

On symmetric Tetranacci polynomials in mathematics and physics

Nico G. Leumer

¹Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), Paseo Manuel de Lardizabal 4, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain

² Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, Institut de Physique et Chimie des Matériaux de Strasbourg, UMR 7504, F-67000 Strasbourg, France

³ Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Regensburg, 93053 Regensburg, Germany

E-mail: nico.leumer@dipc.org

Abstract. In this manuscript, we introduce (symmetric) Tetranacci polynomials ξ_j as a twofold generalization of ordinary Tetranacci numbers, considering both non unity coefficients and generic initial values. We derive a complete closed form expression for any ξ_j with the key feature of a decomposition in terms of generalized Fibonacci polynomials. For suitable conditions, ξ_j can be understood as the superposition of standing waves. The issue of Tetranacci polynomials originated from their application in condensed matter physics. We explicitly demonstrate the approach for the spectrum, eigenvectors, Green's functions and transmission probability for an atomic tight binding chain exhibiting both nearest and next nearest neighbor processes. We demonstrate that in topological trivial models, complex wavevectors can form bulk states as a result of the open boundary conditions. We describe how effective next nearest neighbor bonding is engineered in state of the art theory/ experiment exploiting onsite degrees of freedom and close range hopping. We argue about experimental tune ability and on-demand complex wavevectors.

Keywords: Tetranacci polynomials, Fibonacci decomposition, complex wavevectors, transcendental momentum quantization, bulk-boundary correspondence, (engineering) next nearest neighbor hopping.

Submitted to: *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*

1. Introduction

Undoubtedly one of the most famous sequences are the Fibonacci numbers f_n , defined recursively by $f_{n+1} = f_n + f_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$ and $f_0 = 0, f_1 = 1$ [1, 2, 3, 4]. As noticed by Horadam in the midst of the last century, generalizations require either altered initial values or alternatively a modified recursion formula [3]. For instance, Webb and Parberry did the former and studied Fibonacci polynomials F_n obeying ($n \geq 1$) $F_{n+1} = x F_n + F_{n-1}$, $F_0 = 0, F_1 = 1$ [5]. Half a decade later, Hoggatt Jr. and Long defined generalized Fibonacci polynomials \mathcal{F}_n [6] as ($n \geq 1$)

$$\mathcal{F}_{n+1} = x \mathcal{F}_n + y \mathcal{F}_{n-1}, \quad \mathcal{F}_0 = 0, \mathcal{F}_1 = 1, \quad (1)$$

while Özvatan and Pashaev substituted $\mathcal{F}_{0,1}$ by generic initial values $G_{0,1}$ [7].

Extending the recursion range in (1) from two to three yields Tribonacci numbers or Tribonacci polynomials depending on the coefficients and supposing properly chosen initial values [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Subsequently, the first notion of Tetranacci numbers, where the next element of the sequence is formed by the previous four, appeared (to our best knowledge) in [8]. Since then, Tetranacci or Tetranacci-like sequences were studied in many variations up to modern days, cf. [13, 14, 15, 16, 17] in order to mention only a few. The most generic form of what we call hereinafter a *Tetranacci polynomials* t_n is ($n \geq 0$)

$$t_{n+2} = x_1 t_{n+1} + x_0 t_n + x_{-1} t_{n-1} + x_{-2} t_{n-2} \quad (2)$$

with some initial values t_{-2}, \dots, t_1 and given coefficients x_1, \dots, x_{-2} was previously presented in [14].

In contrast to the generic case, we focus on symmetric Tetranacci polynomials (cf. (4) below) recovered from (2) for $x_{-2} = -1$ and $x_1 = x_{-1}$ but still generic $x_{0,1}$. This particular choice of coefficients seems arbitrary; it is not. Rather, the eigenvectors of ($a, b, c, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$)

$$M(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{bmatrix} c - \alpha & b & a & & & & & \\ b & c & b & a & & & & \\ a & b & c & b & a & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & a & b & c & b & a & \\ & & & a & b & c & b & \\ & & & & a & b & c - \beta & \end{bmatrix}_{N \times N} \quad (3)$$

symmetric Toeplitz matrices $M(\alpha = 0, \beta = 0)$ are composed of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials as we shall discuss. Finite α or β merely modifies the boundary constraints of eigenvectors from the pure Toeplitz case [18].

Besides mathematical interests, symmetric Tetranacci appear also in condensed matter theory. The reason for this is, that we physicists consider most often particular hermitian systems to which we refer as being "translation invariant". Thus, the model's physics is captured by (banded) Toeplitz matrices. For $\alpha = \beta = 0$, M mimics an atomic

chain with nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping, while specific $\alpha \neq 0$, $\beta \neq 0$ are connected to the $X - Y$ chain in transverse magnetic field [19] or the Kitaev chain [18, 19, 20]. It has been shown further, that symmetric Tetranacci polynomials are linked to characteristic polynomial and the Green's functions used in quantum transport [21].

The issue of eigenvalues of banded Toeplitz was investigated formerly in more generality [22]. Particularly, the spectrum of tridiagonal Toeplitz attracted some interest [23, 24, 25] as their the eigenvector elements are Chebyshev [26, 27, 28] or Fibonacci polynomials [29]. Although a matrix as in (3) can be generated by a product of two tridiagonal Toeplitz matrices [18], results for the spectrum of M are more complicated w.r.t. to the tridiagonal case as we shall see.

One of our main contributions is to present a simple and closed form expression for generic symmetric Tetranacci polynomials, which originates from a decomposition into generalized Fibonacci polynomials (cf. section 3). As motivation, the fundamental conviction of physicists is that eigenstates (eigenvectors) of finite systems are given in terms of standing waves. Their form is sinusoidal and the perhaps most evident example are oscillations of a guitar string, being fixed at both ends. By the knowledge that Binet/Binet-like forms of Fibonacci polynomials can be reshaped into a sine function [5, 6], the stage was set.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In section 2, we formally define symmetric Tetranacci polynomials and present the basic strategy to find their closed form expression. Subsequently, we introduce so called *basic* Tetranacci polynomials and discuss a few of their properties. In section 3, we demonstrate that specific generalized Fibonacci polynomials obey also the Tetranacci recursion formula. We verify that any generic Tetranacci polynomial can be expressed in terms of those specific solutions. Then, we focus on applications in quantum physics. In section 4, we discuss the spectrum and the eigenvectors of an atomic chain owning nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping granting (3) for $\alpha = \beta = 0$. Since some feature of this model require the next nearest neighbor process to dominate the close-range coupling, section 5 discusses how arbitrarily large ratios of effective couplings can be engineered experimentally. We conclude in section 6. Appendix A (Appendix B) discusses (states closed formulae for) degenerate roots of the Tetranacci recursion. Finally, Appendix C presents the application to quantum transport. Readers mainly interested in the application may not hesitate to proceed from section 4 on.

2. Generic properties of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials

Definition 2.1 *The symmetric Tetranacci polynomial ξ_j is recursively defined by*

$$\xi_{j+2} = \zeta \xi_j - \xi_{j-2} + \eta (\xi_{j+1} + \xi_{j-1}), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (4)$$

in terms of its initial values $\xi_i = g_i(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$) and complex coefficients ζ, η .

Although the initial values may or may not depend themselves on ζ and/or η , we utilize

always the shorthand notation of g_{-2}, \dots, g_1 and ξ_j respectively. For the purpose of illustration, the first few terms of the sequence read

$$\xi_2 = -g_{-2} + \eta g_{-1} + \zeta g_0 + \eta g_1, \quad (5a)$$

$$\xi_3 = -\eta g_{-2} + (\eta^2 - 1) g_{-1} + \eta(\zeta + 1) g_0 + (\eta^2 + \zeta) g_1, \quad (5b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_4 = & -(\eta^2 + \zeta) g_{-2} + \eta(\eta^2 + \zeta - 1) g_{-1} + (\zeta + 1)(\zeta - 1 + \eta^2) g_0 \\ & + \eta(\eta^2 + 2\zeta + 1) g_1 \end{aligned} \quad (5c)$$

and further ones follow from (4). Alternatively, we may also rely on the generating function $E(t)$.

Proposition 1 *The generating function $E(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \xi_k t^k$ of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials reads*

$$E(t) = \frac{g_1 t + g_0(1 - \eta t) + g_{-1}(\eta t^2 - t^3) - g_{-2} t^2}{1 - \eta t - \zeta t^2 - \eta t^3 + t^4}. \quad (6)$$

Proof Using the definition of the generating function grants

$$\begin{aligned} E(t) &= g_0 + g_1 t + t^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_{n+2} t^n \\ &= g_0 + g_1 t + t^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} [\zeta \xi_n - \xi_{n-2} + \eta(\xi_{n+1} + \xi_{n-1})] t^n \\ &= g_0 + g_1 t + g_{-1} t^2 (\eta - t) - g_{-2} t^2 - g_0 \eta t + E(t) (\zeta t^2 - t^4 + \eta t^3 + \eta t). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here, we substituted (4) in the last term and all sums were completed properly in order to provide $E(t)$. \square

Perhaps contrary to their appearance in (5a)- (5c), the looked for closed form of ξ_j is rather simple. Since the intention of our mindset is the applicability, we aim at a particular expression for ξ_j , namely (9) below, demanding the introduction of specific solutions to (4), hereinafter referred to as the basic Tetranacci polynomials.

Definition 2.2 *The basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$) satisfy (4) for generic $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Their initial values are summarized by*

$$\mathcal{T}_i(j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = -2, \dots, 1. \quad (8)$$

and δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker-Delta \ddagger . We call (8) the selective property of $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ as becomes evident hereinafter.

For the purpose of illustration, Table 1 presents the first few terms of $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$. Additional ones can be anticipated from (5a)-(5c). The primary advantage of the basic Tetranacci polynomial resides in the fact that the arbitrary initial values of ξ_j and the recursion formula (4) separate by means of the selective property (8). A similar strategy was pursued in [16] for Tetranacci numbers. Nevertheless, we then have *initially* to deal with four symmetric Tetranacci polynomials rather than only one.

\ddagger The Kronecker-Delta is defined as $\delta_{nl} = 1$ for $n = l$ and zero otherwise.

j	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2
$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$	η	1	0	0	0	-1
$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j)$	ζ	0	1	0	0	η
$\mathcal{T}_0(j)$	η	0	0	1	0	ζ
$\mathcal{T}_1(j)$	-1	0	0	0	1	η

Table 1. Basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ for $j = -3, \dots, 2$. The central columns ($j = -2, \dots, 1$) provide the initial values according to (8). The inversion point (●) proposes the relations $\mathcal{T}_0(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-1}(-1 - j)$ and $\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - j)$ for arbitrary j , η, ζ proven later in Lemma 2.1.

Corollary 1 Any symmetric Tetranacci polynomial ξ_j can be written as ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$)

$$\xi_j = \sum_{i=-2}^1 g_i \mathcal{T}_i(j) \quad (9)$$

for generic $\eta, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ and complex initial values $\xi_i = g_i$, $i = -2, \dots, 1$.

