

HIDDEN SUBCRITICALITY, SYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE, AND UNIVERSALITY OF SHARP ARITHMETIC SPECTRAL RESULTS FOR TYPE I OPERATORS

LINGRUI GE AND SVETLANA JITOMIRSKAYA

ABSTRACT. We exploit the structure of dual cocycles to develop several new concepts and tools for the study of one-frequency quasiperiodic operators with analytic potentials. As applications we solve two long-standing arithmetic conjectures: universality of sharp phase transition in frequency and absolute continuity of the integrated density of states for all frequencies for the entire class of (non-critical) type I operators, a large open set including the analytic neighborhood of several popular explicit models. Additionally, we prove the universality of $1/2$ -Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for all type I operators with Diophantine frequencies, partially solving You's conjecture [105].

A key dynamical finding: the special symplectic structure of the center of the dual cocycle that, remarkably, holds also in the limit where the cocycle does not even exist, allows, among other things, to pass for the first time from trigonometric polynomials to general analytic potentials, in the duality-based arguments. It is also applicable in other outstanding problems where the results so far have only been obtained for the trigonometric polynomial case. The hidden subcriticality uncovered by this structure allows to define the rotation numbers for these complex-symplectic cocycles and reveals the dynamical nature of the special place of even potentials.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main results	5
3. Main ideas	11
4. Preliminaries	13
5. Multiplicative Jensen's formula for the duals	16
6. The structure of dual symplectic cocycles of type I operators	21
7. The fibered rotation number. Proof of Theorem 2.2 and 2.3	29
8. Localization and reducibility: proof of Theorem 2.1	35
Acknowledgements	41
References	41

1. INTRODUCTION

We study analytic one-frequency Schrödinger operators,

$$(H_{v,\alpha,\theta}u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + v(\theta + n\alpha)u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ is the frequency, $\theta \in \mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is the phase and $v \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ is a 1-periodic real analytic potential.

One of the most interesting features of operators (1.1) is that for irrational α there is an interplay between their spectral properties and approximation arithmetics of α , leading to sharp arithmetic transitions in some spectral features and making frequency-universal results in other features notoriously difficult to prove. Indeed, having to deal with both the Diophantine scales, where the distribution of the potential values is essentially uniform, and Liouville scales where it is manifestly not, presents particular challenges to proving not only “sharp transition” but also many “all frequency” results, giving such problems a strong number-theoretic flavor, where all the arithmetic subtleties need to be confronted.

Three long-standing problems of this *sharp arithmetic* nature, all featured, in their original forms, in Barry Simon’s lists of problems [99, 100], for the **almost Mathieu operator** ((1.1) with $v(x) = \lambda \cos 2\pi x$) are

- (1) The spectrum is a Cantor set for **all** $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ (aka the ten martini problem)
- (2) In the positive Lyapunov exponent regime, there is a sharp spectral transition between singular continuous and a.e. pure point spectrum at $L(E) = \beta(\alpha)$ where L is the Lyapunov exponent (see Subsection 4.1) and $\beta(\alpha)$ is defined in (2.4) (dubbed the Aubry-Andre-Jitomirskaya (AAJ) conjecture in [14])
- (3) the integrated density of states (see Subsection 4.4) is absolutely continuous for **all** $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and all non-critical (see Subsection 4.3) operators (1.1).

After many partial results by various (prominent) authors, these problems were all finally solved in highly celebrated work: the ten martini in [9], the AAJ conjecture in [14, 72] (and in [64] for the original formulation), and the absolute continuity of non-critical IDS in [7].¹

It is important to emphasize that problems (1), (3) were solved for (arithmetically) almost all parameters [64, 94] before their final celebrated all α solutions. Moreover, several other almost Mathieu problems (with final solutions in [3, 12]) have reappeared on Simon’s list [100] already after having been solved for the Diophantine (thus a.e.) α in, correspondingly, [64, 87], underscoring the particular importance given to proving the *sharp arithmetic* results, as formulated. Essentially, those have been treated as number theory problems, with no omission, approximation or perturbation allowed. All these results were for the almost Mathieu operator only, with proofs heavily using its various specific features.

The central position of the almost Mathieu operator among operators (1.1) has various explanations, the most important one being that it is the model at the physics origin of the field, and also the one eliciting continuous current physics interest [16, 51, 52, 92, 93, 96, 98]. This physics nature and relevance certainly suggests that the properties of non-critical almost Mathieu operators should be robust with respect to small analytic perturbations of v .²

At the same time, the almost Mathieu operator is as central and iconic, as it is highly special, and in particular, all the above-mentioned celebrated almost Mathieu proofs do not withstand small perturbations. It has been long open whether the robust versions

¹It should be mentioned that [9] only proved the not very Liouville part, and relied on the result of [25] for very Liouville frequencies; similarly, [14], [7] only proved the Liouville part and relied on the results of [64], [10] for the Diophantine one.

²This consideration is less applicable at criticality, because criticality itself is not robust [4].

of sharp arithmetic results are true, and in fact, previously these results have not been established for **any** operators (1.1) other than the almost Mathieu.³

Here we establish the full robust versions of both sharp arithmetic transitions and non-critical absolute continuity of the IDS, for a large open set of analytic one-frequency operators, by developing several new general tools of independent interest. The ten martini problem was recently established for a large set of v , with the proof given in [37] requiring v to be an even trigonometric polynomial. Our central dynamical results present also a pathway to remove these technical limitations for the robust ten martini, to be fully implemented in [38].

The prototypical nature of the almost Mathieu operator is especially prominent in the Avila’s global theory [4] of operators (1.1), where he, in particular, divide the spectra into *subcritical*, *critical*, and *supercritical* regions, based on the behavior of complexified Lyapunov exponents, and modeled by the corresponding almost Mathieu regimes ($|\lambda| < 1, |\lambda| = 1, |\lambda| > 1$), thus suggesting that various almost Mathieu features should be, at least in some sense, universal for operators (1.1) through corresponding regimes [4–6].

Indeed, by now it has largely been accomplished in the subcritical regime, through the solution of the almost reducibility conjecture (ARC, [5, 6]): subcriticality implies almost reducibility (see also [35] for a duality-based proof for the Diophantine case). This leads to a host of spectral features, in particular, the universality of another sharp arithmetic result: absolutely continuous spectrum for **all** phases and frequencies in the subcritical regime - also a problem appearing on Simon’s lists [99, 100]⁴ as an almost Mathieu problem, and originally solved for the almost Mathieu [3].⁵

The situation, however, becomes different in the supercritical regime. Some results are definitely universal. For example, the universality of the measure-theoretic version of the metal-insulator transition result for the almost Mathieu [64] was shown in a remarkable work of Bourgain-Goldstein [20] that has developed a robust method and had had a substantial followup, e.g. [18, 74]. It is a lot more delicate, however, with the *sharp arithmetic* results, both of the “all frequency” and “sharp transition” kind, as well as for many other results in the supercritical regime.

For example, the Lyapunov exponent that is analytic (even constant) on the spectrum of the almost Mathieu, is only, in general, analytic on the parts of the spectrum that have constant *acceleration*, a simple yet fundamental quantity introduced, and shown to be quantized (integer-valued) in [4]. Additionally, You’s conjecture [105] is that the Hölder exponent of the integrated density of states is universal throughout each constant acceleration part of the spectrum, but not overall. This suggests that, for some results, there are different universality classes, in particular, depending on the acceleration.

³The main results of this paper, including the robust AAJ, were originally presented at QMath in September 2022, and since then in multiple other venues, in particular, [67]. As we were finalizing the manuscript, a proof of AAJ for *even* potentials with acceleration 1 appeared in [51], by adapting the method of [72]. As all techniques going back to [64], it uses crucially the evenness of the potential, thus pertains to a codimension 1 submanifold of an open set needed for robustness and avoids the main difficulty. See also a related discussion at the end of the introduction.

⁴originally in a wrong form!

⁵the almost reducibility conjecture itself was also first shown for the almost Mathieu [10], but as a correlation rather than causation; and in fact it was what has prompted the ARC, originally made in [10].

In general, the universality of a number of prominent **arithmetic** almost Mathieu results ⁶ in the supercritical regime is a big open problem in the field, since Bourgain's semi-algebraic sets approach requires non-arithmetic restrictions on α . The supercritical almost Mathieu has acceleration one throughout the spectrum, so the universality of its properties in this class becomes the first natural question.

This paper is the third in a series started with [40] where we initiated a project to extend the key almost Mathieu facts to its analytic neighborhood. As discussed in [37], acceleration 1 is not a stable property. To this end, the concepts of T-acceleration and type I operators (an open set in each \mathbb{C}_h^ω , therefore stable condition) were introduced in [37] (Definitions 2.2 and 2.3).

This paper is, at the same time, the first to establish the universality of *supercritical arithmetic* results: universality of the AAJ conjecture as given in (2) and the *all-frequency* absolute continuity of non-critical IDS as given in (3), for the entire class of type I operators. The tools we develop to this end present also important ingredients that, combined with the arguments of [37], will also allow to prove the universality of the ten martini for this class in [38]. Additionally, we establish the universality of sharp $1/2$ -Hölder continuity of the IDS conjectured in [105] for the same class.

As for the previous papers in this series: in [40] absolute continuity of the IDS was proved for type I operators, but only under the Diophantine condition, so not a fully *arithmetic* result. In [37] we developed important tools that, in particular, allowed for the first time to crack the ten martini problem beyond the almost Mathieu, and provided a strong pathway to its universality for type I operators.

Thus, together with [37, 38], this paper gives the key spectral results for type I operators and completes the main qualitative part of our project of investigating the spectral properties for this operator family.

This paper is also a part of another series, started with [39], where various hidden mysteries behind Avila's global theory were discovered through developing the non-self-adjoint duality approach to it and its quantitative version. This has provided powerful tools to various spectral problems. In particular, the new characterization of the subcritical regime discovered in [39], together with new ideas in estimating the Green's function, led to a new proof of the almost reducibility conjecture for non-exponentially approximated frequencies [35], which plays a fundamental role in the almost reducibility regime [14, 15, 41, 42, 44, 45]. The deep partially hyperbolic structure discovered in [39], is a foundation to both the current work and the solution of the robust ten martini problem [37, 38]. All in all, together with [37, 39], we provide a feasible scheme to study different spectral problems for general one-frequency analytic Schrödinger operators. The key elements of the techniques developed in this paper are robust and expect to hold in a significantly higher generality.

Many proofs of the spectral results for operators $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ exploit the relation between the rotation number of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles and the IDS in the Schrödinger case, and the related fact that if E is an eigenvalue of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ then

$$\rho(E) = \pm\theta + k\alpha \bmod \mathbb{Z}. \quad (1.2)$$

While dual cocycles are in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ only for the almost Mathieu operator, for all type I operators there is an effective cocycle in the 2-dimensional center. However, it is

⁶Not even necessarily sharp.

an $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ cocycle, which is $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if the function v is *even*. For the same reason, the phase-rotation correspondence (1.2) is only true for $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ with *even* v and acceleration 1. The above consideration enables relatively straightforward proofs of localization for even v with acceleration 1, whether following the methods going back to [64] or the duality based ones.

It is dealing with v that are *not even* that requires substantial new ideas. Here we accomplish this by developing the new concept of fibered rotation numbers of $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ cocycles, as well as its relation to the IDS, that specify correspondingly to classical fibered rotation number and its relation to the IDS for the case of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles. Addressing the same type of issue, we also develop a reducibility-to-localization argument that is based on the pair of rotation numbers rather than the phase-rotation correspondence (1.2).

Another significant difficulty is in dealing with v that are not trigonometric polynomials. In this case, the dual operator is infinite-range, so there is no dual cocycle to utilize the dynamical methods. We prove that the structures of center cocycles (and their fibered rotation numbers) converge upon trigonometric polynomial approximation of v , thus, in particular, defining the fibered rotation numbers for infinite-range operators.

We expect both these results to be of independent interest and wider applicability.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Lyapunov exponent of complexified Schrödinger cocycle, associated with operator (1.1) is defined as

$$L_\varepsilon(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \|A_E(\theta + i\varepsilon + (n-1)\alpha) \cdots A_E(\theta + i\varepsilon)\| d\theta; L(E) := L_0(E), \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$A_E(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} E - v(\theta) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.2)$$

See Section 4 for details. Avila showed [4] that $L_\varepsilon(E)$ is an even convex piecewise affine function with integer slopes.

He introduced the notion of acceleration as the slope of $L_\varepsilon(E)$ at $\varepsilon = 0$.

Definition 2.1. The acceleration is defined by

$$\omega(E) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{L_\varepsilon(E) - L_0(E)}{2\pi\varepsilon}$$

In [37] T-acceleration was introduced as the slope at the first turning point.

Definition 2.2. Let $\varepsilon \leq \infty$ be the natural boundary of analyticity of $v \in C^\omega$. The *T-acceleration* is defined by

$$\bar{\omega}(E) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon_1^+} \frac{L_\varepsilon(E) - L_{\varepsilon_1}(E)}{2\pi(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_1)}$$

where $0 \leq \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$ is the first turning point of the piecewise affine function $L_\varepsilon(E)$. If there is no turning point, we set $\bar{\omega}(E) = 0$.

Definition 2.3 (Type I). We say E is a *type I energy* for operator $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ if $\bar{\omega}(E) = 1$. We say $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ is a *type I operator*, if every E in the spectrum of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ is type I.

It is proved in [37] that the property of T-acceleration being equal to 1 is stable in each $C_h^\omega, \varepsilon_1 < h' < \varepsilon$, and the set of type I operators includes, in particular, appropriate neighborhoods of all operators (1.1) where arithmetic localization has been proved, by various methods: the almost Mathieu operator, the GPS model, the supercritical generalized Harper's model, and analytic cosine type quasiperiodic operators.⁷ We refer to [37] for more detail on these examples.

As mentioned in the introduction, spectral results *may* subtly depend on the pattern of acceleration. Thus the most natural universality class to consider for the almost Mathieu results is operators of Type I. At the same time, all our results are new in the supercritical regime (see, in particular, Remarks 2.1 and 2.2). We use the Type I terminology mainly for consistency with the ten martini result of [37, 38] where both the supercritical and subcritical Type I comes into play.

2.1. The universality of sharp arithmetic transition (aka the AAJ conjecture).

The original Aubry-Andre (AA) conjecture [2] for the almost Mathieu operator

$$(H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + 2\lambda \cos 2\pi(\theta + n\alpha)u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.3)$$

was that $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has absolutely continuous spectrum for $|\lambda| < 1$ and pure point spectrum for $|\lambda| > 1$, corresponding to vanishing/nonvanishing of the Lyapunov exponent, so it did not pay respect to the arithmetics of parameters. It was quickly realized [17] that the arithmetics of α can present obstacles to pure point spectrum, leading even to a temporary overreaction, with [99] suggesting that arithmetics also plays a role for $|\lambda| < 1$.

It turned out, eventually, that non-arithmetic AA conjecture was correct in the $L(E) = 0$ regime [3, 64, 86], a statement that has been later proved universal for all analytic potentials ([5, 6], see also [35]).

To define the relevant arithmetic parameters, assume that α is irrational, and $\frac{p_k}{q_k}$ is the sequence of its continued fraction approximants. The measure of irrationality of α is defined by

$$\beta = \beta(\alpha) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\ln \|k\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{|k|}. \quad (2.4)$$

We will say that α is Diophantine if $\beta(\alpha) = 0$.

