$ is a strongly continuous family of operators on any space \mathcal{L}^r , \mathcal{H}_r and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^r$, \mathcal{K}_r , respectively, for $r \in [1, \infty)$ which follows from the Leibniz rule (4.3), boundedness and Dominated Convergence.

Proposition 6.2. *There is an open set $U_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L} \subset U_2$, such that for all $p \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with $d(0^{(p)}, x) \leq L - p$ and y being the unique child of x , one has that the maps*

$$(\lambda, E, \eta, M) \mapsto \zeta_{\lambda, E+i\eta}^{(x|y)}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad (\lambda, E, \eta, M_+, M_-) \mapsto \xi_{\lambda, E+i\eta}^{(x|y)}(M_+, M_-) \quad (6.3)$$

extend continuously as maps from $U_2 \times [0, \infty) \times \text{Sym}^+(m)$ and $U_2 \times [0, \infty) \times (\text{Sym}^+(m))^2$ to \mathbb{C} , respectively. Moreover, $\|\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}\|_\infty$ and $\|\xi_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}\|_\infty$ are uniformly bounded on compact subsets of $U \times [0, \infty)$.

Proof. First note that $d(0^{(p)}, x) \leq L - p$ means that x is in the starting line segment of $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ and hence $(\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L})^{(x|y)}$ is a finite line with $d(0^{(p)}, x)$ edges and $j = d(0^{(p)}, x) + 1 \leq L$ vertices. In fact, $H_0^{(x|y)} - E$ is given by the matrix \mathcal{A}_j as in (5.8) and using $E \in I_A^{K,L}$ which implies $E - a_j \notin \mathcal{E}_L$ for any eigenvalue of a_j one obtains that $\zeta_{0,E}^{(x|y)}$ and $\xi_{0,E}^{(x|y)}$ exist. Using assumption (V), the boundedness of the distribution of $V(x)$, one obtains existence of $\zeta_{\lambda,E}^{(x|y)}$ and $\xi_{\lambda,E}^{(x|y)}$ for (λ, E) in an open neighborhood of $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L}$. Point wise continuity of the maps follows immediately. Note that the infinity norm of ζ_G and ξ_G are bounded by 1 and the derivatives appearing in the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\!\|\!\cdot\|_\infty$ norms lead to multiplication by determinants of minors of G . Therefore, using assumption (V) again we obtain the uniform bounds of the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\!\|\!\cdot\|_\infty$ norm on compact subsets of $U \times [0, \infty)$. \square

Proposition 6.3. *Let $U = U_1 \cap U_2$ with U_1 and U_2 as in Propositions 6.1 and 6.2. Clearly, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is open and $\{0\} \times I_A^{K,L} \subset U$. For all $x \in \mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ and all $x \in \mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ with $d(x, 0^{(p)}) > L - p$ and all children y of x there is $r(x, y) \in \{2, \infty\}$ such that the maps*

$$(\lambda, E, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \mapsto \zeta_{\lambda, E+i\eta}^{(x|y)} \in \mathcal{L}^{r(x,y)}, \quad (6.4)$$

$$(\lambda, E, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \mapsto \xi_{\lambda, E+i\eta}^{(x|y)} \in \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{r(x,y)}, \quad (6.5)$$

have continuous extensions to maps from $(\lambda, E, \eta) \in U \times [0, \infty)$ to $\mathcal{L}^{r(x,y)}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{r(x,y)}$, respectively. Moreover, for $l(x) = 0$ and $l(y) = 1$ as well as for $l(x) \neq 0$ we have $r(x, y) = 2$ and hence $\mathcal{L}^{r(x,y)} = \mathcal{L}^2 = \mathcal{H}$. For $l(x) = 0 = l(y)$ both, $r(x, y) = 2$ and $r(x, y) = \infty$ are possible. Here, \mathcal{L}^r and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^r$ denote the spaces as defined in Definition 4.1.

For such continuous extensions of maps from $(\lambda, E + i\eta)$ that extend as functions from $U \times [0, \infty)$ to \mathcal{L}^r we will use the notion that such a family of functions extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^r .

