

EXPONENTIAL DECAY OF THE CRITICAL POINTS IN A DISCRETE MODEL OF POLYACETYLENE

DAVID GONTIER ADECHOLA E. K. KOUANDE ÉRIC SÉRÉ

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider stationary states of the SSH model for infinite polyacetylene chains that are homoclinic or heteroclinic connections between two-periodic dimerized states. We prove that such connections converge exponentially fast to the corresponding asymptotic periodic states.

© 2023 by the authors. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Critical points for the infinite SSH model, and main result	2
2.1. The SSH model	2
2.2. The SSH energy difference	3
2.3. Critical points for the infinite SSH model, and main result	4
2.4. Strategy of the proof	5
3. Smoothness and Taylor expansion of the map \mathcal{F}_t	8
3.1. The spectrum of homoclinic and heteroclinic configurations	8
3.2. Taylor expansion of the map \mathcal{F}_t	11
4. Proofs of the Lemmas	12
4.1. Proof of Lemma 2.5	13
4.2. Proof of Lemma 2.6	13
4.3. Proof of Lemma 2.7	14
4.4. Coercivity of the Hessian at the dimerized configuration	14
References	17

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to prove an exponential decay property for critical points in the SSH model. This model was introduced by Su, Schrieffer and Heeger to describe polyacetylene, which is a long one-dimensional chain of carbon (and hydrogen) atoms. In this model, the chain can lower its total energy by dimerizing. This physical phenomenon was first predicted by Peierls [12] (see also [1]) and is now known as the Peierls distortion or dimerization.

Actually, Kennedy and Lieb [6], and Lieb and Nachtergaele [9] proved that the minimizers of the SSH energy associated to closed polyacetylene with an even number L of carbon atoms are always 2-periodic. When $L = 2 \bmod 4$ or when $L = 0 \bmod 4$ is large enough, these minimizers are dimerized, in the sense that they are 2-periodic, but not 1 periodic. In this situation, there

David Gontier: CEREMADE, Université Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, 75016 Paris, France & ENS/PSL University, DMA, F-75005, Paris, France;
email: gontier@ceremade.dauphine.fr

Adéchola E. K. Kouande: CEREMADE, University of Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, 75016 Paris, France
email: kouande@ceremade.dauphine.fr

Éric Séré: CEREMADE, University of Paris-Dauphine, PSL University, 75016 Paris, France
email: sere@ceremade.dauphine.fr

Date: August 2, 2023.

are exactly two minimizing configurations of this energy, that we call \mathbf{t}^- and \mathbf{t}^+ . They are of the form

$$t_n^- := W - (-1)^n \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad t_n^+ := W + (-1)^n \delta. \quad (1)$$

Here, t_n denotes the hopping amplitude between the n -th atom and the $(n+1)$ -th atom. It is related to their distance d_n by an affine relation of the form $t_n = a - b d_n$. The quantity $W > 0$ is the average hopping amplitude between the atoms, and $\delta > 0$ is the distortion. This distortion phenomenon remains in the thermodynamic limit, that is when the number of atom goes to infinity. We proved in [4] that this distortion disappears at a sufficiently high temperature. More precisely there is a critical temperature below which the polyacetylene chain is dimerized ($\delta > 0$) and behaves as an insulator, and above which it is 1-periodic ($\delta = 0$) and behaves as a metal.

In this paper, we study a family of critical points, namely homoclinic and heteroclinic critical points, for the infinite SSH model at zero temperature. Using the terminology of dynamical systems, a configuration $\mathbf{t} = (t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is said to be **homoclinic** if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow -\infty} |t_n - t_n^+| = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |t_n - t_n^+| = 0, \quad (2)$$

and it is said to be **heteroclinic** if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow -\infty} |t_n - t_n^-| = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |t_n - t_n^-| = 0. \quad (3)$$

In other words, a configuration is homoclinic if it converges to the same dimerized state \mathbf{t}^+ at infinity, and it is heteroclinic if it switches from the dimerized state \mathbf{t}^- at $-\infty$ to the dimerized state \mathbf{t}^+ at $+\infty$. Of course, one can also consider homoclinic and heteroclinic configurations which converge to \mathbf{t}^- at $+\infty$. But they can be obtained from the other ones by the shift $n \mapsto n+1$.

As can be expected, the state \mathbf{t}^+ is a homoclinic critical point. The fact that heteroclinic critical points exist was suggested in [8, 15, 18]. A rigorous proof was given by M. Garcia Arroyo and one of us (see [2, 3]). Such configurations are sometimes called *kinks*. Another point of view on these soliton-like solution was initiated by Takayama, Lin-Liu and Maki [17]. In this approach, the SSH model is replaced by a continuum approximation involving the Dirac operator.

Our main goal is to prove that homoclinic and heteroclinic critical points converge exponentially fast to the corresponding dimerized states. In order to state our theorem, we first need to define the notion of critical points for our infinite model.

2. CRITICAL POINTS FOR THE INFINITE SSH MODEL, AND MAIN RESULT

2.1. The SSH model. In order to define critical points for the infinite SSH model, we start with the SSH model for a periodic linear chain with L classical atoms, together with quantum non-interacting electrons. We will take the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ at the end.

We denote by t_n the hopping amplitude between the n -th and $(n+1)$ -th atoms (modulo L), and set $\mathbf{t} = \{\mathbf{t}\} := \{t_1, \dots, t_L\}$. In what follows, we only consider the case where all hopping amplitudes are strictly positive, and we sometime write $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau > 0$ as a shortcut for $t_n \geq \tau$ for all n . For instance, for the dimerized configurations, we have $\delta < W$, so $t_n \geq W - \delta > 0$ (the quantity $z^2 := W^2 - \delta^2$ is positive, see [6, 4]). The SSH energy of the corresponding chain is (see [6, 10, 11, 12, 16, 4])

$$\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\{\mathbf{t}\}) := \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n=1}^L (t_n - 1)^2 - 2\text{Tr}(T_-), \quad (4)$$

where $T = T(\{\mathbf{t}\})$ is the $L \times L$ hermitian matrix

$$T = T(\{\mathbf{t}\}) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & t_L \\ t_1 & 0 & t_2 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t_2 & 0 & t_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & t_{L-2} & 0 & t_{L-1} \\ t_L & 0 & \cdots & 0 & t_{L-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

and where we set $T_- = -T\mathbf{1}(T < 0)$. The first term in (4) is the distortion energy of the atoms: this energy depends quadratically on the distances d_n between successive atoms, but these distances are themselves affine functions on the amplitudes t_n . The parameter $\mu > 0$ is the rigidity of the chain, and our units are such that the jump amplitude between two atoms is 1 when their distortion energy is minimal. The second term in (4) models the electronic energy of the valence electrons under the Hamiltonian T . It results from the identity

$$\min_{0 \leq \gamma = \gamma^* \leq 1} 2\text{Tr}(T\gamma) = 2\text{Tr}(T\mathbf{1}(T < 0)) = -2\text{Tr}(T_-).$$

The minimization on the left-hand side was performed for all one-body density matrices γ representing non-interacting electrons. The condition $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ is the Pauli principle, and the 2 factor stands for the spin.

