

The Topology of Mobility-Gapped Insulators

Jacob Shapiro

Mathematics Department, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

November 21, 2018

Abstract

Studying deterministic operators, we define an appropriate topology on the space of mobility-gapped insulators such that topological invariants are continuous maps into discrete spaces, we prove that this is indeed the case for the integer quantum Hall effect, and lastly we show why our "insulator" condition makes sense from the point of view of the localization theory using the fractional moments method.

1 Introduction

Topological insulators [16] are usually studied in physics by assuming translation invariance, which allows for a topological description of Hamiltonians in terms of continuous maps from the Brillouin torus $\mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow X$ where X is some smooth manifold which depends on the symmetry class under consideration (for example, for a system in class A (no symmetry) gapped after n levels, $X = \text{Gr}_n(\mathbb{C}^\infty)$, the Grassmannian manifold). Such a description is extremely convenient because one may immediately apply classical results from algebraic topology, for example, that the set of homotopy classes $[\mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \text{Gr}_n(\mathbb{C}^\infty)] \cong \mathbb{Z}$. This approach led to many classification results [22, 23] which culminated in the Kitaev periodic table of topological insulators [18], all the while ignoring the fact that the systems to be analyzed are actually *not* translation invariant, and in fact certain physical features of the phenomena demand strong-disorder. Indeed, the plateaus of the integer quantum Hall effect (IQHE henceforth) are explained only when assuming the Fermi energy lies in a region of localized states (*the mobility gap regime*) which cannot appear in a translation invariant system.

Hence a physically more realistic description calls for understanding *disordered* systems in which Bloch decomposition cannot be used. This has been done for the IQHE in [5] by applying ideas from non-commutative geometry, and later generalized to the Kitaev table in [20, 6] (and references therein). One problem with the application of non-commutative geometry is that it still required the Fermi energy to be placed in a spectral gap, which is why [5] goes beyond the C-star algebra generated by continuous functions of the Hamiltonian by defining a so-called "non-commutative Sobolev spaces". Such an approach still uses crucially the translation invariance of the system; in contrast to the studies in physics, however, translation is used in terms of the probability distributions defining a random model. That is, a whole statistical ensemble of models is considered simultaneously, proofs use the covariance property, and statements are made either almost-surely or about disorder averages. Furthermore sometimes certain statements could also not be extended to these bigger Sobolev spaces, including the bulk-edge correspondence or the definition of edge invariants (which requires a certain regularization, see [9, Eq-n (1.2)]).

Further explorations of the mobility gap regime using only one particular deterministic realization (i.e., *without* referring to a statistical ensemble) and without using covariance were pioneered in [9] for the IQHE and extended in [13, 24] for chiral and Floquet topological systems respectively. These studies demonstrate that topological properties do not need translation invariance nor statistical averaging, and should be associated to one particular mobility gapped Hamiltonian rather than an ensemble. Since [9, 13, 24] do not use the algebraic framework of

non-commutative geometry, topological properties such as defining the ambient space of topological insulators or establishing local constancy (w.r.t. deformations of Hamiltonians) of the invariants have been hard to establish (in contrast to the very natural appearance of such properties in the framework of [5]), despite the fact they are important, being one of the defining physical features of topological insulators.

In this note, we have the modest goal of continuing the deterministic line of research of [9, 13, 24] by defining a space of insulators and proving that a topological invariant is locally constant with respect to it. We use the IQHE as a case study since we understand it best, though future studies for other cases of topological insulators are certainly interesting. For example, chiral one-dimensional systems may relate to an extension of Fredholm theory to operators without closed range, but which obey a localization estimate instead, which allows to salvage the local constancy of an integer-valued index.

This note is organized as follows. We begin by giving precise definition of what we mean by a "topological insulator" in our deterministic setting, define a topology on this space, and discuss its various properties. In the next section we take up the IQHE as a case study and establish the deterministic local constancy. In the last section we discuss why our deterministic definition of "insulator" makes sense for probabilistic models which exhibit localization about the Fermi energy.

In regards to existing literature, the question of the appropriate topology for topological insulators has already been raised in previous papers, see the discussion in [10, Appendix D] and [17, Introduction]. The mobility gap continuity has also been dealt with before, in the context of probabilistic covariant models, see [21, Proposition 5.2] and references therein.

2 Deterministic topological insulators

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the space dimension, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the internal number of degrees of freedom, be given and fixed. We define our Hilbert space as $\mathcal{H} := \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d) \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$, and for an operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $A_{xy} \equiv \langle \delta_x, A \delta_y \rangle$ is an $N \times N$ matrix with $(\delta_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ being the position basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. $\|\cdot\|$ is either a matrix norm on $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ or the 1-norm on \mathbb{R}^d .

We next define a metric on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. For brevity, let $X := (0, \infty)$.