Proof Due to the linearity of the Tetranacci recursion formula, any linear combination of solutions also satisfies (4); thus, the l.h.s. of (9) is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial. Hence, in case that (9) holds already for the initial values, this relation is true for generic integer j . Indeed, we find that ($j = -2, \dots, 1$)

$$\xi_j = \sum_{i=-2}^1 g_i \mathcal{T}_i(j) = \sum_{i=-2}^1 g_i \delta_{ij} = g_j \quad (10)$$

is correct, substituting (8) in the intermediate step. \square

Naturally, the description of ξ_j in terms of $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ is not specific for Tetranacci polynomials and small modifications in both Definition 2.2 and (9) extend this strategy to arbitrary (linear) recursive problems.

The basic Tetranacci polynomials inherit some specific traits originating from their particular initial values, as can be anticipated from Table 1. More importantly though, we find interconnections between \mathcal{T}_1 (\mathcal{T}_{-1}) and \mathcal{T}_{-2} (\mathcal{T}_0) reducing effectively the number of involved quantities. Actually, the Lemmata 2.1, 2.2 below even demonstrate that \mathcal{T}_{-1} , \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 can be constructed solely from \mathcal{T}_{-2} .

Lemma 2.1 The basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$) obey

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - j), \quad (11a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-1}(-1 - j), \quad (11b)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) = \mathcal{T}_1(-1 - j), \quad (11c)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) = \mathcal{T}_0(-1 - j), \quad (11d)$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and generic $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof Notice that once the validity of (11a) ((11b)) is shown, (11c) ((11d)) follows automatically by setting $l = -1 - j$ and renaming $l \rightarrow j$ afterwards. Since the proofs of (11a), (11b) are similar, we focus only on the former. The presented values in Table 1 imply the validity of (11a) already for $j = -2, -1, 0$: $\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - j) = 0$. At $j = -3$, we find $\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - j) = -1$. Assuming that (11a) holds already for some integers $n - 2, n - 1, n, n + 1$, we are left to demonstrate (11a) at $n + 2$ ($n - 3$) for increasing (decreasing) indices. Since $\mathcal{T}_1(j), \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ are symmetric Tetranacci polynomials, (4) gives

$$\mathcal{T}_1(n + 2) = \zeta \mathcal{T}_1(n) - \mathcal{T}_1(n - 2) + \eta [\mathcal{T}_1(n + 1) + \mathcal{T}_1(n - 1)] \quad (12)$$

at $j = n$. Similarly at $j = -1 - n$, we find

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-3 - n) = \zeta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - n) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(1 - n) + \eta [\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2 - n) + \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-n)], \quad (13)$$

after reordering the terms. Due to our assumption, we find that (12), (13) are identical which is equivalent to $\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - j)$ at $j = n + 2$. The demonstration for decreasing indices, i.e. for $n - 3$, is carried out analogously by exchanging the $j + 2$ and $j - 2$ terms in (4). \square

Lemma 2.2 *The basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j), \dots, \mathcal{T}_1(j)$ obey*

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) = -\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-j), \quad (14a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j - 1) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j), \quad (14b)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(j) = \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j + 1) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j + 2), \quad (14c)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = -\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j + 1), \quad (14d)$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and generic $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof We focus first on (14a), where a proof for $j \geq 0$ is sufficient. Apparently, (14a) is already valid for $j = 0, 1, 2$ (cf. Table 1). For $j = 3$, we obtain $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(3) = -\eta$ from (4), i.e. we find $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(3) = -\eta = -\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-3)$. Assuming (14a) is true for $n - 2, n - 1, n, n + 1$ ($n \geq 2$) we demonstrate its validity at $n + 2$. (4), implies

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(n + 2) = \zeta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(n) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(n - 2) + \eta [\mathcal{T}_{-2}(n + 1) + \mathcal{T}_{-2}(n - 1)], \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-n - 2) = \zeta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-n) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(2 - n) + \eta [\mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1 - n) + \mathcal{T}_{-2}(1 - n)]. \quad (16)$$

Due to our assumption, the two expressions differ only by a sign. Thus, (14a) is valid. Next, we focus on (14b). $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j - 1)$ is apparently a solution to (4), since $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial, i.e. $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j - 1) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ is one as well due to the linearity of (4). Hence, the latter has only to satisfy the selective property of $\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j)$ for (14b) to be correct. Indeed, we have (cf. Table 1)

$$j = -2: \quad \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-3) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2) = \eta - \eta = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-1}(-2), \quad (17a)$$

$$j = -1: \quad \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1) = 1 - 0 = 1 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-1}(-1), \quad (17b)$$

$$j = 0: \quad \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(0) = 0 - 0 = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-1}(0), \quad (17c)$$

$$j = 1: \quad \mathcal{T}_{-2}(0) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(1) = 0 - 0 = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-1}(1). \quad (17d)$$

The correctness of (14c) is a direct consequence of (11b), (14a), (14b):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_0(j) &= \mathcal{T}_{-1}(-1-j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2-j) - \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1-j) \\ &= \eta \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j+1) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(2+j),\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

while (14d) follows from (11a), (14a):

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1-j) = -\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j+1).\quad (19)$$

Thus, the statements are correct. \square

In the view of Corollary 1 and the Lemmata 2.1, 2.2, the closed form expression of an arbitrary Tetranacci polynomial ξ_j demands merely the one of \mathcal{T}_{-2} . Yet the final result for \mathcal{T}_{-2} presented in Theorem 3.2 below requires some preparation.

Furthermore, (9) is also interesting when studying algebraic properties of ξ_j . For instance, we find ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$)

$$\xi_{-1-j} = g_{-2} \mathcal{T}_1(j) + g_{-1} \mathcal{T}_0(j) + g_0 \mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) + g_1 \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)\quad (20)$$

by imposing (11a)-(11d) on (9). Thus, $\xi_{-1-j} = \xi_j$ holds in case that $g_{-2} = g_1$ and $g_{-1} = g_0$ are true. Similar properties of ξ_j may follow, once they have been proven for $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j), \dots, \mathcal{T}_1(j)$.

Although (21) below is rather trivial from the mathematical point of view, i.e. that ξ_j can be written as linear combination of complex entities, the Lemma summarizes (to our best knowledge) all relations necessary to diagonalize symmetric Toeplitz matrices of bandwidth two. As long as (21) is valid, this relation is consistent with the in solid state physics famous Bloch's theorem without touching further details [30, 31]. Nevertheless, the consequences imposed by the quantities $S_{1,2}$ (defined in Lemma 2.3 below) are of fundamental importance for us.

Lemma 2.3 *Any symmetric Tetranacci polynomial can be expressed as*

$$\xi_j = A e^{i\theta_1 j} + B e^{-i\theta_1 j} + C e^{i\theta_2 j} + D e^{-i\theta_2 j},\quad (21)$$

provided that $S_1 \neq S_2$ and $S_{1,2} \neq \pm 2$ hold true where $S_{1,2} = (\eta \pm \sqrt{\eta^2 + 4(\zeta + 2)})/2$. In (21), we introduced $\theta_{1,2} \in \mathbb{C}$ defined by $2 \cos(\theta_{1,2}) = S_{1,2}$. The coefficients A, B, C, D are set implicitly by $\xi_i = g_i, i = -2, \dots, 1$.

Proof The announced result is found straightforwardly by the power law ansatz $\xi_j \propto r^j$ ($r \neq 0$) on (4). After substituting the ansatz and dividing by $r^j \neq 0$, we arrive at the characteristic equation:

$$r^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} - \zeta - \eta \left(r + \frac{1}{r} \right) = 0.\quad (22)$$

Its peculiar form suggests to introduce the variable $S = r + r^{-1}$, granting in turn the quadratic equation $S^2 - \eta S - \zeta - 2 = 0$, whose zeros are

$$S_{1,2} = \frac{\eta \pm \sqrt{\eta^2 + 4(\zeta + 2)}}{2}.\quad (23)$$

Solving $S = r + r^{-1}$ for r at $S = S_{1,2}$ yields

$$r_{\pm l} = \frac{S_l \pm \sqrt{S_l^2 - 4}}{2}, \quad l = 1, 2, \quad (24)$$

possessing the properties of $r_{+l}r_{-l} = 1$ and $r_{+l} + r_{-l} = S_l$ for $l = 1, 2$. In case of $S_1 \neq S_2$, $S_{1,2} \neq \pm 2$, we can thus express ξ_j as their linear combination:

$$\xi_j = Ar_{+1}^j + Br_{-1}^j + Cr_{+2}^j + Dr_{-2}^j. \quad (25)$$

The coefficients A, B, C, D are to be set by the initial values g_{-2}, \dots, g_1 of ξ_j . Introducing $\theta_{1,2}$ by $2 \cos(\theta_{1,2}) = S_{1,2}$ grants $r_{\pm l} = \exp(\pm i\theta_l)$. \square

Any degeneracy of the roots $r_{\pm 1,2}$ alters (21) qualitatively, i.e. the closed form expression for ξ_j will change, and we refer here to Appendix A for further details. Perhaps contrary to the impression of the reader that we apply next Lemma 2.3 to determine \mathcal{T}_{-2} or ξ_{-2} resulting in a Binet-like form, similar to the one for Tetranacci numbers in [14], we follow a different strategy. In fact specific generalized Fibonacci polynomials also satisfy (4) out of which \mathcal{T}_{-2} can be constructed. One has still to distinguish the cases of: i) $S_1 \neq S_2$, ii) $S_1 = S_2$, but $S_1^2 \neq 4$ and iii) $S_1 = S_2$, $S_1^2 = 4$.

3. The Fibonacci decomposition

Generalized Fibonacci polynomials, defined here according to (1) (cf. [6]), are closely related to symmetric Tetranacci polynomials. The trivial limit is $\eta = 0$, where (4) simplifies to $\xi_{j+2} = \zeta\xi_j - \xi_{j-2}$; thus, separating even and odd indices j . Defining then $v_l = \xi_{2l}$ ($u_l = \xi_{2l+1}$) immediately grants $u_{l+1} = \zeta u_l - u_{l-1}$, $v_{l+1} = \zeta v_l - v_{l-1}$. Yet, even for $\eta \neq 0$ we find that specific symmetric Tetranacci polynomials obey simultaneously a two term recursion formula.

Theorem 3.1 *The generalized Fibonacci polynomial $\varphi_l(j)$ ($l = 1, 2$), set by*

$$\varphi_l(j+1) = S_l \varphi_l(j) - \varphi_l(j-1), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (26)$$

with $S_{1,2} = (\eta \pm \sqrt{\eta^2 + 4(\zeta + 2)})/2$ and initial values $\varphi_l(0) = 0$, $\varphi_l(1) = 1$ is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial.

Proof For the sake of clarity, we suppress the index $l = 1, 2$ in the following. The proposed statement follows straightforwardly by assuming initially that $\varphi_l(j)$ obeys $\varphi(j+1) = x\varphi(j) + y\varphi(j-1)$ ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$) for arbitrary (complex) x, y and initial values f_0, f_1 . In order to be a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial, $\varphi_l(j)$ has to satisfy also (4). Replacing in (4) all terms carrying the indices $j+2, j+1$ grant

$$(x^2 + y - \eta x - \zeta)\varphi(j) = (\eta y + \eta - xy)\varphi(j-1) - \varphi(j-2). \quad (27)$$

Comparing the coefficients between (27) and our ansatz for φ sets $y = -1$ immediately. In turn, $\eta y + \eta - xy = x$ holds without restrictions on x . Instead, the latter is set by $1 = x^2 + y - \eta x - \zeta \equiv x^2 - \eta x - \zeta - 1$ after substituting y . The associated quadratic equation has the two roots $S_{1,2} = (\eta \pm \sqrt{\eta^2 + 4(\zeta + 2)})/2$ introduced earlier in Lemma

j	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
$\varphi_l(j)$	$-(S_l^2 - 1)$	$-S_l$	-1	0	1	S_l	$S_l^2 - 1$

Table 2. The first terms of $\varphi_l(j)$ ($l = 1, 2$) for $j = -3, \dots, 3$.