2.2. The SSH energy difference. Let us fix a configuration \mathbf{t} , and consider the energy difference functional $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(L)}$, defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}) := \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n=1}^L (h_n + 2t_n - 2)h_n - 2\text{Tr}((T + H)_- - T_-), \quad (6)$$

where $T = T(\{\mathbf{t}\})$ and $H = T(\{\mathbf{h}\})$ are the hermitian matrices constructed from $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{h}\}$ respectively. Clearly, $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{E}^{(L)}$ iff $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(L)}$. We have subtracted the quantity $\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t})$ in order to have a finite energy difference at the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. Actually, Eqn. (6) admits a clear analog as $L \rightarrow \infty$, namely, for two bounded sequences $\mathbf{t} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, assuming that $h \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R})$ and that $(T + H)_- - T_-$ is trace-class as an operator acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C})$, we set

$$\boxed{\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (h_n + 2t_n - 2)h_n - 2\text{Tr}((T + H)_- - T_-)}. \quad (7)$$

Now, the operator $T := T(\{\mathbf{t}\})$ (and similarly for $T + H$) is acting on the infinite dimensional Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C})$, whose coefficients in the canonical basis are

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad T_{n,n+1} = T_{n+1,n} = t_n, \quad T_{i,j} = 0 \quad \text{if } |i - j| \neq 1.$$

In what follows, we denote by bold letters $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{u}, \dots$ sequences from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{R} , and by capital letters A, T, H, U, \dots the corresponding operators acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

The fact that the map $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ is well defined when \mathbf{t} is a homoclinic or heteroclinic configuration is given in the next two lemmas (see Section 3.1 for the proof).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic or heteroclinic configuration such that $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. Then there is a positively oriented contour \mathcal{C} in the complex plane, a constant $C \geq 0$ and a constant $\eta > 0$ so that, for all $\{\mathbf{h}\}$ with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \eta$ and for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, the operator $(z - (T + H))$ is invertible with $\|(z - (T + H))^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C$. In addition,*

$$-(T + H)_- = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z}{z - (T + H)} dz.$$

The contour \mathcal{C} is independent of \mathbf{h} , but depends on \mathbf{t} . This Lemma might be surprising, as the energy 0 can be in the spectrum of $T + H$. Actually, we will prove the following:

- If $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ is a homoclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau > 0$, then 0 is never in the spectrum of $T + H$, for \mathbf{h} small enough.

- If $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ is a heteroclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau > 0$, then 0 is always an isolated eigenvalue of $T + H$ of multiplicity 1, for all \mathbf{h} small enough.

In both cases, one can choose a contour \mathcal{C} of the form (see Figure 1)

$$\mathcal{C} := (\Sigma + i) \rightarrow (\Sigma - i) \rightarrow (-g/2 - i) \rightarrow (-g/2 + i) \rightarrow (\Sigma + i), \quad (8)$$

where Σ is a negative enough number, and where $g = \text{dist}(0, \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\})$ is the distance between 0 and the (rest of the) spectrum.




FIGURE 1. Contours used for the Cauchy integral, for a homoclinic configuration (Left), and a heteroclinic configuration (Right). The main difference is that 0 is in the spectrum in the heteroclinic case. We prove below that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W]$, and that the spectrum of T is symmetric with respect to 0.

In the heteroclinic situation, 0 is a stable (or topologically protected) eigenvalue: it is unperturbed by the addition of H . Actually, any T matrix coming from a heteroclinic configuration can be seen as a junction between two SSH chains with different indices [16, 5, 7].

This Lemma allows to prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ is well-defined and smooth around $\{\mathbf{0}\}$. We refer to Section 3.2 for the proof of the following result.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic or heteroclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$, and let $\eta > 0$ and \mathcal{C} be a contour as in Lemma 2.1. The map $\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h})$ is C^∞ on $\{\mathbf{h}, \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1} \leq \eta\}$. In addition, there is $C \geq 0$ so that, for all $\{\mathbf{h}\}$ with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1} < \eta$, we have*

$$\left| \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) - L_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) - \frac{1}{2} H_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \right| \leq C \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^3,$$

where $L_{\mathbf{t}}$ (differential of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$) is the continuous linear form on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by (we set $\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} := \mathbf{1}(T < 0)$ the spectral projector of T on \mathbb{R}^-)

$$L_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) := \mu \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (t_n - 1) h_n + 2 \text{Tr}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} H),$$

and $H_{\mathbf{t}}$ (hessian of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$) is the bilinear form on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by

$$H_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) := \mu \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_n k_n + 2 \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} H \frac{1}{z - T} K \frac{1}{z - T} dz \right). \quad (9)$$

In addition, the bilinear map $H_{\mathbf{t}}$ can be extended continuously as a bilinear map on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

2.3. Critical points for the infinite SSH model, and main result. We can now define the notion of critical points for the infinite SSH model.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic or heteroclinic configuration such that $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. We say that $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ is a critical point if $L_{\mathbf{t}}$ is the null map. Equivalently, using that*

$$\text{Tr}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} H) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_n [(\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}})_{n+1, n} + (\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}})_{n, n+1}] = 2 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_n (\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}})_{n, n+1},$$

the configuration \mathbf{t} is a critical point if

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \boxed{t_n = 1 - \frac{4}{\mu} (\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}})_{n, n+1}}. \quad (10)$$

We implicitly used that Γ is symmetric and real-valued. With this definition, the dimerized configuration \mathbf{t}^+ is a homoclinic critical point. The kink state constructed in [3] is a heteroclinic critical point. Now we can provide our main result, which states that all homoclinic or heteroclinic critical points of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ converge exponentially fast to \mathbf{t}^+ at $+\infty$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic or heteroclinic critical point, and let $\{\mathbf{u}\}$ be the sequence $u_n := t_n - t_n^+$. If \mathbf{u} is square integrable at $+\infty$ ($\mathbf{u} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^+)$), then \mathbf{u} is exponentially localized at $+\infty$: there is $C \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ so that*

$$|u_n| \leq Ce^{-\alpha n}.$$

Of course, the same applies in the $-\infty$ direction, and we have exponential convergence to \mathbf{t}^+ or \mathbf{t}^- at $-\infty$ depending whether the critical configuration is homoclinic or heteroclinic.

We note that there exist critical points (that is configurations satisfying (10)), which do not converge to \mathbf{t}^\pm at infinity. For instance, in [2, 3], the authors show the existence of kink-like solutions for a closed chain with an odd number of atoms (see also Figure 2). This solution satisfies the critical point equation (10), but, seeing the closed chain as a periodic configuration, it does not converge to \mathbf{t}^\pm at infinity.




FIGURE 2. A localized kink appears in the chain with $L = 101$ carbon atoms.

Note that this exponential localization was already known for the exactly soluble continuum model of Takayama, Lin-Liu and Maki [17].

2.4. Strategy of the proof. Let us briefly explain the strategy to prove Theorem 2.4. We break the proof in several Lemmas, that we prove later in Section 4.

Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic or heteroclinic critical point, and let $\{\mathbf{u}\}$ be the sequence $u_n := t_n - t_n^+$, so that $T = T^+ + U$. The configurations $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{t}^+\}$ are critical points, hence satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$t_n = 1 - \frac{4}{\mu} \Gamma_{n,n+1}, \quad t_n^+ = 1 - \frac{4}{\mu} \Gamma_{n,n+1}^+,$$

with $\Gamma := \Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{1}(T^+ + U < 0)$, and $\Gamma^+ := \mathbf{1}(T^+ < 0)$. According to Lemma 2.1, the expression of Γ and $\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}}$ can be written using the Cauchy's residual formula using the *same* contour \mathcal{C} , that is

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{dz}{z - (T^+ + U)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^+ = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{dz}{z - T^+},$$

and where the operators in the integrand are uniformly bounded in $z \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $u_n = t_n - t_n^+$, we obtain (we use the resolvent formula in the last line)

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &= \frac{4}{\mu} (\Gamma^+ - \Gamma)_{n,n+1} = \frac{4}{\mu} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left[\frac{1}{z - T^+} - \frac{1}{z - (T^+ + U)} \right] dz \right)_{n,n+1} \\ &= \frac{-4}{\mu} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} \right) dz \right)_{n,n+1} + \frac{1}{\mu} (\mathbf{Q}_U(U, U))_n, \end{aligned}$$

with the remainder term

$$(\mathbf{Q}_U(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2))_n = -4 \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z - T^+} U_1 \frac{1}{z - (T^+ + U)} U_2 \frac{1}{z - T^+} dz \right)_{n,n+1}.$$

Multiplying by μ and reordering the terms, this can be also written as

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u})_n = (\mathbf{Q}_U(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}))_n, \quad (11)$$

with the linear map

$$(\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u})_n = \mu u_n + 4 \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} \right) dz \right)_{n, n+1}. \quad (12)$$

Formally, if \mathbf{v} is another real sequence, with corresponding operator V , we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}) \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} v_n (\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u})_n = \mu \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} v_n u_n + 2 \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} V \right) dz \quad (13)$$

and we recognize the expression of the Hessian $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$ in (9). Unfortunately, the previous computations is formal, since \mathbf{u} is not necessary in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. We only know that it is square integrable at $+\infty$. Actually, for a heteroclinic configuration, we have $\mathbf{u} \notin \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, since \mathbf{u} does not decay to 0 at $-\infty$. In order to bypass this difficulty, we regularize \mathbf{u} using appropriate cut-off functions.