Proof. All arguments will implicitly use some specific version of the Green's matrix recursion (3.1) in the form as in (3.7). We will also implicitly use Proposition 6.1 and Hölder's inequalities.

Note that $\mathcal{H}_\infty \subset \mathcal{L}^2 \cap \mathcal{L}^\infty$, thus $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^2 and \mathcal{L}^∞ , where $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(p)}$ extends continuously in $\mathcal{L}^2 = \mathcal{H}$. The proof will be done by induction over the distance from the root. For the start on $\mathbb{T}_0^{K,L}$ we have to consider the root $0^{(0)}$ and on $\mathbb{T}_p^{K,L}$ we have to consider the vertex $1_0^{(p)}$ as defined in Theorem 1.2 which is the closest vertex to the root of label 0 and characterized by $d(0^{(0)}, 1_0^{(p)}) = L + 1 - p$. Let y be a child of $0^{(0)}$, then using the general recursion relation (3.1) in the form as (3.5) and taking expectations leads to

$$\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0^{(0)}|y)} = TB_{\lambda,z}((\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^{K-1} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(l(y))})$$

which by Proposition 6.1 gives the continuous extension in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2$ (even \mathcal{H}_∞ if $K \geq 2$), thus $r(0^{(0)}, y) = 2$. Similar, letting x be the parent of $1_0^{(p)}$ and y a child, then

$$\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(1_0^{(p)}|y)} = TB_{\lambda,z}(\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|1_0^{(p)})} (\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^{K-1} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(l(y))})$$

Using Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 and Dominated Convergence one obtains that the product after the operators $TB_{\lambda,z}$ on the right hand side extend continuously in \mathcal{L}^2 and hence the whole term does too. In particular, $r(1_0^{(p)}, y) = 2$.

For the induction step, let x be a descendant of $0^{(0)}$ or $1_0^{(p)}$ for some $p \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. Let x_0 be the parent and y some child of x . We have several cases:

Case 1: $l(x) = q \neq 1$, then $l(x_0) = q - 1$ and $l(y) = q + 1$ or $l(y) = 0$ if $q = L$. We have by induction assumption that $r(x_0, x) = 2$ and so $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^2 . Hence, $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = TB_{\lambda,z} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)}$ does as well and $r(x, y) = 2$.

Case 2: $l(x) = 0$ and $l(y) = 1$, then $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = TB_{\lambda,z}((\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^K \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)})$. By induction assumption $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)}$ either extends in \mathcal{L}^2 or \mathcal{L}^∞ . As $K \geq 1$ we get an extension in \mathcal{L}^2 in either case, so $r(x, y) = 2$.

Case 3: $l(x) = 0$ and $l(y) = 0$, then $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)} = TB_{\lambda,z}((\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(0)})^{K-1} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(1)} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)})$. If $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^2 , then the product after $TB_{\lambda,z}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^1 and hence $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^∞ . If $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x_0|x)}$ extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^∞ then we obtain a continuous extension of $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}$ in \mathcal{L}^2 .

All arguments for the functions $\zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(x|y)}$ are completely analogue. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Using (4.12), the recursion relation (3.1) and $T^2 = \text{id}$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)) &= -i \int \mathbf{D}T \mathbb{E} \zeta_{G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)}(\varphi\varphi^\top) d^{2mn} \varphi \\ &= -i \int \mathbf{D}B_{\lambda,z} \prod_{y:d(x,y)=1} \zeta_{\lambda,z}^{(y|x)}(\varphi\varphi^\top) d^{2mn} \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

and similarly, based on (4.13) one obtains

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| G_\lambda^{[x]}(z) \right|^2 \right) = \int \mathbf{D}^{(-)} \mathbf{D}^{(+)} \mathcal{B}_{\lambda, z} \prod_{y: d(x, y)=1} \xi_{\lambda, z}^{(y|x)} (\varphi_+ \varphi_+^\top, \varphi_- \varphi_-^\top) d^{2mn} \varphi_+ d^{2mn} \varphi_- , \quad (6.7)$$

where \mathbf{D} is defined by (4.11), $\mathbf{D}^{(\pm)}$ represent the matrix-operator \mathbf{D} acting with respect to $M_\pm = \varphi_\pm \varphi_\pm^\top$ and $\mathbf{D}^{(-)} \mathbf{D}^{(+)}$ has to be understood as a matrix product.