2.3. Thus, $\varphi(j)$ obeys (4) for the announced coefficients. As $\varphi(j)$ is well defined by f_0 , f_1 and (26), the initial values $\varphi(-2)$, $\varphi(-1)$, $\varphi(0) = f_0$, $\varphi(1) = f_1$ for the Tetranacci recursion in (4) are fixed. Hence, $\varphi(j)$ satisfies the definition of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials. Without loss of generality, we choose $f_0 = 0$ and $f_1 = 1$ for simplicity. \square

Notice that Theorem 3.1 is an implication: An arbitrary symmetric Tetranacci polynomial ξ_j will not obey (26) due to its generic initial values g_{-2}, \dots, g_1 . For instance, we may choose $g_{-2} = \varphi_1(-2) + \epsilon$, $g_{-1} = \varphi_1(-1)$ and $g_0 = \varphi_1(0) = 0$, $g_1 = \varphi_1(1) = 1$ for $\epsilon > 0$.

Further, Table 2 exposes the first few values of $\varphi_{1,2}$, from where we deduce the next proposition before we turn to their closed form expression.

Proposition 2 *The polynomials $\varphi_l(j)$ ($l = 1, 2$) satisfy $\varphi_l(j) = -\varphi_l(-j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof (26) and the initial values $\varphi_l(0) = 0$, $\varphi_l(1) = 1$ yield $\varphi_l(-1) = -1$. Thus, the statement is correct for $j = 0, 1$. Assuming that $\varphi_l(j) = -\varphi_l(-j)$ holds already at $n, n + 1$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}_0$), (26) states that

$$\varphi_l(n + 2) = S_l \varphi_l(n + 1) - \varphi_l(n) = -[S_l \varphi_l(-n - 1) - \varphi_l(-n)] \quad (28)$$

is true. Exchanging $\varphi_l(j + 1)$, $\varphi_l(j - 1)$ in (26) and using that $n \geq 0$ implies $-n - 1 < -n$, identifies $S_l \varphi_l(-n - 1) - \varphi_l(-n) = \varphi_l(-n - 2)$. \square

Proposition 3 *The explicit closed form expression for $\varphi_l(j)$ ($l = 1, 2, j \in \mathbb{Z}$)*

$$\varphi_l(j) = \frac{r_{+l}^j - r_{-l}^j}{r_{+l} - r_{-l}} \quad (29)$$

is Binet-like whenever $S_l \neq \pm 2$. In terms of $\theta_{1,2}$, one has $\varphi_l = \sin(\theta_l j) / \sin(\theta_l)$ [5, 6]. For $S_l = \pm 2$, we find

$$\varphi_l(j) = j \left(\frac{S_l}{2} \right)^{j+1}. \quad (30)$$

Proof First, we focus on $S_l \neq \pm 2$. Although (29) and its version in terms of θ_l is known as the closed form expression for generalized Fibonacci polynomials (cf. [5, 6]), we re-derive it for completeness and in order to better demonstrate the changes imposed by $S_l^2 = 4$ afterwards. Using the ansatz $\varphi_l \propto r^j$ ($r \neq 0$) on (26), we find $r^2 - S_l r + 1 = 0$ after dividing by r^{j-1} . The two roots are $r_{\pm l} = (S_l \pm \sqrt{S_l^2 - 4})/2$ from (24) in Lemma 2.3 and $S_l \neq \pm 2$ implies $\varphi_l(j) = \alpha r_{+l}^j + \beta r_{-l}^j$. The coefficients α, β are set by $\varphi_l(0) = 0$ and $\varphi_l(1) = 1$ as $\alpha = r_{+l} - r_{-l}$, $\beta = -\alpha$ granting (29). Introducing θ_l as $2 \cos(\theta_l) = S_l$ turns (29) into $\sin(\theta_l j) / \sin(\theta_l)$.

For $S_l = \pm 2$, the two roots $r_{\pm l}$ become degenerate: $r_{+l} = r_{-l} = S_l/2$. Hence, the linear combination $\varphi_l(j) = \alpha r_{+l}^j + \beta r_{-l}^j = \tilde{\alpha} r_{+l}^j$ becomes insufficient to properly account for the two initial values of $\varphi_l(j)$. Since the recursion formula (26) does not change qualitatively at $S_l^2 = 4$, one misses in fact the second solution $j r_{+l}^j$ as demonstrated in the following. Substituting the ansatz $\varphi_l(j) \propto j r_{+l}^j$ into (26) and reordering according to powers in j grants

$$j(r_{+l}^2 - S_l r_{+l} + 1) + r_{+l}^2 - 1 = 0 \quad (31)$$

where the bracket vanishes since r_{+l} is the root of $r^2 - S_l r + 1$. The second term vanishes due to $r_{+l} = S_l/2 = \pm 1$ found from $S_l^2 = 4$. Thus, $\varphi_l(j) = \tilde{\alpha} r_{+l}^j + \tilde{\beta} j r_{+l}^j = (\tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\beta} j) r_{+l}^j$ is true. The initial values of $\varphi_l(j)$ set $\tilde{\alpha} = 0$, $\tilde{\beta} = 1/r_+ = r_+$ and (30) is found. \square

Similar as for "ordinary" symmetric Tetranacci polynomials ξ_j , the situation of $S_1 = S_2$ offers further special solutions to (4) apart from only $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ (cf. Lemma 2.3 and Appendix A). The following lemma is the last intermediate step, before we finally turn to one of the main results of the article: The decomposition of $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ (and thus any symmetric Tetranacci polynomial) in terms of the generalized Fibonacci polynomials $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$.

Lemma 3.1 *For $S_1 = S_2$ (and $S_1 = \pm 2$) also $j\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ ($j^2\varphi_{1,2}(j)$) is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial.*

Proof The situation of $S_1 = S_2$ implies $\varphi_1(j) = \varphi_2(j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ (cf. Theorem 3.1) and thus; we demonstrate the statement for only $j\varphi_1(j)$ and $j^2\varphi_1(j)$. After substituting $j\varphi_1(j)$ into (4), and reordering, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= j \{ \varphi_1(j+2) - \zeta \varphi_1(j) + \varphi_1(j-2) - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) + \varphi_1(j-1)] \} \\ &\quad + 2 [\varphi_1(j+2) - \varphi_1(j-2)] - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_1(j-1)] \\ &= 2 [\varphi_1(j+2) - \varphi_1(j-2)] - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_1(j-1)], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where the curly bracket is identically zero, since $\varphi_1(j)$ is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial (cf. Theorem 3.1). So far, we have not imposed $S_1 = S_2$. According to (23), we find $S_1 = \eta/2$ and using (26) twice shows that (32) is indeed satisfied

$$\begin{aligned} &2 [\varphi_1(j+2) - \varphi_1(j-2)] - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_1(j-1)] \\ &= 2 \underbrace{[\varphi_1(j+2) - S_1 \varphi_1(j+1)]}_{=-\varphi_1(j)} + 2 \underbrace{[S_1 \varphi_1(j-1) - \varphi_1(j-2)]}_{=\varphi_1(j)} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

i.e. $j\varphi_1(j)$ is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial. Notice that the constraint $S_1 = S_2$ is essential, as otherwise only $\eta = S_1 + S_2$ is correct. Then, we may write $S_1 = S_2 + \epsilon$ ($\epsilon \neq 0$) and (32) is not satisfied.

Next, in order for $j^2\varphi_1(j)$ to obey (32) the additional constraint $S_1^2 = 4$ is mandatory. Substituting $j^2\varphi_1(j)$ into (4) and reordering the terms afterwards grants

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= j^2 \{ \varphi_1(j+2) - \zeta \varphi_1(j) + \varphi_1(j-2) - \eta [\varphi_1(j-1) + \varphi_1(j+1)] \} \\ &\quad + 2j \{ 2 [\varphi_1(j+2) - \varphi_1(j-2)] - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_1(j-1)] \} \\ &\quad + 4\varphi_1(j+2) + 4\varphi_1(j-2) - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) + \varphi_1(j-1)] \\ &= 4\varphi_1(j+2) + 4\varphi_1(j-2) - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) + \varphi_1(j-1)], \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the first two lines drop since $\varphi_1(j)$, $j\varphi_1(j)$ are symmetric Tetranacci polynomials. Due to (26) and $S_1 = \eta/2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 4\varphi_1(j+2) + 4\varphi_1(j-2) - \eta [\varphi_1(j+1) + \varphi_1(j-1)] \\
 &= 4[S_1\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_1(j)] + 4[S_1\varphi_1(j-1) - \varphi_1(j)] - \eta S_1\varphi_1(j) \\
 &= 2 \left[2S_1^2 - S_1\frac{\eta}{2} - 4 \right] \varphi_1(j) \\
 &= 2[S_1^2 - 4] \varphi_1(j),
 \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

being zero only for $S_1^2 = 4$ at generic $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Next, we construct \mathcal{T}_{-2} in terms of $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ and $j\varphi_{1,2}(j)$, $j^2\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ when the proper conditions are met.

Theorem 3.2 *The closed form expression of $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ is*

$$\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{\varphi_2(j) - \varphi_1(j)}{S_1 - S_2}, & S_1 \neq S_2 \\ \frac{(1-j)\varphi_1(j+1) + (1+j)\varphi_1(j-1)}{S_1^2 - 4}, & S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 \neq 4 \\ \frac{S_1(1-j^2)}{12} \varphi_1(j), & S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 = 4 \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

