

LANDSCAPE ESTIMATES OF THE INTEGRATED DENSITY OF STATES FOR JACOBI OPERATORS ON GRAPHS

LAURA SHOU, WEI WANG, SHIWEN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We show the integrated density of states for a variety of Jacobi operators on graphs, such as the Anderson model and random hopping models on graphs with Gaussian heat kernel bounds, can be estimated from above and below in terms of the localization landscape counting function. Specific examples of these graphs include stacked and decorated lattices, graphs corresponding to band matrices, and aperiodic tiling graphs. The upper bound part of the landscape law also applies to the fractal Sierpinski gasket graph. As a consequence of the landscape law, we obtain landscape-based proofs of the Lifshitz tails in several models including random band matrix models, certain bond percolation Hamiltonians on \mathbb{Z}^d , and Jacobi operators on certain stacks of graphs. We also present intriguing numerical simulations exploring the behavior of the landscape counting function across various models.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Main results	4
1.2. Bond percolation and discrete $\operatorname{div} A \cdot \nabla$ on \mathbb{Z}^d	7
1.3. Graphs roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d	7
1.4. Lifshitz tails for stacked graphs	8
1.5. Sierpinski gasket graph	8
1.6. Random band models	9
1.7. Outline	10
2. Preliminaries	10
2.1. Operators on graphs and the landscape function	11
2.2. Graph properties and assumptions	11
2.3. Rough isometries and properties preserved under them	17
3. Proof of the Landscape Law for graphs and random hopping models	18
3.1. Proof of the Landscape Law upper bound, Theorem 1.1(i)	18
3.2. Proof of the Landscape Law lower bound, Theorem 1.1(ii)	21
4. Lifshitz tails for the landscape counting function	24
4.1. Lifshitz tails lower bound: proof of Theorem 1.2(i)	25
4.2. Lifshitz tails upper bound: proof of Theorem 1.2(ii)	26
5. Details for applications to specific models	33
5.1. Random band model $H_{d,W}$ and proof of Corollary 1.4	33
5.2. Stacked graphs	36
5.3. Sierpinski gasket graph	38
6. Numerical cases	39
6.1. Random band models	39
6.2. Sierpinski gasket	40
6.3. Penrose tiling	40
Appendix A. Green's function and Poisson kernel for a Dirichlet Laplacian on a ball	43

Appendix B. An explicit proof of Poisson kernel estimates for the 1D random band model	45
Appendix C. Moser–Harnack inequality for subharmonic functions	46
Acknowledgments	49
References	49

1. INTRODUCTION

The structure and dynamics of quantum systems for electrons are generally described using a Hamiltonian operator. The simplified non-interacting Hamiltonian H of a crystalline solid can often be modeled by a graph operator $H = -\Delta + V$, which is a weighted graph Laplacian perturbed by an on-site potential. The integrated density of states (IDS) of H is one of the main quantities encoding the energy levels of the system. It describes the number of energy levels per unit volume below a certain energy level. In the present work, we establish bounds on the IDS of H via the counting function of the so-called localization landscape [14]. Such a *Landscape Law* approach was first established in [9] for the standard Schrödinger operator on \mathbb{R}^d , and later extended to \mathbb{Z}^d in [1, 10].

The goal of the present paper is to establish the landscape law for more general graph operators with both on-site potential and bond interactions. This extension is in two directions: First, by moving to graphs, we lose the regular structure of \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{Z}^d used in [9, 1] to perform partition and translation arguments. Second, by allowing for disordered bond interactions, we extend the class of operators to include random hopping and Jacobi operators, which may have degenerate off-diagonal hopping amplitudes. The resulting landscape law will apply to a range of models, including Jacobi operators on graphs *roughly isometric* to \mathbb{Z}^d (or more generally, graphs with Gaussian heat kernel bounds), which includes stacked and decorated lattices, graphs corresponding to banded matrices, and aperiodic tiling graphs. We also obtain a landscape law upper bound for the Sierpinski gasket graph, which is not roughly isometric to any \mathbb{Z}^d and has non-Gaussian (specifically, sub-Gaussian) heat kernel bounds.

After establishing the landscape law, the general method described in [9, 1] will allow us to recover Lifshitz tail estimates for several of the random hopping models on \mathbb{Z}^d , including random band matrices, bond percolation Hamiltonians with certain boundary conditions, and discrete acoustic operators $\operatorname{div} A \cdot \nabla$. This provides alternate proofs, using the landscape function, for Lifshitz tails in these models (cf. [24, 31, 30, 25, 37]). The landscape law method here also suggests an avenue to obtain Lifshitz tails for non-regular graphs, if one proves certain geometric properties of the graphs.

We now introduce some definitions in order to state our main results. We consider an (unweighted) graph $\Gamma = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where the vertex set \mathbb{V} is countably infinite. We write $x \sim y$ to mean $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{E}$, and in this case say that y is a neighbor of x . The natural graph metric, denoted $d_0(\cdot, \cdot)$, gives the length $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of the shortest path between two points. Define balls in Γ with respect to d_0 as

$$B^{d_0}(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{V} : d_0(x, y) \leq r, x \in \mathbb{V}, r \geq 0\}.$$

We may omit the superscript dependence d_0 and write $B(x, r) = B^{d_0}(x, r)$, unless another metric is also being considered. Since the metric d_0 is integer valued, we allow r to be real and $B(x, r) = B(x, \lfloor r \rfloor)$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. For any subset $S \subset \mathbb{V}$, we denote by $|S| = \#\{x : x \in S\}$ the cardinality of S .

As described below in Assumption 1, in this article we will always work with graphs with the following polynomial volume growth. This property is also called ‘‘Ahlfors α -regular’’ in [8], where the exponent α is the graph analog of the Hausdorff dimension.

Assumption 1. We will always assume Γ is connected and satisfies the following volume control property with parameter α (‘‘Ahlfors α -regular’’): There are $\alpha \geq 1$, $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{V}$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$c_1 r^\alpha \leq |B(x, r)| \leq c_2 r^\alpha. \quad (1.1)$$

Note this also implies bounded geometry: Letting $\deg(x) = \#\{y : x \sim y\}$ be the degree of a vertex $x \in \mathbb{V}$, then

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{V}} \deg(x) := M_\Gamma < \infty. \quad (1.2)$$

We now consider the Jacobi operator H on $\mathcal{H} := \ell^2(\mathbb{V})$ defined as

$$Hf(x) = \sum_{y: y \sim x} (f(x) - \mu_{xy}f(y)) + V_x f(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{V}, \quad (1.3)$$

which has an on-site non-negative potential $\{V_x \geq 0\}_{x \in \mathbb{V}}$, and bond strengths $\{0 \leq \mu_{xy} = \mu_{yx} \leq 1\}_{x \sim y \in \mathbb{V}}$.

Remark 1.1. The placement of the bond strengths μ_{xy} in (1.3) on only $f(y)$, and not as $\mu_{xy}(f(x) - f(y))$, may at first appear unusual. However, the bond strength placement in (1.3) corresponds to tight-binding hopping models commonly encountered in the physics literature, for which (1.3) may be written in the form,

$$H = - \sum_{\langle x, y \rangle} t_{xy}(|x\rangle\langle y| + |y\rangle\langle x|) + \sum_x V_x |x\rangle\langle x| + \sum_x \deg(x) |x\rangle\langle x|.$$

The last diagonal term involving $\deg(x)$ is not usually present, but it is just a constant shift in energy for regular graphs like \mathbb{Z}^d .

As another reason for considering the operator (1.3), we note that when there is no diagonal disorder ($V_x \equiv 0$), then (1.3) becomes a random hopping model like in [11, 21, 40]. For this random hopping model (1.3) on \mathbb{Z}^d with $V_x \equiv 0$, there are still the Lifshitz tails for the integrated density of states (cf. Section 1.2). However, for the different model $\tilde{H}f(x) = \sum_{y: y \sim x} \mu_{xy}(f(x) - f(y))$, the tail behavior of the integrated density of states and the spectrum at low energies can be completely different, for example instead exhibiting van Hove asymptotics similar to that of the non-disordered Laplacian [30].

If one strongly desires the specific term $\mu_{xy}(f(x) - f(y))$ to appear, so as to match the combinatorial Laplacian of a weighted graph with edge weights μ_{xy} , then the difference can be adjusted by changing the $\deg(x)$ part of the diagonal term to $\deg(x) - \mu_x$, where $\mu_x = \sum_{y: y \sim x} \mu_{xy}$.

In order to define the integrated density of states (IDS) and landscape counting function, we first restrict to finite volume sets. Let $A \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a finite subset of vertices and $\Gamma_A \subset \Gamma$ the subgraph induced by A . We denote by $H^A : \ell^2(A) \rightarrow \ell^2(A)$ the restriction of H to A with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$H^A f(x) = \deg(x)f(x) - \sum_{y \in A: y \sim x} \mu_{xy}f(y) + V_x f(x). \quad (1.4)$$

The integrated density of states (IDS) of H^A is then

$$N^A(E) := \frac{1}{|A|} \#\{\text{eigenvalues } E' \text{ of } H^A \text{ such that } E' \leq E\}. \quad (1.5)$$

Next we define the localization landscape function. Since A is finite, H^A is a strictly positive, bounded self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(A)$, with a nonnegative Green's function, $G_A(x, y) = (H^A)^{-1}(x, y) \geq 0$, $\forall x, y \in A$. A direct consequence is that there is a unique vector $u_A \in C_+(A) = \mathbb{R}_+^A = \{f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$, called the *landscape function* of H^A , solving $H^A u_A(x) = 1$, $\forall x \in A$.

The concept of the landscape function was introduced by Filoche and Mayboroda in [14] for studying localization in elliptic operators on \mathbb{R}^d . This approach has led to a number of results and applications in quantum and semiconductor physics; see for example [2] for an overview of the landscape method and applications. Additionally, other mathematical results and applications of localization landscape theory have recently been developed in e.g. [4, 5, 19, 29, 33, 34, 38]. The use of the landscape function as an “effective potential” in place of the original potential V allows one to work in a non-asymptotic regime, in some sense to bring the ideas behind the classical Weyl law, as well as the volume-counting of the Uncertainty Principle of Fefferman and Phong [12], to various models without restrictions on the potential or the pertinent eigenvalues.

In this article, we will use the *landscape counting function* to estimate the true IDS (1.5) for operators on graphs. The landscape counting function was defined and used to estimate the IDS for operators on \mathbb{R}^d in [9], and extended to operators on \mathbb{Z}^d in [1]. In both of these previous cases, the landscape counting function involved counting cleanly partitioned cubes Q where $\min_Q \frac{1}{u} \leq E$. For graphs, we lack the periodicity and will have to make do without a partition, and instead use rougher coverings by (graph distance) balls. Given $R \geq 0$, we call $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(R) = \{B(z_i, R) : z_i \in \mathbb{V}\}_{i \geq 1}$ a countable covering of Γ with centers $\{z_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ if $\bigcup_{i \geq 1} B(z_i, R) = \mathbb{V}$ and $\{z_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is countable. We denote by $\mathcal{P}|_A = \{B \in \mathcal{P} : B \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ (or \mathcal{P}^A) the restriction of \mathcal{P} on $A \subset \Gamma$. We can then define the landscape counting function with respect to this cover \mathcal{P} as follows.

Definition 1. The *landscape counting function* for the covering $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(R)$ and region A is defined for $E > 0$ as

$$N_u^{\mathcal{P}, A}(E) = \frac{1}{|A|} \# \left\{ B \in \mathcal{P}|_A : \min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right\}. \quad (1.6)$$

For the landscape law, we will take the radius of the balls in the partition \mathcal{P} to be proportional to $E^{-1/2}$. As we show in Lemma 2.6, landscape counting functions defined by different covers $\mathcal{P}(R)$ and $\mathcal{P}'(R')$ are comparable to each other as long as the radii R, R' are comparable in the sense $c \leq R'/R \leq C$, and the covers satisfy a finite covering property (2.3). We will thus frequently omit the superscripts \mathcal{P}, A and simply denote the *landscape counting function* with balls of radius $R = E^{-1/2}$ for the region A as

$$N_u(E) = N_u^{\mathcal{P}(E^{-1/2}), A}(E), \quad (1.7)$$

with the understanding that the notation $N_u(E)$ is only meant to be defined up to a constant pre-factor, and is always to be taken with a covering of balls of radius $R = E^{-1/2}$ satisfying the finite covering property (for a fixed constant) in (2.2).

1.1. Main results. Our first result is the landscape law for a general class of graphs, essentially those with the so-called Gaussian heat kernel bounds. The landscape law will demonstrate that the landscape counting function defined in (1.6) can be used to bound the actual integrated density of states for H^A from above and below. Afterwards, we give conditions with which one can use the landscape law to obtain Lifshitz tails for the integrated density of states. The assumptions listed in the following theorems are defined precisely in Section 2.2. For the landscape law, one specific example to keep in mind is graphs Γ that are *roughly isometric* to \mathbb{Z}^d , which will satisfy the required conditions. We provide the precise definition in Section 2.3, but for now we note that rough isometries (or quasi-isometries [16]) are maps that capture the large-scale,

global structure of the graphs. For obtaining Lifshitz tails, we will additionally require technical conditions on the graph Γ involving the harmonic weight of balls, which will be described in Assumption 2 in Section 2.2.

Theorem 1.1 (Landscape Law for graphs). *Let H^A be as in (1.4) with any $\mu_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ and $V_x \geq 0$. Suppose Γ satisfies Assumption 1 and a weak Poincaré inequality (WPI) as described in Section 2.2. In particular, graphs roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d , or more generally those with Gaussian heat kernel estimates (2.11), meet these requirements. Then we have the following landscape law bounds.*

(i) Upper bound:

$$N(E) \leq N_u(CE), \quad \text{for all } E > 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where C depends on Γ , and in particular, is independent of A , μ_{xy} and V_x .

(ii) Lower bound: There are constants c_i, c'_i, c^* , depending only on Γ , such that for any $0 < \kappa < 1/4$,

$$N(E) \geq c_1 \kappa^\alpha N_u(c_3 \kappa^{\alpha+2} E) - c_2 N_u(c_4 \kappa^{\alpha+4} E), \quad \text{for } E \leq c^* \kappa^{-4}, \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$N(E) \geq c'_1 N_u(c'_3 \kappa^2 E) - c'_2 N_u(c'_4 \kappa^4 E), \quad \text{for } E > c^* \kappa^{-4}. \quad (1.10)$$

The above Landscape Law as given by (1.8), (1.9), and (1.10) holds for any $\mu_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ and $V_x \geq 0$, requiring no additional assumptions on μ_{xy} or V_x . Below, we will discuss the disordered model where $\{\mu_{xy}\}$ and $\{V_x\}$ are each sets of independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables. We see that in this case, under additional assumptions on the graph, the lower bound in (1.9) and (1.10) can be improved by removing the negative term on the right hand side, leading to Lifshitz tail estimates for both the landscape counting function and actual IDS in terms of the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of μ_{xy} and V_x .

In what follows, let $\sigma_{xy} = 1 - \mu_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ be i.i.d. random variables with a common CDF

$$F_\mu(E) = \mathbb{P}(1 - \mu_{xy} \leq E), \quad (1.11)$$

and let $V_x \geq 0$ be i.i.d. random variables with a common CDF

$$F_V(E) = \mathbb{P}(V_x \leq E). \quad (1.12)$$

Remark 1.2. We will need only at least one of F_V or F_μ to be non-trivial. As an allowable example, if $F_V(0) = 1$, so that V_x is identically zero for all x , then H is free of potential and there are only off-diagonal disorder terms μ_{xy} .

We start with the general lower bound of the landscape counting function N_u in terms of F , which gives a Lifshitz tail lower bound.

Theorem 1.2 (Landscape Lifshitz tails). *Suppose Γ satisfies Assumption 1 and a weak Poincaré inequality (as described in Definition 3 in Section 2.2). Let F_V and F_μ both have zero as the infimum of their essential support¹, and satisfy $F_V(0)F_\mu(0) < 1$. For any finite set $A \subset \Gamma$ with “sufficient overlap with balls”, i.e. there is $c > 0$ so that for any $x \in A$ and $0 \leq r \leq C \text{diam } A$, where $\text{diam } A := \sup_{x,y \in A} d_0(x,y)$ and $C \geq 1$ is Γ -dependent constant,*

$$|A \cap B(x, r)| \geq cr^\alpha, \quad (1.13)$$

then we have the following bounds on the landscape counting function.

¹ E belongs to the essential support of a distribution function F iff $dF(E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon) > 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Since 0 is the essential support of F_V, F_μ , $F_V(0)F_\mu(0) < 1$ implies that there is $E_0 > 0$ such that $F_V(E)F_\mu(E) \leq F_V(E_0)F_\mu(E_0) < 1$ for all $E \leq E_0$.

(i) *Lower bound: There are constants c_i, E_0 only depending on Γ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}N_u(E) \geq c_1 E^{\alpha/2} (F_\mu(c_2 E))^{c_3 E^{-\alpha/2}} (F_V(c_4 E))^{c_5 E^{-\alpha/2}} \quad (1.14)$$

for all $c_0(\text{diam}A)^{-2} \leq E \leq E_0$.

(ii) *Upper bound: With the additional harmonic weight assumptions in Assumption 2, there are constants c_i, E_1 only depending on Γ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}N_u(E) \leq c_6 E^{\alpha/2} \left(F_\mu(c_7 E) F_V(c_7 E) \right)^{c_8 E^{-\alpha/2}} \quad (1.15)$$

for all $E < E_1$.

As a consequence of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, the methods from [9, 1] then provide Lifshitz tail estimates for the actual integrated density of states (IDS).

Corollary 1.3 (Landscape Law for random models). *Retain the assumptions in Theorem 1.2(ii). Then there are constants c_i only depending on Γ such that for all $E > 0$,*

$$c_1 \mathbb{E}N_u(c_2 E) \leq \mathbb{E}N(E) \leq c_3 \mathbb{E}N_u(c_4 E), \quad (1.16)$$

so that the Lifshitz tail estimates (1.14) and (1.15) hold for $\mathbb{E}N(E)$.

Throughout this article, we work with the finite volume IDS (eigenvalue counting per unit volume) and do not directly consider the thermodynamic limit as $A \nearrow \mathbb{V}$. In general, such limit may not exist unless the operator is in some sense uniform in the underlying graph (e.g., a periodic or random Schrödinger operator defined on a vertex transitive graph). When the infinite volume IDS cannot be defined for general operators, one can consider the liminf or limsup instead, which always exist, and provide lower and upper bounds for the infinite volume one when it exists. Noting that the Lifshitz tail estimates (1.14), (1.15) (the constants therein) for $N_\bullet = N, N_u$ are independent of A , this allows us to take liminf / limsup (for any fixed E small) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 E^{\alpha/2} (F_\mu(c_2 E))^{c_3 E^{-\alpha/2}} (F_V(c_4 E))^{c_5 E^{-\alpha/2}} &\leq \liminf_{A \nearrow \mathbb{V}} \mathbb{E}N_\bullet(E) \\ &\leq \limsup_{A \nearrow \mathbb{V}} \mathbb{E}N_\bullet(E) \leq c_6 E^{\alpha/2} \left(F_\mu(c_7 E) F_V(c_7 E) \right)^{c_8 E^{-\alpha/2}}, \quad E < E_0. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that the double-log limit (in energy E) of the limit in A does always exist as long as $F_V F_\mu$ is not ‘too thin’ near the bottom, e.g., if $F_V(E) F_\mu(E) \gtrsim E^c$ for some $c > 0$, then

$$\lim_{E \searrow 0} \lim_{A \nearrow \mathbb{V}} \frac{\log |\log \mathbb{E}N_\bullet(E)|}{\log E} = -\frac{\alpha}{2},$$

where $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ is usually referred as the Lifshitz tail exponent. We obtain such Lifshitz tail estimates as a by-product of the landscape method. We refer readers to the extensive literature for more details and background about Lifshitz tails, see e.g. [23, 26].

One may also notice that the Lifshitz tail exponent $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ coincides with the volume control parameter α in (1.1) divided by the (weak) Poincaré inequality parameter 2 in (2.5). These two parameters together appear in the *Heat Kernel Bound* $\text{HK}(\alpha, 2)$, a property for the free (probabilistic) Laplacian on the graph, which we describe further in Propositions 2.7. We discuss the relation between more general heat kernel bound parameters on a general graph and the Lifshitz tails exponent in Section 5.3, where we consider the fractal Sierpinski gasket graph.

In the following subsections, we describe applications of Theorem 1.1 or Corollary 1.3 to various models.

1.2. Bond percolation and discrete $\operatorname{div} A \cdot \nabla$ on \mathbb{Z}^d . Bernoulli bond percolation graphs are random graphs formed from a graph $G = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$ by assigning independent Bernoulli(p) random variables $(\omega_{xy})_{xy}$ to the edges $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{E}$, and considering the graph $G' = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E}')$ with new edge set $\mathcal{E}' = \{\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{E} : \omega_{xy} = 1\}$. There has been much interest concerning the spectral properties of such random graphs; see for example the overview [31] on percolation Hamiltonians.

The “adjacency” or “pseudo-Dirichlet” Laplacian Δ_{PD} on \mathbb{Z}^d considered in [24, 30] corresponds to the Jacobi operator (1.3) with no potential ($V_x \equiv 0$), and with i.i.d. $\mu_{xy} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$. There it was shown that Δ_{PD} has Lifshitz tails at the bottom and top of the spectrum, for any $0 < p < 1$. By applying Corollary 1.3, we obtain an alternative proof of the adjacency Laplacian Lifshitz tails result via the landscape law method. (Since the underlying lattice is just \mathbb{Z}^d , Assumption 2 required for Corollary 1.3 always holds.)