Using Propositions 6.1 and 6.3 one obtains for $x \in \mathbb{T}_0^{K, L}$ or $d(x, 0^{(p)}) > L - p$ that the products of the ζ 's on the right hand side of (6.6) have 2 factors that extend continuously in \mathcal{L}^2 and if $l(x) = 0$ some additional bunch of factors that extend continuously in \mathcal{L}^∞ . Therefore, the product extends continuously in \mathcal{L}^1 . Hence, when applying \mathbf{D} , each entry of the matrix extends continuously in $L^1(d^{2mn} \varphi)$. Therefore, the map $(\lambda, E, \eta) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)) \in \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$ extends continuously to a map from $U \times [0, \infty)$ to $\text{Sym}_{\mathbb{C}}(m)$ with U as in Proposition 6.3. By similar arguments the same is true for $(\lambda, E, \eta) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(|G_\lambda^{[x]}(z)|^2) \in \text{Sym}^+(m)$. This proves Theorem 1.4. \square

APPENDIX A. AN IDENTITY FOR THE UNPERTURBED GREEN'S FUNCTIONS ON TREES OF FINITE CONE TYPE

Recall that associated to an $s \times s$ substitution matrix $S \in \text{Mat}(s, \mathbb{Z}_+)$ with non-negative integer entries are the following s rooted trees of finite cone type, denoted by $\mathbb{T}_r, r = 1, \dots, s$. Each vertex has a label, the root of the tree \mathbb{T}_r has label r , any vertex of label p has S_{pq} children of label q . Denoting by Δ the adjacency operator on the forest $\bigcup_r \mathbb{T}^{(r)}$ and by $0^{(r)} \in \mathbb{T}_r$ the root of the tree \mathbb{T}_r , we define for $\text{Im}(z) > 0$ the Green's functions

$$\Gamma_z^{(r)} := \langle 0^{(r)} | (\Delta - z)^{-1} | 0^{(r)} \rangle .$$

We define the set

$$\Sigma = \{ E \in \mathbb{R} : \Gamma_E^{(r)} := \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \Gamma_{E+i\eta}^{(r)} \text{ exists for all } r \text{ and } \text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(q)}) > 0 \text{ for some } q \}$$

Proposition A.1. *Let $\Gamma_E = \text{diag}(\Gamma_E^{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma_E^{(s)})$ denote the diagonal $s \times s$ matrix with the Green's functions along the diagonal. Then one has for $E \in \Sigma$*

$$\det(\mathbf{1} - |\Gamma_E|^2 S) = 0 . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. The recursion relation for the Green's functions is given by

$$\Gamma_E^{(p)} = - \left(E + \sum_{q=1}^s S_{pq} \Gamma_E^{(q)} \right)^{-1} .$$

Multiplying by $(\Gamma_E^{(p)})^*$ and some algebra leads to

$$\left| \Gamma_E^{(p)} \right|^2 \sum_{q=1}^s S_{pq} \Gamma_E^{(q)} = -E \left| \Gamma_E^{(p)} \right|^2 - (\Gamma_E^{(p)})^* .$$

Taking imaginary parts gives

$$\left| \Gamma_E^{(p)} \right|^2 \sum_{q=1}^s S_{pq} \text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(q)}) = \text{Im}(\Gamma_E^{(p)})$$

Defining the vector $\vec{\Gamma}_E = (\Gamma_E^{(1)}, \dots, \Gamma_E^{(s)})^\top$ these equations can be read as

$$|\Gamma_E|^2 S \operatorname{Im}(\vec{\Gamma}_E) = \operatorname{Im}(\vec{\Gamma}_E)$$

and for $E \in \Sigma$, $\operatorname{Im}(\vec{\Gamma})$ is not the zero vector. Hence, $|\Gamma_E|^2 S$ has an eigenvalue 1 which proves (A.1). \square

APPENDIX B. GAUSSIAN INTEGRALS AND THE FOURIER TRANSFORM

The following identities are used at various parts in the article.