A way to take advantage of positivity of the Lyapunov exponents to prove localization was first developed in [62] in the context of almost Mathieu operators, leading eventually to the proof of pure point spectrum for Diophantine frequencies [64]. It was then conjectured in [63] that, for the almost Mathieu operators, for (arithmetically) a.e. phase, there is a *sharp arithmetic transition in frequency* between localization and singular continuity depending entirely on the interplay between the Lyapunov exponent and $\beta(\alpha)$:

- the spectrum on the set

$$\{E \in \mathbb{R} : L(E) > \beta(\alpha)\}$$

is pure point for a.e. θ ,⁸ and

⁷Where v is a real analytic function satisfying the cosine type condition introduced in [101], at nonperturbatively high coupling.

⁸“a.e. θ ” cannot be improved, [78] but was conjectured in [63] to hold arithmetically, proved in [73]. See also [88] for further discussion of the arithmetic conjecture.

- the spectrum on the set

$$\{E \in \mathbb{R}: 0 < L(E) < \beta(\alpha)\}$$

is purely singular continuous for all θ .

It was also dubbed the *AAJ conjecture* in [14]. The conjecture was solved in [14, 72]⁹¹⁰ and since then the question of its *universality* for quasiperiodic operators has been promoted in various review articles, e.g. [66, 75]. Our first main result is

Theorem 2.1. *The sharp arithmetic transition in frequency (i.e. the AAJ) is universal for type I energies E of operators $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$.*

In particular, it is universal for all type I operators thus applies to *all* existing models with previously known (not necessarily sharp) arithmetic localization results and their analytic neighborhoods.

The singular continuous part of the AAJ was established in [14] for all Lipschitz v , so we include it here for completeness only; what we prove is the localization part.

The two proofs of the almost Mathieu AAJ, [14] and [72] use completely different methods.

The arithmetic method of [72] stems from the one originally developed in [62]. It has been improved to work throughout the entire positive Lyapunov exponent regime in [64], then enhanced to treat exponential frequency resonances in [9], and modified in several important technical features in [90].

Resonances are places where box restrictions have exponentially close eigenvalues compared to the distances between the boxes. For quasiperiodic operators, one kind is so-called *exponential frequency resonances*: if $\text{dist}(q\alpha, \mathbb{Z}) < e^{-cq}$ for infinitely many q , a condition holding for an explicit dense G_δ but measure zero set of α . For *even* potentials there are also reflection-based *exponential phase resonances*, where $\text{dist}(\theta + n\alpha, -\theta) < e^{-cn}$ for infinitely many n , a condition holding for an explicit dense G_δ but measure zero set of θ .

A sharp way to treat exponential frequency resonances was developed in [72], finally solving the original AAJ.¹¹

The essence of all the above proofs is in showing that for the almost Mathieu operator there are no other types of resonances, thus when one removes the arithmetically explicit measure zero set of θ for which there are infinitely many phase resonances, only the frequency resonances need to be dealt with.

Another important case where there are only frequency resonances, is that of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ with v that is monotone on the period. In a simultaneous preprint [70] the universality of AAJ is established for all anti-Lipschitz monotone potentials, developing the ideas of [72] in the framework the arguments of [68, 82].

The key to the methods that go back to [62] is that the set of phases where eigenvalues of a restriction to a box of size q can be exponentially close to E , is confined to q exponentially small intervals around zeros of the determinants of box restrictions. It

⁹See also [42, 69] for alternative arguments.

¹⁰The conjecture in [63] also had other parts, one other one proved in [73]. See [88] for further discussion.

¹¹A sharp way to handle the exponential phase resonances was developed in [73], solving the phase part of the AAJ.

is a feature that enables localization proofs not only in the almost Mathieu results [9, 64, 72, 73, 89] where it is due to the fact that \cos being an *even* function, the determinants of restrictions to boxes of size q are polynomials of degree q in the shifted \cos , but also in many other recent localization results that fundamentally go back to the same zero-counting idea, e.g. [21, 54, 61, 68, 70, 71, 79, 80, 82, 83, 97, 104, 107?].

The same phenomenon has been long understood to also happen for $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$, with *even* analytic v at energies with acceleration 1. Indeed, Avila's *proof* of the global theory [4] essentially showed that, for energies with acceleration 1, traces of transfer-matrices (i.e., determinants of block-restrictions with periodic boundary conditions) of size q_n effectively behave like trigonometric polynomials of degree q_n , and thus also have no more than q_n zeros. Thus the extension of techniques of [64] and even those of [73] to the case of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ with acceleration 1 and *even* v , does not seem to encounter any fundamental difficulties. It has been implemented in [56, 57]. However, if v is not even, the zero count, even for the case of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$, becomes $2q_n$ making the approaches that go back to [62] break down, for the same reason they cannot currently extend beyond the acceleration 1, where the zero count also goes up.

We note that even in the perturbative regime, where arithmetic localization was established for cosine type quasiperiodic operators by other methods, it is significantly more difficult to obtain the result without requiring v to be even [27, 33, 101] than for even v [26, 32, 43].¹²

The other method of proof of the almost Mathieu localization, [14] is based on dual reducibility. While the non-perturbative reducibility has been first deduced from the dual localization [10, 95], it has been later obtained directly, through non-standard KAM methods in [8] (employing some ideas of [31]) and in [60, 106]. With the development of Avila's global theory [4] and the proof of the almost reducibility conjecture [5, 6], this allowed to argue localization by the dual reducibility¹³. This has led to the measure-theoretic in θ proof of the AAJ by Avila-You-Zhou in [14], later improved to the arithmetic in θ result in [42]. These results significantly used the specificity of \cos in several key places, most crucially for the fact that the dual cocycle is $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$.

Our universality proof follows this "localization from the dual reducibility" route, removing, for the first time, the \cos dependence, as well as, more generally, the need for v to be even, establishing a general scheme to prove arithmetic localization and developing several tools that should also be useful for going further.

For the particular case of the almost Mathieu neighborhood, the AAJ conjecture immediately leads to a corollary of a particularly nice form. Recall that $H_{\lambda,\alpha,x}^\delta$ is given by

$$(H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}^\delta u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + (2\lambda \cos 2\pi(\theta + n\alpha) + \delta f(\theta + n\alpha))u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.5)$$

Corollary 2.1. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and any 1-periodic real analytic $f \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, there exists $\delta_0(\lambda, \beta, \|f\|_h)$ such that if $|\delta| < \delta_0$, we have*

- (1) *If $|\lambda| < 1$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}^\delta$ has purely absolutely continuous spectrum for all θ ;*
- (2) *If $1 < |\lambda| < e^\beta$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}^\delta$ has purely singular continuous spectrum for all θ ;*
- (3) *If $|\lambda| > e^\beta$, $H_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}^\delta$ has Anderson localization for a.e. θ .*

¹²It is claimed in [33] that evenness of v is also de-facto required in [101].

¹³an earlier version of this argument was first employed in a perturbative regime in [23]

Finally, using that by the global theory [4] for typical operators $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ there are no critical energies, and invoking the ARC [5, 6], we obtain

Corollary 2.2. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and a (measure-theoretically) typical type I operator $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$, we have*

- (1) $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely absolutely continuous spectrum for all θ on $\{E; L(E) = 0\}$;
- (2) $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum for all θ on $\{E : 0 < L(E) < \beta(\alpha)\}$;
- (3) $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ has Anderson localization for a.e. θ on $\{E : L(E) > \beta(\alpha)\}$.

Here “measure-theoretically typical” means prevalent: fixing some probability measure μ of compact support (describing a set of admissible perturbations w), a property is measure-theoretically typical if it is satisfied for almost every perturbation $v + w$ of every starting condition v .

2.2. The universality of arithmetic absolute continuity of the IDS. The integrated density of states (IDS) is defined in a uniform way for Schrödinger operators $(H_{\alpha,v,\theta})_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}}$ by

$$N(E) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mu_{\theta}(-\infty, E] d\theta,$$

where μ_{θ} is the spectral measure associated with $H_{\alpha,v,\theta}$ and δ_0 . Roughly speaking, the density of states measure $N([E_1, E_2])$ gives the “number of states per unit volume” with energy between E_1 and E_2 .

Absolute continuity of the IDS is an important property in itself and often plays a major role in various other proofs, including of absolute continuity of spectra in the regime of zero Lyapunov exponent [28, 84], and also in our proof of Theorem 2.1. As IDS can be measured in an experiment, its absolute continuity for *all* α should be robust with respect to small perturbations. IDS is not expected to be absolutely continuous for operators $(H_{\alpha,v,\theta})_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}}$ with critical energies, as it is not for the critical almost Mathieu operator [12, 87]. In the subcritical regime, the all α absolute continuity of the IDS has now been proved to be universal [5, 6]. However, in the supercritical regime, the all α absolute continuity has *only* been proved for the almost Mathieu operator, as a combination of two celebrated papers: for the Diophantine [64] and Liouville [7] cases. Our second main result is

Theorem 2.2. *The absolute continuity of the IDS for all α is universal for all non-critical type I operators $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$.*

Remark 2.1. *As mentioned above, our result pertains to the supercritical regime. The theorem also holds for all subcritical operators, and is formulated the way it is for the aesthetical reasons. The non-critical condition is essential, and is conjectured to be necessary. The type I condition, however, is likely not necessary also in the supercritical regime, but removing it requires some further ideas.*

As for the past supercritical results, both [10, 64] and [7] heavily use the specifics of the cos. The Liouville argument of [7] besides using several specific almost Mathieu facts, transpires entirely in the subcritical range (then utilizing the self-duality of the almost Mathieu family). Thus it is superseded by [5] and is not useful for the supercritical case, which is the remaining problem. As for the Diophantine localization, while it is shown

to be universal for type I in Theorem 2.1 even for a large range of α , we actually use Theorem 2.2 to prove it, so this cannot be used either. Other previous results in the supercritical regime either require Diophantine α [40, 104] or are not arithmetic at all [50], needing highly implicit elimination of α due to the need to get rid of the so-called “double resonances”. We note also that the method of [40] has no hope to be extendable to Liouvillean frequencies, since it is based on the homogeneity of the spectrum, which is simply not true in the Liouvillean case [13]. The method of [104] not only requires the Diophantine condition but is perturbative (works only for large couplings with the largeness dependent on α).¹⁴ Finally, another recent perturbative result on the absolute continuity of the IDS for C^2 -cosine type quasiperiodic operators was obtained in [46].

As above, we also have some immediate corollaries for the neighborhood of the almost Mathieu operator

Corollary 2.3. *For $|\lambda| \neq 1$ and any 1-periodic real analytic $f \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, there exists $\delta_0(\lambda, \|f\|_h)$ such that if $|\delta| < \delta_0$, the integrated density of states of $(H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}^\delta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}}$ is absolutely continuous for all α .*

and for typical type I operators

Corollary 2.4. *For a (measure-theoretically) typical type I operator $H_{v, \alpha, \theta}$, the integrated density of states is absolutely continuous for all α .*

2.3. The universality of the Hölder exponent and partial solution to You’s conjecture. The IDS of all non-critical almost Mathieu operators with $\beta(\alpha) = 0$ are exactly 1/2-Hölder continuous [10]. This statement is sharp and optimal (there are square root singularities at gap edges [95], and the result does not hold for non-Diophantine α [13] or for some Diophantine α at criticality ([18], Remark after Corollary 8.6). In fact, a lot more delicate statement was recently obtained about local Hölder continuity [91], but the overall exponent 1/2 is sharp. This sharp 1/2-Hölder regularity for Diophantine α is universal throughout the subcritical regime (through a combination of [10] and [6]). Here we prove its universality for all type I operators.

Theorem 2.3. *The 1/2-Hölder regularity of the IDS for all α with $\beta(\alpha) = 0$, is universal for all non-critical type I operators $H_{v, \alpha, \theta}$.*

Remark 2.2. *While, as mentioned, the result holds in the entire subcritical universality class [5, 10] it is optimal in the supercritical regime in each of its conditions. Indeed, by the You’s conjecture 2.1 [105], exponent 1/2 in the supercritical regime cannot be expected beyond type I, and the conditions on α and non-criticality are optimal already for the almost Mathieu family.*

Other than the mentioned universality result of [5, 10], the exact uniform $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuity of the IDS for Diophantine α was previously obtained in [1] for $H_{v, \alpha, \theta}$ in the perturbatively small regime (the reducibility regime of Eliasson [30]) and, more recently, extended to smooth perturbative almost reducibility regime in [24]. Non-sharp $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuity (that is $1/2 - \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$), was obtained under various further conditions in [42, 50, 57]. There have been no previous sharp $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder results in the supercritical regime other than for the almost Mathieu [10].

As mentioned in Remark 2.2, in his ICM talk [105], J. You proposed the following

¹⁴It extends however to the multi-frequency, and, by duality, the multi-dimensional case.

Conjecture 2.1. For $\beta(\alpha) = 0$, the local Hölder exponent of the IDS at an energy E in the supercritical regime is at least $\frac{1}{2\omega(E)}$.

Theorem 2.3 solves You’s conjecture for type I operators.

Finally, as above we have the following immediate corollaries

Corollary 2.5. For $|\lambda| \neq 1$ and any 1-periodic real analytic $f \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, there exists $\delta_0(\lambda, \|f\|_h)$ such that if $|\delta| < \delta_0$, the integrated density of states of $(H_{\lambda, \alpha, \theta}^\delta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}}$ with $\beta(\alpha) = 0$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous.

Corollary 2.6. Let $\beta(\alpha) = 0$. For a (measure-theoretically) typical type I operator $H_{v, \alpha, \theta}$ with $\beta(\alpha) = 0$, the integrated density of states is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous.

3. MAIN IDEAS

We build on the duality approach to global theory developed in [37, 39]. In particular, as mentioned above, our proof of AAJ for type I operators will be based on the dual “reducibility”.

The Aubry dual of operator (1.1) is the following quasiperiodic long-range operator (see Subsection 4.5):

$$(\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta} u)_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{v}_k u_{n+k} + 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta + n\alpha) u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.1)$$

Our strategy is to use finite-range operators to approximate the above long-range operator, obtaining center reducibility for finite-range operators first and then proving convergence.

3.1. The finite-range case. Consider the following finite-range quasiperiodic operator,

$$(\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta} u)_n = \sum_{k=-d}^d \widehat{v}_k u_{n+k} + 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta + n\alpha) u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $v(\theta) = \sum_d \widehat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k \theta}$. For every E , operator (3.2) gives rise to a cocycle given by (??).

The fundamental result of [39] is partial hyperbolicity of dual cocycles

Theorem 3.1 ([37, 39]). E is of type I for operator (1.1) with trigonometric potential v if and only if the cocycle (??) of the dual operator $\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta}$ at energy E is partially hyperbolic with two dimensional center.

This is precisely the feature that allows to extend many of the techniques developed for Schrödinger operators.

Building on this partial hyperbolicity, we include here the following new ideas that may be of independent interest

- (1) Multiplicative Jensen’s formula for the duals of analytic one-frequency Schrödinger operator (Theorem 5.1). The argument that *sub-criticality implies dual super-criticality*, plays an important role in giving a new proof of the almost reducibility conjecture [35]. The fact that *supercriticality implies dual sub-criticality* is a corollary of the multiplicative Jensen’s formula [39]. A direct corollary of our multiplicative Jensen’s formula for the duals is that super-criticality implies dual

sub-criticality *with precise characterization of the subcritical radius*. This plays a fundamental role in obtaining sharp phase transition for type I operators.

