

STRUCTURED QUANTITATIVE ALMOST REDUCIBILITY AND ITS APPLICATIONS

LINGRUI GE, JIANGONG YOU, AND QI ZHOU

ABSTRACT. We establish *structured quantitative almost reducibility*, tailored for analytic quasiperiodic $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycles, which effectively addresses the challenge of infinitely many *normal frequency* resonances. This method paves the way for optimal arithmetic reducibility results for such cocycles, thereby resolving Jitomirskaya's conjecture. From a spectral perspective, it leads to optimal arithmetic Anderson localization for a class of quasiperiodic long-range operators on higher-dimensional lattices. In particular, using structured quantitative almost reducibility, we establish a sharp quantitative version of Aubry duality, enabling us to uncover new spectral insights for almost Mathieu operators with Diophantine frequencies. For example, we precisely determine the exponential decay rate of spectral gaps in non-critical cases, thus addressing a question raised by Goldstein. Additionally, we reveal the optimal asymptotic growth of extended eigenfunctions for subcritical almost Mathieu operators.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	12
3. Local structured quantitative almost reducibility	15
4. Optimal arithmetic reducibility and Anderson localization	22
5. Growth of the cocycle	35
6. Explore the structure of the conjugacy	39
7. Sharp version of quantitative Aubry duality	42
8. Sharp spectral applications for AMO	47
Acknowledgements	51
References	52

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the role of resonances in quasiperiodic dynamical systems. A defining characteristic of quasiperiodic dynamics is the profound impact of arithmetic on its behavior, famously manifesting as the "small denominators" problem in various models, such as circle diffeomorphisms, disc dynamics, quasiperiodic cocycles, surface flows, and Hamiltonian systems in finite and infinite dimensions [2, 3, 34, 63, 85]. The primary challenge in managing "small denominators" issues lies in dealing with various types of resonances.

In this paper, we focus on a significant class of quasiperiodic dynamical systems, named analytic quasiperiodic $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles. Given $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ and rationally independent $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, a quasiperiodic cocycle (α, A) is defined as follows:

$$(\alpha, A): \begin{cases} \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^2 & \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^2 \\ (\theta, v) & \mapsto (\theta + \alpha, A(\theta) \cdot v) \end{cases} .$$

Though our main analysis applies to any dimension d , we concentrate on the one-frequency case, where Avila's groundbreaking global theory for $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycles is established [7]. Suppose $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, which means A takes value in $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and has a holomorphic extension to $\{|\Im z| < h\}$. Cocycles which are not uniformly hyperbolic are classified into three categories: subcritical, critical, and supercritical. More precisely, (α, A) is said to be

- (1) *Subcritical*, if there is a uniform subexponential bound on the growth of $\|A_n(z)\|$ through some band $|\Im z| < \delta$,
- (2) *Supercritical*, if $\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} \|A_n(\theta)\|$ grows exponentially,
- (3) *Critical*, otherwise.

Here, the cocycle iterates are defined as $(\alpha, A)^n = (n\alpha, A_n(\cdot))$, where $A_0(\cdot) = \mathrm{id}$, $A_n(\cdot) = A(\cdot + (n-1)\alpha) \cdots A(\cdot)$ for $n \geq 1$, and $A_{-n}(\cdot) = A_n(\cdot - n\alpha)^{-1}$ for $n \geq 1$.

By Avila's global theory [7], critical cocycles are quite rare. Thus we only consider the rest two cases. Our objective is to provide a comprehensive understanding of resonances in the subcritical regime and leverage this knowledge to address "small denominators" issues in the supercritical regime. We anticipate that our new insights into resonances in this model will be beneficial for studying resonances in more general quasiperiodic dynamical systems.

A central aspect of Avila's global theory is the "Almost Reducibility Conjecture" (ARC), which posits that (α, A) is almost reducible if it is subcritical [5, 6, 7]. Recall that (α, A_1) is conjugated to (α, A_2) if there exists $B \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_1(\theta)B(\theta) = A_2(\theta).$$

Then (α, A) is almost reducible if its analytic conjugate class contains the constant. Almost reducibility crucially depends on two types of resonances, or "small denominators": One is the frequency resonances: the strength of frequency resonances is measured by the arithmetic parameter

$$\beta(\alpha) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\ln \|\langle k, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{|k|}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\|x\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = \inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |x - \ell|$. Another is determined by the resonances caused by the fibred rotation number ρ ¹, which corresponds to the normal frequency in Hamiltonian systems. The strength of rotation number resonances (or normal frequency resonances) is measured by

$$\delta(\alpha, \rho) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\ln \|2\rho + \langle k, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{|k|}. \quad (1.2)$$

Almost reducibility captures the properties of cocycles for which local theory (KAM theory) applies. Fundamentally, classical KAM theory doesn't deal with resonances (by assuming Diophantine-type conditions on the frequency), the philosophy is that

¹See Section 2 for definition.

polynomial growth of the “small denominators” can be controlled by exponential decay of the Fourier coefficients.

In the context of quasiperiodic cocycles, the classical question is whether the cocycle (α, A) is reducible, meaning whether (α, A) can be conjugated to constants. Dinaburg and Sinai’s pioneering work [33] addressed reducibility using classical KAM theory, which assumes no resonances are encountered. Möser and Pöschel’s introduction of a “resonances cancellation” technique [73] enabled Eliasson [35] to treat finitely many rotation number resonances. Around the 2010s, Avila, Fayad, and Krikorian [10], as well as Hou and You [50], independently developed non-standard KAM techniques to handle infinitely many frequency resonances (i.e., $\beta(\alpha) > 0$), but still managed only a finite number of rotation number resonances. However, the challenge of dealing with infinitely many rotation resonances, where $\delta(\alpha, \rho) > 0$, remains open for several decades.

What is worth noting, reducibility theory dovetails nicely with the theory of one-dimensional analytic quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators (QPS), called Anderson localization (pure point spectrum with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions), a central topic in the supercritical regime [23, 40, 36, 55, 58, 59, 82]. QPS, defined as a self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$:

$$(H_{V,\alpha,\theta}u)(n) = u(n+1) + u(n-1) + V(\theta + n\alpha)u(n),$$

where $V : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the potential, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ is the frequency, and θ is the phase, has been a subject of sustained interest in condensed matter physics [18, 75], numerical analysis [52, 53], dynamical systems [7, 13], and spectral theory [5, 6, 11, 14, 15, 67] for decades. If $V(\theta) = 2\lambda \cos(2\pi\theta)$, it reduces to the well-known almost Mathieu operator (AMO):

$$(H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u)(n) = u(n+1) + u(n-1) + 2\lambda \cos(2\pi(\theta + n\alpha))u(n).$$

Initially introduced by Peierls [76] as a model for an electron in a 2D lattice with a homogeneous magnetic field [48, 79], the AMO also plays a crucial role in Thouless et al.’s theory of the integer quantum Hall effect [74].

One crucial aspect in proving Anderson localization lies in the treatment of resonances eigenvalues of box restrictions that are too close to each other in relation to the distance between the box, leading to the so-called “small denominators”. There are also two distinct types of resonances: one is associated with the frequency, characterized by the strength $\beta(\alpha)$, and the other with the phase, measured by $\delta(\alpha, \theta)$. By Aubry duality [46] of AMO, one can roughly see that the dual of the phase θ is the rotation number ρ , thus phase resonance $\delta(\alpha, \theta)$ is closely related to the rotation number resonances $\delta(\alpha, \rho)$.

On the other hand, when studying the eigenequation of a quasiperiodic Schrödinger operator $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}u = Eu$, it yields the Schrödinger cocycle (α, A_E) , where

$$A_E(x) = \begin{pmatrix} E - V(x) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, dynamical methods naturally come into play. Indeed, quantitative almost reducibility has proven to be a powerful tool for investigating the spectral theory of quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators [85, 56], both in the subcritical regime [5, 12, 16, 41, 68, 78] and the supercritical regime [15, 42, 65, 43, 44]. However, as we will delve into, the main difficulty in achieving optimal spectral results lies in whether *infinitely many* rotation resonances in the subcritical regime (or phase resonances in the supercritical regime) can be precisely managed.

Hence, the central problem is how to handle these *infinite* resonances. In this paper, we introduce a novel approach called *structured quantitative almost reducibility* to address this challenge.

1.1. Structured quantitative almost reducibility. Throughout the paper, we assume that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is Diophantine, i.e., there exist $\kappa > 0$ and $\tau > d - 1$ such that

$$\|\langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \frac{\kappa}{|n|^\tau}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Denote by $\text{DC}_d(\kappa, \tau)$ the set of (κ, τ) -Diophantine vectors and $\text{DC}_d := \bigcup_{\kappa > 0, \tau > d-1} \text{DC}_d(\kappa, \tau)$. In particular, when $d = 1$, we simplify the notations to $\text{DC}(\kappa, \tau)$ and DC .

Recall that (α, A) is almost reducible means there exist $B_j \in C_{h_j}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $A_j \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, and $f_j \in C_{h_j}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with $\|f_j\|_{h_j} \rightarrow 0$. The minimal n_j for which $\|2\rho_j - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}}$ where $\epsilon_j =: \|f_j\|_{h_j}$ is denoted as the KAM resonances. In [35], it was proved that n_j grow fast than any polynomial. These resonances are of crucial importance in KAM iterations. Given that A_j is symplectic, we have $A_j = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} i\rho_j & \nu_j \\ \bar{\nu}_j & -i\rho_j \end{pmatrix} M$ where $M = \frac{1}{2i} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{pmatrix}$ is the isomorphism between $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $SU(1, 1)$.

In practical applications, precise structures and estimates of A_j, B_j and F_j , are required, which motivates the establishment of the structured quantitative almost reducibility. We say (α, A) is structured quantitative almost reducibility, if we have the following:

SQ1 : Structure of the conjugations, i.e.,

$$B_j(\cdot) = \tilde{B}_j(\cdot) R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \cdot \rangle}{2}} e^{Y_j(\cdot)},$$

where $R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \cdot \rangle}{2}}$ is the rotation, and $e^{Y_j(\cdot)}$ is close to identity, $\|\tilde{B}_j\| \sim e^{o(n)}$.

SQ2 : Structure and quantitative estimates of the perturbations f_j , i.e. $\|f_j\| \sim e^{-O(N)}$.

SQ3 : Structure and quantitative estimates of the constants A_j , i.e. $|\nu_j| \leq e^{-O(n)}$. More precise estimates will be given in Proposition 3.2 of Section 3.2.

As shown in Section 3.2, the KAM resonances are closely linked to the resonances of the rotation number ρ . For any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, we define an ε_0 -resonance of the rotation number ρ as follows:

$$\|2\rho - \langle l, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\varepsilon_0|l|}.$$

By arranging these ε_0 -resonances in increasing order of their magnitudes, $0 < |\ell_1| < |\ell_2| < \dots$, we will demonstrate that a subset of these rotation number resonances aligns with a subsequence of KAM resonances.

This is a rough version. For the detailed statements, refer to Proposition 3.2 (local) and Proposition 6.1 (global). Before discussing its powerful consequences, let's review the history of almost reducibility that led to our definition. The first weak almost reducibility result (where the analytic radius $h_j \rightarrow 0$) was proved by Eliasson [35], without emphasizing its dependence on the KAM resonances n_j or the structure. Using almost localization of the dual operator [12], Avila [5] provided the first strong almost reducibility result (where $h_j \rightarrow h_* > 0$) satisfying conditions (SQ2) and (SQ3), but the

conjugacy was constructed via the Corona Theorem (with Uchiyama estimates), thus lacking a good structure. Recently, another strong almost reducibility scheme [25, 68] was developed, which grants a better structure of the conjugacy (fulfilling $SQ1$) [44], and an improved exponential decay rate of ν_j compared to [5]. However, $(SQ2)$ remains unaddressed in this approach. Additionally, no optimal lower bound for ν_j has been achieved in any of these schemes. For further discussion, consult Section 1.4, particularly regarding the application of these estimates.

1.2. Dynamical application: Optimal reducibility. As we discussed above, one significant feature in applying KAM theory to different dynamics is the so-called “small divisor” which leads to various arithmetic conditions. A crucial challenge lies in determining the optimal arithmetic conditions for various problems. In the context of analytic circle diffeomorphisms, Yoccoz’s theorems [84] confirm that the Brjuno condition is optimal for local linearization, and the \mathcal{H} condition is optimal for global linearization.

There are two key milestones in the reducibility of quasiperiodic $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles (α, A) in the perturbative regime, i.e., $A(\cdot) \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ is sufficiently close to constant. Dinaburg and Sinai [33] showed that if $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$ and the fiber rotation number $\rho = \rho(\alpha, A)$ belongs to $DC_\alpha(\gamma', \tau')$, where

$$DC_\alpha(\gamma', \tau') := \left\{ \rho \in \mathbb{R} : \|2\rho - \langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} > \frac{\gamma'}{|n|^{\tau'}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\} \right\}, \quad (1.4)$$

then (α, A) is reducible. Later, based on the resonances cancellation developed by Mösner and Pöschel [73], Eliasson [35] showed that if $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, and $\rho \in \cup_{\gamma' > 0} DC_\alpha(\gamma', \tau')$ or ρ is rational with respect to α , then (α, A) is reducible. Therefore, the question remains: what is the optimal arithmetic condition for reducibility of ρ ? During the 2015 conference “Almost Periodic and Other Ergodic Problems”, Jitomirskaya conjectured that the optimal arithmetic condition for reducibility is $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$. In this paper, we confirm her conjecture with the following theorems:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\alpha \in DC_d$, $R \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $2\pi h > 2\pi\tilde{h} > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, Then there exists $\epsilon(\alpha, R, h, \tilde{h})$ such that if $\|A(\cdot) - R\|_h < \epsilon$, then (α, A) is reducible.*

Before explaining its optimality, let’s make some remarks. This theorem, based on KAM techniques, is inherently perturbative. For $d \geq 2$, the smallness requirement might not be independent of α owing to a counterexample by Bourgain [21]. However, in the one-dimensional case ($d = 1$), we can achieve more results:

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $\alpha \in DC$ and (α, A) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < h\}$, if $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, then (α, A) is reducible.*

As an immediate corollary, we have the following arithmetic transition result for almost Mathieu cocycles $S_E^\lambda(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} E - 2\lambda \cos 2\pi(\theta) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$:

Corollary 1.1. *Assume $\alpha \in DC$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then the following holds:*

- (1) *If $-\ln \lambda > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, then (α, S_E^λ) is analytically reducible;*
- (2) *If $-\ln \lambda < \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, then (α, S_E^λ) is not analytically reducible.*

Corollary 1.1 (2) was essentially proved by Jitomirskaya-Liu [59] using duality, while we will give a self-contained new proof here. Then Corollary 1.1 immediately establishes the optimality of Theorem 1.1. Indeed, we can understand its optimality in another way. By the fibred Anosov-Katok construction [64, 69], one can construct dense sets of $f \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, sl(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $\|f\|_h < \epsilon$ and $0 < 2\pi h < \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, such that (α, Ae^f) exhibits sub-linear growth, implying irreducibility, illustrating the necessity of the condition $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$.

We should also remark that Fayad-Krikorian [37] generalized Eliasson's result [35] to the C^∞ setting, i.e., the cocycle map $A \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, considering Herman-Yoccoz's optimal linearization result for circle diffeomorphisms [72, 83]. Their work was also regarded as optimal in the C^∞ setting². However, their focus was on finitely many rotation number resonances, whereas our Theorem 1.1 addresses infinite number of resonances.

1.3. Spectral applications. Now, we explore the spectral applications of structured quantitative almost reducibility. Our first application focuses on the exponential decay of spectral gaps for AMO.

1.3.1. Exact exponential decay rate of the spectral gaps. The spectrum of the Schrödinger operator $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}$, denoted by $\Sigma_{V,\alpha}$, is compact and independent of θ for irrational α . The intervals in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \Sigma_{V,\alpha}$ are known as spectral gaps, and their labeling by integers is governed by the Gap-Labeling Theorem (GLT) [61]. In 1981, at the AMS annual meeting, Mark Kac asked if the "all gaps conjecture" held for the almost Mathieu operator $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ [62, 80], and offered ten martinis as a prize for a proof. Later, Barry Simon popularized it as the Ten Martini Problem and the Dry Ten Martini Problem. The Ten Martini Problem asks whether the spectrum is a Cantor set, while the Dry Ten Martini Problem asks more precisely whether all gaps allowed by the Gap Labelling Theorem are open. Since then, two problems have attracted significant attention, and important progress has been made in [11, 12, 13, 19, 28, 49, 66, 77, 82]. The Ten Martini Problem was completely solved by Avila and Jitomirskaya [11]. Compared to the Ten Martini Problem, the Dry Ten Martini Problem is more challenging. It was solved by Avila-You-Zhou [16] for non-critical AMO with all irrational frequencies, and one can consult [28, 12, 77] for partial advances.

To clarify GLT and the precise meaning of "all gaps are there", let's first recall that the integrated density of states $N_{V,\alpha}(E)$ of the operator $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}$, which is defined as

$$N_{V,\alpha}(E) = \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \mu_{V,\alpha,\theta}(-\infty, E] d\theta,$$

where $\mu_{V,\alpha,\theta}$ is the spectral measure of $H = H_{V,\alpha,\theta}$. According to GLT, every spectral gap G has a unique integer k such that $N_{V,\alpha}|_G = k\alpha \bmod \mathbb{Z}$. We denote these gaps by

$$G_k(V) = \begin{cases} (E_k^-, E_k^+) & k \neq 0 \\ (-\infty, \inf \Sigma_{V,\alpha}) \cup (\sup \Sigma_{V,\alpha}, \infty) & k = 0 \end{cases},$$

and $|G_k(V)|$ denotes the length of $G_k(V)$. For AMO, i.e., $V(\theta) = 2\lambda \cos 2\pi\theta$, we abbreviate it as $|G_k(\lambda)|$. In this aspect, "Dry Ten Martini Problem" only asks whether $|G_k(\lambda)| > 0$ for any k . A more challenging task is to obtain quantitative estimates on

²The authors would like to thank B. Fayad for useful discussions on this.

the size of these gaps. Specifically, are there bounds on the upper and lower limits of each spectral gap $G_k(\lambda)$? These questions are not only interesting in spectral theory but also crucial in the study of the homogeneity of the spectrum [20, 68] and Deift's conjecture [20, 31, 32, 68]. Indeed, after the third author announced the result of [16] at the conference "Almost Periodic and Other Ergodic Problems" in 2015, Goldstein asked if any quantitative lower bound on the size of $G_k(\lambda)$ could be derived in the non-critical $|\lambda| \neq 1$ case. Our paper answers this question by providing the exact exponential decay rate:

Theorem 1.3. *Assume $\alpha \in DC$ and $|\lambda| \neq 1$, then we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln |G_k(\lambda)|}{|k|} = -|\ln \lambda|.$$

Remark 1.1. *The upper bound was proven in [68], and we include it here for completeness.*

Let us review some recent works in connection with the question of gap estimates for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. The study of upper bounds for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators began with Moser and Pöschel [73], who showed that for small analytic $V : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the k -th gap of the continuous quasiperiodic Schrödinger operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$:

$$(\mathcal{L}_{V,\alpha}y)(t) = -y''(t) + V(\alpha t)y(t)$$

decays exponentially with respect to $|k|$, provided that k satisfies certain arithmetic conditions. Later Amor [1] later extended this result to show sub-exponential decay for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, while Damanik and Goldstein [30] confirmed an exponential decay upper bound.

The results in [1, 73] also apply to the discrete quasiperiodic Schrödinger operator $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}$, as their proof, based on KAM theory, is applicable to both discrete and continuous settings. In contrast, the proof in [30] relies on localization techniques and is not directly transferable to the discrete case. Recently, Leguil-You-Zhao-Zhou [68] developed a new KAM scheme, enabling them to obtain a sharp exponential upper bound for spectral gaps with any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, applicable to both discrete and continuous models.

The lower bound estimation is more challenging, particularly for general analytic potentials. Indeed, it's already very difficult to prove the Cantor structure of the spectrum [9, 71, 73, 35]. In this context, we focus on the AMO case. Leguil-You-Zhao-Zhou [68] demonstrated that if $\alpha \in DC$, for any $0 < \lambda < 1$, there exists $\xi \gg 1$ such that:

$$|G_k(\lambda)| \geq C(\lambda, \alpha) \lambda^{\xi|k|}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Fedotov [39] recently used the monodromization method to show that for $0 < \xi < 1/2$ and λ sufficiently small, $\lambda < e^{-c/\xi}$, the lower bound is:

$$|G_k(\lambda)| \geq \lambda^k e^{O(1/h)}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq O(\ln(1/\lambda)).$$

Our contribution is that, if $\alpha \in DC$, we prove that for all $0 < \lambda < 1$:

$$|G_k(\lambda)| \geq C(\lambda, \alpha) \lambda^{|k|}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, \tag{1.5}$$

which provides a lower bound for $\lambda \neq 1$ (not only small λ) and *all* gaps. We remark that Fedotov's result [39] is applicable to any irrational α , but one cannot expect (1.5) for any irrational α ³.