For $\alpha > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ that we choose later (α will be small, and s will be large), we introduce the function $\theta_{\alpha, s} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$\theta_{\alpha, s}(n) = \min\{e^{\alpha n}, e^{\alpha s}\} = \begin{cases} e^{\alpha n}, & \text{if } n < s \\ e^{\alpha s}, & \text{if } n \geq s \end{cases}, \quad (14)$$

and denote by $\Theta_{\alpha, s}$ the multiplication operator by $\theta_{\alpha, s}$, defined by $(\Theta_{\alpha, s})_{n, m} = \theta_{\alpha, s}(n) \delta_{n, m}$.

In what follows, we will consider the sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha, s}$, defined by

$$(\tilde{u}_{\alpha, s})_n := \theta_{\alpha, s}(n) \theta_{\alpha, s}(n+1) u_n, \quad \text{with corresponding operator } \tilde{U}_{\alpha, s} = \Theta_{\alpha, s} U \Theta_{\alpha, s}.$$

Since \mathbf{u} is bounded and square integrable at $+\infty$ the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha, s}$ is in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ for all $\alpha > 0$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. We also introduce the operator $\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+$ acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and defined in the canonical basis by

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \left(\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+ \right)_{n, n+1} := \frac{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n)}{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n+1)} t_n^+, \quad \left(\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+ \right)_{n+1, n} := \frac{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n+1)}{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n)} t_n^+,$$

and $\left(\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+ \right)_{i, j} = 0$ if $|i - j| \neq 1$. Note that $\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+$ is not symmetric. Using that

$$\frac{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n)}{\theta_{\alpha, s}(n+1)} = \begin{cases} e^{-\alpha} & \text{if } n < s \\ 1 & \text{if } n \geq s, \end{cases}$$

we see that $\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+$ has the matrix form

$$\tilde{T}_{\alpha, s}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & 0 & t_{s-2}^+ e^{-\alpha} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & t_{s-2}^+ e^{\alpha} & 0 & t_{s-1}^+ e^{-\alpha} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \ddots & 0 & t_{s-1}^+ e^{\alpha} & 0 & t_s^+ & 0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & 0 & 0 & t_s^+ & 0 & t_{s+1}^+ & \ddots \\ \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & t_{s+1}^+ & 0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

This operator is constructed to satisfy the following commutation relations (see Section 4.1 for the proof).

Lemma 2.5. *The operator $\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+$ satisfies*

$$\Theta_{\alpha,s}T^+ = \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ \Theta_{\alpha,s} \quad \text{and} \quad T^+ \Theta_{\alpha,s} = \Theta_{\alpha,s} \left(\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ \right)^*. \quad (16)$$

There is $\alpha^* > 0$ and $C \geq 0$ so that, for all $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_*$, all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, and all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, the operators $z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+$ and $z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*$ are invertible, with $\|(z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C$ and $\|(z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C$. In addition, we have

$$\Theta_{\alpha,s} \frac{1}{z - T^+} = \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} \Theta_{\alpha,s}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{z - T^+} \Theta_{\alpha,s} = \Theta_{\alpha,s} \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*}.$$

We multiply (11) on the left by $\theta_s(n)$, and on the right by $\theta_s(n+1)$. Using that, for any operator A on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, we have $\theta_{\alpha,s} A_{n,n+1} \theta_{\alpha,s}(n+1) = (\Theta_{\alpha,s} A \Theta_{\alpha,s})_{n,n+1}$, and the fact that

$$\Theta_{\alpha,s} \frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} \Theta_{\alpha,s} = \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} \underbrace{\Theta_{\alpha,s} U \Theta_{\alpha,s}}_{=\tilde{U}_{\alpha,s}} \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*},$$

we obtain an equation of the form

$$\left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha,s} \right)_n = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\alpha,s,U}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \right)_n, \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ is the operator defined on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ by

$$\forall \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}), \quad \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \right)_n := \mu(\tilde{v}_{\alpha,s})_n + 4 \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} \tilde{V} \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*} \right) dz \right)_{n,n+1}, \quad (18)$$

and with the right-hand side given by

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\alpha,s,U}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \right)_n = -4 \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} (\Theta_{\alpha,s} U_1) \frac{1}{z - (T^+ + U)} (U_2 \Theta_{\alpha,s}) \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*} dz \right)_{n,n+1}. \quad (19)$$

The exponential decay is a consequence of the following Lemmas.

Lemma 2.6. *The operator \mathcal{L} defined in (12), seen as an operator from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ to itself, is bounded symmetric with bounded inverse.*

There is $\alpha_* > 0$ and $C \geq 0$ so that, for all $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_*$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ defined in (18), seen as an operator from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ to itself, is bounded with bounded inverse.

Note that the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ is not symmetric for $\alpha > 0$. We refer to Section 4.2 for the proof. A key property that we use in the proof is the fact that the Hessian $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$ is coercive (see Proposition 4.1 below). Due to the equality $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathcal{L} \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\ell^2} = H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})$ for $\mathbf{v} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ (see (13)), this implies that \mathcal{L} is invertible.

In order to control the right-hand side of (17), we use the following result (see Section 4.3 for the proof).

Lemma 2.7. *There is $\alpha_* > 0$ and $C \geq 0$ so that, for all $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_*$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\forall \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}) \cap \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^+), \quad \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{\alpha,s,U}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \leq C \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}_1\|_{\ell^4} \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}_2\|_{\ell^4}.$$

We can now prove the exponential decay of \mathbf{u} . From (17) and the two Lemmas, we get that there is $C \geq 0$ and $\alpha^* > 0$ so that, for all $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha^*$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha,s}\|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq C \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^4}^4. \quad (20)$$

Concerning the left-hand side, we note that $\theta_{\alpha,s}$ is increasing so that $\theta_{\alpha,s}(n) \theta_{\alpha,s}(n+1) \geq \theta_{\alpha,s}^2(n)$. Hence

$$\|\theta_{\alpha,s}^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\alpha,s}\|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

Let us now bound the right-hand side. We fix $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C}}$, where C is the constant appearing in (20). Since \mathbf{u} goes to 0 at $+\infty$, there is M large enough so that $|u_n| < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq M$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{\alpha,s}\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^4}^4 &= \sum_{n \leq M} \theta_{\alpha,s}^4(n)|u_n|^4 + \sum_{n > M} \theta_{\alpha,s}^4(n)|u_n|^4 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^4 \sum_{n \leq M} \theta_{\alpha,s}^4(n) + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{n > M} \theta_{\alpha,s}^4(n)|u_n|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^4 \sum_{n \leq M} e^{4\alpha n} + \varepsilon^2 \|\theta_{\alpha,s}^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^2}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^4 \frac{e^{4\alpha M}}{1 - e^{-4\alpha}} + \varepsilon^2 \|\theta_{\alpha,s}^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging these inequalities in (20) gives

$$(1 - C\varepsilon^2) \|\theta_{\alpha,s}^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^4 \frac{e^{4\alpha M}}{1 - e^{-4\alpha}}.$$

With our choice of ε , the quantity $1 - C\varepsilon^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ is positive. The right-hand side is a bound independent of $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. We can take the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$, and conclude that

$$(e^{2\alpha n} u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}), \quad \text{with} \quad \left\| (e^{2\alpha n} u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \leq 2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^4 \frac{e^{4\alpha M}}{1 - e^{-4\alpha}}.$$

This proves as wanted that the sequence \mathbf{u} is exponentially decaying at $+\infty$.