Lemma B.1. *Let D be an invertible, symmetric $k \times k$ matrix with positive definite real part, i.e. $D = D^\top$, $\operatorname{Re}(D) > 0$. Then, for any complex vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^k$ one has the Gaussian integral*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x+v) \cdot D(x+v)} d^k x = \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2}}{\sqrt{\det(D)}}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Some care needs to be taken to select the correct branch of $\sqrt{\det(D)}$. If $D = A + iB$ where $A > 0$ is the real part, then we write $D = \sqrt{A}(1 + iA^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})\sqrt{A}$ where \sqrt{A} has the same eigenspaces as A and the corresponding eigenvalues are the positive square roots of the eigenvalues of A . Furthermore, $A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}$ is diagonalizable by a real orthogonal matrix. This diagonalizes $1 + iA^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}$ as well and the eigenvalues have all real part 1. Hence, we may define $\sqrt{1 + iA^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}}$ by taking the same eigenspaces and the principal branch of the square roots of the eigenvalues. Then (B.1) is correct with $\sqrt{\det(D)} = \det(\sqrt{A}) \det(\sqrt{1 + iA^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}})$.

Proof. In one dimension one has the well known integral formula

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-z(x+c)^2} dx = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{z}} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, where the square root is the principal branch and c is any fixed complex number. Now if $D = A + iB$, then use a basis change $y = O\sqrt{A}x$, where O is a real orthogonal matrix such that $OA^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}O^\top$ is diagonal. This leads to a Gaussian integral with a diagonal matrix and then (B.1) follows from (B.2). \square

For functions $f(x)$ on \mathbb{R}^k and a $k \times k$ matrix D we define $\mathcal{M}(D)$ and $\mathcal{C}(D)$ to be the multiplication and convolution operator by $e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot Dx}$, i.e.

$$(\mathcal{M}(D)f)(x) = e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot Dx} f(x), \quad (\mathcal{C}(D)f)(x) = \int e^{\frac{1}{2}i(x-y) \cdot D(x-y)} f(y) d^k y.$$

For D invertible we also define $\mathcal{S}(D)$ by $(\mathcal{S}(D)f)(x) = f(Dx)$ which is a change of variables and defines a bounded operator on any L^p space.

Lemma B.2. *Let \mathcal{F} denote the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^k , and let D be a symmetric, invertible $k \times k$ matrix with positive semi-definite imaginary part $\operatorname{Im}(D) \geq 0$.*

(i) *Then as a map from $L^1(\mathbb{R}^k) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$ one has*

$$\mathcal{F}^* \mathcal{M}(D) \mathcal{F} = \frac{\mathcal{C}(-D^{-1})}{(2\pi)^{k/2} \sqrt{\det(-iD)}} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\sqrt{\det(-iD)}$ is selected as in Lemma B.1 (note that $\operatorname{Re}(-iD) \geq 0$).

(ii) If D is real, i.e. $\text{Im}(D) = 0$, this can be re-written as

$$\mathcal{F}^* \mathcal{M}(D) \mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(-iD)}} \mathcal{M}(-D^{-1}) \mathcal{S}(D^{-1}) \mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(-D^{-1}) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Equation (B.4) is valid in operator sense on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$.

(iii) For a real invertible, symmetric matrix D define $D_1 := -D^{-1}$ and iteratively define $D_j := -(D + D_{j-1})^{-1}$ as long as the inverses exist, i.e. $D_2 = -(D - D^{-1})^{-1}$, $D_3 = -(D - (D - D^{-1})^{-1})^{-1}$, and so on. Assume that the first L matrices D_1, \dots, D_L , exist. Then, one has as operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$

$$(\mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(D))^{L+1} = \left[\prod_{j=1}^L \frac{\mathcal{M}(D_j) \mathcal{S}(D_j)}{\sqrt{\det(iD_j^{-1})}} \right] \mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(D + D_L) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Note that all D_j are invertible and therefore these are indeed bounded operators.