1.3.2. Optimal arithmetic Anderson localization. Our second application concerns Anderson localization of the quasiperiodic long-range operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$:

$$(L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u)_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{V}_k u_{n-k} + 2\lambda \cos 2\pi(x + \langle n, \alpha \rangle) u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (1.6)$$

where $V(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{V}(k) e^{2\pi i \langle k, \theta \rangle} \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$ is called the phase and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is called the frequency.

Operator (1.6) has garnered significant interest since the 1980s [12, 22, 24, 29, 44, 57, 26, 27]. On one hand, its spectral properties are closely tied to those of its Aubry dual, multi-frequency quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. On the other hand, (1.6) includes several well-known quasiperiodic models. In particular, when $V(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d 2\lambda^{-1} \cos(2\pi\theta_i)$, (1.6) reduces to the quasiperiodic Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$:

$$L_{\lambda,\alpha,x} = \Delta + 2\lambda \cos 2\pi(x + \langle n, \alpha \rangle) \delta_{nn'}, \quad (1.7)$$

where Δ is the standard Laplacian on the \mathbb{Z}^d lattice. For $d = 1$, this is the celebrated almost Mathieu operator.

In the case $d = 1$, Bourgain and Jitomirskaya [24] established that for any fixed $\alpha \in DC$ and fixed α -Diophantine phase, $L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,x}$ has Anderson localization (AL) for sufficiently large λ . This result is non-perturbative in the sense that the largeness of λ is independent of the Diophantine constant of α . However, as they argued: "current techniques do not extend to operators (1.6) with multi-frequency potentials". If $d \geq 2$, Jitomirskaya and Kachkovskiy [57] proved that for fixed $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,x}$ has pure point spectrum for large enough λ and almost every x . Under the same assumption, Ge-You-Zhou [44] proved that $L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,x}$ has *exponential dynamical localization in expectation* (EDL). An ergodic family $\{H_\omega\}$ is said to have EDL, if

$$\int_\omega \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle \delta_k, e^{-itH_\theta} \delta_\ell \rangle| d\mu \leq C e^{-\gamma|k-\ell|}. \quad (1.8)$$

It is apparent that EDL implies AL for almost every phase. Ge-You [42] show that actually $L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,x}$ has AL for any α -Diophantine phase. This generalizes Bourgain and Jitomirskaya's result [24] to all dimensions. Quite recently, Cao, Shi, and Zhang [26, 27] provided another proof using multiscale analysis. It is natural to ask what the optimal arithmetic condition on x is. We answer this question as follows:

Theorem 1.4. *Assume that $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $V \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$. If $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, x)$, then $L_{V,\lambda,\alpha,x}$ has Anderson localization for sufficiently large $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\alpha, V, d, \delta)$.*

Remark 1.2. *If $d = 1$, Theorem 1.4 is non-perturbative, i.e. the largeness of λ doesn't depend on α .*

The optimality of this result is rooted in the well-known arithmetic phase transition of the almost Mathieu operator (AMO). Around 1995, Jitomirskaya [54] conjectured the following sharp phase transition result:

³The authors would like to thank A. Avila for useful discussions on this.

- **Sharp phase transition in frequency:**
 - (1) If $|\lambda| > e^{\beta(\alpha)}$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has Anderson localization for α -Diophantine θ .
 - (2) If $1 < |\lambda| < e^{\beta(\alpha)}$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum for all θ .
- **Sharp phase transition in phase:**
 - (1) If $|\lambda| > e^{\delta(\alpha,\theta)}$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has Anderson localization for Diophantine α .
 - (2) If $1 < |\lambda| < e^{\delta(\alpha,\theta)}$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum for all irrational α .

One can consult [4, 17, 45, 60, 81] for the history of this conjecture. Concerning its solution, consult [11, 70, 86] for partial results. The measure-theoretic version of the frequency part conjecture was resolved by Avila, You, and Zhou [15], who proved singular continuous spectrum for $1 < |\lambda| < e^\beta$ and Anderson localization for almost every θ when $|\lambda| > e^\beta$. The complete solution to part (1) of the frequency conjecture was given by Jitomirskaya and Liu [58] (consult [65] for another proof based on reducibility). In the phase part, singular continuous spectrum was initially established for $1 < |\lambda| < e^{c\delta(\alpha,\theta)}$ with a small constant c [60]. If $\delta(\alpha,\theta) = 0$, localization was first proved by Jitomirskaya [55], while the full conjecture was ultimately resolved by Jitomirskaya and Liu [59], demonstrating the optimality of Theorem 1.4.

Recently, it became possible to prove pure point spectrum in a non-constructive way, employing reducibility for the dual model, an idea initially developed in [86] and first realized by Avila-You-Zhou [15] (see [57] for an alternate proof). The shortcoming of this approach is that it does not provide a description of the localization phases. In contrast, the proof in [58, 59] is constructive, based on new developments of localization techniques for the AMO, yielding sharp arithmetic phase transitions. More recently, an arithmetic version of Aubry duality was established in [42], leading to a new proof of Jitomirskaya’s sharp phase transition in frequency via reducibility [43]. As pointed out by Jitomirskaya-Liu [59]: “It appears to present a potential for an alternative proof of sharp transition in phase, which would be quite interesting”. In this paper, we answer their question, thus providing a new proof of the sharp transition conjecture in phase.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\alpha \in DC$. If $|\lambda| > e^{\delta(\alpha,\theta)}$, then $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has Anderson localization.*

1.3.3. Stratified, optimal asymptotic growth of extended eigenfunction. Our final application focuses on the asymptotic behavior of extended eigenfunctions (denoted by $u_E(n)$), which corresponds to the generalized eigenfunction in the absolutely continuous spectrum, as found in the physics literature.

These eigenfunctions exhibit a connection to the rotation number. According to Eliasson’s reducibility theory [35], if the rotation number $\rho(E) := \rho(\alpha, S_E^\lambda)$ is rationally related to the frequency, the growth of $u_E(n)$ is linear. Conversely, when $\rho(E)$ is irrational, the eigenfunction’s growth is sub-linear, a property that is shown to be optimal [64]. Theorem 1.1 further states that if the condition $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho(E))$ is met, where δ is an arithmetic invariant, the growth is bounded. We now show that the growth of $u_E(n)$ is actually stratified, reflecting the arithmetic strength of the rotation number.

Theorem 1.6. *Assume $\alpha \in DC_d$ and $V \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0(\alpha, V)$ such that if $\|V\|_h \leq \epsilon_0$, then*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|u_E(n)\|}{\ln |n|} \leq 1 - \min\left\{\frac{2\pi h}{\delta}, 1\right\}. \quad (1.9)$$

The natural question then arises: does the upper bound in (1.9) constitute an optimal growth rate for extended eigenfunctions, or does the arithmetic quantity $\delta(\alpha, \rho)$ truly govern their growth?

On the other hand, as described in [58], a captivating question in solid-state physics is to comprehend the hierarchical structure of spectral features for operators that represent 2D Bloch electrons in a perpendicular magnetic field, linked to the continued fraction expansion of the magnetic flux. Earlier results, like the hierarchical structure, were derived in the works of Sinai [82], Helffer-Sjostrand [49], and Buslaev-Fedotov [38]. Recently, for supercritical AMO, Jitomirskaya-Liu [58, 59] have uncovered a universal hierarchical structure in these localized eigenfunctions, not only determining the optimal asymptotics but also revealing the hierarchical pattern of local maxima through a universal function $f(k)$ derived from resonance phases.

The parallel question in the absolutely continuous spectrum regime is whether a similar universal hierarchical structure exists for extended eigenfunctions. We will address these two questions in the following:

Assume that $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $h_\lambda = -\ln \lambda$. For any $0 < \varepsilon_0 < h_\lambda$, we let $\{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that

$$\|2\rho(E) - \ell_i\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\varepsilon_0|\ell_i|}.$$

Let $\eta_i \in (0, \infty]$ be such that

$$\sin 2\pi(2\rho(E) + \ell_i\alpha) = e^{-\eta_i|\ell_i|}.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, for $e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda|\ell_j|} \leq |n| \leq e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda|\ell_{j+1}|}$, we define

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} \max\{1 - \frac{|\ell_j|h_\lambda}{\ln|n|}, 0\} & e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda|\ell_j|} \leq |n| < e^{\eta_j|\ell_j|} \\ \max\{\frac{\ln|\sin 2\pi n(\rho(E) + \ell_j\alpha/2)| + |\ell_j|(\eta_j - h_\lambda)}{\ln|n|}, 0\} & e^{\eta_j|\ell_j|} < |n| < e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda|\ell_{j+1}|}. \end{cases}$$




Figure 1. Picture of $f(n)$ in two resonant windows

Let ϕ and ψ be two generalized eigenfunctions of the eigenequation $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}u = Eu$, having initial conditions $\begin{pmatrix} \phi(1) & \psi(1) \\ \phi(0) & \psi(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $U_E(n) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(n) & \psi(n) \\ \phi(n-1) & \psi(n-1) \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have the following:

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\alpha \in DC$, $0 < \lambda < 1$. For any $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda,\alpha}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N , such that the associated extended eigenfunction matrix $U_E(n)$ satisfies*

$$|n|^{f(n)-\varepsilon} \leq \|U_E(n)\|_{HS} \leq |n|^{f(n)+\varepsilon}.$$

provided $n > N$. In particular, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|U_E(n)\|_{HS}}{\ln |n|} = 1 - \min\left\{-\frac{\ln \lambda}{\delta}, 1\right\}, \quad (1.10)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|U_E(n)\|_{HS}}{\ln |n|} = 0. \quad (1.11)$$

Remark 1.3. *In the analysis of lower bounds for the solution, the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|U_E(n)\|_{HS}$ is preferred. This selection is justified by the distinct characteristics of gap edges, where one solution displays linear growth while the other remains bounded.*

In conclusion, though we didn't acquire the full universal hierarchical structure, we managed to obtain a partial structure for $U_E(n)$. To simplify, let's assume $0 < \delta(\alpha, \rho(E)) < \infty$. By definition, there exists a sequence of resonances $\{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that:

$$e^{-2\pi(\delta-\epsilon)|\ell_i|} \leq \|2\rho(E) - \ell_i\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-2\pi(\delta+\epsilon)|\ell_i|}.$$

As depicted in Figure 1, for $e^{\frac{1}{256}eh\lambda|\ell_j|} \leq |n| \leq e^{\frac{1}{256}eh\lambda|\ell_{j+1}|}$, the function $f(n)$ increases from 0 to $1 + \frac{\ln \lambda}{\delta(\alpha, \rho(E))}$, then decreases back to 0. Theorem 1.7 highlights the optimal stratified sub-linear growth pattern and reveals that the extended eigenfunction $U_E(n)$ exhibits self-similarity around each resonance ℓ_i .

1.4. Novelty, ideas of the proof. Let's state the main novelty of the paper and outline the ideas of the proof.

- (1) **Structured quantitative almost reducibility.** Structured quantitative almost reducibility plays an important role in addressing an infinite array of rotation number resonances. Our methodology entails investigating the interdependence of the conjugacy $B_j(\cdot)$, constant A_j , and perturbation $f_j(\cdot)$ on the resonances n_j . The properties (SQ1) and (SQ3) are essential for exponential dynamical localization of AMO [44], and (SQ3) has been instrumental in achieving exponential spectral gap decay [68].

Our focus lies in determining the simultaneous satisfaction of (SQ1)-(SQ3), which yields significant implications. For instance, by leveraging (SQ1), we can introduce a novel KAM scheme (Theorem 1.1) that guarantees optimal arithmetic reducibility, with the convergence guaranteed by (SQ2) and (SQ3). This, in turn, leads to the optimal arithmetic localization result encapsulated in Theorem 1.5. The exponential decay of ν_j and f_j with respect to the resonances is of paramount importance, as it ensures that the "small denominators" remain exponentially small.

- (2) **Sharp version of quantitative Aubry duality.** First introduced in [16], quantitative Aubry duality constitutes a crucial connection between quantitative estimates of $B_j(\theta)$ and localized eigenfunctions of dual operators. This was pivotal in resolving the non-critical Dry Ten Martini Problem [16]. Our contribution here lies in developing a refined but sharp quantitative version of this duality, tailored to the specific structure of $B_j(\theta)$. The structured properties (SQ1) enable in-depth analysis of dual localized eigenfunctions, ultimately resulting in optimal lower bounds for $|\nu_j|$ (akin to (SQ3)). These bounds are of fundamental importance for achieving the optimal exponential decay rate of

spectral gaps (as demonstrated in Theorem 1.3) and understanding the asymptotic growth patterns of extended eigenfunctions (Theorem 1.7).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Quasiperiodic cocycles. Given $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}))$ and rationally independent $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the *quasiperiodic cocycle* (α, A) :

$$(\alpha, A): \begin{cases} \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{C}^2 & \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{C}^2 \\ (\theta, v) & \mapsto (\theta + \alpha, A(\theta) \cdot v) \end{cases}.$$

The iterates of (α, A) are of the form $(\alpha, A)^n = (n\alpha, \mathcal{A}_n)$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\theta) := \begin{cases} A(\theta + (n-1)\alpha) \cdots A(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta), & n \geq 0 \\ A^{-1}(\theta + n\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + (n+1)\alpha) \cdots A^{-1}(\theta - \alpha), & n < 0 \end{cases}.$$

The *Lyapunov exponent* is defined by $L(\alpha, A) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \ln \|\mathcal{A}_n(\theta)\| d\theta$.

The cocycle (α, A) is *uniformly hyperbolic* if, for every $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^d$, there exists a continuous splitting $\mathbb{C}^2 = E^s(\theta) \oplus E^u(\theta)$ such that for every $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_n(\theta)v| &\leq Ce^{-cn}|v|, \quad v \in E^s(\theta), \\ |\mathcal{A}_n(\theta)^{-1}v| &\leq Ce^{-cn}|v|, \quad v \in E^u(\theta + n\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C, c > 0$. This splitting is invariant by the dynamics, i.e.,

$$A(\theta)E^*(\theta) = E^*(\theta + \alpha), \quad * = \text{“s” or “u”}, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Assume that $A \in C(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ is homotopic to the identity. It induces the projective skew-product $F_A: \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{S}^1$ with

$$F_A(\theta, w) := \left(\theta + \alpha, \frac{A(\theta) \cdot w}{\|A(\theta) \cdot w\|} \right),$$

which is also homotopic to the identity. Thus we can lift F_A to a map $\tilde{F}_A: \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ of the form $\tilde{F}_A(\theta, y) = (\theta + \alpha, y + \psi_\theta(y))$, where for every $\theta \in \mathbb{T}^d$, ψ_θ is \mathbb{Z} -periodic. The map $\psi: \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *lift* of A . Let μ be any probability measure on $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ which is invariant by \tilde{F}_A , and whose projection on the first coordinate is given by Lebesgue measure. The number

$$\rho(\alpha, A) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}} \psi_\theta(y) d\mu(\theta, y) \bmod \mathbb{Z}$$

depends neither on the lift ψ nor on the measure μ , and is called the *fibred rotation number* of (α, A) (see [47, 61] for more details).

Given $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$, let $R_\phi := \begin{pmatrix} \cos 2\pi\phi & -\sin 2\pi\phi \\ \sin 2\pi\phi & \cos 2\pi\phi \end{pmatrix}$. If $A: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ is homotopic to $\theta \mapsto R_{\frac{\langle n, \theta \rangle}{2}}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then we call n the *degree* of A and denote it by $\text{deg } A$. The fibred rotation number is invariant under real conjugacies which are homotopic to the identity. More generally, if (α, A_1) is conjugated to (α, A_2) , i.e., $B(\cdot + \alpha)^{-1}A_1(\cdot)B(\cdot) = A_2(\cdot)$, for some $B: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ with $\text{deg } B = n$, then

$$\rho(\alpha, A_1) = \rho(\alpha, A_2) + \frac{\langle n, \alpha \rangle}{2}. \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, immediately from the definition of rotation number, we have

Lemma 2.1. *For any $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, there exists a numerical constant $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|\rho(\alpha, B) - \rho(\alpha, A)| < C_2 \|B(\cdot) - A\|_0^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In particular, if $A = R_\phi$, then we have

$$|\rho(\alpha, B) - \phi| < C_2 \|B(\cdot) - R_\phi\|_0.$$

2.2. Almost Mathieu cocycle. Note that a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a formal solution of the eigenvalue equation $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta} u = E u$ if and only if it satisfied

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{n+1} \\ u_n \end{pmatrix} = S_E^\lambda(\theta + n\alpha) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ u_{n-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we denote

$$S_E^\lambda(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} E - 2\lambda \cos 2\pi(\theta) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{R}).$$

then (α, S_E^λ) can be seen as a quasiperiodic cocycle, and we call it almost Mathieu cocycle.

Denote the spectrum of $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}$ by $\Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$, which is independent of θ when $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. The spectral properties of $H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}$ and the dynamics of (α, S_E^λ) are closely related by the well-known fact: $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$ if and only if (α, S_E^λ) is *not* uniformly hyperbolic. If $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$, then the Lyapunov exponent of almost Mathieu cocycle can be computed explicitly.

Theorem 2.1. [51] *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$, then we have*

$$L(\alpha, S_E^\lambda) = \max\{0, \ln |\lambda|\}.$$

Denote $(n\alpha, \mathcal{A}_E^n) := (\alpha, S_E^\lambda)^n$, the iterates of the almost Mathieu cocycle. Then as a consequence of Theorem 2.1, we have the following:

Lemma 2.2. [15] *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $\lambda > 1$. For any small $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $N(\epsilon, \lambda, \alpha) < \infty$, such that for any $|m| > N(\epsilon, \lambda, \alpha)$, $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$, we have*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{|m|} \ln \|\mathcal{A}_E^m(\theta)\| < \ln \lambda + \epsilon.$$

2.3. Aubry duality. Consider the fiber direct integral,

$$\mathcal{H} := \int_{\mathbb{T}}^{\oplus} \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) d\theta,$$

which, as usual, is defined as the space of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ -valued, L^2 -functions over the measure space $(\mathbb{T}, d\theta)$. The extensions of the Schrödinger operators and their long-range duals to \mathcal{H} are given in terms of their direct integrals, which we now define. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$ be fixed. Interpreting $H_{V, \alpha, \theta}$ as fibers of the decomposable operator,

$$H_{V, \alpha} := \int_{\mathbb{T}}^{\oplus} H_{V, \alpha, \theta} d\theta,$$

then the family $\{H_{V, \alpha, \theta}\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}}$ naturally induces an operator on the space \mathcal{H} , i.e. ,

$$(H_{V, \alpha} \Psi)(\theta, n) = \Psi(\theta, n+1) + \Psi(\theta, n-1) + V(\theta + n\alpha) \Psi(\theta, n).$$

Similarly, the direct integral of long-range operator $L_{V,\alpha,x}$, denote as $L_{V,\alpha}$, is given by

$$(L_{V,\alpha}\Psi)(x, n) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{V}_k \Psi(x, n+k) + 2 \cos 2\pi(x + \langle n, \alpha \rangle) \Psi(x, n),$$

where \hat{V}_k is the k -th Fourier coefficient of $V(\theta)$. Let U be the following operator on \mathcal{H} :

$$(\mathcal{U}\phi)(\eta, m) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} e^{2\pi i \langle m, \theta \rangle} e^{2\pi i n \langle m, \alpha \rangle + \eta} \phi(\theta, n) d\theta.$$

Then direct computations show that U is unitary and satisfies

$$U H_{V,\alpha} U^{-1} = L_{V,\alpha},$$

and the quasiperiodic long-range operator $L_{V,\alpha,x}$ is called the dual operator of $H_{V,\alpha,\theta}$ [46].

2.4. Algebraic lemma. Recall $sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ is the set of 2×2 matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} x & y+z \\ y-z & -x \end{pmatrix}$$

where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. It is isomorphic to $su(1, 1)$, the group of matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix}$$

with $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$. The isomorphism between $sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $su(1, 1)$ is given by $B \rightarrow MBM^{-1}$ where

$$M = \frac{1}{2i} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Direct calculation shows that

$$M \begin{pmatrix} x & y+z \\ y-z & -x \end{pmatrix} M^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} iz & x-iy \\ x+iy & -iz \end{pmatrix}.$$

We state the following lemma concerning the diagonalization of elliptic matrices in $su(1, 1)$. The diagonalizing conjugation given by the lemma is of optimal norm.