Proof For $S_1 \neq S_2$, we have that $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ satisfy (4), while $j\varphi_{1,2}(j)$, $j^2\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ do not (cf. Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.1). Since $S_1 \neq S_2$ also implies $\varphi_1(j) \neq \varphi_2(j)$ (cf. (26)) for all $j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and due to the linearity of (4), $[\varphi_2(j) - \varphi_1(j)]/(S_1 - S_2)$ is a non-trivial solution to (4). Hence, the statement is correct provided that $[\varphi_2(j) - \varphi_1(j)]/(S_1 - S_2)$ inherits the selective property of $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$. Using Table 2, we have indeed that

$$j = -2 : \quad \frac{\varphi_2(-2) - \varphi_1(-2)}{S_1 - S_2} = \frac{-S_2 - (-S_1)}{S_1 - S_2} = 1 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2), \tag{37a}$$

$$j = -1 : \quad \frac{\varphi_2(-1) - \varphi_1(-1)}{S_1 - S_2} = \frac{-1 - (-1)}{S_1 - S_2} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1), \tag{37b}$$

$$j = 0 : \quad \frac{\varphi_2(0) - \varphi_1(0)}{S_1 - S_2} = \frac{0 - 0}{S_1 - S_2} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(0), \tag{37c}$$

$$j = 1 : \quad \frac{\varphi_2(1) - \varphi_1(1)}{S_1 - S_2} = \frac{1 - 1}{S_1 - S_2} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(1), \tag{37d}$$

holds true. Turning to the case of $S_1 = S_2$ but $S_1^2 \neq 4$, we first find $\varphi_1(j) = \varphi_2(j)$ (cf. (26)) for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, but also $j\varphi_1(j)$ satisfies now (4) due to Lemma 3.1. Since $\varphi_1(j \pm 1)$, $(1 \pm j)\varphi_1(j \pm 1)$ are apparent solutions of (4), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1-j)\varphi_1(j+1) + (1+j)\varphi_1(j-1) &= 2\varphi_1(j+1) - (j+1)\varphi_1(j+1) \\
 &\quad + 2\varphi_1(j-1) + (j-1)\varphi_1(j-1)
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

is one too. In addition, we have (cf. Table 2)

$$j = -2 : \quad \frac{3\varphi_1(-1) - \varphi_1(-3)}{S_1^2 - 4} = \frac{-3 + (S_1^2 - 1)}{S_1^2 - 4} = 1 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2), \tag{39a}$$

$$j = -1 : \quad \frac{2\varphi_1(0) + 0\varphi_1(-2)}{S_1^2 - 4} = \frac{0 + 0}{S_1^2 - 4} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-1), \tag{39b}$$

$$j = 0 : \quad \frac{\varphi_1(1) + \varphi_1(-1)}{S_1^2 - 4} = \frac{1 - 1}{S_1^2 - 4} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(0), \quad (39c)$$

$$j = 1 : \quad \frac{0\varphi_1(2) + 2\varphi_1(0)}{S_1^2 - 4} = \frac{0 + 0}{S_1^2 - 4} = 0 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(1), \quad (39d)$$

i.e. $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ is properly constructed. Finally, in case of $S_1 = S_2$ and $S_1^2 = 4$ also $j^2\varphi_1(j)$ satisfies (4) (Lemma 3.1). Apparently, $(1 - j^2)\varphi_1(j)$ vanishes at $j = \pm 1$ and also for $j = 0$ due to $\varphi_1(0) = 0$. For $j = -2$, we find

$$\frac{S_1(1 - 4)}{12} \varphi_1(-2) = \frac{3S_1^2}{12} = 1 \equiv \mathcal{T}_{-2}(-2), \quad (40)$$

and the statement is correct. \square

Since the expression for $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$ is known to us, we can next construct the remaining basic Tetranacci polynomials by applying the Lemmata 2.1, 2.2.

Proposition 4 *For generic integer j , we have*

$$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) = \frac{\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_2(j+1) + S_2\varphi_1(j) - S_1\varphi_2(j)}{S_1 - S_2}, \quad (41a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(j) = \frac{S_1\varphi_2(j+1) - S_2\varphi_1(j+1) + \varphi_2(j) - \varphi_1(j)}{S_1 - S_2}, \quad (41b)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \frac{\varphi_1(j+1) - \varphi_2(j+1)}{S_1 - S_2}, \quad (41c)$$

supposing here $S_1 \neq S_2$. The results for $S_1 = S_2$ are presented in Appendix B.

Proof The displayed formulae follow directly by substituting (36) into the relations from Lemmata 2.1, 2.2 and exploiting the properties of $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ drawn in Proposition 2 and Theorem 3.1. Alternatively, the (41a) - (41c) are apparently linear combinations of solutions to the recursion formula in (4) and one is left to demonstrate the respective selective property, which we delegate as exercise to the reader. \square

In the beginning of this manuscript, we promised to provide a rather simple closed form expression for ξ_j . On first glance of $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$) in Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 4, this seems wrong. However, substituting the basic Tetranacci polynomials into (1) yields ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j = & \varphi_2(j) \frac{g_{-2} - S_1 g_{-1} + g_0}{S_1 - S_2} - \varphi_1(j) \frac{g_{-2} - S_2 g_{-1} + g_0}{S_1 - S_2} \\ & + \varphi_1(j+1) \frac{g_{-1} - S_2 g_0 + g_1}{S_1 - S_2} - \varphi_2(j+1) \frac{g_{-1} - S_1 g_0 + g_1}{S_1 - S_2} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

in case of $S_1 \neq S_2$. Similar expressions can be anticipated also for $S_1 = S_2$, $S_1^2 \neq 4$ and $S_1 = S_2$, $S_1^2 = 4$ from Appendix B. In view of Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 2.2, we demonstrated explicitly the decomposition of a generic symmetric Tetranacci polynomial ξ_j in terms of the generalized Fibonacci polynomials $\varphi_{1,2}$.

The substitution $\varphi_{1,2}(j) = \sin(\theta_{1,2}j)/\sin(\theta_{1,2})$ ($S_{1,2} \neq \pm 2$, cf. Proposition 3) shows that ξ_j can be seen as combination of standing waves. Particularly, we replace $\theta_{1,2} = k_{1,2}d$ in terms of wavevectors $k_{1,2}$ for physical models with lattice constant d . In

case a boundary condition is applied, the values of $k_{1,2}$ become quantized accordingly [18].

However, these wavevectors are generally complex. The reason is that $r_{\pm l} = \exp(\pm i\theta_l)$ ($l = 1, 2$) is the polar form of $r_{\pm l}$ since $\theta_l = R_l + iI_l$ ($R_l, I_l \in \mathbb{R}$) yields $r_{\pm l} = |r_{\pm l}| \exp(\pm iR_l)$ with $|r_{\pm l}| = \exp(\mp I_l)$. Importantly, the potential complex nature of $k_{1,2}$ is independent of the model's topological classification and do not necessarily corresponds to edge modes. We verify the statement in section 4.4 below.

In the context of a tight binding model, we discuss the potential of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials in physics. During our in-depth analysis we also show current limitations of the approach as for instance, unknown non-linear identities (if existent) of $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$.

4. Lattice model with nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping

The simplest physical model featuring Tetranacci polynomials as defined in (4) is a tight binding chain of atoms interconnected by nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping. In terms of spinless fermionic creation/ annihilation operators c_j^\dagger, c_j , the one-dimensional lattice Hamiltonian reads ($\mu, t_{1,2} \in \mathbb{R}$)

$$\hat{H} = -\mu \sum_{j=1}^N c_j^\dagger c_j - \left[\sum_{n=1}^2 t_n \sum_{j=1}^{N-n} (c_{j+n}^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_{j+n}) \right] \quad (43)$$

where μ denotes an onsite energy and (t_2) t_1 abbreviates (next) nearest neighbor coupling. Figure 1 provides a sketch of the model for six atoms. Contrary to physical intuition, we also allow for $|t_2| > |t_1|$. Later in section 5, we discuss how effective t_2, t_1 couplings of arbitrary ratio may be engineered in experiments.

4.1. General approach to the spectrum

On the assumptions of both open boundary conditions and finite length, direct diagonalization methods can be applied on (43). The fermionic field $\hat{\Psi} = (c_1, \dots, c_N)$, $\hat{\Psi}^\dagger = (c_1^\dagger, \dots, c_N^\dagger)^T$ yields the hermitian Toeplitz matrix

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu & -t_1 & -t_2 & & & & & & & & \\ -t_1 & -\mu & -t_1 & -t_2 & & & & & & & \\ -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & -t_1 & -t_2 & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & -t_1 & -t_2 & & & \\ & & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & -t_1 & & & \\ & & & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & & & \\ & & & & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & & \\ & & & & & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu & \\ & & & & & & & & -t_2 & -t_1 & -\mu \end{bmatrix}_{N \times N} \quad (44)$$

satisfying $\hat{H} = \hat{\Psi}^\dagger \mathcal{H} \hat{\Psi}$. Please notice that \mathcal{H} recovers $M(\alpha = 0, \beta = 0)$ from (3). On first glance an eigenvector $\vec{\psi}_E = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N)$ of (44) to eigenvalue $E \in \mathbb{R}$ obeys ($j = 3, \dots, N - 2$)

$$0 = (E + \mu) \xi_j + t_1 (\xi_{j+1} + \xi_{j-1}) + t_2 (\xi_{j+2} + \xi_{j-2}), \quad (45)$$




Figure 1. Atomic chain with nearest t_1 and next nearest neighbor hopping t_2 .

and four boundary conditions

$$0 = (E + \mu) \xi_1 + t_1 \xi_2 + t_2 \xi_3, \quad (46a)$$

$$0 = (E + \mu) \xi_2 + t_1 (\xi_3 + \xi_1) + t_2 \xi_4, \quad (46b)$$

$$0 = (E + \mu) \xi_{N-1} + t_1 (\xi_{N-2} + \xi_N) + t_2 \xi_{N-3}, \quad (46c)$$

$$0 = (E + \mu) \xi_N + t_1 \xi_{N-1} + t_2 \xi_{N-2}. \quad (46d)$$

Since the latter four mimic (45) apart from missing terms, we define $\xi_0, \xi_{-1}, \xi_{-2} \dots, \xi_N, \xi_{N+1}, \xi_{N+2} \dots$ as the continuation of ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N while the eigenvector $\vec{\psi}_E$ remains untouched. Thus, we establish the Tetranacci recursion formula ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$)

$$\xi_{j+1} = \zeta \xi_j - \xi_{j-2} + \eta (\xi_{j+1} + \xi_{j-1}), \quad \zeta = -\frac{E + \mu}{t_2}, \quad \eta = -\frac{t_1}{t_2} \quad (47)$$

and the boundary conditions reduce to $\xi_{-1} = \xi_0 = \xi_{N+1} = \xi_{N+2} = 0$ as expected from the physical perspective. Please notice though that we aim mainly on the situation of $t_2 \neq 0$, as otherwise (44) becomes tridiagonal corresponding to Fibonacci polynomials [24, 27].

Next, we provide the connection between (47) and physical quantities such as the bulk dispersion relation and wave vectors $k_{1,2}$. Applying Lemma 2.3 and renaming $\theta_{1,2} \rightarrow k_{1,2}d$ (d is the inter atomic distance) sets $\xi_j = A \exp(ik_1d_j) + B \exp(-ik_1d_j) + C \exp(ik_2d_j) + D \exp(-ik_2d_j)$ in terms of two right and two left moving plane waves. Naturally, $k_{1,2}$ are related to the eigenvalue $E \equiv E(k_{1,2})$ and $E(k_1) = E(-k_1) = E(k_2) = E(-k_2)$ has to be true. The key relations to remind are i) $S_{1,2} = r_{\pm 1,2} + r_{\pm 1,2}^{-1}$ and ii) $S_{1,2}^2 - \eta S_{1,2} - \zeta - 2 = 0$ relating $k_{1,2}$ and E (kept inside ζ). Indeed, solving for E yields

$$E(k) = -\mu - 2t_1 \cos(kd) - 2t_2 \cos(2kd) \quad (48)$$

the bulk dispersion relation at $k = k_{1,2}$ [31]. Usually, (48) is found from (43) for $N \rightarrow \infty$ and periodic boundary conditions after a Fourier analysis. We are left to demonstrate that $E(\pm k_1) = E(\pm k_2)$ is true. From (23), we find $S_1 + S_2 = \eta$ granting $S_1^2 - \eta S_1 = S_1^2 - (S_1 + S_2)S_1 = -S_1S_2 = S_2^2 - (S_1 + S_2)S_2 = S_2^2 - \eta S_2$. In turn, ii) implies $\zeta = S_1^2 - \eta S_1 - 2 = S_2^2 - \eta S_2 - 2$; thus we have $E(\pm k_1) = E(\pm k_2)$. Since the parameters $\mu, t_{1,2}$ and E have the physical dimension of an energy, we refer to $S_1 + S_2 = \eta$ as the equal energy constraint. Written explicitly, we have

$$\cos(k_1d) + \cos(k_2d) = -\frac{t_1}{2t_2}. \quad (49)$$

By (48), (49), the eigenvalues E demand the determination of $k_{1,2}$. Imposing the open boundary conditions on $\xi_j = A \exp(ik_1d_j) + B \exp(-ik_1d_j) + C \exp(ik_2d_j) + D \exp(-ik_2d_j)$