Proof. First assume $\text{Im}(D) > 0$, then for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k)$ and any $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the map $(x, w) \mapsto e^{-iy \cdot x} e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot Dx} e^{ix \cdot w} f(w)$ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2k})$ and one finds

$$\begin{aligned} (2\pi)^k \mathcal{F}^* \mathcal{M}(D) \mathcal{F} f(y) &= \int e^{-iy \cdot x} e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot Dx} e^{ix \cdot w} f(w) d^k w d^k x \\ &= \int \left[\int e^{\frac{1}{2}[x+D^{-1}(w-y)] \cdot iD[x+D^{-1}(w-y)]} d^k x \right] e^{-\frac{1}{2}(y-w) \cdot D^{-1}(y-w)} f(w) d^k w \\ &= \frac{(2\pi)^{k/2}}{\sqrt{\det(-iD)}} \mathcal{C}(-D^{-1}) f(y). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Now, if $\text{Im}(D)$ is only positive semi-definite, we approach D by $D + i\epsilon$ and let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$. Then as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, the right hand side converges point wise (for fixed y). As the L^2 norm is uniformly bounded by $\|f\|_2$, Dominated Convergence shows convergence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$. As the operators $\mathcal{M}(e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot (D+i\epsilon)x})$ converge for $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ in the strong operator topology, we also get convergence on the left hand side in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$. For part (ii) and (B.4) note that

$$\int e^{-\frac{1}{2}(y-w) \cdot D^{-1}(y-w)} f(w) d^k w = e^{-\frac{1}{2}y \cdot D^{-1}y} \int e^{iD^{-1}y \cdot w} e^{-\frac{1}{2}w \cdot D^{-1}w} f(w) d^k w.$$

As the left hand side and right hand side of (B.4) are compositions of bounded operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$ the validity for functions in the dense subset $L^1(\mathbb{R}^k) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$ implies the validity on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$.

For (iii) note that (B.4) also implies

$$\mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(D) \mathcal{F} = \frac{\mathcal{M}(-D^{-1}) \mathcal{S}(-D^{-1})}{\sqrt{\det(-iD)}} \mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(-D^{-1}) = \frac{\mathcal{M}(D_1) \mathcal{S}(D_1)}{\sqrt{\det(iD_1^{-1})}} \mathcal{F} \mathcal{M}(D_1).$$

Now iteration and using $\mathcal{M}(A)\mathcal{M}(B) = \mathcal{M}(A+B)$ yields (B.5). \square

Remark B.3. For part (iii) one can reformulate the condition that the iteratively defined $k \times k$ matrices D_j exist for $j = 1, \dots, L$. Note, $D_2^{-1} = -D + D^{-1}$ is the Schur complement w.r.t. the first upper block of the block matrix $\begin{pmatrix} -D & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & -D \end{pmatrix}$. Inductively, one obtains that D_j is the inverse of the Schur complement of the upper left $k \times k$ block of a $jk \times jk$ matrix D_j . This matrix has a tri-diagonal block

structure given by $k \times k$ blocks with $-D$ along the diagonal and identity matrices $\mathbf{1}$ on the side diagonals, i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}_j := \begin{pmatrix} -D & \mathbf{1} & & & \\ \mathbf{1} & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{1} & \\ & & & \mathbf{1} & -D \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{D}_1 = -D. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Now, for a matrix $Y = \begin{pmatrix} U & V \\ W & X \end{pmatrix}$ with X being invertible one has that the invertibility of Y and the invertibility of the Schur complement $U - VX^{-1}W$ are equivalent. Therefore, one obtains by induction that the existence of all the matrices $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_L$ is equivalent to the invertibility of all the matrices $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_L$.

APPENDIX C. COMPACT OPERATORS INVOLVING FOURIER TRANSFORMS

In the analysis of the Frechet derivative it is important that a certain power is a compact operator. In this work we need a little bit more general results compared to previous work as [Sad] to prove that. As above, for functions $f(M)$, $g(M_+, M_-)$ and $h(x)$, $\mathcal{M}(f(M))$, $\mathcal{M}(g(M_+, M_-))$ and $\mathcal{M}(h(x))$ will denote the corresponding multiplication operators. Recall $\zeta_B(M) = e^{\frac{i}{2}\text{Tr}(BM)}$, $\xi_B(M_+, M_-) = e^{\frac{i}{2}\text{Tr}(BM_+ - \bar{B}M_-)}$.