Lemma 2.3. [64] *Let the matrix*

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix} \in su(1, 1)$$

satisfy $\det \tilde{A} > 0$. Then, calling $\rho = \sqrt{\det \tilde{A}}$, we have

$$U^{-1} \tilde{A} U = \begin{pmatrix} i\rho & 0 \\ 0 & -i\rho \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U &= (\cos 2\varphi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\phi} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi & \sin \varphi \\ \sin \varphi & \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\cos 2\varphi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi & e^{2i\phi} \sin \varphi \\ e^{-2i\phi} \sin \varphi & \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $2\phi = \arg \nu - \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\varphi \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ satisfies

$$2\varphi = -\arctan \frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{t^2 - |\nu|^2}}$$

In addition we have

$$\|U\|^2 = \frac{(1 - \tan \varphi)^2}{1 - \tan^2 \varphi} = \frac{|t| + |\nu|}{\rho}. \quad (2.2)$$

As a consequence, we have the following:

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that*

$$MAM^{-1} = \exp \begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix} \in SU(1,1)$$

with $\text{spec}\{A\} = \{e^{i\xi}, e^{-i\xi}\}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists $U \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, such that

$$U^{-1}AU = R_\xi,$$

with the following estimates:

(1) If $|\frac{2\nu}{\xi}| \leq 1$, then $\|U - id\| \leq |\frac{\nu}{\xi}|$.

(2) otherwise, we have $\|U\|^2 \leq \frac{4|\nu|}{\xi}$.

Moreover, there exists $U' \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$U'^{-1}AU' = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\xi} & \nu' \\ 0 & e^{-i\xi} \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\|U'\| \leq 2, \quad |\nu'| \leq 4|\nu|. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. Note (1) follows direct construction of U in Lemma 2.3, one can consult Corollary 2.1 in [64] (see also Lemma 4.1 in [44]) for details. Now if $|\frac{2\nu}{\xi}| > 1$, it follows that

$$|t| + |\nu| < 4|\nu|, \quad (2.4)$$

then (2) follows from (2.4) and (2.2) of Lemma 2.3, while (2.3) follows from (2.4) and Schur's lemma. \square

3. LOCAL STRUCTURED QUANTITATIVE ALMOST REDUCIBILITY

In this section, we introduce the concept of structured quantitative almost reducibility within the perturbed regime. By emphasizing the "structure" and providing precise estimates, we aim to offer a novel approach to manage resonances. This method will enable us to achieve various sharp dynamical and spectral applications.

First we recall the following strong almost reducibility result:

Proposition 3.1. [25, 68] *Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$. Suppose that $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $f \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$. Then for any $h_+ < h$, there exists numerical constant C_0 , and constant $D_0 = D_0(\kappa, \tau, d)$ such that if*

$$\|f\|_h \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{D_0}{\|A\|^{C_0}} (h - h_+)^{C_0\tau},$$

then there exists $B \in C_{h_+}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $A_+ \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $f_+ \in C_{h_+}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)Ae^{f(\theta)}B(\theta) = A_+e^{f_+(\theta)} = M^{-1}\exp \begin{pmatrix} it^+ & \nu^+ \\ \bar{\nu}^+ & -it^+ \end{pmatrix} Me^{f_+(\theta)}.$$

More precisely, let $\text{spec}(A) = \{e^{i\xi}, e^{-i\xi}\}$, $N = \frac{2}{h-h_+} |\ln \epsilon|$, then we can distinguish two cases:

- (Non-resonant case) if for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $0 < |n| \leq N$, we have

$$\|2\xi - \langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

then

$$\|B - id\|_{h_+} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|f_+\|_{h'} \leq \epsilon e^{-2\pi N(h-h')}, \quad \forall h' \leq h_+.$$

Moreover, $\|A_+ - A\| < 2\epsilon$.

- (Resonant case) if there exists n_* with $0 < |n_*| \leq N$ such that

$$\|2\xi - \langle n_*, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon^{\frac{1}{15}}, \quad (3.1)$$

then there exists $P \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that $P^{-1}AP = R_\xi$ with estimate

$$\|P\| \leq \frac{|n_*|^\tau}{\kappa},$$

and the conjugacy $B(\theta)$ takes the form $B(\theta) = B'(\theta)R_{\frac{\langle n_*, \theta \rangle}{2}} = Pe^{Y(\theta)}R_{\frac{\langle n_*, \theta \rangle}{2}}$ with

$$\deg B = n_*, \quad \|Y\|_{h_+} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|f_+\|_{h_+} < \epsilon e^{-h_+ \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{18\tau}}}, \quad |\nu^+| \leq \epsilon^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_*| h}.$$

3.1. Local structured quantitative almost reducibility. By Proposition 3.1, we can easily prove that for any cocycle $(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0(\cdot)})$, if f_0 is small enough, then $(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0(\cdot)})$ is almost reducible [25, 68], i.e. there exist sequence of $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $A_j \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $f_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_0 e^{f_0(\theta)}B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)}.$$

Here, n_* satisfying (3.1) is called the KAM resonance. Indeed, by (3.2), we can label all the resonances as

$$I_j = \{n_{i-1} = \deg B_i - \deg B_{i-1} \mid \deg B_i \neq \deg B_{i-1}, 1 \leq i \leq j\} := \{n_{i_1}, \dots, n_{i_j}\},$$

i.e. $i_j \leq j-1$ is the last resonance up to j -th KAM step. By the construction we have

$$\deg B_j = n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_j}. \quad (3.3)$$

If there are only finite number KAM resonances, we formally set $|n_{i_{j+1}}| = \infty$. To prove the structured quantitative almost reducibility, the first step is to relate directly the estimate of B_j to the KAM resonances n_{i_j} , and explore the structure of B_j , which is also directly related to n_{i_j} . Now we state the result as follows:

Proposition 3.2. Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $h > \tilde{h} > 0$, $R \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$. If

$$\|A(\cdot) - R\|_h \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{D_0(\kappa, \tau, d)}{\|A\|_{C_0}^\tau} (h - h_+)^{C_0 \tau},$$

then there exist $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $f_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimates

$$|\nu^j| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|\tilde{h}}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}. \quad (3.5)$$

where $\epsilon_j \leq \epsilon^{2^j}$. Moreover, the conjugation $B_j(\cdot)$ takes the form

$$B_j(\theta) = \tilde{B}_j(\theta) R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y_j(\theta)},$$

with estimate

$$\|Y_j\|_{\tilde{h}} < e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|^4\tilde{h}}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\|\tilde{B}_j\|_{\tilde{h}} < C(\alpha)|n_{i_j}|^\tau e^{2\epsilon_{i_{j-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}}|n_{i_j}|}, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\|B_j\|_0 < C(\alpha)|n_{i_j}|^{2\tau}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$|\deg B_j - n_{i_j}| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_{j-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}}|n_{i_j}|. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. We prove the result by iteration, and divide the proof into three steps:

Step 1: One step of KAM:

First by simple implicit functional theorem, we can rewrite $A(\theta) = Re^{f(\theta)}$ with $\|f\|_h \leq \epsilon$. Let $A_0 = R$, $f_0(\theta) = f(\theta)$, $h_0 = h$, $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon$, assume that we are at the $(j+1)$ -th KAM step, i.e. we already construct $B_j \in C_{h_j}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_0e^{f_0(\theta)}B_j(\theta) = A_je^{f_j(\theta)},$$

where $A_j \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ with two eigenvalues $e^{\pm i\xi_j}$ and

$$\|B_j\|_{h_j} \leq C(\alpha)e^{4\pi h(1-\frac{1}{4^j})|n_{i_j}|}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\|B_j\|_0 \leq C(\alpha) \prod_{k \leq j} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k})|n_{i_k}|^{2\tau}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\|f_j\|_{h_j} \leq \epsilon_j \leq \epsilon_0^{2^j},$$

then we define

$$h_j - h_{j+1} = \frac{h - \tilde{h}}{4^{j+1}}, \quad N_j = \frac{2|\ln \epsilon_j|}{h_j - h_{j+1}}.$$

By our selection of ϵ_0 , one can check that

$$\epsilon_j \leq \frac{D_0}{\|A_j\|^{C_0}} (h_j - h_{j+1})^{C_0\tau}. \quad (3.12)$$

Indeed, ϵ_j on the left side of the inequality decays at least super-exponentially with j , while $(h_j - h_{j+1})^{C_0\tau}$ on the right side decays exponentially with j .

Note that (3.12) implies that Proposition 3.1 can be applied iteratively, consequently one can construct

$$\bar{B}_j \in C_{h_{j+1}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})), \quad A_{j+1} \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}), \quad f_{j+1} \in C_{h_{j+1}}(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$$

such that

$$\bar{B}_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_je^{f_j(\theta)}\bar{B}_j(\theta) = A_{j+1}e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)}.$$

Let $B_{j+1} = B_j(\theta)\bar{B}_j(\theta)$, then we have

$$B_{j+1}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_0e^{f_0(\theta)}B_{j+1}(\theta) = A_{j+1}e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)},$$

More precisely, we can distinguish two cases:

Non-resonant case: If for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $0 < |n| \leq N_j$, we have

$$\|2\xi_j - \langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

then by Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\|A_{j+1} - A_j\| \leq 2\epsilon_j. \quad (3.13)$$

$$\|\bar{B}_j - id\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|f_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j^2 := \epsilon_{j+1}, \quad (3.14)$$

As a consequence,

$$\deg B_{j+1} = \deg B_j, \quad (3.15)$$

since $\bar{B}_j(\theta)$ is close to the identity. By (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} &\leq C(\alpha)(1 + \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}})e^{4\pi h(1 - \frac{1}{4^j})|n_{i_j}|} \leq C(\alpha)e^{4\pi h(1 - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}})|n_{i_j}|}, \\ \|B_{j+1}\|_0 &\leq C(\alpha)(1 + \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}) \prod_{k \leq j} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k})|n_{i_j}|^{2\tau} \leq C(\alpha) \prod_{k \leq j+1} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k})|n_{i_j}|^{2\tau}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the simple fact that $\epsilon_j \leq 16^{-j-1}$. Moreover, by the selection $\epsilon_{j+1} = \epsilon_j^2$, we can easily check in this case the truncation satisfies

$$N_{j+1} = 8N_j. \quad (3.16)$$

Resonant case: If there exists n_j with $0 < |n_j| \leq N_j$ such that

$$\|2\xi_j - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

again by Proposition 3.1, the conjugacy $\bar{B}_j(\theta)$ takes the form as $\bar{B}_j(\theta) = \bar{B}'_j(\theta)R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}$ with estimates

$$\|\bar{B}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq 2\frac{|n_j|^\tau}{\kappa}e^{2\pi h_{j+1}|n_j|}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$\|\bar{B}'_j\|_{h_{j+1}} < 2\frac{|n_j|^\tau}{\kappa}, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\|f_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j e^{-h_{j+1}\epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{18\tau}}} := \epsilon_{j+1}. \quad (3.19)$$

By the construction,

$$\deg B_{j+1} = \deg B_j + \deg \bar{B}_j = \deg B_j + n_j, \quad (3.20)$$

thus by the definition of i_{j+1} , we have $n_{i_{j+1}} = n_j$.

Furthermore, the resonance condition implies

$$\|2\xi_{i_{j+1}} - \langle n_{i_{j+1}}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon_{i_{j+1}}^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

hence by the assumption that $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, we have

$$|\xi_{i_j+1}| \geq \frac{\kappa}{2|n_{i_j+1}|^\tau} - \epsilon_{i_j+1}^{\frac{1}{15}} \geq \frac{\kappa}{3|n_{i_j+1}|^\tau}.$$

On the other hand, according to Proposition 3.1, after the $(i_j + 1)^{th}$ -step, $|\xi_{i_j+1}| \leq \epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{1}{16}}$, and between $(i_j + 1)^{th}$ -step and $(i_{j+1} + 1)^{th}$ -step, there are no resonant steps, it follows from (3.13) that $|\xi_{i_j+1}| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{1}{16}}$, consequently we have

$$|n_{i_j+1}| \geq \epsilon_{i_j}^{-\frac{1}{17\tau}} |n_{i_j}|. \quad (3.21)$$

By (3.10), (3.17) and (3.21), we have

$$\|B_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq e^{4\pi h(1-\frac{1}{4^j})|n_{i_j}|} \frac{|n_{i_j+1}|^\tau}{\kappa} e^{2\pi h_{j+1}|n_{i_j+1}|} \leq e^{4\pi h(1-\frac{1}{4^{j+1}})|n_{i_j+1}|}.$$

By (3.11), (3.18) and (3.21), we have

$$\|B_{j+1}\|_0 \leq \prod_{k \leq j} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k}) |n_{i_j}|^{2\tau} \frac{|n_{i_j+1}|^\tau}{\kappa} \leq \prod_{k \leq j+1} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k}) |n_{i_j+1}|^{2\tau}.$$

We thus finish one step of iteration, and prove the cocycle is almost reducible.

Step 2: Structure of the conjugacy $B_j(\theta)$:

Next we prove that the conjugacy $B_j(\theta)$ can be written in the desired form with good estimates. Indeed, we may assume that the last resonance happens at some step $0 < i_j < j - 1$ (if $i_j = j - 1$ then the proof would be much simpler). By the above iteration process, there exist $\{\bar{B}_\ell\}_{\ell=i_j}^{j-1}$ and $\{A_\ell\}_{\ell=i_j+1}^j$ such that

$$\bar{B}_\ell^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_\ell e^{f_\ell(\theta)} \bar{B}_\ell(\theta) = A_{\ell+1} e^{f_{\ell+1}(\theta)}.$$

For $\ell = i_j$, since this is a resonant step, one has $\bar{B}_{i_j}(\theta) = \bar{B}'_{i_j}(\theta) R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}}$. By (3.18) and (3.19), we have

$$\|\bar{B}'_{i_j}\|_{h_{i_j+1}} \leq 2 \frac{|n_{i_j}|^\tau}{\kappa}, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\|f_{i_j+1}\|_{h_{i_j+1}} \leq e^{-\epsilon_{i_j}^{-\frac{1}{18\tau}} \bar{h}} = \epsilon_{i_j+1}. \quad (3.23)$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 3.1, we have

$$MA_{i_j+1}M^{-1} = \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^{i_j+1} & \nu^{i_j+1} \\ \bar{\nu}^{i_j+1} & -it^{i_j+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with estimate

$$|\nu^{i_j+1}| < \epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_{i_j}| \bar{h}}. \quad (3.24)$$

For $i_j + 1 \leq \ell \leq j - 1$, there is no resonance since i_j is the last resonant step before j . By the iteration process, we have

$$\|\bar{B}_\ell - id\|_{h_{\ell+1}} \leq \epsilon_\ell^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|A_{\ell+1} - A_\ell\| \leq 2\epsilon_\ell. \quad (3.25)$$

Now if we denote by

$$\tilde{B}_j(\theta) = B_{i_j-1}(\theta) \bar{B}'_{i_j}(\theta), \quad e^{Y_j(\theta)} = \bar{B}_{i_j+1}(\theta) \cdots \bar{B}_{j-1}(\theta),$$

then by our construction $B_j(\theta)$ can be rewritten as

$$B_j(\theta) = B_{i_j-1}(\theta) \bar{B}'_{i_j}(\theta) R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} \bar{B}_{i_j+1}(\theta) \cdots \bar{B}_{j-1}(\theta) = \tilde{B}_j(\theta) R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y_j(\theta)}.$$

Note by (3.23) and (3.25), we have

$$\|Y_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq 2\|\bar{B}_{i_j+1} - id\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{i_j}^{-\frac{1}{18\tau}}\tilde{h}} < e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|^4\tilde{h}},$$

by (3.10), (3.21) and (3.22), one has

$$\|\tilde{B}_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \|B_{i_j-1}\|_{\tilde{h}} \|B'_{i_j}\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq 2C(\alpha) e^{4\pi h(1-\frac{1}{4\tau})|n_{i_j-1}|} \frac{|n_{i_j}|^\tau}{\kappa} \leq C(\alpha) |n_{i_j}|^\tau e^{2\epsilon_{i_j-1}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}}|n_{i_j}|},$$

which proves (3.7), while (3.8) follows directly from (3.11). By (3.3) and (3.21), one can estimate

$$|\deg B_j - n_{i_j}| \leq \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} |n_{i_m}| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_{j-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} |n_{i_j}|,$$

which gives (3.9). These finish the estimates of the conjugacy B_j .

Step 3: Quantitative estimates of ν_j and f_j .

By (3.25), we have $\|A_j - A_{i_j+1}\| \leq C\epsilon_{i_j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, combining (3.24), which imply that

$$|\nu^j| \leq |\nu^{i_j+1}| + \|A_j - A_{i_j+1}\| \leq \epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|\tilde{h}} + C\epsilon_{i_j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} < 2\epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|\tilde{h}}.$$

Finally, if we take $j = i_{j+1}$ to be the resonant step, while $(j-1)$ -th is non-resonant, then according to Proposition 3.1, while f_j is well defined in $C_{h_j}(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, we have estimates

$$\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_{j-1} e^{-2\pi N_{j-1}(h_j - \tilde{h})},$$

by (3.16), we have $N_{i_{j+1}} = 8N_{i_j+1-1}$, it follows that

$$\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8} N_{i_j+1}(h - \tilde{h})} \leq \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8} |n_{i_j+1}|(h - \tilde{h})}.$$

□

3.2. KAM resonances and rotation number resonances. In this section, we delve into the intricate connection between KAM resonances and rotation number resonances.

For any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, we say that k is an ε_0 -resonance if

$$\|2\rho - \langle k, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-|k|\varepsilon_0} \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\|2\rho - \langle k, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = \min_{|j| \leq |k|} \|2\rho - \langle j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}. \quad (3.27)$$

As pointed out by Avila-Jitomirskaya [12], if $\alpha \in \bar{\partial}DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, then (3.26) implies (3.27) for $|n| > n(\gamma, \tau)$. We order the ε_0 -resonances $0 = |\ell_0| < |\ell_1| \leq |\ell_2| \leq \cdots$. We say that ρ is ε_0 -resonant if the set of resonances is infinite. If ρ is non-resonant, with the set of resonances $\{\ell_0, \cdots, \ell_j\}$ we formally set $\ell_{j+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be any vector such that $|\ell_{j+1}| = \infty$.

Lemma 3.1. *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.2, for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exist $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that*

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)} \quad (3.28)$$

with $\ell_i = \deg B_j$ provided ℓ_i is large enough (the choice of j depends on ℓ_i).

Proof. First by Proposition 3.2, (α, A) is almost reducible, and there exist $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimate $\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_j$, where

$$\epsilon_{k+1} = \begin{cases} \epsilon_k^2 & k \neq i_m, \\ \epsilon_k e^{-h_k \epsilon_k^{-\frac{1}{18\tau}}} & k = i_m. \end{cases} \quad (3.29)$$

and $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{i_j} \leq j - 1$ are the resonances, see (3.14) and (3.19).

First by (2.1), we have

$$2\rho(\alpha, A_k e^{f_k}) = 2\rho(\alpha, A) - \langle \deg B_k, \alpha \rangle,$$

by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$|\rho(\alpha, A_k e^{f_k}) - \xi_k| = |\rho(\alpha, A_k e^{f_k}) - \rho(\alpha, A_k)| \leq C \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

it then follows from (3.26) that

$$\|\langle \ell_i - \deg B_k, \alpha \rangle - 2\xi_k\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 2C \epsilon_k^{\frac{1}{2}} + e^{-|\ell_i|\varepsilon_0} \quad (3.30)$$

Now for any $\ell_i \in \{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, there exists j such that $N_{j-1} \leq |\ell_i| < N_j$, thus we can distinguish the proof into two cases:

Case I: $j - 1 = i_j$. By the definition of resonances, there exists $|n_{i_j}| \leq N_{j-1}$ we have

$$\|2\xi_{j-1} - \langle n_{i_j}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon_{j-1}^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

combining (3.30) with $k = j - 1$, we have

$$\|\langle \ell_i - \deg B_j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = \|\langle \ell_i - \deg B_{j-1} - n_{i_j}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 2\epsilon_{j-1}^{\frac{1}{15}}.$$

By Diophantine condition $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, if $\ell_i \neq \deg B_j$ and if j is large, we have

$$|\ell_i - \deg B_j| \geq \kappa^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \epsilon_{j-1}^{-\frac{1}{15\tau}} \gg N_j = \frac{2|\ln \epsilon_j|}{h_j - h_{j+1}},$$

the last inequality holds by (3.29).

However, by (3.9), we have

$$|\ell_i - \deg B_j| \leq N_j + 2|n_{i_j}| \leq N_j + 2N_{j-1} \leq 2N_j, \quad (3.31)$$

this is a contradiction. Thus in this case $\ell_i = \deg B_j$ for ℓ_i sufficiently large.

Case II: $j - 1 \neq i_j$. In this case, by (3.16), we have $N_j = 8N_{j-1}$. Apply (3.30) with $k = j$, we have

$$\|\langle \ell_i - \deg B_j, \alpha \rangle - 2\xi_j\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 2C\epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} + e^{-\frac{|N_j|}{8}\epsilon_0} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}}.$$

If $\ell_i - \deg B_j = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, similar as (3.31), $|\ell_i - \deg B_j| \leq 2N_j$. We further distinguish the proof into two subcases:

Case II-1: If $j = i_{j+1}$. Then by the definition of resonances, there exists $|n_{i_{j+1}}| \leq N_j$, such that

$$\|2\xi_j - \langle n_{i_{j+1}}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

then same as Case I, by the Diophantine condition $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, if $\ell_i - \deg B_j \neq n_{i_{j+1}}$, then

$$|\ell_i - \deg B_j - n_{i_{j+1}}| \geq \kappa^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{15\tau}} \gg N_j$$

which again contradicts to $|\ell_i - \deg B_j - n_{i_{j+1}}| < 3N_j$.