- (2) A precise characterization of the symplectic structure of the dual “center” (Corollary 6.2). As mentioned, it was already shown in [37, 39] that the dual of type I family has a two dimensional center. In this paper, we further uncover the complex symplectic structure of the center: the center corresponds to a *subcritical* complex symplectic ($Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$) cocycle. It is this structure where the role of evenness is hidden. More precisely, if the potential is even, then the dual center corresponds to a *real symplectic* ($SL(2, \mathbb{R})$) cocycle, which makes the argument much easier. We develop a way to overcome the difficulty of losing the evenness by exploiting that any $A \in Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ can be written as,

$$A = Pe^{i\gamma}A'P^{-1}, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \quad A' \in SL(2, \mathbb{R}), \quad P \in Sp(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

- (3) We introduce the concept of fiber rotation numbers of a **class of** $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ cocycles, applying it to the center cocycle, and establish the relation between the rotation numbers of the center and the IDS (Corollary 7.1). This relation, together with the almost reducibility theorem [5, 6], directly implies the absolute continuity of the IDS in both subcritical and supercritical regimes, and also plays an important role in our completeness argument needed for proving arithmetic localization. Our proof is based on a dynamical point of view of the m -function, going back to Johnson-Moser [81].
- (4) Finally, we develop a new completeness argument in the reducibility-to-localization type method. This argument was first made in [14] exploiting certain quantitative information on the almost Mathieu reducibility. A simple general argument was then developed in [68], and an arithmetic in θ way was found in [41]. In all these proofs, as well as other related developments, a crucial symmetry: the fact that each eigenvalue E corresponds only to two phases $\pm\theta(E)$, was involved. However, such symmetry is fully lost for the duals of operators with non-even potentials, even after employing all the reduction to the center and type I considerations. For non-even type I family, we discover here a different phenomenon: each eigenvalue E corresponds to two phases, $\rho_1(E)$ and $\rho_2(E)$ with $\rho_1(E) \neq -\rho_2(E)$. Thus the previous localization arguments [14, 41, 68] do not work. The method we develop, while building on the previous duality based localization arguments, has a potential to be applicable also in a higher generality than presented here.

3.2. The infinite-range case. This paper initiates a scheme to pass the spectral properties of quasiperiodic operators with trigonometric polynomial potentials to general real analytic potentials. In [39], it was proved that the dual Lyapunov exponents converge upon trigonometric polynomial approximation. Here, we go further by proving that the complex symplectic cocycles corresponding to the 2-dimensional dual center of the type I operator also converge. Our approach starts with the invariance of the Green’s function (see Section 6 for the definitions):

$$U^{-1}(H_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha} - E)^{-1}U = (\widehat{H}_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha} - EI)^{-1}.$$

The main strategy is to establish the relation between the invariant section, thus the dual center, and the Green's function. Avila's global theory [4] implies the convergence of the Green's functions, thus transferring to the convergence of the centers.

The limit can then be defined as the "center" of the dual quasiperiodic infinite-range operator, which allows to define the rotation numbers and also reducibility for it, thus bootstrapping all the previous trigonometric polynomial results. Our method is robust and also works for the ten martini problem, in a forthcoming paper [38].

3.3. Structure of the rest of the paper. Section 4 contains the preliminaries.

In Section 5, we prove the multiplicative Jensen's formula for the duals of one-frequency analytic Schrödinger operators. In particular, we prove that super-criticality of the Schrödinger operator implies sub-criticality of the dual operator.

In Section 6, we present more precise characterization of type I operators and discover the complex-symplectic structure of the cocycle corresponding to the center.

In Section 7, we involve the m -function to establish the relation between the rotation numbers and the IDS of the dual of type I operators, which allows to complete proofs of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3.

In Section 8, we develop the reducibility-to-localization argument for type I families. The key is to present a new completeness argument, without the evenness restriction on the potential. This allows to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1.

4. PRELIMINARIES

4.1. Cocycles and the Lyapunov exponents. Let $GL(m, \mathbb{C})$ be the set of all $m \times m$ invertible matrices. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(m, \mathbb{C}))$, we define the complex one-frequency cocycle (α, A) by:

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

The iterates of (α, A) are of the form $(\alpha, A)^n = (n\alpha, A_n)$, where

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

We denote by $L_1(A) \geq L_2(A) \geq \dots \geq L_m(A)$ the Lyapunov exponents of (α, A) repeatedly according to their multiplicities, i.e.,

$$L_k(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \sigma_k(A_n(x)) dx,$$

where $\sigma_1(A_n) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_m(A_n)$ denote its singular values (eigenvalues of $\sqrt{A_n^* A_n}$). Since the k -th exterior product $\Lambda^k A_n$ satisfies $\sigma_1(\Lambda^k A_n) = \|\Lambda^k A_n\|$, $L^k(A) = \sum_{j=1}^k L_j(A)$ satisfies

$$L^k(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \|\Lambda^k A_n(x)\| dx.$$

In particular, consider a finite-range quasiperiodic operator $\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta}$ given by (3.2). Given E , the eigenequation $\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta} u = Eu$ induces the $2d$ -dimensional cocycle (α, \widehat{A}_E)

where

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta) = \frac{1}{\widehat{v}_d} \begin{pmatrix} -\widehat{v}_{d-1} & \cdots & -\widehat{v}_1 & E - 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta) - \widehat{v}_0 & -\widehat{v}_{-1} & \cdots & -\widehat{v}_{-d+1} & -\widehat{v}_{-d} \\ \widehat{v}_d & & & & & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \widehat{v}_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since (α, \widehat{A}_E) is complex symplectic, it has d non-negative Lyapunov exponents, which we denote as $\gamma_d(E) \geq \cdots \geq \gamma_1(E) \geq 0$.

4.2. Uniform hyperbolicity and dominated splitting. Let $Sp(2m, \mathbb{C})$ be the set of all $2m \times 2m$ symplectic matrices. For $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, Sp(2m, \mathbb{C}))$, we say the cocycle (α, A) is *uniformly hyperbolic* if there exists a continuous splitting $\mathbb{C}^{2m} = E^s(x) \oplus E^u(x)$ such that for some constants $C > 0, c > 0$, and for every $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |A_n(x)v| &\leq Ce^{-cn}|v|, \quad v \in E^s(x), \\ |A_n(x)^{-1}v| &\leq Ce^{-cn}|v|, \quad v \in E^u(T^n x). \end{aligned}$$

This splitting is left invariant by the dynamics: for every $x \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$A(x)E^*(x) = E^*(Tx), \quad * = s, u.$$

For $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(m, \mathbb{C}))$, we say the cocycle (α, A) is k -dominated (for some $1 \leq k \leq m-1$) if there exists a measurable decomposition $\mathbb{C}^m = E_+(x) \oplus E_-(x)$ with $\dim E_+(x) = k$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any unit vector $v_\pm \in E_\pm(x) \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\|A_n(x)v_+\| > \|A_n(x)v_-\|.$$

4.3. Global theory of one-frequency quasiperiodic cocycles. The key concept for Avila's global theory [4] is the acceleration. If $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(m, \mathbb{C}))$ admits a holomorphic extension to $|\Im z| < \delta$, then for $|\varepsilon| < \delta$ we can denote $A_\varepsilon(x) = A(x + i\varepsilon)$. The accelerations of (α, A) are defined as

$$\omega^k(A) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi\varepsilon} (L^k(A_\varepsilon) - L^k(A)).$$

The key ingredient of the global theory is that the acceleration is quantized.

Theorem 4.1 ([4, 11]). *There exists $1 \leq l \leq m$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $l\omega^k$ are integers. In particular, if $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{C}))$, then $\omega^1(A)$ is an integer.*

Remark 4.1. If $L_j(A) > L_{j+1}(A)$, then $\omega^j(A)$ is an integer, as follows from the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [11], see also footnote 17 in [11].

We say that (α, A) is k -regular if $\varepsilon \rightarrow L^k(A_\varepsilon)$ is an affine function of ε in a neighborhood of 0.

Theorem 4.2 ([4, 11]). *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(m, \mathbb{C}))$. If $1 \leq j \leq m - 1$ is such that $L_j(A) > L_{j+1}(A)$, then (α, A) is j -regular if and only if (α, A) is j -dominated.*

For Schrödinger cocycles (α, A_E) with A_E given by (2.2), we have $L(E) = L(A_E)$ and $\omega(E) = \omega(A_E)$ where $L(E)$ is given by (2.1) and $\omega(E)$ is defined in the Definition 2.1. For E outside the spectrum of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ we have $L(E) > 0, \omega(E) = 0$. For E in the spectrum of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$, modeled by the almost Mathieu operator, Avila defines three regimes [4]

- (1) The *subcritical* regime: $L(E) = \omega(E) = 0$;
- (2) The *critical* regime: $L(E) = 0$ and $\omega(E) > 0$;
- (3) The *supercritical* regime: $L(E) > 0$ and $\omega(E) > 0$.

Moreover, as an immediate corollary [37] of the multiplicative Jensen's formula of [39], is that for operators (1.1) of type I, with $v(\theta) = \sum_d \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k \theta}$ and thus the dual given by $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ we have

Regime	$H_{v,\alpha,x}$	$\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$
subcritical	$L(E) = \omega(E) = 0$	$L(E) = 0$ and $\gamma_1(E) > 0$ is simple
critical	$L(E) = 0, \omega(E) = 1$	$L(E) = 0$ and $\gamma_1(E) = 0$ is simple
supercritical	$L(E) > 0, \omega(E) = 1$	$L(E) > 0$ and $\gamma_1(E) = 0$ is simple

4.4. The rotation number and the IDS. Assume $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ is homotopic to the identity. Then (α, A) induces the projective skew-product $F_A: \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{S}^1$

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

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

$$\rho(A) := \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}} \psi_x(y) d\mu(x, y) \bmod \mathbb{Z} \quad (4.1)$$

depends neither on the lift ψ nor on the measure μ , and is called the *fibered rotation number* of (α, A) (see [58, 81] for more details).

For Schrödinger cocycles (α, A_E) with A_E given by (2.2), we will write $\rho(E) := \rho(A_E)$, when v, α are otherwise fixed.

The *integrated density of states* (IDS) $N: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ is defined by

$$N(E) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mu_{v,\alpha,x}(-\infty, E] dx,$$

where $\mu_{v,\alpha,x}$ is the spectral measure of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ and vector δ_0 .

It is well known that $\rho(E) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is related to the integrated density of states N as follows:

$$N(E) = 1 - 2\rho(E). \quad (4.2)$$

4.5. Aubry duality. We consider the following (possibly non-hermitian) quasiperiodic operators,

$$(H_{v,\alpha,\theta}^w u)_n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{v}_k u_{n+k} + w(\theta + n\alpha)u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where v, w are two possibly complex-valued 1-periodic measurable functions.

Consider the fiber direct integral,

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

which, as usual, is defined as the space of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ -valued, L^2 -functions over the measure space (\mathbb{T}, dx) . 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 $H_{v,\alpha,x}^w$ as fibers of the decomposable operator,

$$H_{v,\alpha}^w := \int_{\mathbb{T}}^{\oplus} H_{v,\alpha,x}^w dx,$$

the family $\{H_{v,\alpha,x}^w\}_{x \in \mathbb{T}}$ naturally induces an operator on the space \mathcal{H} , i.e. ,

$$(H_{v,\alpha}^w \Psi)(x, n) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{v}_k \Psi(\theta, n+k) + w(x + n\alpha) \Psi(x, n).$$

Similarly, the direct integral of long-range operator $H_{w,\alpha,\theta}^v$, denoted as $H_{w,\alpha}^v$, is given by

$$(H_{w,\alpha}^v \Psi)(\theta, n) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{w}_k \Psi(\theta, n+k) + v(\theta + n\alpha) \Psi(\theta, n).$$

Indeed, by analogy with the heuristic and classical approach to Aubry duality [48], let U be the following operator on \mathcal{H} :

$$(U\phi)(\eta, m) := \hat{\phi}(m, \eta + m\alpha) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{2\pi i m x} e^{2\pi i n(m\alpha + \eta)} \phi(x, n) dx. \quad (4.3)$$

U is clearly unitary and a direct computation show that it conjugates $H_{v,\alpha}^w$ and $H_{w,\alpha}^v$

$$U H_{v,\alpha}^w U^{-1} = \hat{H}_{w,\alpha}^v. \quad (4.4)$$

5. MULTIPLICATIVE JENSEN'S FORMULA FOR THE DUALS

Multiplicative Jensen's formula lies in the foundation of the duality based quantitative global theory for analytic one-frequency Schrödinger operators developed in [39]. It has played a crucial role in proving the almost reducibility conjecture [35] and the ten martini problem for type I operators [37, 38]. In this section, we establish multiplicative Jensen's formula and quantitative global theory for the duals of Schrödinger operators. Remarkably, it takes a particularly simple form. The highlight is that we exactly characterize the first affine piece of the *individual complexified dual Lyapunov exponents*. This will play a fundamental role in proving Theorem 2.1.

We consider the following non-Hermitian finite-range quasiperiodic operator

$$(\hat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}^\varepsilon u)_n = \sum_{k=-d}^d \hat{v}_k u_{n+k} + 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta + i\varepsilon + n\alpha)u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $v_k = \overline{v_{-k}}$. It is a complexification of the dual operator of (3.2) of the operator (1.1) with trigonometric polynomial $v(\theta) = \sum_d^d \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i \theta}$.

The eigenequation $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}^\varepsilon u = Eu$ induces the $2d$ -dimensional cocycle $(\alpha, \widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$ where

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta + i\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\hat{v}_d} \begin{pmatrix} -\hat{v}_{d-1} & \cdots & -\hat{v}_1 & E - 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta + i\varepsilon) - \hat{v}_0 & -\hat{v}_{-1} & \cdots & -\hat{v}_{-d+1} & -\hat{v}_{-d} \\ \hat{v}_d & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & & & \hat{v}_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Following the definition in Section 4.1, for $1 \leq k \leq 2d$, we denote $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^k(E) := L^k(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$. Let $L(E) := L_1(A_E)$ where A_E is defined in (2.2).

Theorem 5.1. For $E \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$,

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) = \begin{cases} \widehat{L}_0^d(E) & |\varepsilon| \in [0, L(E)/2\pi], \\ \widehat{L}_{L(E)}^d(E) + (2\pi|\varepsilon| - L(E)) & |\varepsilon| \in (L(E)/2\pi, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for $1 \leq k \leq d$

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^k(E) = \widehat{L}_0^k(E), \quad \forall |\varepsilon| \in [0, L(E)/2\pi].$$

Proof. For any $E \in \mathbb{C}$, notice that one always has

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} \ln \|\Lambda^d \widehat{A}_E(\theta + i\varepsilon)\| \leq 2\pi\varepsilon + O(1),$$

thus by convexity for any $E \in \mathbb{C}$, the absolute value of the slope of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E)$ as a function of ε is less than or equal to 2π . By direct computation, for sufficiently large ε ,

$$(\widehat{A}_E)_d(\theta + i\varepsilon) = e^{2\pi\varepsilon} e^{2\pi i \theta} \begin{pmatrix} -C^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + o(1)$$

where

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_d & \cdots & \hat{v}_1 \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & \hat{v}_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

By continuity of the Lyapunov exponent [11], we have

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) = 2\pi|\varepsilon| - \ln |\hat{v}_d| + o(1).$$

thus by Theorem 4.1,

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) = 2\pi|\varepsilon| - \ln |\hat{v}_d| \quad \text{as } |\varepsilon| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.2)$$

i.e. the slope of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon(E)$ is $\pm 2\pi$, as $|\varepsilon| \rightarrow \infty$.