Figure 2. Numerical eigenvalues of (44) in terms of ζ , η for $N = 20$ ($N = 21$) in (a) ((b)). (a) The spectrum features several degeneracies associated to line crossings at specific parameter values. (b) For N odd, no degenerate eigenvalues appear at $\eta = 0$ (red vertical line). Generally, the spectrum is symmetric in η . (c) ((d)) Zoom of (a) ((b)).

grants a homogeneous 4×4 system of equations $M\vec{x} = 0$ in $\vec{x} = (A, B, C, D)^T$. Since $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$ yields $\vec{\psi}_E = \vec{0}$, M is singular. After some algebra, we find ($2k_{\pm} = k_1 \pm k_2$)

$$\frac{\sin^2 [k_+ d (N + 2)]}{\sin^2(k_+ d)} = \frac{\sin^2 [k_- d (N + 2)]}{\sin^2(k_- d)} \quad (50)$$

setting the discrete (quantized) values of $k_{1,2}$. Notice that (50) has to be solved together with (49). Thus, $k_{1,2}$ depends on t_1/t_2 . Due to the matrix size, we expect N pairs (k_1, k_2) satisfying (50) and without loss of generality, their real part is restrained to the first Brillouin zone, i.e. $-\pi/d \leq \text{Re}(k_{1,2}) \leq \pi/d$, due to 2π -periodicity of (49), (50).

Unfortunately though, the transcendental character of (50) denies further progress apart from limiting cases. The appearance of $N+2$ pronounces the next nearest neighbor character of the model and naive expectations as $k = n\pi/(N+1)$ ($n = 1, \dots, N$) clearly fail. Even worse, $t_{1,2}$ have a strong influence. For simplicity we discuss the situation of $t_1 = 0$, when only next nearest neighbor hopping remains. Then, the Hamiltonian (43) possess two separated sublattices consisting of only even (odd) j such that (44)

becomes block diagonal in the associated basis. Each block itself is tridiagonal and mimics a nearest neighbor chain with hopping constant t_2 . For N even, each eigenvalue is twice degenerated

$$E = -\mu - 2t_2 \cos\left(\frac{2n\pi}{N+2}\right), \quad n = 1, \dots, N/2 \quad (51)$$

while N odd gives

$$E = -\mu - 2t_2 \cos\left(\frac{2n\pi}{N+3}\right), \quad n = 1, \dots, (N+1)/2 \quad (52)$$

$$E = -\mu - 2t_2 \cos\left(\frac{2n\pi}{N+1}\right), \quad n = 1, \dots, (N-1)/2 \quad (53)$$

and the general dependence in N is non trivial [31]. In (51) - (53), we extract $k_1 d$ from the cosine functions. We have $k_2 = k_1 - \pi/d$ corresponding to $k_+ = k_1 + \pi/(2d)$, $k_- = \pi/(2d)$ and both (49) (50) are satisfied. In Figure 2, the solutions from (51) mark the line closings on the vertical $\eta = 0$ axis.

Next, we turn to degenerate eigenvalues. As can be seen from Figure 2, they exist only for well defined ratios t_1/t_2 . We shall derive the exact conditions (cf. (55) below) and proof that only twofold degeneracies exist.

4.2. Degenerate eigenvalues

Initially, we assume that the degeneracy is D -fold associated to linear independent eigenvectors $\vec{\psi}_E^{(d)} = (\xi_1^{(d)}, \dots, \xi_N^{(d)})$ ($d = 1, \dots, D \geq 2$) of (44). From Corollary (1), we have $\xi_j^{(d)} = \sum_{i=-2}^1 g_i^{(d)} \mathcal{T}_i(j)$ with initial values $g_i^{(d)}$. Notice that the basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ are the same for all $\vec{\psi}_E^{(d)}$. The boundary condition demands $\xi_{-1}^{(d)} = \xi_0^{(d)} = 0$ granting $\xi_j^{(d)} = g_{-2}^{(d)} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) + g_1^{(d)} \mathcal{T}_1(j)$. Since only two initial values remain, the degeneracy is at best twofold as we shall see. Due to the linearity of the eigenvector equation and the Tetranacci recursion formula, linear combinations of eigenvectors correspond to one of initial values. Without loss of generality, we set $g_{-2}^{(1)} = g_1^{(2)} = 0$. Then, we observe that $\vec{\psi}_E^{(3)}, \dots, \vec{\psi}_E^{(D)}$ are composed of $\vec{\psi}_E^{(1)}, \vec{\psi}_E^{(2)}$, i.e. $D = 2$. Next, we derive the parameter constraints.

The full boundary condition was not yet imposed on $\vec{\psi}_E^{(1)}, \vec{\psi}_E^{(2)}$. Demanding $\xi_{N+1}^{(1,2)} = \xi_{N+2}^{(1,2)} = 0$, yields the four constraints $\mathcal{T}_1(N+1) = \mathcal{T}_1(N+2) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N+1) = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N+2) = 0$ due to $g_1^{(1)} \neq 0, g_{-2}^{(2)} \neq 0$. Exploiting (14d), i.e. $\mathcal{T}_1(j) = -\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j+1)$ grants $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(l) = 0$ at $l = N+1, N+2, N+3$. In physics, we trust in Bloch's theorem, i.e. only the case $S_1 \neq S_2$ can be relevant. We verify this assumption later by counting all crossings in order to ensure that none is missing. From (29), we have $\varphi_{1,2}(N+2) = \sin[k_{1,2}d(N+2)] = 0$. Seemingly, one can choose $(n_{1,2} = 1, \dots, N+1)$

$$k_{1,2}d = \frac{n_{1,2}\pi}{N+2} \quad (54)$$

independently. However, any linear combination of $\vec{\psi}_E^{(1)}, \vec{\psi}_E^{(2)}$ has to satisfy the boundary conditions. Hence, (50) has to be satisfied as well, imposing selection rules on $k_{1,2}$.

In terms of $n_{\max} = (N + 2)/2$ ($n_{\max} = (N + 1)/2$) for even (odd) N , we arrive at ($n = 2, \dots, n_{\max}, l = 1, \dots, n - 1$)

$$(k_+d, k_-d) = \left(\frac{n\pi}{N+2}, \frac{l\pi}{N+2} \right). \quad (55)$$

The ratio for t_1/t_2 is set by (49) upon inserting k_{\pm} . Then, the eigenvalue follows from (48). Notice that (55) corresponds to values of $\eta \geq 0$ ($t_1/t_2 < 0$). For $\eta \leq 0$, set $k_+d \rightarrow \pi - k_+d$ while k_-d is kept fixed. Avoiding double counting at $\eta = 0$ for even N , the total number of line crossings is $N^2/4$ ($(N^2 - 1)/4$) for N even (odd) in agreement with the numerical investigation. Henceforth, the earlier restriction on $S_1 \neq S_2$ was correct indeed. Next, we turn to the eigenvectors.

4.3. Eigenvectors and spatial inversion symmetry

Although we "determine" all eigenvectors in the following, the lack of non-linear identities (if existent) for generic ξ_j or at least for $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ is a current limitation of the approach and the solution for $\vec{\psi}_E$ appears rather unsatisfying. A similar issue may potentially arise in quantum transport depending specifically on the investigated model (cf. Appendix C).

When an eigenvalue E is chosen, the eigenvectors are set by the initial values g_{-2}, \dots, g_1 . Imposing the open boundary conditions on (9) gives $\xi_j = g_{-2} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) + g_1 \mathcal{T}_1(j)$ for non degenerate eigenvalues. Otherwise, we have $\xi_j^{(d)} = g_{-2}^{(d)} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) + g_1^{(d)} \mathcal{T}_1(j)$, $d = 1, 2$ where $g_{-2}^{(d)}, g_1^{(d)}$ can be chosen independently. Therefore, we have

$$\xi_j^{(1)} = g_{-2}^{(1)} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j), \quad (56)$$

$$\xi_j^{(2)} = -g_1^{(2)} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j + 1) \quad (57)$$

exploiting (14d). Here, $g_{-2}^{(1)}, g_1^{(2)}$ adopt the role of normalization constants. Contrary for the non degenerate case, $\xi_{N+1} = 0$ imposes that $g_1 = -g_{-2} \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 1) / \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 2)$ using (14d). Both $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 1), \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 2)$ are finite in the non-degenerate case. Replacing g_1 , yields

$$\xi_j = \frac{g_{-2}}{\mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 2)} [\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 2) - \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N + 1) \mathcal{T}_{-2}(j + 1)]. \quad (58)$$

satisfying the open boundary conditions by construction. Notice though that $\xi_{N+2} = 0$ yields the quantization condition (50). Unfortunately, further progress beyond (58) is denied due to our lack of non-linear identities for $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$.

The Hamiltonian (43) possess time reversal τ and spatial inversion symmetry \mathcal{I} . Both imply that wavevectors appear in $\pm k$ pairs. Yet, the attempt of exploiting those fails. Explicitly, we have $\tau = \mathbf{1}_N \hat{\mathcal{K}}$ ($\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ denotes the operator of complex conjugation) for spinless electrons [32] and

$$\mathcal{I} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & 1 \\ & & & 1 & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & \beta \\ & 1 & & & \\ 1 & & & & \end{bmatrix}_{N \times N}. \quad (59)$$




Figure 3. Relation between inversion symmetry $\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} = \pm 1$ and branch $s_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pm 1$ in (a), (b) ((c), (d)) for even (odd) N . Numerically, we conclude $\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} s_{\mathcal{Q}} = -1$ always, i.e. for all eigenvalues and independently of N .

Time reversal symmetry has little impact since all quantities in Eq. (58) are real and g_{-2} can be chosen freely. The inversion symmetry is self-inverse $\mathcal{I}^2 = \mathbf{1}_N$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} = \pm 1$. Since $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{H}\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{H}$ is true, the eigenvectors $\vec{\psi}_E$ fall into two categories $\mathcal{I}\vec{\psi}_E = \lambda_{\mathcal{I}}\vec{\psi}_E$. Even (odd) eigenvectors $\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} = +1$ ($\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} = -1$) obey $\xi_{N+1-j} = \lambda_{\mathcal{I}}\xi_j$.

However, this does not solve the basic problem as $\lambda_{\mathcal{I}}$ is imprinted into the quantization constraint. In fact, (50) has two branches $f(k_+) = s_{\mathcal{Q}}f(k_-)$ ($f(k) = \sin[k(N+2)]/\sin(k)$) with $s_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pm 1$. Numerically, we find $s_{\mathcal{Q}}\lambda_{\mathcal{I}} = -1$ as shown in Figure 3.

The numerical investigation supports the criterion of degenerate energies. Figure 3 illustrates that line crossings occur between eigenvectors of opposite spatial inversion symmetry. Henceforth, the degenerate case demands $f(k_+) = f(k_-)$, $f(k_+) = -f(k_-)$ simultaneously, i.e. $f(k_+) = f(k_-) = 0$ is the only solution. Indeed, both sides of (50) vanish independently upon inserting (55).