Case II-2: If $j \neq i_{j+1}$, i.e. it is still non-resonant, then again (3.16), we have $N_{j+1} = 8N_j$, Apply (3.30) with $k = j + 1$, we have

$$\|\langle \ell_i - \deg B_{j+1}, \alpha \rangle - 2\xi_{j+1}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 2C\epsilon_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} + e^{-\frac{|N_{j+1}|}{64}\epsilon_0} \leq \epsilon_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{15}}.$$

Since $|\ell_i - \deg B_{j+1}| = |\ell_i - \deg B_j| < 2N_j < N_{j+1}$, by the definition of resonances, this forces $j + 1 = i_{j+1}$, and consequently there exists $|n_{i_{j+1}}| < N_{j+1}$, such that $\ell_i - \deg B_{j+1} = n_{i_{j+1}}$, which just means $\ell_i = \deg B_{j+2}$. \square

4. OPTIMAL ARITHMETIC REDUCIBILITY AND ANDERSON LOCALIZATION

In this section, we demonstrate the practical applications of structured quantitative almost reducibility when the condition $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$ holds. By doing so, we extend Eliasson's reducibility theorem [35] in an optimal manner. This advancement allows us to exploit the power of Aubry duality to achieve the optimal arithmetic Anderson localization.

4.1. Optimal arithmetic reducibility-local case. We will construct a novel KAM scheme for $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ quasiperiodic cocycles with Liouville rotation numbers, which constitutes a generalization of Eliasson's theorem. To appreciate the challenge, consider Proposition 3.1, which highlights two key obstacles: the normalization transformation P_j , of order $\mathcal{O}(|n_{i_j}|^\tau)$, and the rotation transformation $R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}}$, with a size of $\mathcal{O}(e^{\pi h |n_{i_j}|})$.

When dealing with an infinite number of resonances, these transformations can potentially lead to a divergent conjugacy. However, the strength of quantitative structured almost reducibility, as encapsulated in Proposition 3.2, enables us to overcome these hurdles.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $2\pi h > 2\pi\tilde{h} > \delta > 0$, $R \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. If*

$$\|A(\cdot) - R\|_h \leq \bar{\epsilon} := \frac{D_0(\kappa, \tau, d)}{\|R\|^{C_0}} \left(\frac{h - \tilde{h}}{2}\right)^{C_0\tau},$$

- $\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, where

$$LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta) = \{\phi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \|2\phi - \langle m, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \gamma e^{-|m|\delta}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}.$$

then (α, A) is analytically reducible. Moreover, there exist $C = C(\gamma, \delta, \alpha, \|R\|)$ and $B_A \in C_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $\deg B_A = 0$, such that

$$B_A(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} A(\theta) B_A(\theta) = R_{\rho(\alpha, A)},$$

with estimate $\|B_A\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C$, and B_A is continuous on $\mathcal{A}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ in the sense

$$\lim_{\substack{A', A \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta) \\ \|A' - A\| \rightarrow 0}} \|B_{A'} - B_A\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} = 0$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta) = \{A : \rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)\}.$$

Remark 4.1. If one replace $LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ by $DC_\alpha(\gamma, \tau)$ where

$$DC_\alpha(\gamma, \tau) = \{\phi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \|2\phi - \langle m, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \frac{\gamma}{(|m| + 1)^\tau}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}.$$

Then, it is the classical Eliasson's reducibility theorem [35], the main difference here is that one replaces the polynomial small lower bound by the exponential small lower bound which will lead to essential difficulties in the proof.

Proof. We will first prove the cocycle is analytically reducible, then give the continuity argument.

4.1.1. Part 1: Reducibility. First by Proposition 3.2, there exist $Z_p \in C_{\frac{h+\tilde{h}}{2}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ and $i_p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Z_p^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)Z_p(\theta) = \tilde{A}_p e^{\tilde{f}_p(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} i\tilde{t}^p & \tilde{\nu}^p \\ \tilde{\nu}^p & -i\tilde{t}^p \end{pmatrix} M e^{\tilde{f}_p(\theta)}$$

with estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_p\|_{\frac{h+\tilde{h}}{2}} &\leq \tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p} e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}|n_{i_p+1}|(h-\tilde{h})}, \\ |\tilde{\nu}^p| &\leq 2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-\pi|n_{i_p}|(h+\tilde{h})}, \\ |\ell_p| := |\deg Z_p| &\leq (1 + 2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p-1}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})|n_{i_p}| \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_p \leq \tilde{\epsilon}^{2^p}$.

If there are finite resonant steps, i.e. there are at most finitely many n_i , Proposition 3.2 actually implies that the cocycle is reducible (actually in this case $|n_{i_j+1}| = \infty$), then there is nothing to say. In the following, we always assume that there are infinite many resonant steps, i.e. $|n_i| \rightarrow \infty$. Just note that Proposition 3.2 implies that the constant matrix \tilde{A}_p are uniformly bounded, one can thus select $p_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ (independent of \tilde{A}_p) to be

the smallest integer p (or equivalently to say, to select the smallest i_p) satisfying

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p} e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}|n_{i_{p+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})} \leq \frac{D_0 \gamma^4 e^{-4|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta}}{\|\tilde{A}_p\|^{C_0}} \left(\frac{h-\tilde{h}}{2}\right)^{C_0\tau}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p} \leq \gamma^4, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\pi(h+\tilde{h}) > (1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta, \quad (4.4)$$

where (4.2) follows from (3.21), (4.4) follows from our selection that $2\pi h > 2\pi\tilde{h} > \delta$.

Once we have this, we can prove the result by induction. Take $(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) := (\alpha, \tilde{A}_{p_0} e^{\tilde{f}_{p_0}})$,

$$h_0 = \frac{h+\tilde{h}}{2}, \quad \epsilon_0 = \tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p} e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}|n_{i_{p+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}.$$

Assume that we are at the $(j+1)^{th}$ KAM step, i.e. we already construct $B_j \in C_{h_j}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_0 e^{f_0(\theta)} B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $A_j \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ has two eigenvalues $e^{\pm i\xi_j}$ and

$$\|f_j\|_{h_j} \leq \epsilon_j \leq \epsilon_0^{2^j}. \quad (4.6)$$

Moreover, if we denote $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell < \dots$ to be all the KAM resonant steps, we have the following estimates:

$$\|B_j\|_{h_j - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq (1 + \tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{1}{4}}) \prod_{\substack{\ell \\ j_\ell \leq j}} (1 + \epsilon_{j_\ell}^{\frac{1}{4}}) \prod_{k \leq j} (1 + \frac{1}{4^k}), \quad (4.7)$$

$$\|B_j\|_{h_j} \leq \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{100}}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$|\nu^j| \leq \begin{cases} 2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-\pi|n_{i_p}|(h+\tilde{h})} + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \epsilon_k & j < j_1 \\ 0 & j = j_i \\ \sum_{k=j_{i-1}}^{j-1} \epsilon_k & j_{i-1} < j < j_i. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

We define the induction sequence

$$h_j - h_{j+1} = \frac{h_0 - \tilde{h}}{4^{j+1}}, \quad N_j = \frac{2|\ln \epsilon_j|}{h_j - h_{j+1}}.$$

By our selection of ϵ_0 , one can check that

$$\epsilon_j \leq \frac{D_0 \gamma^4 e^{-4|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta}}{\|A_j\|^{C_0}} (h_j - h_{j+1})^{C_0\tau}. \quad (4.10)$$

Indeed, ϵ_j on the left side of the inequality decays at least super-exponentially with j , while $(h_j - h_{j+1})^{C_0\tau}$ on the right side decays exponentially with j .

Note that (4.10) implies that one can apply Proposition 3.1, consequently there exists $\bar{B}_j \in C_{h_{j+1}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $\bar{A}_{j+1} \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\bar{f}_{j+1} \in C_{h_{j+1}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\bar{B}_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} \bar{B}_j(\theta) = \bar{A}_{j+1} e^{\bar{f}_{j+1}(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} \frac{it^{j+1}}{\bar{\nu}^{j+1}} & \frac{\bar{\nu}^{j+1}}{-it^{j+1}} \end{pmatrix} M e^{\bar{f}_{j+1}(\theta)} \quad (4.11)$$

Moreover, we can distinguish the following two cases:

Non-resonant case: If the $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ is non-resonant, i.e. for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $0 < |n| \leq N_j$, we have

$$\|2\xi_j - \langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

by Proposition 3.1, the conjugacy \bar{B}_j takes the form $\bar{B}_j(\theta) = e^{\bar{Y}_j(\theta)}$ with

$$\|\bar{Y}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} < \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|\bar{A}_{j+1} - A_j\| \leq 2\epsilon_j. \quad (4.12)$$

$$\|\bar{f}_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j^2 := \epsilon_{j+1}.$$

Let $B_{j+1} = B_j(\theta) \bar{B}_j(\theta)$, we have

$$B_{j+1}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_0 e^{f_0(\theta)} B_{j+1}(\theta) = \bar{A}_{j+1} e^{\bar{f}_{j+1}(\theta)} := A_{j+1} e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)}.$$

By (4.12), B_{j+1} satisfy the estimate (4.7) and (4.8) with $j+1$ in place of j , and $|\nu^{j+1}|$ satisfy the estimate (4.9) with $j+1$ in place of j .

Resonant case: If the $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ is resonant, i.e. there exists n_j with $0 < |n_j| \leq N_j$ such that

$$\|2\xi_j - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{15}},$$

by Proposition 3.1, the conjugacy \bar{B}_j takes the form

$$\bar{B}_j(\theta) = \bar{P}_j e^{\bar{Y}_j(\theta)} R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}$$

where P_j is given by

$$\bar{P}_j^{-1} A_j \bar{P}_j = R_{\xi_j}. \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover, we have the following estimates:

$$\|\bar{Y}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} < \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\|\bar{f}_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j e^{-h_{j+1} \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{15\tau}}} := \bar{\epsilon}_{j+1}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$|\overline{\nu}^{j+1}| < \epsilon_j^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_j| h_j}. \quad (4.16)$$

To make the whole scheme converges, we need to add two new ingredients to the KAM machine. First we need a refined estimate of \bar{P}_j , which will be taken care in the next step.

Step 1: Refined estimate of normalization of A_j .

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, then*

$$\rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta}, \delta). \quad (4.17)$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\|\bar{P}_j - id\| \leq \begin{cases} \tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{1}{2}} & j+1 = j_1 \\ \epsilon_{j_{i-1}}^{\frac{1}{2}} & j+1 = j_i > j_1. \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. Note by (2.1), we have

$$2\rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) = 2\rho(\alpha, A) - \langle \deg Z_p, \alpha \rangle = 2\rho(\alpha, A) - \langle \ell_p, \alpha \rangle, \quad (4.19)$$

thus if $\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, then (4.19) implies that

$$\|2\rho(\alpha, A) - \langle m, \alpha \rangle - \langle \ell_p, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \gamma e^{-(|m+\ell_p|)\delta} \geq \gamma e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta} e^{-\delta|m|},$$

which directly implies (4.17).

Similarly, notice that $\deg B_j = 0$ by (4.7), then by (2.1), we have

$$\rho(\alpha, A_j e^{f_j}) = \rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}), \quad (4.20)$$

consequently by (4.2) and (4.17), we have

$$|\rho(\alpha, A_j e^{f_j})| \geq \gamma e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta} \geq \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (4.21)$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$|\rho(\alpha, A_j) - \rho(\alpha, A_j e^{f_j})| \leq C\epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.22)$$

which implies that

$$|\xi_j| = |\rho(\alpha, A_j)| \geq \gamma e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta} - C\epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta}. \quad (4.23)$$

On the other hand, by (4.9), one can estimate

$$|\nu^j| \leq \begin{cases} 4\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-\pi|n_{i_p}|(h+\tilde{h})} & j < j_1 \\ 2\epsilon_{j_{i-1}} & j_{i-1} \leq j < j_i \end{cases}$$

Therefore, if $j+1 = j_1$, by (4.3) and (4.4), we have

$$\left| \frac{2\nu^j}{\xi_j} \right| \leq \frac{16\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-\pi|n_{i_p}|(h+\tilde{h})}}{\gamma e^{-|n_{i_p}|(1+2\tilde{\epsilon}_{i_{p-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}})\delta}} \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_{i_p}^{\frac{1}{2}} < 1.$$

If $j+1 = j_i > j_1$, by (4.21) and (4.23), we have

$$\left| \frac{2\nu^j}{\xi_j} \right| \leq \frac{4\epsilon_{j_{i-1}}}{\epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{4}}} \leq \epsilon_{j_{i-1}}^{\frac{1}{2}} < 1.$$

By Lemma 2.4, \bar{P}_j satisfy (4.13) with estimate (4.18). □

Step 2: Normalization of \bar{A}_{j+1} . The rest difficulty is to deal with the effect of rotation transformation $R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}$. The key observation here is that if the rotation number $\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, one can normalize \bar{A}_{j+1} with a conjugacy \bar{U}_{j+1} which is close to the identity, consequently one can rotation backward $R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}$, and the conjugacy $R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} \bar{U}_{j+1} R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}$ is close to the identity.

Denote $\text{spec}(\bar{A}_{j+1}) = \{e^{i\bar{\xi}_{j+1}}, e^{-i\bar{\xi}_{j+1}}\}$, then one can normalize \bar{A}_{j+1} as follows:

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that $\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, then*

$$|\bar{\xi}_{j+1}| \geq \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{8}} e^{-\delta |n_j|}.$$

Consequently, there exists $\bar{U}_{j+1} \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\bar{U}_{j+1}^{-1} \bar{A}_{j+1} \bar{U}_{j+1} = R_{\bar{\xi}_{j+1}} \quad (4.24)$$

with estimate

$$\|\bar{U}_{j+1} - id\| \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-(2\pi h_j - \delta) |n_j|}. \quad (4.25)$$

Proof. Notice that $\deg \bar{B}_j = n_j$, then by (2.1), (4.11) and (4.20), we have

$$2\rho(\alpha, \bar{A}_{j+1} e^{\bar{f}_{j+1}}) = 2\rho(\alpha, A_j e^{f_j}) - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle = 2\rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle, \quad (4.26)$$

by (4.15) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$|\rho(\alpha, \bar{A}_{j+1} e^{\bar{f}_{j+1}}) - \rho(\alpha, \bar{A}_{j+1})| \leq C \bar{\epsilon}_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

meanwhile by (4.11) and (4.16), we have

$$|\bar{t}^{j+1} - \rho(\alpha, \bar{A}_{j+1})| \leq 2|\bar{\nu}^{j+1}| \leq 2\epsilon_j^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_j| h_j}.$$

It thus follows from (4.26) that

$$|2\bar{t}^{j+1} - 2\rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) + \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle| \leq 4\epsilon_j^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_j| h_j} + 2C \bar{\epsilon}_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.27)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.1 and our selection of ϵ_0 , we have

$$\|2\rho(\alpha, A_0 e^{f_0}) - \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\delta |n_j|}, \quad (4.28)$$

thus (4.28) and (4.27) imply that

$$|\bar{t}^{j+1}| \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\delta |n_j|} - 2\epsilon_j^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi |n_j| h_j} - 2C \bar{\epsilon}_{j+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\delta |n_j|}, \quad (4.29)$$

where in the final inequality, we use the fact that $2\pi h_j > 2\pi \tilde{h} > \delta$ and (4.15).

Notice that $\text{spec}(\bar{A}_{j+1}) = \{e^{i\bar{\xi}_{j+1}}, e^{-i\bar{\xi}_{j+1}}\}$. By (4.16) and (4.29), we have

$$|\bar{\xi}_{j+1}|^2 = |\bar{t}^{j+1}|^2 - |\bar{\nu}^{j+1}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{16} \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-2\delta |n_j|} - \epsilon_j^{\frac{5}{8}} e^{-4\pi h_j |n_j|} \geq \frac{1}{64} \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-2\delta |n_j|}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \frac{\bar{\nu}^{j+1}}{\bar{\xi}_{j+1}} \right| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_j^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi h_j |n_j|}}{\frac{1}{8} \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\delta |n_j|}} \leq 16 \epsilon_j^{\frac{11}{16}} e^{-(2\pi h_j - \delta) |n_j|} \leq 1,$$

then the result follows from Lemma 2.4 directly. \square

Step 3: Rotation backward. Now we can make a rotation backward, which makes the conjugacy close to identity in a shrinking strip. More precisely, let

$$\tilde{B}_j(\theta) = \bar{B}_j(\theta)\bar{U}_{j+1}R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} = \bar{P}_j e^{\bar{Y}_j(\theta)} R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} \bar{U}_{j+1} R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}, \quad (4.30)$$

then by (4.11) and (4.24), we have

$$\tilde{B}_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} \tilde{B}_j(\theta) = R_{\xi_{j+1} + \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle} e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)} := A_{j+1} e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)},$$

where

$$f_{j+1}(\theta) = R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} \bar{U}_{j+1}^{-1} \bar{f}_{j+1}(\theta) \bar{U}_{j+1} R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}, \quad (4.31)$$

consequently let $B_{j+1} = B_j(\theta) \tilde{B}_j(\theta)$, then we have

$$B_{j+1}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_0 e^{f_0(\theta)} B_{j+1}(\theta) = A_{j+1} e^{f_{j+1}(\theta)}. \quad (4.32)$$

Now we give the desired estimate and finish one step of the iteration.

First the construction $A_{j+1} = R_{\xi_{j+1} + \langle n_j, \alpha \rangle}$ implies that if $j+1 = j_i$ is the resonant step, then $\nu^{j+1} = 0$. By (4.15) and (4.31), we have

$$\|f_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq e^{2\pi h |n_j|} \|\bar{f}_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \epsilon_j e^{-h_{j+1} \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{20\pi}}} := \epsilon_{j+1}. \quad (4.33)$$

By (4.30) and (4.8), we have

$$\|B_{j+1}\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq \|\tilde{B}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} \|B_j\|_{h_{j+1}} \leq 2 \frac{|n_j|^\tau}{\kappa} e^{2\pi h_j |n_j|} \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{100}} \leq \epsilon_{j+1}^{-\frac{1}{100}}.$$

Moreover, (4.14) and (4.25) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{B}_j - id\|_{h_{j+1} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \\ & \leq \|\bar{P}_j - id\| + \|\bar{Y}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} + \|R_{\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} \bar{U}_{j+1} R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}} - id\|_{h_{j+1} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \\ & \leq \|\bar{P}_j - id\| + \|\bar{Y}_j\|_{h_{j+1}} + \|R_{-\frac{\langle n_j, \theta \rangle}{2}}\|_{h_{j+1} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^2 \|\bar{U}_{j+1} - id\| \\ & \leq \|\bar{P}_j - id\| + \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} + \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-2\pi(h_j - h_{j+1})|n_j|}. \end{aligned}$$

consequently Lemma 4.1 implies that

$$\|\tilde{B}_j - id\|_{h_{j+1} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq \begin{cases} \tilde{\epsilon}_{j_1}^{\frac{1}{4}} & j+1 = j_1 \\ \epsilon_{j_i-1}^{\frac{1}{4}} & j+1 = j_i > j_1 \end{cases}$$

which means B_{j+1} satisfies the estimate (4.7) with $j+1$ in place of j .

Once we have this, we finished the whole step of the iteration, (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7) imply the reducibility of (α, A) .