Definition 2.1. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, define the *local distance* between them as

$$d_\ell(A, B) := \inf\left(\left\{ t \in X \mid \exists C, \mu \in X : t = \max(\{ C, \mu^{-1} \}) \wedge \|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq C e^{-\mu\|x-y\|} \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \right\}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

This distance measures not only how close-by position-basis matrix elements are, but also their rate of off-diagonal exponential decay. The metric is mainly used as follows:

Lemma 2.2. *If $d_\ell(A, B) \in X$ then $\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq d_\ell(A, B) e^{-\|x-y\|/d_\ell(A, B)} \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.*

Proof. By the approximation property of the infimum, we have $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ some $C_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon \in X$ such that $d_\ell(A, B) \leq \max(C_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon^{-1}) < d_\ell(A, B) + \varepsilon$ and $\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\mu_\varepsilon\|x-y\|} \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This implies that $C_\varepsilon \leq d_\ell(A, B) + \varepsilon$ and $\mu_\varepsilon \geq (d_\ell(A, B) + \varepsilon)^{-1}$. Hence

$$\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq (d_\ell(A, B) + \varepsilon) e^{-\|x-y\|/(d_\ell(A, B) + \varepsilon)} \quad (2.2)$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ which implies the result. \square

It is of course comforting to know that

Lemma 2.3. *d_ℓ is a metric on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof. By definition it is obvious that d_ℓ is non-negative and symmetric.

Next, we want that $d_\ell(A, A) = 0$. The second requirement in the set under the infimum in (2.1) becomes trivial for $d_\ell(A, A) = 0$, so that taking $C > 0$ arbitrarily small and μ fixed for example we reach a zero infimum.

If we assume that $d_\ell(A, B) = 0$, we want that $A = B$. This assumption implies that $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists C_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon \in X$ with $\max(\{C_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon^{-1}\}) < \varepsilon$ and $\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq C_\varepsilon e^{-\mu_\varepsilon \|x-y\|}$, which implies $\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq C \leq \varepsilon$. This means $A = B$.

Finally we get to the triangle inequality. Let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be given. We have by the usual triangle inequality for the matrix norm that $\|(A - B)_{xy}\| \leq \|(A - C)_{xy}\| + \|(C - B)_{xy}\|$. By Lemma 2.2, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A - B)_{xy}\| &\leq d_\ell(A, C) e^{-\|x-y\|/d_\ell(A, C)} + d_\ell(C, B) e^{-\|x-y\|/d_\ell(C, B)} \\ &\leq (d_\ell(A, C) + d_\ell(C, B)) e^{-\|x-y\|/\min(d_\ell(A, C), d_\ell(C, B))} \end{aligned}$$

which means that $d_\ell(A, B) \leq \max(\{d_\ell(A, C) + d_\ell(C, B), \min(d_\ell(A, C), d_\ell(C, B))\}) = d_\ell(A, C) + d_\ell(C, B)$, so we are finished. \square

Remark 2.4. d_ℓ is unfortunately not homogeneous, so it cannot induce a norm (it is translation invariant though). This is because it measures also the rate of exponential decay. Compare this with the local norm of [15] which has a fixed rate of decay.

Remark 2.5. To require off-diagonal *exponential* decay is probably stronger than what is necessary for the topological invariants to be well-defined and continuous (as we see below). However, in the interest of keeping the calculations somewhat simpler, we prefer to stipulate one concrete form of off-diagonal decay. This means that the topology induced by d_ℓ on the space insulating Hamiltonians (to be defined below) is finer than the *initial topology* corresponding to the topological invariant considered as a map from insulating Hamiltonians into \mathbb{Z} . Since a continuous map may stop being so if the topology of its domain is made coarser, that means that using the topology induced by d_ℓ , a-priori, we might not detect all path-connected components on the space of topological insulators. Since in this paper we anyway don't concern ourselves with calculating the space of path-connected components of topological insulators, we ignore this problem.

Lemma 2.6. *If $A_n \rightarrow A$ in the topology induced by d_ℓ then $A_n \rightarrow A$ in the norm operator topology.*

Proof. Recall Holmgren's bound

$$\|A\| \leq \max_{x \leftrightarrow y} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|A_{xy}\|$$

which together with Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$\|A_n - A\| \leq d_\ell(A_n, A) \left(\coth\left(\frac{1}{2d_\ell(A_n, A)}\right) \right)^d. \quad (2.3)$$

We conclude by noting that $\coth(t) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

This shows also that $A_n \rightarrow A$ in d_ℓ does *not* imply the same in trace norm.

Definition 2.7. A Hamiltonian H is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $d_\ell(0, H) < \infty$.

Without loss of generality we assume onwards that the Fermi energy is placed at zero energy (if this is not the case replace the Hamiltonian by a shifted one).

Definition 2.8. An insulator is a Hamiltonian H such that there is some open interval $\mathbb{R} \supseteq \Delta \ni 0$ such that:

- All eigenvalues of H within Δ are of finite degeneracy.
- With $B_1(\Delta)$ the set of all Borel bounded functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which obey $|f(\lambda)| \leq 1 \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and which are constant below and above Δ (possibly with different constants) (see [9]) there are $C < \infty, \mu > 0, a \in \ell^p(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that

$$\sup_{f \in B_1(\Delta)} \|f(H)_{xy}\| \leq C|a(x)|^{-1} e^{-\mu\|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (2.4)$$

- For any compact sub-interval $\Delta' \subset \Delta$, there is some $s \in (0, 1), b \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ we have some $D_\alpha < \infty$ with

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \leq D_\alpha |b(x)|^{-1} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \quad (2.5)$$

where $G(x, y; z) \equiv R(z)_{xy} \equiv (H - z\mathbf{1})_{xy}^{-1}$ is the Greens' function associated to H .