4.4. The Tetranacci arrow and complex wavevectors

The presence of only \mathcal{I} , τ implies that (43) is of class AI, i.e. topological trivial according to the classification scheme of Altland and Zirnbauer [33]. Thus, we neither expect the existence of complex wavevectors nor of topologically protected edge states. However, complex values of $k_{1,2}$ are necessary in order to account properly for $t_2 \rightarrow 0$. The




Figure 4. Numerical spectrum of (44) for $N = 40$. (a) Real values of both $k_{1,2}$ are limited to the Tetranacci arrow in red. Outside and shown in blue, one wavevector becomes complex. (b) Maximal deviation of eigenvector entries for t_2 and $t_2 \neq 0$. The complex solution for k enables the proper limit on the spectrum for $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ ($t_2 \rightarrow 0$). Details are stated in the main text.

spectrum effectively separates into two entities associated with only real wavevectors or alternatively one complex and one real wavevector. In Figure 4 (a), the former is depicted in red. We refer to this region as the Tetranacci arrow.

Naturally, we expect a continuous transition between $|t_2| \gg |t_1|$ and $|t_2| \ll |t_1|$. At $t_2 = 0$ the spectrum of (44) is $E = -\mu - 2t_1 \cos(kd)$ with $kd = n\pi/(N+1)$, $n = 1, \dots, N$ [23, 24, 25, 28, 29] setting the tendency of the blue lines in Figure 4 (a). Yet, both $t_{1,2}$ influence $k_{1,2}$, particularly close to the arrow's boundary. Here, (49) suggests complex solutions of $k_{1,2}$ being apparent for $|t_1| > 4|t_2|$. In Figure 4 (a), the red (blue) color indicates two real (one complex and one real) wavevector.

Analytically, the boundary conditions (46a) - (46d) explain the behavior. While $t_{1,2} \neq 0$ corresponds to four constraints and two left/ right mover contributions to ξ_j , the situation of $t_2 = 0$ implies $\xi_0 = \xi_{N+1} = 0$ and $\xi_j = A \exp(ikdj) + B \exp(-ikdj)$. In order to satisfy the extreme case of $t_2 \rightarrow 0$, one wavevector becomes complex. With increasing imaginary part, the complex wavevectors contribution to ξ_j diminishes as shown in Fig. 4 (b). For the numerical data, we diagonalized (44) at $t_2 \neq 0$, $t_2 = 0$, ordering eigenvectors from lowest to largest eigenvalues. The color indicates the largest absolute deviation of the corresponding normalized eigenvector entries. Of course, the comparison is fruitless within the Tetranacci arrow where t_2 dominates. A closer numerical investigation reveals that the difference diminishes on exponential scales (as expected from (21)) and does not change abruptly to zero outside the arrow. Additionally, non of the eigenvectors of (44) is an edgestate in agreement with the bulk edge correspondence [34, 35].

Despite the complex wavevector outside the Tetranacci arrow, all eigenvalues lie correctly within the frame set by the bulk dispersion relation and the first Brillouin zone. Recalling $S_{1,2}^2 - \eta S_{1,2} - \zeta - 2 = 0$ from Lemma 2.3 and $S_{1,2} = 2 \cos(k_{1,2}d)$ provides a direct link to Figure 2. Due to the 2π periodicity, the (real part of) $k_{1,2}$ lies between $-\pi/d$ and π/d . The two extremes provide the boundaries $\zeta = 2 \mp 2\eta$ of the blue double




Figure 5. Numerical spectrum of the Kitaev chain in terms of ζ , η for $N = 20$ and $t/\Delta = 4$ ($t/\Delta = 0.25$) in (a) ((b)). The spectrum differs for $|t/\Delta| > 1$ and $|t/\Delta| < 1$ associated to different limiting cases for $-\tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 \rightarrow 0$. The Majorana fermions correspond to the lowest parabolic-like curve around $\eta = 0$ [18].

fan from Figure 4 (a). In $\zeta - \eta$ space, both lines cross in the upper tip of the arrow at $(\eta, \zeta) = (0, 2)$. The two flanks follow $\zeta = 2 \mp 2\eta$ when $\zeta \leq 2$. For the lower boundary of the Tetranacci arrow, we notice that $S_{1,2}^2 - \eta S_{1,2} - \zeta - 2 = 0$ yields smaller values of ζ when $|S_{1,2}| < 2$. The lowest parameterized curve follows from $\partial\zeta/\partial S_{1,2} = 0$ for fixed η . For $S_{1,2} = \eta/2$, we have $\zeta = -2 - \eta^2/4$ applicable only for $|\eta| \leq 4$ since $k_{1,2}$ are found real and reside within the first Brillouin zone. For both finite number of atoms N and open boundary conditions, $\zeta \neq -2 - \eta^2/4$ as otherwise $S_1 = S_2$ contradicts Bloch's theorem by (23).

5. Engineering effective next nearest neighbor coupling

Unfortunately the most interesting part of the model, i.e. the Tetranacci arrow, is hardly accessible in experiments. However, the basic ingredients of nearest neighbor processes and onsite degrees of freedom allow the engineering of effective (next) nearest neighbor bonds \tilde{t}_1 (\tilde{t}_2). Importantly, the ratio \tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 is easy to manipulate and tuning it yields arbitrarily large or small values. For the proof of principle, we consider the $X - Y$ chain in transverse magnetic field and the Kitaev chain.

The former consists of N spins placed along a $1d$ axis and neighbors interact via their x (y) components S_j^x (S_j^y) [36]. Adding a transverse magnetic field h , the model reads [19]

$$\hat{H}_{XY} = -h \sum_{j=1}^N S_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (J_x S_j^x S_{j+1}^x + J_y S_j^y S_{j+1}^y) \quad (60)$$

where J_x , J_y abbreviate interaction constants. The diagonalization of (60) was undertaken in [19] ([36]) for $h \neq 0$ ($h = 0$) using the Jordan-Wigner transformation which replaces spin operators by spin-less fermionic operators c_j , c_j^\dagger . The spin chain maps on the Kitaev chain as pointed out by Zvyagin [37]. Therefore, we start directly from the latter. Spinless electrons experiencing hopping t and p -wave superconductivity

between nearest neighboring atoms, setting the Kitaev chain as [20]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{KC}} = & -\mu \sum_{j=1}^N \left(c_j^\dagger c_j - \frac{1}{2} \right) - t \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} \right) \\ & + \Delta \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j^\dagger + c_{j+1} c_j \right). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

We consider $t, \Delta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and N atoms. Independently of the $X - Y$ -chain, this model has attracted some attention in the past as it is the archetypal model for topological superconductors. Although p -wave superconductivity is itself rare in nature, several promising platforms were proposed in the past decade in order to engineer the desired odd parity superconductivity [38, 39, 40, 41]. However, the hunt for Majorana fermions/Majorana zero modes is not our motivation to subsequently introduce Majorana operators [20, 34]

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_j^A \\ \gamma_j^B \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -i & i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_j \\ c_j^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (62)$$

rather the aim for technical simplicity. The advantage is that Majorana operators treat t and Δ equally since they own particle and hole properties simultaneously: $(\gamma_j^A)^\dagger = \gamma_j^A$, $(\gamma_j^B)^\dagger = \gamma_j^B$. Then, (61) becomes [20, 34]

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KC}} = -i\mu \sum_{j=1}^N \gamma_j^A \gamma_j^B + i(\Delta - t) \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \gamma_j^A \gamma_{j+1}^B + i(\Delta + t) \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \gamma_j^B \gamma_{j+1}^A \quad (63)$$

Aiming on the spectrum of (63) suggest the introduction of Majorana sublattices $\hat{\Psi}_\alpha = (\gamma_1^\alpha, \dots, \gamma_N^\alpha)^\text{T}$, $\alpha = A, B$. In this basis, the eigenvectors entries are revealed as symmetric Tetranacci polynomials with coefficients $\zeta = (E^2 - \mu^2 - 2t^2 - 2\Delta^2)/(t^2 - \Delta^2)$, $\eta = -2t\mu/(t^2 - \Delta^2)$ [18, 31] and E as eigenvalue. Comparing $\eta = -\tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2$ with the lattice model from section 4, we have effective (next) nearest neighbor hopping *processes* $\tilde{t}_1 = 2t\mu$ ($\tilde{t}_2 = t^2 - \Delta^2$), ignoring the wrong physical dimension of $\tilde{t}_{1,2}$. The ratio (value of) \tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 (η) could be tuned by an electrostatic gate shifting the potential; thus, modifying the onsite energy μ . From [19], we have $\tilde{t}_1 = -2h(J_x + J_y)$, $\tilde{t}_2 = J_x J_y$ for the $X - Y$ -chain. Henceforth, a small magnetic field in z direction reflects strong effective next nearest neighbor coupling. We finish this section discussing the emergence of the Tetranacci sequence and thus the engineering of $\tilde{t}_{1,2}$.

A first impression can be taken from Fig. 5, where the numerically found spectrum forms the Tetranacci arrow. Notice though that $\tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 \rightarrow \infty$ has distinct limits due the substructure of \tilde{t}_2 . Analytically, one can avoid the cumbersome algebra from [18] and deduce the proper result pictorially from the system's sketch in Figure 6. The diagonalization of (63) implies a disentanglement of the sublattices; thus projecting the information of sublattice $\hat{\Psi}_B$ on $\hat{\Psi}_A$ (or vice versa). This demands merely to identify all non repetitive processes from some γ_j^A to some γ_l^A ($j, l = 1, \dots, N$) by following the arrows and multiplying the associated constants. Ignoring initially all boundary effects, we use γ_j^A as starting position as sketched in Figure 6. Spatial inversion symmetry allows




Figure 6. Kitaev chain in Majorana sublattice basis for $N = 7$ atoms. Solid (dashed) arrows correspond to $i\mu$ in black, $a = i(\Delta - t)$ ($-a$) in purple and $b = i(\Delta + t)$ ($-b$) in blue. Only the horizontal axis has a spatial extend with d as the interatomic distance. The vertical axis displays onsite degrees of freedoms.

to focus only on forward processes, i.e. on growing j . For nearest neighbors $\gamma_j^A \rightarrow \gamma_{j+1}^A$, we have $\downarrow \nearrow \equiv -i\mu b$ and $\searrow \uparrow \equiv a i\mu$. For $\gamma_j^A \rightarrow \gamma_{j+2}^A$, we have $\searrow \nearrow = ab$ only, without repetitive use of effective nearest neighbor bonds. The effective onsite terms $\gamma_j^A \rightarrow \gamma_j^A$ are $\downarrow \uparrow = \mu^2$, $\searrow \swarrow = -a^2$, $\swarrow \nearrow = -b^2$; merely a corrective factor has to be added when the chain has finite length. Collecting all information and accounting for the backward processes yields $(j, j' = 1, \dots, N)$

$$h_{jj'} = [\mu^2 - a^2(1 - \delta_{jN}) - b^2(1 - \delta_{j1})] \delta_{j,j'} + i\mu(a - b) (\delta_{j,j'+1} + \delta_{j+1,j'}) + ab (\delta_{j,j'+2} + \delta_{j+2,j'}). \quad (64)$$

The spectrum of (63) is found from $h\vec{v}_A = E^2\vec{v}_A$ with (\vec{v}_A, \vec{v}_B) as eigenvector of (63). The entries of both sublattice vectors $\vec{v}_{A,B}$ are symmetric Tetranacci polynomials with the earlier mentioned coefficients. Although h has the same structure as $M(\alpha \neq 0, \beta \neq 0)$ from (3) (and is thus not a Toeplitz matrix) $h\vec{v}_A = E^2\vec{v}_A$ can be treated along the lines of section 4 [18].