3. SMOOTHNESS AND TAYLOR EXPANSION OF THE MAP $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$

In this section, we prove Lemma 2.1, which states that $\mathbf{h} \mapsto (T + H)_-$ is smooth locally around $\mathbf{0}$, whenever T is a homoclinic or heteroclinic configurations.

We first record a useful Lemma that we will use many times throughout the article. In what follows, we denote by $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}))$ the set of bounded operators acting in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and by $\mathfrak{S}_p := \mathfrak{S}_p(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}))$ the p -Schatten class: $A \in \mathfrak{S}_p$ iff A is a compact operator with $\|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}_p} := \text{Tr}(|A|^p)^{1/p} < +\infty$. The set \mathfrak{S}_∞ is simply the set of compact operators, with $\|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}_\infty} = \|A\|_{\text{op}}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathbf{a} be a sequence from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{R} , and let A be the corresponding operator.*

- If $\mathbf{a} \in \ell^\infty$, then A is a bounded operator ($A \in \mathcal{B}$), and $\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^\infty}$;
- If \mathbf{a} goes to 0 at $\pm\infty$, then A is compact ($A \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$) ;
- If $\mathbf{a} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$ for some $1 \leq p < \infty$, then A is in the Schatten class \mathfrak{S}_p , and

$$\|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}_p} \leq 2\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^p}.$$

Proof. For the first part, we note that, for all $\psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$|\langle \psi, A\psi \rangle_{\ell^2}| = \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n (\overline{\psi_n} \psi_{n+1} + \overline{\psi_{n+1}} \psi_n) \right| \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^\infty} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (|\psi_n|^2 + |\psi_{n+1}|^2) = 2\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^\infty} \|\psi\|_{\ell^2}^2,$$

where we used that $\overline{ab} + a\overline{b} \leq |a|^2 + |b|^2$ in the middle inequality.

For the second part, we note that the operator A is the limit, for the operator norm, of the finite-rank operators A^N associated with the truncated configurations $a^N := (\mathbf{1}_{-N \leq n \leq N} a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Hence A is compact.

For the last part, we first prove the result for $p = 1$. We have, by duality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}_1} &= \sup_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{B} \\ \|K\|_{\text{op}}=1}} |\text{Tr}(AK)| = \sup_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{B} \\ \|K\|_{\text{op}}=1}} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n (K_{n+1,n} + K_{n,n+1}) \right| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^1} \sup_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{B} \\ \|K\|_{\text{op}}=1}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (|K_{n+1,n}| + |K_{n,n+1}|) \leq 2\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^1}. \end{aligned}$$

We used in the last line that $|K_{n,n+1}| = |\langle e_n, K e_{n+1} \rangle| \leq \|K\|_{\text{op}}$. Finally, to conclude the proof, we proceed by interpolation using Riesz-Thorin interpolation theorem for Schatten spaces (see [14, Remark 1 p.23] and [13, p.115] for the version with \mathcal{B} instead of \mathfrak{S}_∞). \square

3.1. The spectrum of homoclinic and heteroclinic configurations. In order to prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ is smooth, we first study the spectrum of the operator T when \mathbf{t} is such a configuration. We treat the two cases separately.

3.1.1. *Homoclinic configurations.* Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a homoclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. Then, we can write $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^+ + \mathbf{u}$, where we recall that \mathbf{t}^+ is the dimerized configuration $t_n^+ = W + (-1)^n \delta$ with $\delta > 0$, and where the sequence \mathbf{u} goes to 0 at $\pm\infty$.

We have $T = T^+ + U$. The operator T^+ has purely essential spectrum, of the form (see for instance [4] and references therein)

$$\sigma(T^+) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T^+) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W].$$

In particular, T^+ has a spectral gap of size 4δ around 0. On the other hand, since \mathbf{u} goes to 0 at $\pm\infty$, U is compact, see Lemma 3.1. We thus deduce from Weyl's theorem that

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T^+) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W]. \quad (21)$$

In particular, $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T)$. In addition, we claim that 0 is not an eigenvalue of T . More specifically, we have the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be any configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ (in particular, all coefficients t_n are non null). Assume there is $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \kappa < 1$ so that*

$$\text{(Homoclinic case)} \quad \forall |n| \geq N_0, \quad \left| \frac{t_{2n+1}}{t_{2n}} \right| \leq \kappa.$$

Then 0 is not an eigenvalue of T . Conversely, if

$$\text{(Heteroclinic case)} \quad \forall n \geq N_0, \quad \left| \frac{t_{2n+1}}{t_{2n}} \right| \leq \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{t_{-2n}}{t_{-2n-1}} \right| \leq \kappa,$$

then 0 is an eigenvalue of T of multiplicity 1.

For a homoclinic (resp. heteroclinic) configurations, the first (resp. second) condition is satisfied with $\kappa = \frac{W-\delta}{W+\delta} < 1$.

Proof. The eigenvalue equation $T\psi = 0$ reads

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad t_n \psi_n + t_{n+1} \psi_{n+2} = 0.$$

We obtain directly

$$\psi_{2n} = (-1)^n \prod_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{t_{2m-2}}{t_{2m-1}} \right) \psi_0, \quad \psi_{2n+1} = (-1)^n \prod_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{t_{2m-1}}{t_{2m}} \right) \psi_1.$$

The vector space $\{\psi, T\psi = 0\}$ is therefore 2 dimensional, since $\psi \in \{T\psi = 0\}$ can be recovered from its values ψ_0 and ψ_1 , and we have $\text{Ker}(T) = \{T\psi = 0\} \cap \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Let us first consider the homoclinic case, and let $\psi \in \{T\psi = 0\}$. Since $|t_{2n}/t_{2n+1}| \geq \kappa^{-1} > 1$ for $n \geq N_0$, we have $|\psi_{2N_0+2k}| \geq |\psi_{2N_0}| \kappa^{-k}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so ψ cannot be square integrable at $+\infty$, unless $\psi_{2N_0} = 0$, which is equivalent to $\psi_0 = 0$. Similarly, we have $|\psi_{-2N_0-2k+1}| \geq |\psi_{-2N_0+1}| \kappa^{-k}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, so ψ cannot be square integrable at $-\infty$, unless $\psi_{-2N_0+1} = 0$, which gives $\psi_1 = 0$ as well. So $\text{Ker}(T) = \{0\}$.

In the heteroclinic case, the same reasoning shows that we must have $\psi_0 = 0$. However, given $\psi_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, the function ψ with $\psi_{2n+1} = (-1)^n \prod_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{t_{2m-1}}{t_{2m}} \right) \psi_1$ and $\psi_{2n} = 0$ is a square integrable non null eigenvector. In this case, $\dim \text{Ker}(T) = 1$. \square

Remark 3.3. *In the heteroclinic case, the corresponding normalized eigenvector ψ is sometimes called an edge state, or interface state or zero mode. As shown in the proof, it is exponentially decaying at $\pm\infty$: there is $C \geq 0$ and $\beta := -\log(\kappa) > 0$ so that $|\psi_n| \leq C e^{-\beta|n|}$. It is always exponentially decaying, even though the sequence \mathbf{t} may converge to \mathbf{t}^\pm very slowly at $\pm\infty$. Actually, we do not require \mathbf{t} to be a critical point here.*

Note that it is only supported on the odd integers: $\psi_{2n} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, the corresponding projector $Z := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ satisfies

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad Z_{n,n+1} = Z_{n+1,n} = 0.$$

Let us return to the homoclinic case. We proved that $0 \notin \sigma(T)$. Let $g := \text{dist}(0, \sigma(T))$ be the distance between 0 and the spectrum of T , and set $\eta := g/8$. Let \mathbf{h} be any perturbation with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty \leq \eta$. Then $\|H\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\eta$ by Lemma 3.1. In particular, the spectrum of $T + H$ is 2η -close to the one of T , hence $\sigma(T + H) \cap [-g/2, g/2] = \emptyset$.