We note that the landscape law method also applies to i.i.d. μ_{xy} with distributions other than Bernoulli, providing a landscape-law based proof for Lifshitz tails for these models as well. The Lifshitz tails upper bound for such models was proved earlier in [25] by comparison to on-diagonal disorder models.

By a duality/symmetry argument [24], the bottom of the spectrum of bond percolation Hamiltonians can be used to study the top of the spectrum for the *discrete* version of $\operatorname{div} A \cdot \nabla$ on \mathbb{Z}^d . Such operators describe acoustic waves in a medium [13]. Let $H = \nabla^\dagger A \nabla$ on \mathbb{Z}^d , where $A(x)$ is a real symmetric semidefinite $d \times d$ matrix for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. When $A(x)$ is a non-negative diagonal matrix, each diagonal entry of the $d \times d$ matrix $A(x)$ can be associated with one of the $2d$ edges in the graph \mathbb{Z}^d involving the node x . The operator $\nabla^\dagger A \nabla$ then just becomes the weighted nearest neighbor combinatorial Laplacian,

$$Hf(x) \equiv (\nabla^\dagger A \nabla f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d: y \sim x} a(x, y)(f(x) - f(y)), \quad (1.17)$$

where $a(x, y) = a(y, x)$ is the corresponding entry from one of the matrices $A(x)$. When $a(x, y)$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(p) random variables, then H is the “Neumann Laplacian” from [24, 30], and can have different behavior at the top vs bottom of the spectrum. The top of the spectrum always exhibits Lifshitz tails, but the bottom of the spectrum can also exhibit “van Hove singularities” [30]. As we do not specialize to the precise operator dual to H , the duality/symmetry argument applied with Corollary 1.3 or [25] yields the Lifshitz tails *upper* bound for $1 - N(E)$ for discrete $\operatorname{div} A \cdot \nabla$ at the top of the spectrum. This also applies for non-Bernoulli i.i.d. disorder $a(x, y)$, and one could investigate if the matching lower bound can be obtained by applying the landscape law method to the precise dual operator.

1.3. Graphs roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d . While we have not yet defined rough isometries between graphs (we will do so in Section 2.3), we provide a few brief examples here of graphs roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d , to which Theorem 1.1 applies. Roughly speaking, roughly isometric will mean that there is a map between the graphs that preserves distances up to some error.

We first give the example of the vertex graph Γ_P of the Penrose rhomb tiling of the plane (see for example the textbook [3]), shown in Figure 1. The tiling involves two kinds of rhombuses, a wide rhombus with angles 72° and 108° , and a narrow rhombus with angles 36° and 144° . This Penrose tiling possesses a five-fold rotational symmetry, but is aperiodic, with no translational symmetry. While the vertex graph Γ_P is also nonregular, it is roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^2 (see Section 2.3), so that Theorem 1.1 implies the Landscape Law for Jacobi operators on the Penrose tiling Γ_P .

Next, we consider lattices and some of their variations. Lattices such as the triangular and hexagonal lattices are readily seen to be roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^2 . Local perturbations of lattices, such as adding decorations to sites, also remain roughly isometric. Stacked lattices, obtained by




FIGURE 1. A section of the Penrose tiling with the vertices of Γ_P drawn.

taking $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ for a fixed M and adding edges between identical sites in adjacent layers, also remain roughly isometric. The landscape law Theorem 1.1 then holds for all these graphs.




FIGURE 2. Stacked lattices illustration.

1.4. Lifshitz tails for stacked graphs. For a graph $\Gamma = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$, construct the stacked graph $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ as follows, similarly as described for stacked lattices in the previous subsection. The vertices of $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ are (x, j) , for $x \in \mathbb{V}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, and the edges are those in each copy of Γ ($(x, j) \sim (y, j)$ if $x \sim y$ in Γ), along with new edges between identical sites in adjacent copies of Γ , $(x, j) \sim (x, k)$ if $|j - k| = 1$. This is easiest to visualize when Γ is e.g. a 2D lattice or tiling graph such as in Figure 2.

If the properties in Assumption 2 (defined below in Section 2.2) hold with the natural metric d_Γ and harmonic weight (2.14) for a graph Γ , then as we verify in Section 5.2, the required properties also hold for the described $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ with metric $\tilde{d}((x, j), (y, k)) := d_\Gamma(x, y) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_{(x=y) \wedge (j \neq k)}$ and “bad set” $X_R \times \mathbb{Z}_M$. Thus if Γ also satisfies the other hypotheses for Theorem 1.2, then this implies that Lifshitz tails for both Γ and the stacked model $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ follow from Corollary 1.3 in this situation.

1.5. Sierpinski gasket graph. We briefly discuss the Sierpinski gasket graph (Figure 3), which is a fractal graph. It is not roughly isometric to any \mathbb{Z}^d , but it satisfies a similar type of heat kernel bounds, called *sub-Gaussian* heat kernel bounds (for \mathbb{Z}^d , one has *Gaussian* heat kernel bounds). The sub-Gaussian heat kernel bounds allow us to obtain the Landscape Law upper bound Theorem 1.2(ii), for Jacobi operators on the Sierpinski gasket graph. (Section 5.3.)




FIGURE 3. Sierpinski gasket graph. This is a graph embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 whose edges are essentially the edges of triangles in a Sierpinski triangle. The bottom left corner is 0, each edge is length 1, and the graph grows unboundedly in the positive x and y directions.

1.6. Random band models. In this part, we discuss the graph induced by a band matrix on \mathbb{Z}^d , for which we will see all assumptions required for the Lifshitz tails (1.16) in Corollary 1.3 hold. More precisely, let $\Gamma_{d,W} = (\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{E}_W)$ be a (naturally weighted) graph with the vertex set \mathbb{Z}^d . For a positive integer W , the edge set \mathcal{E}_W is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_W = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < \|x - y\| \leq W\}, \quad (1.18)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ can be the 1-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$ (induced by the shortest path metric d_0 on \mathbb{Z}^d), or the ∞ -norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$, or the Euclidean-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$, or any other norm which is equivalent to these norms. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we then write $x \sim y$ iff $0 < \|x - y\| \leq W$. The Jacobi operator in (1.3) is denoted as $H_{d,W}$ and acts on functions on $\Gamma_{d,W}$ as

$$H_{d,W}f(x) = \sum_{y:y \sim x} (f(x) - \mu_{xy}f(y)) + V_x f(x). \quad (1.19)$$

The (negative) Laplacian on $\Gamma_{d,W}$, denoted as $-\Delta_{d,W}$, is given by setting $\mu_{xy} = 1$ and $V_x = 0$ in $H_{d,W}$. An example of the graph for $W = 2$, $d = 1$ is shown in Figure 4, where the matrix representation of the negative Dirichlet sub-graph Laplacian $-\Delta_{1,2}^I$, $I = \llbracket 1, 7 \rrbracket$ is

$$-\Delta_{1,2}^I = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 4 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 4 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The random operator $H_{d,W}$ in matrix form corresponds to adding the potential V_x to the diagonal, and replacing off-diagonal -1 s with the appropriate $-\mu_{xy}$.

For general d and W , the band graph $\Gamma_{d,W}$ is a notable example where all assumptions required in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold. We will prove this later in Section 5.1. As a consequence, we obtain both the landscape law and the Lifshitz tails,

Corollary 1.4 (application to random band matrices). *Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $H_{d,W}^A$ be the restriction of $H_{d,W}$ on A . Then the Landscape Law (1.8), (1.9), and (1.10) holds with $\alpha = d$, where all constants c_i depend only on d, W .*




FIGURE 4. The graph $\Gamma_{1,2} = (\mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{E}_2)$ consists of vertices \mathbb{Z} and edges $\mathcal{E}_2 = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : 0 < |i - j| \leq 2\}$.

If $\{\mu_{xy}\}$ and $\{V_x\}$ are sets of i.i.d. random variables with the same assumptions in Theorem 1.2, and A satisfies (1.13), then there are constants c_i, E_0 only depending on d and W such that

$$c_1 \mathbb{E} N_u(c_2 E) \leq \mathbb{E} N(E) \leq c_3 \mathbb{E} N_u(c_4 E) \quad (1.20)$$

for all $E > 0$. Additionally,

$$c_5 E^{d/2} (F(c_6 E))^{c_7 E^{-d/2}} \leq \mathbb{E} N_u(E), \mathbb{E} N(E) \leq c_8 E^{d/2} (F(c_9 E))^{c_{10} E^{-d/2}}, \quad (1.21)$$

for all $c_0(\text{diam} A)^{-2} \leq E \leq E_0$.

Lifshitz tails for random band matrices were also proved in [37], using different methods (a variational argument and comparison with a diagonal model).

For other graphs such as the Penrose tiling or Sierpinski gasket graph, we do not have a complete understanding of the geometric properties that would be required to obtain all of the desired results as in Corollary 1.4, though we do obtain some of the results as discussed in previous sections. Instead, in Section 6, we numerically study the landscape law on some of these models, providing strong evidence that the landscape counting functions can be used to establish effective upper and lower bounds for the IDS across various models. Additionally, the numerics demonstrate the advantage of the landscape counting function in productively reflecting the Lifshitz tails through appropriate scalings.

1.7. Outline. The rest of this article is organized as follows.

- In Section 2, we introduce background and preliminaries concerning operators on graphs, the landscape function and landscape counting function, and rough isometries of graphs. We provide precise definitions for all terms and assumptions mentioned for the main results.
- In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.1, first the upper bound part (i), and then the lower bound part (ii).
- In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2 on the landscape law Lifshitz tails.
- In Section 5, we finish the proofs for applying the main results to the specific examples in Sections 1.4–1.6.
- Finally, in Section 6, we provide numerical results for Anderson models on the Penrose tiling and Sierpinski gasket, and for random band models with bond disorders.

Throughout the paper, constants such as C , c , and c_i may change from line to line. We will use the notation $X \lesssim Y$ to mean $X \leq cY$, and $X \gtrsim Y$ to mean $X \geq cY$, for some constant c depending only on Γ . If $X \lesssim Y \lesssim X$, we may also write $X \approx Y$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce graph operators and the landscape function, followed by the precise assumptions on the graphs and discussion concerning rough isometries.

2.1. Operators on graphs and the landscape function. For convenience, we collect several useful facts from graph operator theory and landscape function theory in this section. More background and details can be found in [1, §2], [36, §2], and the references therein.

We consider functions on the vertices of the graph, which will be denoted by the function space $C(\mathbb{V}) := \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{V}} = \{f : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$. We denote by $\mathbb{1} \in C(\mathbb{V})$ the function which is identically 1, and by $\mathbb{1}_A$ the indicator function of $A \subset \mathbb{V}$. The space $\ell^2(\mathbb{V})$ is defined via the ℓ^2 norm induced by the usual (non-weighted) inner product $\langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}} f(x)g(x)$. The subspaces $\ell^2(A)$ and $\ell^\infty(A)$ are defined accordingly for any finite subset $A \subset \mathbb{V}$.

For H^A as defined in (1.4), the corresponding quadratic form is

$$\langle f, H^A f \rangle = \sum_{x \in A} (\deg(x) + V_x) f(x)^2 - \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} f(x) f(y),$$

which can also be written as

$$\langle f, H^A f \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in A} (\deg(x) - \mu_x^A + V_x) f(x)^2,$$

where $\mu_x^A = \sum_{y \in A: y \sim x} \mu_{xy}$.

The following maximum principle will be useful in obtaining bounds on the landscape function.

Definition 2. For $A \subset \mathbb{V}$, we say $H^A : \ell^2(A) \rightarrow \ell^2(A)$ satisfies the (weak) maximum principle if $\inf_{x \in A} (H^A f)(x) \geq 0$ implies $\inf_{x \in A} f(x) \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2.1, [36]). *Let $A \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a finite subset. If H^A is strictly positive and satisfies the (weak) maximum principle, then $\langle x | (H^A)^{-1} | y \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in A$. As a consequence, the landscape function $u_A(x) = (H^A)^{-1} \mathbb{1}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in A$.*

The (weak) maximum principle holds widely, including for H (and its restriction H^A) given in (1.3).

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 2.2, [36]). *Let H be as in (1.3), and let H^A be its restriction on $\ell^2(A)$ for some finite subset $A \subset \mathbb{V}$. Assume that $0 \leq \mu_{xy} = \mu_{yx} \leq 1$ and $V_x \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in A$. Then H^A is self-adjoint and has positive spectrum, and satisfies the (weak) maximum principle as in Definition 2.*

Lemma 2.3 (Landscape uncertainty principle). *There is a unique $u = u^A \in \mathcal{H}^A := \ell^2(A)$ such that $H^A u = \mathbb{1}_A$. In addition, for $f \in \mathcal{H}^A$,*

$$\langle f, H^A f \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A: \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} u(x) u(y) \left(\frac{f(x)}{u(x)} - \frac{f(y)}{u(y)} \right)^2 + \sum_{x \in A} \frac{f^2(x)}{u(x)}. \quad (2.1)$$

2.2. Graph properties and assumptions. Roughly speaking, we will want to work on graphs that are amenable to tools from harmonic analysis. This will allow us to adapt tools and methods from [9, 1]. Our first obstruction in moving from \mathbb{R}^d or \mathbb{Z}^d to graphs comes from the non-regular geometry. For the landscape laws in [9, 1], the periodic structure of \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{Z}^d was used to construct perfect partitions of cubes and perform arguments utilizing the resulting translation invariance. For graphs, we have no such possibilities and instead must work with *coverings* rather than partitions, and with certain collections of coverings rather than translation invariance. To this end, we will need certain geometric covering properties. We have the following covering results which are consequences of the volume control assumption (1.1).

Proposition 2.4 (covering properties). *Assume volume control (1.1). Then the following properties hold.*

(a) *Finite overlap:* Then there is a constant $b_\Gamma > 0$ such that for any $R \geq 1$, there is a covering $\mathcal{P}(R) = \{B(z_i, R), z_i \in \mathbb{V}\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{V}} \#\{B \in \mathcal{P}(R) : y \in B\} \leq b_\Gamma < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

(b) *Translation replacement:* There are constants C and b so that for any $0 < \kappa < 1$ and $R \geq 1$, there is a collection of at most $C\kappa^{-\alpha}$ covers $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R) = \{B(z_i^{(j)}, R)\}_i$, all with finite covering constant b , so that $\bigcup_j \bigcup_i B(z_i^{(j)}, \kappa R)$ is a covering (not necessarily with any particular covering constant) of Γ .

Proof of Proposition 2.4. (a) Follows from [7, Lemma 6.2].

(b) First, we can cover a ball $B(z, R)$ with $\leq C_\Gamma \kappa^{-\alpha}$ smaller balls $\{B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R)\}_j$, where $x^{(j)} \in B(z, R)$, using a similar volume comparison argument as in [7, Lemma 6.2]. Take a maximal set of points $x^{(j)} \in B(z, R)$ so that $B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R/2)$ are disjoint, and let M be the number of such points. Then $\bigcup_{j=1}^M B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R)$ covers $B(z, R)$ by maximality, and $\bigcup_{j=1}^M B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R/2)$ is a disjoint union contained in the larger ball $B(z, 3R/2)$. Thus

$$C_U (3/2)^\alpha R^\alpha \geq |B(z, 3R/2)| \geq \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^M B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R/2) \right| = \sum_{j=1}^M |B(x^{(j)}, \kappa R/2)| \geq M \tilde{C}_L 2^{-\alpha} \kappa^\alpha R^\alpha,$$

where $\tilde{C}_L := \min(C_L, 1)$, so that $M \leq \frac{C_U}{\tilde{C}_L} 3^\alpha \kappa^{-\alpha}$.

Next, let $\mathcal{P}(R/2) = \{B(z_i, R/2)\}_i$ be a covering with finite overlap constant b_Γ as in (2.2). For each ball $B(z_i, R/2)$, cover it by the M_i smaller balls $\mathcal{C}_i = \{B(x_i^{(j)}, \kappa R/2)\}_{j=1}^{M_i}$ as described above (with radius $R/2$). We form the covers $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R)$ by taking one center $x_i^{(j)}$ from each \mathcal{C}_i . By repeating the elements of \mathcal{C}_i , we can ensure there are $M = \lfloor \frac{C_U}{\tilde{C}_L} 3^\alpha \kappa^{-\alpha} \rfloor$ elements in \mathcal{C}_i . Then for $j = 1, \dots, M$, define

$$\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R) = \{B(x_i^{(j)}, R)\}_i,$$

which covers Γ since $B(x_i^{(j)}, R) \supset B(z_i, R/2)$. By construction, $\bigcup_i \bigcup_{j=1}^M B(x_i^{(j)}, \kappa R)$ covers Γ (even with radii $\kappa R/2$ instead). Finally, each $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R)$ has finite overlap covering constant

$$\#\{i : y \in B(x_i^{(j)}, R)\} \leq \#\{i : y \in B(z_i, 2R)\} \leq \frac{C_U}{C_L} 8^\alpha b_\Gamma,$$

using (2.3) in Lemma 2.5 for the last inequality. \square

Example 1. For the standard \mathbb{Z}^d lattice, we can consider different balls, such as a cube (ℓ^∞ ball), Euclidean ℓ^2 ball, or ℓ^1 (graph/natural metric) ball, and construct explicit coverings that satisfy Proposition 2.4. For example, the finite overlap property in part (a) is clear for cubes, and follows for the other balls, for example by embedding a cube within each ball and considering a covering with those cubes.

For part (b), we can use the fact that \mathbb{Z}^d does have translation invariance. Given a cover $\mathcal{P}(R) = \{B(z_i, R)\}_i$ with finite overlap constant as in (a), consider its translation $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R) = \{B(T^j z_i, R)\}_i$ where T^j is a translation (affine map) mapping the center z_i to $T^j z_i \in B(z_i, R)$. Then for $r < R$, considering cubes or cubes embedded in the other balls, we only need at most $C(R/r)^d$ many T^j so that $\{B(T^j z_i, r)\}_j$ covers $B(z_i, R)$ for any fixed i , and then $\bigcup_i \bigcup_j B(T^j z_i, r)$ covers \mathbb{Z}^d .

Under the finite overlap covering property in (2.3), we prove the following two lemmas, first that one also obtains a finite overlap property for larger balls with the same centers, and second,

that the landscape counting function N_u defined in (1.6) is comparable (up to a constant factor) across different choices of coverings \mathcal{P} .

Lemma 2.5 (Scaled finite overlap covering property). *Under the volume control $\text{Vol}(B(x, r)) \asymp r^\alpha$ from (1.1), the finite overlap condition (2.2) for a partition $\mathcal{P}(r) = \{B(z_i, r)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ implies that for any $\lambda \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{V}} \#\{z_i : y \in B(z_i, \lambda r)\} \leq \frac{2^\alpha C_U}{C_L} \lambda^\alpha b_\Gamma. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. This is a volume comparison. In what follows, z_i will always denote a center of a ball in the given covering $\mathcal{P}(r)$. First, the set $\{z_i : y \in B(z_i, \lambda r)\} = \{z_i : d(y, z_i) \leq \lambda r\}$ is the set $\{z_i : z_i \in B(y, \lambda r)\}$. Let $S = \bigcup_{z_i \in B(y, \lambda r)} B(z_i, r)$, which is contained in $B(y, \lambda r + r)$. By equation (2.2), each point $x \in S$ can appear in at most b_Γ of the balls $B(z_i, r)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z_i \in B(y, \lambda r)} |B(z_i, r)| &= \sum_{x \in S} \#\{B(z_i, r) : x \in B(z_i, r)\} \\ &\leq b_\Gamma |B(y, \lambda r + r)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|B(z_i, r)| \geq C_L r^\alpha$ and $|B(y, \lambda r + r)| \leq C_U (\lambda + 1)^\alpha r^\alpha$, this yields,

$$\#\{z_i : z_i \in B(y, \lambda r)\} = \sum_{z_i \in B(y, \lambda r)} 1 \leq b_\Gamma \frac{C_U (\lambda + 1)^\alpha r^\alpha}{C_L r^\alpha} = \frac{C_U}{C_L} (\lambda + 1)^\alpha b_\Gamma.$$

□

If we consider different coverings with similar radii R and R' , the corresponding landscape counting functions differ only by a constant pre-factor depending on Γ . This allows us to work with any specific choice of partition \mathcal{P} satisfying the finite overlap property (2.2), since the resulting landscape counting functions are equivalent up to the constant factor.

Lemma 2.6 (partition comparison). *Suppose Γ has volume growth control (1.1). Let \mathcal{P} be a covering of balls of radius R , and \mathcal{P}' a covering of balls of radius R' . Suppose that $R' \leq C_0 R$ and that \mathcal{P} has cover overlap constant b_Γ in (2.2). Then for any region A and energy E ,*

$$N_u^{\mathcal{P}(R), A}(E) \leq (1 + C_0)^\alpha C_\Gamma b_\Gamma N_u^{\mathcal{P}'(R'), A}(E).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}|_A = \{B \in \mathcal{P} : B \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that since any point $x \in B \cap A$ with $\frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E$ is also contained in some $B' \in \mathcal{P}'|_A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A : \min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E\} &\subseteq \{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A : B \text{ overlaps some } B' \in \mathcal{P}'|_A \text{ with } \min_{x \in B' \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\substack{B' \in \mathcal{P}'|_A \\ \min_{x \in B' \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E}} \{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A : B \text{ overlaps } B'\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

If $B = B(z, R)$ and $B' = B(z', R')$ overlap, we must have $d(z, z') \leq R + R' \leq (1 + C_0)R$. By (2.3) in Lemma 2.5 applied to z' , there can be at most $(1 + C_0)^\alpha C_\Gamma b_\Gamma$ balls $B \in \mathcal{P}$ with centers satisfying $d(z, z') \leq (1 + C_0)R$. Thus the cardinality of (2.4) is bounded above by $N_u^{\mathcal{P}'(R'), A}(E)(1 + C_0)^\alpha C_\Gamma b_\Gamma$. □

Next, we discuss several traditional concepts from harmonic analysis that are known to carry over to the discrete setting on graphs.