4.1.2. Part 2: Continuity. Finally, assume $A, A' \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ satisfy $\|A' - A\|_h \leq \eta$ where η is arbitrary small such that

$$\|Z_{p_0}\|_{\frac{h+\bar{h}}{2}}^2 \|A - A'\|_h \leq \epsilon_0, \quad (4.34)$$

then there is $j \geq 0$ such that

$$\epsilon_{j+1} < \|A - A'\|_h \leq \epsilon_j.$$

By the above iteration, there exist $B_j \in C_{\tilde{h}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ and $f_j \in C_{\tilde{h}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)Z_{p_0}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)Z_{p_0}(\theta)B_j(\theta) = R_{\phi_j}e^{f_j(\theta)} \quad (4.35)$$

with

$$\|B_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_j^{-\frac{1}{100}}, \quad \|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_j, \quad (4.36)$$

Hence (4.34) and (4.36) allow us to conclude

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)Z_{p_0}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A'(\theta)Z_{p_0}(\theta)B_j(\theta) = R_{\phi_j}e^{f'_j(\theta)}$$

with $\|f'_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that (4.2)-(4.4) are always satisfied with $(\alpha, \tilde{A}_{p_0}e^{\tilde{f}_{p_0}})$ replaced by $(\alpha, R_{\phi_j}e^{f_j})$ or $(\alpha, R_{\phi_j}e^{f'_j})$. Thus, there are $Y, Y' \in C_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$e^{-Y(\theta+\alpha)}R_{\phi_j}e^{f_j(\theta)}e^{Y(\theta)} = R_{\phi_j}, \quad e^{-Y'(\theta+\alpha)}R_{\phi_j}e^{f'_j(\theta)}e^{Y'(\theta)} = R_{\phi_j'}$$

with estimate

$$\|Y'\|_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}}, \quad \|Y\|_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{8}}$$

Denote $\deg Z_{p_0}B_j = k_j$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} B_A(\theta) &= Z_{p_0}(\theta)B_j(\theta)e^{Y(\theta)}R_{-\frac{\langle k, \theta \rangle}{2}}, \\ B_{A'}(\theta) &= Z_{p_0}(\theta)B_j(\theta)e^{Y'(\theta)}R_{-\frac{\langle k, \theta \rangle}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

then $\deg B_A = \deg B_{A'} = 0$. By (4.33), we have

$$\|B_A - B_{A'}\|_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C\|B_j\|_{\tilde{h}}^4 \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{8}} \leq \epsilon_j^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} \leq \frac{1}{-\ln|\epsilon_{j+1}|} \leq \frac{1}{-\ln\|A - A'\|_h}.$$

Thus, we finish the whole proof. \square

4.2. Optimal arithmetic reducibility-global case.

We denote

$$\mathcal{AR}_h = \{E : (\alpha, A_E) \text{ is almost reducible in the strip } |\Im z| < h\}.$$

As a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1, we have the following:

Corollary 4.1. *Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $\Sigma_{V, \alpha} = \mathcal{AR}_h$, $\rho(E) \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ with $2\pi h > 2\pi\tilde{h} > \delta$. Then (α, A_E) is analytically reducible. Moreover, there exist $C = C(\gamma, \delta, \alpha, V)$ and $B_E \in C_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that*

$$B_E(\theta + \alpha)^{-1}A_E(\theta)B_E(\theta) = R_{\rho(E)},$$

with estimates $\|B_E\|_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C$, moreover B_E is continuous on $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ in $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{h}-\frac{\delta}{2\pi}}$ where

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta) = \{E : \rho(E) \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)\}.$$

Proof. By the assumption that $\Sigma_{V, \alpha} = \mathcal{AR}_h$. One can conclude for any $E \in \Sigma_{V, \alpha}$, and for any $\eta > 0$, there exist $\Phi_E \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\Phi_E(\theta + \alpha)^{-1}A_E(\theta)\Phi_E(\theta) = C_E e^{f_E(\theta)},$$

with estimates

$$\|\Phi_E\|_h \leq \Gamma = \Gamma(V, \alpha, \eta), \quad \|f_E\|_h \leq \eta. \quad (4.37)$$

Indeed, (α, A_E) is almost reducible but not uniformly hyperbolic, one can always take $C_E = R_{\phi(E)} \in SO(2, \mathbb{R})$ [86, Corollary 4.2].

Indeed, one can always take η small enough such that

$$\eta \leq \bar{\epsilon}_0 \leq \frac{D_0(\kappa, \tau, 1)}{\|R_{\phi(E)}\|^{C_0}} \left(\frac{h - \tilde{h}}{2}\right)^{C_0 \tau}, \quad (4.38)$$

where $D_0(\kappa, \tau, 1)$ is the constant defined in Theorem 4.1. Just note the smallness of $\bar{\epsilon}_0$ can be taken uniform with respect to $R_\phi \in SO(2, \mathbb{R})$. By footnote 5 of [6] and (4.37), we have

$$|\deg \Phi_E| \leq C |\ln \Gamma| := \Gamma_1 \quad (4.39)$$

for some constant $C = C(V, \alpha) > 0$. Moreover, by (2.1),

$$2\rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)}) = 2\rho(E) - \langle \deg \Phi_E, \alpha \rangle. \quad (4.40)$$

Therefore, if $|E - E'| \leq \Gamma^{-4} \bar{\epsilon}_0^4$, then

$$\Phi_E(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} A_{E'}(\theta) \Phi_E(\theta) = R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_{E'}(\theta)}, \quad (4.41)$$

with estimate $\|f_{E'}(\theta)\|_h \leq \bar{\epsilon}_0$. On the other hand, if $\rho(E) = \rho(E') \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, by (4.40) and (4.41), this implies that there is $\gamma' > 0$ such that

$$\rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)}) = \rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_{E'}(\theta)}) \in LC(\gamma', \delta).$$

By Theorem 4.1, there are $\tilde{B}_E, \tilde{B}_{E'} \in C_{h - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\tilde{B}_E^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)} \tilde{B}_E(\theta) = R_{\rho(E) - \frac{\langle \deg \Phi_E, \alpha \rangle}{2}},$$

$$\tilde{B}_{E'}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_{E'}(\theta)} \tilde{B}_{E'}(\theta) = R_{\rho(E') - \frac{\langle \deg \Phi_{E'}, \alpha \rangle}{2}}$$

with

$$\lim_{E \rightarrow E'} \|\tilde{B}_E - \tilde{B}_{E'}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} = 0,$$

$$\|\tilde{B}_E\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C(\gamma, \delta, \alpha, V).$$

Let $B_E(\theta) = \Phi_E(\theta) \tilde{B}_E(\theta) R_{-\frac{\langle \Phi_E, \theta \rangle}{2}}$ and $B_{E'}(\theta) = \Phi_{E'}(\theta) \tilde{B}_{E'}(\theta) R_{-\frac{\langle \Phi_{E'}, \theta \rangle}{2}}$, we finish the whole proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Note that $\alpha \in DC$ and (α, A) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < h\}$. By Avila's solution of almost reducibility conjecture [6, 8], for any $\varepsilon > 0$, (α, A) is almost reducible in the strip $\{|\Im z| < h - \varepsilon\}$. Note by the definition of $\delta(\alpha, \rho(\alpha, A))$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\gamma > 0$, such that

$$\rho(\alpha, A) \in LC_\alpha(\gamma, \delta(\alpha, \rho(\alpha, A)) + \varepsilon),$$

then the result follows from Corollary 4.1. \square

4.3. Optimal arithmetic localization. For any $E \in \mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, by Corollary 4.1, there exists $B_E \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_E^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_E(\theta)B_E(\theta) = R_{\rho(E)}. \quad (4.42)$$

We define a vector-valued function $u_E : \mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ as the following,

$$u_E(n) = \frac{\hat{b}_E(n)}{\|b_E\|_{L^2}} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{T}} b_E(\theta) e^{2\pi i \langle n, \theta \rangle} d\theta}{\|b_E\|_{L^2}}, \quad (4.43)$$

where $b_E(\theta) = \frac{ib_E^{11}(\theta) - b_E^{12}(\theta)}{2i}$ and $B(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} b_E^{11}(\theta) & b_E^{12}(\theta) \\ b_E^{21}(\theta) & b_E^{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$.

For any fixed $x \in L_\alpha(\delta) = \cup_{\gamma > 0} L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, we denote by

$$E_m(x) = \begin{cases} \rho^{-1}(T^m x) & T^m x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \rho^{-1}(-T^m x + 1) & T^m x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1) \end{cases}.$$

We can define the following \mathcal{R} -measure,

Definition 4.1 (\mathcal{R} -measure). $\nu_{x, \delta_n} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as:

$$\nu_{x, \delta_n}(B) = \sum_{m \in N_x^B} |u_{E_m(x)}(m+n)|^2,$$

for all B in the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{R} , where $N_x^B = \{m | E_m(x) \in B\}$.

The \mathcal{R} -measure is well defined, as proved in [42]. Moreover, following the proof of [42, 41], one has

Lemma 4.3. We have $\nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)) = |L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)|$ for a.e. x , where $|\cdot|$ is the Lebesgue measure.

We fix γ, δ and n in the following.

Lemma 4.4. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0(\gamma, \delta, V, \alpha, n, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{N_0} \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)) := \sum_{|m| > N_0: T^m x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)} |u_{E_m(x)}(m+n)|^2 \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Note that for any $T^m x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, by Corollary 4.1, there exists $B_{E_m(x)} \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_{E_m(x)}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_{E_m(x)}(\theta)B_{E_m(x)}(\theta) = R_{T^m x},$$

with $\|B_{E_m(x)}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C(\gamma, \delta, \alpha, V)$. We denote by

$$\tilde{B}_E(\theta) = B_E(\theta) \frac{1}{2i} \begin{pmatrix} i & i \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{b}_E^{11}(\theta) & \tilde{b}_E^{12}(\theta) \\ \tilde{b}_E^{21}(\theta) & \tilde{b}_E^{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$

then

$$\tilde{B}_{E_m(x)}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_{E_m(x)}(\theta)\tilde{B}_{E_m(x)}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i T^m x} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i T^m x} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.44)$$

By (4.43), we have

$$|u_{E_m(x)}(m+n)|^2 = \frac{|\hat{b}_{E_m(x)}^{11}(m+n)|^2}{\|\tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{11}\|_{L^2}^2}.$$

By (4.44), we have

$$\tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{11}(\theta) = \tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{21}(\theta + \alpha)e^{2\pi iT^m x},$$

By the fact that $|\det \tilde{B}_{E_m(x)}| = 1$, one has

$$2\|\tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{11}\|_{L^2} = \|\tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{11}\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{b}_{E_m(x)}^{21}\|_{L^2} \geq \|\tilde{B}_{E_m(x)}\|_{C^0}^{-1}. \quad (4.45)$$

It follows that if $T^m x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, then

$$|u_{E_m(x)}(m+n)|^2 \leq C e^{-(\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi})|m+n|}.$$

Thus for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0(\gamma, \delta, V, \alpha, n, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$,

$$\sum_{|m| > N_0: T^m x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)} |u_{E_m(x)}(m+n)|^2 \leq \epsilon.$$

□

Lemma 4.5. *For any $N > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta(\gamma, \delta, V, \alpha, N, \epsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{T}_N \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta)) - \mathcal{T}_N \nu_{x', \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta))| \leq \epsilon$$

for any $x, x' \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ with $|x - x'| \leq \eta$ where

$$\mathcal{T}_N \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta)) := \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta)) - \mathcal{R}_N \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta)).$$

Proof. For any fixed N and any $x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, we have

$$\|x + \langle k, \alpha \rangle + \langle n, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \gamma e^{-\delta|k+n|} \geq \gamma e^{-\delta N} e^{-\delta|n|}, \quad |k| \leq N.$$

Let $\gamma_1 = \gamma e^{-\delta N}$. By Corollary 4.1, there exists $\eta(\gamma, \delta, V, \alpha, N, \epsilon)$, such that the following holds: if $T^k x, T^k x' \in L_\alpha(\gamma_1, \delta)$ and $|T^k x - T^k x'| = |x - x'| < \eta$, then there exist $B_{E_k(x)}, B_{E_k(x')} \in C_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that

$$B_{E_k(x)}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_{E_k(x)}(\theta) B_{E_k(x)}(\theta) = R_{T^k x},$$

$$B_{E_k(x')}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_{E_k(x')}(\theta) B_{E_k(x')}(\theta) = R_{T^k x'},$$

with estimates

$$\|B_{E_k(x)}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}}, \|B_{E_k(x')}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq C(\gamma, \delta, V, \alpha, N), \quad (4.46)$$

$$\|B_{E_k(x)} - B_{E_k(x')}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq \frac{\epsilon C^{-4}}{500(2N+1)}. \quad (4.47)$$

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2} - \|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2} \right| &\leq \|b_{E_k(x)} - b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|B_{E_k(x)} - B_{E_k(x')}\|_{C^0} \leq \frac{\epsilon C^{-4}}{500(2N+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

On the other hand, by (4.47),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{b}_{E_k(x)}(n) - \hat{b}_{E_k(x')}(n) \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} (b_{E_k(x)}(\theta) - b_{E_k(x')}(\theta)) e^{-2\pi i \langle n, \theta \rangle} d\theta \right| \\ &\leq \|B_{E_k(x)} - B_{E_k(x')}\|_{\tilde{h} - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}} \leq \frac{\epsilon C^{-4}}{500(2N+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

(4.48) and (4.49) imply for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{E_k(x)}(n) - u_{E_k(x')}(n)| &= \left| \frac{\hat{b}_{E_k(x)}(n)}{\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2}} - \frac{\hat{b}_{E_k(x')}(n)}{\|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2}} \right| \\ &= \frac{|\hat{b}_{E_k(x)}(n)\|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2} - \hat{b}_{E_k(x')}(n)\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2}|}{\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2}\|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon C^{-4}}{500(2N+1)} \frac{\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2} + C}{\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2}\|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

As we have

$$\|b_{E_k(x)}\|_{L^2}\|b_{E_k(x')}\|_{L^2} \geq \frac{1}{4C^2},$$

these imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{E_k(x)}(n) - u_{E_k(x')}(n)| &\leq \frac{\epsilon C^{-4}}{500(2N+1)} \frac{\|b_{E(T^k x)}^{11}\|_{L^2} + C}{\|b_{E(T^k x)}^{11}\|_{L^2}\|b_{E(T^k x')}^{11}\|_{L^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{100(2N+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition 4.1 and (4.43), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{T}_{N\nu_x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta)) - \mathcal{T}_{N\nu_{x'}, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\delta))| \\ &= \left| \sum_{|k| \leq N} |u_{E(T^k x)}(n+k)|^2 - \sum_{|k| \leq N} |u_{E(T^k x')}(n+k)|^2 \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{50(2N+1)}(2N+1) \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.6. *For any $x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$, we have*

$$(x - \sigma, x + \sigma) \cap L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta) > 0$$

for any sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$.

Proof. Let

$$\Theta_k = \{x \in [0, 1) : \|2x - \langle k, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \gamma e^{-(1+\varepsilon)\delta|k|},$$

then $L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta) = [0, 1) \setminus \cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \Theta_k$. Thus for any $\sigma > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$(x - \sigma, x + \sigma) \cap L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta) = (x - \sigma, x + \sigma) \setminus \cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta_k.$$

Notice that if $\Theta_k \cap (x - \sigma, x + \sigma) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\gamma e^{-\delta|k|} \leq \|\langle k, \alpha \rangle + 2x\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 2\sigma.$$

It follows that $|k| \geq \frac{\ln \frac{\gamma}{2\sigma}}{\delta}$, thus $|\Theta_k| \leq C(\gamma)\sigma^{1+\varepsilon}$ which implies that

$$|(x - \sigma, x + \sigma) \cap L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)| \geq 2\sigma - \sum_{|k| \geq \frac{\ln \frac{\gamma}{2\sigma}}{\delta}} \Theta_k \geq \sigma > 0.$$

□

Once we have these preparing lemmas, we arrive at the following result:

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$ and $V \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$ with $\Sigma_{V, \alpha} = \mathcal{AR}$. If $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, x)$, then $L_{V, \alpha, x}$ has Anderson localization.*

Proof. For any fixed $x \in L_\alpha(\gamma, \delta)$ with $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, x)$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{2\pi h - \delta}{10}$, by Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.3, there exists a sequence $x_k \in L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)$ such that $x_k \rightarrow x$ and

$$\nu_{x_k, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) = |L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)|.$$

By Lemma 4.4, there exists $N_0(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta, V, \alpha, n, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}_{N_0} \nu_{x_k, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \leq \gamma.$$

By Lemma 4.5,

$$\mathcal{T}_{N_0} \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{N_0} \nu_{x_k, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)),$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) &\geq \mathcal{T}_{N_0} \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{N_0} \nu_{x_k, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \\ &\geq |L_\alpha(\gamma, (1 + \varepsilon)\delta)| - \gamma \geq 1 - 2\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$1 \leq \nu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \leq \mu_{x, \delta_n}^{pp}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \leq \mu_{x, \delta_n}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha((1 + \varepsilon)\delta)) \leq 1,$$

where μ_{x, δ_n} is the spectral measure of $L_{V, \alpha, x}$ defined by

$$\langle \delta_n, \chi_B(L_{V, \alpha, x})\delta_n \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_B d\mu_{\theta, \delta_n}.$$

Thus we finish the proof. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4: By the assumption, if $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\alpha, V, d, \delta)$ is large enough, the dual Schrödinger cocycle is almost reducible by Proposition 3.2, then the result follows directly from Theorem 4.2. □

Proof of Corollary 1.5: By Avila's global theory [7], if $|\lambda| < 1$, (α, S_E^λ) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < -\frac{\ln \lambda}{2\pi}\}$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, (α, S_E^λ) is almost reducible in the strip $\{|\Im z| < -\frac{\ln \lambda}{2\pi}(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\}$ [5, 8]. The result again follows directly from Theorem 4.2. □

5. GROWTH OF THE COCYCLE

In previous section, we apply the structured quantitative almost reducibility (Proposition 3.2) in the case $2\pi h > \delta(\alpha, \rho(\alpha, A))$, to prove the cocycle is reducible. In this section, we apply the structured quantitative almost reducibility in the opposite case $2\pi h \leq \delta(\alpha, \rho(\alpha, A))$, to estimate the growth of cocycles.

Recall that Proposition 3.2 implies that (α, A) is almost reducible:

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

Denote $\text{spec}(A_j) = \{e^{i\xi_j}, e^{-i\xi_j}\}$, $(\alpha, A)^n = (n\alpha, \mathcal{A}_n)$, then we have the following:

Lemma 5.1. *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.2, then we have the following:*

(1) *If $|\frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j}| < \frac{1}{2}$, then for any $e^{\frac{\pi}{128}|n_{i_j}|(h-\tilde{h})} \leq n < e^{\frac{\pi}{8}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}$, we have*

$$C^{-1} \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{4\tau}.$$

(2) *If $|\frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j}| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then we have the following:*

• *If $e^{\frac{\pi}{128}|n_{i_j}|(h-\tilde{h})} \leq n < \min\{\frac{1}{\xi_j}, e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}\}$, then*

$$C^{-1} (|n||\nu_j| + 1) \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C (|n||\nu_j| + 1) \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{4\tau}.$$

• *If $\frac{1}{\xi_j} \leq n < e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}$, then*

$$C^{-1} \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n\xi_j) \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2} \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n\xi_j) \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2} \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}} \right)^{4\tau}.$$

Remark 5.1. *The inequality $\sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n\xi_j) \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2} \leq C(|n||\nu_j| + 1)$ suggests that according to Lemma 5.1, the quantity $\|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0$ initially experiences growth, followed by a subsequent decay. The maximum value is attained when $n \sim 1/\xi_j$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, there exist $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, $f_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimates

$$|\nu^j| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|\tilde{h}}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\|B_j\|_0 < C(\alpha)|n_{i_j}|^{2\tau}. \quad (5.3)$$

To control the growth of the cocycles, the starting point is the following simple observation:

Lemma 5.2 ([10, 87]). *We have that*

$$M_l(\text{id} + y_l) \cdots M_0(\text{id} + y_0) = M^{(l)}(\text{id} + y^{(l)}),$$

where $M^{(l)} = M_l \cdots M_0$ and

$$\|y^{(l)}\| \leq e^{\sum_{k=0}^l \|M^{(k)}\|^2 \|y_k\|} - 1. \quad (5.4)$$

In case (1), by Lemma 2.4, there exists $U_j \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ with $\|U_j - \mathrm{id}\| \leq \frac{|\nu_j|}{|\xi_j|}$ such that $U_j^{-1} A_j U_j = R_{\xi_j}$, which implies that

$$U_j^{-1} B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A(\theta) B_j(\theta) U_j = R_{\xi_j} e^{f'_j(\theta)} \quad (5.5)$$

where $f'_j(\theta) = U_j^{-1} f_j(\theta) U_j$. Consequently, for any $n < e^{\frac{\pi}{8} |n_{i_{j+1}}| (h - \tilde{h})}$, by Lemma 5.2, we have estimate

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \left\| \prod_{k=0}^n R_{\xi_j} e^{f'_j(\theta + k\alpha)} \right\|_0 \leq 2,$$

by (5.5), we further have estimate

$$\frac{1}{2} \|B_j U_j\|_0^{-2} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq 2 \|B_j U_j\|_0^2,$$

thus by the assumption $e^{\frac{\pi}{128} |n_{i_j}| (h - \tilde{h})} \leq n$, and (5.3), we have

$$C^{-1} \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h - \tilde{h}} \right)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h - \tilde{h}} \right)^{4\tau}.$$

In case (2), we actually can assume (otherwise the argument would be more simpler)

$$|\xi_j| \geq e^{-\frac{\pi}{32} |n_{i_{j+1}}| (h - \tilde{h})}.$$

We distinguish the proof into two cases, according to the time scales.

