

MULTI-PARTICLE LOCALIZATION FOR WEAKLY INTERACTING ANDERSON TIGHT-BINDING MODELS

EKANGA TRÉSOR*

ABSTRACT. We establish the complete spectral and strong dynamical localization for the one-dimensional multi-particle Anderson tight-binding model and for weakly interacting particles system. In other words, we also show stability of the one-dimensional localization from the single-particle to multi-particle systems with an arbitrary large but finite number of particles and for sufficient weakly interacting models. The proof uses the multi-scale analysis estimates for multi-particle systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Localization for discrete multi-particle random Schrödinger operators was initially proved by Aizenmann and Warzel [1,2] using the fractional moment method and by Chulaevsky and Suhov [10,11] using the multiscale analysis in the strong disorder regime. Some other strategies using different forms of the multi-scale analysis were recently developed by Chulaevsky [7,8]. While similar results were obtained by Anne Boutet de Monvel et al. [3,4] for the multi-particle model with alloy-type external random potential in the continuum.

In [1], the authors assumed that the distribution function of the i.i.d. random variables is absolutely continuous with a bounded density satisfying another technical condition and proved stability of localization from single-particle to weakly interacting multi-particle systems. Note that the decay of eigenfunctions correlators implies that of the Green's functions. The analysis of eigenfunctions correlators towards localization using the multi-scale analysis is not essential, only some probability bounds on the Green's functions are needed. Our method covers a large class of models with absolutely continuous distributions. We decided to address here only the lattice case and we hope that a continuum version of the results can be settled with similar arguments.

In the present paper, we use the multi-particle multi-scale analysis of [8,11], in the high disorder case and adapted in [15,16] in the low energy regime and show the complete spectral and strong dynamical localization for the discrete model with absolutely continuous distributions in one dimension. Such a strategy is valid in one dimension and the method uses a perturbed argument based on the resolvent identities for operators in Hilbert spaces. We restricted our-self in one dimension since the disorder is arbitrary and in dimension greater than one, it is well known that the multi-scale analysis in the single-particle localization theory for an arbitrary disorder are proved at extreme energies.

Let us come back again and stress that the actual believe from physical experiences is that the complete Anderson localization occurs in two dimension in the same way as the one-dimensional case. In two dimension, the physics of the system is more richer and the multi-scale analysis bounds might be less stronger than exponential as for one-dimensional systems.

Date: January 20, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 47B80, 47A75. Secondary 35P10.

Key words and phrases. multi-particle, weakly interacting systems, random operators, Anderson localization.

In one dimension Carmona et al. [5, 6] in the discrete case and Damanik et al. [13] in the continuum proved strong forms of Wegner and multi-scale analysis estimates for the single-particle Anderson-Bernoulli model.

The derivation of the spectral localization from the multi-scale analysis results is then obtained using the scheme proposed in [15, 16] which idea goes back to Fröhlich et al. [17] and Dreifus and Klein [14]. While for the proof dynamical localization we refer again to the paper [16]. We recall that dynamical localization with methods relying on the multi-scale analysis was initially obtained by Germinet and De Bièvre [18], Damanik and Stollmann [12, 22] and Germinet and Klein [19].

In one dimension, our main results for arbitrary disorder and for sufficient weakly interacting systems are Theorem 1 (Anderson localization) and Theorem 2 (strong dynamical localization).

In Section 2 we describe our multi-particle models, the assumptions and the statement of the results. Section 3 is devoted to the Wegner and the Combes-Thomas estimates. We establish in Section 4 the initial scale length estimate for the one-dimensional multi-particle system with weak interaction. In Section 4.3, we develop the one-dimensional multi-particle multi-scale induction step in the lattice at fixed energy. We then deduce the variable energy MSA bounds in Section 5. A proof of the main results based on the multi-particle multi-scale analysis bounds are given in Sections 6 and 7.

2. THE MODEL, ASSUMPTIONS AND THE RESULTS

2.1. The n -particle Hamiltonian on the lattice. Define the two following norms on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^D)$ for arbitrary $D \geq 1$: $|\mathbf{x}| = \max_{i=1, \dots, D} |x_i|$ and $|\mathbf{x}|_1 = |x_1| + \dots + |x_D|$. We consider a system of N -particles where $N \geq 2$ is finite and fixed. Let $d \geq 1$ and $1 \leq n \leq N$. We analyze random Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}(\omega)$ of the form

$$\mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}(\omega) = -\Delta + \sum_{j=1}^n V(x_j, \omega) + h\mathbf{U} = -\Delta + \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) + h\mathbf{U}, \quad (2.1)$$

acting on $\ell^2((\mathbb{Z}^d)^n) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{nd})$ with $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^n$. Above, Δ is the nd -dimensional lattice nearest-neighbor Laplacian:

$$(\Delta\Psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} \\ |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|_1=1}} (\Psi(\mathbf{y}) - \Psi(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} \\ |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|_1=1}} \Psi(\mathbf{y}) - 2dn\Psi(\mathbf{x}), \quad (2.2)$$

for $\Psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{nd})$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$. $V: \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a random field relative to a probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{B}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\mathbf{U}: (\mathbb{Z}^d)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the potential of inter-particle interaction. \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{U} act on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{nd})$ as multiplication operators by functions $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$ and $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x})$ respectively.

Technically, we will prove in this paper, stability of initial MSA bounds from the one-dimensional single-particle estimates to the multiparticle estimates under sufficiently weak interaction. This will allow us to perform multiparticle multiscale analysis for the weak interacting multiparticle Anderson model leading to the complete Anderson localization.

2.2. Assumptions.

(I) Short-range interaction. Fix any $n = 1, \dots, N$. The potential of inter-particle interaction \mathbf{U} is bounded and of the form

$$\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \Phi(|x_i - x_j|), \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where $\phi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a compactly supported function such that

$$\exists r_0 \in \mathbb{N} : \text{supp } \Phi \subset [0, r_0]. \quad (2.3)$$

To describe our assumptions on the random potential

$$V: \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

we need some notations. Denote by F_V the distribution function on \mathbb{R} of the i.i.d. random variables. Namely, let $E \in \mathbb{R}$

$$F_V(E) := \mathbb{P}\{V(0, \omega) \leq E\}$$

and let μ be the associated measure on \mathbb{R} , i.e.,

$$\mu([a, b]) = F_V(b) - F_V(a).$$

Define the quantity

$$s(\mu, \varepsilon) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \mu([a, a + \varepsilon]) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} (F_V(a + \varepsilon) - F_V(a)).$$

We also define

$$L^\infty((1 + |x|)^{1+\kappa}) := \{f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f(x)(1 + |x|)^{1+\kappa}| < \infty\},$$

for some $\kappa \in (0, 1)$.

(P) Absolutely continuous distribution. The random potential $V: \mathbb{Z}^d \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is i.i.d. and bounded, i.e., there exists $M \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\text{supp } \mu \subset [-M, M]$. Furthermore, the probability distribution measure μ has a bounded density, i.e., $\mathbb{P}\{V(0, \omega) \in A\} = \mu(A) = \int_A \rho(\lambda) d\lambda$, and $\rho \in L^\infty((1 + |x|)^{1+\kappa})$.