The space of all insulators where the objects involved $\Delta, C, a, \mu, s, b, D_\alpha$ in the estimates (2.4, 2.5) are uniformly bounded by some fixed given worst objects $\Delta_0, C_0, a_0, \mu_0, s_0, b_0, D_{0,\alpha}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{I} \equiv \mathcal{I}(\Delta_0, C_0, a_0, \mu_0, s_0, b_0, D_{0,\alpha})$. It is a subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. We give it the subspace topology induced by the metric topology from d_ℓ on the space of all Hamiltonians.

All of the constraints in the above definition except (2.5) are standard almost-sure consequences for Hamiltonians for which localization is established in a region about zero energy, as we explain below in Section 3. In Proposition 3.1 we show that (2.5) is *also* an almost-sure consequence of localization (which needs no further input from a model), so that this set of assumptions is reasonable for models that either have a spectral gap or fractional moment localization about zero energy.

We note that it is probably false that \mathcal{I} is an open subset with respect to the topology induced by d_ℓ . Indeed, in [11] it is observed that Anderson localization of "generic" models (sufficiently random) breaks down by a rank-one perturbation with arbitrarily small norm. See also [7].

One could hope to get rid of the uniform objects $\Delta_0, C_0, a_0, \mu_0, s_0, b_0, D_{0,b,\alpha}$ on which \mathcal{I} depends. This might be possible, but probably requires further specification of the details of the models considered and how their randomness arises (i.e. the probability distributions). In order to avoid this specificity we use these rather unsatisfying uniform bounds. They allow us to conclude that if we have a sequence $(H_n)_n \subset \mathcal{I}$ such that $d_\ell(H_n, H) \rightarrow 0$ for some fixed $H \in \mathcal{I}$, the corresponding objects in the localization estimates $\Delta_n, C_n, a_n, \mu_n, s_n, b_n, D_{n,\alpha}$ cannot explode. In analogy to the spectral gap regime, this is tantamount to assuming not only that there is a gap, but the whole collection of operators we consider has a uniform gap. In turn, this restriction means we cannot detect the path-connected components of topological phases of insulators.

2.1 The integer quantum Hall effect

We take the integer quantum Hall effect as a convenient case study for topological insulators, since much is known about it already; we rely mainly on [9]. For the IQHE, one takes $d = 2$, and the topological invariant, physically the transversal (Hall) conductivity, is given by the Kubo formula as the Chern number

$$\mathcal{I} \ni H \mapsto \text{Ch}(H) := 2\pi i \text{tr} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} P P_{,\alpha} P_{,\beta} \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.6)$$

Here $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ is the anti-symmetric tensor (with Einstein summation), $A_{,\alpha} := -i[\Lambda_\alpha, A]$ is the non-commutative derivative of an operator A with $\Lambda_\alpha := \Lambda(X_\alpha)$, X_α the position operator in direction α on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, and $\Lambda : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any *switch function* (in the sense of [8], that is, any measurable

interpolation from zero on negative values to one on positive values with bounded variation)–the choice of Λ does not influence the value of Ch , but is fixed once and for all. Finally, $P := \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(H)$ is the Fermi projection associated with H . [9] contains a proof of the fact that (2.6) is a well defined map.

Our main result is

Theorem 2.9. *The map $\text{Ch} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is continuous.*

Consequently, since Ch is \mathbb{Z} -valued, it is locally constant. This finally gives a concrete criterion to be able to tell when two Hamiltonians will have the same Chern number, without having to actually calculate it. As noted in Remark 2.5, it is not the weakest possible criterion.

Since the Chern number of a Hamiltonian is defined through its associated Fermi projection, one would naively hope to bound $d_\ell(P, P')$ by $d_\ell(H, H')$. Not only does this turn out not to work, but the very definition of an insulator shows that we can't even hope to have $\|P_{xy}\|$ decaying in $\|x - y\|$ uniformly. It is even false if we relax the condition to merely asking that $\|(P - P')_{xy}\|$ is small, and has some off-diagonal decay and diagonal blow-up. Indeed, the problem is that $\chi_{(-\infty, 0)}$ is not a continuous function, and we are considering operators that precisely have spectrum near zero, so even considering just the diagonal element $\|(P - P')_{xx}\|$ for fixed x , an arbitrarily small change from H to H' could make an eigenvalue jump over zero so that $\|(P - P')_{xx}\|$ is one.

The way out is to mimic the probabilistic approach (which cures things by looking at averages, which has the effect of smoothening discontinuities), with a trick of averaging over the Fermi energy within the gap. Indeed, the point is that even though $\chi_{(-\infty, 0)}$ is not a continuous function, $\int \chi_{(-\infty, \lambda)} d\lambda$ is. Our main effort below is to make this intuitive argument rigorous.