Case (2)-1: $e^{\frac{\pi}{128} |n_{i_j}| (h - \tilde{h})} < n < \frac{1}{\xi_j}$. First by Lemma 2.4, there exists $U_j \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$U_j^{-1} A_j U_j = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\xi_j} & \nu'_j \\ 0 & e^{-i\xi_j} \end{pmatrix},$$

with estimate

$$\|U_j\| \leq 2, \quad |\nu'_j| \leq 4|\nu_j|.$$

Consequently,

$$U_j^{-1} B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A(\theta) B_j(\theta) U_j = A'_j e^{f'_j(\theta)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\xi_j} & \nu'_j \\ 0 & e^{-i\xi_j} \end{pmatrix} e^{f'_j(\theta)} \quad (5.6)$$

To estimate the growth of the cocycle, we recall the following:

Lemma 5.3 ([11]). *Assume that*

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i\theta} & c \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i\theta} \end{pmatrix},$$

then we have

$$T^n = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i(n\theta)} & t_n \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i(n\theta)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $t_n = c e^{2\pi i(n-1)\theta} \frac{e^{-4\pi i n\theta} - 1}{e^{-4\pi i\theta} - 1}$. Thus, for any n with $|n| \|\theta\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} c |n| \leq |t_n| \leq c |n|.$$

Consequently, for any $n < \frac{1}{\xi_j} < e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_j+1}|(h-\tilde{h})}$, by Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$1 + \frac{1}{2}|n||\nu'_j| \leq \left\| \prod_{k=0}^n A'_j e^{f'_j(\theta+k\alpha)} \right\|_0 \leq 1 + 2|n||\nu'_j|,$$

similar as case (1), by (5.1), (5.3), and (5.6) we have

$$C^{-1}(|n||\nu_j| + 1) \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h - \tilde{h}} \right)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C(|n||\nu_j| + 1) \left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h - \tilde{h}} \right)^{4\tau}.$$

Case (2)-2: $\frac{1}{\xi_j} \leq n < e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_j+1}|(h-\tilde{h})}$. By Lemma 2.4, there exists $U_j \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ with $\|U_j\|^2 \leq \left| \frac{A\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|$ such that $U_j^{-1}A_jU_j = R_{\xi_j}$. In this case, the crucial observation is the following:

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that*

$$A = \exp \begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SU}(1, 1)$$

with $\text{spec}\{A\} = \{e^{i\xi}, e^{-i\xi}\}$, $0 \neq \xi \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists $U \in \text{SU}(1, 1)$, such that

$$U^{-1}AU = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\xi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\xi} \end{pmatrix},$$

Consequently, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, denoting $\tilde{A} = U \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix} U^{-1}$, then we have

$$\|\tilde{A}\|_{HS}^2 = 2 + 4 \sin^2 \theta \left| \frac{\nu}{\xi} \right|^2.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, one can take

$$U = (\cos 2\varphi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi & e^{2i\phi} \sin \varphi \\ e^{-2i\phi} \sin \varphi & \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

then direct computations shows that

$$\tilde{A} = \frac{1}{\cos 2\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} \cos^2 \varphi - e^{-i\theta} \sin^2 \varphi & ie^{2i\phi} \sin \theta \sin 2\varphi \\ -ie^{2i\phi} \sin \theta \sin 2\varphi & e^{-i\theta} \cos^2 \varphi - e^{i\theta} \sin^2 \varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

therefore one can further compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}\|_{HS}^2 &= \frac{1}{\cos^2 2\varphi} (2 \cos^2 \varphi + 2 \sin^4 \varphi + (4 \sin^2 \theta - 1) \sin^2 2\varphi) \\ &= \frac{1}{\cos^2 2\varphi} (\cos^2 2\varphi + 1 - \sin^2 2\varphi + 4 \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 2\varphi) \\ &= 2 + 4 \sin^2 \theta \tan^2 2\varphi \end{aligned}$$

then the result follows directly from

$$2\varphi = -\arctan \frac{|\nu|}{\sqrt{t^2 - |\nu|^2}}.$$

□

Apply Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\prod_{k=0}^n A_j e^{f_j(\theta+k\alpha)} = U_j R_{n\xi_j} U_j^{-1} e^{\tilde{f}_n(\theta)},$$

thus if $n < e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_j+1}|(h-\tilde{h})}$, then by (5.1), (5.2) and (5.4), we have estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_n\|_0 &\leq \sum_{k=0}^n \|U_j R_{k\xi_j} U_j^{-1}\|^2 \|f_j(\theta+k\alpha)\|_0 \\ &\leq n \|U_j\|^4 \|f_j(\theta)\|_0 \\ &\leq n \left| \frac{4\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2 \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8}|n_{i_j+1}|(h-\tilde{h})} < \epsilon_{i_j}, \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1 imply that

$$C^{-1} \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n\xi_j) \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2} \|B_j\|_0^{-2} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_n\|_0 \leq C \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n\xi_j) \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right|^2} \|B_j\|_0^2,$$

similar as the first case, the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6: We only need to consider the case $\delta(\alpha, \rho) > 0$, otherwise if $\delta(\alpha, \rho) = 0$, then Theorem 4.1 implies that (α, A_E) is reducible thus the cocycle is bounded, (1.9) become the trivial bound.

In the following, we only consider $0 < \delta < \infty$, as the remaining case is easier. First by Proposition 3.2, (α, A_E) is almost reducible. More precisely, take $\tilde{h} = h - \varepsilon$, there exist a sequence of KAM resonances $\{n_{i_j}\}_j$, $B_j \in C_{\tilde{h}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with

$$\deg B_j = n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_j}$$

such that

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) A_E(\theta) B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimate

$$|\nu^j| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_j}^{\frac{15}{16}} e^{-2\pi|n_{i_j}|\tilde{h}}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\|f_j\|_{\tilde{h}} \leq \epsilon_{i_j} e^{-\frac{\pi}{8}|n_{i_j+1}|(h-\tilde{h})}, \quad (5.8)$$

$$|\deg B_j - n_{i_j}| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_{j-1}}^{\frac{1}{187}} |n_{i_j}|. \quad (5.9)$$

By the definition of δ , then

$$e^{-\eta_j|n_{i_j}|} := \|2\rho(E) - \langle n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_j}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq e^{-(\delta+\frac{\varepsilon}{2})|n_{i_1}+\cdots+n_{i_j}|}$$

it follows from (5.9) that

$$\eta_j \leq \delta + \varepsilon. \quad (5.10)$$

Meanwhile, by (5.8) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\|2\rho(E) - 2\xi_j - \langle n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_j}, \alpha \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}(h-\tilde{h})|n_{i_j+1}|},$$

by (5.10), this further implies that

$$|\xi_j| \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\eta_j|n_{i_j}|} \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-(\delta+\varepsilon)|n_{i_j}|}, \quad (5.11)$$

Now we distinguish the proof into two cases:

Case 1: $2\pi\tilde{h} > \eta_j$. In this case, (5.7) implies that $\left|\frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then by Lemma 5.1 (1), for any $n \in I_j = [e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_j}|(h-\tilde{h})}, e^{\frac{\pi}{32}|n_{i_{j+1}}|(h-\tilde{h})}]$, we have

$$\|(A_E)_n\|_0 \leq C\left(\frac{|\ln n|}{h-\tilde{h}}\right)^{4\tau},$$

then (1.9) follows directly.

Case 2: $2\pi\tilde{h} \leq \eta_j$. Lemma 5.1 (see also Remark 5.1) implies that for any $n \in I_j$,

$$\|(A_E)_n\|_0 \leq C\left(\frac{|\nu_j|}{|\xi_j|} + 1\right)\left(\frac{|\ln \xi_j|}{h-\tilde{h}}\right)^{4\tau},$$

i.e. the maximum is obtained at $n \sim 1/\xi_j$. By (5.11), this just means

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|(A_E)_n\|_0}{\ln |n|} \leq 1 - \frac{2\pi\tilde{h}}{\eta_j} + \varepsilon$$

let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the result. \square

6. EXPLORE THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONJUGACY

In Section 4 and Section 5, we leverage quantitative structured almost reducibility to manage an infinite number of resonances, and we show its applications in both dynamical system and spectral theory. This section delves deeper into the quantitative aspects of structured almost reducibility, with a particular emphasis on understanding the intricate structure of the conjugacy. It will be crucial for us to establish the optimal quantitative Aubry duality in the next section.

The basic observation is that quantitative structure of the conjugacy $B \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ would imply nice estimates of its Fourier coefficients. To precise this, we introduce the following goodness definition of B . We denote by

$$B(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(\theta) & b_{12}(\theta) \\ b_{21}(\theta) & b_{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})).$$

Let $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$ be the n -th Fourier coefficients of $b_{11}(\theta)$ and $b_{12}(\theta)$ respectively. Then we introduce the following:

Definition 6.1. For any $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $B(\theta)$ is said to be (C_1, C_2, γ, ℓ) -good, if (H1)-(H2) hold where

(H1): $\|B\|_0 \leq C_1$,

(H2): $|\hat{b}_{11}(n)|, |\hat{b}_{12}(n)| \leq C_2(e^{-\gamma|n+\frac{\ell}{2}|} + e^{-\gamma|n-\frac{\ell}{2}|})$, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Remark 6.1. We give an explanation of this definition. Actually (H1) was used to control the ℓ^2 norm of $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$, while (H2) controls the distribution of the localization center $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $V \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\Sigma_{V, \alpha} = \mathcal{AR}_h$. Then for any $E \in \Sigma_{V, \alpha}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist sequence of $B_j \in C_{h(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that*

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_E(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimates

- $\|f_j\|_{h(1-\varepsilon)} \leq e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}\varepsilon h |n_{i_j+1}|}$,
- $|\nu_j| \leq e^{-2\pi h(1-\varepsilon)|n_{i_j}|}$.

Moreover, there exists $C = C(V, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ such that

- (1) $|\deg B_j - n_{i_j}| < (\varepsilon h)^2 |n_{i_j}|$.
- (2) $\|B_j\|_r \leq C(V, \alpha, \varepsilon) e^{(\varepsilon h)^2 |n_{i_j}|} e^{\pi r |n_{i_j}|}$, $\forall r < h(1-\varepsilon)$.
- (3) $B_j(\theta)$ is $(C|n_{i_j}|^{2\tau}, C e^{(\varepsilon h)^2 |n_{i_j}|}, 2\pi h(1-\varepsilon), n_{i_j})$ -good.

Proof. For any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{h}$, one can take η small enough such that

$$\eta \leq \varepsilon_0 \leq D_0(\kappa, \tau, 1) \left(\frac{\varepsilon h}{2}\right)^{C_0 \tau}, \quad (6.1)$$

where $D_0(\kappa, \tau, 1)$ is the constant defined in Proposition 3.2. Same as in the proof of Corollary 4.1, by the assumption that $\Sigma_{V, \alpha} = \mathcal{AR}_h$ and $E \in \Sigma_{V, \alpha}$, there exists $\Phi_E \in C_{h(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2})}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\Phi_E(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} A_E(\theta) \Phi_E(\theta) = R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)},$$

with estimates

$$\|\Phi_E\|_h \leq \Gamma = \Gamma(V, \alpha, \eta), \quad |\deg \Phi_E| \leq C(\alpha) |\ln \Gamma|, \quad \|f_E\|_h \leq \eta. \quad (6.2)$$

Moreover, by (2.1),

$$2\rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)}) = 2\rho(E) - \langle \deg \Phi_E, \alpha \rangle.$$

Note that (6.1) implies that one can apply Proposition 3.2, consequently there exists $B'_j \in C_{h(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$B'_j(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)} B'_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

with estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu^j| &\leq e^{-2\pi h(1-\varepsilon)|n_{i_j}|}, \\ \|f_j\|_{h(1-\varepsilon)} &\leq e^{-\frac{\pi}{16}\varepsilon h |n_{i_j+1}|}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $B'_j(\theta)$ can be rewritten as $B'_j(\theta) = \tilde{B}'_j(\theta) R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y'_j(\theta)}$ with estimate

$$\|Y'_j\|_{h(1-\varepsilon)} < e^{-2\pi h(1-\varepsilon)|n_{i_j}|^4}, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\|\tilde{B}'_j\|_{h(1-\varepsilon)} < C(\alpha) e^{3\epsilon_{i_j-1}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} |n_{i_j}|}, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\|B'_j\|_0 < C(\alpha) |n_{i_j}|^{2\tau}, \quad (6.5)$$

$$|\deg B'_j - n_{i_j}| \leq 2\epsilon_{i_j-1}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} |n_{i_j}|. \quad (6.6)$$

If we let

$$B_j(\theta) = \Phi_E(\theta)B'_j(\theta) = \Phi_E(\theta)\tilde{B}'_j(\theta)R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y'_j(\theta)} := \tilde{B}_j(\theta)R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y'_j(\theta)}$$

then one has

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_E(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} e^{f_j(\theta)}.$$

In the following, we give the estimates of the conjugacy B_j . First note (6.1) implies that

$$2\epsilon_{i_{j-1}}^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} < 2\epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{18\tau}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon h)^2. \quad (6.7)$$

By (6.2), (6.4) and (6.7), we have

$$\|\tilde{B}_j\|_{h(1-\epsilon)} \leq \|\Phi_E\|_{h(1-\epsilon)} \|\tilde{B}'_j\|_{h(1-\epsilon)} \leq C(V, \alpha, \epsilon) e^{(\epsilon h)^2 |n_{i_j}|}. \quad (6.8)$$

Consequently, (1) follows from (6.2), (6.6), and (6.7). While (2) and (H1) part of (3) follows from (6.2), (6.5) and (6.7).

We are left to prove (H2) part of (3). To prove this, rewrite $B_j(\theta)$ as

$$B_j(\theta) = \tilde{B}_j(\theta)R_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} e^{Y'_j(\theta)} = \tilde{B}_j(\theta)M^{-1}MR_{\frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} M^{-1}e^{MY'_j(\theta)M^{-1}}M,$$

if we denote

$$e^{M^{-1}Y'_j(\theta)M} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{11}(\theta) & y_{12}(\theta) \\ y_{21}(\theta) & y_{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B}_j(\theta)M^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{b}_{11}(\theta) & \tilde{b}_{12}(\theta) \\ \tilde{b}_{21}(\theta) & \tilde{b}_{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

then direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} b_{11}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{2i}(y_{11}(\theta) + y_{12}(\theta))\tilde{b}_{11}(\theta)e^{2\pi i \frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2i}(y_{21}(\theta) + y_{22}(\theta))\tilde{b}_{12}(\theta)e^{-2\pi i \frac{\langle n_{i_j}, \theta \rangle}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.3) and (6.8), we have

$$|\hat{b}_{11}(n)| \leq C e^{(\epsilon h)^2 |n_{i_j}|} (e^{-2\pi h(1-\epsilon)|n + \frac{n_{i_j}}{2}|} + e^{-2\pi h(1-\epsilon)|n - \frac{n_{i_j}}{2}|}),$$

similarly, one obtain estimates of $|\hat{b}_{12}(n)|$ and finish the whole proof of (3). \square

Note in section 3.2, we initially demonstrated the link between KAM resonances and rotation number resonances within the perturbative regime. However, our analysis actually extends to the global almost reducibility regime, revealing the connection between these two phenomena that persists even in the non-perturbative regime. Similarly, We order the ϵ_0 -resonances of $\rho(E)$ by $0 = |\ell_0| < |\ell_1| \leq |\ell_2| \leq \dots$.

Corollary 6.1. *Under the assumption of Proposition 6.1, for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, there exist $B_j \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that*

$$B_j^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A_E(\theta)B_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^j & \nu^j \\ \bar{\nu}^j & -it^j \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_j(\theta)} \quad (6.9)$$

with $\ell_i = \deg B_j$ provided ℓ_i is large enough (the choice of j depends on ℓ_i).

Proof. Note that by Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\Phi_E(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} A_E(\theta) \Phi_E(\theta) = R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)},$$

and thus

$$2\rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)}) = 2\rho(E) - \langle \deg \Phi_E, \alpha \rangle.$$

where by (6.2), $\deg \Phi_E$ is uniformly bounded for $E \in \Sigma_{V, \alpha}$. Hence for i sufficiently large,

$$\cdots < |\ell_i - \deg \Phi_E| \leq |\ell_{i+1} - \deg \Phi_E| \leq \cdots$$

are the ε'_0 -resonances of $\rho(\alpha, R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)})$ for some $\varepsilon'_0 \leq \varepsilon_0$.

By Lemma 3.1, there exists B'_j with $\deg B'_j = \ell_i - \deg \Phi_E$ such that

$$B'_j(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} R_{\phi(E)} e^{f_E(\theta)} B'_j(\theta) = A_j e^{f_j(\theta)}$$

Let $B_j = \Phi_E B'_j$, the desired result follows. \square

7. SHARP VERSION OF QUANTITATIVE AUBRY DUALITY

In the previous section, we established structured quantitative almost reducibility, which provided tight upper bounds on the off-diagonal entries ν_j within the constant matrix. However, this approach lacked a complementary lower bound analysis, leaving the optimality of these estimates uncertain. This section introduces a novel, sharp version of quantitative Aubry duality, which serves as a crucial stepping stone to address this gap.

The key insight lies in the interplay between the smallness of ν_j and the structure of the conjugacy matrix B_j , particularly its goodness properties (characterized by (C_1, C_2, γ, k)). When ν_j is small, this implies the dual almost Mathieu operator $H_{\lambda^{-1}, \alpha, 0}$ exhibits two approximately linearly independent localized eigenfunctions, centered around $\pm \frac{k}{2}$. However, this observation contradicts the fundamental principle of the Wronskian argument, which prohibits such a configuration.

By leveraging this contradiction, we not only demonstrate the optimality of the estimates derived from quantitative almost reducibility but also open the door to a range of optimal spectral applications.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $0 < |\lambda| < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon h_\lambda < \frac{1}{1000}$ and $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Then*

$$B(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} S_E^\lambda(\theta) B(\theta) = Id + F(\theta) \tag{7.1}$$

has no $B \in C_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with

- (1) $B(\theta)$ is $(C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) |k|^{2\tau}, C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 |k|}, h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon), k)$ - good,
- (2) $\|F\|_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)} \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|k|}$.

if $|k| \geq K(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ is sufficiently large.

Proof. We will argue by contradiction, i.e. assume (1) and (2) hold. Without loss of generality, we assume $k > 0$, and denote

$$B(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(\theta) & b_{12}(\theta) \\ b_{21}(\theta) & b_{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix} = (\vec{u}(\theta), \vec{v}(\theta)), \quad F(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1(\theta) & \beta_2(\theta) \\ \beta_3(\theta) & \beta_4(\theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

then (7.1) implies

$$b_{11}(\theta) = b_{21}(\theta + \alpha) + b_{21}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_1(\theta) + b_{22}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_3(\theta), \quad (7.2)$$

$$b_{12}(\theta) = b_{21}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_2(\theta) + b_{22}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_4(\theta) + b_{22}(\theta + \alpha). \quad (7.3)$$

As the perturbation $F(\theta)$ may not be zero, the Fourier coefficients of $b_{11}(\theta)$ and $b_{12}(\theta)$, denoted by $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$, are not necessarily to be the solutions of the dual almost Mathieu operator $H_{\lambda^{-1}, \alpha, 0}$:

$$\hat{u}(k+1) + \hat{u}(k-1) + 2\lambda^{-1} \cos(k\alpha)\hat{u}(k) = \lambda E \hat{u}(k). \quad (7.4)$$

However, $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$ are two approximate solutions of (7.4) if $F(\theta)$ is sufficiently small. To see this, by (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3), we have

$$(E - 2\lambda \cos 2\pi\theta)b_{11}(\theta) - b_{11}(\theta - \alpha) - b_{11}(\theta + \alpha) = f(\theta), \quad (7.5)$$

$$(E - 2\lambda \cos 2\pi\theta)b_{12}(\theta) - b_{12}(\theta - \alpha) - b_{12}(\theta + \alpha) = g(\theta), \quad (7.6)$$

where

$$f(\theta) = b_{11}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_1(\theta) + b_{12}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_3(\theta) - b_{21}(\theta)\beta_1(\theta - \alpha) - b_{22}(\theta)\beta_3(\theta - \alpha),$$

$$g(\theta) = b_{11}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_2(\theta) + b_{12}(\theta + \alpha)\beta_4(\theta) - b_{21}(\theta)\beta_2(\theta - \alpha) - b_{22}(\theta)\beta_4(\theta - \alpha),$$

and the assumption (1) and (2) imply the estimates

$$\|f\|_0, \|g\|_0 \leq 4\|B\|_0\|F\|_0 \leq 4C|k|^{2\tau} e^{-h\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|k|} \leq e^{-h\lambda(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)|k|}. \quad (7.7)$$

Setting $\mathbb{A}(\theta) = S_{\lambda^{-1}E}^{\lambda^{-1}}(\theta)$, going to Fourier coefficients, it immediately follows from (7.5) and (7.6) that $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(n)$ satisfy

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{11}(n+1) \\ \hat{b}_{11}(n) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{A}(n\alpha) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{11}(n) \\ \hat{b}_{11}(n-1) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}\hat{f}(n) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.8)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{12}(n+1) \\ \hat{b}_{12}(n) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{A}(n\alpha) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{12}(n) \\ \hat{b}_{12}(n-1) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1}\hat{g}(n) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.9)$$

The first observation is that assumption (1) implies that $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ has two localization center $\pm \frac{k}{2}$, consequently $\hat{b}_{11}(n)$ has relatively large coefficients around $\pm \frac{k}{2}$. Denote

$$I_k = \left[\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{10}\right) \frac{k}{2}, \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{10}\right) \frac{k}{2} \right],$$

Then we have the following:

Lemma 7.1. *There exists $k_0 \in I_k \cup -I_k$ and $K_0(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) > 0$, such that*

$$|\hat{b}_{11}(k_0)| \geq \frac{1}{|k|^{6\tau}}, \quad (7.10)$$

provided $k > K_0$.