Note that assumption **(P)** above implies that μ is Hölder continuous of order 1.

Remark that, under the assumptions **(I)** and **(P)**, we have that the spectrum of the one-dimensional mutiparticle Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(N)}(\omega)$ satisfies:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{H}^{(N)}(\omega)h) \subset [-N(4d + M) - |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|, N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|] \quad a.s.$$

Therefore it suffices for our purposes to show Anderson localization on

$$I = [-1 - N(4d + M) - |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|, N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\| + 1].$$

2.3. The results.

Theorem 1. *Under assumptions **(I)** and **(P)**, there exists $h^* > 0$ such that for any $h \in (-h^*, h^*)$ the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(N)}$, with interaction of amplitude $|h|$, exhibits complete Anderson localization, i.e., with \mathbb{P} -probability one,*

- (i) *the spectrum of $\mathbf{H}^{(n)}$ is pure point,*
- (ii) *the eigenfunctions $\Psi_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$ relative to eigenvalues $E_i(\omega) \in I$ are rapidly decaying at infinity: for each Ψ_j for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ and some constants $a, c, C_i(\omega) > 0$*

$$|\Psi_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)| \leq C_i(\omega) e^{-a(\ln|\mathbf{x}|)^{1+c}}.$$

Denote by \mathcal{B}_1 the set of bounded measurable functions $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$. We now give our result on strong Hilbert-Schmidt dynamical localization of any order.

Theorem 2. *Under assumptions **(I)** and **(P)**, there exists $h^* > 0$ such that for any $h \in (-h^*, h^*)$ any bounded Borel function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, any bounded region $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ and any $s > 0$ we have:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_1} \left\| |\mathbf{X}|^{\frac{s}{2}} f(\mathbf{H}^{(N)}(\omega)) \mathbf{P}_I(\mathbf{H}_h^{(N)}(\omega)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{K}} \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

where $(|\mathbf{X}|\Psi)(\mathbf{x}) := |\mathbf{x}|\Psi(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{P}_I(\mathbf{H}^{(N)}(\omega))$ is the spectral projection of $\mathbf{H}^{(N)}(\omega)$ onto the interval I .

3. WEGNER AND COMBES-THOMAS ESTIMATES

According to the general structure of the MSA, we work with lattice *rectangles*, for $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, we denote by $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ the n -particle cube, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}| \leq L \right\},$$

and given $\{L_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, we define the rectangle

$$\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{i=1}^n C_{L_i}^{(1)}(u_i), \quad (3.1)$$

where $C_{L_i}^{(1)}(u_i)$ are cubes of side length L_i center at points u_i . We define the *internal boundary* of the domain $\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ by

$$\partial^- \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} : \text{dist} \left(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{Z}^{nd} \setminus \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \right) = 1 \right\}, \quad (3.2)$$

and its *external boundary* by

$$\partial^+ \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} \setminus \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) : \text{dist} \left(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \right) = 1 \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

The cardinality of the cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $|\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})| := \text{card } \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = (2L + 1)^{nd}$. We define the restriction of the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}$ to $\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ by

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)} = \mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}|_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}$$

with simple boundary conditions on $\partial^+ \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$,

i.e., $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ whenever $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ otherwise. We denote the spectrum of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}$ by $\sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)})$ and its resolvent by

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E) := \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)} - E \right)^{-1}, \quad E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}). \quad (3.4)$$

The matrix elements $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)$ are usually called the *Green functions* of the operator $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}$.

Let $m > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be given. A cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, $1 \leq n \leq N$ will be called (E, m, h) -*nonsingular* ((E, m, h) -NS) if $E \notin \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)})$ and

$$\max_{\mathbf{v} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})} \left| \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; E) \right| \leq e^{-\gamma(m,L,n)L}, \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\gamma(m, L, n) = m(1 + L^{-1/8})^{N-n+1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Otherwise it will be called (E, m, h) -*singular* ((E, m, h) -S).

Definition 1. Let $n \geq 1$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$.

(A) A cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ is called (E, h) -*resonant* ((E, h) -R) if

$$\text{dist} \left[E, \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})}^{(n)}) \right] \leq e^{-L^{1/2}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Otherwise it is called (E, h) -*non-resonant* ((E, h) -NR).

(B) A cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ is called (E, h) -*completely nonresonant* ((E, h) -CNR), if it does not contain any (E, h) -R cube of size $\geq L^{1/\alpha}$. In particular $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ is itself (E, h) -NR.

We will also make use of the following notion.

Definition 2. A cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is \mathcal{J} -separable from $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$ if there exists a nonempty subset $\mathcal{J} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} C_L^{(1)}(x_j) \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{j \notin \mathcal{J}} C_L^{(1)}(x_j) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^n C_L^{(1)}(y_j) \right) = \emptyset.$$

A pair $(\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}))$ is separable if $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| > 7NL$ and if one of the cube is \mathcal{J} -separable from the other.

Lemma 1 ([16]). *Let $L > 1$.*

(A) *For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, there exists a collection of n -particle cubes $\mathbf{C}_{2nL}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)})$ with $\ell = 1, \dots, \kappa(n)$, $\kappa(n) = n^n$ such that if \mathbf{y} satisfies $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| > 7NL$ and*

$$\mathbf{y} \notin \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\kappa(n)} \mathbf{C}_{2nL}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)})$$

then the cubes $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$ are separable.

(B) *Let $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ be an n -particle cube. Any cube $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ with $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| > \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |y_i - y_j| + 5NL$ is \mathcal{J} -separable from $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y})$ for some $\mathcal{J} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

In our earlier work [16] such as in other previous papers in the multi-particle localization theory [3, 11] the above notion was crucial in order to prove the Wegner estimates for pairs of multi-particle cubes via Stollmann's Lemma. It is plain [16] Section 4.1, that sufficiently distant pairs of fully interactive cubes have disjoint projections and this fact combined with independence is used in that case to bound the probability of an intersection of events relative to those projections. The multi-particle multi-scale induction step of the multi-scale analysis of the present text mostly overlap with the previous paper [16].

Theorem 3 (Wegner estimates [9, 16]). *Assume that the random potential satisfies assumption (P), then*

(A) *for any $E \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is not } E\text{-CNR} \right\} \leq e^{-\tau_1 L^{1/2}}, \quad (3.8)$$

for some $\tau_1 \in (4, \tau)$.

(B)

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists E \in \mathbb{R} : \text{neither } \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ nor } \mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) \text{ is } E\text{-CNR} \right\} \leq e^{-\tau_2 L^{1/2}}, \quad (3.9)$$

for some $\tau_2 \in (4, \tau)$.