The Fermi-energy averaging is permitted using the following key result:

Proposition 2.10. ([9, Proposition 2]) *Let $H \in \mathcal{I}$. Then according to Definition 2.8, there is some $\Delta \in \text{Open}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \in \Delta$ and for which the mobility gap estimates are fulfilled. Then the following map is constant:*

$$\Delta \ni E_F \mapsto \text{Ch}(H - E_F \mathbf{1}) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We can then formulate precisely in which sense is $P - P'$ small given that $H - H'$ is small:

Proposition 2.11. *Let $H, H' \in \mathcal{I}$ with $d_\ell(H, H') < \infty$. Let Δ' be a compact interval contained in the localization estimate interval (Definition 2.8) of both H and H' . Define*

$$P_\lambda := \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(H - \lambda \mathbf{1}) = \chi_{(-\infty, \lambda)}(H).$$

Then we have some $s \in (0, 1)$, $C < \infty$, $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ (dependent on H, H') such that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{xy}\| d\lambda \leq C d_\ell(H, H')^s |a(x)|^{-1} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. We replace the disorder averaging of [21, Proposition 5.2] with Fermi-energy averaging. We start from the formula [1]

$$P_\lambda = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma(\lambda)} R(z) dz$$

where $\Gamma(\lambda)$ is a rectangular curve in \mathbb{C} going counter-clockwise passing the points $\lambda + i, \lambda - i, -\|H\| - 1 - i, -\|H\| - 1 + i$. We divide the curve into two parts: $\Gamma_1(\lambda)$ which is the two horizontal segments and the left vertical segment, and $\Gamma_2(\lambda)$, the right vertical segment. On $\Gamma_1(\lambda)$, z is always a minimum distance of 1 from $\sigma(H)$ so that one may use the Combes-Thomas

estimate. On $\Gamma_2(\lambda)$ we must use localization, since we (possibly) cross the spectrum as we pass the real axis.

We thus find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{xy}\| &= \left\| \left(\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma(\lambda)} R(z) \, dz - \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma(\lambda)} R'(z) \, dz \right)_{xy} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1(\lambda)} (G(x, y; z) - G'(x, y; z)) \, dz \right\| + \left\| \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_2(\lambda)} (G(x, y; z) - G'(x, y; z)) \, dz \right\| \end{aligned}$$

Then with the resolvent identity

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1(\lambda)} (G(x, y; z) - G'(x, y; z)) \, dz \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1(\lambda)} \|G(x, y; z) - G'(x, y; z)\| \, |dz| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1(\lambda)} \sum_{x', x''} \|G(x, x'; z)\| \| (H' - H)_{x', x''} \| \|G'(x'', y; z)\| \, |dz| \end{aligned}$$

Using [Lemma 2.2](#) and the Combes-Thomas estimate (for some universal $\mu > 0$)

$$\|G(x, y; z)\| \leq \frac{2}{\text{dist}(z, \sigma(H))} e^{-\mu \text{dist}(z, \sigma(H)) \|x-y\|}$$

we now estimate this (recalling that for $z \in \Gamma_1(\lambda)$, $\text{dist}(z, \sigma(H)) \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{\Gamma_1(\lambda)} \sum_{x', x''} e^{-\mu \|x-x'\|} d_\ell(H, H') e^{-\|x'-x''\|/d_\ell(H, H')} e^{-\mu \|x''-y\|} \, |dz| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} |\Gamma_1(\lambda)| (\coth(\mu/2))^{2d} d_\ell(H, H') e^{-\frac{1}{2} \min(\mu, d_\ell(H, H')^{-1}) \|x-y\|} \end{aligned}$$

We see that $\Gamma_1(\lambda)$ apparently doesn't require the averaging over energy.

On the other hand for $\Gamma_2(\lambda)$, we do use the localization estimate, which needs the Fermi energy averaging. Let $s \in (0, 1)$. Then using the basic estimate $\|G(x, y; \lambda + i\eta)\| \leq |\eta|^{-1}$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Delta'} \left\| \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma_2(\lambda)} (G(x, y; z) - G'(x, y; z)) \, dz \right\| \, d\lambda = \\ &= \int_{\Delta'} \left\| \frac{-1}{2\pi} \int_{-1}^1 (G(x, y; \lambda + i\eta) - G'(x, y; \lambda + i\eta)) \, d\eta \right\| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \lambda + i\eta) - G'(x, y; \lambda + i\eta)\| \, d\lambda \, d\eta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{\Delta'} \left| \frac{2}{\eta} \right|^{1-s/2} \|G(x, y; \lambda + i\eta) - G'(x, y; \lambda + i\eta)\|^{s/2} \, d\lambda \, d\eta \end{aligned}$$

Only now, after pulling a fractional power of the imaginary energy (unlike in [\[21\]](#)), do we use the resolvent identity:

$$\dots \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \int_{\Delta'} \left| \frac{2}{\eta} \right|^{1-s/2} \sum_{x', x''} \|G(x, x'; \lambda + i\eta)\|^{s/2} \| (H' - H)_{x', x''} \|^{s/2} \|G'(x'', y; \lambda + i\eta)\|^{s/2} \, d\lambda \, d\eta$$

We may pull out the $\sum_{x', x''}$ sum out of the integrals using Fatou. Use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the $\int_{\Delta'} \cdot \, d\lambda$ integral to get