For a real, symmetric $k \times k$ matrix D define the $jk \times jk$ matrix $\mathcal{D}_j = \mathcal{D}_j(D)$ as a tri-diagonal $k \times k$ block matrix with $-D$ along the diagonal and the unit matrix $\mathbf{1}$ along the side diagonal, as in (B.7). We denote the set of real, symmetric $k \times k$ matrices D , where $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_L$ are invertible, by $\mathcal{S}(k, L)$.

Proposition C.1.

- (i) Let h_1, h_2 be exponentially decaying, continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^k , let \mathcal{F} denote the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^k and let $D \in \mathcal{S}(k, L)$. Then,

$$\mathcal{M}(h_1)\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}(h_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(h_1) \left(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}(e^{\frac{1}{2}ix \cdot Dx}) \right)^{L+1} \mathcal{M}(h_2) \quad (\text{C.1})$$

are compact operators from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^k)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^k)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty]$.

- (ii) For $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{PE}(m)$ and $B \in \mathcal{S}(m, L)$ the operators

$$\mathcal{M}(f_1)\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}(f_2), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(f_1) (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}(\zeta_B))^{L+1} \mathcal{M}(f_2) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

are compact operators from \mathcal{H}_p to \mathcal{H}_q for any $p, q \in [1, \infty]$. (Note that the case where one Banach space is \mathcal{H} is included as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_2$ as a set, only the norm differs technically by a factor 2).

- (iii) For $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{PE}(m) \otimes \mathcal{PE}(m)$, $B \in \mathcal{S}(m, L)$, the operators

$$\mathcal{M}(g_1)\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}(g_2), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(g_1) (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}(\xi_B))^{L+1} \mathcal{M}(g_2) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

are compact operators from \mathcal{K}_p to \mathcal{K}_q for any $p, q \in [1, \infty]$.

Proof. For (i) let us first assume that h_1 and h_2 are compactly supported and consider $\mathcal{M}(h_1)\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}(h_2)$. Let \mathcal{K} be the compact support of h_2 . There exists a constant $C_{\mathcal{K}}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{K}$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we have $|e^{ix \cdot y} - e^{ix \cdot y'}| \leq C_{\mathcal{K}}|y - y'|$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}(h_2)f)(y) - (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}(h_2)f)(y')| &\leq (2\pi)^{-k/2} C_{\mathcal{K}}|y - y'| \|h_2 f\|_1 \\ &\leq (2\pi)^{-k/2} C_{\mathcal{K}} \|h_2\|_2 \|f\|_2 |y - y'| \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\mathcal{M}(h_1)\mathcal{FM}(h_2)$ maps a L^2 bounded sequence of functions into a sequence of equi-continuous functions, supported on the compact support of h_1 . By the theorem of Arzela Ascoli we obtain a convergent subsequence in L^∞ and hence in any L^p norm.

If h_1 and h_2 are continuous and exponentially decaying, then we can approach them in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm by compactly supported continuous functions $h_{1,n}, h_{2,n}$. Then $\mathcal{M}(h_{1,n})\mathcal{FM}(h_{2,n})$ approaches $\mathcal{M}(h_1)\mathcal{FM}(h_2)$ in $L^2 \rightarrow L^p$ operator norm for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ (here, consider $\mathcal{M}(h_2)$ as map from L^2 to L^1 , \mathcal{F} as map from L^1 to L^∞ and $\mathcal{M}(h_1)$ as map from L^∞ to L^p).

For the second operator in (C.1) note that by Remark B.3 for $D \in \mathcal{S}(k, L)$ Lemma B.2 (iii) applies. By (B.5) one finds after commuting the multiplication and shift operators on the left hand side that $\mathcal{M}(h_1) (\mathcal{FM}(e^{ix \cdot Dx}))^{L+1} \mathcal{FM}(h_2) = \mathcal{S}_A \mathcal{M}(\hat{h}_1) \mathcal{FM}(\hat{h}_2)$ where \hat{h}_1 and \hat{h}_2 are exponentially decaying functions and A is the product of the D_j as in B.2 (iii). Therefore, by the previous statement, this defines a compact operator from L^2 to any L^p , $p \in [1, \infty]$.