For $1 \leq k \leq 2d$, we denote $\widehat{L}_k(E) := \widehat{L}_k(\widehat{A}_E)$,

$$\omega_{\pm}^k(A) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{\pm}} \frac{L^k(A(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) - L^k(A)}{2\pi\varepsilon}, \quad \omega_{\pm}^k(E) = \omega_{\pm}^k(\widehat{A}_E),$$

$$t_k^+(E) = \sup \left\{ \varepsilon : \varepsilon \geq 0, \quad L_k(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = \widehat{L}_k(E) \right\},$$

$$t_k^-(E) = \sup \left\{ -\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq 0, \quad L_k(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = \widehat{L}_k(E) \right\}.$$

Note that $E \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ implies (α, \widehat{A}_E) is uniformly hyperbolic. Thus

$$\widehat{L}_d(E) > 0 > \widehat{L}_{d+1}(E)$$

which by Remark 4.1 implies that $\omega_{\pm}^d(E)$ is an integer¹⁵. On the other hand, it was proved in [37, 39] (see Proposition 3.1 in [39], Theorem 4.1 in [37]) that

$$|\omega_{\pm}^k(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))| < 1, \quad 1 \leq k \leq d-1, \quad (5.3)$$

$$|\omega_{\pm}^d(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))| \leq 1 \quad (5.4)$$

for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\omega_{\pm}^d(E) = \pm 1$, then by the convexity of $\widehat{L}_{\varepsilon}^d(E)$, we have $\omega_{\pm}^d(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot \pm i\varepsilon)) = \pm 1$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus,

$$\widehat{L}_{\varepsilon}^d(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) + 2\pi|\varepsilon|,$$

which implies that

$$\widehat{L}_0^d(E) = -\ln |\widehat{v}_d|. \quad (5.5)$$

By Haro and Puig [53], we have for any $E \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$L(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) + \ln |\widehat{v}_d|. \quad (5.6)$$

By (5.6) and (5.5), we have $L(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) + \ln |\widehat{v}_d| = 0$, contradicting $E \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ ¹⁶. Hence $\omega_{\pm}^d(E) = 0$.

For $E \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq k \leq d-1$, we further claim

- (1) $t_{k+1}^{\pm}(E) \begin{cases} < t_k^{\pm}(E), & \widehat{L}_k(E) > \widehat{L}_{k+1}(E) \\ = t_k^{\pm}(E), & \widehat{L}_k(E) = \widehat{L}_{k+1}(E) \end{cases}$;
- (2) $\omega_{\pm}^k(E) = 0$;
- (3) $\omega_{\pm}^{k+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{k+1}^{\pm}(E))) - \omega_{\pm}^k(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{k+1}^{\pm}(E))) > 0$.

We only prove (1)-(3) for the + case (since the proof of the - case is exactly the same) and omit + in the notations for simplicity.

Assume for $k \leq m-1$, the (1)-(3) above are true. Then for $k = m < d$, we distinguish two cases:

Case I: $\widehat{L}_m(E) > \widehat{L}_{m+1}(E)$. For (1), if $t_{m+1}(E) \geq t_m(E)$, then by the definition of $t_m(E)$ and $t_{m+1}(E)$,

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) = \widehat{L}_m(E) > \widehat{L}_{m+1}(E) = L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))).$$

Thus by Remark 4.1, we have $\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) \in \mathbb{Z}$. By (5.3), we have $|\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E)))| < 1$, thus $\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) = 0$. On the other hand, by induction ((3) is true for $k = m-1$) and convexity of $\widehat{L}_{\varepsilon}^{m-1}(E)$, we have

$$\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) > \omega^{m-1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) \geq 0$$

¹⁵Although Remark 4.1 only states the result for $\omega_{+}^d(E)$, all results in [11] work for both $\omega_{\pm}^d(E)$.

¹⁶In this case (α, A_E) is uniformly hyperbolic, thus $L(E) > 0$.

which is a contradiction. Thus $t_{m+1}(E) < t_m(E)$.

For (2), since $\widehat{L}_m(E) > \widehat{L}_{m+1}(E)$, by Remark 4.1 and (5.3), we have $\omega^m(E) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|\omega^m(E)| < 1$, thus $\omega^m(E) = 0$.

For (3), note first that (1), (2) and the definition of $t_m(E)$ imply that $\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) = 0$. By the convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^{m+1}(E)$ and the definition of $t_{m+1}(E)$, we have

$$\omega^{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) - \omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) = \omega^{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) > 0.$$

Case II: $\widehat{L}_m(E) = \widehat{L}_{m+1}(E)$. For (2), if there is a sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0^+$ such that

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_n)) \neq L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_n)),$$

then $\omega^m(E) \in \mathbb{Z}$, thus by the same argument as above, we have $\omega^m(E) = 0$ which implies (2). Otherwise, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)), \quad 0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \delta_0. \quad (5.7)$$

In this case, if there is a sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0^+$ such that

$$L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_n)) \neq L_{m+2}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_n)),$$

then $\omega^{m+1}(E) = 0$ which together with (5.7) implies by induction that

$$\omega^m(E) = \omega^{m-1}(E) + \frac{\omega^{m+1}(E) - \omega^{m-1}(E)}{2} = 0.$$

Otherwise, there is $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_0$ such that

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_{m+2}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)), \quad \varepsilon \leq \delta_1.$$

Continuing this process, we may finally arrive at the case

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = \cdots = L_d(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)), \quad \varepsilon \leq \delta'.$$

Then by induction,

$$\omega^m(E) = \omega^{m-1}(E) + \frac{\omega^d(E) - \omega^{m-1}(E)}{d - m + 1} = 0$$

which finishes the proof.

For (1), if $t_{m+1}(E) > t_m(E)$, take $\varepsilon_1 > t_m(E)$ sufficiently close to $t_m(E)$. By induction ((3) is true for $k = m - 1$), we have

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) > L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))).$$

By the definition of $t_m(E)$ and $t_{m+1}(E)$,

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) = \widehat{L}_m(E) = \widehat{L}_{m+1}(E) = L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)),$$

hence

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) > L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)).$$

By a similar argument to the above, we have $\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) = 0$. Again, by induction on (3) and convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^{m-1}(E)$, we have

$$\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) = \omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) > \omega^{m-1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) \geq 0$$

which is a contradiction.

If $t_{m+1}(E) < t_m(E)$, then

$$\omega^{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) = \omega^{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) - \omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) < 0,$$

which contradicts the convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^{m+1}(E)$. Hence $t_{m+1}(E) = t_m(E)$.

For (3), note that by induction, we have

$$\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) - \omega^{m-1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) > 0. \quad (5.8)$$

If we further assume

$$\omega^{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) - \omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_{m+1}(E))) \leq 0, \quad (5.9)$$

then we take $\varepsilon_1 = t_m(E) + \delta = t_{m+1}(E) + \delta$ where $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Then (5.8) and (5.9) imply

$$L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) > L_m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + it_m(E))) \geq L_{m+1}(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)).$$

Thus $\omega^m(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon_1)) = 0$ which contradicts the definition of $t_m(E)$ and convexity of $L_\varepsilon^m(E)$.

For the remaining results, we distinguish two cases:

Case I: $L(E) = 0$. Then $\omega_\pm^d(E) = 1$. Indeed, otherwise, if $\omega_\pm^d(E) < 1$, by convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E)$ and Theorem 4.1¹⁷, there are $f_\pm(E) > 0$ such that for ε sufficiently large, we have

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) - f_\pm(E) \pm 2\pi\varepsilon.$$

Together with (5.2), we have $\widehat{L}_0^d(E) - f_\pm(E) = -\ln|\widehat{v}_d|$ and hence $L(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) + \ln|\widehat{v}_d| = f_\pm(E) > 0$ which is a contradiction.

Then by convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E)$, we have $\omega^d(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot \pm i\varepsilon)) = 1$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus,

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E) + 2\pi|\varepsilon|,$$

Case II: If $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $L(E) > 0$, there is a sequence $E_n \rightarrow E$ with $E_n \in \mathbb{C}_+$, such that $\omega_\pm^d(E_n) = \omega_\pm^d(\overline{E_n}) = 0$ and (1)-(3) are true for all E_n and $\overline{E_n}$. Note that we always have

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta + i\varepsilon)^* S \widehat{A}_{\overline{E}}(\theta - i\varepsilon) = S. \quad (5.10)$$

Assume $t_d^+(E_n) \leq t_d^-(\overline{E_n})$. By (5.10) we have

$$L_{d+1}(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))) = -L_d(\widehat{A}_{\overline{E_n}}(\cdot - it_d^+(E_n))) \leq 0$$

Hence

$$L_d(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))) > 0 \geq L_{d+1}(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))).$$

It follows that $\omega^d(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))) \in \mathbb{Z}$. By convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E_n)$, the definition of $t_d^+(E_n)$ and (5.4), $0 < \omega^d(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))) \leq 1$, so we have $\omega^d(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + it_d^+(E_n))) = 1$. Hence by convexity of $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E_n)$, we have $\omega^d(\widehat{A}_{E_n}(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = 1$ for any $\varepsilon \geq t_d^+(E_n)$. Together with (5.2), it follows that

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(E_n) = \widehat{L}_0^d(E_n) + 2\pi(\varepsilon - t_d^+(E_n)) = 2\pi\varepsilon - \ln|\widehat{v}_d|,$$

thus $t_d^+(E_n) = \frac{L(E_n)}{2\pi}$. On the other hand, $\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(\overline{E_n})$ is a piecewise convex affine function with final slope 2π , so there is $f(\overline{E_n}) > 0$ such that for ε sufficiently large, we have

$$\widehat{L}_\varepsilon^d(\overline{E_n}) = \widehat{L}_0^d(\overline{E_n}) - f(\overline{E_n}) + 2\pi\varepsilon,$$

Moreover, by (1)-(3) for $\overline{E_n}$, we have $f(\overline{E_n}) \geq 2\pi t_d^-(\overline{E_n})$ ¹⁸. Hence $L(E_n)/2\pi = t_d^+(E_n) \leq t_d^-(\overline{E_n}) \leq f(\overline{E_n})/2\pi = L(\overline{E_n})/2\pi$. Letting $E_n \rightarrow E$, by continuity of the

¹⁷I.e. $L_\varepsilon^d(E)$ is a piecewise convex affine function with final slope 2π .

¹⁸The inequality holds if and only if $t_d^-(\overline{E_n})$ is the only turning point of $L_\varepsilon^d(\overline{E_n})$ when $\varepsilon \leq 0$.

Lyapunov exponent [11, 21], we have $t_d^+(E) = t_d^-(E) = L(E)/2\pi$. This completes the proof. \square

6. THE STRUCTURE OF DUAL SYMPLECTIC COCYCLES OF TYPE I OPERATORS

The characterization of type I operators with trigonometric polynomial v as the ones whose dual cocycle is partially hyperbolic with 2-dimensional center (PH2) was developed in [37], and used there to establish higher dimensional versions of Puig's argument and Kotani theory.

In this section, we use multiplicative Jensen's formula obtained in Section 5 to uncover the structure of those dual cocycles, paving the way to obtain dual characterization of type I operators with general analytic v .

- (1) We give a more precise dual characterization of supercritical type I operators, including determining explicit subcritical radius and obtaining nice structure of the 2-dimensional center of dual symplectic cocycle, which is crucial for our applications.
- (2) We initiate a way to show the convergence of the above structure of the dual symplectic cocycle when doing trigonometric polynomial approximation, leading to a concept of the center for dual long-range operator (where there is no cocycle).

Define

$$(H_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha}^\varepsilon \Psi)(x, n) = e^{-\varepsilon} \Psi(x, n+1) + e^\varepsilon \Psi(x, n-1) + v(x+i\varepsilon+n\alpha) \Psi(x, n).$$

and its Aubry dual

$$(\widehat{H}_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha}^\varepsilon \Psi)(\theta, n) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-2\pi k \varepsilon} \widehat{v}_k \Psi(\theta, n+k) + 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta+i\varepsilon+n\alpha) \Psi(\theta, n).$$

Indeed, it follows by a direct computation that

$$U H_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha}^\varepsilon U^{-1} = \widehat{H}_{v(\cdot+i\varepsilon),\alpha}^\varepsilon. \quad (6.1)$$

where U is given by (4.3).

6.1. The trigonometric polynomial case. In this subsection, we let

$$v(x) = \sum_{k=-d}^d \widehat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}, \quad \widehat{v}_k = \overline{\widehat{v}_{-k}}$$

be a real trigonometric polynomial of degree d . For simplicity, we denote the dual of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ by $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$. Let $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}$ be the spectrum of $H_{v,\alpha,x}$. The following is the dual characterization of type I operators

Proposition 6.1 ([37], Corollary 4.4). *$H_{v,\alpha,x}$ is a type I operator if and only if $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ is PH2 in the sense that for all $E \in \Sigma_{v,\alpha}$,*

- (1) $\widehat{L}_d(E)$ is simple;
- (2) (α, \widehat{A}_E) is $(d-1)$ and $(d+1)$ -dominated.

In the following, we explore further properties of $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ which will be important for our applications. As a corollary of Theorem 5.1, we have

Corollary 6.1. *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, and $E \in \mathbb{R}$ is a type I energy of operator $H_{v,\alpha,x}$. Then*

- (1) if $L(E) = 0$, $(\alpha, \widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$ is $(d-1)$ and $(d+1)$ -dominated for any $|\varepsilon| < \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$;
- (2) if $L(E) > 0$, $(\alpha, \widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$ is $(d-1)$ and $(d+1)$ -dominated for any $|\varepsilon| < L(E)/2\pi$.

Proof. If $L(E) = 0$, it follows from the openness of dominated splitting, see Proposition 3.1 in [39] or Theorem 4.1 in [37] for the the proof. If $L(E) > 0$, it follows directly from Proposition 6.1 and Theorem 5.1 that $(\alpha, \widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$ is $(d-1)$ and $(d+1)$ -regular for any $|\varepsilon| < L(E)/2\pi$, thus by Theorem 4.2, $(\alpha, \widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon))$ is $(d-1)$ and $(d+1)$ -dominated for any $|\varepsilon| < L(E)/2\pi$. \square

Hence if we assume $\bar{\omega}(E) = 1$, there exists a continuous invariant decomposition

$$\mathbb{C}^{2d} = E_s(\theta) \oplus E_c(\theta) \oplus E_u(\theta), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T},$$

where $E_c(\theta)$ is the two dimensional invariant subspace corresponding to the minimal non-negative Lyapunov exponent. Actually, by Theorem 6.1 in [11] and Corollary 6.1, $E_s(\theta)$, $E_c(\theta)$ and $E_u(\theta)$ can be chosen to depend analytically on $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and can be extended to $|\Im z| < \delta(E)$ where

$$\delta(E) = \begin{cases} \delta & L(E) = 0 \\ L(E)/2\pi & L(E) > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (6.2)$$

In the following, we fix $0 < h < \delta(E)$. Involving the complex symplectic structure, we actually have a *symplectic* invariant decomposition of \mathbb{C}^{2d} , depending analytically on θ .

Lemma 6.1. *For any $|\varepsilon| < h$, there exist $u(\theta + i\varepsilon), v(\theta + i\varepsilon) \in E_c(\theta + i\varepsilon)$, such that*

- (1) $u(z)$ and $v(z)$ depend analytically on z ;
- (2) $u^*(\theta + i\varepsilon)Sv(\theta + i\varepsilon) \neq 0$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ where

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -C^* \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix};$$

- (3) $u(\theta)^*Sw(\theta) = v(\theta)^*Sw(\theta) = 0$ for any $w(\theta) \in E_s(\theta) \cup E_u(\theta)$.

Proof. Let s be a symplectic form on \mathbb{C}^{2d} with symplectic inner product

$$s(u, v) = u^*Sv, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}.$$

Given a subspace $V \subset \mathbb{C}^{2d}$, we denote its s -orthogonal complement by V^\perp , i.e. V^\perp consists of $u \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ such that $s(u, v) = 0$ for any $v \in V$. V is called a symplectic subspace if $V \cap V^\perp = \{0\}$. We therefore only need to prove that $E_c(\theta)$ is a symplectic subspace, that is $E_c(\theta) \cap E_c(\theta)^\perp = \{0\}$.