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{x', x''} \int_{-1}^1 \left| \frac{2}{\eta} \right|^{1-s/2} \, d\eta \| (H' - H)_{x', x''} \|^{s/2} \left(\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, x'; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \right)^{1/2} \times \\ &\quad \times \left(\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \int_{\Delta'} \|G'(x'', y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

At this point we employ the part of the assumption on H, H' concerning (2.5), so using $s > 0$, we have for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\dots \leq \frac{2^{2-s/2} D_{0,\alpha}}{\pi s} d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2} \sum_{x', x''} e^{-\frac{s}{2d_\ell(H, H')} \|x' - x''\|} |b(x)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x - x'\|)^{-\alpha/2} |b(y)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x'' - y\|)^{-\alpha/2}.$$

Using the triangle inequality $(1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha} (1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} \leq (1 + \|x - z\|)^{-\alpha}$ we can pull out a polynomially-decaying factor in $\|x - y\|$ to get:

$$\dots \leq \frac{2^{2-s/2} D_{0,\alpha} Q}{\pi s} d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2} |b(y)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha/2}$$

with

$$Q := \sum_{x', x''} e^{-\frac{s}{2d_\ell(H, H')} \|x' - x''\|} |b(x)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x - x'\|)^{-\alpha/2} |b(y)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x'' - y\|)^{-\alpha/2}.$$

But $Q < \infty$ manifestly, so we get our result. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Let $H \in \mathcal{I}$ be given. We seek some $\varepsilon > 0$ (dependent on H) such that if $H' \in \mathcal{I}$ with $d_\ell(H, H') < \varepsilon$, then $\text{Ch}(H) = \text{Ch}(H')$.

By Proposition 2.10 we may replace the Chern number with its average within the mobility gap to get

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Ch}(H) - \text{Ch}(H')| &\leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\Delta'|} \left| \int_{\Delta'} \text{Ch}(H - \lambda \mathbf{1}) \, d\lambda - \int_{\Delta'} \text{Ch}(H' - \lambda \mathbf{1}) \, d\lambda \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2\pi}{|\Delta'|} \int_{\Delta'} |\text{tr}(\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} (P_\lambda P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta} - P'_\lambda P'_{\lambda,\alpha} P'_{\lambda,\beta}))| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq \frac{2\pi}{|\Delta'|} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)=(1,2),(2,1)} \int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda) P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 + \|P'_\lambda (P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 + \|P'_\lambda P'_{\lambda,\alpha} (P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\beta}\|_1 \, d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

We will use the estimate

$$\|AB\|_1 \leq \sum_{xyz} \|A_{xy}\| \|B_{yz}\|.$$

Consider the first term with $\alpha \neq \beta$:

$$\int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda) P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 \, d\lambda \leq \int_{\Delta'} \sum_{xyz} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{xy}\| \|(P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta})_{yz}\| \, d\lambda.$$

Using (2.4) we know that P_λ have off-diagonal decay with diagonal explosion, which was called "weakly-local" in [24]. Since $\chi_{(-\infty, \lambda)} \in B_1(\Delta)$, the "weakly-local" estimate we get does not depend on λ . Using [24, Remark 3.4] we estimate $\|(P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta})_{yz}\| \leq C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} (1 + \|z\|)^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ as large as we want, and the constant C does not depend on λ . We conclude now using Proposition 2.11 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda) P_{\lambda,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 \, d\lambda &\leq \sum_{xyz} C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} (1 + \|z\|)^{-\alpha} \int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{xy}\| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq \sum_{xyz} C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} (1 + \|z\|)^{-\alpha} \times \\ &\quad \times \frac{2^{2-s/2} D_{0,\alpha} Q}{\pi s} d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2} |b(y)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This last expression after the triple sum is summable so that we get some constant times $d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2}$, which means we can make this term as small as we like by appropriate choice of H' .

Consider now one of the derivative terms with $\alpha \neq \beta$, where we again use (2.4) with estimates independent of λ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta'} \|P'_\lambda(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 d\lambda &\leq \int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 d\lambda \\ &\leq \int_{\Delta'} \sum_{xyz} \|((P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha})_{xy}\| \|((P_{\lambda,\beta})_{yz})\| d\lambda \\ &\leq \sum_{xyz} C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} |a(y)|^{-1} (1 + |y_\beta|)^{-\alpha} \int_{\Delta'} \|((P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha})_{xy}\| d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