Proof. On one hand, note that $\|\vec{u}\|_{L^2} \|\vec{v}\|_{L^2} > 1$ since $\det B(\theta) = 1$. It follows that

$$\|\vec{u}\|_{L^2} > \frac{1}{\|\vec{v}\|_{L^2}} > \frac{1}{\|B\|_{C^0}}.$$

By (7.2), one has

$$2\|b_{11}\|_{L^2} + 2\|B\|_0^2\|F\|_0 \geq \|b_{11}\|_{L^2} + \|b_{21}\|_{L^2} = \|\vec{u}\|_{L^2} \geq \|B\|_{C^0}^{-1},$$

consequently by (7.7) and (H1) part of the assumption (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{b}_{11}\|_{\ell^2} = \|b_{11}\|_{L^2} &\geq (2\|B\|_{C^0})^{-1} - \|B\|_0^2 \|F\|_0 \\ &\geq 2^{-1}C^{-1}|k|^{-2\tau} - C^2|k|^{4\tau} e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|k|} \geq 4^{-1}C^{-1}|k|^{-2\tau}.\end{aligned}\quad (7.11)$$

On the other hand, by (H2) part of the assumption (1), we have

$$|\hat{b}_{11}(n)| \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|} \left(e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n+\frac{k}{2}|} + e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n-\frac{k}{2}|} \right),$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{n \notin I_k \cup -I_k} |\hat{b}_{11}(n)|^2 \leq 4C^2 e^{2(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|} e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\varepsilon}{10}|k|} \leq e^{-10(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|}.$$

By (7.11) and the fact $|I_k \cup -I_k| \leq k$, it follows that there exists $k_0 \in I_k \cup -I_k$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}k|\hat{b}_{11}(k_0)|^2 &\geq \sum_{n \in I_k \cup -I_k} |\hat{b}_{11}(n)|^2 = \|b_{11}\|_{\ell^2}^2 - \sum_{n \notin I_k \cup -I_k} |\hat{b}_{11}(n)|^2 \\ &\geq 16^{-1}C^{-2}|k|^{-4\tau} - e^{-10(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|},\end{aligned}$$

then the result follows. \square

In the following, k_0 is chosen so that (7.10) is satisfied, and denote

$$D_{k_0} = \det \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{11}(k_0) & \hat{b}_{12}(k_0) \\ \hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1) & \hat{b}_{12}(k_0+1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will show actually (1) and (2) imply that vectors $(\hat{b}_{12}(n))_n$ and $(\hat{b}_{11}(n))_n$ are almost linearly independent.

Lemma 7.2. *There exists $K_1(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that if $k > K_1$, then*

$$|D_{k_0}| \geq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{5})k}.$$

Proof. We prove this by contradiction. If $|D_{k_0}| \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{5})k}$, then by the fact that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{12}(k_0) \\ \hat{b}_{12}(k_0+1) \end{pmatrix} = C_{k_0} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{11}(k_0) \\ \hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1) \end{pmatrix} + \frac{D_{k_0}}{\sqrt{|\hat{b}_{11}(k_0)|^2 + |\hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1)|^2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{\hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1)} \\ \hat{b}_{11}(k_0) \end{pmatrix},$$

one sees that

$$\left| \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{12}(k_0) - C_{k_0}\hat{b}_{11}(k_0) \\ \hat{b}_{12}(k_0+1) - C_{k_0}\hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1) \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq |D_{k_0}| < e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{5})k}, \quad (7.12)$$

which means the orthogonal projection of $(\hat{b}_{12}(k_0), \hat{b}_{12}(k_0+1))^T$ to the vector $(\hat{b}_{11}(k_0), \hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1))^T$ is small. Since

$$C_{k_0} = \frac{\hat{b}_{12}(k_0) + D_{k_0}\overline{\hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1)}}{\hat{b}_{11}(k_0)} \Big/ \sqrt{|\hat{b}_{11}(k_0)|^2 + |\hat{b}_{11}(k_0+1)|^2},$$

by Lemma 7.1 and (H1) part of the assumption (1), we have

$$|C_{k_0}| \leq C|k|^{12\tau} e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 k} \leq e^{4(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 k}, \quad (7.13)$$

provided k is sufficiently large depending on $\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon$.

In the following, we consider

$$\widehat{B}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(\theta) & b_{12}(\theta) - C_{k_0} b_{11}(\theta) \\ b_{11}(\theta - \alpha) & b_{12}(\theta - \alpha) - C_{k_0} b_{11}(\theta - \alpha) \end{pmatrix}$$

and aim to estimate its determinant. First, we will show as a consequence of (7.12), $b_{12}(\theta) - C_{k_0} b_{11}(\theta)$ is small. To show this, we have the following:

Claim 1. *If $|k| \geq K_1(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ is large enough, then we have:*

(1) *If $n \geq (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{20})k$ or $n \leq (-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{20})k$, then*

$$|\hat{b}_{12}(n) - C_{k_0} \hat{b}_{11}(n)| \leq e^{-\frac{\varepsilon h \lambda}{25}|k|} e^{-h \lambda (1-\varepsilon)|n - \frac{k}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon k}{20}|}.$$

(2) *If $(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{20})k \leq n \leq (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{20})k$, then*

$$|\hat{b}_{12}(n) - C_{k_0} \hat{b}_{11}(n)| \leq e^{-\frac{\varepsilon h \lambda}{25}|k|}.$$

Proof. By (7.13) and (H2) part of the assumption (1), we have

$$|b_{12}(n)| + C_{k_0} |b_{11}(n)| \leq C e^{6(\varepsilon h \lambda)^2 |k|} e^{-h \lambda (1-\varepsilon) \frac{\varepsilon}{10} \frac{|k|}{2}} e^{-h \lambda (1-\varepsilon) |n - \frac{k}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon k}{20}|},$$

the the first item follows.

To prove the second item, denote by

$$\tilde{p}_n = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda^{-1} \hat{g}(n) + \lambda^{-1} C_{k_0} \hat{f}(n) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{y}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{b}_{12}(n+1) - C_{k_0} \hat{b}_{11}(n+1) \\ \hat{b}_{12}(n) - C_{k_0} \hat{b}_{11}(n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then as a result of (7.8) and (7.9), we have

$$\tilde{y}_n = \mathbb{A}(n\alpha) \tilde{y}_{n-1} + \tilde{p}_n,$$

which implies that

$$\tilde{y}_n = \mathbb{A}^{n-k_0} ((k_0 + 1)\alpha) \tilde{y}_{k_0} + \sum_{j=k_0+1}^n \mathbb{A}^{n-j} ((j+1)\alpha) \tilde{p}_j$$

where $\mathbb{A}^n(\theta) = \mathbb{A}(\theta + (n-1)\alpha) \cdots \mathbb{A}(\theta)$.

By the assumption and (7.7), we have

$$|\tilde{p}_n| \leq e^{-h \lambda (1 + \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)|k|}, \quad |\tilde{y}_{k_0}| = |D_{k_0}| \leq e^{-h \lambda (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5})k},$$

while by Lemma 2.2, we have for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\|\mathbb{A}^n(\theta)\| \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) e^{h \lambda (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{100})|n|}. \quad (7.14)$$

As a result, if k is sufficiently large depending on $\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon$, then one can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{y}_n| &\leq C e^{h \lambda (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{100})|n-k_0|} \left(e^{-h \lambda (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5})|k|} + |n - k_0| e^{-h \lambda (1 + \frac{4\varepsilon}{5})|k|} \right) \\ &\leq e^{h \lambda (1 + \frac{4\varepsilon}{25})|k|} e^{-h \lambda (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{5})|k|} \leq e^{-\frac{\varepsilon h \lambda}{25}|k|}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the choice of k_0 that $|n - k_0| \leq (1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{10})k$. \square

This claim immediate imply that $\|b_{12}(\cdot) - C_{k_0}b_{11}(\cdot)\|_0 \leq 2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon h_\lambda}{25}|k|}$, as a consequence,

$$\det \widehat{B} \leq 2Ce^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 k} e^{-\frac{\varepsilon h_\lambda}{25}|k|} \leq \frac{1}{100}.$$

However by (7.2) and (7.3), we have

$$\det \widehat{B} \geq \det B - 4\|B\|_0^2\|F\|_0 \geq \det B - 4C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)^2|k|^{4\tau} e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|k|} > \frac{1}{2},$$

this is a contradiction. \square

Let $(u_1(n)), (u_2(n))$ be two solutions of the almost Mathieu operator, with the initial datum $u_1(k_0) = b_{11}(k_0)$, $u_1(k_0 + 1) = b_{11}(k_0 + 1)$ and $u_2(k_0) = b_{12}(k_0)$, $u_2(k_0 + 1) = b_{12}(k_0 + 1)$. Denote

$$D'_n := \det \begin{pmatrix} u_1(n) & u_2(n) \\ u_1(n+1) & u_2(n+1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, we have the following estimates:

Lemma 7.3. *There exists $K_2(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that if $k > K_2$, then*

$$|D'_{(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)k}| \leq 4e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon)k}, \quad \text{if } k_0 \in I_k,$$

$$|D'_{-(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)k}| \leq 4e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon)k}, \quad \text{if } k_0 \in -I_k.$$

Proof. We only prove the case $k_0 \in I_k$, the other case follows exactly the same way. First by (H2) part of the assumption (1), we have

$$|\hat{b}_{11}(n)|, |\hat{b}_{12}(n)| \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|} \left(e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n+\frac{k}{2}|} + e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n-\frac{k}{2}|} \right),$$

which implies that

$$|\hat{b}_{11}(k + \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon k)|, |\hat{b}_{12}(k + \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon k)| \leq 2C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|} e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)\frac{|k|}{2}} \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{2}{5}\varepsilon)\frac{|k|}{2}}, \quad (7.15)$$

without loss of generality, we only need to prove that

$$|\hat{u}_2(k + \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon k)| \leq 2e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{2}{5}\varepsilon)\frac{|k|}{2}}, \quad (7.16)$$

Denote by

$$p_n = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda^{-1}\hat{g}(n) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y_n = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u}_2(n+1) - \hat{b}_{12}(n+1) \\ \hat{u}_2(n) - \hat{b}_{12}(n) \end{pmatrix},$$

then by the similar argument as in Lemma 7.2, we know

$$y_n = \mathbb{A}^{n-k_0}((k_0+1)\alpha)y_{k_0} + \sum_{j=k_0+1}^n \mathbb{A}^{n-j}((j+1)\alpha)p_j,$$

As the initial datum of $\hat{u}(k_0)$ and $\hat{b}_{12}(k_0)$ are equal, i.e. $y_{k_0} = 0$, then by (7.7) and (7.14), we have

$$|y_{(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)k}| \leq 2|k|e^{h_\lambda(1+\frac{1}{100}\varepsilon)(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{17}{20}\varepsilon)|k|} C e^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|} e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|k|} \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon)\frac{|k|}{2}}$$

provided k is sufficiently large depending on $\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon$. Once we have this, then (7.16) follows from (7.15), and we finish the proof. \square

We can now finish the proof of Proposition 7.1. Since $(\hat{u}_1(n)), (\hat{u}_2(n))$ are two linearly independent solutions of the almost Mathieu operator $H_{\lambda^{-1}, \alpha, 0}$, then by Liouville's theorem, we have

$$D'_{-(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)k} = D'_{(1+\frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)k} = D'_{k_0} = D_{k_0},$$

however by Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3, this is a contradiction. \square

8. SHARP SPECTRAL APPLICATIONS FOR AMO

This section exclusively focuses on the applications of spectral theory of AMO, which constitutes the primary impetus for the development of our structured quantitative almost reducibility. Key findings encompass estimates on the size of spectral gaps, asymptotic properties of generalized eigenfunctions, and a novel proof of the arithmetic transition conjecture in phase space.

8.1. Sharp estimates on the length of spectral gaps: It was first observed by Moser-Pöschel [73] that to estimate the size of each spectral gap, we need to analyze the behavior of Schrödinger cocycles at the edge points of the spectral gaps. More precisely, Moser and Pöschel [73] showed for an arithmetic defined subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, if we are at the k -th edge point with $k \in \mathcal{K}$, saying E_k in the spectrum with $N(E_k) = k\alpha \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}$, the cocycle is reducible to a constant parabolic or elliptic cocycle. i.e., there is $B \in C_{h_*}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \text{PSL}(2, R))$ such that

$$B_k^{-1}(x + \alpha)A_{E_k}(x)B_k(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c_k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8.1)$$

Moreover, the conjugacy B_k is close to identity, consequently

$$\frac{|c_k|}{4} \leq |G_k(V)| \leq 2|c_k|, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}.$$

In general, we have the criterion on the spectral gaps:

Proposition 8.1 ([68]). *Let $\alpha \in DC_d(\kappa, \tau)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and $V \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{R})$ be a non-constant function. Let E be an edge point of the spectral gap $G(V)$. Assume that there are $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $B \in C_r^\omega(\mathbb{T}^d, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that*

$$B(x + \alpha)^{-1}A_E(x)B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with estimate

$$\|B\|_r^{14} c^\varepsilon \leq C(d, \kappa, \tau) r^{4(4\tau+1)},$$

where $C(d, \kappa, \tau)$ is numerical constant, then we have

$$c^{1+\varepsilon} \leq |G(V)| \leq c^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

The key observation is from Avila-You-Zhou's solution of non-critical Dry Ten Martini Problem [16], more precisely, for subcritical AMO, while (8.1) is true for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ (provided by Eliasson's theory [35]), a lower bound estimate for c_k is indeed achievable. With the aid of *sharp quantitative Aubry duality*, the precise decay rate of c_k can now be determined.

Corollary 8.1. *Let $\alpha \in DC$, $0 < |\lambda| < 1$ and $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$ with $2\rho(E) = k\alpha \bmod \mathbb{Z}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Given any $0 < \varepsilon h_\lambda < \frac{1}{1000}$, if $|k| \geq K(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ is large enough, there exist $B \in C_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ and $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$B^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)S_E^\lambda(\theta)B(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c_k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with estimate

$$(1) \|B\|_r \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{2(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|k|}e^{2r|k|}, \quad \forall r < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon),$$

$$(2) e^{-h_\lambda(1+2\varepsilon)|k|} \leq |c| \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1-2\varepsilon)|k|}.$$

Proof. By Avila's global theory [7], if $|\lambda| < 1$, (α, S_E^λ) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}\}$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, (α, S_E^λ) is almost reducible in the strip $\{|\Im z| < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2})\}$ [5, 8]. If we assume $2\rho(E) = k\alpha \bmod \mathbb{Z}$, then it is well-known there are at most finitely many KAM resonances [35, 68], denote the last resonance by n_{i_k} and $n_{i_k+1} = \infty$. Furthermore, by Proposition 6.1, there exists $B_k \in C_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ which is $(C|n_{i_k}|^{2\tau}, Ce^{(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|n_{i_k}|}, h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon), n_{i_k})$ -good, such that

$$B_k^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)S_E^\lambda(\theta)B_k(\theta) = A = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix} M$$

with estimate

$$|\nu| \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n_{i_k}|}. \quad (8.2)$$

Moreover, by noting $\deg B_k = k$, then we have estimate

$$|k - n_{i_k}| < (\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 |n_{i_k}|, \quad (8.3)$$

$$\|B_k\|_r \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{2(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2|n_{i_k}|}e^{2\pi r|n_{i_k}|}, \quad \forall r < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon). \quad (8.4)$$

If furthermore $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$, then A is parabolic, which implies that $t = |\nu|$. Thus if k is large enough (i.e. n_{i_k} is large), then by Proposition 7.1, we have

$$t = |\nu| > e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_k}|}. \quad (8.5)$$

Meanwhile, as A is parabolic, there exists $P \in SO(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$P^{-1}AP = P^{-1}M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it & \nu \\ \bar{\nu} & -it \end{pmatrix} MP = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $B = B_k P$ satisfy our needs, while (1) follows from (8.3) and (8.4), (2) follows from (8.2), (8.3) and (8.5). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Choose $r = \frac{\varepsilon h_\lambda}{300}$, then by Corollary 8.1, if $|k| \geq K(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ is large enough, then we have

$$\|B\|_r^{14} c_k^\varepsilon \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)^{15} e^{\frac{\varepsilon h_\lambda}{10}|k|} e^{-\varepsilon h_\lambda(1-2\varepsilon)|k|} \leq C(\alpha) r^{4(4\tau+1)},$$

then by Proposition 8.1 and (2) of Corollary 8.1, we have

$$c(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)^2|k|} \leq c_k^{1+\varepsilon} \leq G_k(\lambda) \leq c_k^{1-\varepsilon} \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)^2|k|}.$$

Finally, let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we then finish the proof of Theorem 1.3. \square

8.2. Optimal asymptotical growth. For any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, let $\{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that

$$\|2\rho(E) - \ell_j \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\varepsilon_0 |\ell_j|}. \quad (8.6)$$

By Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 6.1, for any fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, we have

$$\ell_j = n_{i_0} + n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_j}, \quad \ell_{j+1} = \ell_j + n_{i_{j+1}} + \cdots + n_{i_{j+m(j)}}.$$

where $(n_{i_j})_{j \geq 0}$ are the KAM resonances, and $n_{i_0} \leq C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ comes from the global to local reduction, which are uniformly for all $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Meanwhile, let $\eta_{j+k} \in [0, \infty]$ be such that

$$|\sin 2\pi(2\rho(E) - (n_{i_0} + \cdots + n_{i_{j+k}})\alpha)| = e^{-\eta_{j+k}|n_{i_0} + \cdots + n_{i_{j+k}}|}. \quad (8.7)$$

Once we have these, we can state the following quantitative almost reducibility result for almost Mathieu cocycle:

Proposition 8.2. *Let $\alpha \in DC$, $0 < |\lambda| < 1$ and $E \in \Sigma_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist sequence of $B_j \in C_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $\deg B_j = \ell_j$, such that for any $0 \leq k \leq m(j) - 1$,*

$$B_{j+k}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha) S_E^\lambda(\theta) B_{j+k}(\theta) = A_{j+k} e^{f_{j+k}(\theta)} = M^{-1} \exp \begin{pmatrix} it^{j+k} & \nu^{j+k} \\ \bar{\nu}^{j+k} & -it^{j+k} \end{pmatrix} M e^{f_{j+k}(\theta)} \quad (8.8)$$

with estimates

- (1) $\|f_{j+k}\|_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{32}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}$,
- (2) $|\nu_{j+k}| \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}$,
- (3) $|\nu_{j+k}| \geq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}$ if $(1+\varepsilon)h_\lambda < \eta_{j+k}$,
- (4) $|\deg B_{j+k} - n_{i_{j+k}}| < (\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 |n_{i_{j+k}}|$,
- (5) $\|B_{j+k}\|_0 \leq C |n_{i_{j+k}}|^\tau$.

Proof. By Avila's global theory [7], if $|\lambda| < 1$, (α, S_E^λ) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}\}$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, (α, S_E^λ) is almost reducible in the strip $\{|\Im z| < \frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\}$ [8, 5]. Then we only need to prove (3), while the others follow directly from Proposition 6.1.