Theorem 4 (Combes-Thomas estimate [20]). *Consider a lattice Schrödinger operator*

$$H_\Lambda = -\Delta_\Lambda + W(x)$$

acting in $\ell^2(\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $\nu \geq 1$, with an arbitrary potential $W: \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $E \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\text{dist}(E, \sigma(H_\Lambda)) \geq \eta$ with $\eta \in (0, 1]$. Then

$$\forall x, y \in \Lambda, \quad \left| (H_\Lambda - E)^{-1}(x, y) \right| \leq 2\eta^{-1} e^{-\frac{\eta}{12\nu}|x-y|}. \quad (3.10)$$

4. FIX-ENERGY MSA BOUNDS UNDER WEAK INTERACTION

In this Section we fix $d = 1$, i.e., we consider here the one-dimensional multiparticle random Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(N)}(\omega) = -\Delta + \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) + h\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x})$ acting in the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^N)$. Now, we aim to prove stability of the MSA bounds from the single-particle lattice systems to multiparticle systems with sufficiently weak interaction in the interval

$$I = [-1 - N(4d + M)|h|\|\mathbf{U}\|, N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\| + 1],$$

Consider the one-dimensional single-particle Hamiltonian

$$H^{(1)}(\omega) = -\Delta + V(\omega)$$

with a non-constant i.i.d. random potential $V : \mathbb{Z} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Recall that in one-dimensional Anderson models one can prove strong estimates on the Green functions (cf. [6, 14, 21]) and also on eigenfunction correlators.

It follows for example by Theorem IX (a) in [21] that for all L_0 large enough and any bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ if,

$$\Upsilon_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u)}(x, y, I; \omega) := \sum_{E_j \in \sigma(H_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u)}^{(1)}) \cap I} |\psi_j(x)\psi_j(y)|,$$

There exists a constant $\tilde{\mu}(I) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Upsilon_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u)}(x, y, I; \omega) \right] \leq e^{-\tilde{\mu}|x-y|}. \quad (4.1)$$

where $\{E_j, \psi_j\}_{j=1, \dots, |C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u)|}$ are the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenfunctions of $H_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u)}^{(1)}(\omega)$.

4.1. The initial MSA bound for the n-particle system without interaction. The main result of this subsection is Lemma 5 given below. The proof of Lemma 5 relies on an auxiliary statement formulated below, Lemma 2. We need to introduce first

$$\{(\lambda_{j_i}^{(i)}, \psi_{j_i}^{(i)}) : j_i = 1, \dots, |C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u_i)|\},$$

the eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenfunctions of $H_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u_i)}^{(1)}(\omega)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the eigenvalues $E_{j_1 \dots j_n}$ of the non-interacting multiparticle random Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_{C_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}(\omega)$ are written as sum

$$E_{j_1 \dots j_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{j_i}^{(i)} = \lambda_{j_1}^{(1)} + \dots + \lambda_{j_n}^{(n)},$$

while the corresponding eigenfunctions $\Psi_{j_1 \dots j_n}$ can be chosen as tensor products

$$\Psi_{j_1 \dots j_n} = \psi_{j_1}^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \psi_{j_n}^{(n)}.$$

The eigenfunctions of finite volume Hamiltonian are assumed normalised.

Theorem 5. *Let $1 \leq n \leq N$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ as in (4.1). Consider $m^* = \min(\frac{1}{2^{N-1}12Nd}, 2^{-N-1}\tilde{\mu})$. Then for all $E \in I$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$:*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m^*, 0)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_0^{-2p^*4^{N-n}}, \quad (4.2)$$

with L_0 large enough.

The proof of Lemma 5 relies on the following auxiliary statement.

Lemma 2. *Let be given $N \geq n \geq 2$, $m^* > 0$, a cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$, and $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is E -NR, and for any operator $H_{C_{L_0}(u_i)}^{(1)}$, all its eigenfunctions ψ_j satisfy*

$$|\psi_j(u_i) \psi_j(u_i \pm L_0)| \leq e^{-2\gamma(m^*, L_0, n)L_0}. \quad (4.3)$$

Then $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $(E, m^*, 0)$ -NS, provided that $L_0 \geq L_*(m^*, N, d)$.

Proof. Fix any $\mathbf{y} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$. There exists $i \in [1, n]$ such that $|u_i - y_i| = L_0$. Decompose the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ as follows: $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n-1)}(\mathbf{u}') \times \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(1)}(u_i)$, $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{Z}^{(n-1)d}$. In a similar way, we factorize every eigenfunction, $\Psi_k(\mathbf{u}) = \Psi_{k'}(\mathbf{u}') \psi_i(u_i)$, and the respective eigenvalue, $E_k = E_{\neq i} + \lambda_{j_i}^{(i)}$. Now we have that

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E) = \sum_{k'} \Psi_{k'}(\mathbf{u}') \Psi_{k'}(\mathbf{y}') G_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u_i)}^{(1)}(u_i, y_i; E - E_{\neq i}).$$

Here $\|\Psi_{k'}\|_\infty \leq 1$, since $\|\Psi_k\|_2 = 1$, therefore,

$$|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)| \leq (2L_0 + 1)^{nd} \frac{e^{-2\gamma(m^*, L_0, n)L_0}}{e^{-L_0^\beta}} \leq e^{-\gamma(m^*, L_0, n)L_0},$$

for L large enough (depending on m^*, N, d). \square

Proof of Lemma 5. We will say that $\mathbf{H}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is m^* -localized if all conditions (4.3) for the eigenfunctions of all operators $H_{C_{L_0}(u_i)}^{(1)}$ are satisfied. Introduce the events

$$\mathcal{N} := \{ \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}(\omega) \text{ is not } m^*\text{-localized} \},$$

$$\mathcal{R} := \{ \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)} \text{ is } E\text{-R} \}.$$

Then by Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m^*, 0)\text{-S} \right\} &\leq \mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{N} \} + \mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{R} \}, \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\Upsilon_{C_{L_0}^{(1)}(u_i)}(u_i, u_i \pm L_0, I; \omega) \right]}{e^{-2\gamma(m^*, L_0, n)L_0}} + \mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{R} \}, \\ &\leq e^{(-\tilde{\mu} + 2\gamma(m^*, L_0, n)L_0)} + e^{-L_0^{\beta'}} \leq L_0^{-p^*} 4^{N-n}, \end{aligned}$$

since $2\gamma(m^*, L_0, n) < 2^{N+1}m^* \leq \tilde{\mu}$. \square

4.2. The initial MSA bound for weakly interacting multi-particle systems. Now we derive the required initial estimate from its counterpart established for non-interacting systems.