Now we have $\|(A_{,\alpha})_{xy}\| = \|[\Lambda_\alpha, A]_{xy}\| = \|(\Lambda(x_\alpha) - \Lambda(y_\alpha))A_{xy}\|$. We can now invoke [13, Proof of Lemma 2] to bound $|\Lambda(x_\alpha) - \Lambda(y_\alpha)| \leq C_\Lambda(1 + |x_\alpha - y_\alpha|)^\mu(1 + \frac{1}{2}|x_\alpha|)^{-\mu}$ to get, using Proposition 2.11 again:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta'} \|P'_\lambda(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{,\alpha} P_{\lambda,\beta}\|_1 d\lambda &\leq \sum_{xyz} C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} |a(y)|^{-1} (1 + |y_\beta|)^{-\alpha} \times \\ &\quad \times C_\Lambda(1 + |x_\alpha - y_\alpha|)^\mu (1 + \frac{1}{2}|x_\alpha|)^{-\mu} \int_{\Delta'} \|(P_\lambda - P'_\lambda)_{xy}\| d\lambda \\ &\leq \sum_{xyz} C(1 + \|y - z\|)^{-\alpha} |a(y)|^{-1} (1 + |y_\beta|)^{-\alpha} \times \\ &\quad \times C_\Lambda(1 + |x_\alpha - y_\alpha|)^\mu (1 + \frac{1}{2}|x_\alpha|)^{-\mu} \times \\ &\quad \times \frac{2^{2-s/2} D_{0,\alpha} Q}{\pi s} d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2} |b(y)|^{-1/2} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This last expression is unfortunately very long but the point is (when the dust settles) that it really is just a summable expression after the triple sum, so that we again get a constant times $d_\ell(H, H')^{s/2}$, which we can make as small as we like (there will still be a coth dependence on $d_\ell(H, H')$ coming from the sum, as in (2.3), and similarly that dependence approaches $d_\ell(H, H') \rightarrow 0$). The last derivative term is dealt with in the same manner, and we find our result. \square

In concluding this proof of continuity of Ch, we compare it to the *probabilistic* proof of [21, Proposition 5.2]. In short, the latter proof shows that if $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto H(t)$ is a family of random ergodic Hamiltonians with t the parameter of deformations, then $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\text{Ch}(H(t))]$ is locally constant. Since we know that $\mathbb{E}[\text{Ch}(H(t))]$ is almost-surely equal to $\text{Ch}(H(t))$ (by Birkhoff), we conclude that almost-surely, if $|t - s|$ is small, $\text{Ch}(H(t)) = \text{Ch}(H(s))$ (in the setting of [21], the family $t \mapsto H(t)$ varies within one and the same random probability space so that it makes sense to compare random configurations at different values of t).

In contrast, Theorem 2.9 shows that if the mobility gap property holds for two given realizations (independently) of near-by Hamiltonians (as measured by d_ℓ), then their respective Chern numbers are necessarily equal. Hence, now we know it is impossible to toss some coins in a very lucky way in the laboratory and avoid the local constancy of the Chern number, and we know that the key topological property, namely the local constancy of the Chern number, is unrelated, and does not rely on covariance.

Remark 2.12. In [24], it is shown that the topological invariant for mobility-gapped Floquet 2D systems with no symmetry is invariant under selection of the logarithm branch cut within the

mobility gap. This means that it might be possible for the proof above to be adapted for such systems. Indeed, apparently the crucial ingredients are statements such as [Proposition 2.10](#) and a rewriting of the invariant in terms of contour integrals on resolvents, which allows for resolvent identities to be used. Part of [\[24, Theorem 2.1\]](#) is the analog of [Proposition 2.10](#), though it is only through [\[24, Theorem 2.6\]](#) that this is really established. Coincidentally an analog of [Proposition 2.10](#) is precisely what we do not have for the chiral 1D systems studied in [\[13\]](#).

In contrast, there is little hope to control the local constancy of \mathbb{Z}_2 invariants associated to time-reversal invariant systems using the approach presented here, since a jump between two invariants of the same parity should be allowed by continuous deformations.

3 Signatures of localization

In this section we justify the somewhat awkward [Definition 2.8](#). Let $H \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be given random (ergodic) Hamiltonian. Let $\Delta \in \text{Open}(\mathbb{R})$ be a given bounded interval. The fractional moments condition on Δ [\[3, Lemma 2.1\]](#) says that for Lebesgue-almost-all $E \in \Delta$ there is some fraction $s_E \in (0, 1)$ and constants $C_E < \infty, \mu_E > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|G(x, y; E + i\eta)\|^{s_E}] \leq C_E e^{-\mu_E \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (3.1)$$

Here \mathbb{E} is the disorder averaging and the other notation symbols are as in the preceding sections.

A further condition [\[14, Eq. \(4\)\]](#) that doesn't seem to follow automatically from [\(3.1\)](#) (see [\[19\]](#)), but rather requires more input from H is that for all $E \in \Delta$ there are constants $C_E < \infty, \mu_E > 0$ (here and below, these constants are different for each constraint) such that

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \eta \mathbb{E}[\|G(x, y; E + i\eta)\|^2] \leq C_E e^{-\mu_E \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (3.2)$$

Two very important consequences of these two conditions for topological insulators appeared in [\[1\]](#). [\(3.1\)](#) was shown to imply that for all $E \in \Delta$, there are constants $C_E < \infty, \mu_E > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\chi_{(-\infty, E)}(H)_{xy}\|] \leq C_E e^{-\mu_E \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (3.3)$$

[\(3.2\)](#) in turn was shown to imply that there are constants $C < \infty, \mu > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{f \in B_1(\Delta)} \|f(H)_{xy}\|] \leq C e^{-\mu \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (3.4)$$

With $B_1(\Delta)$ as in [Definition 2.8](#). We note that since $\chi_{(-\infty, E)} \in B_1(\Delta)$, [\(3.4\)](#) implies [\(3.3\)](#). Also, this implies that almost-surely, there is a (random) constant $C < \infty$ and (deterministic) $\mu > 0, a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that

$$\sup_{f \in B_1(\Delta)} \|f(H)_{xy}\| \leq C |a(x)|^{-1} e^{-\mu \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d). \quad (3.5)$$

as in, e.g., [\[9, Eq. \(1.2\)\]](#).