Given a nonzero vector $v_1 \in E_c(\theta)$, there exists $\bar{v}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ such that $s(v_1, \bar{v}_1) \neq 0$ (otherwise $v_1 = 0$). Since symplectic form is preserved by the dynamics, $\bar{v}_1 \in E_c(\theta)$. We complete the symplectic basis of $E_c(\theta)$ obtaining $\{v_1, \bar{v}_1\}$. Let $u \in E_c(\theta) \cap E_c(\theta)^\perp$. Since $u \in E_c(\theta)$, we have $u = c_1v_1 + c_2\bar{v}_1$ for some $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, since $u \in E_c(\theta)^\perp$, we have $0 = s(u, v_1) = s(c_1v_1 + c_2\bar{v}_1, v_1) = c_2s(\bar{v}_1, v_1)$ which implies that $c_2 = 0$. Similarly, using that $s(u, \bar{v}_1) = 0$, one has $c_1 = 0$. Thus $E_c(\theta)$ is a symplectic subspace.

Notice that $E_c(z)$ depends analytically on z , the basis of $E_c(z)$ can be chosen to depend analytically on z . i.e., there exist $u(\theta + i\varepsilon), v(\theta + i\varepsilon) \in E_c(\theta + i\varepsilon)$, such that $u^*(\theta + i\varepsilon)Sv(\theta + i\varepsilon) \neq 0$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. \square

Let $M \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(2, \mathbb{C}))$ be such that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta + i\varepsilon)(u(\theta + i\varepsilon), v(\theta + i\varepsilon)) = (u(\theta + i\varepsilon + \alpha), v(\theta + i\varepsilon + \alpha))M(\theta + i\varepsilon), \quad (6.3)$$

$c(\theta + i\varepsilon) = u^*(\theta + i\varepsilon)Sv(\theta + i\varepsilon)$ and $\Omega(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c(\theta) \\ -c(\theta) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then

Proposition 6.2. *For any $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$M(\theta)^*\Omega(\theta + \alpha)M(\theta) = \Omega(\theta).$$

Proof. Taking the transpose on each side of equation (6.3), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta) \\ v^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_E(\theta)^* = M^*(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ v^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Multiplying S on both sides of the above equation, one has

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta) \\ v^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_E(\theta)^*S = M^*(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ v^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S.$$

Involving the fact that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)^*S = S\widehat{A}_E(\theta)^{-1},$$

it follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta) \\ v^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S = M^*(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ v^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S\widehat{A}_E(\theta).$$

Multiplying $(u(\theta), v(\theta))$ to the right of each side,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta) \\ v^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S(u(\theta), v(\theta)) &= M^*(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ v^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S\widehat{A}_E(\theta)(u(\theta), v(\theta)) \\ &= M^*(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ v^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S(u(\theta + \alpha), v(\theta + \alpha))M(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Finally one can easily check that

$$\Omega(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} u^*(\theta) \\ v^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S(u(\theta), v(\theta)),$$

thus completing the proof. \square

We now obtain a more precise dual characterizations of the center.

Corollary 6.2. *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{\omega}(E) = 1$. For any $0 < h < \delta(E)$ where δ is defined in (6.2), there exist linearly independent $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}^{2d})$, $\phi \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $C \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that*

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)(\tilde{u}(\theta), \tilde{v}(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}(\theta + \alpha), \tilde{v}(\theta + \alpha))e^{2\pi i\phi(\theta)}C(\theta). \quad (6.4)$$

Moreover, $\tilde{u}(\theta)^*S\tilde{v}(\theta) = 1$ and if $L(E) > 0$, we further have

$$L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_1(C), \quad \forall |\varepsilon| < h.$$

Proof. We denote $M(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} a_1(\theta) & a_2(\theta) \\ a_3(\theta) & a_4(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\Omega(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c(\theta) \\ -c(\theta) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. By Proposition 6.2, we have

$$a_1(\theta)c(\theta) = \det M(\theta)\overline{a_1(\theta)c(\theta + \alpha)}, \quad a_2(\theta)\overline{c(\theta)} = \det M(\theta)\overline{a_2(\theta)c(\theta + \alpha)}, \quad (6.5)$$

$$a_3(\theta)c(\theta) = \det M(\theta)\overline{a_3(\theta)c(\theta + \alpha)}, \quad a_4(\theta)\overline{c(\theta)} = \det M(\theta)\overline{a_4(\theta)c(\theta + \alpha)}. \quad (6.6)$$

It follows from (6.5) and (6.6),

$$a_1(\theta) = \pm |a_1(\theta)| \sqrt{\det M(\theta) \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)}}, \quad a_4(\theta) = \pm |a_4(\theta)| \sqrt{\det M(\theta) \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)}}, \quad (6.7)$$

$$a_2(\theta) = \pm |a_2(\theta)| \sqrt{\det M(\theta) \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)}}, \quad a_3(\theta) = \pm |a_3(\theta)| \sqrt{\det M(\theta) \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)}}. \quad (6.8)$$

We define

$$\tilde{u}(\theta + i\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c(\theta + i\varepsilon)}} u(\theta + i\varepsilon), \quad \tilde{v}(\theta + i\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c(\theta + i\varepsilon)}} v(\theta + i\varepsilon), \quad (6.9)$$

$$\tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{c(\theta + \alpha + i\varepsilon)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{c(\theta + \alpha + i\varepsilon)} \end{pmatrix} M(\theta + i\varepsilon) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{c(\theta + i\varepsilon)}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{c(\theta + i\varepsilon)}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.10)$$

$$C(\theta + i\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon)}} \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon). \quad (6.11)$$

Note that $\det \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon) \neq 0$ for any $|\varepsilon| < h$. Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln |\det \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon)| = 0. \quad (6.12)$$

By (6.10), (6.11) and (6.12), for $|\varepsilon| < h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(M(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) &= L_1(\tilde{M}(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) \\ &= L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln |\det \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon)| d\theta = L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

We denote

$$\sqrt{\det \tilde{M}(\theta + i\varepsilon)} = e^{2\pi i \phi(\theta + i\varepsilon)},$$

By Proposition 6.2, $|\det M(\theta)| = \left| \frac{c(\theta)}{c(\theta + \alpha)} \right|$. By (6.10),

$$\det \tilde{M}(\theta) = \det M(\theta) \left| \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)} \right|.$$

Thus $\phi \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$. By (6.7)-(6.11), one can also check that

$$C(\theta) = \pm \begin{pmatrix} |a_1(\theta)| \sqrt{\left| \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)} \right|} & |a_2(\theta)| \sqrt{\left| \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)} \right|} \\ |a_3(\theta)| \sqrt{\left| \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)} \right|} & |a_4(\theta)| \sqrt{\left| \frac{c(\theta + \alpha)}{c(\theta)} \right|} \end{pmatrix},$$

hence $C \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$.

Finally, it follows directly from (6.3) and (6.9)-(6.11) that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta + i\varepsilon)(\tilde{u}(\theta + i\varepsilon), \tilde{v}(\theta + i\varepsilon)) = (\tilde{u}(\theta + i\varepsilon + \alpha), \tilde{v}(\theta + i\varepsilon + \alpha)) e^{2\pi i \phi(\theta + i\varepsilon)} C(\theta + i\varepsilon).$$

Moreover, $\tilde{u}(\theta)^* S \tilde{v}(\theta) = 1$. By the property of invariant decomposition, (6.13) and Theorem 5.1, we have

$$L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_1(M(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_d(\widehat{A}_E(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_d(\widehat{A}_E) = L_1(M) = L_1(C).$$

□

Thus, for trigonometric polynomial v , we obtain an $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ -cocycle of the form $(\alpha, e^{2\pi i\phi}C)$, where ϕ, C are as in Corollary 6.2, corresponding to the 2-dimensional center of (α, \widehat{A}_E) .

6.2. The general case: the limiting cocycle. Let now v be a general real analytic function. Note that in this case, $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ is a long-range operator, thus we cannot define the corresponding cocycle, so the methods of Section 6.1 completely break down. We will employ trigonometric approximation to define the limiting $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ cocycle corresponding to the ‘‘center’’ of the long-range operator.

We let $v_n(x) = \sum_{k=-n}^n \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}$ be the n -th trigonometric polynomial truncation of $v(x)$. Since $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ is a type I operator, by Corollary 4.1 in [37], for n sufficiently large, $H_{v_n,\alpha,x}$ is also type I. To specify the dependence on v_n , in this case, we will denote $A_E(x)/\widehat{A}_E(x)$ corresponding to v_n by $S_E^{v_n}(x)/\widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(x)$, and denote their non-negative Lyapunov exponents by $L^{v_n}(E)/\{\gamma_j^{v_n}(E)\}_{j=1}^n$ (where $0 \leq \gamma_1^{v_n}(E) \leq \gamma_2^{v_n}(E) \leq \dots \leq \gamma_n^{v_n}(E)$), respectively. The corresponding symplectic forms will be denoted by S_n . Assume $L_\varepsilon^v(E)$ has at least two non-negative turning points $0 \leq \varepsilon_1(E) < \varepsilon_2(E) < h_1$ (otherwise the argument will be simpler).

Theorem 6.1. *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $E \in \mathbb{R}$, $v \in C_{h_1}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $L(E) > 0$, $\varepsilon_1(E)$ sufficiently small, and $\bar{\omega}(E) = 1$. For any $0 < h < L(E)/2\pi$, there exist $\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}^{2n})$, $\phi_n \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $C_n \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, satisfying Corollary 6.2. I.e.,*

$$\widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(\theta)(\tilde{u}_n(\theta), \tilde{v}_n(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}_n(\theta + \alpha), \tilde{v}_n(\theta + \alpha))e^{2\pi i\phi_n(\theta)}C_n(\theta),$$

such that

$$|\phi_n - \phi|_h, |C_n - C|_h \leq e^{-\delta|n|},$$

for some $\delta > 0$, $\phi \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $C \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$. As a consequence, we have

$$L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_1(C), \quad \forall |\varepsilon| < h.$$

Moreover, if we denote

$$\tilde{u}_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} u_n(\theta, n-1) \\ u_n(\theta, n-2) \\ \vdots \\ u_n(\theta, -n) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{v}_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} v_n(\theta, n-1) \\ v_n(\theta, n-2) \\ \vdots \\ v_n(\theta, -n) \end{pmatrix},$$

then there is $u(\theta, 0), v(\theta, 0) \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$|u_n(\cdot, 0) - u(\cdot, 0)|_h, |v_n(\cdot, 0) - v(\cdot, 0)|_h \leq C e^{-\delta n}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1 in [39], we have

$$\varepsilon_j(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_j^n(E), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

For any $\varepsilon_1(E) < 2\pi\varepsilon < \varepsilon_2(E)$, we have $(\alpha, S_E^v(\cdot \pm i\varepsilon))$ is regular. Since $L_\varepsilon^v(E) \geq L^v(E) > 0$, by Theorem 6 in [4], $(\alpha, S_E^v(\cdot \pm i\varepsilon))$ is uniformly hyperbolic.

By the openness of uniform hyperbolicity and continuity of $L_\varepsilon(E)$ [21], there is an analytic neighborhood U_v of v such that for any $v' \in U_v$, there exists a continuous invariant splitting $\mathbb{C}^2 = E^s(v', x + i\varepsilon) \oplus E^u(v', x + i\varepsilon)$ for any $(x, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{T} \times (\varepsilon_1(E), \varepsilon_2(E))$. Actually, by Theorem 6.1 in [11], $E^s(v', x + i\varepsilon)$ and $E^u(v', x + i\varepsilon)$ can be chosen to be analytic on $\mathbb{T} \times (\varepsilon_1(E), \varepsilon_2(E))$ and for any $v' \in U_v$,

$$|E^*(v', x + i\varepsilon) - E^*(v, x + i\varepsilon)| \leq C(K)|v' - v|_{h_1 - \delta}, \quad * = s, u.$$

for some δ sufficiently small, on any compact subset K of $\mathbb{T} \times (\varepsilon_1(E), \varepsilon_2(E))$.

Thus for any $v' \in U_v$, there are $u(v', z) \in E^u(v', z)$ and $s(v', z) \in E^s(v', z)$, analytic on $z \in \mathbb{T} \times (\varepsilon_1(E) + \delta, \varepsilon_2(E) - \delta)$ and

$$|s(v', x + i\varepsilon) - s(v, x + i\varepsilon)|, |u(v', x + i\varepsilon) - u(v, x + i\varepsilon)| \leq C(\delta)|v' - v|_{h_1 - \delta}, \quad (6.14)$$

where δ is sufficiently small.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} f_1^k(v', x + i\varepsilon) \\ f_1^{k-1}(v', x + i\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix} &= (S_E^{v'})_k(x + i\varepsilon)s(v', x + i\varepsilon), \\ \begin{pmatrix} f_2^k(v', x + i\varepsilon) \\ f_2^{k-1}(v', x + i\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix} &= (S_E^{v'})_k(x + i\varepsilon)u(v', x + i\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

For any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(|f_1^k(v', x + i\varepsilon)|^2 + |f_1^{k-1}(v', x + i\varepsilon)|^2)}{2k} = -L_\varepsilon^{v'}(E), \quad (6.15)$$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(|f_2^k(v', x + i\varepsilon)| + |f_2^{k-1}(v', x + i\varepsilon)|^2)}{2k} = L_\varepsilon^{v'}(E). \quad (6.16)$$

Let $\delta(x, k) := \delta_0(k)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then by (4.3),

$$(U^{-1}\delta)(x, k) = \delta(x, k).$$

By the continuity of the Lyapunov exponent [21], if $|v - v'|_{h_1}$ is sufficiently small, we have

$$|L_\varepsilon^v(E) - L_\varepsilon^{v'}(E)| < \delta/4. \quad (6.17)$$

By (6.15), (6.16) and (6.17), for $|\varepsilon| < (L_\varepsilon^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$, we have

$$e^{2\pi k\varepsilon} f_1^k(v', x + i\varepsilon) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+), \quad e^{2\pi k\varepsilon} f_2^k(v', x + i\varepsilon) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_-). \quad (6.18)$$

We now need the following lemma,

Lemma 6.2 ([39]). *Consider the following 2d order difference operator,*

$$(Lu)(n) = \sum_{k=-d}^d a_k u(n+k) + V(n)u(n).$$

If the eigenequation $Lu = Eu$ has 2d linearly independent solutions $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{2d}$ satisfying

$$\phi_i \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^+)(i = 1, \dots, m) \quad \phi_i \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^-)(i = m+1, \dots, 2d),$$

then $L - EI$ is invertible. Moreover,

$$\langle \delta_p, (L - EI)^{-1} \delta_q \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(p) \Phi_{1,i}(q)}{a_d \det \Phi(q)} & p \geq q + 1 \\ \frac{\sum_{i=m+1}^{2d} \phi_i(p) \Phi_{1,i}(q)}{-a_d \det \Phi(q)} & p \leq q \end{cases},$$

where

$$\Phi(q) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1(q+d) & \phi_2(q+d) & \cdots & \phi_{2d}(q+d) \\ \phi_1(q+d-1) & \phi_2(q+d-1) & \cdots & \phi_{2d}(q+d-1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \phi_1(q-d+1) & \phi_2(q-d+1) & \cdots & \phi_{2d}(q-d+1) \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\Phi_{i,j}(q)$ is the (i,j) -th cofactor of $\Phi(q)$.