Theorem 6. *Let $1 \leq n \leq N$, m^* . Suppose that the Hamiltonians $\mathbf{H}_0^{(n)}(\omega)$ (without inter-particle interaction) fulfill the following condition: for all $E \in I$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m^*, 0)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_0^{-2p^* 4^{N-n}}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$p^* > 6Nd,$$

Then there exists $h^* > 0$ such that for all $h \in (-h^*, h^*)$ the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_h^{(n)}(\omega)$, with interaction of amplitude $|h|$, satisfies a similar bound: there exist some $p > 6Nd, m > 0$ such that for all $E \in I$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_0^{-2p 4^{N-n}}.$$

Proof. Note first that the assumption of Lemma 6 is proved in the statement of Lemma 5. Set

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E) = (\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)} - E)^{-1}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By definition, a cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is $(E, m^*, 0)$ -NS iff

$$\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})} \left| \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E) \right| \leq e^{-m^*(1+L_0^{-1/8})^{N-n+1}L_0}, \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, there exists sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{y} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})} \left| \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E) \right| \leq e^{-m(1+L_0^{-1/8})^{N-n}L_0} - \epsilon, \quad (4.6)$$

where $m = m^*/2 > 0$. Since, by assumption, $p^* > 6Nd$, there exists $6Nd < p < p^*$ and $\tau > 0$ such that $L_0^{-2p'4^{N-n}} - \tau > L_0^{-2p^*4^{N-n}}$. With such values p' and τ , inequality (4.4) with $p^* > 6Nd$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m^*, 0)\text{-S}\} < L_0^{-2p'4^{N-n}} - \tau. \quad (4.7)$$

Next, it follows from the second resolvent identity that

$$\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E) - \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\| \leq |h| \|\mathbf{U}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E)\| \cdot \|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\|. \quad (4.8)$$

By Lemma 3, applied to Hamiltonians $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}^{(n)}$, for any $\tau > 0$ there is $B(\tau) \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E)\| \geq B(\tau)\} &\leq \frac{\tau}{4}, \\ \mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\| \geq B(\tau)\} &\leq \frac{\tau}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E) - \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\| \geq |h| \|\mathbf{U}\| B^2(\tau)\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E)\| \geq B(\tau)\} + \mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\| \geq B(\tau)\} \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\tau}{4} = \frac{\tau}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $h^* := \frac{\epsilon}{2\|\mathbf{U}\|(B(\tau))^2} > 0$. We see that if $|h| \leq h^*$, then $|h| \times \|\mathbf{U}\| \times (B(\tau))^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0} - \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}\| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\} \leq 2 \frac{\tau}{4}. \quad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.6), (4.7), and (4.9), we obtain that for all $E \in I$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S}\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m^*, 0)\text{-S}\} \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\{\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),0}(E) - \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}),h}(E)\| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\} \\ &\leq (L_0^{-2p'4^{N-n}} - \tau) + \frac{\tau}{2} < L_0^{-2p'4^{N-n}}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4.3. Multiscale induction. We recall the following facts: For any $1 \leq n \leq N$, if $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v})$ are two FI cubes with $|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}| > 7NL_k$, then $\Pi\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Pi\mathbf{C}_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{v}) = \emptyset$.

Given an n -particle cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$,

- by $M_{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), E)$ the maximal number of (not necessarily separable) *partially interactive* (E, m) -singular cubes $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) \subset \mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ with $|\mathbf{u}^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}^{(j')}| > 7NL_k$ for all $j \neq j'$;
- by $M_{\text{FI}}(\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), E)$ the maximal number of *fully interactive* (E, m) -singular cubes $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}^{(j)}) \subset \mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ with $|\mathbf{u}^{(j)} - \mathbf{u}^{(j')}| > 7NL_k$ for all $j \neq j'$

Lemma 3 ([16]). *Let $J = \kappa(n) + 5$ with $\kappa(n) = n^n$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that*

- (i) $\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is E -CNR,
- (ii) $M(\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), E) \leq J$.

Then there exists $\tilde{L}_2^(J, N, d) > 0$ such that if $L_0 \geq \tilde{L}_2^*(J, N, d)$ we have that $\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m) -NS.*

4.3.1. Fixed energy bounds for PI cubes.

Lemma 4. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider a PI cube with the canonical decomposition $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \times \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')$. Assume that*

- (i) $\forall \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')})$ the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')$ is $(E - \mu_j, m)$ -NS,
- (ii) $\forall \lambda_i \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')})$ the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')$ is $(E - \lambda_i, m)$ -NS.

Then the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m) -NS.

Proof. By Definition of the canonical decomposition, the subconfigurations \mathbf{u}' and \mathbf{u}'' are non-interacting so that $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{u}') + \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{u}'')$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}$ reads as

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)} = \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')} \otimes \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')}^{(n'')}.$$

Therefore its eigenvalues are the sums $E_{ij} = \lambda_i + \mu_j$ where $\{\lambda_i\} = \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')})$ and $\{\mu_j\} = \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')}^{(n'')})$. Eigenvectors of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}^{(n)}$ can be chosen in the form $\Psi_{ij} = \varphi_i \otimes \phi_j$, where $\{\varphi_i\}$ are eigenvectors of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')}$ and $\{\phi_j\}$ are eigenvectors of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')}^{(n'')}$. We have

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E) = \sum_{\lambda_i} \sum_{\mu_j} \frac{\varphi_i(\mathbf{u}') \varphi_i(\mathbf{y}') \phi_j(\mathbf{u}'') \phi_j(\mathbf{y}'')}{E - \lambda_i - \mu_j} \quad (4.10)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda_i} \varphi_i(\mathbf{u}') \varphi_i(\mathbf{y}') \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')}(\mathbf{u}'', \mathbf{y}''; E - \lambda_i) \quad (4.11)$$

$$= \sum_{\mu_j} \phi_j(\mathbf{u}'') \phi_j(\mathbf{y}'') \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{y}'; E - \mu_j). \quad (4.12)$$

For any $\mathbf{y} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ either $|\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{y}'| = L_k$ or $|\mathbf{u}'' - \mathbf{y}''| = L_k$. In the former case using (4.12) combined with assumption (i) we have

$$|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)}| \leq |\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'')| \times e^{-\gamma(m, L_k, n-1)L_k},$$

while in the latter case, we have by (4.11) and (ii),

$$|\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}; E)| \leq |\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')| \times e^{-\gamma(m, L_k, n-1)L_k}.$$

Now it is easy to see that, for $2 \leq n \leq N$

$$\gamma(m, L_k, n-1) - L_k^{-1} \ln(2L_k + 1)^{(n-1)d} > \gamma(m, L_k, n),$$

if L_0 is sufficiently large. This implies the required result. \square

Lemma 5. *Let $2 \leq n \leq N$. Consider $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$, and $0 < m \leq 1/(2^{N+1}12Nd)$. Assume that for all $E \in I$, $1 \leq n' < n$, $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{Z}^{n'd}$ and $p > \frac{6Nd}{1-3\theta}$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-2p4^{N-n'}(1+\theta)^k},$$

then for all $E \in I$ and any PI cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-6p4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k}.$$