Let us consider the positively oriented contour \mathcal{C} in (8). We deduce first that $(z - (T + H))$ is invertible for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, and with $\|(z - (T + H))^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C$ for a constant C independent of $z \in \mathcal{C}$. Also, from the Cauchy residual formula, we have

$$\mathbf{1}(T + H < 0) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{dz}{z - (T + H)},$$

and

$$(T + H)_- = -(T + H)\mathbf{1}(T + H < 0) = \frac{-1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z}{z - (T + H)} dz.$$

3.1.2. *Heteroclinic configurations.* Now, let $\{\mathbf{t}\}$ be a heteroclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. First, we claim that $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathbf{t} be a heteroclinic configuration. Then*

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W].$$

In particular, $0 \notin \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T)$.

Proof. Introduce the sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ with $\tilde{t}_n = t_n$ if $n \neq 0$, and $\tilde{t}_0 = 0$. We denote by \tilde{T} the corresponding operator, and set $K := T - \tilde{T}$. In a matrix format, the decomposition $T = \tilde{T} + K$ reads

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \ddots & \ddots & 0 & & & \\ \ddots & 0 & t_{-1} & 0 & & \\ 0 & t_{-1} & 0 & t_0 & 0 & \\ \hline & 0 & t_0 & 0 & t_1 & 0 \\ & & 0 & t_1 & 0 & \ddots \\ & & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \ddots & \ddots & 0 & & & \\ \ddots & 0 & t_{-1} & 0 & & \\ 0 & t_{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ \hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & t_1 & 0 \\ & & 0 & t_1 & 0 & \ddots \\ & & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \end{array} \right) + \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \ddots & \ddots & 0 & & & \\ \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t_0 & 0 & \\ \hline & 0 & t_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots \\ & & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \end{array} \right)$$

The operator K is of rank 2, hence is compact, so $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(T) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T})$ by Weyl's theorem. In addition, the operator \tilde{T} is of the form $\tilde{T} = \tilde{T}_L \oplus \tilde{T}_R$ acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \sim \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^-) \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^+)$, hence

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_L) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R).$$

Let us first focus on the right operator \tilde{T}_R . The hopping amplitudes \tilde{t}_n for $n \geq 1$ are of the form $\tilde{t}_n = t_n^+ + u_n$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = 0$. So, with obvious notation, $\tilde{T}_R = \tilde{T}_R^+ + U_R$. The sequence (u_n) goes to zero, so U_R is a compact operator (the proof is similar than for Lemma (3.1)), and $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R^+)$. Finally, reasoning as before and introducing the cut compact operator $K^+ := T^+ - \tilde{T}^+$, we have

$$\sigma(T^+) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(T^+) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_L^+) \cup \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R^+).$$

In addition, since $t_{-n}^+ = t_n^+$ for the dimerized configuration \mathbf{t}^+ , \tilde{T}_L^+ is unitary equivalent to \tilde{T}_R^+ , and in particular

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R^+) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_L^+) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W].$$

Altogether, we proved that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(\tilde{T}_R) = [-2W, -2\delta] \cup [2\delta, 2W]$. The proof for the left part is similar, upon replacing T^+ by T^- . \square

In addition, using Lemma 3.2, we know that 0 is an eigenvalue of T of multiplicity 1. So 0 is an isolated eigenvalue, and we set

$$g := \text{dist}(0, \sigma(T) \setminus \{0\}) > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta := \min \left\{ \frac{g}{8}, \frac{\tau}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} > 0.$$

By standard perturbation theory, for all \mathbf{h} with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \eta$ (hence $\|H\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\eta$ by Lemma 3.1), the spectrum of $T + H$ is composed of an isolated eigenvalue $\lambda_0(T + H)$ of multiplicity 1, with $|\lambda_0(T + H)| \leq 2\eta \leq g/4$ corresponding to the perturbation of the 0 eigenvalue of T , and the rest of the spectrum, at distance at least $g - 2\eta > 3g/4$ from 0.

Since $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} < \tau/2$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} < \delta/2$, the vector $\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{h}$ satisfies $\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{h} \geq \tau/2 > 0$ and $(t_n + h_n) \in (t_n - \delta/2, t_n + \delta/2)$. In particular, it satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.2 (heteroclinic case) with $\kappa = \frac{W - \delta/2}{W + \delta/2} < 1$. So $\lambda_0(T + H) = 0$: the eigenvalue 0 is unperturbed by the addition of H .

We consider the positively oriented contour \mathcal{C} defined in (8). We deduce from the previous discussion that, for all \mathbf{h} with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \eta$, we have

$$(T + H)_- = -(T + H)\mathbf{1}(T + H < 0) = \frac{-1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z}{z - (T + H)} dz,$$

where all operators appearing are uniformly bounded by some constant $C \geq 0$ independent of $z \in \mathcal{C}$. We also remark that we have

$$\mathbf{1}(T + H < 0) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{dz}{z - (T + H)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{1}(T + H \leq 0) = \mathbf{1}(T + H < 0) + Z,$$

where $Z = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is the rank-1 projector onto the normalized zero-mode $\psi \in \text{Ker}(T + H)$, see Remark 3.3.

3.2. Taylor expansion of the map $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$. In this section, we study the energy $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ in (7), and prove Lemma 2.2. Recall that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (h_n + 2t_n - 2)h_n - 2\text{Tr}((T + H)_- - T_-).$$

In what follows, \mathbf{t} is a homoclinic or heteroclinic configuration with $\mathbf{t} \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. We introduce the constant $\eta > 0$ and the contour \mathcal{C} as in the previous section.

First, we claim that for all \mathbf{h} with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1} \leq \eta$ (we now use the ℓ^1 norm), the map $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h})$ is well-defined and finite. Since $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1} \leq \eta$, \mathbf{h} satisfies the conditions of the previous section. For the first part of the energy, we write that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_n^2 = \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (2t_n - 2)h_n \right| \leq (2\|\mathbf{t}\|_{\ell^\infty} + 2) \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1},$$

so the first part is continuous from ℓ^1 to \mathbb{R} . For the second part, we use the Cauchy residual formula, and get that

$$(T + H)_- - T_- = \frac{-1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{z}{z - (T + H)} - \frac{z}{z - T} \right) dz = \frac{-1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{z - (T + H)} H \frac{1}{z - T} \right) z dz,$$

where we used the resolvent formula in the last equality. In particular, for all $\mathbf{h} \in \ell^1$ with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1} \leq \eta$ and all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, we have, using Lemma 3.1,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{z - (T + H)} H \frac{1}{z - T} \right\|_{\mathfrak{S}_1} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{z - (T + H)} \right\|_{\text{op}} \|H\|_{\mathfrak{S}_1} \left\| \frac{1}{z - T} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2C^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1}. \quad (22)$$

Integrating z in the compact \mathcal{C} eventually shows that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h})$ is well-defined and continuous around $\mathbf{0}$ for the ℓ^1 norm.

We can push the resolvent formula, and write that

$$\frac{1}{z - (T + H)} - \frac{1}{z - T} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{z - T} \left(H \frac{1}{z - T} \right)^n,$$

where the sum on the right is absolutely convergent in \mathcal{B} whenever

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \left\| \frac{1}{z - T} H \right\|_{\text{op}} < 1,$$

which happens whenever $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^\infty}$ is small enough, according to Lemma 3.1. Actually, it is also absolutely convergent in \mathfrak{S}_1 whenever $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1}$ is small enough. We deduce directly that $\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h})$ is analytic on a ℓ^1 neighborhood of $\mathbf{0}$.