Using (4.9) and the Leibniz-rule (4.3) the statements (ii) and (iii) immediately follow from (i). For the connection of the matrix B in (ii) with D as used in (i), note that the operator T involves a Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n} \cong \mathbb{R}^{2mn}$, so $k = 2mn$, and combining the column vectors of $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 2n}$ to one large vector $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{2mn}$ vector, $\text{Tr}(\varphi \varphi^\top B) = \text{Tr}(\varphi^\top B \varphi)$ can be written as $\varphi \cdot D \varphi$ where D is a $2mn \times 2mn$ matrix which is block-diagonal with the repeated $m \times m$ block B along the diagonal, $D = \begin{pmatrix} B & \\ & \ddots \\ & & B \end{pmatrix}$. Then $B \in \mathcal{S}(m, L)$ implies $D \in \mathcal{S}(2mn, L)$ so we can use part (i). Starting with an \mathcal{H} bounded sequence one can subsequently construct a subsequence converging in all L^2 and L^p norms involved in the definition of \mathcal{H}_p . Similar considerations can be made to obtain part (iii). \square

REFERENCES

- [Aiz] M. Aizenman, *Localization at weak disorder: some elementary bounds*, Rev. Math. Phys. **6**, 1163-1182 (1994)
- [ASW] M. Aizenman, R. Sims and S. Warzel, *Stability of the absolutely continuous spectrum of random Schrödinger operators on tree graphs*, Prob. Theor. Rel. Fields, **136**, 363-394 (2006)
- [AM] M. Aizenman and S. Molchanov, *Localization at large disorder and extreme energies: an elementary derivation*, Commun. Math. Phys. **157**, 245-278 (1993)
- [AW] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, *Resonant delocalization for random Schrödinger operators on tree graphs*, preprint arXiv:1104.0969 (2011)
- [AW2] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, *Absolutely continuous spectrum implies ballistic transport for quantum particles in a random potential on tree graphs*, J. Math. Phys. **53**, 095205 (2012)
- [Breu] J. Breuer, *Localization for the Anderson model on trees with finite dimensions*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **8**, 1507-1520 (2007)
- [CKM] R. Carmona, A. Klein and F. Martinelli, *Anderson localization for Bernoulli and other singular potentials*, Commun. Math. Phys. **108**, 41-66 (1987)
- [DLS] F. Delyon, Y. Levy and B. Souillard, *Anderson localization for multidimensional systems at large disorder or low energy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **100**, 463-470 (1985)
- [DK] H. von Dreifus and A. Klein, *A new proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **124**, 285-299 (1989)
- [FHH] R. Froese, F. Halasan and D. Hasler, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for the Anderson model on a product of a tree with a finite graph*, J. Funct. Analysis **262**, 1011-1042