Proof. Consider the canonical decomposition $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \times \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')$ of the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$. It follows from the definition of a PI cube that $\Pi \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \cap \Pi \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')} = \emptyset$. By virtue of Lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')}}^{(n'')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E - \mu_j, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \\ & + \mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \lambda_i \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')} \text{ is } (E - \lambda_i, m, h)\text{-S} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us focus on the first term in the RHS. The second term will be bound with similar arguments.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')}}^{(n'')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E - \mu_j, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')}}^{(n'')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E - \mu_j, m, h)\text{-S} \mid \mathfrak{B}'' \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{B}'' is the sigma-algebra generated by the values of the random potential in $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')(\mathbf{u}'')}$. Now for $E \in I$, assume first that $E - \mu_j < -1 - N(4d + M) - |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|$, then since $\lambda_i \geq -N(4d + M) - |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist} \left[E - \mu_j, \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')}) \right] &= \min_{i=1, \dots, |\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')|} (\lambda_i - (E - \mu_j)) \\ &\geq -N(4d + M) - |h|\|\mathbf{U}\| - (E - \mu_j) > 1, \end{aligned}$$

next if $E - \mu_j > N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\| + 1$, then since $\lambda_i \leq N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\|$, we also have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist} \left[E - \mu_j, \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')}) \right] &= \min_{i=1, \dots, |\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')|} ((E - \mu_j) - \lambda_i) \\ &\geq (E - \mu_j) - N(4d + M) + |h|\|\mathbf{U}\| > 1. \end{aligned}$$

In either case, the Combes-Thomas estimate (Theorem 4) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{y}' \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')} |\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{y}'; E - \mu_j)| &\leq 2e^{-\frac{1}{12Nd}|\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{y}'|} \\ &< e^{-m(1+L_0^{-1/8})^{N-n'+1}L_0} = e^{-\gamma(m, L_0, n')L_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{C}_{L_0}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}')$ must be $(E - \mu_j, m, 0)$ -NS provided $m \leq 1/(2^{N+1}12Nd)$. Since the random potential is i.i.d. and $\Pi \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \cap \Pi \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'') = \emptyset$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}}^{(n'')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E - \mu_j, m, h)\text{-S} \mid \mathfrak{B}'' \right\} \\ \leq \sup_{E'' \in I} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E'', m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence by hypothesis

$$\sup_{E'' \in I} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E'', m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-2p4^{N-n'}(1+\theta)^k}.$$

We finally obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \mu_j \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}}^{(n'')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E - \mu_j, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \\ \leq C(n, N, d) L_k^{nd-2p \cdot 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k} \\ \leq L_k^{-6p4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k}, \end{aligned}$$

since $p > \frac{6Nd}{1-3\theta}$. Similarly

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists \lambda_i \in \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}}^{(n')}) : \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n'')}(\mathbf{u}'') \text{ is } (E - \lambda_i, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-6p4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k}.$$

□

4.3.2. *Fixed energy scale induction.* Let us set for $k \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_k &= \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\}. \\ \mathbf{Q}_{k+1} &= \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, h)\text{-R} \right\}. \\ \mathbf{S}_{k+1} &= \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ contains a PI } (E, m, h)\text{-S cube of size } L_k \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7. *Assume that condition (P) holds true. Assume that for all $k \geq 0$ and $E \in I$ the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) for all $\mathbf{u}' \in \mathbb{Z}^{n'd}$, $1 \leq n' < n$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n')}(\mathbf{u}') \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-2p4^{N-n'}(1+\theta)^k},$$

(ii) for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-2p4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k}.$$

Then for all $E \in I$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_{k+1}^{-2p4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1}}$$

Proof. First observe that assumption (i) implies by Lemma 5 that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k+1} &\leq C(N, d) L_{k+1}^{nd} L_k^{-6p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k} \\ &\leq C(n, d) L_{k+1}^{nd - \frac{6}{\alpha(1+\theta)}} p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} L_{k+1}^{-2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $p > \frac{6Nd}{1-3\theta}$. Next, by lemma 3, if $\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$ is (E, m, g, h) -S then, it is (E, g, h) -R or $M_{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), E) + M_{\text{FI}}(\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}), E) \geq n^n + 6 > 2$. There are $< \frac{3^{2nd}}{2} L_{k+1}^{2nd}$ pairs of L_k -cubes with centers at distance $> 7NL_k$ in $\mathbf{C}_{L_{k+1}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u})$. Thus,

$$P_{k+1} \leq \frac{3^{2nd}}{2} L_{k+1}^{2nd} P_k^2 + Q_{k+1} + S_{k+1}.$$

Let us assess the first term in the RHS:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3^{2nd}}{2} L_{k+1}^{2nd} P_k^2 &\leq C(n, d) L_{k+1}^{2nd - \frac{4}{\alpha(1+\theta)}} p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} L_{k+1}^{-2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $p > \frac{6Nd}{1-3\theta}$ and $0 < \theta < 1/3$. On the other hand using corollary 3, we have that

$$Q_{k+1} \leq e^{-L_{k+1}^{\beta'}} < \frac{1}{2} L_{k+1}^{-2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1}},$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln(1/2) + 2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1} \ln L_k &\leq \ln 2 + 2p 2^{k+1} \alpha^{k+1} \ln L_0 \\ &\leq C(p, n, N) 2^{k+1} \alpha^{k+1} \ln L_0 \\ &\leq L_0^{\beta' \alpha^{k+1}} \leq L_{k+1}^{\beta'}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed

$$\alpha^{k+1} \geq \frac{\ln C(n, N, p)}{\beta' \ln L_0} + (k+1) \frac{\ln(2\alpha)}{\beta' \ln L_0} + \frac{\ln \ln L_0}{\beta' \ln L_0},$$

if $L_0 \geq L(n, N, p)$ for some large enough $L(n, N, p) > 0$. Now we can conclude that

$$S_{k+1} \leq L_{k+1}^{-2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^{k+1}},$$

as required. \square

4.3.3. Conclusion. Taking into account the above results, we finally get by induction on n that for all $E \in I$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(n)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ is } (E, m, h)\text{-S} \right\} \leq L_k^{-2p 4^{N-n}(1+\theta)^k} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0. \quad (4.13)$$

5. VARIABLE-ENERGY MSA BOUNDS FOR THE WEAKLY INTERACTING SYSTEM

To derive the variable energy bound from its fixed energy counterpart, we follow the same strategy as in [8]. Let I be a bounded interval, i.e., $|I| < \infty$. Given an integer $L > 0$ and points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ set:

$$F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(E) = |\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)|, \quad F_{\mathbf{x}}(E) = \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \partial \mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})} F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(E).$$

Let $a > 0$, also introduce

$$E_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(a) = \{E \in I : F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(E) \geq a\} \quad E_{\mathbf{x}}(a) = \{E \in I : F_{\mathbf{x}}(E) \geq a\}.$$

Theorem 8. Let $L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \partial^- \mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$. Let $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1, \dots, |\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})|}$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}^{(N)}(\omega)$ and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ a bounded interval. Let be given numbers $a, b, c, \mathcal{P}_L > 0$ such that

$$b \leq \min\{|\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})|^{-1}ac^2, c\} \quad (5.1)$$

and for all $E \in I$

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}}(E) \geq a\} \leq \mathcal{P}_L. \quad (5.2)$$

Then there is an event $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)$ with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)\} \leq b^{-1}|I|\mathcal{P}_L$ such that for all $\omega \notin \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)$, the set

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(2a) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(2a, \omega) = \{E \in I : \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}}(E) \geq 2a\}$$

is contained in a union of intervals $\bigcup_{j=1, \dots, |\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})|} I_j$, $I_j = \{E \in I : |E - \lambda_j| \leq 2c\}$, $\lambda_j \in I$.