Definition 3. The graph Γ satisfies a (weak) Poincaré inequality (PI) if there exist C_P and $\lambda \geq 1$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $r \geq 1$, if $B = B(x, r)$, $B^* = B(x, \lambda r)$ and $f : B^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\sum_{x \in B} (f(x) - \bar{f}^B)^2 \leq C_P r^2 \sum_{x, y \in B^*: x \sim y} (f(x) - f(y))^2 \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\bar{f}^B = \frac{1}{\deg(B)} \sum_{x \in B} f(x) \deg(x), \quad \deg(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{V}: y \sim x} 1, \quad \deg(B) = \sum_x \deg(x). \quad (2.6)$$

It is well-known that the standard \mathbb{Z}^d graph satisfies the weak PI (2.5), see e.g. [7, Cor. 3.30]. Note also that by embedding different balls within each other, if the graph Γ satisfies the weak PI with one particular metric for defining the balls, then it also satisfies the weak PI (with possibly different scaling constant λ) with any strongly equivalent metric.

Remark 2.1. In general, one can consider a β -Poincaré inequality for any $\beta \geq 2$, with the power r^β rather than r^2 in (2.5). Under a β -Poincaré inequality, if one revises the definition of $N_u(E)$ in (1.6) using covers $\mathcal{P}(E^{-1/\beta})$ of radius $E^{-1/\beta}$ rather than $E^{-1/2}$, then one can still obtain the landscape law upper bound (1.8). We will discuss this further for the Sierpinski gasket graph in Section 5.3.

The weak PI is known to be connected to several other notions concerning random walks and harmonic analysis on graphs. For any $B_r = B(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{V}$, let Δ^{B_r} be the Dirichlet Laplacian on $B(x_0, r)$,

$$(\Delta^{B_r} f)(x) = \sum_{y \in B_r(x_0): y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x)), \quad (2.7)$$

and let $G_r(x, y) = (-\Delta^{B_r})^{-1}(x, y)$ be the Green's function on such a ball $\bar{B}(x_0, r)$.

Proposition 2.7. *If Γ satisfies the weak PI (2.5) and volume control (1.1) with parameter $\alpha \geq 1$, then it also satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) *Moser–Harnack inequality for subharmonic functions: There exists a constant C_H such that for any $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $r > 0$ and non-negative subharmonic function $f(x)$ (that is, $f(x) \geq 0$ and $-\Delta f(x) \leq 0$), then*

$$\sup_{y \in B(x, r)} f(y)^2 \leq \frac{C_H}{|B(x, 2r)|} \sum_{y \in B(x, 2r)} f(y)^2. \quad (2.8)$$

- (ii) *Free landscape/exit time upper bound: There is a positive constant c such that for $x \in \mathbb{V}$, $r \geq 1$, and $B = B(x, r)$,*

$$(-\Delta^B)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_B(x) \leq cr^2. \quad (2.9)$$

(Additionally, by the maximum principle Lemma 2.2, the inequality also holds for the landscape function $u_B \leq (-\Delta^B)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_B$.)

- (iii) *Green's function estimates: For any $x \in B_R(x_0)$, let $r = d(x_0, x)$. There are constants C_1, C_2 depending only on α and the ratio $\frac{R}{r} > 1$, such that*

$$C_1 r^{2-\alpha} \leq G_R(x_0, x) \leq C_2 r^{2-\alpha}, \quad x \in \partial B_r \cup \partial^i B_r. \quad (2.10)$$

- (iv) *Gaussian heat kernel bounds HKC($\alpha, 2$). (In fact, one has equivalence.) These are defined in terms of the natural graph metric d_0 and continuous time heat kernel $q_t(x, y) = \mathbb{P}_x(Y_t = y) / \deg(y)$, where Y_t is the continuous time simple random walk on Γ , as*

$$\frac{c_3}{t^{\alpha/2}} \exp(-c_4 d_0(x, y)^2/t) \leq q_t(x, y) \leq \frac{c_1}{t^{\alpha/2}} \exp(-c_2 d_0(x, y)^2/t), \quad (2.11)$$

for $t \geq \max(1, d_0(x, y))$.

Proofs and references for the above results can be found in the textbook [7], particularly Theorems 6.19 and 7.18, and Lemma 4.21. We make two brief remarks concerning the proofs:

- (1) First, for property (i), Theorem 7.18 in [7] states the elliptic Harnack inequality (EHI) for harmonic functions. The Moser–Harnack inequality (2.8) for subharmonic functions can be derived from the harmonic version via standard elliptic PDE techniques. We include details for the discrete case in Appendix C for the reader’s convenience.
- (2) Second, while we do not directly work with the probabilistic Laplacian as in [7], the results still follow since the Laplacian (2.7) differs only by multiplication by the diagonal matrix of vertex degrees, which has bounded, nonzero entries by the bounded geometry and connectedness properties.

The properties (i)–(iii) in Proposition 2.7 will be utilized in the landscape law proofs. We will see in Section 2.3 that Assumption 1 and the weak Poincaré inequality, which are required for the Landscape Law, will be preserved under rough isometry between graphs. Since the required properties hold for \mathbb{Z}^d , then the landscape law Theorem 1.1 will hold for all graphs roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d as well. While these examples have integer values of $\alpha = d$, Ref. [8] constructed graphs satisfying heat kernel bounds $\text{HK}(\alpha, \beta)$ for any real $\alpha \geq 1$ and $2 \leq \beta \leq 1 + \alpha$.

In order to apply the Moser–Harnack inequality in the proof of Theorem 1.1(ii), we will use the following corollary, which uses that the landscape function u^A always satisfies $-\Delta u^A(y) \leq 1$ for $y \in \Gamma$.

Corollary 2.8 (Moser–Harnack for landscape). *Let $r \geq 1$. Suppose Γ satisfies the exit time upper bound (2.9), and that $f \geq 0$ satisfies $-\Delta f(y) \leq 1$ for all $y \in B(x, 2r)$. Then the Moser–Harnack inequality (2.8) implies*

$$\sum_{y \in B(x, 2r)} f(y)^2 \geq (2C_H)^{-1} |B(x, 2r)| \left(\sup_{B(x, r)} f(y)^2 - c_2 r^4 \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Proof. Let $B^* := B(x, 2r)$, and let $u_0^{B^*}$ be the free landscape function $u_0^{B^*} = -\Delta_{B^*}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{B^*}$. Set $g := f - u_0^{B^*} + \|u_0^{B^*}\|_\infty$, which then satisfies $g \geq 0$ and for $x \in B^*$, $-\Delta g(x) \leq 0$. Applying the Moser–Harnack inequality and the exit time bound (2.9) for $u_0^{B^*}$ then yields (2.12). \square

In order to obtain the Lifshitz tail upper bound in Theorem 1.2(ii) for N_u , we will also require control on the lower bound of a “harmonic weight” on balls. Most of the time, we work on the natural balls given by the graph or chemical metric $d_0(x, y)$ (shortest-path distance) on Γ . However, for specific applications, it may be more convenient to consider other distance functions $d(x, y)$ which are (strongly) equivalent to d_0 , in the sense that $c_1 d_0(x, y) \leq d(x, y) \leq c_2 d_0(x, y)$ for some universal constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on Γ . We thus state Assumption 2 in terms of a more general metric function, since it may be easier to verify the required properties for a different metric. We will denote by $B_R^d = B^d(\xi, R)$ the ball of radius of R with respect to the metric d , and by $B_R = B_R^{d_0}$ the natural metric ball. Immediately, there is $c > 0$ so that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{V}$ and $r \geq 0$,

$$B(\xi, r/c) \subset B^d(\xi, r) \subset B(\xi, cr). \quad (2.13)$$

The mean value property of a harmonic function f on \mathbb{R}^d (on Euclidean balls) states that $f(\xi) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(\xi, R))} \int_{B(\xi, R)} f(y) dy$. The integral weight for such an \mathbb{R}^d -harmonic function is thus the constant function $\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(B(\xi, R))}$. A similar mean value property holds for harmonic functions on graphs, but with a general “harmonic weight” function (cf. (2.16)), which also depends on

the metric on the graph. In general, the harmonic weight is not unique, and not necessarily a constant (with respect to the volume of the ball), as it is for \mathbb{R}^d .

For the natural graph metric d_0 , we have $\partial B(\xi, \rho) = B(\xi, \rho + 1) \setminus B(\xi, \rho)$, which gives a filtered structure $B(\xi, R) = \{\xi\} \cup \bigcup_{\rho=0}^{R-1} \partial B(\xi, \rho)$. There is then the following natural way to define a harmonic weight and the volume average on $B(\xi, R)$, explicitly through the Poisson kernel or random walk hitting measure on each layer. Letting Y_n be a discrete-time simple random walk and $\tau_A := \min\{n \geq 0 : Y_n \notin A\}$ the exit time from a region A , one can take a harmonic weight $h_{B(\xi, R)} : B(\xi, R) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for the ball $B(\xi, R)$ to be

$$h_{B(\xi, R)}(y) = \frac{1}{R+1} \mathbb{P}_x[Y_{\tau_{B(\xi, r)}} = y; \tau_{B(\xi, r)} < \infty], \quad \text{where } r := d_0(\xi, y). \quad (2.14)$$

This corresponds to values of the Poisson kernel of the ball $B(\xi, r)$, normalized by $R+1$ since we will average over $R+1$ layers. More precisely, the Poisson kernel $H_A : \bar{A} \times \partial A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of a region A is defined as $H_A(x, y) = \mathbb{P}_x[Y_{\tau_A} = y]$. For f harmonic in A with boundary values $f(y)$, $y \in \partial A$, then

$$f(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[f(Y_{\tau_A})] = \sum_{y \in \partial A} H_A(x, y) f(y). \quad (2.15)$$

Thus for f harmonic at points in $B(\xi, R-1)$, we have

$$f(\xi) = \frac{1}{R+1} \sum_{r=0}^R \sum_{y \in \partial B(\xi, r-1)} H_{B(\xi, r)}(\xi, y) f(y) = \sum_{y \in B(\xi, R)} h_{B(\xi, R)}(y) f(y),$$

where the $r=0$ term corresponds to just $y = \xi$ and $h_{B(\xi, 0)}(\xi, \xi) = 1/(R+1)$. For further background and details, see Appendix A and [27, §6.2], [7, Thm. 2.5].

For a general metric d , the boundary of a ball $\partial B^d(x, r)$ may not relate nicely to larger balls. One can still introduce a harmonic weight in a similar spirit as the above, but which is technically more involved.

We are most interested in the case when there is a harmonic weight that is uniformly bounded from below on most parts of the ball.

Assumption 2. There is a metric d on Γ , strongly equivalent to the natural metric d_0 , such that the following hold. Given $R > 0$, $\xi \in \mathbb{V}$, and $B_R^d(\xi) = B^d(\xi, R)$, there exists a function (the harmonic weight) $h_{B_R^d(\xi)}(y) : B_R^d(\xi) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying

- Submean property: if f is Δ -subharmonic in the sense $-\Delta f \leq 0$ (on a set containing $B_R^d(\xi) \cup \partial B_R^d(\xi)$), then

$$f(\xi) \leq \sum_{y \in B_R^d(\xi)} h_{B_R^d(\xi)}(y) f(y), \quad (2.16)$$

and the equality holds if $\Delta f = 0$.

- Uniform lower bound: there is a constant $c > 0$, depending only on Γ , and a ‘bad’ subset $X_R(\xi) \subseteq B_R^d(\xi)$ such that

$$h_{B_R^d(\xi)}(y) \geq \frac{c}{|B_R^d(\xi)|}, \quad y \in B_R^d(\xi) \setminus X_R(\xi), \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_R(\xi)|}{|B_R^d(\xi)|} = 0. \quad (2.17)$$

From the preceding discussion, we see the continuous analogue of both properties holds immediately on \mathbb{R}^d with $X_R = \emptyset$. In [1], a statement similar to (2.17) was obtained for \mathbb{Z}^d cubes (ℓ^∞ -balls), based on explicit formulas of the Green’s function and Poisson kernel on cubes (see Lemma 4.3 of [1]). More generally, for the band graph $\Gamma_{d,W}$ (1.18), we will prove in Section 5.1 that such a harmonic weight exists with respect to the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{Z}^d , based on surface

area control and Poisson kernel estimates in e.g. [27]. We are curious about such properties on general graphs, in particular:

Question 1. What properties of a graph Γ guarantee the existence of a harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d}$ such that Assumption 2 holds?

2.3. Rough isometries and properties preserved under them. Here we finally formally define rough isometries between (unweighted) graphs and summarize several key properties preserved under them. We refer readers to [7] for further details.

Definition 4 (rough isometry).

- Let (X_1, d_1) and (X_2, d_2) be metric spaces. A map $\varphi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is a *rough isometry* if there exists constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$C_1^{-1}(d_1(x, y) - C_2) \leq d_2(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq C_1(d_1(x, y) + C_2),$$

$$\bigcup_{x \in X_1} B_{d_2}(\varphi(x), C_2) = X_2.$$

If there exists a rough isometry between two spaces then they are *roughly isometric*, and this is an equivalence relation.

- Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be connected graphs whose vertices have uniformly bounded degrees. A map $\varphi : \mathbb{V}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_2$ is a *rough isometry* if:
 - (1) φ is a rough isometry between the metric spaces $(\mathbb{V}_1, d_{\Gamma_1})$ and $(\mathbb{V}_2, d_{\Gamma_2})$ with constants C_1 and C_2 .
 - (2) there exists $C_3 < \infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{V}_1$,

$$C_3^{-1} \deg(x) \leq \deg(\varphi(x)) \leq C_3 \deg(x).$$

Two graphs are *roughly isometric* if there is a rough isometry between them, and this is an equivalence relation.

Example 2. The band graph $\Gamma_{d,W}$ in (1.18) is roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d , see e.g. [36, §3.2.1].

Example 3. We revisit the Penrose tiling vertex graph Γ_P from Section 1.3, which we now view as embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 with edges of length 1, to provide details demonstrating it is roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^2 . Like in [39], which considered another graph derived from the Penrose tiling (the tile graph rather than vertex graph), we start by comparing Γ_P to $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^2$ for a small $\varepsilon > 0$. Letting $\psi : \Gamma_P \rightarrow \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^2$ be the map defined by taking $x \in \Gamma_P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to a closest point $\psi(x) \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^2$, we obtain for $x \neq y$ and sufficiently small ε (which ensures that ψ is injective),

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2}d_{\Gamma_P}(x, y) &\geq \sqrt{2}\|x - y\|_2 \geq \|x - y\|_1 \geq \|\psi(x) - \psi(y)\|_1 - \|x - \psi(x)\|_1 - \|y - \psi(y)\|_1 \\ &\geq c\|\psi(x) - \psi(y)\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

since $\|x - \psi(x)\|_1$ and $\|y - \psi(y)\|_1$ are both of order ε , while $\|\psi(x) - \psi(y)\|_1 \geq c_0 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ is lower-bounded using the minimum distance between two corners of the rhombi. Then defining $\varphi : \Gamma_P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ via $\varphi(x) = \varepsilon^{-1}\psi(x)$, we obtain for $x \neq y$ in Γ_P ,

$$\sqrt{2}d_{\Gamma_P}(x, y) \geq c\varepsilon\|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\|_1 = c\varepsilon d_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)).$$

Additionally, $d_{\Gamma_P}(x, y) \leq C_1 d_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) + C_2$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$: One can consider the set of rhombi \mathcal{R} in the tiling that intersect the straight line segment L between x and y (including intersections on edges and corners). This set \mathcal{R} allows for a path in Γ_P between x and y of length at most twice the cardinality of \mathcal{R} . The number $\#\mathcal{R}$ of such rhombi scales with the length $|L| = \|x - y\|_2$ by area considerations (take for example the rectangle around L of five units in each direction, which covers \mathcal{R}), and so $d_{\Gamma_P}(x, y) \leq C_{1,\varepsilon} d_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) + C_{2,\varepsilon}$.

Finally, there is a numerical constant C (based on the maximum distance between corners of rhombi) so that $\bigcup_{x \in \Gamma_P} B_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(\varphi(x), C\varepsilon^{-1}) = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

As is readily seen, rough isometry preserves bounded geometry (1.2) and (as can be seen with more work) volume control (1.1) (cf. [7, Exercise 4.16]), so that Assumption 1 is preserved under rough isometry. The next proposition states that Proposition 2.4 and the weak Poincaré inequality are also preserved under rough isometry.

Proposition 2.9. *Assume volume control (1.1). The following properties are preserved under rough isometries.*

- (i) *Finite overlap property in Proposition 2.4(a) (with a possibly different constant b_Γ , depending on the rough isometry constants).*
- (ii) *Translation-type property in Proposition 2.4(b).*
- (iii) *The weak Poincaré inequality (Definition 3).*
- (iv) *Gaussian heat kernel estimates $\text{HKC}(\alpha, 2)$ as in (2.11).*

Note that Proposition 2.9(iii) combined with Proposition 2.7 implies that if a graph Γ with volume control satisfies the weak Poincaré inequality, then it and any graph roughly isometric to it also satisfy the Moser–Harnack inequality and exit time upper bound (2.9). For the proofs of Proposition 2.9(iii,iv), see [7, Thms. 3.33, 6.19]. Parts (i) and (ii) follow automatically from Proposition 2.4 since volume control (1.1) is preserved by rough isometry.

3. PROOF OF THE LANDSCAPE LAW FOR GRAPHS AND RANDOM HOPPING MODELS

In this section, we prove the Landscape Law for graphs and Jacobi/random hopping models as stated in Theorem 1.1. In the upper bound, the main differences from the \mathbb{R}^d or \mathbb{Z}^d case are that we repeatedly use the finite covering property in Proposition 2.4(a) to make up for not having a clean partition into cubes, and that since the bond weights μ_{xy} can become arbitrarily close to (or equal to) zero, we must separately truncate and bound these small bond weights using leftover diagonal terms (Lemma 3.1). We must also consider boundary terms coming from inner and outer boundaries of graph balls, as well as the relation to the non-regular shape of A , carefully throughout.

In the lower bound, the main difference from \mathbb{R}^d or \mathbb{Z}^d is to utilize Proposition 2.4(b) to make up for not having a clean partition or translation invariance. Combined with Proposition 2.4(a) and scaling in Lemma 2.6, this will allow us to handle comparisons with overlapping covers. Additionally, by allowing for overlapping covers and graph-dependent constants, the proof we give actually provides a simpler proof of the \mathbb{Z}^d case from [1].

3.1. Proof of the Landscape Law upper bound, Theorem 1.1(i). Let $r(E) = E^{-1/2}$ be the covering radius for the partition, and define the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ B \in \mathcal{P}^A(r(E)) : \min_{x \in B} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right\},$$

so that the landscape counting function (1.6) is $N_u(E) = \frac{\#\mathcal{F}}{|A|}$.

Case I: We first consider $r(E) = E^{-1/2} \geq 1$. The other case $r(E) = E^{-1/2} < 1$ (large E) corresponds to balls consisting only of a single point, and follows immediately from the landscape uncertainty principle as described in Case II near the end of this subsection.

Let

$$S = \left\{ f \in \ell^2(A) : \bar{f}^B \equiv \frac{1}{\deg(B)} \sum_{x \in B} f(x) \deg(x) = 0, \quad B \in \mathcal{F} \right\},$$

where \bar{f}^B is the weighted average of f (w.r.t. the natural weight) on B and $\deg(x)$ is the degree in the graph Γ , as in the weak PI (2.6). We will show that for $f \in S$, that $\langle f, H^A f \rangle \geq C_1 E \langle f, f \rangle$, so that $N(C_1 E) \leq \text{codim } S$. For any set B , let $v_B \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{V})$ be the vector with elements $\deg(x)$ for $x \in B$ and 0 otherwise. Then the space S is the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}(\{v_B : B \in \mathcal{F}\})$. The balls B in \mathcal{F} may not be disjoint, but this does not matter, since we just need an upper bound on $\text{codim}(S) = \dim(\text{span}(\{v_B : B \in \mathcal{F}\})) \leq \#\mathcal{F}$. Hence,

$$\text{codim} S \leq \#\mathcal{F},$$

and the main work is to bound $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$ from below for $f \in S$, which will lead to an upper bound on the number of eigenvalues below an energy E in terms of $\text{codim} S$.

In order to obtain a bound like $C_1 E \langle f, f \rangle \leq \langle f, H^A f \rangle$, we consider coordinates $x \in A$ in the sum $\langle f, f \rangle = \sum_{x \in A} f(x)^2$ according to whether they are in a ball $B \in \mathcal{P}^A \setminus \mathcal{F}$ or in a ball $B \in \mathcal{F}$. Coordinates $x \in A$ may be in both types of balls, but due to the finite covering property in Proposition 2.4, such overcounting is allowable. We start with balls $B \in \mathcal{P}^A \setminus \mathcal{F}$. In this case, the property $\min_{x \in B} \frac{1}{u(x)} \geq E$ implies that

$$E \sum_{B \notin \mathcal{F}} \sum_{x \in B \cap A} f(x)^2 \leq \sum_{B \notin \mathcal{F}} \sum_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} f(x)^2 \leq b_\Gamma \sum_{x \in A} \frac{1}{u(x)} f(x)^2 \leq b_\Gamma \langle f, H^A f \rangle, \quad (3.1)$$

where we used the finite covering property (2.3) followed by the landscape uncertainty principle (2.1) for the last two inequalities.