- [FHS] R. Froese, D. Hasler and W. Spitzer, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for the Anderson Model on a tree: A geometric proof of Klein's Theorem*, Commun. Math. Phys. **269**, 239-257 (2007)
- [FHS2] R. Froese, D. Hasler and W. Spitzer, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for a random potential on a tree with strong transverse correlations and large weighted loops*, Rev. Math. Phys. **21**, 709-733 (2009)
- [FLSSS] R. Froese, D. Lee, C. Sadel, W. Spitzer and G. Stolz, *Localization for transversally periodic random potentials on binary trees*, preprint arXiv:1408.3961
- [FMSS] J. Fröhlich, F. Martinelli, E. Scoppola and T. Spencer *Constructive proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **101**, 21-46 (1985)
- [FS] J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, *Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **88**, 151-184 (1983)
- [GMP] Ya. Gol'dsheid, S. Molchanov and L. Pastur, *Pure point spectrum of stochastic one dimensional Schrödinger operators*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **11**, 1-10 (1977)
- [Hal] F. Halasan, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for the Anderson model on trees*, PhD thesis 2009, arXiv:0810.2516v3 (2008)
- [Kel] M. Keller, *On the spectral theory of operators on trees*, PhD Thesis 2010, accessible at arXiv:1101.2975
- [KLW] M. Keller, D. Lenz and S. Warzel, *On the spectral theory of trees with finite cone type*, Israel J. Math. **194**, 107-135, (2013)
- [KLW2] M. Keller, D. Lenz and S. Warzel, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for random operators on trees of finite cone type*, J. D' Analyse Math. **118**, 363-396
- [KLW3] M. Keller, D. Lenz and S. Warzel, *An invitation to trees of finite cone type: random and deterministic operators*, preprint, arXiv:1403.4426
- [K11] A. Klein, *The supersymmetric replica trick and smoothness of the density of states for random Schrödinger operators*, Proc. Symposia in Pure Mathematics **51**, 315-331 (1990)
- [K12] A. Klein, *Localization in the Anderson model with long range hopping*, Braz. J. Phys. **23**, 363-371 (1993)
- [K13] A. Klein, *Absolutely continuous spectrum in the Anderson model on the Bethe lattice*, Math. Res. Lett. **1**, 399-407 (1994)
- [K14] A. Klein, *Absolutely continuous spectrum in random Schrödinger operators*, Quantization, nonlinear partial differential equations, and operator algebra (Cambridge, MA, 1994), 139-147, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **59**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996
- [K15] A. Klein, *Spreading of wave packets in the Anderson model on the Bethe lattice*, Commun. Math. Phys. **177**, 755-773 (1996)
- [K16] A. Klein, *Extended states in the Anderson model on the Bethe lattice*, Advances in Math. **133**, 163-184 (1998)
- [KLS] A. Klein, J. Lacroix and A. Speis, *Localization for the Anderson model on a strip with singular potentials*, J. Funct. Anal. **94**, 135-155 (1990)
- [KS] A. Klein and C. Sadel, *Absolutely Continuous Spectrum for Random Schrödinger Operators on the Bethe Strip*, Math. Nachr. **285**, 5-26 (2012)
- [KS2] A. Klein and C. Sadel, *Ballistic Behavior for Random Schrödinger Operators on the Bethe Strip*, J. Spectr. Theory **1**, 409-442 (2011)
- [KSp] A. Klein and A. Speis, *Smoothness of the density of states in the Anderson model on a one-dimensional strip*, Annals of Phys. **183**, 352-398 (1988)
- [Klo] F. Klopp, *Weak disorder localization and Lifshitz tails*, Commun. Math. Phys. **232**, 125-155 (2002)
- [KuS] H. Kunz and B. Souillard, *Sur le spectre des operateurs aux differences finies aleatoires*, Commun. Math. Phys. **78**, 201-246 (1980)
- [Lac] J. Lacroix, *Localisation pour l'opérateur de Schrödinger aléatoire dans un ruban*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré ser **A40**, 97-116 (1984)
- [Sad] C. Sadel, *Absolutely continuous spectrum for random Schrödinger operators on tree-strips of finite cone type*, Annales Henri Poincaré, **14**, 737-773 (2013)
- [SS] C. Sadel and H. Schulz-Baldes, *Random Dirac Operators with time reversal symmetry*, Commun. Math. Phys. **295**, 209-242 (2010)
- [Sha] M. Shamis, *Resonant delocalization on the Bethe strip*, Annales Henri Poincare, published online, DOI 10.1007/s00023-013-0280-6

- [SW] B. Simon and T. Wolff, *Singular continuum spectrum under rank one perturbations and localization for random Hamiltonians*, Commun. Pure. Appl. Math. **39**, 75-90 (1986)
- [Wa] W.-M Wang, *Localization and universality of Poisson statistics for the multidimensional Anderson model at weak disorder*, Invent. Math. **146**, 365-398 (2001)

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC, V6T 1Z2,
CANADA; AND INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUSTRIA, 3400 KLOSTERNEUBURG
E-mail address: `Christian.Sadel@ist.ac.at`