Proof. Set for $b > 0$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b) = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{mes}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(a)) > b\}$$

By Chebychev's inequality and Fubini's Theorem combined with (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)\} &\leq b^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\text{mes}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(a))] \\ &= b^{-1} \int_I dE \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}}(E) \geq a\}}] \leq b^{-1}|I|\mathcal{P}_L. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\omega \notin \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)$, so that $\text{mes}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}}(a, \omega)) \leq b$. Consider the function

$$f : E \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E) = \sum_j \frac{\Psi_j(\mathbf{x})\Psi_j(\mathbf{y})}{\lambda_j - E}$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(2c) &= \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \min_j |\lambda_j - \lambda| \geq 2c\} \\ \mathbf{R}(c) &= \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \min_j |\lambda_j - \lambda| \geq c\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for $E \in \mathbf{R}(c)$, $|f'(E)| \leq c^{-2}|\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})|$. Now, we show by contraposition that with $\omega \notin \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(b)$

$$\{E \in I : |\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; E)| \geq 2a\} \cap \mathbf{R}(2c) = \emptyset.$$

Assume otherwise and consider any point λ^* in the non empty set figuring in the above LHS and let $J = \{E' \in I : |E' - \lambda^*| \leq b\} \subset \mathbf{R}(c)$, $b \leq c$. Then for any $E \in J$, one has by (5.1)

$$|f(E)| \geq |f(\lambda^*)| - |E - \lambda^*| \sup_{E' \in J} |f'(E')| > 2a - |\mathbf{C}_L^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})|c^{-2} \cdot b \geq a$$

so $J \subset \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(a)$ and $|\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(a)| \geq \text{mes}(J) = 2b > b$ contrary to the choice of ω . We therefore get the assertion, since the set $\mathbf{R}(c)$ is independent of \mathbf{y} . \square

Taking into account the results of the fixed energy MSA established in the previous subsection (cf. (4.13)), we have $\mathcal{P}_{L_k} \leq L_k^{-2p(1+\theta)^k}$ with $p > \frac{6Nd}{1-3\theta}$, $0 < \theta < 1/3$. A straightforward calculation shows that, with $L = L_k$, $k \geq 0$, the condition (5.1) is satisfied with the following numbers: $a = a(L_k)$, $b = b(L_k)$, $c = c(L_k)$

$$a(L_k) = L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}, \quad b(L_k) = L_k^{-\frac{4pk}{5}}, \quad c(L_k) = 3^{\frac{Nd}{2}} L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}},$$

provided that $p_k \geq 5Nd$. The latter inequality follows from our assumption that $p > 6Nd/(1-3\theta)$, since $p_k = p(1+\theta)^k$. These values will be used below.

Theorem 9. *Assume that assumption (P) holds true, then for any pairs of separable cubes $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})$, $k \geq 0$, one has*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists E \in I : \min\{F_{\mathbf{x}}(E), F_{\mathbf{y}}(E)\} \geq 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}} \right\} \leq C(|I|, N, d) L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5} + (2N+1)d}$$

Proof. With the above choice of a, b, c , introduce the events

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{E \in I : F_{\mathbf{x}}(E) \geq 2a(L_k)\}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{y}} = \{E \in I : F_{\mathbf{y}}(E) \geq 2a(L_k)\}$$

as in Theorem 8. Further, introduce the events $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b)$, $b = b(L_k)$ relative to the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 8, and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{y}}(b)$ relative to the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})$. Set $\mathcal{B}(b) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{x}}(b) \cup \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{y}}(b)$. For any $\omega \notin \mathcal{B}(b)$,

$$\text{dist}(E, \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}^{(N)})) \leq 2c(L_k), \quad \text{dist}(E, \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})}^{(N)})) \leq 2c(L_k).$$

Thus applying Theorem 3 (B), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{y}} \neq \emptyset\} &\leq \mathbb{P} \{\mathcal{B}(b)\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ \text{dist}(\sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})}^{(N)}), \sigma(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})}^{(N)})) \leq 4c(L_k) \right\} \\ &\leq |I| L_k^{-\frac{pk}{6}} + C(N, d) L_k^{(2N+1)d} (c(L_k)) \\ &\leq C(|I|, N, d) L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5} + (2N+1)d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Given $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ and an integer $k \geq 0$, set, using the notations of Lemma 1,

$$R(\mathbf{u}) := \max_{\ell=1, \dots, \kappa(N)} |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}|, \quad b_k(\mathbf{u}) := 7N + R(\mathbf{u})L_k^{-1}, \quad M_k(\mathbf{u}) = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\kappa(N)} \mathbf{C}_{7NL_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})$$

and define

$$A_{k+1}(\mathbf{u}) := \mathbf{C}_{bb_{k+1}L_{k+1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{b_kL_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}),$$

where the parameter b is to be chosen later. One can easily check that:

$$M_k(\mathbf{u}) \subset \mathbf{C}_{b_kL_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}).$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{u})$, then cubes $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u})$ are separable by Lemma 1. Define the event

$$\Omega_k(\mathbf{u}) := \left\{ \exists E \in I, \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{u}) : \min\{F_{\mathbf{x}}(E), F_{\mathbf{u}}(E)\} \geq 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}} \right\}.$$

Theorem 9 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \{\Omega_k\} &\leq (2bb_{k+1}L_{k+1} + 1)^{Nd} C(|I|, N, d) L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5} + (2N+1)d} \\ &\leq (2bb_{k+1} + 1)^{Nd} L_k^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)k}{5} + \alpha Nd}, \end{aligned}$$

The series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \{\Omega_k(\mathbf{u})\} < \infty$ converges. Thus By Borel-Cantelli Lemma,

$$\mathbb{P} \{\Omega_{<\infty}\} := \mathbb{P} \left\{ \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}, \Omega_k(\mathbf{u}) \text{ occurs finitely many times} \right\} = 1.$$

Therefore, it suffices to pick the potential $\{V(y, \omega), y \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ with $\omega \in \Omega_{<\infty}$ and prove the exponential decay of any nonzero generalised eigenfunction Ψ of \mathbf{H} . Since Ψ is polynomially bounded, there exist $C, t \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$

$$|\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \omega)| \leq C(|\mathbf{x}|)^t.$$