For $B \in \mathcal{F}$, we first apply the weak Poincaré inequality (2.5) to $f \in S$ with $\bar{f}^B = 0$ to obtain,

$$\sum_{x \in B} f(x)^2 = \sum_{x \in B} (f(x) - \bar{f}^B)^2 \leq C_P r^2 \sum_{x, y \in B^* : x \sim y} (f(x) - f(y))^2, \quad (3.2)$$

where $B = B(z_i, r)$ and $B^* = B(z_i, \lambda r)$ are given as in (2.5). It remains to bound the right hand side of (3.2) from above by $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$. Note that the kinetic energy term (non-potential term) in the Hamiltonian H^A defined in (1.4) has a weight $\mu_{xy} \in [0, 1]$, which may take the degenerate value zero. If we had $\mu_{xy} \geq \varepsilon > 0$ for all μ_{xy} , then (3.2) is readily bounded using the kinetic term in (1.4) and the finite-overlap property. In the general case where μ_{xy} takes values arbitrarily close (or equal to) 0, we first must truncate the weight μ_{xy} and compare the resulting kinetic energy to an additional diagonal term which can be eventually absorbed into $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$. The following truncation lemma allows us to compare the kinetic term in $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$, which may have degenerate weights μ_{xy} , to the right hand side of (3.2). The proof of the lemma is given at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.1 (ε -cutoff). *For $\mu_{xy} \in [0, 1]$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\mu_{xy}^\varepsilon = \max\{\varepsilon, \mu_{xy}\}$. Then for any region $R \subseteq \Gamma$,*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy}^\varepsilon (f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + 4\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1} \sum_{x \in R} (\deg^R x - \mu_x^R) f(x)^2. \quad (3.3)$$

As a consequence, by choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{5}$,

$$\sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq 10 \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in R} (\deg^R x - \mu_x^R) f(x)^2 \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Applying the above equation (3.4) to B^* in (3.2), and recalling that $r^2 = E^{-1}$, we obtain for $f \in S$,

$$\sum_{x \in B} f(x)^2 \leq 10C_P E^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B^* \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in B^*} (\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^*}) f(x)^2 \right). \quad (3.5)$$

For showing the right side of (3.5) is bounded by a factor of $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$, one complication is that B^* may contain points outside A . This will be handled using the $\deg(x) - \mu_x^A$ term in $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$ as follows. Using that f is zero outside A and that $\mu_{xy} = \mu_{yx}$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B^* \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in B^*} (\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^*}) f(x)^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} (\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^*}) f(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} \sum_{\substack{y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} \sum_{\substack{y \in B^*, y \notin A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} f(x)^2 \\ & = \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} (\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^* \cap A}) f(x)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} \sum_{\substack{y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

The diagonal term can be bounded using $\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^* \cap A} \leq \deg(x) - \mu_x^A$, and the kinetic term using that by (2.3), for any function $g \geq 0$ on A ,

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}^A} \sum_{x \in B^* \cap A} g(x) = \sum_{x \in A} g(x) \#\{B \in \mathcal{P}^A : x \in B^*\} \leq C\lambda^\alpha b_\Gamma \sum_{x \in A} g(x).$$

Applying these bounds in (3.6) and summing over $B \in \mathcal{F}$ then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{B \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B^* \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in B^*} (\deg^{B^*} x - \mu_x^{B^*}) f(x)^2 \right] \\ & \leq C\lambda^\alpha b_\Gamma \sum_{x \in A} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + (\deg(x) - \mu_x^A) f(x)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As the latter is exactly $C\lambda^\alpha b_\Gamma \langle f, H^A f \rangle$, combining with (3.1) and (3.5) then yields

$$E \sum_{x \in A} f(x)^2 \leq E \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}^A} \sum_{x \in B} f(x)^2 \leq C_1 \langle f, H^A f \rangle,$$

for $C_1 = (10C_P C\lambda^\alpha + 1)b_\Gamma$. Therefore, the number of eigenvalues of H^A below $C_1^{-1}E$ is bounded from above by the codimension of the subspace S , that is, for $E \leq 1$,

$$N(C_1^{-1}E) \leq \frac{\#\mathcal{F}}{|A|} = N_u(E). \quad (3.7)$$

By rescaling the energy as $\tilde{E} = C_1 E \leq 1$, we obtain that for $E \leq C_1^{-1}$,

$$N(E) \leq N_u(C_1 E). \quad (3.8)$$

Case II: $r(E) = E^{-1/2} < 1$. In this case, we just have

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ x \in A : \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right\}, \text{ and } S = \{ f \in \ell^2(A) : f(x) = 0, \text{ if } x \in \mathcal{F} \}.$$

For $f \in \mathcal{S}$, the landscape uncertainty principle (2.1) then implies

$$\langle f, H^A f \rangle \geq \sum_{x \in A} \frac{f(x)^2}{u(x)} = \sum_{x \notin \mathcal{F}} \frac{f^2(x)}{u(x)} \geq E \sum_{x \in A} f(x)^2,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1(i). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.1 (ε -cutoff). Start by writing

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy}^\varepsilon (f(x) - f(y))^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ \mu_{xy} \geq \varepsilon}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y \\ \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon}} \varepsilon (f(x) - f(y))^2.$$

We upper bound the last term by comparing it to a sum involving $\deg^R x - \mu_x^R$. Since $\mu_{xy} = \mu_{yx}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ x \sim y \\ \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon}} \varepsilon (f(x) - f(y))^2 &\leq 2\varepsilon \sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon}} (f(x)^2 + f(y)^2) \\ &= 4\varepsilon \sum_{x \in R} f(x)^2 \cdot \#\{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\#\{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon\}$ is large, then so is $\deg^R x - \mu_x^R$: Using $\mu_x^R = \sum_{y \in R} \mu_{xy}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_x^R = \sum_{y \in R} \mu_{xy} &\leq \sum_{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon} \varepsilon + \sum_{y \in R : \mu_{xy} \geq \varepsilon} 1 \\ &= \varepsilon \#\{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon\} + \deg^R x - \#\{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \#\{y \in R : \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon\} \leq \deg^R x - \mu_x^R.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{x, y \in R \\ \mu_{xy} < \varepsilon}} \varepsilon (f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq 4\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)^{-1} \sum_{x \in R} (\deg^R x - \mu_x^R) f(x)^2,$$

which gives (3.3). \square

3.2. Proof of the Landscape Law lower bound, Theorem 1.1(ii). Similar to the landscape law upper bound, if we can bound $\langle f, H^A f \rangle$ from above by E on some subspace $\mathcal{S}' \subset \ell^2(A)$, then the eigenvalue counting function at E will be at least the dimension of \mathcal{S}' . In what follows, we will consider $0 < \kappa < 1/4$.

Case I: First we consider $E \leq c^2$ for $0 < c < 1$ to be determined later. In view of the constants inside the argument of N_u in (1.9), we pre-emptively take the partition radius $R = (c\kappa^{-1})E^{-1/2}$. As we will be using the Moser–Harnack inequality (2.12), we will need to work with smaller balls, say of radius $r = \kappa R$ for $0 < \kappa < 1/4$. With the condition $E < c^2$, then $r \geq 1$ and $R \geq 4$.

For a ball $B = B(z, R)$, denote by $\check{B} := B(z, r)$ the smaller ball with the same center z , and set

$$\mathcal{F}' = \left\{ B \in \mathcal{P}(R) : \min_{x \in \check{B}} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{x \in B} \frac{1}{u(x)} \geq \kappa^2 E \right\}.$$

First we define a preliminary set \mathcal{S}_0 as

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = \text{span} \{u\chi_B : B = B(z, R) \in \mathcal{F}'\},$$

where $\chi_{B(z, R)}$ denotes a cut-off function supported on $B(z, R)$ defined via

$$\chi_{B(z, R)}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B(z, R/2) \\ 0, & x \notin B(z, R) \\ 1 - \frac{2}{R}(d(z, x) - R/2), & R/2 \leq d(z, x) \leq R \end{cases}. \quad (3.9)$$

Note that for adjacent $x \sim y \in B(z, R/2)$, that

$$|\chi_{B(z, R)}(x) - \chi_{B(z, R)}(y)| \leq \frac{4}{R}.$$

The functions in \mathcal{S}_0 need not be orthogonal or linearly independent due to the overlap allowed in the covering. To remedy this, we construct \mathcal{F}'' and \mathcal{S}' as follows: To choose a set of disjoint balls $\mathcal{F}'' = \{B(z, R)\}$ from \mathcal{F}' , go through the balls in \mathcal{F}' , and for each ball $B(z, R)$ still remaining, remove all other balls that overlap with $B(z, R)$. Let \mathcal{F}'' be the set of remaining balls. If two balls overlap, then their centers satisfy $d(z, z_i) \leq 2R$, and so by the finite cover property (2.3), there can only be $C_\Gamma b_\Gamma$ balls that overlap $B(z, R)$. So for each ball we kept for \mathcal{F}'' , we only removed at most $C_\Gamma b_\Gamma - 1$ balls from \mathcal{F}' . Since $\#\mathcal{F}' = \#\mathcal{F}'' + \#\{\text{removed}\} \leq \#\mathcal{F}'' C_\Gamma b_\Gamma$, then we must have

$$\#\mathcal{F}'' \geq \frac{1}{C_\Gamma b_\Gamma} \#\mathcal{F}'.$$

Now take

$$\mathcal{S}' = \text{span} \{u\chi_B : B = B(z, R) \in \mathcal{F}''\}.$$

Since such $u\chi_B$ have disjoint supports, they are linearly independent and $\dim \mathcal{S}' = \#\mathcal{F}''$. Additionally, their supports are separated from each other by distance at least $R \geq 4$, so that $\langle u\chi_B, H^A(u\chi_{B'}) \rangle = 0$ for different balls $B, B' \in \mathcal{F}''$.

Now we want to bound $\frac{\langle u\chi_B, H^A(u\chi_B) \rangle}{\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle}$ from above for each $u\chi_B \in \mathcal{S}'$. First, by the landscape uncertainty principle (2.1) and using that $\max_{x \in B} u(x) \leq \kappa^{-2} E^{-1}$ by the definition of \mathcal{F}' , we can bound the numerator as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u\chi_B, H^A(u\chi_B) \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \\ x \sim y}} \mu_{xy} u(x) u(y) (\chi_B(x) - \chi_B(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in A} u(x) \chi_B(x)^2 \\ &\leq C M_\Gamma |B(z, R+1)| (\kappa^{-4} E^{-2}) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^2 + |B(z, R)| (\kappa^{-2} E^{-1}) \\ &\leq c_1 R^{\alpha-2} \kappa^{-4} E^{-2} + c_1 R^\alpha \kappa^{-2} E^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

For the denominator, using $\chi_{B(z, R)}(x) = 1$ for $x \in B(z, R/2)$ which includes $B(z, 2r)$, followed by the Moser–Harnack inequality (2.12) yields for $r \geq 1$,

$$\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle \geq \sum_{x \in B(z, 2r)} u(x)^2 \geq c'_H |B(z, 2r)| \left(\sup_{y \in B(z, r)} u(y)^2 - c_2 r^4 \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Using that $\max_{y \in B(z, r)} u(y) \geq E^{-1}$ by the definition of \mathcal{F}' and that $r = \kappa R = cE^{-1/2}$, then (3.11) becomes

$$\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle \geq C \kappa^\alpha R^\alpha E^{-2} (1 - c_2 c^4) \geq c_3 \kappa^\alpha R^\alpha E^{-2}, \quad (3.12)$$

provided that c is chosen small enough that $c_2 c^4 < 1$.

Combining (3.12) and (3.10) and using $R = \kappa^{-1}cE^{-1/2}$ then yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle u\chi_B, H^A(u\chi_B) \rangle}{\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle} &\leq c'_1\kappa^{-\alpha-4}R^{-2} + c'_2\kappa^{-\alpha-2}E \\ &= C_2\kappa^{-\alpha-2}E. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Since the $u\chi_B$ for $B \in \mathcal{F}''$ have disjoint supports separated from each other by distance at least $R \geq 4$, the bound (3.13) holds for all linear combinations $f \in \mathcal{S}'$, and we obtain

$$N(C_2\kappa^{-\alpha-2}E) \geq \frac{1}{|A|} \dim \mathcal{S}' \geq \frac{1}{|A|C_\Gamma b_\Gamma} \#\mathcal{F}'.$$

Now to compare $\#\mathcal{F}'$ favorably to $N(E)$, we will need to make use of Proposition 2.4(b). From this property, there are covers $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R) = \{B(z_i^{(j)}, R)\}_i$, for $j = 1, \dots, C\kappa^{-\alpha}$, all with a finite covering constant b_Γ , and such that $\bigcup_j \bigcup_i B(z_i^{(j)}, \kappa R)$ is also a cover (not necessarily with a particular covering constant), say $\tilde{P}(r)$. Applying the preceding argument to any $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(C_2\kappa^{-\alpha-2}E) &\geq \frac{1}{|A|C_\Gamma b_\Gamma} \left(\#\{B(z_i^{(j)}, R) \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)} : \min_{B(z_i^{(j)}, r)} \frac{1}{u} \leq E\} - \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \#\{B(z_i^{(j)}, R) : \min_{B(z_i^{(j)}, R)} \frac{1}{u} \leq \kappa^2 E\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

The negative term $|A|^{-1}\#\{B(z_i^{(j)}, R) : \min_{B(z_i^{(j)}, R)} \frac{1}{u} \leq \kappa^2 E\}$ is already $N_u^{\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R)}(\kappa^2 E)$. For the first term, we apply (3.14) to each cover $\mathcal{P}^{(j)}(R)$, $j = 1, \dots, C\kappa^{-\alpha}$, and take the sum, which results in the landscape counting function $N_u^{\tilde{P}(r)}(E)$ for the covering $\tilde{P}(r)$ with smaller radius $r = \kappa R = cE^{-1/2}$. With the summation, we obtain

$$N(C_2\kappa^{-\alpha-2}E) \geq (C_\Gamma b_\Gamma)^{-1} C^{-1} \kappa^\alpha N_u^{\tilde{P}(r)}(E) - c_\Gamma N_u^{\mathcal{P}(R)}(\kappa^2 E), \quad (3.15)$$

where the $N_u^{\mathcal{P}(R)}(\kappa^2 E)$ term is for any partition $\mathcal{P}(R)$ with finite overlap constant b_Γ , and is comparable to $N_u(\kappa^2 E)$. While $\tilde{P}(r)$ may not have a particular covering constant, we only need to note that $N_u^{\tilde{P}(r)}$ upper bounds N_u (up to the geometric constant in Lemma 2.6).

Case II: $E > c^2$. In this case $r = cE^{-1/2} < 1$, so that $\check{B} = B(z, r) = \{z\}$. Retaining the definitions of \mathcal{F}' and \mathcal{F}'' from before, then for any $B(z, R)$ in \mathcal{F}' or \mathcal{F}'' , we have $u(z)^2 \geq E^{-2}$. If $R = c\kappa^{-1}E^{-1/2} \geq 4$, corresponding to $c^2 < E \leq c^2(4\kappa)^{-2}$, then the numerator upper bound (3.10) still holds. A lower bound

$$\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle \geq u(z)^2 \geq E^{-2}$$

is immediate, and so using $E > c^2$ we obtain

$$\frac{\langle u\chi_B, H^A u\chi_B \rangle}{\langle u\chi_B, u\chi_B \rangle} \leq \frac{c_1 R^{\alpha-2} \kappa^{-4} E^{-2} + c_1 R^\alpha \kappa^{-2} E^{-1}}{E^{-2}} \leq C_3 \kappa^{-\alpha-2} E,$$

which is the same scaling of κ as in (3.13), leading to the same form as (3.15).

If instead $0 < R < 4$, so that $E > c^2(4\kappa)^{-2}$, then we make an adjustment to \mathcal{S}' to ensure the supports are far enough apart. Define \mathcal{F}' as before, and form \mathcal{F}'' by going through each ball $B(z, R)$ in \mathcal{F}' , and removing all other balls whose centers z_i are within distance 2 of z . By volume control (1.1), there are at most $C_U 2^\alpha$ points within distance 2 of z , so

$$\#\mathcal{F}'' \geq \frac{1}{C_U 2^\alpha} \#\mathcal{F}.$$

Then take $\mathcal{S}' = \text{span}\{\mathbb{1}_z : z \in \mathcal{F}''\}$. Since $E > c^2(4\kappa)^{-2}$, the landscape uncertainty principle implies for any $z \in \mathcal{F}''$,

$$\langle \mathbb{1}_z, H^A \mathbb{1}_z \rangle \leq M_\Gamma \kappa^{-4} + \kappa^{-2} E \leq C_4 \kappa^{-2} E,$$

which leads to

$$N(C_4 \kappa^{-2} E) \geq \frac{1}{|A|} \dim \mathcal{S}' \geq \frac{1}{C_U 2^\alpha |A|} \#\mathcal{F}',$$

and a similar lower bound as (3.15), except the bound is for $N(C_4 \kappa^{-2} E)$.

Rescaling: With new constants c_1, c_2 and applying Lemma 2.6 (noting that the constants that arise from having $R = (c\kappa^{-1})E^{-1/2}$ can be taken independent of κ since $\kappa < 1/4$), Cases I and II in summary imply,

$$\begin{aligned} N(C_2 \kappa^{-\alpha-2} E) &\geq c_1 \kappa^\alpha N_u(E) - c_2 N_u(\kappa^2 E), \quad \text{for } E \leq c^2, \\ N(C_3 \kappa^{-\alpha-2} E) &\geq c_1 \kappa^\alpha N_u(E) - c_2 N_u(\kappa^2 E), \quad \text{for } c^2 < E \leq c^2(4\kappa)^{-2}, \\ N(C_4 \kappa^{-2} E) &\geq c_1 N_u(E) - c_2 N_u(\kappa^2 E), \quad \text{for } E > c^2(4\kappa)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Rescaling and using that $N(E)$ is (non-strictly) increasing in E , we obtain for a constant c^* , that

$$\begin{aligned} N(E) &\geq c_1 \kappa^\alpha N_u(c_3 \kappa^{\alpha+2} E) - c_2 N_u(c_4 \kappa^{\alpha+4} E), \quad \text{for } E \leq c^* \kappa^{-4}, \\ N(E) &\geq c'_1 N_u(c'_3 \kappa^2 E) - c'_2 N_u(c'_4 \kappa^4 E), \quad \text{for } E > c^* \kappa^{-4}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1(ii). \square

Note that when E is small, the above argument requires the domain to contain at least one small ball of radius $r \approx E^{-1/2}$, leading to the condition $\text{diam}A \gtrsim E^{-1/2}$. The restrictions on $\text{diam}A$ can however be removed easily. If $\text{diam}A \lesssim E^{-1/2}$, then $\max_A u \lesssim (\text{diam}A)^2 \lesssim E^{-1}$. Hence, $N_u(cE)$ vanishes for some constant c depending only on Γ , leading to $N(E) \geq 0 = N_u(cE)$. In other words, the landscape law lower bound (1.9) holds (neglecting the negative term on the right hand side) trivially when $\text{diam}A$ is small.

4. LIFSHITZ TAILS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COUNTING FUNCTION

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 on Lifshitz tails for the landscape counting function for Jacobi operators on graphs. The process of establishing Lifshitz tails behavior of N_u was done in [9] for \mathbb{R}^d and then extended to \mathbb{Z}^d in [1]. In those settings, only cubes with periodic boundary conditions and diagonal disorder were considered for simplicity. In the current paper, we work on a general domain A with Dirichlet boundary conditions and consider both diagonal and off-diagonal disorder. The argument follows the general approach of the \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{Z}^d cases, though requires additional consideration for the general graph structure and shape of balls, lack of exact formulas, and metric in Assumption 2. One example where these assumptions are satisfied is the graph induced by a random band model, which we will discuss in Section 5.1.

Recall we are interested in a Jacobi operator of the form (1.3) where $\{\mu_{xy}\}$ and $\{V_x\}$ are each sets of i.i.d. random variables, and that such an operator can be written in the form

$$Hf(x) = \sum_{y:y \sim x} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y)) + (\sigma_x + V_x) f(x),$$

where

$$\sigma_{xy} = 1 - \mu_{xy}, \quad \sigma_x = \sum_{y:y \sim x} \sigma_{xy} = \text{deg}(x) - \mu_x.$$

The corresponding quadratic form is

$$\langle f, Hf \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y: y \sim x} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_x (\sigma_x + V_x) f(x)^2.$$

For a finite $A \subset \Gamma$, the Dirichlet restriction of H is

$$H^A f(x) = \sum_{y \in A: y \sim x} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y)) + (\sigma_x^A + V_x) f(x)$$

and

$$\langle f, H^A f \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \mu_{xy} (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in A} (\sigma_x^A + V_x) f(x)^2, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\sigma_x^A = \sum_{\substack{y \in A \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} = \deg(x) - \mu_x^A$.

The Lifshitz tail lower bound proof follows the same method as for \mathbb{R}^d or \mathbb{Z}^d , but accounts for the random hopping terms and uses the “sufficient overlap with balls” property to make up for not having a partition into cubes. The upper bound proof will require more adaptation, in particular dealing with the different metrics in Assumption 2, and the lack of exact formulas for e.g. the Green’s function and Poisson kernel which were utilized in the \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{Z}^d cases.

4.1. Lifshitz tails lower bound: proof of Theorem 1.2(i). For $E > 0$, let $R = mE^{-1/2}$ for an m to be specified later depending only on Γ , and let $\mathcal{P} = \{B(z_i, R)\}_i$ be a cover of Γ . We will require $R \geq 1$, i.e. $E \leq m^2 := E_0$, so that we may later apply volume control (1.1).

From the landscape counting function definition, we have

$$\mathbb{E} N_u^{\mathcal{P}}(E) = \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A} \mathbb{P} \left[\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right], \quad (4.2)$$

so to prove the lower bound (1.14), we will want to bound $\mathbb{P}[\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E]$ from below in terms of the CDF F .