Note that $\{e^{2\pi(k-1)\epsilon} f_j^k(v', x+i\epsilon)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ ($j = 1, 2$) are two linearly independent solutions to $H_{v'(\cdot+i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon u = Eu$. By (6.18) and Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ((H_{v'(\cdot+i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} U^{-1} \delta)(x, k) = \langle \delta_k, (H_{v'(\cdot+i\epsilon), \alpha, x}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} \delta_0 \rangle \\ & = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{2\pi h \epsilon} f_1^k(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^0(v', x+i\epsilon)}{f_1^1(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^0(v', x+i\epsilon) - f_1^0(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^1(v', x+i\epsilon)} & k \geq 0, \\ \frac{e^{2\pi k \epsilon} f_1^0(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^k(v', x+i\epsilon)}{f_1^1(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^0(v', x+i\epsilon) - f_1^0(v', x+i\epsilon) f_2^1(v', x+i\epsilon)} & k < 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

For any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $2\pi\epsilon \in (\varepsilon_1(E) + \delta, \varepsilon_2(E) - \delta)$ and $|\epsilon| < (L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$, we denote

$$f_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^\epsilon(x, k) = (H_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} U^{-1} \delta(x, k).$$

By (6.14)-(6.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^\epsilon(x, k) - f_{v(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^\epsilon(x, k)| = e^{2\pi k \epsilon} |f_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^0(x, k) - f_{v(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^0(x, k)| \\ & \leq C |v' - v|_{h_1 - \delta} e^{-(L_\varepsilon^v(E) - 2\pi\epsilon - \delta/2)|k|} \leq C |v' - v|_{h_1 - \delta} e^{-(L^v(E) - 2\pi\epsilon - \delta/2)|k|}. \end{aligned}$$

If we further denote

$$g_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}(\theta, k) = U(H_{v'(\cdot+i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} U^{-1} \delta(\theta, k),$$

by (4.3), we have

$$g_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}(\theta, k) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{2\pi i k \eta} e^{2\pi i m(k\alpha + \theta)} f_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^0(\eta, m) d\eta.$$

It follows that for any $2\pi\epsilon \in (\varepsilon_1(E) + \delta, \varepsilon_2(E) - \delta)$ and $|\epsilon| \leq (L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |g_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k) - g_{v(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k)| \\ & \leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi m \epsilon} |f_{v'(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^0(\cdot, m) - f_{v(\cdot \pm i\epsilon)}^0(\cdot, m)|_0 \leq C |v' - v|_{h_1 - \delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

Note also that

$$U(H_{v_n(\cdot \pm i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} U^{-1} \delta = (\widehat{H}_{v_n(\cdot \pm i\epsilon), \alpha}^\epsilon - E)^{-1} \delta.$$

Since $\varepsilon_1(E)$ is sufficiently small, we now fix $\varepsilon_1(E) + \delta/10 < 2\pi\epsilon < \delta/8 < \varepsilon_2(E)$. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $|\epsilon| \leq (L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$, we define

$$u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) = \begin{cases} e^{-2\pi k \epsilon} g_{v_n(\cdot+i\epsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k) - e^{2\pi k \epsilon} g_{v_n(\cdot-i\epsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k) & k \geq -n, \\ (\widehat{H}_{v_n, \alpha, \theta}^\epsilon - E)u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, \cdot) = 0 \text{ inductively} & k < -n. \end{cases} \quad (6.21)$$

It follows that $\{u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a solution of $(\widehat{H}_{v_n, \alpha, \theta}^\epsilon - E)u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, \cdot) = 0$. Moreover, by (6.20), we have $u_n(\cdot, k) \in C_{(L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ and

$$|u_n(\cdot, k) - u_{n+1}(\cdot, k)|_{(L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi} \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}n} \quad (6.22)$$

for $-n \leq k \leq n+1$. Moreover, we have

Lemma 6.3. For $|\epsilon| < (L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$, we have

$$u_n(\theta + i\epsilon) = (u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, n) \quad u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, n-1) \quad \cdots \quad u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, -n+1))^t \in E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$$

where $E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$ is the center corresponding to $(\alpha, \widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(\cdot + i\epsilon))$.

Proof. By Corollary 6.1, and continuity of the Lyapunov exponent [21], $(\alpha, \widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(\cdot + i\epsilon))$ is $(d-1)$, $(d+1)$ -dominated for $|\epsilon| < (L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi$. As a consequence of dominated splitting, there exists a continuous invariant decomposition

$$\mathbb{C}^{2d} = E_s^n(\theta + i\epsilon) \oplus E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon) \oplus E_u^n(\theta + i\epsilon), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T},$$

which implies that there are linearly independent $\{u_i^n(\theta + i\epsilon)\}_{i=1}^{n-1} \in E_s^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$, $u^n(\theta + i\epsilon), v_n(\theta + i\epsilon) \in E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$ and $\{v_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon)\}_{j=1}^{n-1} \in E_u^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$ depending analytically on θ . Let $\{u_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$, $\{v_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$, $u^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k), v^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)$ be $2n$ linearly independent solutions of $\widehat{H}_{v, \alpha, \theta}^\epsilon u = Eu$ with the above corresponding initial data. Then, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2k} \ln \sum_{k=-n+1}^n |u_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)|^2 < -\gamma_1^n(E), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1,$$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2k} \ln \sum_{k=-n+1}^n |v_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)|^2 > \gamma_1^n(E), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1,$$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2k} \ln \sum_{k=-n+1}^n |u^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)|^2, \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2k} \ln \sum_{k=-n+1}^n |v^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)|^2 \leq \varepsilon_1(E) + \delta/10.$$

It is obvious that $\{e^{\pm 2\pi k \varepsilon} u_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$, $\{e^{2\pi \varepsilon} v_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$, $e^{2\pi \varepsilon} u^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)$, $e^{2\pi \varepsilon} v^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k)$ are $2n$ independent solutions of $\widehat{H}_{v(\cdot + i\varepsilon), \alpha, \theta}^\epsilon u = Eu$. Thus for $\varepsilon_1(E) + \delta/10 < 2\pi \varepsilon < \delta/8 < \varepsilon_2(E)$ and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$e^{\pm 2\pi k \varepsilon} u_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^+), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \quad (6.23)$$

$$e^{\pm 2\pi k \varepsilon} v_j^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^-), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \quad (6.24)$$

$$e^{\pm 2\pi k \varepsilon} u^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k), \quad e^{2\pi k \varepsilon} v^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^\mp). \quad (6.25)$$

By (6.23)-(6.25) and Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) &= e^{-2\pi k \varepsilon} g_{v_n(\cdot + i\varepsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k) - e^{2\pi k \varepsilon} g_{v_n(\cdot - i\varepsilon)}(\theta + i\epsilon, k) \\ &= a(\theta + i\epsilon) u^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k) + b(\theta + i\epsilon) v^n(\theta + i\epsilon, k). \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

Thus $u_n(\theta + i\epsilon) \in E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$. \square

By (6.22) and the definition of S_n , we have

$$|S_n u_n - S_{n+1} u_{n+1}|_{(L^v(E) - \delta)/2\pi} \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta}{2} n}. \quad (6.27)$$

Moreover, we have $S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon) \in E_c^n(\theta + i\epsilon)$ since

$$c_n(\theta + i\epsilon) = u_n^*(\theta + i\epsilon) S_n S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon) = -|S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon)|^2 < 0. \quad (6.28)$$

Finally we let

$$\widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(\theta + i\epsilon)(u_n(\theta + i\epsilon), S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon)) = (u_n(\theta + i\epsilon + \alpha), S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon + \alpha)) M_n(\theta + i\epsilon). \quad (6.29)$$

For any $|\epsilon| < h < L^v(E)/2\pi$, similar to Corollary 6.2, we can define

$$\tilde{u}_n(\theta + i\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_n(\theta + i\epsilon)}} u_n(\theta + i\epsilon), \quad \tilde{v}_n(\theta + i\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_n(\theta + i\epsilon)}} S_n u_n(\theta + i\epsilon),$$

$$\widetilde{M}_n(\theta+i\epsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{c_n(\theta+\alpha+i\epsilon)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{c_n(\theta+\alpha+i\epsilon)} \end{pmatrix} M_n(\theta+i\epsilon) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_n(\theta+i\epsilon)}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_n(\theta+i\epsilon)}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_n(\theta+i\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \widetilde{M}_n(\theta+i\epsilon)}} \widetilde{M}_n(\theta+i\epsilon),$$

$$\sqrt{\det \widetilde{M}_n(\theta+i\epsilon)} = e^{2\pi i \phi_n(\theta+i\epsilon)}.$$

Then we have

$$\widehat{S}_E^{v_n}(\theta)(\tilde{u}_n(\theta), \tilde{v}_n(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}_n(\theta+\alpha), \tilde{v}_n(\theta+\alpha)) e^{2\pi i \phi_n(\theta)} C_n(\theta).$$

$$L_1(C_n(\cdot+i\epsilon)) = L_1(C_n), \quad \forall |\epsilon| < h.$$

By (6.22), (6.27), (6.28), (6.29) and the above definition, we have

$$|\phi_n - \phi_{n+1}|_h, \quad |C_n - C_{n+1}|_h \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}n},$$

hence there exist $\phi \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $C \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$|\phi_n - \phi|_h, \quad |C_n - C|_h \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}n}.$$

By continuity of the Lyapunov exponent, we have

$$L_1(C(\cdot+i\epsilon)) = L_1(C), \quad \forall |\epsilon| < h.$$

□

7. THE FIBERED ROTATION NUMBER. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 AND 2.3

In this section, we define the fibered rotation number for duals of type I operators and link it to the IDS. As far as we know, this is the first time that the rotation number is defined in a situation without real symmetric coefficients. There are two significant issues to deal with

- (1) The rotation numbers have been defined in the literature for finite-range operators with *real symmetric coefficients*. This real symmetry is crucial for the definition. However, if the potential is a *non-even* trigonometric polynomial, then its dual is a finite-range operator with *Hermitian symmetric* but not real-symmetric coefficients. We believe our definition/determination of rotation number is the first of its kind.
- (2) If the potential v is a real analytic function that is not a trigonometric polynomial, then its dual is an infinite-range operator. Therefore one cannot even define a corresponding cocycle, not even talking about the rotation number. We will define the rotation number through the limit of those of cocycles corresponding to trigonometric polynomial approximations.

7.1. The finite-range case. In this subsection, we assume v is a trigonometric polynomial of degree d . By Corollary 6.2, for any $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain a $Sp(2, \mathbb{C})$ -cocycle $(\alpha, e^{2\pi i \phi} C)$ corresponding to the 2-dimensional center of (α, \widehat{A}_E) . Consider the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycle (α, C) and set $\widehat{\rho}(E) := \rho(C)$, where $\rho(C)$ is given by (4.1). We now define two functions that can be viewed as “fibered rotation numbers” of (α, \widehat{A}_E) and will play a key role in establishing localization and absolute continuity of IDS,

$$\rho_1(E) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta + \widehat{\rho}(E), \quad \rho_2(E) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta - \widehat{\rho}(E).$$

In the following, we establish the relation between the fibered rotation numbers and integrated density of states for finite-range operators, akin to the relation (4.2) in the Schrödinger case.

We note that by the definition of PH2, there is $\delta(v) > 0$ such that if (α, \widehat{A}_E) is PH2 for $E \in \Sigma_{v, \alpha}$, then every $z \in \mathbb{C}_\delta$ where \mathbb{C}_δ is a open neighborhood of $\Sigma_{v, \alpha}$, (α, \widehat{A}_z) is still PH2. It is known that for any $z \in \mathbb{H}_\delta = \mathbb{C}_\delta \cap \mathbb{H}$, the cocycle (α, \widehat{A}_z) is uniformly hyperbolic, thus d -dominated. Hence (α, \widehat{A}_z) is $(d-1)$, d , $(d+1)$ -dominated. As a consequence of dominated splitting, for any $z \in \mathbb{H}_\delta$, there exist a continuous invariant decomposition

$$\mathbb{C}^{2d} = E_z^s(\theta) \oplus E_z^+(\theta) \oplus E_z^-(\theta) \oplus E_z^u(\theta), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{T},$$

which implies that there are linearly independent $\{u_z^i(\theta)\}_{i=1}^{d-1} \in E_z^s(\theta)$, $u_z(\theta) \in E_z^+(\theta)$, $v_z(\theta) \in E_z^-(\theta)$ and $\{v_z^i(\theta)\}_{i=1}^{d-1} \in E_z^u(\theta)$ depending analytically on θ and z , $M_z^\pm \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL_{d-1}(\mathbb{C}))$ and $m_z^\pm \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ such that

$$\widehat{A}_z(\theta)(U_z(\theta), u_z(\theta)) = (U_z(\theta + \alpha), u_z(\theta + \alpha)) \text{diag}\{M_z^+(\theta), m_z^+(\theta)\}, \quad (7.1)$$

$$\widehat{A}_z(\theta)(V_z(\theta), v_z(\theta)) = (V_z(\theta + \alpha), v_z(\theta + \alpha)) \text{diag}\{M_z^-(\theta), m_z^-(\theta)\}, \quad (7.2)$$

where

$$U_z(\theta) = (u_z^1(\theta), \dots, u_z^{d-1}(\theta)), \quad V_z(\theta) = (v_z^1(\theta), \dots, v_z^{d-1}(\theta)).$$

Moreover, by the invariance of each subspace we have

$$\widehat{L}_d(z) = \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta, \quad \widehat{L}_{d+1}(z) = \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^-(\theta) d\theta.$$

Now, we define

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_+(k, \theta, z) \\ F_+(k-1, \theta, z) \end{pmatrix} = (\widehat{A}_E)_{dk}(\theta)(U_z(\theta), u_z(\theta)), \quad (7.3)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_-(k, \theta, z) \\ F_-(k-1, \theta, z) \end{pmatrix} = (\widehat{A}_E)_{dk}(\theta)(V_z(\theta), v_z(\theta)),$$

and the M matrices similar to [39, 85], that we denote by $M^\pm(z, \theta)$,

$$M^+(z, \theta) = F_+(1, \theta, z) F_+^{-1}(0, \theta, z), \quad (7.4)$$

$$M^-(z, \theta) = F_-(-1, \theta, z) F_-^{-1}(0, \theta, z).$$

Finally, we define the Floquet exponents,

$$w^\pm(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M^\pm(z, \theta) d\theta. \quad (7.5)$$

Note that $M^\pm(z, \theta)$ can be conjugated to $\text{diag}\{M_z^\pm(\theta), m_z^\pm(\theta)\}$. We have

Proposition 7.1. *There exist $B_{\pm} \in C^{\omega}(\mathbb{T}, GL(d, \mathbb{C}))$ such that*

$$B_{\pm}^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)M^{\pm}(z, \theta)B_{\pm}(\theta) = \text{diag}\{M_z^{\pm}(\theta), m_z^{\pm}(\theta)\}.$$

Proof. By (7.1) and (7.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} F_+(1, \theta, z) \\ F_+(0, \theta, z) \end{pmatrix} &= (U_z(\theta + \alpha), u_z(\theta + \alpha)) \text{diag}\{M_z^+(\theta), m_z^+(\theta)\}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} F_+(0, \theta, z) \\ F_+(-1, \theta, z) \end{pmatrix} &= (U_z(\theta), u_z(\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Let $B_+(\theta) = F_+(0, \theta, z)$. By (7.4), we have

$$B_+^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)M^+(z, \theta)B_+(\theta) = \text{diag}\{M_z^+(\theta), m_z^+(\theta)\}.$$

□

By (7.5) and Proposition 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Im(w^+(z) - w^-(z)) &= \Im \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^+(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^-(\theta) d\theta \right) \\ &\quad + \Im \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^-(\theta) d\theta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.1. *We have*

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^+(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^-(\theta) d\theta \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Note that $M_z^{\pm}(\theta)$ depend analytically on z . Assume $z = E + i\varepsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^+(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^-(\theta) d\theta \right) \\ = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^+(\theta) d\theta - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^-(\theta) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)(U_E(\theta), V_E(\theta)) = (U_E(\theta + \alpha), V_E(\theta + \alpha)) \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\} \quad (7.6)$$

Taking the transpose on each side of equation (7.6), we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta) \\ V_E^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_E(\theta)^* = \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}^* \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ V_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Multiplying S on both sides of the above equation, one has

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta) \\ V_E^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_E(\theta)^* S = \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}^* \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ V_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S.$$

Involving the fact that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)^* S = S \widehat{A}_E(\theta)^{-1},$$

it follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta) \\ V_E^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S = \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}^* \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ V_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S \widehat{A}_E(\theta).$$

Multiplying each side by $(U_E(\theta), V_E(\theta))$ from the right,

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta) \\ V_E^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S(U_E(\theta), V_E(\theta)) = \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}^* \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ V_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S\widehat{A}_E(\theta)(U_E(\theta), V_E(\theta)) \\ & = \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}^* \begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \\ V_E^*(\theta + \alpha) \end{pmatrix} S(U_E(\theta + \alpha), V_E(\theta + \alpha)) \text{diag}\{M_E^+(\theta), M_E^-(\theta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Involving the symplectic structure, we may assume

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_E^*(\theta) \\ V_E^*(\theta) \end{pmatrix} S(U_E(\theta), V_E(\theta)) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D(\theta) \\ -D^*(\theta) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, we have

$$D(\theta) = M_E^+(\theta)^* D(\theta + \alpha) M_E^-(\theta),$$

which implies the result. \square

Lemma 7.2. *For $z = E + i\varepsilon$, we have*

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta = \rho_1(E), \quad (7.7)$$

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^-(\theta) d\theta = \rho_2(E). \quad (7.8)$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in E on any compact set.