6. Conclusion

Subsequent to the definition of symmetric Tetranacci polynomials ξ_j ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$), we gave a closed form expression in terms of basic Tetranacci polynomials $\mathcal{T}_i(j)$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$). Due to their initial values $\mathcal{T}_i(l) = \delta_{il}$ ($l = -2, \dots, 1$), they inherit specific traits and interrelations. In turn, ξ_j can be constructed from \mathcal{T}_{-2} alone. We demonstrated in (36) the decomposition of $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$, and thus generic ξ_j , in terms of the Fibonacci/Tetranacci polynomials $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$. The sinusoidal representation of $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ enables a standing wave form of ξ_j in (42); thus reflecting already their potential in condensed matter physics when appropriate prerequisites are met. We discussed that Tetranacci polynomials generally allow for complex wavevectors $k_{1,2}$ independently of a physical model's topological classification. Contrary to previous works (cf. [18, 21]), we both generalized and simplified the presented results beyond $S_1 \neq S_2$. Based on the rigorous mathematical approach, the shown results are generic and generalize beyond a concrete physical system; thus, extending earlier limitations.

Besides the theoretical treatment of Tetranacci polynomials, we have shown their appearance in three physical systems: The $X - Y$ model in transverse magnetic field, the Kitaev chain and in atomic tight-binding systems owning nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping. For the latter, we explicitly demonstrated that Tetranacci polynomials ξ_j set the wave function at an atomic position j . Solving the associated eigenvector equation, we derived a transcendental quantization condition for the wavevectors $k_{1,2}$, cf. (50). Typically, the solution differs from the naively expected particle in the box behavior, that is $k = n\pi/(N + 1)$ ($n = 1, \dots, N$) for N atoms. The three main reasons are, firstly that $k_{1,2}$ depend on the models parameters by means of the equal energy constraint $E(\pm k_1) = E(\pm k_2)$. Secondly, the quantization constraint captures the next nearest neighbor character of the model, i.e. $N + 2$ rather than $N + 1$ appears. Lastly, $k_{1,2}$ are generally complex. The momentum quantization condition yields a degenerate spectrum at well defined parameter values. We deduced and stated the conditions. Spatial inversion symmetry protect the degenerate eigenvalues and we demonstrated that the spatial parity of the associated eigenstates is imprinted into the transcendental constraint (50).

This proofed fatal since symmetry relation fail to simplify the expression of eigenvectors beyond a merely formal solution due to unknown non-linear identities (if existent) of $\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j)$. Quantum transport (cf. Appendix C) suffers the same fate although model specific traits may allow progress in the linear transport regime as has been demonstrated earlier for the Kitaev chain [21].

When the Tetranacci recursion is obeyed, the spectrum of quantum devices features a shape we dubbed as *Tetranacci arrow*. Inside, wavevectors are real and all degenerated eigenvalues are placed within. Experimental access to the Tetranacci arrow is seemingly denied, as the next nearest neighbor hopping t_2 has to dominate its nearest neighbor cousin t_1 . However, coupled onsite degrees of freedom and nearest neighbor processes allows to engineer effective (next) nearest neighbor bonding \tilde{t}_1 (\tilde{t}_2) with arbitrarily large or small ratio \tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 . We provided a descriptive proof of principle based on the $X - Y$ -model and the Kitaev chain. For the former, we argued that \tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 depends on the onsite energy μ and is thus experimentally tune able by an electronic gate. For the $X - Y$ chain this ratio depends on the external magnetic field, where small field strength relate to large \tilde{t}_1/\tilde{t}_2 .

Several setups to simulate the Kitaev chain in table-top experiments using macroscopic elements were proposed and realized [42, 43]. Particularly, the usage of magnetic spinners to fabricate a macroscopic version of a quantum ladder provides an mechanical analog of the Kitaev chain with an adjustable onsite term [44]. Besides, unpaired electrons in carbon ladder polymers exhibit ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions such that effective $\tilde{t}_{1,2}$ bonds are formed [45]. The discussed physics of an atomic chain featuring nearest and next nearest neighbor hopping is therefore experimentally accessible and allows the on-demand facilitation of complex wavevectors. In short terms, the Tetranacci arrow is real indeed.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB 1277 Project B04), the Elitenetzwerk Bayern (IGK Topological Insulators) and from the French National Research Agency ANR through project ANR-20-CE30-0028-01. We acknowledge interesting and fruitful discussion with M. Grifoni, M. Marganska, D. Weinmann and S. Hrdina. Further, we thank W. Häusler and M. Nieper-Wisskirchen for encouraging us to write this manuscript. Finally, we are grateful for all suggestions by the referees.

Appendix A. Degenerated roots $r_{\pm 1,2}$

Proposition 5 *Degeneracies of $r_{\pm 1}$ grant*

$$r_{\pm 1}^j, j r_{\pm 1}^j, \quad S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 \neq 4, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$r_{+1}^j, j r_{+1}^j, j^2 r_{+1}^j, j^3 r_{+1}^j, \quad S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 = 4 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

as additional solutions to (4).

Proof We focus first on $S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 \neq 4$, where (24) implies $r_{\pm 1} = r_{\pm 2}$. Substituting $\xi_j \propto j r_{\pm 1}^j$ into (4) and dividing by $r_{\pm 1}^{j-2} \neq 0$ gives

$$0 = j [r_{\pm 1}^4 - \zeta r_{\pm 1}^2 + 1 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 + r_{\pm 1})] + 2 r_{\pm 1}^4 - 2 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 - r_{\pm 1}). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Here, the first bracket vanishes since $r_{\pm 1}$ satisfies (4). Due to (23), $S_1 = S_2$ implies $\eta = 2S_1$. Using $S_1 = r_{+1} + r_{-1}$, one has

$$0 = 2 r_{\pm 1}^4 - 2 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 - r_{\pm 1}) = 2 r_{\pm 1}^4 - 2 - 2(r_{+1} + r_{-1}) (r_{\pm 1}^3 - r_{\pm 1}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Recalling $r_{+1}r_{-1} = 1$ and (A.3) is satisfied indeed. Thus, $\xi_j \propto j r_{\pm 1}^j$ is a symmetric Tetranacci polynomial.

For $S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 = 4$, (24), states $r_{+1} = r_{-1} = r_{+2} = r_{-2}$. Due to $S_1 = S_2, j r_{+1}^j$ is already a solution and we turn directly to $j^2 r_{+1}^j$. From (4), we find

$$0 = j^2 [r_{\pm 1}^4 - \zeta r_{\pm 1}^2 + 1 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 + r_{\pm 1})] + 2j [2 r_{\pm 1}^4 - 2 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 - r_{\pm 1})], \\ + 4 r_{\pm 1}^4 + 4 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 + r_{\pm 1}). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Here, the first line vanishes. Since (24) implies $r_{+1} = S_1/2$ at $S_1 = S_2, S_1^2 = 4$, we find

$$4 r_{\pm 1}^4 + 4 - \eta (r_{\pm 1}^3 + r_{\pm 1}) = 4 \left(\frac{S_1}{2} \right)^4 - 4 \frac{S_1}{2} \left(\frac{S_1}{2} \right)^3 + 4 - S_1^2 = 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Thus, $j^2 r_{+1}^j$ is a solution to (4). Further, $j^3 r_{+1}^j$ also satisfies (4). Similar as before, terms associated to j^2, j, j^0 drop. We arrive at

$$0 = 8 r_{+1}^4 - 8 - \eta r_{+1}^3 + \eta r_{+1} = 8 \left(\frac{S_1}{2} \right)^4 - 8 - \eta r_{+1} (r_{+1}^2 - 1) \\ = 8 \left(\frac{S_1}{2} \right)^4 - 8 - \eta r_{+1} \left(\frac{S_1^2}{4} - 1 \right) \equiv 0, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

due to $r_{+1} = S_1/2, S_1^2 = 4$. Hence, $j^3 r_{+1}^j$ satisfies (4). \square

Appendix B. $\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j)$, $\mathcal{T}_0(j)$, $\mathcal{T}_1(j)$ for degenerate roots

For $S_1 = S_2 \neq \pm 2$, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) = \frac{3j\varphi_1(j+2) - (j+2)(S_1^2 - 1)\varphi_1(j)}{S_1^2 - 4}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(j) = \frac{2(S_1^2 - 1)(j+2)\varphi_1(j+1) - 3(j+1)S_1\varphi_1(j+2)}{S_1^2 - 4}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = \frac{j\varphi_1(j+2) - (j+2)\varphi_1(j)}{S_1^2 - 4}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

while $S_1 = S_2 = \pm 2$ gives

$$\mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) = S_1 \frac{(2-j)j\varphi_1(j-1) + 2S_1(j^2 - 1)\varphi_1(j)}{12}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(j) = S_1 \frac{(3+j)(1+j)\varphi_1(j+2) - 2S_1(j+2)j\varphi_1(j+1)}{12}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1(j) = S_1 \frac{(2+j)j\varphi_1(j+1)}{12} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

for generic integer j .

Proof The displayed formulae follow directly by substituting (36) into the relations from Lemmata 2.1, 2.2 and exploiting the properties of $\varphi_{1,2}(j)$ drawn in Proposition 2 and Theorem 3.1. \square

Appendix C. Tetranacci polynomials in quantum transport

When applicable, Tetranacci polynomials own the potential to provide exact analytic results for the linear and non-linear transport of quantum and mesoscopic devices. However, the unknown non-linear identities between Tetranacci polynomials (if existent) impose serious challenges in simplifying the retarded Green's function (see below). Captured by the explicit structure of the coefficients ζ , η , model specific properties may still allow substantial progress as has been shown in case of the Kitaev chain [21, 31]. Unfortunately, this seems not to be true for the atomic chain discussed in section 4. However, the system actually allows for a short and evident connection between Tetranacci polynomials, the retarded Green's function G^r and the transmission probability $\mathcal{T}(E)$. We provide a sketch on the basic strategy.