Denote by kB the scaled ball $B(z, kR)$, and let $0 \leq \chi_B \leq 1$ be the discrete cut-off function supported on $2B$ defined as

$$\chi_B(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B \\ 0, & x \notin 2B \\ 1 - \frac{E^{1/2}}{m} (d(z, x) - mE^{-1/2}), & mE^{-1/2} \leq d(z, x) \leq 2mE^{-1/2} \end{cases}.$$

Note for $x \sim y \in 2B$, that $|\chi_B(x) - \chi_B(y)| \leq \frac{E^{1/2}}{m}$.

Applying the landscape uncertainty principle (2.1) along with (4.1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in 2B} \frac{\chi_B^2(x)}{u(x)} &\leq \langle \chi_B, H^A \chi_B \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \\ y \sim x}} (\chi_B(x) - \chi_B(y))^2 + \sum_{x \in A} (\sigma_x^A + V_x) \chi_B(x)^2 \\ &\leq M_\Gamma |B(z, 2R + 1)| \frac{E}{m^2} + |2B| (M_\Gamma \max_{\substack{x, y \in 3B \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} + \max_{x \in 2B} V_x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Since

$$\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq \frac{1}{|B \cap A|} \sum_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq \frac{1}{|B \cap A|} \sum_{x \in 2B} \frac{\chi_B^2(x)}{u(x)},$$

we then obtain using (4.3), the volume control (1.1), and the condition (1.13) that $|A \cap B(x, R)| \gtrsim R^\alpha$ for $R \leq C \text{diam } A$ and $x \in A$, that

$$\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq c_1 \frac{E}{m^2} + c_2 \max_{\substack{x, y \in 3B \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} + c_2 \max_{x \in 2B} V_x.$$

Choosing $m^2 = 2c_1$ and using independence of the random variables then yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right] &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[c_2 \max_{\substack{x, y \in 3B \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} + c_2 \max_{x \in 2B} V_x \leq \frac{1}{2} E \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[c_2 \max_{\substack{x, y \in 3B \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} \leq \frac{1}{4} E \right] \mathbb{P} \left[c_2 \max_{x \in 2B} V_x \leq \frac{1}{4} E \right] \\ &\geq (F_\mu(c_3 E))^{c_4 E^{-\alpha/2}} (F_V(c_5 E))^{c_6 E^{-\alpha/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus with (4.2), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} N_u^{\mathcal{P}}(E) \geq \frac{\#\{B \in \mathcal{P}', B \cap A \neq \emptyset\}}{|A|} (F_\mu(c_3 E))^{c_4 E^{-\alpha/2}} (F_V(c_5 E))^{c_6 E^{-\alpha/2}}.$$

Since \mathcal{P} is a covering of A , we must have

$$\#\{B \in \mathcal{P}, B \cap A \neq \emptyset\} \geq \frac{|A|}{|B|} \geq cmE^{\alpha/2}|A|,$$

which completes the proof of (1.14). \square

4.2. Lifshitz tails upper bound: proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). For $E > 0$, set $R = c_0 E^{-1/2}$ for c_0 to be determined later (cf. Lemma 4.1), and set $\mathcal{P} = \{B(z_i, R)\}_i$ be a covering of Γ satisfying (2.3) with a finite overlap constant b_Γ . Using (4.2), then

$$\mathbb{E} N_u^{\mathcal{P}}(E) \leq \frac{\#\{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A\}}{|A|} \max_{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A} \mathbb{P} \left[\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right], \quad (4.4)$$

and so we must bound $\mathbb{P} \left[\min_{x \in B \cap A} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right]$ from above for each $B \in \mathcal{P}$. This is achieved by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.2(ii), there is $0 < E_* < 1$ and $c_i > 0$ such that for $E < E_*$ and any x_0 ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\min_{x \in B(x_0, c_0 E^{-1/2})} \frac{1}{u(x)} \leq E \right] \leq c_1 (F(c_2 E))^{c_3 E^{-\alpha/2}}. \quad (4.5)$$

Assuming this lemma, we then have

Proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). By the finite covering assumption with constant b_Γ , and sufficient overlap of A with balls of radius $R \leq \text{diam } A$, observe that

$$\frac{\#\{B \in \mathcal{P}|_A\}}{|A|} \leq cE^{\alpha/2},$$

and so (1.15) follows immediately from (4.4) and (4.5). \square

The key ingredient to prove Lemma 4.1 is the following deterministic result for the growth of the landscape function u .

Lemma 4.2 (landscape growth). *Let $u = u^A$ be the landscape function for H^A . Choose $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in \Gamma$ with $B(x_0, r) \cap A \neq \emptyset$, and let*

$$J_r = J_{r, x_0} = \left\{ x \in B(x_0, r) \cap A : V_x \geq mr^{-2} \text{ or } \sum_{\substack{y \in B(x_0, r) \cap A \\ y \sim x}} (1 - \mu_{xy}) \geq mr^{-2} \right\}, \quad (4.6)$$

for a constant $m > 0$ to be chosen later. Then under the assumptions in Theorem 1.2(ii), for any $0 < \lambda < 1$, there are $\varepsilon < 1$, $M, m, r_* > 1$, depending only on α and λ , such that if the following two conditions hold for $r_* \leq r \leq 2 \operatorname{diam} A$:

(i) there is $\xi \in B(x_0, r)$ such that

$$u(\xi) \geq Mr^2, \quad (4.7)$$

(ii) there is the lower bound on the size of J_r ,

$$|J_r| \geq \lambda |B(x_0, r) \cap A|, \quad (4.8)$$

then for $R = (1 + \varepsilon)r$, there is $\xi' \in B(\xi, CR) \cap A$ such that

$$u(\xi') \geq (1 + 3\varepsilon)u(\xi) \geq MR^2, \quad (4.9)$$

where $C = 2c^2$ with the constant $c > 0$ given in (2.13).

One of the key ingredients of the proof of Lemma 4.2 is that the landscape function u is superharmonic. We will use submean properties of u , together with conditions on μ_{xy}, V_x in (4.8), to obtain the growth of u on a larger ball. Recall that due to Assumption 2, we will work with assumptions on a general metric d rather than on the natural metric d_0 . Balls with respect to the metric d will always be denoted with a superscript, such as B_ρ^d or $B^d(\xi, \rho)$, while balls with respect to the natural metric d_0 will either not have the superscript or will be identified with a superscript d_0 .

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $\xi \in B(x_0, r)$ satisfy $u(\xi) \geq Mr^2$ as in (4.7). Let the d -metric ball B_R^d and a harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d}$ be given as in Assumption 2, satisfying (2.16) and (2.17).

Before starting with the main cases of the proof, we introduce several useful quantities. We will need to consider weighted averages of the landscape function u on balls and spheres, with respect to the metric d and the associated harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d}$. To that end, denote by a_ρ^d the weighted surface average of u on the exterior boundary $\partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$,

$$a_\rho^d = \sum_{y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho)} P_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y) u(y), \quad \rho \geq 0,$$

where $P_{B_\rho^d}$ is the Poisson kernel (centered at ξ , with respect to Δ) defined as in (A.1) on $\partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$.

Next, denote by A_ρ^d the weighted volume average of u on $B^d(\xi, \rho)$, with respect to $h_{B_R^d}$, defined as

$$A_\rho^d = \sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, \rho)} h_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y) u(y), \quad (4.10)$$

One can verify the following by taking a constant function in the integration by parts formula (A.3),

$$\sum_{y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho)} P_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, \rho)} h_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y) = 1.$$

The key properties of a_ρ^d and A_ρ^d we will need are the following, which follow from submean properties of Δ using that $-\Delta u \leq 1$ pointwise on $B^d(x, \rho)$:

$$a_\rho^d \geq u(\xi) - c_0\rho^2, \quad (4.11)$$

$$A_\rho^d \geq u(\xi) - c_0\rho^2. \quad (4.12)$$

- For (4.11), let u' be the solution to $-\Delta u' = 1$ on $B^d(\xi, \rho)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$. By Proposition 2.7 and equivalence of the metric d with the natural metric, u' satisfies $0 \leq u'(\xi) \leq c_0\rho^2$. Let w be harmonic with boundary data $w(y) = u(y)$ for $y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$. By (A.2) then $w(\xi) = a_\rho^d$. Set $f := w + u' - u$, so $-\Delta f \geq 0$ and $f = 0$ on the boundary $\partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$. Then $f = w + u' - u \geq 0$ by the maximum principle, which yields

$$u(\xi) \leq u'(\xi) + w(\xi) \leq c_0\rho^2 + a_\rho.$$

- Let u' be as above. Then $-\Delta(u - u') \leq 0$. For (4.12), using the submean property (2.16) and the non-negativity of $h_{B_\rho^d}$ and u' , we obtain

$$u(\xi) - u'(\xi) \leq \sum_{y \in B_\rho^d} h_{B_\rho^d} [u(y) - u'(y)] \leq \sum_{y \in B_\rho^d} h_{B_\rho^d} u(y) = A_\rho^d,$$

which yields (4.12).

Given $\xi \in B(x_0, r)$, we will work on enlarged balls centered at ξ containing $B(x_0, r)$ (with slightly larger radius under the different metric). In particular, let $c > 0$ be the scaling constant between the metric d_0 and d in (2.13), so that

$$B(x_0, r) \subset B(\xi, 2r) \subset B^d(\xi, 2cr) \subset B(\xi, 2c^2r). \quad (4.13)$$

Let A_{2cr}^d be the weighted average of u on the d -metric ball $B^d(\xi, 2cr)$ of radius $2cr$, as given in the definition (4.10). Then (4.12) yields

$$A_{2cr}^d \geq u(\xi) - c_1r^2.$$

Now let J_r be given in (4.6) where m will be picked later, and satisfying (4.8). By the conditions $|B(z, r) \cap A| \geq c_2r^\alpha$ for $r < C \text{diam } A$, (4.8), and $r \leq C \text{diam } A$, we have

$$|J_r| \geq \lambda |B(x_0, r) \cap A| \geq c_2\lambda r^\alpha. \quad (4.14)$$

Let

$$I_r = \{x \in J_r : u(x) < \frac{1}{2} A_{2cr}^d\}, \quad (4.15)$$

which describes $x \in J_r$ where $u(x)$ takes small values, and let

$$S_1 = \sum_{y \in I_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y), \quad S_2 = \sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \setminus I_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y) = 1 - S_1.$$

Now we are ready to look for ξ' satisfying (4.9) by considering the following two cases:

Case I: $|I_r| \geq \frac{1}{2}|J_r|$. In this case, we have many points x where $u(x)$ is much smaller than the weighted average A_{2cr}^d . As a consequence, the remaining values $u(x)$ must be large to compensate for those in I_r . More precisely, summing over the complement of I_r , the definition of I_r implies

$$\frac{\sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \setminus I_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y)u(y)}{\sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \setminus I_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y)} \geq \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}S_1}{1 - S_1} A_{2cr}^d \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}S_1\right) A_{2cr}^d.$$

If $S_1 \geq 4c_3$ for some $c_3 > 0$ (depends only on Γ and λ), then we will be done, since then there is some $\xi' \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \setminus I_r$ with $u(\xi') \geq (1 + 2c_3)A_{2cr}^d$. Using (4.12) and $u(\xi) \geq Mr^2$ with a sufficiently large M then implies

$$u(\xi') \geq (1 + 2c_3)\left(u(\xi) - c_1r^2\right) \geq (1 + 2c_3)(1 - c_1/M)u(\xi) \geq (1 + c_3)u(\xi),$$

provided $M \geq (1 + 2c_3)c_1/c_3$.

To show we have $S_1 \geq 4c_3$, first apply Assumption 2 to obtain a $c_4 > 0$ and subset $X_r \subset B^d(\xi, 2cr)$ such that

$$h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y) \geq \frac{c_4}{|B^d(\xi, 2cr)|}, \quad y \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \setminus X_r, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_r|}{|B^d(\xi, 2cr)|} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

The lower bound on $|J_r|$ from (4.14) and of $h_{B_{2cr}^d}$ from (4.16) imply for sufficiently large $r > r_*(\lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{y \in I_r \setminus X_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y) + \sum_{y \in I_r \cap X_r} h_{B_{2cr}^d}(y) \geq \frac{c_4}{|B^d(\xi, 2cr)|} |I_r \setminus X_r| \\ &\geq \frac{c_5}{r^\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{2} |J_r| - o(|B^d(\xi, 2cr)|) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{c_5}{r^\alpha} \left(\frac{c_2}{2} \lambda r^\alpha - \frac{c_2}{4} \lambda r^\alpha \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} c_2 c_5 \lambda := 4c_3. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is enough to pick $3\varepsilon \leq c_3 = \frac{1}{16} c_2 c_5 \lambda$ so that (4.9) holds for $\xi' \in B^d(\xi, 2cr) \subset B(\xi, 2c^2r) \subset B(\xi, 2c^2R)$. Since $u(x) = 0$ for $x \notin A$, it is clear that $\xi' \in A \cap B(\xi, 2c^2R)$.

Case II: $|I_r| < \frac{1}{2}|J_r|$. Take $R = (1 + \varepsilon)r$ for some $\varepsilon \leq 1$, which gives $R^2 - r^2 \leq 3\varepsilon r^2$. Let a_{2r}, a_{2R} and G_{2r}, G_{2R} be the surface averages of u and the Green's functions on $B_{2r} = B(\xi, 2r), B_{2R} = B(\xi, 2R)$, with respect to the natural metric d_0 (we omit the superscript d_0 on the balls for simplicity), respectively. Applying the discrete Green's identity (integration by parts formula) (A.2) to both B_{2r} and B_{2R} yields

$$a_{2R} - a_{2r} = \sum_{x \in B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, x) \Delta u(x) + \sum_{x \in B_{2r}} (G_{2R}(\xi, x) - G_{2r}(\xi, x)) \Delta u(x). \quad (4.17)$$

With the relation $\Delta u(x) = -1 + \sum_{y \in A: y \sim x} \sigma_{xy} u(y) + V(x)u(x)$, and defining

$$b_x = \begin{cases} \sum_{y \in A: y \sim x} \sigma_{xy} u(y) + V(x)u(x), & x \in A \\ 1, & x \notin A \end{cases}, \quad (4.18)$$

equation (4.17) then implies

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2R} - a_{2r} &\geq - \sum_{x \in B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, x) - \sum_{x \in B_{2r}} \left(G_{2R}(\xi, x) - G_{2r}(\xi, x) \right) + \\ &\quad + \sum_{x \in B_{2r}} \left(G_{2R}(\xi, x) - G_{2r}(\xi, x) \right) b_x. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

We next make two uses of the maximum principle for harmonic functions (see e.g. [36, Lemma 2.2]).

- Since $G_{2R}(\xi, x)$ is Δ -harmonic in $B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r}$, the maximum principle implies

$$\max_{y \in B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, x) \leq \max_{x \in \partial(B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r})} G_{2R}(\xi, x) = \max_{x \in \partial^{(i)} B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, x),$$

with the last inequality because $G_{2R}(\xi, x) = 0$ for $x \in \partial B_{2R}$.

- On the other hand, $G_{2R}(\xi, x) - G_{2r}(\xi, x)$ is Δ -harmonic in B_{2r} and equal to $G_{2R}(\xi, \cdot)$ on $\partial B_{2r}(\xi)$, so the maximum principle implies for $x \in B_{2r}$,

$$\min_{y \in \partial B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, y) \leq G_{2R}(\xi, x) - G_{2r}(\xi, x) \leq \max_{y \in \partial B_{2r}} G_{2R}(\xi, y).$$

Next, by Proposition 2.7, if $x \in \partial B_{2r} \cup \partial^{(i)} B_{2r}$, there are the Green's function bounds

$$c'_1 r^{2-\alpha} \leq G_{2R}(\xi, x) \leq c'_2 r^{2-\alpha},$$

where c'_1, c'_2 only depend on α and the ratio $\frac{2R}{2r} = 1 + \varepsilon$. Therefore, continuing from (4.19),

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2R} - a_{2r} &\geq -c'_2 r^{2-\alpha} |B_{2R} \setminus B_{2r}| - c'_2 r^{2-\alpha} |B_{2r}| + c'_1 r^{2-\alpha} \sum_{x \in B_{2r}} b_x \\ &\geq -c'_3 r^2 + c'_1 r^{2-\alpha} \left(\sum_{x \in B_{2r} \cap A} \sum_{\substack{y \in B_{2r} \cap A: \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} u(y) + \sum_{x \in B_{2r} \cap A} V_x u(x) \right) \\ &\geq -c'_3 r^2 + c'_1 r^{2-\alpha} \sum_{x \in J_r \setminus I_r} \left(\sum_{\substack{y \in B(x_0, r) \cap A: \\ y \sim x}} \sigma_{xy} + V_x \right) u(x), \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where in the last line we used that $J_r \subset B(x_0, r) \cap A \subset B(\xi, 2r) \cap A$. Recall that by the definition (4.6) of J_r , for all $x \in J_r$,

$$V_x + \sum_{y \in B(x_0, r) \cap A: y \sim x} (1 - \mu_{xy}) \geq m r^{-2},$$

and that by the definition of I_r in (4.15), for all $x \in J_r \setminus I_r$, $u(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} A_{2cr}^d$. Therefore, the last sum in (4.20) can be bounded from below as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in J_r \setminus I_r} \left(\sum_{y \in B(x_0, r) \cap A: y \sim x} \sigma_{xy} + V_x \right) u(x) &\geq m r^{-2} \left(\frac{1}{2} A_{2cr}^d \right) |J_r \setminus I_r| \\ &\geq m r^{-2} \left(\frac{1}{2} A_{2cr}^d \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} |J_r| \right) \geq \frac{1}{4} c_2 m r^{\alpha-2} \lambda A_{2cr}^d, \end{aligned}$$

where we have now made use of the Case II condition that $|I_r| < |J_r|/2$, and also applied the bound $|J_r| \geq c_2 \lambda r^\alpha$ in (4.14). Putting everything together, we thus obtain

$$a_{2R} - a_{2r} \geq -c'_3 r^2 + c'_1 r^{2-\alpha} \frac{1}{4} c_2 m r^{\alpha-2} \lambda A_{2cr}^d \geq -c'_3 r^2 + 4\varepsilon A_{2cr}^d,$$

provided $m \geq 16\varepsilon/(c'_1 c_2 \lambda)$.

Finally, applying the lower bounds of a_{2r} and A_{2cr}^d in (4.11) and (4.12), and the condition $r^2 \leq u(\xi)/M$ in (4.7), we obtain

$$a_{2R} \geq u(\xi) - c_0 r^2 - c'_3 r^2 + 4\varepsilon(u(\xi) - c_0 r^2) \geq (1 + 3\varepsilon)u(\xi),$$

provided $M \geq (c_0 + c'_3 + 4\varepsilon c_0)/\varepsilon$. Since $a_{2R} = \sum_{\partial B_{2R}} P_R(\xi, x) u(x)$ and $\sum_{\partial B_{2R}} P_R(\xi, x) = 1$, there is therefore $\xi' \in \partial B(\xi, 2R) \subset B(\xi, CR)$ such that

$$u(\xi') \geq (1 + 3\varepsilon)u(\xi),$$

where $C = 2c^2 > 2$ is the radius scaling constant given in (4.13). Just as in case I, $u(x) = 0$ for $x \notin A$ implies that $\xi' \in A \cap B(\xi, CR)$, which completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

Once Lemma 4.2 is established, if $u(\xi) \geq E^{-1} = Mr_0^2$, then one can attempt to apply the lemma inductively to construct a sequence of balls with growing radii $r_{k+1} = (1 + \varepsilon)r_k$ satisfying (4.9), until one exhausts the region A . Because the outcome (4.9) is inputted into the next application of Lemma 4.2, the only remaining condition we need to check each time to apply the lemma is (4.8). The probability that (4.8) holds in each step of the induction can be estimated in terms of the cumulative probability distribution function F_V and F_μ , leading to:

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For $E > 0$, let $r_0 = (ME)^{-1/2}$ be the initial scale to be used for Lemma 4.2, and let $\mathcal{P} = \{B(z_i, r_0)\}$ be a cover of Γ with the finite overlap property (2.3). For any ball $B(x_0, r_0) \in \mathcal{P}$, we will bound the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\min_{\xi \in B} \frac{1}{u(\xi)} \leq E\right\} = \mathbb{P}\left\{\exists \xi \in B(x_0, r_0) : u(\xi) \geq E^{-1} = Mr_0^2\right\} \quad (4.21)$$

from above. Considering the event $u(\xi) \geq Mr_0^2$, we will apply Lemma 4.2 repeatedly, assuming (4.8) holds, on each scale $r_k = (1 + \varepsilon)r_{k-1}$, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, until $r_K > \text{diam}A/2$. At this point, the conclusion (4.9) will no longer hold if we start with ξ_∞ where u obtains its maximum, and so somewhere along the way (for some $k = 1, \dots, K$), the condition (4.8) must have failed. This gives an upper bound for (4.21) in terms of probabilities of events of the form (4.8), which can in turn be bounded in terms of the CDFs F_V and F_μ .

For the first step, we start with the event $u(\xi_0) \geq Mr_0^2$ for some $\xi_0 \in B(x_0, r_0)$. We suppose the following event also holds

$$\mathcal{E}_0 := \left\{ |J_{r_0}| \geq \lambda |B(x_0, r_0) \cap A| \right\},$$

where $J_{r_0} = J_{r_0, x_0}$ is defined as in (4.6). Then Lemma 4.2 guarantees a point $\xi_1 \in B(\xi, Cr_1) \cap A$ such that $u(\xi_1) \geq Mr_1^2$. Note ξ_1 is contained in $B(x_0, Cr_0 + Cr_1) \cap A$ since

$$d(x_0, \xi_1) \leq d(x_0, \xi_0) + d(\xi_0, \xi_1) \leq r_0 + Cr_1 \leq C(r_0 + r_1).$$

As in the argument in the proof of Proposition 2.4(b), we only need at most $N_1 \leq c \left(\frac{r_0 + r_1}{r_1}\right)^\alpha$ many balls of radius r_1 to cover $B(x_0, Cr_0 + Cr_1)$, where c depends only on the overlap constant b_Γ in (2.3), and the volume control constants (and α) in (1.1). Then ξ_1 must be located in one of these balls, which we call $B(x_1^0, r_1)$. We denote by $B(x_1^i, r_1)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_1 - 1$ the rest of the balls of the same radius r_1 that we used to cover $B(x_0, Cr_0 + Cr_1)$. To apply Lemma 4.2 again, we will assume the following event holds,

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \bigcap_{i=0}^{N_1-1} \left\{ |J_{r_1, x_1^i}| \geq \lambda |B(x_1^i, r_1) \cap A| \right\},$$

where J_{r_1, x_1^i} , $i = 0, 1, \dots, N_1 - 1$ are defined as in (4.6) on different balls $B(x_1^i, r_1)$.