To prove this, note by the assumption

$$|2\rho(\alpha, A_{j+k} e^{f_{j+k}})| = e^{-\eta_{j+k}|n_{i_0} + \cdots + n_{i_{j+k}}|} \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|},$$

by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$|\xi_{j+k}| = |\rho(\alpha, A_{j+k})| \leq |\rho(\alpha, A_{j+k} e^{f_{j+k}})| + e^{-\frac{1}{64}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|} < 2e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}. \quad (8.9)$$

Thus if we assume $|\nu_{j+k}| \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}$, then (8.9) implies that $|t_{j+k}| \leq 2e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}$, consequently we can rewrite $A_{j+k} e^{f_{j+k}(\theta)} := \text{id} + \tilde{f}_{j+k}(\theta)$ with estimate

$$\|\tilde{f}_{j+k}\|_{\frac{h_\lambda}{2\pi}(1-\varepsilon)} \leq e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|n_{i_{j+k}}|}.$$

Meanwhile, Proposition 6.1 shows that $B_{j+k}(\theta)$ is $(C|n_{i_{j+k}}|^{2\tau}, C e^{(\varepsilon h)^2 |n_{i_{j+k}}|}, h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon), n_{i_{j+k}})$ -good. This is a contradiction by Proposition 7.1. Then the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7: Recall that $\{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a sequence such that

$$\|2\rho(E) - \ell_j \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\varepsilon_0 |\ell_j|}. \quad (8.10)$$

where $\varepsilon_0 < h_\lambda$. Thus one can take ε sufficiently small such that

$$h_\lambda(1 - 2\varepsilon) > \varepsilon_0(1 + \varepsilon h_\lambda), \quad (8.11)$$

and then choose j sufficiently large such that

$$|(\varepsilon h_\lambda)^2 |n_{i_j}| \leq \frac{1}{512} \varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|, \quad (8.12)$$

$$\frac{8\tau \ln t}{t} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad \forall t \geq |n_{i_j}|. \quad (8.13)$$

As direct consequence of (3) of Proposition 8.2 and (8.12), we have the following consequence of KAM resonances and rotation number resonances:

$$(1 - \varepsilon h_\lambda) |\ell_j| < |n_{i_j}| < (1 + \varepsilon h_\lambda) |\ell_j|, \quad (8.14)$$

Within these parameters, we can finish the whole proof. First by Proposition 8.2 and Lemma 5.1⁴, there is $C(\lambda, \alpha, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq k \leq m(j) - 1$, we have:

(a) If $|\frac{\nu_{j+k}}{\xi_{j+k}}| < \frac{1}{2}$, then for any $e^{\frac{1}{512}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k}}|} \leq n < e^{\frac{1}{32}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}$, we have

$$C^{-1}(|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq C(|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

(b) $|\frac{\nu_{j+k}}{\xi_{j+k}}| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then we have the following:

- If $e^{\frac{1}{512}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k}}|} \leq n < \min\{\frac{1}{\xi_{j+k}}, e^{\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}\}$, then

$$C^{-1}(|n| |\nu_{j+k}| + 1) (|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq C(|n| |\nu_{j+k}| + 1) (|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

- If $\frac{1}{\xi_{j+k}} \leq n < e^{\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}$, then

$$C^{-1} \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n \xi_{j+k})} \left| \frac{\nu_{j+k}}{\xi_{j+k}} \right| (|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq C \sqrt{1 + 2 \sin^2(n \xi_{j+k})} \left| \frac{\nu_{j+k}}{\xi_{j+k}} \right| (|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

By (8.8), Lemma 2.1 and (1) of Proposition 8.2, we have

$$|2\rho(E) - 2\xi_{j+k} - (n_{i_0} + \dots + n_{i_{j+k}})\alpha| \leq e^{-\frac{1}{64}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|} \quad (8.15)$$

by (4) of Proposition 8.2 and (8.7), we have

$$\frac{1}{2} e^{-\eta_{j+k} |n_{i_0} + \dots + n_{i_{j+k}}|} \leq |\xi_{j+k}| \leq 2e^{-\eta_{j+k} |n_{i_0} + \dots + n_{i_{j+k}}|}. \quad (8.16)$$

Then we distinguish the proof into three cases:

Case I: $1 \leq k \leq m(j) - 1$. Notice that by the definition of ℓ_i , in this case, we have $\eta_{j+k} < \varepsilon_0$, then by (2) of Proposition 8.2, (8.11) and (8.16), we have

$$\left| \frac{\nu_{j+k}}{\xi_{j+k}} \right| \leq e^{-\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k}}|} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

By (a) above, for $e^{\frac{1}{512}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k}}|} < |n| < e^{\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}$, we have

$$C^{-1}(|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq C(|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

⁴Actually we need an additional global to local reduction transformation by ARC [8, 5], but this will not change the growth of cocycles.

Case II: $k = 0$ and $\eta_j \leq (1 + \varepsilon)h_\lambda$, then by (2) of Proposition 8.2, (8.14) and (8.16), we have

$$\left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right| \leq 2e^{-(h_\lambda - \eta_j - 2\varepsilon h_\lambda)|\ell_j|} \leq 2e^{2\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|}.$$

By (a), (b) above and Remark 5.1, for $e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|} \leq |n| < e^{\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+1}}|}$, we have estimate

$$C^{-1}e^{-2\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|}(|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq Ce^{2\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|}(|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

Case III: $k = 0$ and $\eta_j > (1 + \varepsilon)h_\lambda$, then by (2), (3) of Proposition 8.2, (8.14) and (8.16), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{-(h_\lambda - \eta_j + 2\varepsilon h_\lambda)|\ell_j|} \leq \left| \frac{\nu_j}{\xi_j} \right| \leq 2e^{-(h_\lambda - \eta_j - 2\varepsilon h_\lambda)|\ell_j|}.$$

Case III-1: $e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|} \leq |n| < e^{\eta_j |\ell_j|}$. By (a), (b) above and (8.14), for

$$e^{\frac{1}{512}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_j}|} < e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_j|} \leq |n| < e^{\eta_j |\ell_j|},$$

we have estimate

$$C^{-1}(|n|e^{-h_\lambda(1+\varepsilon)|\ell_j|} + 1)(|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq C(|n|e^{-h_\lambda(1-\varepsilon)|\ell_j|} + 1)(|\ln n|)^{4\tau}.$$

Case III-2: $e^{\eta_j |\ell_j|} \leq |n| < e^{\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+1}}|}$. In this case, (8.15) implies that

$$\|2n\xi_j - n(2\rho(E) - (n_{i_0} + \cdots + n_{i_{j+k}})\alpha)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{128}\varepsilon h_\lambda |n_{i_{j+k+1}}|}.$$

Consequently by (b) above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1}\sqrt{1 + 2\sin^2 2\pi(n(\rho(E) - \ell_j\alpha/2))}e^{-2(h_\lambda - \eta_j + 2\varepsilon h_\lambda)|\ell_j|}(|\ln n|)^{-4\tau} &\leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \\ &\leq C\sqrt{1 + 2\sin^2 2\pi(n(\rho(E) - \ell_j\alpha/2))}e^{-2(h_\lambda - \eta_j - 2\varepsilon h_\lambda)|\ell_j|}(|\ln n|)^{4\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these cases together, by (8.13), these imply that

$$|n|^{f(n)-\varepsilon} \leq \|\mathcal{A}_E^n\|_0 \leq |n|^{f(n)+\varepsilon}, \quad (8.17)$$

where we denote

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} \max\{1 - \frac{|\ell_j|h_\lambda}{\ln|n|}, 0\} & e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_i|} \leq |n| < e^{\eta_j |\ell_j|} \\ \max\{\frac{\ln|\sin 2\pi n(\rho(E) + \ell_j\alpha/2)| + |\ell_j|(\eta_j - h_\lambda)}{\ln|n|}, 0\} & e^{\eta_j |\ell_j|} < |n| < e^{\frac{1}{256}\varepsilon h_\lambda |\ell_{j+1}|}. \end{cases}$$

As a consequence, (1.10) and (1.11) follow directly from (8.17). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.1: By Avila's global theory [7], if $|\lambda| < 1$, (α, S_E^λ) is subcritical in the strip $\{|\Im z| < -\frac{\ln \lambda}{2\pi}\}$, thus by Theorem 1.2, if $\alpha \in DC$ and $-\ln \lambda > \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, (α, S_E^λ) is reducible. On the other hand, $-\ln \lambda < \delta(\alpha, \rho)$, by (1.10), (α, S_E^λ) is unbounded, which immediately imply (α, S_E^λ) is not analytically reducible (even not C^0 reducible). \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by National Key R&D Program of China (2020 YFA0713300) and Nankai Zhide Foundation. L. Ge was partially supported by NSFC grant (12371185) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (the start-up fund), Peking University. J. You was also partially supported by NSFC grant (11871286). Q. Zhou was supported by NSFC grant (12071232).

REFERENCES

- [1] Amor, S.H.: Hölder continuity of the rotation number for quasi-periodic co-cycles in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **287**(2), 565–588 (2009)
- [2] Arnold, V.I.: Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics. *Russian Mathematical Surveys* (1963)
- [3] Arnold, V.I., Kozlov, V.V., Neishtadt, A.: *Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics*. Vol. 3. Berlin: Springer (2006)
- [4] Aubry, S., André, G.: Analyticity breaking and Anderson localization in incommensurate lattices. *Ann. Israel Phys. Soc.* **3**, 133–164 (1980)
- [5] Avila, A.: The absolutely continuous spectrum of the almost Mathieu operator. preprint arXiv:0810.2965 (2008)
- [6] Avila, A.: Almost reducibility and absolute continuity I. preprint arXiv:1006.0704 (2010)
- [7] Avila, A.: Global theory of one-frequency Schrödinger operators. *Acta Math.* **215**, 1–54 (2015)
- [8] Avila, A.: KAM, Lyapunov exponents, and the spectral dichotomy for typical one-frequency Schrödinger operators. preprint arXiv:2307.11071v2 (2023)
- [9] Avila, A., Bochi, J., Damanik, D.: Cantor spectrum for schrödinger operators with potentials arising from generalized skew-shifts. *Duke Math. J.* **146**, 253–280 (2009)
- [10] Avila, A., Fayad, B., Krikorian, R.: A KAM scheme for $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles with Liouvillean frequencies. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **21**(5), 1001–1019 (2011)
- [11] Avila, A., Jitomirskaya, S.: The ten martini problem. *Ann. of Math.* **170**, 303–342 (2009)
- [12] Avila, A., Jitomirskaya, S.: Almost localization and almost reducibility. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **12**(1), 93–131 (2010)
- [13] Avila, A., Krikorian, R.: Reducibility or nonuniform hyperbolicity for quasiperiodic Schrödinger cocycles. *Ann. of Math.* **164**(3), 911–940 (2006)
- [14] Avila, A., Last, Y., Shamis, M., Zhou, Q.: On the abominable properties of the almost mathieu operator with well approximated frequencies. *Duke Math. J.* **173**(4), 603–672 (2024)
- [15] Avila, A., You, J., Zhou, Q.: Sharp phase transitions for the almost Mathieu operator. *Duke Math. J.* **166**(14), 2697–2718 (2017)
- [16] Avila, A., You, J., Zhou, Q.: Dry ten Martini problem in the non-critical case. preprint arXiv:2306.16254v2 (2023)
- [17] Avron, J., Simon, B.: Singular continuous spectrum for a class of almost periodic Jacobi matrices. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **6**(1), 81–85 (1982)
- [18] Avron, J.E., Osadchy, D., Seiler, R.: A topological look at the quantum Hall effect. *Physics today*. pp. 38–42 (2003)
- [19] Bellissard, J., Simon, B.: Cantor spectrum for the almost mathieu equation. *J. Funct. Anal.* **48**, 408–419 (1982)
- [20] Binder, I., Damanik, D., Goldstein, M., Lukic, M.: Almost periodicity in time of solutions of the KdV equation. *Duke Math. J.* **167**(14), 2633–2678 (2018)
- [21] Bourgain, J.: On the spectrum of lattice Schrödinger operators with deterministic potential. II. *J. Anal. Math.* **88**, 221–254 (2002). Dedicated to the memory of Tom Wolff
- [22] Bourgain, J.: Green’s function estimates for lattice Schrödinger operators and applications, *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, vol. 158. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (2005)
- [23] Bourgain, J., Goldstein, M.: On nonperturbative localization with quasi-periodic potential. *Ann. of Math.* **152**(3), 835–879 (2000)
- [24] Bourgain, J., Jitomirskaya, S.: Absolutely continuous spectrum for 1D quasiperiodic operators. *Invent. Math.* **148**(3), 453–463 (2002)
- [25] Cai, A., Chavaudret, C., You, J., Zhou, Q.: Sharp Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent of finitely differentiable quasi-periodic cocycles. *Math. Z.* **291**(3-4), 931–958 (2019)
- [26] Cao, H., Shi, Y., Zhang, Z.: Localization and regularity of the integrated density of states for Schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^d with C^2 -cosine like quasi-periodic potential. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **404**(1), 495–561 (2023)
- [27] Cao, H., Shi, Y., Zhang, Z.: On the spectrum of quasi-periodic schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^d with c^2 -cosine type potentials. preprint arxiv:2310.07407 (2023)

- [28] Choi, M., Elliott, G., Yui, N.: Gauss polynomials and the rotation algebra. *Invent. Math.* **99**, 225–246 (1990)
- [29] Chulaevsky, V., Dinaburg, E.: Methods of kam-theory for long-range quasi-periodic operators on \mathbb{Z}^d . pure point spectrum. *Commun. Math. Phys* **153**, 559–577 (1993)
- [30] Damanik, D., Goldstein, M.: On the inverse spectral problem for the quasi-periodic Schrödinger equation. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **119**, 217–401 (2014)
- [31] Deift, P.: Some open problems in random matrix theory and the theory of integrable systems. In: *Integrable systems and random matrices*, *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 458, pp. 419–430. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2008)
- [32] Deift, P.: Some open problems in random matrix theory and the theory of integrable systems. II. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **13**, Paper No. 016, 23 (2017)
- [33] Dinaburg, E., Sinai, Y.: The one dimensional schrödinger equation with a quasi-periodic potential. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* pp. 279–289 (1975)
- [34] Dumas, H.S.: *The KAM story: A friendly introduction to the content, History, and significance Of dimensional Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser theory.* World Scientific Publishing Company (2014)
- [35] Eliasson, L.: Floquet solutions for the 1-dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **146**(3), 447–482 (1992)
- [36] Eliasson, L.H.: Discrete one-dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators with pure point spectrum. *Acta Math.* **179**(2), 153–196 (1997)
- [37] Fayad, B., Krikorian, R.: Rigidity results for quasiperiodic $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycles. *J. Mod. Dyn.* **3**(4), 497–510 (2009)
- [38] Fedotov, A.: Monodromization method in the theory of almost-periodic equations. *St. Petersburg Mathematical Mathematics* **179**(2), 153–196 (1997)
- [39] Fedotov, A.: A series of spectral gaps for the almost Mathieu operator with a small coupling constant. preprint arXiv:2012.03356 (2020)
- [40] Frohlich, J., Spencer, T., Wittwer, P.: Localization for a class of one dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators. *Commun. Math. Phys* **132**, 5–25 (1990)
- [41] Ge, L., Kachkovskiy, I.: Ballistic transport for one-dimensional quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **76**(10), 2577–2612 (2023)
- [42] Ge, L., You, J.: Arithmetic version of Anderson localization via reducibility. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **30**(5), 1370–1401 (2020)
- [43] Ge, L., You, J., Zhao, X.: Hölder regularity of the integrated density of states for quasi-periodic long-range operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **392**(2), 347–376 (2022)
- [44] Ge, L., You, J., Zhou, Q.: Exponential dynamical localization: Criterion and applications. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* **56**(1), 91–126 (2023)
- [45] Gordon, A.: The point spectrum of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk.* **31**, 257–258 (1976)
- [46] Gordon, A., Jitomirskaya, S., Last, Y., Simon, B.: Duality and singular continuous spectrum in the almost mathieu equation. *Acta Math.* **178**, 169–183 (1997)
- [47] Halperin, B.: Quantized hall conductance, current-carrying edge states, and the existence of extended states in a two-dimensional disordered potential. *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 2185 (1982)
- [48] Harper, P.: Single band motion of conduction electrons in a uniform magnetic field. *Pro. Phys. Soc.* **68**(10), 874–878 (1955)
- [49] Helffer, B., Sjöstrand, J.: Semi-classical analysis for Harper’s equation. iii: Cantor structure of the spectrum. *Mem. Soc. Math. France* **39**, 1–124 (1989)
- [50] Hou, X., You, J.: Almost reducibility and non-perturbative reducibility of quasi-periodic linear systems. *Invent. Math.* **190**(1), 209–260 (2012)
- [51] J.Bourgain, Jitomirskaya, S.: Continuity of the lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential. *J. Stat. Phys.* pp. 1203–1218 (2002)
- [52] Jiang, K., Li, S., Zhang, P.: Numerical methods and analysis of computing quasiperiodic systems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **62**(1), 353–375 (2024)
- [53] Jiang, K., Zhang, P.: Numerical mathematics of quasicrystals. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. IV. Invited lectures*, pp. 3591–3609. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ (2018)

- [54] Jitomirskaya, S.: Almost everything about the almost Mathieu operator. II. In: XIth International Congress of Mathematical Physics (Paris, 1994), pp. 373–382. Int. Press, Cambridge, MA (1995)
- [55] Jitomirskaya, S.: Metal-insulator transition for the almost Mathieu operator. *Ann. of Math.* (2) **150**(3), 1159–1175 (1999)
- [56] Jitomirskaya, S.: One-dimensional quasiperiodic operators: global theory, duality, and sharp analysis of small denominators. In: ICM—International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. 2. Plenary lectures, pp. 1090–1120. EMS Press, Berlin (2023)
- [57] Jitomirskaya, S., Kachkovskiy, I.: l^2 -reducibility and localization for quasiperiodic operators. *Math. Res. Lett.* **23**, 431–444 (2016)
- [58] Jitomirskaya, S., Liu, W.: Universal hierarchical structure of quasiperiodic eigenfunctions. *Ann. of Math.* **187**(3), 721–776 (2018)
- [59] Jitomirskaya, S., Liu, W.: Universal reflective-hierarchical structure of quasiperiodic eigenfunctions and sharp spectral transition in phase. To appear in *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* (2018)
- [60] Jitomirskaya, S., Simon, B.: Operators with singular continuous spectrum. III. Almost periodic Schrödinger operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **165**(1), 201–205 (1994)
- [61] Johnson, R., Moser, J.: The rotation number for almost periodic potentials. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **84**(3), 403–438 (1982)
- [62] Kac, M.: Public commun. AMS Annual Meeting (1981)
- [63] Kappeler, T., Pöschel, J.: *KdV & KAM*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2013)
- [64] Karaliolios, N., Xu, X., Zhou, Q.: Anosov-Katok constructions for quasi-periodic $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles. *Peking Math. J.* **7**(1), 203–245 (2024)
- [65] L. Ge, J.Y., Zhao, X.: The arithmetic version of the frequency transition conjecture: new proof and generalization. *Peking. Math. J.* **5**(2), 349–364 (2021)
- [66] Last, Y.: Zero measure spectrum for the almost mathieu operator. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **164**, 421–432 (1994)
- [67] Last, Y.: Spectral theory of Sturm-Liouville operators on infinite intervals: a review of recent developments. In: *Sturm-Liouville theory*, pp. 99–120. Birkhäuser, Basel (2005)
- [68] Leguil, M., You, J., Zhao, Z., Zhou, Q.: Asymptotics of spectral gaps of quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators. arXiv:1712.04700 (2017)
- [69] Li, X., You, J., Zhou, Q.: Exact local distribution of the absolutely continuous spectral measure. In preparation (2024)
- [70] Liu, W., Yuan, X.: Anderson localization for the almost Mathieu operator in the exponential regime. *J. Spectr. Theory* **5**(1), 89–112 (2015)
- [71] M. Goldstein, W.S.: On resonances and the formation of gaps in the spectrum of quasi-periodic schrödinger equations. *Ann. of Math.* **173**, 337–475 (2011)
- [72] M.Herman: Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle a des rotations. *Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math* (5-233) (1979)
- [73] Moser, J., Pöschel, J.: An extension of a result by Dinaburg and Sinai on quasiperiodic potentials. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **59**(1), 39–85 (1984)
- [74] Niu, Q., Thouless, D., Wu, Y.: Quantized Hall conductance as a topological invariant. *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 3372 (1985)
- [75] Osadchy, D., Avron, J.E.: Hofstadter butterfly as quantum phase diagram. *J. Math Phys.* **42**, 5665–5671 (2001)
- [76] Peierls, R.: Zur theorie des diamagnetismus von leitungselektronen. *Z. Phys.* **80**(11), 763–791 (1933)
- [77] Puig, J.: Cantor spectrum for the almost mathieu operator. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **244**, 297–309 (2004)
- [78] Puig, J.: A nonperturbative eliasson’s reducibility theorem. *Nonlinearity* **19**(2), 355–376 (2005)
- [79] Rauh, A.: Degeneracy of landau levels in crystals. *Phys. Status Solidi B* **65**, 131–135 (1974)
- [80] Simon, B.: Almost periodic Schrödinger operators: a review. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **3**(4), 463–490 (1982)
- [81] Simon, B.: Localization in general one-dimensional random systems. I. Jacobi matrices. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **102**(2), 327–336 (1985)
- [82] Sinai, Y.G.: Anderson localization for one-dimensional difference Schrödinger operator with quasiperiodic potential. *J. Stat. Phys.* **46**(5-6), 861–909 (1987)

- [83] Yoccoz, J.C.: Conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle dont le nombre de rotation vérifie une condition diophantienne. *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* (333-359) (1984)
- [84] Yoccoz, J.: Analytic linearization of circle diffeomorphism. In: *Dynamical System and Small divisors*(Cetraro, 1998), *Lecture Notes in Math*, pp. 125–173. Springer-Verlag, New York (2002)
- [85] You, J.: Quantitative almost reducibility and its applications. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. III. Invited lectures*, pp. 2113–2135. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ (2018)
- [86] You, J., Zhou, Q.: Embedding of analytic quasi-periodic cocycles into analytic quasi-periodic linear systems and its applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **323**(3), 975–1005 (2013)
- [87] Zhou, Q., Wang, J.: Reducibility results for quasiperiodic cocycles with Liouvillean frequency. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* **24**(1), 61–83 (2012)

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

Email address: lingruige10@163.com

CHERN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300071, CHINA

Email address: jyou@nankai.edu.cn

CHERN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300071, CHINA

Email address: qizhou@nankai.edu.cn