Now we obtain the following additional *deterministic* consequence of [\(3.1\)](#), which to our knowledge, is not a consequence of [\(3.5\)](#) or [\(3.4\)](#).

Proposition 3.1. *If H is localized on Δ in the sense of [\(3.1\)](#), then almost-surely, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a (random) constant $C_\alpha < \infty$ and (deterministic) $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \leq C_\alpha \frac{1}{|a(x)|} (1 + \|x - y\|)^{-\alpha} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \quad (3.6)$$

where $\Delta' \subset \Delta$ is a compact sub-interval.

With this consequence, it seems reasonable to include (3.6) in the set of deterministic localization assumptions one makes on H in the interval Δ , alongside with (3.5).

To calibrate (3.6), let us first make the

Remark 3.2. Regardless of the status of localization for H , for *all* disorder configurations, for any fixed interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, $s \in (0, 1)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \int_I \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s < \infty \quad (3.7)$$

as shown in [2, Eq. (8.2)].

To prove Proposition 3.1, we start by making the weaker statement about what happens not in $\sup_{\eta \neq 0}$ but only in the $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+}$.

Lemma 3.3. *If H obeys the fractional moment condition on Δ , (3.1), then for any compact sub-interval $\Delta' \subset \Delta$, almost-surely, there is a (random) constant $C < \infty$ and (deterministic) $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, $\mu > 0$, $s \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \leq C |a(x)|^{-1} e^{-\mu \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. Relating to the notations above (3.1), let $s := \min(\{s_E \mid E \in \Delta'\})$,

$$C' := |\Delta'| \max\left\{C_E^{\frac{s}{s_E}} \mid E \in \Delta'\right\}, \quad \mu := \frac{s}{2 \max(\{s_E \mid E \in \Delta'\})} \min(\{\mu_E \mid E \in \Delta'\})$$

and pick *any* $a \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. By Remark 3.2 we know that $\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s < \infty$, so that we may use the dominated convergence theorem in the second line below. Fatou's lemma is applied in the first line, Fubini in the third, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \star &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s |a(x)| e^{+\mu \|x-y\|}\right] \\ &\leq \liminf_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}\left[\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s |a(x)| e^{+\mu \|x-y\|}\right] \\ &= \liminf_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\Delta'} \|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s |a(x)| e^{+\mu \|x-y\|}\right] \\ &= \liminf_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \mathbb{E}[\|G(x, y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s] |a(x)| e^{+\mu \|x-y\|} \end{aligned}$$

Now we note that if (3.1) holds for some $s_E \in (0, 1)$, then the same holds with s_E replaced by σ for all $\sigma \in (0, s_E)$ by Jensen's inequality:

$$\sup_{\eta \neq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|G(x, y; E + i\eta)\|^\sigma] \leq C_E^{\frac{\sigma}{s_E}} e^{-\frac{\sigma}{s_E} \mu_E \|x-y\|} \quad (x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d).$$

If we restrict to $E \in \Delta'$ then the RHS is bounded by $\frac{1}{|\Delta'|} C' e^{-2\mu \|x-y\|}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \star &\leq \liminf_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \frac{1}{|\Delta'|} C' e^{-2\mu \|x-y\|} |a(x)| e^{+\mu \|x-y\|} \\ &= C' \sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\mu \|x-y\|} |a(x)| \\ &= C' \|a\|_{\ell^1} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\mu \|x\|} \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there is some random $C < \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x,y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s |a(x)| e^{+\mu\|x-y\|} \leq C$$

and so also

$$\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Delta'} \|G(x,y; \cdot + i\eta)\|^s \leq C |a(x)|^{-1} e^{-\mu\|x-y\|} \quad (x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square

Our next task is to upgrade the limsup to a sup. We first have to establish a certain subharmonicity:

Lemma 3.4. *With $\mathbb{C}_+ := \{z \mid \operatorname{Im}\{z\} > 0\}$ we have that for any $a > 0, s \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{C}_+ \ni z \mapsto \int_{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}-a}^{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}+a} \|G(x,y; \cdot + i\operatorname{Im}\{z\})\|^s =: \varphi_{x,y,a,s}(z) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is a subharmonic function.