Inductively, suppose we have $\xi_k \in B(\xi_{k-1}, Cr_k) \cap A$ such that $u(\xi_k) \geq Mr_k^2$. We can check ξ_k is contained in $B(x_0, 2Cr_k/\varepsilon) \cap A$ since

$$d(x_0, \xi_k) \leq C(r_0 + r_1 + \dots + r_k) \leq Cr_k \frac{1}{1 - (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1}} \leq \frac{2Cr_k}{\varepsilon}.$$

We only need at most $N_k \leq c\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ many balls of radius r_k to cover $B(x_0, 2Cr_k/\varepsilon)$, where c again only depends on the overlap constant b_Γ in (2.3) and volume control constants (and α) in (1.1). Proceeding as before, the new event we need to assume to hold is

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \bigcap_{i=0}^{N_k-1} \left\{ |J_{r_k, x_k^i}| \geq \lambda |B(x_k^i, r_k) \cap A| \right\},$$

where $B(x_k^i, r_k)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$ are all the balls of radius r_k that we used to cover $B(x_0, 2Cr_k/\varepsilon)$.

When we reach the first radius such that $r_K > \text{diam}A/2$ with $u(\xi_K) \geq Mr_K^2$ for some $\xi_K \in B(x_0, 2Cr_K/\varepsilon) \cap A$, we then consider $\xi_\infty \in A$ where the maximum of u is attained. Since $u(\xi_\infty)$ is the maximum, then $u(\xi_\infty) \geq u(\xi_K) \geq Mr_K^2$. To apply Lemma 4.2, since $\text{diam}A/2 \leq r_K \leq \text{diam}A$, we only need $N_K \leq C \left(\frac{\text{diam}A}{r_K}\right)^\alpha \leq (2C)^\alpha \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ many balls $B(x_K^i, r_K)$ to cover the entire domain A . The corresponding event we need to assume holds is

$$\mathcal{E}_K := \bigcap_{i=0}^{N_K-1} \{|J_{r_K, x_K^i}| \geq \lambda |B(x_K^i, r_K) \cap A|\}.$$

Lemma 4.2 then produces a point $\xi' \in A$ such that $u(\xi') \geq (1 + 3\varepsilon)u(\xi_\infty) > u(\xi_\infty)$, which contradicts the maximality of $u(\xi_\infty)$. Thus

$$\{\exists \xi \in B(x_0, r_0) : u(\xi) \geq Mr_0^2\} \subset \left(\mathcal{E}_0 \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cdots \cap \mathcal{E}_K\right)^C = \mathcal{E}_0^C \cup \mathcal{E}_1^C \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{E}_K^C,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\min_{\xi \in B(x_0, r_0)} \frac{1}{u(\xi)} \leq E\right\} \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_0^C) + \cdots + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K^C). \quad (4.22)$$

Finally, it remains to estimate the probabilities of the events \mathcal{E}_k^C in terms of the CDFs F_V and F_μ . For any of the $x_k = x_k^i$, recall the definition of $J_{r_k} = J_{r_k, x_k}$ in (4.6) and rewrite $J_{r_k} = J_{r_k}^V \cup J_{r_k}^\mu$, where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{r_k}^V &= \{x \in B(x_k, r_k) \cap A : V_x \geq mr_k^{-2}\}, \\ J_{r_k}^\mu &= \{x \in B(x_k, r_k) \cap A : \sum_{y \in B(x_k, r_k) \cap A : y \sim x} (1 - \mu_{xy}) \geq mr_k^{-2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Because counting $J_{r_k}^\mu$ involves dependent variables, first bound its size in terms of the independent variables $\sigma_{xy} = 1 - \mu_{xy}$,

$$|J_{r_k}^\mu| \geq \frac{1}{2M_\Gamma} |\{\sigma_{xy} \geq mr_k^{-2} : x, y \in B(x_k, r_k) \cap A, x \sim y\}|.$$

Applying the Chernoff bound to the binomial random variables $|J_{r_k}^V|$ and $|\{\sigma_{xy} \geq mr_k^{-2}\}|$ with the optimal parameter (cf. [1, Lemma 4.5]), there are r_* and λ_* such that if $r_k \geq r_*$ and $\lambda \leq \lambda_*$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{|J_{r_k}^V| \leq \lambda |B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|\} \leq F_V(mr_k^{-2})^{|B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|/2} \leq F_V(mr_k^{-2})^{cr_k^\alpha}, \quad (4.23)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\{|J_{r_k}^\mu| \leq \lambda |B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|\} \leq F_\mu(mr_k^{-2})^{|B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|/2} \leq F_\mu(mr_k^{-2})^{cr_k^\alpha}, \quad (4.24)$$

where in the last inequalities we used the lower bound $|B(x_k, r_k) \cap A| \geq cr_k^\alpha$ from (1.13) and that $F_V, F_\mu \leq 1$. Since $J_{r_k} = J_{r_k}^V \cup J_{r_k}^\mu$, then using independence of the μ_{xy} and V_x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{|J_{r_k}| \leq \lambda |B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|\right\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{|J_{r_k}^V| \leq \lambda |B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|\} \mathbb{P}\{|J_{r_k}^\mu| \leq \lambda |B(x_k, r_k) \cap A|\} \\ &\leq \left(F_V(mr_k^{-2})F_\mu(mr_k^{-2})\right)^{cr_k^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

As the above argument does not depend on the particular center x_k , (4.23), (4.24) and (4.25) hold for all J_{r_k, x_k^i} on the different balls $B(x_k^i, r_k)$. Since there are at most $N_k \leq c\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$ many balls for each $k \in \{0, \dots, K\}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k^C) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{N_k-1} \mathbb{P}\left\{|J_{r_k, x_k^i}| \leq \lambda |B(x_k^i, r_k) \cap A|\right\}$$

$$\leq c\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \left(F_V(mr_k^{-2}) F_\mu(mr_k^{-2}) \right)^{cr_k^\alpha} \leq c\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \left(F_V(mr_0^{-2}) F_\mu(mr_0^{-2}) \right)^{cr_k^\alpha}, \quad (4.25)$$

where for the last inequality we used that $F_V(E), F_\mu(E) > 0$ are non-decreasing for $E \leq E_0$, and that $mr_k^{-2} \leq mr_0^{-2}$. Furthermore, $r_k = (1 + \varepsilon)^k r_0$ implies $r_k^\alpha \geq (1 + \varepsilon \alpha k) r_0^\alpha \geq r_0^\alpha + k$ provided $r_0 \geq r_*(\varepsilon, \alpha)$. Combined with the assumption $F_V(E) F_\mu(E) < 1$ for all $E < E_0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k^C) \leq c\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \left(F_V(mr_0^{-2}) F_\mu(mr_0^{-2}) \right)^{cr_0^\alpha + ck}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, K.$$

Putting all these estimates together with (4.22) and setting $F_* = F_V(E_*) F_\mu(E_*) < 1$ with $E_* = \min\{E_0, 1/(Mr_*^2)\}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \min_{\xi \in B(x_0, r_0)} \frac{1}{u(\xi)} \leq E \right\} &\leq \frac{2c\varepsilon^{-\alpha}}{1 - F_*^c} \left(F_V(mr_0^{-2}) F_\mu(mr_0^{-2}) \right)^{cr_0^\alpha} \\ &= C \left(F_V(mME) F_\mu(mME) \right)^{cM^{-\alpha/2} E^{-\alpha/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the landscape Lifshitz tail upper bound (1.15).

Note the above induction starts with the initial scale $cE^{-1/2} = r_0 < \text{diam}A/2$. For $\text{diam}A/2 \leq r_0$, we can do the following instead: Since $\max u \lesssim (\text{diam}A)^2$ by Proposition 2.7(ii), then $N_u(E) = 0$ for $E \leq c_1/(\text{diam}A)^2$ (equivalently, $r_0 \geq C \text{diam}A$), and the Lifshitz tail upper bound (1.15) holds trivially. For $c_1/(\text{diam}A)^2 \leq E \leq c_2/(\text{diam}A)^2$, with constants c_1, c_2 corresponding to the regime $\text{diam}A/2 \leq r_0 \leq C \text{diam}A$, we can take $r_K = r_0$ and jump to the last step directly. Note the $C \geq 1$ here is the one that can be taken in (1.13). Hence, there is no restriction on the diameter of A as in the Lifshitz tails lower bound. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 1.2, we obtain the landscape law for random models in Corollary 1.3. We do not prove Corollary 1.3 directly, as previous work [9, 1] reduced the proof of Corollary 1.3 to the Landscape Law bounds (1.8), (1.9), (1.10) and Lifshitz tail bounds (1.14), (1.15) for N_u . In particular, the landscape law for random models in (1.16) follows from Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 using the argument of [9, Thm. 3.56]. See also [1, §4.2] for an axiomatic version of this method.

5. DETAILS FOR APPLICATIONS TO SPECIFIC MODELS

In this section, we provide details for applications to random band models (Section 5.1), stacked graphs (Section 5.2), and the Sierpinski gasket graph (Section 5.3).

5.1. Random band model $H_{d,W}$ and proof of Corollary 1.4. Recall the standard \mathbb{Z}^d lattice satisfies Assumption 1 and a (weak) Poincaré inequality (2.5), see e.g. Example 1 and [7]. Retain the definitions of the band graph $\Gamma_{d,W}$ in (1.18). As mentioned in Example 2 in Section 2.3, $\Gamma_{d,W}$ is roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^d . As a consequence of Proposition 2.9, all aforementioned properties of \mathbb{Z}^d will be preserved on $\Gamma_{d,W}$ by the rough isometry. Hence, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to $H_{d,W}$ on $\Gamma_{d,W}$ since all requirements are met. The (weak) Poincaré inequality (2.5) also guarantees the Lifshitz tails *lower* bound (1.14) for $H_{d,W}$ as long as the domain A satisfies (1.13). In order to obtain the Lifshitz tails upper bound (1.15), it remains to explicitly construct a harmonic weight as required in Assumption 2 for $\Gamma_{d,W}$. This will then complete the proof of Corollary 1.4.

Denote by $d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} (x_i - y_i)^2}$ the usual Euclidean distance for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $B_R^d(\xi) = \{x : d(\xi, x) \leq R\}$ be Euclidean ball of radius R . Recall on $\Gamma_{d,W}$, that $x \sim y$ iff $d(x, y) \leq W$. The exterior boundary $B_R^d(\xi)$, with respect to this metric, is

$$\partial B_R^d(\xi) = \{x \notin B_R^d(\xi) : \exists y \in B_R^d(\xi) \text{ such that } d(x, y) \leq W\}.$$

Let $P_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y)$ be the Poisson kernel on $\partial B^d(\xi, \rho)$ in $\Gamma_{d,W}$, defined as in (A.4). We will use $P_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y)$ to construct the desired harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d}$ on the Euclidean ball $B_R^d(\xi)$. Intuitively, we want to define the harmonic weight layer by layer using the Poisson kernel, but the graph structure for $W > 1$ complicates the boundary regions. We will thus first need the following technical lemma, which says that ‘‘spherical shells’’ in \mathbb{Z}^d can be covered by thin layers of exterior boundaries in $\Gamma_{d,W}$.

Lemma 5.1. *There is $\rho_0(d, W) > 0$ so that for any $\rho \geq \rho_0(d, W)$,*

$$B^d(\xi, \rho + 1) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho) \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{k_*} \partial B^d(\xi, \rho + a_k),$$

where $k_* := \lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \rfloor$, $a_k = 1 - k \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, k_* - 1$, and $a_{k_*} = 0$.

We note that if $W > 2\sqrt{d}$, then $B^d(\xi, \rho + 1) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho) \subset \partial B(0, \rho)$, and we do not need the extra thin layers in between. Also note that $a_{k-1} - a_k = \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$ for $k = 1, \dots, k_* - 1$, and that

$$a_{k-1} - a_{k_*} = 1 - \left(\lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \rfloor - 1 \right) \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} = 1 - \lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \rfloor \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} + \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} \geq \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}. \quad (5.1)$$

We will now use Lemma 5.1 to explicitly construct the harmonic weight and prove Corollary 1.4. The proof of the lemma is left to the end of this section. Let ρ_0 and a_i be as in Lemma 5.1. Then applying Lemma 5.1 several times, for e.g. $R \geq 2W$,

$$B^d(\xi, R - W) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_0) = \bigcup_{\rho=\rho_0}^{R-W-1} B^d(\xi, \rho + 1) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho) \subset \bigcup_{\rho=\rho_0}^{R-W-1} \bigcup_{k=1}^{k_*} \partial B^d(\xi, \rho + a_k).$$

We rearrange the above radii $\{\rho + a_k\}_{\rho, a_k}$ in increasing order and denote them by $\rho_i \in [\rho_0, \rho_{i_*}]$, $i = 0, \dots, i_*$, so that $\rho_{i+1} - \rho_i \geq \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$, and $\rho_{i_*} = R - W - \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$. The covering can then be rewritten as

$$B^d(\xi, R - W) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_0) \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{i_*} \partial B^d(\xi, \rho_i) := Y_R.$$

We define $X_R := B^d(\xi, R) \setminus Y_R$, which will be the ‘‘bad set’’ in Assumption 2. Note that

$$|X_R| = |B(\xi, R) \setminus Y_R| \leq |B^d(\xi, \rho_0)| + |B^d(\xi, R) \setminus B^d(\xi, R - W)| \leq C, \quad (5.2)$$

for some constant C depending only on d, W , so that $|X_R|/|B^d(\xi, R)| \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Overall, Lemma 5.1 thus allows us to cover a large portion of $B^d(\xi, R)$ using thin exterior boundaries of Euclidean balls. With such a filtration, we can define the associated harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d}(\xi, y)$ on $B^d(\xi, R)$ layer by layer.

For $y \in Y_R = \bigcup_{i=0}^{i_*} \partial B^d(\xi, \rho_i)$, we then set

$$h_{B_R^d}(\xi)(y) = \frac{1}{|B_{R-W}^d \setminus B_{\rho_0}^d|} \sum_{i=0}^{i_*} |B_{\rho_{i+1}}^d \setminus B_{\rho_i}^d| \cdot P_{B_{\rho_i}^d}(\xi, y) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{y \in \partial B_{\rho_i}^d\}}, \quad (5.3)$$

and for $y \in X_R$, set $h_{B_R^d}(\xi, y) = 0$.

We first verify that $h_{B_R^d}$ is a harmonic weight satisfying (2.16) from Assumption 2. Suppose $-\Delta f(x) \leq 0$ (for $x \in \Omega \supset B_R^d \cup \partial B_R^d$). Then by the surface submean property (A.5), for any $\rho_i \leq R - W$,

$$f(\xi) \leq \sum_{y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho_i)} P_{B_{\rho_i}^d}(\xi, y) f(y).$$

Multiply the equation both sides by the volume (cardinality) of $|B^d(\xi, \rho_{i+1}) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_i)|$ and then sum all the equations from $i = 0$ to $i = i_*$ (setting $\rho_{i_*+1} = R - W$) to obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{i_*} |B_{\rho_{i+1}}^d \setminus B_{\rho_i}^d| f(\xi) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{i_*} \sum_{y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho_i)} |B_{\rho_{i+1}}^d \setminus B_{\rho_i}^d| P_{B_{\rho_i}^d}(\xi, y) f(y),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} f(\xi) &\leq \frac{1}{|B_{R-W}^d \setminus B_{\rho_0}^d|} \sum_{i=0}^{i_*} \sum_{y \in \partial B^d(\xi, \rho_i)} |B_{\rho_{i+1}}^d \setminus B_{\rho_i}^d| P_{B_{\rho_i}^d}(\xi, y) f(y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in Y_R} h_{B_R^d}(\xi)(y) f(y), \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{B_R^d}$ is given as in (5.3). Putting together the definition $h_{B_R^d}(\xi, y) = 0$ for $y \in X_R$, one concludes that for $-\Delta f(x) \leq 0$,

$$f(\xi) \leq \sum_{y \in B^d(\xi, y)} h_{B_R^d}(\xi)(y) f(y),$$

which verifies (2.16). Clearly, the equality holds if f is harmonic ($\Delta f = 0$).

We already verified the ‘bad’ set X_R is small in (5.2). It thus remains to show that $h_{B_R^d}$ has the desired lower bound in (2.17) on Y_R . For this, we will need the following Poisson kernel bounds.

Proposition 5.2 (Lemma 6.3.7 in [27]). *There are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on d, W such that*

$$c_1 \rho^{1-d} \leq P_{B_\rho^d}(\xi, y) \leq c_2 \rho^{1-d}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad y \in \partial B_\rho^d(\xi). \quad (5.4)$$

From classical results, as $s \rightarrow \infty$ the standard Euclidean ball $B^d(\xi, s)$ contains $\omega_d s^d + o(s^{d-1})$ lattice points, where ω_d is the volume of the unit Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^d ; see e.g. [41, 17, 20] for further references and more precise error estimates. Thus there is $c_3 > 0$ so that for a fixed $a > 0$ and all $s \geq 1$,

$$|B^d(\xi, s)| - |B^d(\xi, s - a)| = d\omega_d a s^{d-1} (1 + o(1)) \geq c_3 a s^{d-1}.$$

Using this lower bound between the layers $\rho_{i+1} - \rho_i \geq \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$ in (5.1), we have

$$|B^d(\xi, \rho_{i+1}) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_i)| \geq c_3 \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} \rho_i^{d-1}, \quad i = 0, \dots, i_*.$$

Combined with the lower bound in (5.4), this implies for $y \in \partial B_{\rho_i}^d(\xi)$,

$$|B^d(\xi, \rho_{i+1}) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_i)| P_{B_{\rho_i}^d}(\xi, y) \geq c_1 c_3 \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}.$$

Since for $y \in Y_R = \bigcup_{i=0}^{i_*} \partial B_{\rho_i}^d(\xi)$, the sum (5.3) contains at least one (non-zero) term. Hence,

$$h_{B_R^d}(\xi)(y) \geq \frac{1}{|B^d(\xi, R - W) \setminus B^d(\xi, \rho_0)|} c_1 c_3 \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} \geq \frac{c_5}{|B^d(\xi, R)|}, \quad y \in Y_R,$$

which verifies (2.17) in Assumption 2.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Since the annulus is symmetric and \mathbb{Z}^d -translation invariant, it is enough to consider $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in B^d(0, \rho + 1) \setminus B^d(0, \rho)$ where $x_1 \geq 0$, and $x_1 \geq x_i, i = 2, \dots, d$. In this region, x satisfies

$$\rho^2 < \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2 \leq (\rho + 1)^2 \implies x_1 \geq \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

Since x_1 is the maximal direction, consider the point $x' = x - We_1$, which is a neighbor $x' \sim x$ in $\Gamma_{d,W}$. We will see that if W is relatively large (compared to \sqrt{d}), then $x' \in B(0, \rho)$ so that $x \in \partial B(0, \rho)$. Otherwise, we will need intermediate layers of thickness $\frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}$ to reach the entire annulus. Direct computation using $\|x\|_2^2 \leq (\rho + 1)^2$ and $x_1 \geq \rho/\sqrt{d}$ shows

$$\|x'\|_2^2 = (x_1 - W)^2 + \sum_{i=2}^d x_i^2 \leq \rho^2 + 2\left(1 - \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}\right)\rho - \frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}\rho + W^2 + 1.$$

Hence, if $W \geq 2\sqrt{d}$, then for $\rho > \rho_0 := \sqrt{d}(W + 1/W)$, $\|x'\|_2^2 \leq \rho^2 - \frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}\rho + W^2 + 1 \leq \rho^2$, so that $x' = x - We_1 \in B^d(0, \rho)$ and $x \in \partial B^d(0, \rho)$.

If $W < 2\sqrt{d}$, set

$$a_k = 1 - k \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \right\rfloor - 1.$$

For each $k = 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \right\rfloor - 1$, if $x \in B(0, \rho + a_{k-1}) \setminus B(0, \rho + a_k)$, then $\|x\|_2^2 \leq (\rho + a_{k-1})^2$ and $x_1 \geq \rho/\sqrt{d}$ imply

$$\|x'\|_2^2 = (x_1 - W)^2 + \sum_{i=2}^d x_i^2 \leq \rho^2 + 2\left(a_{k-1} - \frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\rho + W^2 + a_{k-1}^2 \leq (\rho + a_k)^2,$$

for $\rho \geq (W^2 + 1)/(\frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}) > (W^2 + a_{k-1}^2 - a_k^2)/(\frac{W}{\sqrt{d}})$. This shows $x' \in B(0, \rho + a_k)$, hence $x \in \partial B(0, \rho + a_k)$ since $x \notin B(0, \rho + a_k)$.