Let us compute the differential and hessian of this map. We write

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) = L_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) + \frac{1}{2}H_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) + R_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}),$$

with the linear form (differential) $L_{\mathbf{t}}$ on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$, defined by

$$L_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) := \mu \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (t_n - 2)h_n + 2\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} z dz \right),$$

the bilinear form (hessian) $H_{\mathbf{t}}$ on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}) \times \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$, defined by

$$H_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) := \mu \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h_n k_n + 4\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} K \frac{1}{z-T} z dz \right),$$

and the rest

$$R_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}) := \frac{2}{\text{Tr}} \left(2i\pi \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left[\frac{1}{z-T} H \right]^3 \frac{1}{z-T} z dz \right).$$

Reasoning as in (22), we see that $|R_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h})| \leq C\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^3}^3 \leq C\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^1}^3$. Similarly, we have

$$|H_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k})| \leq C\|H\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}\|K\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2} \leq C'\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\ell^2},$$

so the $H_{\mathbf{t}}$ bilinear form can be extended continuously on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

To end the proof of Lemma 2.2, it remains to simplify the expressions of $L_{\mathbf{t}}$ and $H_{\mathbf{t}}$. We use the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *We have*

$$\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} z dz \right) = \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H dz \right) = \text{Tr}(\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} H) \quad (23)$$

and

$$4\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} K \frac{1}{z-T} z dz \right) = 2\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} K dz \right). \quad (24)$$

Proof. First, writing that $z = (z - T) + T$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint \frac{z dz}{(z-T)^2} = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint \frac{dz}{z-T} + \frac{T}{2i\pi} \oint \frac{dz}{(z-T)^2},$$

and the second term vanishes by the Cauchy residual formula. We recognize the spectral projector

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{t}} := \mathbf{1}(T < 0) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{dz}{z-T},$$

in the first term. This and the cyclicity of the trace gives (23). We now differentiate this equality with respect to T , in the direction K . We get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{z-T} K \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} + \frac{1}{z-T} H \frac{1}{z-T} K \frac{1}{z-T} \right) z dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{z-T} K \frac{1}{z-T} H \right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using again the cyclicity of the trace gives (24). \square

4. PROOFS OF THE LEMMAS

In this section, we provide the proofs of the Lemmas appearing in Section 2.4.

4.1. Proof of Lemma 2.5. We first prove Lemma 2.5, which compares T and $\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+$. The fact that $\Theta_{\alpha,s}T^+ = \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+\Theta_{\alpha,s}$ is a simple computation. Taking the adjoint gives the second equality of (16).

Let us now prove that $(z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)$ is invertible for α small enough. The operator $T - T_{\alpha,s}^+$ satisfies

$$(T - T_{\alpha,s}^+)_{n,n+1} = \begin{cases} t_n^+(1 - e^{-\alpha}) & \text{if } n < s \\ 0 & \text{if } n \geq s \end{cases}, \quad (T - T_{\alpha,s}^+)_{n+1,n} = \begin{cases} t_n^+(1 - e^\alpha) & \text{if } n < s \\ 0 & \text{if } n \geq s \end{cases},$$

and $(T - T_{\alpha,s}^+)_{i,j} = 0$ if $|i - j| \neq 1$. Reasoning as in Lemma 3.1, we deduce that

$$\|T - T_{\alpha,s}^+\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2 \max_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |t_n^+| \cdot \max\{|1 - e^{-\alpha}|, |1 - e^\alpha|\} = 2(W + \delta)(e^\alpha - 1). \quad (25)$$

This bound is independent of $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, and goes to 0 as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Since $(z - T^+)$ is invertible for all $z \in \mathcal{C}$, we deduce that for α small enough, $(z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)$ is invertible with bounded inverse, and satisfies $\|(z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^{-1}\| \leq C$ for a constant C independent of $z \in \mathcal{C}$.

Finally, from the equality $\Theta_{\alpha,s}T^+ = \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+\Theta_{\alpha,s}$, we get $\Theta_{\alpha,s}(z - T^+) = (z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)\Theta_{\alpha,s}$, which gives, as wanted

$$\Theta_{\alpha,s} \frac{1}{z - T^+} = \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} \Theta_{\alpha,s}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{z - T^+} \Theta_{\alpha,s} = \Theta_{\alpha,s} \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*}.$$

4.2. Proof of Lemma 2.6. We now prove Lemma 2.6. The first and most important step is to prove the following Proposition, whose proof is postponed to Section 4.4

Proposition 4.1. *For the dimerized configuration \mathbf{t}^+ , the hessian $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$ is bounded on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ and coercive.*

Using this result, we can prove that \mathcal{L} is a symmetric bounded invertible operator. Recall that \mathcal{L} is defined in (12) by

$$(\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u})_n = \mu u_n + 4 \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} \right) dz \right)_{n,n+1}.$$

As we already noticed in (13), we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathcal{L}\mathbf{w} \rangle_{\ell^2} = \langle \mathcal{L}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\ell^2} = H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}).$$

This equality is first valid for \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} compactly supported, but can be extended for $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ by continuity of $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$. This already proves that \mathcal{L} is a symmetric bounded operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. In addition, the coercivity of $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$ shows that \mathcal{L} is invertible with bounded inverse (Lax-Milgram theorem).

We now focus on the map $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ defined in (18). We claim that $\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s} - \mathcal{L}\|_{\text{op}}$ goes to 0 as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. This will eventually prove that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ is also invertible with bounded inverse.

We have, for $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$,

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, (\mathcal{L} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s})\mathbf{u} \rangle_{\ell^2} = 2\text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \left[\frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} V - \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} U \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*} V \right] dz \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{z - T^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} - \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} U \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*} = \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} - \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} \right) U \frac{1}{z - T^+} + \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} U \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} - \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*} \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{z - T^+} (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ - T^+) \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} + \frac{1}{z - \tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+} U \frac{1}{z - T^+} ((\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^* - T^+) \frac{1}{z - (\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+)^*}. \end{aligned}$$

We then use estimates of the form (R stands for resolvent)

$$\mathrm{Tr}(R_1(T-\tilde{T})R_2UR_3V) \leq \left\| R_1(T-\tilde{T})R_2UR_3V \right\|_{\mathfrak{S}^1} \leq \|R_1\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|R_2\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|R_3\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|T-\tilde{T}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|U\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \|V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2}.$$

We deduce that there is $C \geq 0$ so that, for α small enough,

$$\left| \langle \mathbf{v}, (\mathcal{L} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}) \mathbf{u} \rangle_{\ell^2} \right| \leq C \|\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ - T^+\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|U\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \|V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \leq 2C \|\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ - T^+\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\ell^2},$$

where we used Lemma 3.1 in the last inequality. We proved in Lemma 25 that $\|\tilde{T}_{\alpha,s}^+ - T^+\|_{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Together with the fact that \mathcal{L} is invertible, we deduce that for there is $\alpha^* > 0$ and $C \geq 0$ so that, for all $0 \leq \alpha < \alpha^*$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s}$ is invertible with $\|(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\alpha,s})^{-1}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \leq C$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.6

4.3. Proof of Lemma 2.7. Finally, we focus on the map $\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,s,U}$ defined in (19). First, using that $\sum_n (A)_{n,n+1}^2 \leq \|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2}^2$ and estimates of the form

$$\|R_1(\Theta V)R_2(W\Theta)R_3\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \leq \|R_1\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|R_2\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|R_3\|_{\mathrm{op}} \|\Theta V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^4} \|W\Theta\|_{\mathfrak{S}^4},$$

we get

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,s,U}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})}^2 \leq C \|\Theta_{\alpha,s} V\|_{\mathfrak{S}^4} \|W\Theta_{\alpha,s}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^4}.$$