Since Ψ is not identically zero, there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ such that $\Psi(\mathbf{u}) \neq 0$. Let us show that there is an integer $k_1 = k_1(\omega, E, \mathbf{u})$ such that $\forall k \geq k_1$, $F_{\mathbf{u}}(E) \geq 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}$. Indeed, given an integer $k \geq 0$, assume that $F_{\mathbf{u}}(E) < 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}$. Then by the geometric resolvent inequality for the eigenfunction implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(\mathbf{u})| &\leq C(N, d)L_k^{Nd-1}L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}} \cdot \max_{\mathbf{v}: |\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}| \leq L_{k+1}} |\Psi(\mathbf{v})| \\ &\leq C'(N, d)L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}+Nd-1}(1+|\mathbf{u}|+L_k)^t \xrightarrow{L_k \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that if $F_{\mathbf{u}}(E) < 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}$ for arbitrary large values of L_k (i.e., for an infinite number of values k), then $|\Psi(\mathbf{u})| = 0$, in contradiction with the definition of the point \mathbf{u} . So there is an integer $k_1 = k_1(\omega, E, \mathbf{u}) < \infty$ such that $\forall k \geq k_1$ $F_{\mathbf{u}}(E) \geq 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}$. At the same time since $\omega \in \Omega_\infty$ there exists $k_2 = k_2(\omega, \mathbf{u})$ such that if $k \geq k_2$, $\Omega_k(\mathbf{u})$ does not occur. We conclude that $\forall k \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in A_{k+1}(\mathbf{u})$, $F_{\mathbf{x}}(E) < 2L_k^{-\frac{pk}{5}}$. Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and choose b such that

$$b > \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}.$$

introduce the annuli

$$\tilde{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{C}_{c'_k L_{k+1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{c''_k L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u}),$$

with

$$c'_k = \frac{bb_{k+1}}{1+\rho}, \quad c''_k = \frac{b_{k+1}}{1-\rho}.$$

Now observe that, if $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}| > b_0 L_0 / (1 - \rho)$, then there exists $k \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{A}_{k+1}(\mathbf{u})$. Thus, the cube $\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ must satisfied the bound

$$\max_{\mathbf{v} \in \partial \mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u})} |\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{C}_{L_k}^{(N)}(\mathbf{u})}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}; E)| \leq 2L_k^{-\frac{p}{5}(1+\theta)^k} \leq Ce^{-a(\ln L_k)^{1+c}}, \quad (6.1)$$

for some constants $a, c, C > 0$. The bound (6.1) implies that

$$|\Psi(\mathbf{x})| \leq C \cdot e^{-a(\ln L_k)^{1+c}} \cdot C(|\mathbf{u}|) \cdot L_k^{Const} \leq C(|\mathbf{u}|) \cdot e^{-a'(\ln L_k)^{1+c}}, \quad (6.2)$$

where $a' \geq a/2 > 0$ for large values of k (hence, L_k). Next, since $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{A}_{k+1}$, we have that

$$\ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}| \leq \ln(c'_k L_{k+1}) = \ln(c'_k L_k^\alpha) = c''_k + \alpha \ln L_k,$$

which implies that

$$\ln L_k \geq \frac{\ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}| - c''_k}{\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2} \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}|,$$

for large values of k . Therefore, the bound (6.2) implies that

$$|\Psi(\mathbf{x})| \leq C(|\mathbf{u}|) \cdot e^{-a' \cdot (\frac{1}{2} \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}|)^{1+c}} \leq C(|\mathbf{u}|) \cdot e^{-a''(\ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}|)^{1+c}},$$

with $a'' = a'/2 > 0$ \square .

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We summarize in Theorem 10 below some well-known results on expansions in generalised eigenfunctions for lattice Schrödinger operators which can be found, e.g., in the book [20]. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and denote by $\nu(I) = P_I(H)$ the projection valued measure associated to H . Further, given any pair of points $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^D$, introduce a real valued Borel measure $\nu_{n,m}(\cdot)$ by

$$\nu_{n,m}(I) = \langle \delta_n, \nu(I) \delta_m \rangle.$$

Consider a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^D}$ with $\alpha_n > 0$, $\sum \alpha_n = 1$ and define a positive spectral measure $\rho(\cdot)$ by

$$\rho(I) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^D} \alpha_n \nu_{n,n}(I). \quad (7.1)$$

Observe that ρ is a normalized Borel measure: $\rho(\mathbb{R}) = 1$.

Theorem 10. *Let ρ be a spectral measure for $H = \Delta + W(x)$ acting in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^D)$. Then there exist measurable functions $F_{n,m} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\langle \delta_n, f(H)\delta_m \rangle = \int f(\lambda) F_{n,m}(\lambda) d\rho(\lambda) \quad (7.2)$$

for any bounded measurable function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, the functions $\Psi^{(m,\lambda)} : n \rightarrow F_{n,m}(\lambda)$ on \mathbb{Z}^D satisfy

$$H\Psi = \lambda\Psi \quad \text{for } \rho\text{-a.e. } \lambda,$$

and are polynomially bounded, i.e.,

$$|\Psi(n)| \leq C(1 + |n|)^t, \quad \text{for some } C > 0 \text{ and } t > 0.$$

Proof. See the proof of Proposition 7.4 in [20]. □

Before we turn to the proof of Theorem 2, we need to make the following observations. For every bounded set $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ figuring in Theorem 2 there exists $k_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbf{C}_{L_{k_0}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})$. Now for $j \geq k_0$, set

$$\mathbf{M}_j(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_{j+1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0}) \setminus \mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0}).$$

Observe that for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})$, $\mathbf{C}_{7NL_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y}) \subset \mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})$. Then, if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}_j(\mathbf{0})$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})$, we have that $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| > 7NL_j$. Since $\text{diam}(H\mathbf{y}) \leq 2L_j$, it follows that $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| > \text{diam}(H\mathbf{y}) + 3NL_j$. Thus using assertion (B) of Lemma 1, the cubes $\mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y})$ are separable. We need the following statement establishing the decay of the kernels in the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

Lemma 6. *Consider a random Schrödinger operator \mathbf{H} satisfying assumptions of Theorem 2. There exists $k_1 \geq 0$ such that for any bounded Borel function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ all $k \geq k_1$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}_j(\mathbf{0})$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})$:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{P}_I(\mathbf{H}) \delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS}^2 \right] \leq e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}} + C(|I|, N, d) L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5} + (2N+1)d}, \quad (7.3)$$

where $a, c \in (0, \infty)$, $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$ and $p > 6Nd/(1 - 3\theta)$.