The above works for all $k \leq k_* - 1$. In the last layer when $k = k_* = \left\lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W}$, we have

$$a_{k_*-1} = 1 - (k_* - 1) \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} - 1\right) \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}} = \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}},$$

and similarly as before,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x'\|_2^2 &\leq \rho^2 + 2\left(a_{k_*-1} - \frac{W}{2\sqrt{d}}\right)\rho - \frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}\rho + W^2 + a_{k_*-1}^2 \\ &= \rho^2 - \left(k_* + 1 - \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W}\right) \frac{W}{\sqrt{d}}\rho + W^2 + a_{k_*-1}^2 \leq \rho^2, \end{aligned}$$

provided $\rho > (W^2 + a_{k_*-1}^2)/(c\frac{W}{\sqrt{d}})$, where $c = \left\lfloor \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} \right\rfloor + 1 - \frac{2\sqrt{d}}{W} > 0$. Hence, $d(0, x') \leq \rho$ and $x \in \partial B(0, \rho) = \partial B(0, \rho + a_{k_*})$, where we set $a_{k_*} = 0$. \square

5.2. Stacked graphs. In this section, we provide details for the application to stacks of graphs in Section 1.4. In particular, we verify that if Assumption 2 holds for a graph Γ with the natural metric d_Γ , then the required properties also hold for the stacked graph $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ with the metric $\tilde{d}((x, j), (y, k)) := d_\Gamma(x, y) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_{(x=y) \wedge (j \neq k)}$. Since the weak Poincaré inequality is preserved under rough isometry, this together allows for obtaining Lifshitz tails for $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ via Corollary 1.3.

First, the metric \tilde{d} is strongly equivalent to the natural metric on $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$. The balls under the metric \tilde{d} are simpler however. For $R \geq 1/2$, the ball is $B_{\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M}^{\tilde{d}}((\xi, j), R) = B_\Gamma(\xi, R) \times \mathbb{Z}_M$. For $R < 1/2$, the ball centered at (ξ, j) is the singleton set $\{(\xi, j)\}$.

To define the harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d((\xi, j))}((y, k))$, we use the random walk formulation of the Poisson kernel for the ball $B^d((\xi, j), R)$. Letting $H_A((\xi, j), (y, k)) = \mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_A} = (y, k)]$ be the Poisson kernel for a region A , we will take

$$h_{B_R^d((\xi, j))}((y, k)) = \begin{cases} 0, & (y, k) \in \{\xi\} \times \mathbb{Z}_M \\ \frac{1}{R} H_{B_{r-1}^d((\xi, j))}((\xi, j), (y, k)), & r = d((\xi, j), (y, k)) \geq 2 \\ \frac{1}{R} H_{B_{1/2}^d((\xi, j))}((\xi, j), (y, k)), & r = d((\xi, j), (y, k)) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

We can then check the required properties in Assumption 2.

- Submean property: For $R > 3/2$ and f harmonic at points in $B^d(\xi, R-1)$, then for any $3/2 \leq r \leq R$, the Poisson kernel property (2.15) implies

$$f((\xi, j)) = \sum_{(y, k) \in \partial B_{r-1}^d((\xi, j))} H_{B_{r-1}^d((\xi, j))}((\xi, j), (y, k)) f((y, k)). \quad (5.6)$$

Averaging over $r \in \{3/2\} \cup \{2, 3, \dots, R\}$, then

$$f((\xi, j)) = \sum_{(y, k) \in B_R^d((\xi, j))} h_{B_R^d((\xi, j))}((y, k)) f((y, k)). \quad (5.7)$$

The required inequality (2.16) then follows for subharmonic functions from (5.6). If $R \leq 3/2$ then we can simply take the “trivial” harmonic weight $h_{B_R^d((\xi, j))} = \delta_{(\xi, j)}$, since the second property in Assumption 2 only matters as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

- Bad set: The plan is to compare $h_{B_R^d((\xi, j))}$ for $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ to the harmonic weight for Γ , using the random walk relation and Laplace equation properties of the Poisson kernel. We claim that if $X_R(\xi)$ is the “bad set” for $B^d(\xi, R)$ in Γ , then $(X_R(\xi) \times \mathbb{Z}_M) \cup (\{\xi\} \times \mathbb{Z}_M)$ can be taken as the “bad set” for $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$.

Since we added the entire stack of M points $\{\xi\} \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ to the bad set, we can ignore it and only consider the Poisson kernel at points (ξ, j) and (y, k) with $r = d((\xi, j), (y, k)) \geq 1$, i.e. $y \neq \xi$. Assuming $r \geq 1$, we first show that for $k = 1, \dots, M$,

$$H_{B_r^d((\xi, j))}((\xi, j), (y, k)) = \mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}} = (y, k)]$$

are all comparable. For a path $S = (v_0, \dots, v_n)$ of length $n = \tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}$ exiting at $v_n = (y, k) \in \partial B^d((\xi, j), r)$, we can construct a path S' of length $n + |k - \ell|$ exiting at (y, ℓ) instead, by following S up to v_{n-1} and then moving vertically to the ℓ th layer before exiting. Since the maximum degree in $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ is bounded by $M_\Gamma + 2$, this implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}} = (y, k)] \geq \frac{1}{(M_\Gamma + 2)^M} \mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}} = (y, \ell)], \quad (5.8)$$

for any $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

Averaging (5.8) over $\ell \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ yields for $r \geq 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}} = (y, k)] &\geq \frac{1}{M(M_\Gamma + 2)^M} \sum_{\ell=1}^M \mathbb{P}_{(\xi, j)}[Y_{\tau_{B^d((\xi, j), r)}} = (y, \ell)] \\ &= \frac{1}{M(M_\Gamma + 2)^M} \mathbb{P}_\xi[\tilde{Y}_{\tau_{B(\xi, r)}} = y], \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where \tilde{Y}_n is simple random walk on Γ . The last equality follows using the Poisson kernel formula for solving Laplace’s equation: For a finite region $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$, let $H_\Lambda(x, y)$ be the Poisson kernel on Γ and $H_{\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M}((x, j), (y, \ell))$ be the Poisson kernel on $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M$. If $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is harmonic on $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ with boundary values $f(y)$ for $y \in \partial\Lambda$, then

$\tilde{f} : \Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\tilde{f}((x, j)) = f(x)$ is also harmonic on $\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M$ with boundary values $\tilde{f}((y, \ell)) = f(y)$ for $(y, \ell) \in \partial\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M$. Then

$$f(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[f(Y_{\tau_\Lambda})] = \sum_{y \in \partial\Lambda} H_\Lambda(x, y) f(y),$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) = \tilde{f}((x, j)) &= \sum_{(y, \ell) \in \partial(\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M)} H_{\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M}((x, j), (y, \ell)) \tilde{f}(y, \ell) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \partial\Lambda} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^M H_{\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M}((x, j), (y, \ell)) \right) f(y). \end{aligned}$$

By considering boundary values δ_y , this implies we must have

$$H_\Lambda(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M H_{\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_M}((x, j), (y, \ell)). \quad (5.10)$$

Taking $\Lambda = B(\xi, r)$ yields (5.9).

5.3. Sierpinski gasket graph. In this part, we discuss the landscape law and Lifshitz tails for Jacobi operators on the Sierpinski gasket graph Γ_{SG} , drawn in Figure 3. The Sierpinski gasket graph is a fractal-like graph, and is not roughly isometric to any \mathbb{Z}^d . Let K_0 be the unit triangle on \mathbb{R}^2 with vertices $\mathbb{V}_0 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)\} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. Then Γ_{SG} is constructed using the images of \mathbb{V}_0 (as vertices) by the iteration of Ψ . Let $\mathbb{V}_\ell = 2^\ell \Psi^\ell(\mathbb{V}_0)$ be the set of vertices of the triangles of side length 1 in $2^\ell \Psi^\ell(K_0)$. Let $\mathbb{V} = \cup_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbb{V}_\ell$. The edge set $\mathcal{E} = \{x \sim y : x, y \in \mathbb{V}\}$ is defined by the relation $x \sim y$ iff x, y belongs to a triangle in $2^\ell \Psi^\ell(K_0)$ for some ℓ . The Sierpinski gasket graph is then $\Gamma_{SG} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$.

A key feature of Γ_{SG} is that it satisfies sub-Gaussian heat kernel bound $\text{HKC}(\alpha, \beta)$; for $t \geq \max(1, d_0(x, y))$,

$$\frac{c_3}{t^{\alpha/2}} \exp\left(-c_4(d_0(x, y)^\beta/t)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}\right) \leq q_t(x, y) \leq \frac{c_1}{t^{\alpha/2}} \exp\left(-c_2(d_0(x, y)^\beta/t)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}\right),$$

where $q_t(x, y)$ is the (continuous time) heat kernel as in (2.11), $\alpha = \log 3 / \log 2$ is the volume growth parameter as in (1.1), and $\beta = \log 5 / \log 2$ is the sub-Gaussian parameter. (See e.g. [7, Cor. 6.11].) Since the volume control property (1.1) holds, we have the covering of balls provided by Proposition 2.4. As mentioned in Remark 2.1, the parameter β is equivalent to the parameter used in (weak) Poincaré inequalities. In the previous sections of this paper, we focused on the case $\beta = 2$ and assumed the corresponding weak Poincaré inequality (2.5). On Γ_{SG} , as a result of the sub-Gaussian heat kernel bounds, a β -version of (2.5) holds [7, §6], with r^β rather than r^2 in the Poincaré inequality, i.e.,

$$\sum_{x \in B} (f(x) - \bar{f}^B)^2 \leq C_P r^\beta \sum_{x, y \in B^*: x \sim y} (f(x) - f(y))^2,$$

with the same average \bar{f}^B , and the ball scaling as in (2.5). This suggests to consider a slightly different landscape counting function $N_{u, \beta}$, which depends on the parameter $\beta > 2$. More precisely, unlike coverings of radius $R = E^{-1/2}$ used in (1.7), instead, we consider coverings of radius $R = E^{-1/\beta}$. The associated landscape counting function is defined as

$$N_{u, \beta}(E) = N_u^{\mathcal{P}(E^{-1/\beta}), A}(E). \quad (5.11)$$

Following the proof in Section 3.1, replacing the use of Poincaré inequality (2.5) by its β -version, one can obtain the landscape law upper bound

$$N(E) \leq N_{u,\beta}(CE), \quad \text{for all } E > 0, \quad (5.12)$$

where C depends on α, β .

Unfortunately, the argument for the landscape lower bounds (1.9), (1.10) does not go through for Γ_{SG} . Additionally, we do not verify Assumption 2 for the gasket graph, which prevents using the landscape law argument to obtain a β version of the Lifshitz tails property.

Recently, authors in [6] established the Lifshitz tails singularity of the integrated density of states for certain random operators on (continuous) nested fractals, including the continuous Anderson model on the planar Sierpinski gasket set; see also earlier related work in [32, 35, 22]. In particular, for (infinite volume) IDS $N^\infty(E)$ of a random Schrödinger operator (under mild condition on the hopping and the random distribution) on the planar Sierpinski gasket set, Ref. [6] showed that

$$\lim_{E \searrow 0} \frac{\log |\log N^\infty(E)|}{\log E} = -\frac{\alpha}{\beta}. \quad (5.13)$$

To the best of our knowledge, there is no such result for the (combinatorial) Sierpinski gasket graph. In upcoming work (in preparation), we prove (5.13) for the Anderson model on Γ_{SG} , via a modified Neumann–Dirichlet method close to the spirit of the work in [35].

6. NUMERICAL CASES

In this section, we introduce and discuss a series of detailed numerical simulations aimed at investigating the behavior of the landscape counting function $N_u(E)$. These simulations identify more precise behavior (such as explicit numerically determined scalings) governed by our general results Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and also provide evidence for a landscape law or Lifshitz tails in models where we lack an analytical proof. To comprehensively explore the applicability of the landscape law, we will consider a variety of cases, including random band models, and the Anderson model on the Sierpinski gasket graph and Penrose tiling.

6.1. Random band models. Let's first recall some of the notations to be used in this section. Let $\Gamma_{d,W} = (\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{E}_W)$ be the graph defined in Section 1.6, where the vertex set is \mathbb{Z}^d and the edge set \mathcal{E}_W has the “ W -step band structure” in (1.18). Our results in Section 1.6 apply to Jacobi operators $H_{d,W}$ (1.19) with both onsite and bond disorders. In the numerical simulations, we will focus only on the bond disorder, i.e., operators in the form

$$H_{d,W}f(x) = \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ \|x-y\| \leq W}} (f(x) - \mu_{xy}f(y)).$$

We will consider the above operator $H_{d,W}$ in the cases $d = 1, 2$ (see $\Gamma_{1,W}$ in Figure 4 and $\Gamma_{2,W}$ in Figure 5) for different choices of bandwidth W . For the $\Gamma_{2,W}$ cases, the graph is induced by a band matrix on \mathbb{Z}^2 . Specifically, we employ the ℓ^1 -norm to define \mathcal{E}_W . As a point of comparison with Figure 4, Figure 5 provides an illustrative example that displays all nodes connected to the central node within a bandwidth of $W = 2$.

In Figure 6, the top row shows an example in 1D with $|A| = 20000$ and $W = 10$, where the bond interactions will be modeled using a uniform distribution over the interval $[0,1]$. The bottom row shows a 2D example using a Bernoulli distribution taking values in $\{0,1\}$ with half and half probabilities, where $|A| = 100^2$ and $W = 2$. Furthermore, the on-site non-negative potential is set to be 0. It is important to note that the simulations presented are based on a single random realization, rather than on the average of multiple realizations.




FIGURE 5. All nodes and edges corresponding to the centering node (in orange) in the graph $\Gamma_{2,2} = (\mathbb{Z}^2, \mathcal{E}_2)$

Building upon the previously discussed configurations, we globally get the control of the IDS from above and below through the landscape counting functions. Besides, beyond the global bounds from above and below, the landscape counting function, upon appropriate scaling, can serve as a good approximation for the Lifshitz tail of the IDS. The examples shown in Figure 6(b) and (e) are also to show how the suitably scaled landscape counting function closely mirrors the behavior of the Lifshitz tail (1.21) under varying conditions:

6.2. Sierpinski gasket. Next, we consider the Anderson model (without the bond disorder)

$$Hf(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{V}: y \sim x} (f(x) - f(y)) + V_x f(x)$$

on Sierpinski gasket graph $\Gamma_{SG} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$ discussed in Section 5.3 (see Figure 3, a fractal structure composed of interconnected equilateral triangles). For the landscape counting function, we specifically employ equilateral triangular boxes for the counting process. Figure 7 illustrates one such example, demonstrating the methodology employed to compute the landscape counting function $N_{u,\beta}$ in (5.11).

Given that the Sierpinski gasket possesses a volume growth parameter $\alpha = \frac{\log 3}{\log 2}$, we define the box size using $r = E^{-\frac{1}{\beta}}$, where $\beta = \frac{\log 5}{\log 2}$. As discussed in Section 5.3, we are only able to prove the landscape law upper bound (5.12) on the Sierpinski gasket. We expect a landscape law lower bound should also hold. We will next illustrate the application of the landscape law. Note that in this example, we consider only the on-site non-negative potential V , without implementing any bond interaction. The subsequent figure presents the landscape law, with V selected uniformly at random between 0 and 10, and $|A| = 9843$.

6.3. Penrose tiling. Lastly, we present an example illustrating the Lifshitz tail for the Anderson model on the Penrose tiling in Section 1.3 (see Figure 1), employing Neumann boundary conditions. The on-site non-negative potential V is randomly assigned values from a uniform distribution $[0, 4]$. As discussed in Example 3, the Penrose tiling is roughly isometric to \mathbb{Z}^2 . Hence, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to the Anderson model on it with $\alpha = 2$. As we do not verify the harmonic weight assumption in Assumption 2 for the Penrose tiling, we do not obtain the Lifshitz tails results through Corollary 1.3, though here we provide numerical evidence supporting the behavior. In Figure 9(c), we display the low energy regime of the IDS, fitted by




FIGURE 6. The landscape law for random band models in 1D (top row (a), (b), (c)) and 2D (bottom row (d), (e), (f)) cases. (a), (d): the global control from above and below. (b), (e): the scaled landscape counting $c_1 N_u(c_2 E)$ effectively approximates the Lifshitz tail of $N(E)$ following appropriate scaling adjustments. Specifically, in (b) $c_1 = 3, c_2 = \frac{1}{1.19}$; in (e): $c_1 = \frac{1}{2}, c_2 = \frac{1}{1.35}$. (c), (f): the log-log view.

an exponential function. Additionally, a scaled landscape counting function is presented, which is calculated over the lattice of equilateral triangles as illustrated in Figure 7. For comparative purposes, we also calculate the IDS for the free Laplacian over the same tiling in Figure 9(b).




FIGURE 7. Triangular boxes used for computing the landscape counting function. In the equilateral triangles lattice, only those boxes that include at least one vertex of the gasket (highlighted in gray) are considered in the counting process.




FIGURE 8. Landscape Law and Lifshitz tail behavior for the Anderson model on the Sierpinski gasket graph. Left: the control of the IDS from above and below. Right: an expanded view of the lower energy spectrum, modeled by an exponential function with constants $m_1 = 419.4$, $m_2 = -19.2$. The scaled landscape counting function employs $c_1 = 0.7$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{1.4}$.




FIGURE 9. (a) The Penrose tiling used for calculation. (b) The IDS: the uniform disorder case (black) and the free Laplacian case (red). (c) Enlarged view of the Lifshitz tail behavior of the IDS with its exponential fitting ($m_1 = 4.7, m_2 = -9.1$) and scaled landscape counting function ($c_1 = 0.14, c_2 = \frac{1}{1.3}$).

APPENDIX A. GREEN'S FUNCTION AND POISSON KERNEL FOR A DIRICHLET LAPLACIAN ON A BALL

We summarize some facts about Green's function and Poisson kernel on graphs. These are standard results and can be found in e.g. [7, 27].

Let $\Gamma = (\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a graph, equipped with some distance function $d(x, y) : \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Note that this distance function and the results in this section are not limited to the natural graph metric (shortest-path distance). The graph Laplacian is

$$\Delta f(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{V}: y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x)).$$

For a ball $B_r(\xi) = \{y \in \mathbb{V} : d(x, y) \leq r\}$, the Dirichlet Laplacian on $B_r(\xi)$ is:

$$(\Delta^{B_r} f)(x) = \sum_{y \in B_r(\xi): y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x)), \quad x \in B_r(\xi).$$

The exterior boundary of B_r is $\partial B_r = \{x \notin B_r : \exists y \in B_r \text{ with } x \sim y\}$, and the interior boundary is defined as $\partial^i B_r = \partial(\mathbb{V} \setminus B_r)$. Denote by $\bar{B}_r = B_r \cup \partial B_r$ the discrete closure of B_r . Let $G_r(x, y) = G_{B_r}(x, y) = (-\Delta^{B_r})^{-1}(x, y) : \bar{B}_r \times \bar{B}_r \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the Green's function associated with $-\Delta^{B_r}$. And denote by $P_{B_r}(x, y) : \bar{B}_r \times \partial B_r \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the associated Poisson kernel. Recall that G_{B_r} and P_{B_r} are the unique solutions to the following systems: for any $y \in B_r$,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta G_{B_r}(x, y) = \delta_y(x), & x \in B_r \\ G_{B_r}(x, y) = 0, & x \in \partial B_r \end{cases},$$

and for any $y \in \partial B_r$,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta P_{B_r}(x, y) = 0, & x \in B_r \\ P_{B_r}(x, y) = \delta_y(x), & x \in \partial B_r \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

One can verify the following integration by parts formula for g supported on $B_r = B(\xi, r)$ and any f ,

$$\sum_{w \in B(\xi, r)} -\Delta g(w) f(w) = \sum_{w \in B(\xi, r)} -\Delta f(w) g(w) + \sum_{w \in \partial^i B(\xi, r)} g(w) \sum_{\substack{y: y \sim w \\ y \notin B(\xi, r)}} f(y).$$

By taking $g = G_{B_r}(\xi, \cdot)$, then we see

$$f(\xi) = \sum_{w \in B_r(\xi)} -\Delta f(w) G_{B_r}(\xi, w) + \sum_{w \in \partial^i B_r(\xi)} G_{B_r}(\xi, w) \sum_{\substack{y: y \sim w \\ y \notin B_r(\xi)}} f(y) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$= \sum_{w \in B_r(\xi)} -\Delta f(w) G_{B_r}(\xi, w) + \sum_{y \in \partial B_r(\xi)} P_{B_r}(\xi, y) f(y), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the second line follows from the relation between the Green's function and the associated Poisson's kernel

$$P_{B_r}(\xi, x) = \sum_{y \in B_r: y \sim x} G_{B_r}(\xi, y), \quad x \in \partial B_r. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Taking $f \equiv 1$ in (A.3) also shows

$$\sum_{y \in \partial B_r(\xi)} P_{B_r}(\xi, y) = 1.$$

If f is subharmonic ($-\Delta f \leq 0$), then (A.3) implies the surface submean property

$$f(\xi) \leq \sum_{y \in \partial B_r(\xi)} P_{B_r}(\xi, y) f(y), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and the equality holds if $\Delta f = 0$.

APPENDIX B. AN EXPLICIT PROOF OF POISSON KERNEL ESTIMATES FOR THE 1D RANDOM BAND MODEL

To obtain the general Lifshitz tails lower bound, one needs the control on the Poisson kernel $P_r = P_{B_r}$ as in Proposition 5.2, which provides the harmonic weight as required by Assumption 2. One notable example where we have such estimates is the graph $\Gamma_{d,W}$ (1.18) induced by the band model.