Proof. First note that $\mathbb{C}_+ \ni z \mapsto G(x,y;z) \in \operatorname{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ is analytic, so that $\mathbb{C}_+ \ni z \mapsto \|G(x,y;z)\|^s =: g(z)$ is *subharmonic*. To verify that φ is subharmonic, we pick any $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B_r(z)} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_+$ (so $r < \operatorname{Im}\{z\}$) and aim to prove $\varphi(z) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \varphi(z + r e^{i\theta}) d\theta$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(z) &\equiv \int_{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}-a}^{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}+a} g(\lambda + i\operatorname{Im}\{z\}) d\lambda \\ &\quad \text{(Subharmonicity of } g) \\ &\leq \int_{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}-a}^{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}+a} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} g(\lambda + i\operatorname{Im}\{z\} + r e^{i\theta}) d\theta d\lambda \\ &\quad \text{(Fubini)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}-a}^{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}+a} g(\lambda + i\operatorname{Im}\{z\} + r e^{i\theta}) d\lambda d\theta \\ &\quad (\lambda' := \lambda + r \cos(\theta)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} \int_{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}-a+r \cos(\theta)}^{\operatorname{Re}\{z\}+a+r \cos(\theta)} g(\lambda' + i(\operatorname{Im}\{z\} + r \sin(\theta))) d\lambda d\theta \\ &\quad \text{(Use definition of } \varphi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} \varphi(\operatorname{Re}\{z\} + r \cos(\theta) + i(\operatorname{Im}\{z\} + r \sin(\theta))) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} \varphi(z + r e^{i\theta}) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Since $\varphi_{x,y,a,s}$ is a sub-harmonic function which decays in $\|x-y\|$ above the real axis (via the Combes-Thomas estimate) and whose limsup on the real axis decays in $\|x-y\|$ via Lemma 3.3, we find our result using either [4, Theorem 4.2] or [12, Proposition 25]. \square

Acknowledgements: I thank Gian Michele Graf for many useful discussions. This research is supported in part by Simons Foundation Math + X Investigator Award #376319 (Michael I. Weinstein).

References

- [1] Aizenman, M. and Graf, G. M.: Localization bounds for an electron gas. *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.* **31**, 6783–6806 (1998)
- [2] Aizenman, M. and Warzel, S.: *Random Operators*. Amer. Math. Soc., 2015.
- [3] Aizenman, M. and Molchanov, S.: Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies: an elementary derivation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **157** (2), 245–278 (1993)
- [4] Aizenman, M. et al.: Finite-volume fractional-moment criteria for Anderson localization. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **224** (1), 219–253 (2001)
- [5] Bellissard, J., van Elst, A., and Schulz-Baldes, H.: The noncommutative geometry of the quantum Hall effect. *Journal of Mathematical Physics.* **35**, 5373–5451 (1994)
- [6] Bourne, C., Kellendonk, J., and Rennie, A.: The K-Theoretic Bulk–Edge Correspondence for Topological Insulators. *Annales Henri Poincaré.* **18** (5), 1833–1866 (2017)
- [7] Del Rio, R., Makarov, N., and Simon, B.: Operators with singular continuous spectrum. II. Rank one operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **165** (1), 59–67 (1994)
- [8] Elbau, P. and Graf, G. M.: Equality of bulk and edge Hall conductance revisited. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **229** (3), 415–432 (2002)
- [9] Elgart, A., Graf, G. M., and Schenker, J.: Equality of the bulk and edge Hall conductances in a mobility gap. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **259** (1), 185–221 (2005)
- [10] Freed, D. S. and Moore, G. W.: Twisted Equivariant Matter. *Annales Henri Poincaré.* **14** (8), 1927–2023 (2013)
- [11] Gordon, A. Y.: Pure point spectrum under 1-parameter perturbations and instability of Anderson localization. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **164** (3), 489–505 (1994)
- [12] Graf, G. M. and Shapiro, J.: Complete localization for disordered chiral chains. in preparation. (2018)
- [13] Graf, G. M. and Shapiro, J.: The bulk-edge correspondence for disordered chiral chains. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **363**, (2018)
- [14] Graf, G. M.: Anderson localization and the space-time characteristic of continuum states. *Journal of Statistical Physics.* **75** (1), 337–346 (1994)
- [15] Graf, G. M. and Tauber, C.: Bulk-edge correspondence for two-dimensional floquet topological insulators. *Ann. Henri Poincaré.* **19** (3), 709–741 (2018)
- [16] Hasan, M. Z. and Kane, C. L.: Colloquium: Topological insulators. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 3045–3067 (2010)
- [17] Kellendonk, J.: On the C-star-Algebraic Approach to Topological Phases for Insulators. *Annales Henri Poincaré.* **18** (7), 2251–2300 (2017)
- [18] Kitaev, A.: Periodic table for topological insulators and superconductors. *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1134** (1), 22–30 (2009)
- [19] Mavi, R. and Schenker, J.: Resonant tunneling in a system with correlated pure point spectrum. 2017. arXiv: [1705.03039](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.03039) [[math-ph](#)].
- [20] Prodan, E. and Schulz-Baldes, H.: *Bulk and Boundary Invariants for Complex Topological Insulators: From K-Theory to Physics*. Springer, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-29351-6_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29351-6_4).
- [21] Prodan, E. and Schulz-Baldes, H.: Non-commutative odd Chern numbers and topological phases of disordered chiral systems. *J. Funct. Anal.* **271** (5), 1150–1176 (2016)
- [22] Ryu, S. et al.: Topological insulators and superconductors: tenfold way and dimensional hierarchy. *New J. Phys.* **12** (6), 065010 (2010)

- [23] Schnyder, A. P. et al.: Classification of topological insulators and superconductors in three spatial dimensions. Phys. Rev. B. **78**, 195125 (2008)
- [24] Shapiro, J. and Tauber, C.: Strongly Disordered Floquet Topological Systems. 2018. arXiv: [1807.03251](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.03251) [math-ph].