It remains to bound $\|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U\|_{\mathfrak{S}^4}$ by $\|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^4}$. To do so, we follow the steps of Lemma 3.1, and prove that for all $1 \leq p < \infty$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, we have $\Theta_{\alpha,s} U$ in \mathfrak{S}_p (in \mathcal{B} if $p = \infty$), and

$$\|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U\|_{\mathfrak{S}_p} \leq C_p \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^p} \quad (26)$$

for a constant C_p independent of \mathbf{u} (and $\|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U\|_{\mathrm{op}} \leq C_\infty \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}$ for $p = \infty$). We use below the fact that

$$\theta_{\alpha,s}(n) \leq \theta_{\alpha,s}(n+1) \leq e^\alpha \theta_{\alpha,s}(n). \quad (27)$$

First, for $p = \infty$, we have, for $\psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U \psi\|_{\ell^2}^2 &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_{\alpha,s}^2(n) |u_{n-1} \psi_{n-1} + u_n \psi_{n+1}|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta_{\alpha,s}^2(n) |u_{n-1}|^2 |\psi_{n-1}|^2 + \theta_{\alpha,s}^2(n) |u_n|^2 |\psi_{n+1}|^2 \\ &\leq 2e^\alpha \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\psi\|_{\ell^2}^2 + 2 \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\psi\|_{\ell^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We used that $|a+b|^2 \leq 2|a|^2 + 2|b|^2$ for the first inequality, and (27) for the second. This proves the bound

$$\|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U\|_{\mathrm{op}}^2 \leq (2e^\alpha + 2) \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2.$$

In the case $p = 1$, we have by duality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_{\alpha,s} U\|_{\mathfrak{S}^1} &= \sup_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{B} \\ \|K\|_{\mathrm{op}}=1}} |\mathrm{Tr}(\Theta_{\alpha,s} U K)| = \sup_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{B} \\ \|K\|_{\mathrm{op}}=1}} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} u_n \theta_{\alpha,s}(n) K_{n+1,n} + u_n \theta_{\alpha,s}(n+1) K_{n,n+1} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_n \theta_{\alpha,s}(n)| + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_n \theta_{\alpha,s}(n+1)| \leq \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^1} + e^\alpha \|\theta_{\alpha,s} \mathbf{u}\|_{\ell^1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used that both $|K_{n,n+1}|$ and $|K_{n+1,n}|$ are smaller than 1, and (27) for the last inequality.

We conclude that (26) holds for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ using Riesz-Thorin interpolation.

4.4. Coercivity of the Hessian at the dimerized configuration. In this section, we prove Proposition 4.1. Recall that

$$H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = \mu \|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + 2 \mathrm{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z - T^+} H \frac{1}{z - T^+} H dz \right)$$

We already proved that $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$ is a bounded quadratic form on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. We now prove that, for the dimerized configuration \mathbf{t}^+ , the Hessian $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$ is a coercive bilinear map on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, namely that there is $C > 0$ so that, for all $\mathbf{h} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \geq C \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

By density, it is enough to prove the result for all compactly supported sequences \mathbf{h} . Assume that \mathbf{h} is such a sequence, so that $h_n = 0$ for all $|n| \geq S$. First, we claim that there is $C > 0$ so that, for all L large enough, we have

$$H_{\mathbf{t}_L^+}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \geq C \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2, \quad (28)$$

where $H_{\mathbf{t}_L^+}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})$ is the hessian of the SSH model for the closed $L = 2N$ chain, defined by

$$H_{\mathbf{t}_L^+}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = \mu \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 + 2\mathrm{Tr}_L \left(\frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{z - T_L^+} H \frac{1}{z - T_L^+} H dz \right).$$

Here, Tr_L is the trace for $L \times L$ hermitian matrices, \mathbf{t}_L^+ is the dimerized ground state of the closed L -chain (L even), of the dimerized form (see [6])

$$\mathbf{t}_L^+ = W_L + (-1)^n \delta_L, \quad (29)$$

and T_L^+ is the associated $L \times L$ hermitian matrix. It was proved in [3, 4] that $W_L \rightarrow W$ and $\delta_L \rightarrow \delta$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Actually, the bound (28) was more or less proved in [3], with a constant C independent of L for L large enough. We provide here another proof.

To prove (28), as in [6], we use the convexity of the function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$[0, 1] \ni x \mapsto -\sqrt{x} - \frac{1}{8}x^2.$$

As a consequence, the map $A \mapsto \mathrm{Tr} f(A)$ is convex on the set of hermitian matrices with spectrum in $[0, 1]$. This implies that, with $A = \frac{1}{\|T\|_{\mathrm{op}}^2} T^2$,

$$-\mathrm{Tr}(\sqrt{T^2}) \geq -\mathrm{Tr}(\sqrt{\langle T^2 \rangle}) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{\|T\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \mathrm{Tr}[T^4 - \langle T^2 \rangle^2],$$

where $\langle A \rangle$ is the average of A over all translations, namely

$$\langle A \rangle = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \Theta_1^k A \Theta_1^{-k}, \quad \Theta_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We deduce that

$$\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{n=1}^L (t_n - 1)^2 - \mathrm{Tr}_L(\sqrt{\langle T^2 \rangle}) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{\|T\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \mathrm{Tr}_L[T^4 - \langle T^2 \rangle^2]. \quad (30)$$

Since the operator T_L^\pm always corresponds to a 2-periodic configuration, it holds

$$\Theta_1 (T_L^\pm)^2 \Theta_1^* = (T_L^\pm)^2 \quad \text{and, in particular} \quad (T_L^\pm)^2 = \langle (T_L^\pm)^2 \rangle.$$

We deduce that there is equality in (30) for \mathbf{t}_L^+ . We also deduce from (30) that, for all \mathbf{t} , we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+) \geq \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{\|T\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \mathrm{Tr}[T^4 - \langle T^2 \rangle^2].$$

We apply this inequality for $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_L^+ + s\mathbf{h}$ and get that

$$\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+ + s\mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+) \geq \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{\|T_L^+ + sH\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \mathrm{Tr}[(T_L^+ + sH)^4 - \langle (T_L^+ + sH)^2 \rangle^2]$$

For the denominator, we use the fact that, for s small enough, we have $\|T_L^+ + sH\|_{\mathrm{op}} \leq 2\|T_L^+\|_{\mathrm{op}}$. For the numerator, expanding the expression and using that $(T_L^+)^2 = \langle (T_L^+)^2 \rangle$, so that $\mathrm{Tr}_L((T_L^+)^3 H) =$

$\mathrm{Tr}_L(\langle (T_L^+)^2 \rangle \langle T_L^+ H \rangle)$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_L(\langle (T_L^+)^2 \rangle \langle H^2 \rangle) = \mathrm{Tr}_L(\langle (T_L^+)^2 H^2 \rangle)$ (so that the orders $O(1)$ and $O(s)$ vanish), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+ + s\mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+) &\geq \frac{s^2}{16} \frac{1}{\|T_L^+\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \mathrm{Tr}_L \left[(T_L^+ H + H T_L^+)^2 - \langle T_L^+ H + H T_L^+ \rangle^2 \right] + o(s^2) \\ &= \frac{s^2}{16} \frac{1}{\|T_L^+\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \left(\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 - \|\langle T_L^+ H + H T_L^+ \rangle\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 \right) + o(s^2) \end{aligned}$$

The previous computation is valid for all \mathbf{h} . We now use the fact that \mathbf{h} is compactly supported in $[-S, S]$, and that $L \gg S$. This allows to prove that the last term is small. More specifically, we have the following.