Proof. We only give the proof of (7.7); the proof of (7.8) is the same. Similar to Lemma 6.1, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}_\delta$, there exist $\tilde{u}_z(\theta), \tilde{v}_z(\theta) \in E_z^c(\theta)$, such that $\tilde{u}_z(\theta)$ and $\tilde{v}_z(\theta)$ depend analytically on z . By invariance, there is $\widetilde{M}_z(\theta) \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, GL(2, \mathbb{C}))$ such that

$$\widehat{A}_z(\theta)(\tilde{u}_z(\theta), \tilde{v}_z(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}_z(\theta + \alpha), \tilde{v}_z(\theta + \alpha)) \widetilde{M}_z(\theta). \quad (7.9)$$

Note that $m_z^+(\theta) \neq 0$, thus

$$\Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \arg m_z^+(\theta) d\theta.$$

Since $m_z^+(\theta)$ is continuous in θ , by the ergodic theorem and unique ergodicity, we have for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \arg m_z^+(\theta) d\theta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \arg (m_z^+)_n(\theta)$$

where the convergence is uniform θ and $(m_z^+)_n(z, \theta) = m_z^+(\theta + (n-1)\alpha) \cdots m_z^+(\theta + \alpha) m_z^+(\theta)$.

Let $(\tilde{u}_z(\theta), \tilde{v}_z(\theta)) := (u_z(\theta), v_z(\theta)) B_z(\theta)$ where $u_z(\theta) \in E_z^+(\theta)$ and $v_z(\theta) \in E_z^-(\theta)$. By (7.9), (7.1) and (7.2), we have

$$\widetilde{M}_z(\theta) = B_z(\theta + \alpha)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} m_z^+(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & m_z^-(\theta) \end{pmatrix} B_z(\theta).$$

It follows that

$$(\widetilde{M}_z)_n(\theta) B_z(\theta)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = (m_z^+)_n(\theta) B_z(\theta + n\alpha)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.10)$$

We denote $Q = \frac{-1}{1+i} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{pmatrix}$, $M_z(\theta) = Q\widetilde{M}_z(\theta)Q^{-1}$,

$$Q(\widetilde{M}_z)_n(\theta)Q^{-1} = (M_z)_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} a_n(z, \theta) & b_n(z, \theta) \\ c_n(z, \theta) & d_n(z, \theta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (7.10), for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $m \in \mathbb{D}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \arg (m_z^+)_n(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \arg \frac{a_n(z, \theta)m + b_n(z, \theta)}{c_n(z, \theta)m + d_n(z, \theta)}.$$

Note that for any fixed n , we have

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{n} \arg \frac{a_n(z, \theta)m + b_n(z, \theta)}{c_n(z, \theta)m + d_n(z, \theta)} = \frac{1}{n} \arg \frac{a_n(E, \theta)m + b_n(E, \theta)}{c_n(E, \theta)m + d_n(E, \theta)}$$

uniformly in E on any compact set.

Note that we can further choose $\tilde{u}_z(\theta), \tilde{v}_z(\theta)$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_E(\theta) = \tilde{u}(\theta), \quad \tilde{v}_E(\theta) = \tilde{v}(\theta),$$

where $\tilde{u}(\theta), \tilde{v}(\theta)$ are defined in Corollary 6.2. By (7.9) and (6.4), we have

$$\widetilde{M}_E(\theta) = e^{2\pi i \phi(\theta)} C(\theta).$$

Hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_n(E, \theta) & b_n(E, \theta) \\ c_n(E, \theta) & d_n(E, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = e^{2\pi i n \phi(\theta)} Q C_n(\theta) Q^{-1}.$$

By the definition of rotation number of (α, C) , we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \arg \frac{a_n(E, \theta)m + b_n(E, \theta)}{c_n(E, \theta)m + d_n(E, \theta)} d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta + \rho(C) = \rho_1(E)$$

uniformly in E on any compact set.

Thus

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta = \rho_1(E)$$

uniformly in E on any compact set. \square

We are now ready to link ρ_1 and ρ_2 with the IDS.

Theorem 7.1. *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ we have on $\Sigma_{v, \alpha}^{sup} = \{E \in \mathbb{R} : L(E) > 0, \omega(E) = 1\}$,*

- (1) *for almost every E , $\rho_1'(E) \leq 0$ and $\rho_2'(E) \geq 0$;*
- (2) *there is a constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $-2\hat{\rho}(E) = \rho_2(E) - \rho_1(E) = N(E) - k$.*

Proof. Note that by (7.5) and Thouless formula, real parts of $w^\pm(z)$ and $\pm(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln(E - z) dN(E))$ must coincide. Therefore there is a constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$w^\pm(z) = \pm \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln(E - z) dN(E) + ik \right).$$

Thus

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \Im(w^+(z) - w^-(z)) = -N(E) + 2k.$$

By Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2, we have

$$2\hat{\rho}(E) = \rho_1(E) - \rho_2(E) = -N(E) + 2k. \quad (7.11)$$

Thus $\hat{\rho}(E)$ is a continuous non-increasing function, hence it is differentiable at almost every E . Note also that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi_E(\theta) d\theta$ ¹⁹ is analytic in E . Thus $\rho_1(E), \rho_2(E)$ are differentiable for almost every E . By Lemma 7.2, (7.11) and Thouless formula, we have

$$\lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \Im w^+(z) = \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^+(\theta) d\theta + \rho_1(E) = N(E)/2 + k = \hat{\rho}(E), \quad (7.12)$$

which implies that

$$\Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^+(\theta) d\theta = - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi_E(\theta) d\theta.$$

Note that for almost every $E \in \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{sup}$, we have $L_d(E) = 0$, so by (7.12) and Cauchy-Riemann equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1'(E) &= \frac{d \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi_E(\theta) d\theta}{dE} + \hat{\rho}'(E) = - \frac{d \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^+(\theta) d\theta}{dE} + \hat{\rho}'(E) \\ &= \lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^+(\theta) d\theta}{\partial \Im z} - \frac{\partial \Re w^+(z)}{\Im z} = - \lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\widehat{L}_d(z)}{\Im z} \leq 0, \\ \rho_2'(E) &= \frac{d \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi_E(\theta) d\theta}{dE} - \hat{\rho}'(E) = - \frac{d \Im \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_E^+(\theta) d\theta}{dE} - \hat{\rho}'(E) \\ &= \lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^+(\theta) d\theta}{\partial \Im z} - \frac{\partial \Re w^-(z)}{\Im z} = - \lim_{\Im z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\widehat{L}_{d+1}(z)}{\Im z} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use $w^\pm(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln \det M_z^\pm(\theta) d\theta + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^\pm(\theta) d\theta$, $\widehat{L}_d(z) = \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^+(\theta) d\theta$ and $\widehat{L}_{d+1}(z) = \Re \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln m_z^-(\theta) d\theta$. \square

7.2. The infinite-range case. Let $v(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}$ be a real analytic function, and $v_n(\theta) = \sum_{k=-n}^n \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}$ be its n -th truncation. Assume $L_\epsilon^v(E)$ has at least two non-negative turning points $0 \leq \epsilon_1(E) < \epsilon_2(E) < h_1$ (otherwise the argument will be simpler). Since e type I property is stable in the analytical category, there is an open neighborhood Ω_δ of $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}$ such that any $E \in \Omega_\delta$ is a type I energy of $H_{v_n,\alpha,\theta}$ if n is sufficiently large, enabling us to apply the results in the previous subsection.

To specify the dependence on n , in this case, we denote the integrated density of states of $H_{v_n,\alpha,\theta}$ by $N_n(E)$. By continuity of the Lyapunov exponent,

$$L^{v_n}(E) \rightarrow L^v(E), \quad N_n(E) \rightarrow N(E), \quad \forall E \in [\inf \Sigma_{v,\alpha}, \sup \Sigma_{v,\alpha}],$$

uniformly in E .

We denote

$$\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+ = \{E : L(E) > 0\} \cap \{E : \epsilon_1(E) < \epsilon\},$$

where ϵ is sufficiently small so that Theorem 6.1 holds. Note that both $L(E)$ and $\epsilon_1(E)$ are continuous functions, thus $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$ is an open set.

By Theorem 6.1, ϕ_n depends analytically on E and $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ uniformly on $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$. Thus ϕ depends analytically in E on $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$. We also have $C_n \rightarrow C$ where $C \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$.

We now define $\hat{\rho}(E) := \rho(C)$ and

$$\rho_1(E) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta + \hat{\rho}(E), \quad \rho_2(E) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta - \hat{\rho}(E).$$

We will call ρ_1 and ρ_2 the fibered rotation numbers of $\widehat{H}_{v,\alpha,\theta}$.

¹⁹We address the dependence on E here.

Corollary 7.1. *For type I operators $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, there is a constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $E \in \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$, $-2\hat{\rho}(E) = \rho_2(E) - \rho_1(E) = N(E) + k$.*

7.3. Proof of Theorem 2.2. The gist of the proofs of Theorems 2.2, 2.3 is in relation of the IDS and the rotation number of the hidden (limiting) $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycle (α, C) , whose subcriticality obtained in Corollary 6.2 allows to appeal to the results in the universal subcritical regime. Denote

$$\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar} = \{E : \omega(E) = 0\}.$$

By the almost reducibility theorem [5, 6], the above set is open. Moreover, if $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ has no critical regime, then $\Sigma_{v,\alpha} \subset \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar} \cup \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$.

It was proved by Avila [5, 6] that $\rho(E)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar}}$ is absolutely continuous, thus $N(E)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar}} = 1 - 2\rho(E)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar}}$ is absolutely continuous.

On the other hand, since by Corollary 6.2, $L(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L(C)$ for $|\varepsilon| < h$ when $E \in \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$, we have $\hat{\rho}(E)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+} = \rho(C)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+}$ is absolutely continuous [5, 6], and hence by Theorem 7.1, $N(E) = 2\hat{\rho}(E)|_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+}$ is absolutely continuous. \square

7.4. Proof of Theorem 2.3. Since $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+$ is open, it can be written as $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^+ = \cup_i I_i$ where I_i are open intervals, not intersecting $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar}$. Since $H_{v,\alpha,x}$ has only subcritical/supercritical regime, we have $\Sigma_{v,\alpha} \subset \Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar} \cup_{i=1}^m I_i$. Since by Corollary 6.2, $L(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L(C)$ for $|\varepsilon| < h$ when $E \in I_i$, we have $\hat{\rho}(E)|_{I_i} = \rho(C^E)|_{I_i}$ is 1/2-Hölder continuous [5, 6]. $\rho(E)$ is also 1/2 Hölder continuous on $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^{ar}$ [5, 6]. Hence by Theorem 7.1, $N(E)|_{I_i} = 2\hat{\rho}(E)|_{I_i}$ is 1/2-Hölder continuous. \square

8. LOCALIZATION AND REDUCIBILITY: PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

In this section, we establish the reducibility-to-localization type argument for type I operators. First reducibility-to-complete-localization proof was developed by Avila-You-Zhou [14], for the almost Mathieu operator, then made more general in [68], and further improved by Ge-You [41] and Ge-You-Zhao [43] to the arithmetic level. Not only all these arguments start with reducibility for an $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycle, but they also crucially use the identification of its rotation number ρ to (the rotation trajectory of) $\pm\theta$. Both are available only for *even* v . Additionally, if v is not a trigonometric polynomial, there is no dual cocycle to even talk about reducibility. Thus we have to deal with both issues

- (1) When v is not even, there is no arithmetic localization. More importantly, there are two different rotation numbers ρ_1 and ρ_2 , and the previous localization arguments [14, 41, 43] do not work. We will develop several new tools to overcome this.
- (2) We use trigonometric polynomial approximation to establish “reducibility” for the dual infinite-range operator, where one cannot even define reducibility. However, it is well-known that in the finite-range case, reducibility is manifested spectrally through the Bloch waves. We prove that for infinite-range dual operators, Bloch waves still exist, via “continuity of reducibility” obtained in [41, 43].

8.1. Nonperturbative reducibility. Suppose that $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ admits a holomorphic extension to $\{|\Im z| < h\}$. Recall that the cocycle (α, A) is said to be almost reducible if for any $0 < h' < h$ there exists a sequence $B_n \in C_{h'}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, PSL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that $B_n^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)A(\theta)B_n(\theta)$ converges to constant uniformly in $|\Im \theta| < h'$. We have

Theorem 8.1 ([5, 6]). *Any subcritical (α, A) with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $A \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, is almost reducible.*

For every $\tau > 1$ and $\gamma > 0$, we define

$$\Theta_\gamma^\tau := \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mid \|2\theta + k\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq \frac{\gamma}{(|k| + 1)^\tau}, k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}; \Theta := \cup_{\tau > 1, \gamma > 0} \Theta_\gamma^\tau.$$

The following theorem is a direct corollary of Theorem 8.1.

Theorem 8.2 ([14, 43]). *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $h > \beta(\alpha)/2\pi$, $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $L(\alpha, A(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = 0$ for $|\varepsilon| < h$, and $\rho(\alpha, A) \in \Theta$. Then (α, A) is reducible to a constant rotation*

It was further proved in [43] that the conjugation map depends continuously on A .

Theorem 8.3 ([41, 43]). *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, $h > \beta(\alpha)/2\pi$, $A \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ with $L(\alpha, A(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = 0$ for $|\varepsilon| < h$. Then there exist $B(A) \in C_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}}^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, such that*

$$B(x + \alpha)^{-1} A(x) B(x) = R_{\rho(A)}.$$

Moreover, $|B(A)|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}} \leq C$ uniformly and $B(A)$ is continuous on each $\rho^{-1}(\Theta_\gamma^\tau)$ in $\|\cdot\|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}}$.

Remark 8.1. Note that [41] (in case of $\beta(\alpha) = 0$), [43] (in case of $\beta(\alpha) > 0$) proved the above theorem for Schrödinger cocycles, but they work for any $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycle, without any change of the proof.

We define

$$Sp_{2d \times 2}(\mathbb{C}) = \{F \in M_{2d \times 2}(\mathbb{C}) : F^* S F = J\}, \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Corollary 8.1. *Assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, v is a real trigonometric polynomial of degree d , $\omega(E) = 1$ with $L(E) > \beta(\alpha)$ and $\hat{\rho}(E) \in \Theta$. Then there exist $F \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, Sp_{2d \times 2}(\mathbb{C}))$, and $R_{\hat{\rho}(E)} \in SO(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta) F(\theta) = F(\theta + \alpha) e^{2\pi i \hat{\phi}(0)} R_{\hat{\rho}(E)},$$

where $\hat{\phi}(0) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \phi(\theta) d\theta$.