The above general case is obtained in [27] by the method of random walk. Below, we give a direct proof of the case $d = 1, W \geq 1$ with explicit constants depending on the band width W . Recall on $\Gamma_{1,W} = (\mathbb{Z}, \mathcal{E}_W)$, $\mathcal{E}_W = \{\sim : x \sim y \text{ if } |x - y| \leq W\}$. The associated graph Laplacian is

$$\Delta_W f(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}: |x-y| \leq W} (f(y) - f(x)).$$

In this part, we use the natural graph metric (shortest path) $d_0(x, y) = \lceil W^{-1}|x - y| \rceil$. Then the ball centered at ξ of radius r is $B_r(\xi) = B(\xi, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x - \xi| \leq rW\}$, with exterior boundary $\partial B_r = \{x : rW < |x - \xi| \leq (r+1)W\}$, and interior boundary $\partial^i B_r = \{x : (r-1)W < |x - \xi| \leq rW\}$. (For 1D, it is enough to consider integer valued radius r only.) We denote by $G_r = G_{B_r}$ and $P_r = P_{B_r}$ the Green's function and the Poisson's kernel of $-\Delta_W^{B_r}$ on B_r , respectively.

Lemma B.1. *For all $x \in B_r(\xi)$,*

$$\frac{1}{2W^3}(rW + 1 - |x - \xi|) \leq G_r(\xi, x) \leq \frac{1}{W^2}(W + rW - |x - \xi|). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

For all $x \in \partial B_r(\xi)$,

$$\frac{1}{2W^3} \leq P_r(\xi, x) \leq 1. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Proof of (B.1). Without loss of generality, we assume $\xi = 0$ and only consider $B_r = B(0, r)$. The following estimates hold for any center $\xi \in A_K$ by translation. It is clear that $B(0, r) = \llbracket -L, L \rrbracket$: with $L = rW$, and $\partial B_r = \partial^l B_r + \partial^r B_r$ with $\partial^r B_r = \llbracket rW + 1, (r+1)W \rrbracket$ and $\partial^l B_r = \llbracket -(r+1)W, -rW - 1 \rrbracket$.

Notice that $G_r(x, y) = G_r(y, x)$. Let $g(x) = G_r(x, 0), |x| \leq L$ be the centric (0th) column of G_r . Since G_r is the inverse of $-\Delta_W^{B_r}$, then $-\Delta_W^{B_r} g(x) = \delta_0(x)$. To estimate $g(x)$ from above, we choose a test function

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} W + L - |x|, & |x| \leq L \\ 0, & |x| > L \end{cases}$$

$f(x) = W + L - |x|$ for any x . Direct computation shows that

$$-\Delta_W^{B_r} f(x) \begin{cases} = W^2 + W, & x = 0, \\ \geq 0, & 0 < |x| \leq L - W, \\ = 0, & L - W < |x| \leq L. \end{cases}$$

Hence, $-\Delta_W^{B_r} f(x) \geq W^2 \delta_0(x) = -\Delta_W^{B_r}(W^2 g(x))$ for all $x \in B_r$. By the maximum principle of $-\Delta_W^{B_r}$, one obtains $g(x) \leq \frac{1}{W^2} f(x)$ for all $|x| \leq L$. In particular, for $x \in \partial^i B_r = \{x : |x| \geq L - W\}$,

$$G_r(0, x) = G_r(x, 0) \leq \frac{1}{W^2} f(x) = \frac{1}{W^2}(W + L - |x|) \leq \frac{2}{W}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Next, we get a lower bound of $g(x) = G_r(0, x)$ through the test function

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} L + 1 + W(W - 1), & x = 0 \\ L - |x| + 1, & 0 < |x| \leq L. \\ 0, & |x| > L \end{cases}$$

Direct computation shows

$$-\Delta_W^{B_r} p(x) = \begin{cases} = W(2W^2 - W + 1), & x = 0, \\ \leq 0, & 0 < |x| < W, \\ = 0, & W \leq x \leq L, \end{cases}$$

leading to $-\Delta_W^{B_r} p(x) \leq 2W^3 \delta_0(x) = -\Delta_W^{B_r} (2W^3 g(x))$ for all $x \in B_r$. By the maximum principle again, $g(x) \geq p(x)/(2W^3)$ for all $|x| \leq L$. In particular, for $x \in \partial^i B_r = \{x : L - W \leq |x| \leq L\}$, one has

$$G_r(0, x) = G_r(x, 0) = g(x) \geq (L - |x| + 1)/(2W^3) \geq 1/(2W^3).$$

Together with (B.3), we have that for $x \in \partial^i B_r = \{x : L - W \leq |x| \leq L\}$,

$$\frac{1}{2W^3} \leq G_r(0, x) \leq \frac{1}{W}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Recall the relation between P_r and G_r in (A.4),

$$P_r(0, x) = \sum_{y \in B_r : y \sim x} G_r(0, y), \quad x \in \partial B_r.$$

Clearly, for $x \in \partial B_r$, $\emptyset \neq \{y \in B_r : y \sim x\} \subset \partial^i B_r$. As a consequence of (B.4),

$$\frac{1}{2W^3} \leq \sum_{y \in B_r : y \sim x} G_r(0, y) = P_r(0, x) \leq \sum_{y \in \partial^i B_r} G_r(0, y) \leq W/W = 1,$$

which completes the proof of (B.2). \square

Notice in this 1D model with the natural metric d_0 , $\partial B_{\rho-1} = \partial^i B_\rho = B_\rho \setminus B_{\rho-1}$ for all ρ . To construct the harmonic weight, we do not need the filtration lemma Claim 5.1. One can define directly

$$h_{B_r}(\xi, y) = \frac{1}{|B_r|} \begin{cases} |\partial B_\rho| P_\rho(\xi, y), & y \in \partial B_\rho, \rho = 0, \dots, r-1 \\ 1, & y = \xi. \end{cases}$$

Since $|\partial B_\rho| = 2W$, then (B.2) implies $h_{B_r}(\xi, y) \geq \frac{1}{|B_r|W^2}$ for all $y \in B_r$, which gives an explicit bound required by Assumption 2.

APPENDIX C. MOSER–HARNACK INEQUALITY FOR SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

We say a graph Γ satisfies an elliptic Harnack inequality (EHI), given $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}, \tau > 1$, and $R \geq 2/(\tau - 1)$, if there exists a constant C_H depending only on τ and Γ , such that for $h \geq 0$ on $B(x_0, \tau R)$ and harmonic ($\Delta h = 0$) in $B(x_0, R)$, then

$$\sup_{B(x_0, R)} h \leq C_H \inf_{B(x_0, R)} h. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Under the volume control assumption (1.1), EHI is equivalent to the (weak) Poincaré inequality (2.5) or the Gaussian heat kernel estimates HKC($\alpha, 2$) (2.11); for more discussion see the textbook [7], particularly Theorems 6.19 and 7.18, and Lemma 4.21.

Clearly, (EHI) implies the Moser–Harnack inequality

$$\sup_{y \in B(x, R)} h(y)^2 \leq \frac{C_H}{|B(x, CR)|} \sum_{y \in B(x, CR)} h(y)^2, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

for a positive harmonic function h and any scaling constant $C \geq 1$. The version (2.8) that we need for a subharmonic function $-\Delta f \leq 0$ essentially follows from the harmonic version, combined with the discrete Caccioppoli (“reverse Poincaré”) inequality and Poincaré inequality with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The authors in [28] proved a Moser–Harnack inequality for subharmonic functions on general graphs without the volume control assumptions (1.1), where the Moser–Harnack constant depends exponentially large on the radius of the ball. We did not find a radius-independent version of [28, Theorem 1.2] in the literature, and so we sketch the proof of (2.8) here for completeness.

Throughout, we write $B_R = B(x_0, R)$ for a ball centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$ of radius R . Let $S \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a finite set. Define the Dirichlet energy subject to the boundary condition on ∂S to be

$$I(f, S) := \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{V} \\ y \sim x}} (f(y) - f(x))^2. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Note that in some literature, the concept ‘Dirichlet form’ may refer to the energy with the zero boundary condition on ∂S , see e.g. [7, §1.4], that is:

$$\mathcal{E}_S(f, f) = \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{\substack{y \in S \\ y \sim x}} (f(y) - f(x))^2 \leq I(f, S).$$

The equality holds only if $f = 0$ on the exterior boundary ∂S .

The following is the discrete version of the well-known energy minimizing property of a harmonic function.

Lemma C.1 (Energy minimizer, [18, Theorem 3.5]). *If h is harmonic on $\bar{S} = S \cup \partial S$, then h is a minimizer of $I(f, s)$ among functions in \bar{S} with the same values on ∂S . More precisely, if $\Delta h = 0, x \in S$, then for any f satisfying $f = h$ on ∂S ,*

$$I(h, S) \leq I(f, S). \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Lemma C.2 (discrete Caccioppoli inequality, see e.g. [28, Lemma 2.4]). *Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$, $R \geq 1$ and $\tau < 2$. Suppose f is a nonnegative and subharmonic function on $B_{2R} = B(x_0, 2R)$. Then we have*

$$I(f, B_{\tau R}) \leq \frac{C}{R^2} \sum_{x \in B_{2R}} f(x)^2, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where C depends only on τ and $M_\Gamma = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{V}} \deg(x)$ from (1.2).

This follows the proof of the Caccioppoli inequality for functions on \mathbb{R}^d , see e.g. [15, §4.1].

Proof. Let $0 \leq \chi(x) \leq 1$ the cut-off function constructed (in a similar manner) as in (3.9), satisfying $\chi(x) = 1$ on $B(x_0, \tau R)$, $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x \notin B(x_0, 2R - 1)$, and $|\chi(x) - \chi(y)| \leq \frac{c_\tau}{R}$ for all $x \sim y$.

Since $-\Delta f(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in B_{2R}$, then for the test function $\varphi(x) = f(x)\chi^2(x) \geq 0$, the discrete Gauss–Green Theorem (integration by parts, see e.g. [7, Theorem 1.24]) implies

$$0 \geq \langle \varphi, -\Delta f \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} \chi^2(x) (f(x) - f(y))^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} f(y) (\chi^2(x) - \chi^2(y)) (f(x) - f(y)), \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where we used that $\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) = (f(x) - f(y))\chi^2(x) + f(y)(\chi^2(x) - \chi^2(y))$. Therefore (C.6), with Cauchy–Schwarz and properties of χ , implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} \chi^2(x)(f(x) - f(y))^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} (\chi(x) + \chi(y))|f(x) - f(y)||f(y)|\chi(x) - \chi(y)| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} \chi^2(x)(f(x) - f(y))^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} f(y)^2(\chi(x) - \chi(y))^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq 2 \left(\sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} \chi^2(x)(f(x) - f(y))^2 \right)^{1/2} \frac{c_\tau}{R} \left(\sum_{y \in B_{2R}} f(y)^2 \right)^{1/2} M_\Gamma^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by the square root of the left hand side, and using that $\chi(x) = 1$ on $B(x_0, \tau R)$, yields

$$\sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y: y \sim x} (f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq \sum_{\substack{x,y \in B_{2R} \\ x \sim y}} \chi^2(x)(f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq \frac{4c_\tau^2 M_\Gamma}{R^2} \sum_{y \in B_{2R}} f(y)^2. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

□

Next, we will need that the weak (or “mean”) Poincaré inequality (2.5) implies the following zero-boundary Poincaré inequality. We do not actually directly use the weak PI formulation (2.5), but just that the exit time bound in Proposition 2.7(ii) holds.

Lemma C.3 (Poincaré inequality with the Dirichlet boundary condition). *Suppose volume control (1.1) and the weak Poincaré inequality (2.5) hold. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{V}$ and $R > 0$. For f vanishing on the exterior boundary $\partial B(x_0, R)$, then one has*

$$\sum_{x \in B(x_0, R)} f(x)^2 \leq CR^2 \sum_{x \in B(x_0, R)} \sum_{y: y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x))^2, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where C depends only on Γ .

Proof. Let $B_R = B(x_0, R)$ and Δ^{B_R} be the Dirichlet Laplacian on B_R . Let E_1 be the smallest eigenvalue of $-\Delta^{B_R}$. By Proposition 2.7(ii), there is the bound $\|(-\Delta_{B_R})^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{B_R}\|_\infty \leq cR^2$. Since in general $E_1 \|(-\Delta_{B_R})^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{B_R}\|_\infty \geq 1$ (see e.g. [36, Lemma 2.1]), then for some C depending only on Γ ,

$$E_1 \geq \frac{C}{R^2}.$$

Notice that when $f = 0$ on ∂B_R , the Dirichlet energy $I(f, B_R)$ in (C.3) equals the Dirichlet energy $\mathcal{E}_S(f, f)$ subject to the zero boundary condition:

$$I(f, B_R) \equiv \sum_{x \in B_R} \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{V} \\ y \sim x}} (f(y) - f(x))^2 = \sum_{x \in B_R} \sum_{\substack{y \in B_R \\ x \sim y}} (f(y) - f(x))^2.$$

Then (C.8) follows directly from the definition of the ground state energy E_1 by minimizing the zero-boundary Dirichlet energy (among functions not identically zero) on the right hand side. □

Proof of (2.8). The idea follows from the outline of the proof of [28, Theorem 1.2]. However, we must consider the (in)dependence of the radius more carefully using (C.5) and (C.8). Let $f \geq 0$ be a subharmonic function on $\bar{B}_{2R} = \bar{B}(x_0, 2R)$. Let h be a harmonic function on $\bar{B}_{3R/2} = \bar{B}(x_0, 3R/2)$ which agrees f on the (exterior) boundary of $B_{3R/2}$, i.e., h satisfies $\Delta h = 0, x \in B_{3R/2}$ and $h(x) = f(x)$ for $x \in \partial B_{3R/2}$. By the maximum principle, $f \leq h$ on $B_{3R/2}$. Then the Moser–Harnack property (C.2) (with $\tau = 3/2$) for h implies

$$\sup_{B_R} f^2 \leq \sup_{B_R} h^2 \leq \frac{C_H}{|B_{\tau R}|} \sum_{B_{\tau R}} h^2 \leq \frac{2C_H}{|B_{\tau R}|} \sum_{B_{\tau R}} (h - f)^2 + \frac{2C_H}{|B_{\tau R}|} \sum_{B_{\tau R}} f^2. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

The second term is readily bounded by a constant times the average of f^2 on B_{2R} using the volume control (1.1). For the first sum, since $w := h - f = 0$ on $\partial B_{\tau R}$, by the Poincaré inequality (C.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} w(x)^2 &\leq CR^2 \sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y \sim x} (w(y) - w(x))^2 \\ &\leq 2CR^2 \sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y \sim x} (h(y) - h(x))^2 + 2CR^2 \sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x))^2 \\ &\leq 4CR^2 \sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

where in the last line we used (C.4), that the harmonic function h is a minimizer of the energy $I(B_{\tau R}, f)$. Then the Caccioppoli inequality (C.5) implies the sum in (C.10) is bounded as

$$\sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} \sum_{y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x))^2 \leq \frac{C}{R^2} \sum_{B_{2R}} f^2,$$

leading to $\sum_{x \in B_{\tau R}} w(x)^2 \leq C' \sum_{B_{2R}} f^2$ for some constant C' independent of R . Using this in (C.9), we obtain

$$\sup_{B_R} f^2 \leq \frac{2C_H}{|B_{\tau R}|} \sum_{B_{\tau R}} w^2 + \frac{2C_H}{|B_{\tau R}|} \sum_{B_{\tau R}} f^2 \leq \frac{C}{|B_{2R}|} \sum_{B_{2R}} f^2.$$

□

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Douglas N. Arnold and Svitlana Mayboroda for useful discussions. L.S. was supported in part by the Julian Schwinger Foundation for Physics Research and Simons Foundation grant 563916, SM.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Arnold, M. Filoche, S. Mayboroda, W. Wang, and S. Zhang. The landscape law for tight binding Hamiltonians. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 396(3):1339–1391, 2022.
- [2] D. N. Arnold, G. David, M. Filoche, D. Jerison, and S. Mayboroda. Computing spectra without solving eigenvalue problems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 41(1):B69–B92, 2019.
- [3] M. Baake and U. Grimm. *Aperiodic order. Vol. 1*, volume 149 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. A mathematical invitation, With a foreword by Roger Penrose.
- [4] S. Bachmann, R. Froese, and S. Schraven. Counting eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators using the landscape function. *J. Spectr. Theory*, 13(4):1445–1472, 2023.
- [5] S. Bachmann, R. Froese, and S. Schraven. Two-sided Lieb–Thirring bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19023*, 2024.
- [6] H. Balsam, K. Kaleta, M. Olszewski, and K. Pietruska-Pałuba. Density of states for the Anderson model on nested fractals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05980*, 2023.

- [7] M. Barlow. *Random Walks and Heat Kernels on Graphs*. Number 438 in London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [8] M. T. Barlow. Which values of the volume growth and escape time exponent are possible for a graph? *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 20(1):1–31, 2004.
- [9] G. David, M. Filoche, and S. Mayboroda. The landscape law for the integrated density of states. *Advances in Mathematics*, 390:107946, 2021.
- [10] P. Desforges, S. Mayboroda, S. Zhang, G. David, D. N. Arnold, W. Wang, and M. Filoche. Sharp estimates for the integrated density of states in Anderson tight-binding models. *Physical Review A*, 104(1):012207, 2021.
- [11] F. J. Dyson. The dynamics of a disordered linear chain. *Phys. Rev.*, 92:1331–1338, Dec 1953.
- [12] C. L. Fefferman. The uncertainty principle. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 9(2):129–206, 1983.
- [13] A. Figotin and A. Klein. Localization of electromagnetic and acoustic waves in random media. Lattice models. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 76(3-4):985–1003, 1994.
- [14] M. Filoche and S. Mayboroda. Universal mechanism for Anderson and weak localization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(37):14761–14766, 2012.
- [15] M. Giaquinta and L. Martinazzi. *An introduction to the regularity theory for elliptic systems, harmonic maps and minimal graphs*, volume 11 of *Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, second edition, 2012.
- [16] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.
- [17] D. R. Heath-Brown. Lattice points in the sphere. In *Number theory in progress, Vol. 2 (Zakopane-Kościełisko, 1997)*, pages 883–892. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.
- [18] I. Holopainen and P. M. Soardi. p -harmonic functions on graphs and manifolds. *Manuscripta Math.*, 94(1):95–110, 1997.
- [19] J. G. Hoskins, H. Quan, and S. Steinerberger. Magnetic Schrödinger operators and landscape functions. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 49(1-2):1–14, 2024.
- [20] M. N. Huxley. Exponential sums and lattice points. III. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 87(3):591–609, 2003.
- [21] M. Inui, S. A. Trugman, and E. Abrahams. Unusual properties of midband states in systems with off-diagonal disorder. *Phys. Rev. B*, 49:3190–3196, Feb 1994.
- [22] K. Kaleta and K. Pietruska-Pałuba. Integrated density of states for Poisson–Schrödinger perturbations of subordinate Brownian motions on the Sierpiński gasket. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125(4):1244–1281, 2015.
- [23] W. Kirsch. An invitation to random Schrödinger operators. In *Random Schrödinger operators*, volume 25 of *Panor. Synthèses*, pages 1–119. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2008. With an appendix by Frédéric Klopp.
- [24] W. Kirsch and P. Müller. Spectral properties of the Laplacian on bond-percolation graphs. *Math. Z.*, 252(4):899–916, 2006.
- [25] F. Klopp and S. Nakamura. A note on Anderson localization for the random hopping model. *J. Math. Phys.*, 44(11):4975–4980, 2003.
- [26] W. König. *The parabolic Anderson model*. Pathways in Mathematics. Birkhäuser/Springer, [Cham], 2016. Random walk in random potential.
- [27] G. F. Lawler and V. Limic. *Random walk: a modern introduction*, volume 123. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [28] Y. Lin and H. Song. Harnack and mean value inequalities on graphs. *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)*, 38(6):1751–1758, 2018.
- [29] J. Lu, C. Murphrey, and S. Steinerberger. Fast localization of eigenfunctions via smoothed potentials. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 90(1):Paper No. 38, 18, 2022.
- [30] P. Müller and P. Stollmann. Spectral asymptotics of the Laplacian on super-critical bond-percolation graphs. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 252:233–246, 2007.
- [31] P. Müller and P. Stollmann. Percolation Hamiltonians. In *Random walks, boundaries and spectra*, volume 64 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 235–258. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.
- [32] K. Pietruska-Pałuba. The Lifschitz singularity for the density of states on the Sierpinski gasket. *Probability theory and related fields*, 89(1):1–33, 1991.
- [33] B. Poggi. Applications of the landscape function for Schrödinger operators with singular potentials and irregular magnetic fields. *Adv. Math.*, 445:Paper No. 109665, 54, 2024.
- [34] D. Sánchez-Mendoza. Principal eigenvalue and landscape function of the Anderson model on a large box. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 190(7):Paper No. 122, 19, 2023.

- [35] T. Shima. Lifshitz tails for random Schrödinger operators on nested fractals. *Osaka J. Math.*, 29(4):749–770, 1992.
- [36] L. Shou, W. Wang, and S. Zhang. Landscape approximation of the ground state eigenvalue for graphs and random hopping models. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 286(7):110339, 2024.
- [37] B. Staffler. Lifshitz tails for random band matrices. Master’s thesis, LMU Munich, Theoretical and Mathematical Physics, 2013.
- [38] S. Steinerberger. An Agmon estimate for Schrödinger operators on graphs. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 113(1):Paper No. 12, 9, 2023.
- [39] A. Telcs. Diffusive limits on the Penrose tiling. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 141(4):661–668, 2010.
- [40] G. Theodorou and M. H. Cohen. Extended states in a one-dimensional system with off-diagonal disorder. *Phys. Rev. B*, 13:4597–4601, May 1976.
- [41] A. Walfisz. Gitterpunkte in mehrdimensionalen Kugeln. *Jber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein.*, 61:11–31, 1958.

L. Shou, Condensed Matter Theory Center and Joint Quantum Institute, Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

E-mail address: lshou@umd.edu

W. Wang, LSEC, Institute of Computational Mathematics and Scientific/Engineering Computing, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

E-mail address: ww@lsec.cc.ac.cn

S. Zhang, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Southwick Hall, 11 University Ave. Lowell, MA 01854

E-mail address: shiwen.zhang@uml.edu