Lemma 4.2. *For all $S \in \mathbb{N}$ all $L \gg S$, all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{C}^L$ and all $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^L$ compactly supported in $[-S, S]$, we have*

$$\|\langle TH \rangle\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 \leq \frac{6S}{L} \|\mathbf{t}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

Proof. Set $A = TH$, so that

$$A_{n,n} = t_n h_n + h_{n-1} t_{n-1}, \quad A_{n,n+2} = t_{n+1} h_n, \quad A_{n,n-2} = t_{n-2} h_{n-1}.$$

The matrix $\langle A \rangle$ is of the form

$$\langle A \rangle_{n,n} = 2a_0, \quad \langle A \rangle_{n,n+2} = a_1, \quad \langle A \rangle_{n,n-2} = a_{-1}, \quad \text{with} \quad a_m := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} t_{k+m} h_k.$$

Using that h is compactly supported and Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$|a_m|^2 = \frac{1}{L^2} \left(\sum_{k=-S}^S t_{k+m} h_k \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{L^2} \|\mathbf{t}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \left(\sum_{k=-S}^S h_k \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{L^2} \|\mathbf{t}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 S.$$

We obtain

$$\|A\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 = \sum_{n,m} \langle A \rangle_{n,m}^2 = L(2a_0)^2 + La_1^2 + La_{-1}^2 \leq 6L \frac{1}{L^2} \|\mathbf{t}\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 S.$$

□

This proves that

$$\mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+ + s\mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+) = \frac{s^2}{16} \frac{1}{\|T_L^+\|_{\mathrm{op}}^3} \left(\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 - \frac{12S}{L} \|\mathbf{t}_L^+\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 \right) + o(s^2).$$

Finally, we bound from below the remaining $\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2$. A computation shows that the matrix $A := TH + HT$ satisfies

$$A_{n,n} = 2(t_n h_n + t_{n-1} h_{n-1}), \quad A_{n,n+2} = t_n h_{n+1} + h_n t_{n+1}, \quad A_{n,n-2} = t_{n-1} h_{n-2} + h_{n-1} t_{n-2},$$

and $A_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. Squaring all terms and summing gives

$$\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 = \sum_n 4(t_n h_n + t_{n-1} h_{n-1})^2 + (t_n h_{n+1} + h_n t_{n+1})^2 + (t_{n-1} h_{n-2} + h_{n-1} t_{n-2})^2.$$

Expanding, relabelling all sums, and using that \mathbf{t}_L^+ is dimerized, of the form (29), we obtain

$$\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 = 2 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} h_n \\ h_{n+1} \end{pmatrix}, Q_n \begin{pmatrix} h_n \\ h_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle, \quad \text{with} \quad Q_n = \begin{pmatrix} 2t_n^2 + t_{n+1}^2 & 3t_n t_{n+1} \\ 3t_n t_{n+1} & t_n^2 + 2t_{n+1}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have

$$\mathrm{Tr}(Q_n) = 3(t_n^2 + t_{n+1}^2) = 6(W_L^2 + \delta_L^2)$$

and

$$\det Q_n = (2t_n^2 + t_{n+1}^2)(t_n^2 + 2t_{n+1}^2) - 9t_n^2 t_{n+1}^2 = 2t_n^4 + 2t_{n+1}^4 - 4t_n^2 t_{n+1}^2 = 2(t_n^2 - t_{n+1}^2)^2 = 32 W_L^2 \delta_L^2.$$

Since $\delta_L \rightarrow \delta > 0$ and $W_L \rightarrow W$ for L large enough, there is a constant $C \geq 0$ such that $Q_n \geq C > 0$ for a constant C independent of n and L large enough. So

$$\|T_L^+ H + H T_L^+\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 \geq 2C \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2.$$

Altogether, we proved that for L large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+ + s\mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{E}^{(L)}(\mathbf{t}_L^+) &\geq \frac{s^2}{16 \|T_L^+\|_{\text{op}}^3} \left(2C - \frac{12S}{L} \|\mathbf{t}_L^+\|_{\ell^\infty}^2 \right) \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 + o(s^2) \\ &\geq \tilde{C} s^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2 + o(s^2), \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{C} is independent of L , for L large enough ($L \geq L_0$, where L_0 depends on the support S of \mathbf{h}). This proves the lower bound (28) for $H_{\mathbf{t}_L^+}^{(L)}$.

To conclude the proof, we note that

$$\left| \text{Tr}_L \left(\frac{1}{z - T^+} H \frac{1}{z - T^+} H \right) - \text{Tr}_L \left(\frac{1}{z - T_L^+} H \frac{1}{z - T_L^+} H \right) \right| \leq C \|H\|_{\mathfrak{S}_2}^2 \|T^+ - T_L^+\|_{\text{op},L}.$$

Since $W_L \rightarrow W$ and $\delta_L \rightarrow L$, we have $\|T^+ - T_L^+\|_{\text{op},L} \rightarrow 0$ as $L = 2N$ (even) goes to infinity. So for L large enough, we have

$$\left| H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) - H_{\mathbf{t}_L^+}^{(L)}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \right| \leq \frac{C}{2} \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2,$$

where C is the bound in (28). This proves $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) \geq \frac{C}{2} \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell^2}^2$, where the constant C is independent of \mathbf{h} . We proved the bound for \mathbf{h} compactly supported, but by density, it can be extended for all $\mathbf{h} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, hence the coercivity of $H_{\mathbf{t}^+}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Fröhlich. On the theory of superconductivity: The one-dimensional case. *Proc. R. Soc. London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 223(1154):296–305, 1954.
- [2] M. Garcia Arroyo. *Étude variationnelle des états électroniques de la molécule de polyacétylène : modèles continu et discret*. PhD thesis, Paris 9, 2011.
- [3] M. Garcia Arroyo and É. Séré. Existence of kink solutions in a discrete model of the polyacetylene molecule. Preprint hal-00769075, 2012.
- [4] D. Gontier, A. E. K. Kouande, and É. Séré. Phase transition in the Peierls model for polyacetylene. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 2023.
- [5] D. Gontier, D. Monaco, and S. Perrin-Roussel. Symmetric Fermi projections and Kitaev’s table: Topological phases of matter in low dimensions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 63(4):041902, 2022.
- [6] T. Kennedy and E. H. Lieb. Proof of the Peierls instability in one dimension. In *Condensed Matter Physics and Exactly Soluble Models*, pages 85–88. Springer, 2004.
- [7] A. Kitaev. Periodic table for topological insulators and superconductors. In *AIP conference proceedings*, volume 1134, pages 22–30. American Institute of Physics, 2009.
- [8] S. Kivelson and D. Heim. Hubbard versus Peierls and the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model of polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. B*, 26(8):4278, 1982.
- [9] E. H. Lieb and B. Nachtergaele. Stability of the Peierls instability for ring-shaped molecules. *Phys. Rev. B*, 51(8):4777, 1995.
- [10] E. H. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis. Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain. *Anna. of Phys.*, 16(3):407–466, 1961.
- [11] N. Macris and B. Nachtergaele. On the flux phase conjecture at half-filling: an improved proof. *Journal of statistical physics*, 85(5-6):745–761, 1996.
- [12] R. E. Peierls. *Quantum theory of solids*. Clarendon Press, 1996.
- [13] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol. IV: Analysis of Operators*. Academic Press, 1977.
- [14] B. Simon. *Trace Ideals and Their Applications*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2005.
- [15] W. P. Su. Existence of neutral kinks in polyacetylene. *Solid State Communications*, 35(11):899–901, 1980.
- [16] W. P. Su, J. R. Schrieffer, and A. Heeger. Solitons in polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. letters*, 42(25):1698, 1979.
- [17] Hajime Takayama, Y. R. Lin-Liu, and Kazumi Maki. Continuum model for solitons in polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. B*, 21:2388–2393, 1980.
- [18] L. F. Vos, D. P. Aalberts, and W. van Saarloos. Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model applied to chains of finite length. *Phys. Rev. B*, 53(22):14922, 1996.