We consider two normal conducting, non interacting contacts ($\alpha = L, R$)

$$\hat{H}_\alpha = \sum_k \epsilon_{k\alpha} c_{k\alpha}^\dagger c_{k\alpha} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

sandwiching the atomic chain \hat{H} stated in (43). Here, $\epsilon_{k\alpha}^{(\dagger)}$ removes (adds) a spinless electron from (to) contact α and $\epsilon_{k\alpha}$ denotes the electron's energy. The tunneling Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_T = \sum_k \left(t_L(k) d_1^\dagger c_{kL} + t_R(k) d_N^\dagger c_{kR} \right) + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

allows the exchange of particles only close to the chain's ends for simplicity. An applied bias eV between the two contacts initializes an electric current $I(t) = -e d\langle \hat{N}_\alpha \rangle / (dt)$, $e > 0$. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \hat{H} + \hat{H}_T + \hat{H}_L + \hat{H}_R$ captures the time evolution of the particle number operator $\hat{N}_\alpha = \sum_k c_{k\alpha}^\dagger c_{k\alpha}$. Applying the non-equilibrium Green's function technique yields straightforwardly the steady state current [30, 46, 47, 48]

$$I = \frac{e}{h} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \mathcal{T}(E) [f(E) - f(E + eV)], \quad (\text{C.3})$$

after some algebra. Here, $f(E)$ abbreviates the Fermi function and h is Planck's constant. The self-energies $\Sigma_{L,R}^r(i, j = 1, \dots, N)$

$$(\Sigma_L^r)_{i,j} = (\Lambda_L - i\gamma_L) \delta_{1i} \delta_{1j}, \quad (\text{3.4a})$$

$$(\Sigma_R^r)_{i,j} = (\Lambda_R - i\gamma_R) \delta_{Ni} \delta_{Nj} \quad (\text{3.4b})$$

account for the coupling of leads and chain. They are sparse matrices due to the choice of \hat{H}_T . The quantities $\gamma_\alpha = \pi \sum_k |t_\alpha(k)|^2 \delta(E - \epsilon_{k\alpha})$, $\Lambda_\alpha = \mathcal{P} \sum_k |t_\alpha(k)|^2 / (E - \epsilon_{k\alpha})$ are real and \mathcal{P} denotes Cauchy's principle value. The transmission probability $\mathcal{T}(E) = \text{Tr}\{\Gamma_L G^r \Gamma_R G^a\}$ is given as a trace over broadening matrices $\Gamma_\alpha = -2 \text{Im}(\Sigma_\alpha^r)$ and retarded (advanced) Green's functions G^r (G^a). Due to $G^a = (G^r)^\dagger$, $G^r = (E\mathbb{1}_N - \mathcal{H} - \Sigma_L^r - \Sigma_R^r)^{-1}$ and \mathcal{H} from (44), $\mathcal{T}(E)$ is fully determined.

Contrary to the full non-linear transport regime in (C.3), the linear conductance

$$G = \lim_{eV \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial I}{\partial V} = \frac{e^2}{h} \mathcal{T}(E = 0). \quad (\text{3.5})$$

relates to $\mathcal{T}(0)$ only for zero temperature. The sparsity of $\Gamma_{L,R}$ yields generally $\mathcal{T}(E) = 4\gamma_L\gamma_R |G_{1N}^r|^2$. Instead of performing the inversion, G_{1N}^r can be obtained much easier using Tetranacci polynomials. Since the connection is more apparent for $E \neq 0$, we focus on $\mathcal{T}(E)$ instead.

Obviously, G^r obeys $(E\mathbb{1}_N - \mathcal{H} - \Sigma_L^r - \Sigma_R^r)G^r = \mathbb{1}_N$. As we shall see, we can approach as for the eigenvector equation of \mathcal{H} . However, notice that E is a continuous variable and not necessarily an eigenvalue of \mathcal{H} . When $G^r = (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_N)^T$ is written in terms of column vectors $\vec{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$, those obey ($i = 1 \dots, N$)

$$(E\mathbb{1}_N - \mathcal{H} - \Sigma_L^r - \Sigma_R^r)\vec{v}_i = \vec{e}_i \quad (\text{3.6})$$

where \vec{e}_i abbreviates the i -th column of $\mathbb{1}_N$. The structure of (3.6) reminds an eigenvector equation for the matrix $\mathcal{H} + \Sigma_L^r + \Sigma_R^r$, but the inhomogeneity \vec{e}_i yields a unique solution for \vec{v}_i . Aiming on G_{1N}^r , sets $i = N$ in (3.6). Defining $\vec{v}_N = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)^T$ grants $\sigma_{j+2} = \zeta \xi_j - \xi_{j-2} + \eta (\xi_{j+1} + \xi_{j-1})$ with $\zeta = -(E + \mu)/t_2$, $\eta = -t_1/t_2$ for $j = 3 \dots, N-3$ similar to the eigenvector equation of \mathcal{H} . Yet, the self-energies modify the boundary conditions. Extending again the recursion to all integers j , but keeping \vec{v}_N untouched, the constraints reduce to

$$0 = \sigma_0 \quad (\text{3.7a})$$

$$0 = \sigma_{N+1}, \quad (\text{3.7b})$$

$$0 = (i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L)\sigma_1 - t_2\sigma_{-1}, \quad (3.7c)$$

$$1 = (i\gamma_R - \Lambda_R)\sigma_N - t_2\sigma_{N+2}, \quad (3.7d)$$

for $t_2 \neq 0$. Here "1" originates from $(\vec{v}_N)_N = 1$. Due to Corollary 1, we search for $g_{-2} \dots, g_{-1}$. From (3.7a)-(3.7d), we find

$$\sigma_j = g_{-2}\mathcal{T}_{-2}(j) + g_1 \left[\mathcal{T}_1(j) + \frac{i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L}{t_2} \mathcal{T}_{-1}(j) \right] \quad (3.8)$$

thus a 2×2 matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g_{-2} \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.9)$$

with coefficients

$$a = \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N+1), \quad (3.10a)$$

$$b = \mathcal{T}_1(N+1) + \frac{i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L}{t_2} \mathcal{T}_{-1}(N+1), \quad (3.10b)$$

$$c = (i\gamma_R - \Lambda_R)\mathcal{T}_{-2}(N) - t_2\mathcal{T}_1(N+2), \quad (3.10c)$$

$$d = (i\gamma_R - \Lambda_R) \left[\mathcal{T}_1(N) + \frac{i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L}{t_2} \mathcal{T}_{-1}(N) \right] - t_2 \left[\mathcal{T}_1(N+2) + \frac{i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L}{t_2} \mathcal{T}_{-1}(N+2) \right]. \quad (3.10d)$$

The solution to (3.9) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_{-2} \\ g_1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{ab - cd} \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{T}_1(N+1) - \frac{i\gamma_L - \Lambda_L}{t_2} \mathcal{T}_{-1}(N+1) \\ \mathcal{T}_{-2}(N+1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence, $G_{1N}^r \equiv \sigma_N$ contains non-linear combinations of $\mathcal{T}_i(N)$, $\mathcal{T}_i(N+1)$ ($i = -2, \dots, 1$) when (3.11) is inserted into (3.8).

For zero temperature, the linear conductance depends on $G_{1N}^r|_{E=0}$ and non-linear identities can possibly be circumvented. In case of the Kitaev chain, the setting $E = 0$ turns all Tetranacci into Fibonacci polynomials [21]. However, this is a model specific property imprinted into the respective composition of ζ , η in terms of the model's parameters. Unfortunately, the nearest neighbor hopping chain misses this feature and further progress towards an useful explicit formula for $G_{1N}^r|_{E=0}$, $\mathcal{T}(0)$ is prohibited.

References

- [1] Vajda S 2007 *Fibonacci and Lucas numbers, and the Golden section: Theory and Applications* (New York: Dover Publications)
- [2] Hoggatt Jr. V 1969 *Fibonacci and Lucas numbers* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin)
- [3] Horadam A F 1961 *Amer. Math. Month.* **68** 455-459
- [4] Andelić M, Du Z, da Fonseca C M and Kılıç E 2020 *J. Differ. Equ. Appl.* **26** 149-162
- [5] Webb W A and Parberry E A 1969 *Fibonacci Q.* **7** 457-463
- [6] Hoggatt Jr. V and Long C T 1974 *Fibonacci Q.* **12** 113-120
- [7] Özvatan M and Pashaev O K 2017 arXiv:1707.09151
- [8] Feinberg M 1963 *Fibonacci Q.* **1** 70-74
- [9] Jishe F 2011 *Ars Comb.* **100** 73-78

- [10] Hoggatt Jr. V and Bicknell M 1973 *Fibonacci Q.* **11** 457–465
- [11] Hoggatt Jr. V and Bicknell M 1973 *Fibonacci Q.* **11** 399-419
- [12] Waddill M E and Sacks L 1967 *Fibonacci Q.* **5** 209-222
- [13] Taşcı D and Acar H 2017 *CMA* **8** 379-386
- [14] Soykan Y 2020 *Int. J. Adv. Appl. Math. and Mech.* **8** 15 – 26
- [15] Waddill M E 1992 *Fibonacci Q.* **30** 9-19
- [16] Singh B, Bhadouria P, Sikhwal O and Sisodiya K 2014 *Gen. Math. Notes* **20** 136-141
- [17] Hathiwala G and Shah D V 2019 *Math. J. Interdiscip. Sci.* **6** 37-48
- [18] Leumer N, Marganska M, Muralidharan B and Grifoni M 2020 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **32** 445502
- [19] Loginov A V and Pereverzev Yu V 1997 *Low Temp. Phys.* **23** 534–540
- [20] Kitaev A 2001 *Phys. Usp.* **44** (105) 131–136
- [21] Leumer N, Grifoni M, Muralidharan B and Marganska M 2021 *Phys. Rev. B* **103** 165432
- [22] Trench W F 1985 *Linear Algebra Appl.* **64** 199-214
- [23] Kouachi S 2008 *App. math.* **35** 107–120
- [24] Kouachi S 2006 *Electron. J. Linear Algebra* **15** 115-133
- [25] Yueh W-C 2005 *Appl. Math. E-Notes* **5** 66-74 [electronic only]
- [26] Da Fonseca C M and Petronilho J 2005 *Numer. Math.* **100** 457-482
- [27] Da Fonseca C M and Kowalenko V 2019 *Acta Math. Hungarica* **160** 376-389
- [28] Gover M J C 1994 *Linear Algebra Appl.* **197–198** 63-78
- [29] Shin B C 1997 *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **55** 249-254
- [30] Flensberg K and Bruus H 2004 *Introduction to Many-Body Quantum Theory in Condensed Matter Physics* (Oxford: Oxford Graduate Texts)
- [31] N. Leumer 2021 Spectral and transport signatures of 1d topological superconductors of finite size in the sub- and supra-gap regime: An analytical study
- [32] Bernevig A B and Hughes T L 2013 *Topological Insulators and Topological Superconductors* (Princeton University Press)
- [33] Altland A and Zirnbauer M R 1997 *Phys. Rev. B* **55** 1142-1161
- [34] Aguado R 2017 *La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **40** 523
- [35] Mong R S K and Shivamoggi V 2011 *Phys. Rev. B* **83** 125109
- [36] Lieb E, Schultz T and Mattis D 1961 *Annals of Physics* **16** 407–466
- [37] Zvyagin A A 2015 *Low Temp. Phys.* **41** 625–629
- [38] Lutchyn R M, Sau J D and Das Sarma S 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 077001
- [39] Oreg Y and Refael G and von Oppen F 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 177002
- [40] Alicea J 2012 *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75** 076501
- [41] Izumida W, Milz L, Marganska M and Grifoni M 2017 *Phys. Rev. B* **96** (12) 125414
- [42] Liu T-W and Semperlotti F 2023 *Phys. Rev. Applied* **accepted paper**
- [43] Allein F, Chaunsali R, Anastasiadis A, Frankel I, Boechler N, Diakonov F and Theocharis G 2022 *arXiv:2203.10311*
- [44] Qian K, Apigo D J, Padavić, Ahn K H, Vishveshwara S and Prodan C 2023 *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5** L012012
- [45] Ortiz R, Giedke G and Frederiksen T 2023 *Phys. Rev. B* **107** L100416
- [46] Meir Y and Wingreen N S 1992 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** 2512-2515
- [47] Ryndyk D A 2015 *Theory of Quantum Transport at Nanoscale* (Heidelberg: Springer)
- [48] Haug H and Jauho A-P 1996 *Quantum Kinetics in Transport and Optics of Semiconductors* (Berlin: Springer)