Proof. Define

$$B_j := \left\{ \forall \lambda \in I, \text{ either } F_{\mathbf{x}}(\lambda) < 2L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5}} \text{ or } F_{\mathbf{y}}(\lambda) < 2L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5}} \right\}.$$

Consider a bounded Borel function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and set $f_I = f\chi_I$, where χ_I is the indicator function of the interval I . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS}^2 &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}} |\langle \delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\delta_{\mathbf{z}}, \delta_{\mathbf{v}} \rangle|^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}} |\langle f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\delta_{\mathbf{z}}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}}\delta_{\mathbf{v}} \rangle|^2 \\ &= |\langle f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle|^2 \\ &= |\langle \delta_{\mathbf{x}}, f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle|^2. \end{aligned}$$

For $\omega \in B_j$, since

$$|\langle \delta_{\mathbf{x}}, f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle| = |\langle \delta_{\mathbf{y}}, \overline{f_I(\mathbf{H})}\delta_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle|,$$

we can assume without loss of generality that $F_{\mathbf{x}}(\lambda) < 2L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5}}$. Now using Theorem 10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 &\leq |\langle \delta_{\mathbf{x}}, f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle| \\ &\leq \int_I |f(\lambda)| |T_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\lambda)| d\rho(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

and the function $\Psi : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow T_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\lambda)$ is polynomially bounded for ρ a.e. λ . Next, the geometric resolvent inequality for eigenfunctions gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \left| \partial \mathbf{C}_{L_j}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \cdot 2L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5}} \cdot |\Psi(\mathbf{x}')| \\ &\leq C(N, d)L_j^{Nd-1} L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5}} (1 + |\mathbf{x}| + L_j)^t \\ &\leq C(N, d)L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5} + \alpha t + Nd - 1} < e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a, c > 0$ are some constants and provided $j \geq k_1$ for some $k_1 \geq 0$ large enough, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS} &\leq \|f\|_{\infty} \rho(I) e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\infty} e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\omega \in B_j^c$, we have

$$\|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS} = |\langle \delta_{\mathbf{x}}, f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle| \leq \|f\|_{\infty}.$$

Finally, since by Theorem 9 $\mathbb{P}\{B_j^c\} \leq C(|I|, N, d)L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5} + (2N+1)d}$, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H})\delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS}^2 \right] &\leq e^{-mL_j/2} \mathbb{P}\{B_j\} + \mathbb{P}\{B_j^c\} \\ &\leq e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}} + C(|I|, N, d)L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)^j}{5} + (2N+1)d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we finish the proof Theorem 2. Let $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}$ with $|\mathbf{K}| < \infty$, $j \geq k_1$ as in Lemma 6 and $p > 6Nd/(1 - 3\theta)$ for any $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$. Pick any $s > 0$ and any bounded Borel

function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\| |X|^{\frac{s}{2}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{K}} \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_{k_1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})} |X|^{\frac{s}{2}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{K}} \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{j \geq k_1} C_1(N, d) L_{j+1}^s \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}_j(\mathbf{0})} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{K}}\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Nd}} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_{k_1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})} |X|^{\frac{s}{2}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{K}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{j \geq k_1} C_1(N, d) L_{j+1}^s \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{M}_j(\mathbf{0}) \\ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{C}_{L_{k_1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \|\delta_{\mathbf{x}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \delta_{\mathbf{y}}\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\|f\|_\infty \leq 1} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}} \left\| \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{C}_{(7N+1)L_{k_1}}^{(N)}(\mathbf{0})} |X|^{\frac{s}{2}} f_I(\mathbf{H}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] \\
& \quad + C_2(N, d) L_{k_1}^{Nd} \sum_{j \geq k_1} L_j^{\alpha s + \alpha Nd} \left(e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}} + C(|I|, N, d) L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)j}{5} + (2N+1)d} \right) \\
& \leq C_3(N, d, |\mathbf{K}|) L_{k_1}^s + C'_2(|I|, N, d) L_{k_1}^{Nd} \sum_{j \geq k_1} L_j^{\alpha s + \alpha Nd} \left(e^{-a(\ln L_j)^{1+c}} + L_j^{-\frac{p(1+\theta)j}{5} + (2N+1)d} \right) \\
& < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, *Localization bounds for multiparticle systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. (2009), 903–934. ↑1
- [2] M. Aizenman and S. Warzel, *Complete dynamical localization in disordered quantum multi-particle systems*, XVIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2010, pp. 556–565. ↑1
- [3] A. Boutet de Monvel, V. Chulaevsky, P. Stollmann, and Y. Suhov, *Anderson localization for a multi-particle model with an alloy-type external random potential*, 2010, arXiv:math-ph/1004.1300v1. ↑1, 5
- [4] A. Boutet de Monvel, V. Chulaevsky, and Y. Suhov, *Dynamical localization for multiparticle model with an alloy-type external random potential*, Nonlinearity **24** (2011), 1451–1472. ↑1
- [5] R. Carmona, A. Klein, and F. Martinelli, *Anderson localization for Bernoulli and other singular potentials*, Commun. Math. Phys. **108** (1987), 41–66. ↑2
- [6] R. Carmona and J. Lacroix, *Spectral Theory of Random Schrödinger Operators*, Vol. 20, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1990. ↑2, 6
- [7] V. Chulaevsky, *Direct scaling analysis of localization in disordered systems II. Multi-particle lattice systems*, 2011, arXiv:math-ph/1106.2234v2. ↑1
- [8] ———, *Fixed energy multi-particle MSA implies dynamical localization*, 2012, arXiv:math-ph/1206.1952. ↑1, 12
- [9] V. Chulaevsky and Y. Suhov, *Wegner bounds for a two particle tight-binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **283** (2008), 479–489. ↑5
- [10] V. Chulaevsky and Y. Suhov, *Eigenfunctions in a two-particle Anderson tight binding model*, Comm. Math. Phys. **289** (2009), 701–723. ↑1

- [11] V. Chulaevsky and Y. Suhov, *Multi-particle Anderson Localization: Induction on the number of particles*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **12** (2009), 117–139. ↑1, 5
- [12] D. Damanik and P. Stollmann, *Multi-scale analysis implies strong dynamical localization*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), no. 1, 11–29. ↑2
- [13] D. Damanik, R. Sims, and G. Stolz, *Localization for one-dimensional, continuum, Bernoulli-Anderson models*, Duke Math. Journal **114** (2002), 59–100. ↑2
- [14] H. von Dreifus and A. Klein, *A new proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **124** (1989), 285–299. ↑2, 6
- [15] T. Ekanga, *On two-particle Anderson localization at low energies*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **349** (2011), 167–170. ↑1, 2
- [16] ———, *Anderson localization at low energies in the multi-particle tight binding model*, 2012, arXiv:math-ph/1201.2339v2. ↑1, 2, 5, 9
- [17] J. Fröhlich, F. Martinelli, E. Scoppola, and T. Spencer, *Constructive proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **101** (1985), 21–46. ↑2
- [18] F. Germinet and S. De Bièvre, *Dynamical localization for discrete and continuous random Schrödinger operators*, Comm. Math. Phys. **194** (1998), no. 2, 323–341. ↑2
- [19] F. Germinet and A. Klein, *Bootstrap Multi-Scale Analysis and localization in random media*, Commun. Math. Phys. **222** (2001), 415–448. ↑2
- [20] W. Kirsch, *An Invitation to Random Schrödinger Operators*, 2008, Panorama et Synthèses, 25, Soc. Math. France, Paris. ↑5, 15, 16
- [21] H. Kunz and B. Souillard, *Sur le spectre des opérateurs aux différences finies aléatoires*, Commun. Math. Phys. **78** (1980), 201–246. ↑6
- [22] P. Stollmann, *Caught by disorder*, Progress in Mathematical Physics, vol. 20, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2001. Bound states in random media. ↑2

*INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS DIDEROT, BATIMENT SOPHIE GERMAIN, 13 RUE ALBERT EINSTEIN, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE

E-mail address: ekanga@math.jussieu.fr