Proof. Fix E as above. By Corollary 6.2, for any $0 < h < L(E)/2\pi$, there exist linearly independent $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}^{2d})$, and $\phi \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $C \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ such that

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)(\tilde{u}(\theta), \tilde{v}(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}(\theta + \alpha), \tilde{v}(\theta + \alpha)) e^{2\pi i \phi(\theta)} C(\theta).$$

Moreover,

$$\tilde{u}(\theta)^* S \tilde{v}(\theta) = 1, \quad L_1(C(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_1(C) = 0, \quad \forall |\varepsilon| < h.$$

We define $\psi(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} e^{2\pi i k \theta}$ where

$$\hat{\psi}(k) = \frac{\hat{\phi}(k)}{e^{2\pi i k \alpha} - 1}. \quad (8.1)$$

Since $h > \beta(\alpha)/2\pi$, it is easy to check that $\psi \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\psi(\theta + \alpha) - \psi(\theta) = \phi(\theta) - \hat{\phi}(0)$.

On the other hand, by Theorem 8.2, there is $B \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ and $R \in SO(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$B(\theta + \alpha)^{-1}C(\theta)B(\theta) = R_{\hat{\rho}(E)}.$$

Finally, we define

$$F(\theta) = (\tilde{u}(\theta), \tilde{v}(\theta))B^{-1}(\theta)e^{2\pi i\psi(\theta)}. \quad (8.2)$$

Then one can check that $F \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, Sp_{2d \times 2}(\mathbb{C}))$ and

$$\widehat{A}_E(\theta)F(\theta) = F(\theta + \alpha)e^{2\pi i\hat{\phi}(0)}R_{\hat{\rho}(E)}.$$

□

8.2. Nonperturbative localization. Recall that $v(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}$ is a real analytic function and $v_n(\theta) = \sum_{k=-d}^d \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k x}$ is its n -th truncation. Let

$$\Sigma_{v, \alpha}^\beta = \{E \in \Sigma_{v, \alpha} : L(E) > \beta(\alpha) \geq 0\}.$$

For every $\tau > 1$ and $\gamma > 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau = \Sigma_{v, \alpha}^\beta \cap \{E \in \mathbb{R} : \hat{\rho}(E) \in \Theta_\gamma^\tau\}.$$

Note that for any $E \in \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau$, by Theorem 8.3, $(\alpha, e^{2\pi i\phi}C)$ is reducible, where $(\alpha, e^{2\pi i\phi}C)$ is the cocycle defined in Theorem 6.1. Hence $\hat{\rho}'(E)$ exists (since $\hat{\rho}(E) = \rho(C)$). Take E_n such that $\hat{\rho}_n(E_n) = \hat{\rho}(E)$ where $\hat{\rho}_n(E_n) = \rho(C_n)$ and (α, C_n) corresponds to the center of the cocycle $(\alpha, \widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n})$. By Theorem 6.1 for E_n , we have

$$|\hat{\rho}_n(E_n) - \hat{\rho}(E_n)| \leq C e^{-\delta n}.$$

Since $\hat{\rho}_n(E_n) = \hat{\rho}(E)$, we have

$$|\hat{\rho}(E_n) - \hat{\rho}(E)| \leq C e^{-\delta n},$$

Since $\hat{\rho}'(E)$ exists, for n sufficiently large.

$$|E - E_n| \leq C e^{-\delta n}.$$

Thus for any $0 < h < L^v(E)/2\pi$, by continuity of the Lyapunov exponent, we have $0 < h < L^{v_n}(E_n)$. By Theorem 6.1, there exist $\phi_n \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $C_n \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$, satisfying Corollary 6.2 with $\widehat{A}_E(\theta) = \widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n}(\theta)$ such that

$$|\phi_n - \phi|_h, |C_n - C|_h \leq e^{-\delta|n|}, \quad (8.3)$$

and

$$L_1(C_n(\cdot + i\varepsilon)) = L_1(C_n), \quad \forall |\varepsilon| < h.$$

By Theorem 8.3, there is a sequence $B_n \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $B \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$B_n^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)C_n(\theta)B_n(\theta) = R_{\hat{\rho}_n(E_n)} = R_{\hat{\rho}(E)},$$

with

$$|B_n - B|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (8.4)$$

and

$$B^{-1}(\theta + \alpha)C(\theta)B(\theta) = R_{\hat{\rho}(E)}.$$

By Theorem 6.1, we have

$$\widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n}(\tilde{u}_n(\theta), \tilde{v}_n(\theta)) = (\tilde{u}_n(\theta + \alpha), \tilde{v}_n(\theta + \alpha))e^{2\pi i\phi_n(\theta)}C_n(\theta).$$

If we denote

$$\tilde{u}_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} u_n(n-1, \theta) \\ u_n(n-2, \theta) \\ \vdots \\ u_n(-n, \theta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{v}_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} v_n(n-1, \theta) \\ v_n(n-2, \theta) \\ \vdots \\ v_n(-n, \theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

then there is $u(0, \theta), v(0, \theta) \in C_h^\omega(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$|u_n(0, \theta) - u(0, \theta)|_h, \quad |v_n(0, \theta) - v(0, \theta)|_h \leq Ce^{-\delta n}. \quad (8.5)$$

By Corollary 8.1, there exist $F_n \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, Sp_{2d \times 2}(\mathbb{C}))$ such that

$$\widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n}(\theta) F_n(\theta) = F_n(\theta + \alpha) e^{2\pi i \hat{\phi}_n(0)} R_{\hat{\rho}(E)}. \quad (8.6)$$

Moreover, by (8.2), we have

$$F_n(\theta) = (\tilde{u}_n(\theta), \tilde{v}_n(\theta)) B_n^{-1}(\theta) e^{2\pi i \psi_n(\theta)}.$$

By (8.1) and (8.3), we have

$$|\psi_n - \psi|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}} < Ce^{-\delta n}. \quad (8.7)$$

Let

$$F_n(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{11}^n(\theta) & f_{12}^n(\theta) \\ f_{21}^n(\theta) & f_{22}^n(\theta) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ f_{2n,1}^n(\theta) & f_{2n,2}^n(\theta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (8.4), (8.5) and (8.7), for $j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{nj}^n - f_j|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}} &\leq C(|u_n(0, \theta) - u(0, \theta)|_h + |v_n(0, \theta) - v(0, \theta)|_h \\ &\quad + |B_n - B|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}} + |\psi_n - \psi|_{\frac{h-\beta/2\pi}{6}}) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (8.8)$$

where

$$(f_1(\theta), f_2(\theta)) = (u(0, \theta), v(0, \theta)) B^{-1}(\theta) e^{2\pi i \psi(\theta)}.$$

We now define vector-valued functions $u_E, v_E : \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ as the following,

$$u_E(n) = \frac{\hat{f}(n)}{\|f\|_{L^2}} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) e^{2\pi i n \theta} d\theta}{\|f\|_{L^2}}, \quad v_E(n) = \frac{\hat{g}(n)}{\|g\|_{L^2}} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(\theta) e^{2\pi i n \theta} d\theta}{\|g\|_{L^2}}, \quad (8.9)$$

where

$$f(\theta) = \frac{if_1(\theta) - f_2(\theta)}{2i}, \quad g(\theta) = \frac{if_1(\theta) + f_2(\theta)}{2i}.$$

Theorem 8.4. *We have that $\{u_E(n)\}$ is an eigenfunction of $H_{v, \alpha, \rho_1(E)}$ and $\{v_E(n)\}$ is an eigenfunction of $H_{v, \alpha, \rho_2(E)}$, both with the eigenvalue E .*

Proof. We define

$$h_{k,j}^n(\theta) = \frac{if_{k,1}^n(\theta) + (-1)^j f_{k,2}^n(\theta)}{2i}.$$

By the definition of $\widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n}$ and (8.6), one has for $j = 1, 2$,

$$-\frac{1}{\hat{v}_n} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2n} \hat{v}_{n-k} h_{k,j}^n(\theta) + (E_n - 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta)) h_{n,j}^n(\theta) \right) - e^{2\pi i \rho_j^n(E_n)} h_{1,j}^n(\theta + \alpha) = 0, \quad (8.10)$$

$$h_{k,j}^n(\theta) = h_{k+1,j}^n(\theta + \alpha)e^{2\pi i \rho_j^n(E_n)}, \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2n-1, \quad (8.11)$$

where $\rho_j^n(E_n)$ ($j = 1, 2$) is the rotation number of $(\alpha, \widehat{S}_{E_n}^{v_n})$.

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (8.10), (8.11) (8.3) and (8.8) that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k \rho_j(E)} h_j(\theta + k\alpha) + (E - 2 \cos 2\pi(\theta)) h_j(\theta) = 0, \quad (8.12)$$

where $h_1 = f$ and $h_2 = g$. Taking the Fourier transform of (8.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k(\rho_1(E) + n\alpha)} \hat{f}(n) + \hat{f}(n+1) + \hat{f}(n-1) &= E \hat{f}(n), \\ \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{v}_k e^{2\pi i k(\rho_2(E) + n\alpha)} \hat{g}(n) + \hat{g}(-n+1) + \hat{g}(-n-1) &= E \hat{g}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{u_E(n)\}$ is an eigenfunction of $H_{v,\alpha,\rho_1(E)}$ and $\{v_E(n)\}$ is an eigenfunction of $H_{v,\alpha,\rho_2(E)}$, corresponding to eigenvalue E . \square

Fix $\tau > 1$. For $j = 1, 2$, we let

$$\tilde{\Theta}_j^\tau = \{\rho_j(E) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}} : E \in \cup_\gamma \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau\}, \quad \tilde{\Theta}^\tau = \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \cup \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau.$$

For any fixed $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}^\tau$, we define

$$E(\theta) = \begin{cases} \rho_1^{-1}(\theta) & \theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \\ \rho_2^{-1}(\theta) & \theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \\ \rho_1^{-1}(\theta) \cup \rho_2^{-1}(\theta) & \theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \cap \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \\ \emptyset & \theta \notin \tilde{\Theta} \end{cases}.$$

Note that by Proposition 8.4, $E(\theta)$ is a set that contains at most countably many elements. Set $T\theta = \theta + \alpha$. We also denote by $E_m(\theta) = E(T^m\theta)$.

Definition 8.1. ν_θ is defined as:

$$\nu_\theta = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{E \in E_k(\theta)} |e_E(0)|^2$$

where for any $E \in E_k(\theta)$,

$$|e_E(0)|^2 = \begin{cases} |u_E(0)|^2 & T^k\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \\ |v_E(0)|^2 & T^k\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \\ |u_E(0)|^2 + |v_E(0)|^2 & T^k\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \cap \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \\ 0 & T^k\theta \notin \tilde{\Theta} \end{cases}.$$

It's easy to check that $\nu_\theta = \nu_{T\theta}$, thus for a.e. θ , $\nu_\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \nu_\theta d\theta$.

Lemma 8.1. We have $\nu_\theta = |N(\Sigma_{v,\alpha})|$ for a.e. θ .

Proof. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $P_k(\theta)$ be the spectral projection of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ onto the eigenspace corresponding to eigenvalues $E_k(\theta)$. By the definition of $E_k(\theta)$ and Proposition 8.4, for any $E \in E_k(\theta)$, $\{u_E(n)\}$ or $\{v_E(n)\}$ is a normalized eigenfunction

of $H_{v,\alpha,T^k\theta}$, thus $T_{-k}u_E(n)$ or $T_{-k}v_E(n)$ ²⁰ is a normalized eigenfunction of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$. Now we define a projection operator for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$P(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} P_k(\theta).$$

Note that $E_k(\theta) \cap E_\ell(\theta) = \emptyset$ for $k \neq \ell$ and thus $P_k(\theta)$ are mutually orthogonal. It follows that $P(\theta)$ is a projection. Moreover, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \nu_\theta d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle P(\theta)\delta_0, \delta_0 \rangle d\theta = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle P_k(\theta)\delta_0, \delta_0 \rangle d\theta = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle P_k(T^{-k}\theta)\delta_0, \delta_0 \rangle d\theta.$$

Since $T_k H_{v,\alpha,T^{-k}\theta} T_{-k} = H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ and $E_k(T^{-k}\theta) = E(\theta)$, for any $E \in E(\theta)$, we have

$$H_{v,\alpha,T^{-k}\theta} T_{-k} u_E(n) = T_{-k} H_{v,\alpha,\theta} u_E(n) = E T_{-k} u_E(n) = E T_{-k} u_E(n).$$

It follows that $T_{-k}u_E(n)$ or $T_{-k}v_E(n)$ belongs to the range of $P_k(T^{-k}\theta)$, thus

$$\langle P_k(T^{-k}\theta)\delta_0, \delta_k \rangle = \sum_{E \in E(\theta)} |\langle T_{-k}e_E(n), \delta_0 \rangle|^2 = \sum_{E \in E(\theta)} |e_E(k)|^2.$$

For any $E \in E(\theta)$, both u_E and v_E are normalized eigenfunctions, i.e.,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_E(k)|^2 = 1, \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |v_E(k)|^2 = 1.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \nu_\theta d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{E \in E(\theta)} |e_E(k)|^2 d\theta = \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau} |E(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau} |E(\theta)| d\theta$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of a set.

Since both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are absolutely continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\cup_{\gamma>0} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau} \rho'_1(E) dE + \int_{\cup_{\gamma>0} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau} \rho'_2(E) dE = - \int_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta} \rho'_1(E) dE + \int_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta} \rho'_2(E) dE \\ & = \int_{\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta} N'(E) dE = N(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta). \end{aligned}$$

By (1) of Theorem 7.1, and the continuity of B_n , we have

$$\hat{\rho}'(E) = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|B(\theta)\|_{HS} d\theta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|B_n(\theta)\|_{HS} d\theta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\rho}'_n(E_n).$$

Moreover, $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ uniformly, depending analytically on E , thus

$$\frac{d\hat{\phi}_n(0)}{dE}(E_n) \rightarrow \frac{d\hat{\phi}(0)}{dE}(E).$$

Hence

$$\rho'_1(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_1^n)'(E_n) \leq 0, \quad \rho'_2(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_2^n)'(E_n) \geq 0.$$

²⁰ T_{-k} is a translation defined by $T_{-k}u(n) := u(n+k)$.

Notice that there exist $\{I_j\}$ where $I_j = (a_j, b_j)$ are disjoint open intervals such that $\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta \subset \cup_{j=1}^\infty I_j$. By the definition of $E(\theta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau} |E(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau} |E(\theta)| d\theta \\
&= \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau} |\rho_1^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau \setminus \tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau} |\rho_2^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau \cap \tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau} |\rho_1^{-1}(\theta)| + |\rho_2^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta \\
&= \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau} |\rho_1^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau} |\rho_2^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \chi_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau}(\theta) |\rho_1^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \chi_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau}(\theta) |\rho_2^{-1}(\theta)| d\theta \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\rho_1(a_j)}^{\rho_1(b_j)} \chi_{\tilde{\Theta}_1^\tau}(\theta) |\rho_1^{-1}(\theta) \cap (a_j, b_j)| d\theta + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\rho_2(a_j)}^{\rho_2(b_j)} \chi_{\tilde{\Theta}_2^\tau}(\theta) |\rho_2^{-1}(\theta) \cap (a_j, b_j)| d\theta \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{a_j}^{b_j} \chi_{\cup_{\gamma>0} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau}(E) |\rho'_1(E)| dE + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{a_j}^{b_j} \chi_{\cup_{\gamma>0} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^\tau}(E) |\rho'_2(E)| dE = |N(\Sigma_{v,\alpha})|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of (2) of Theorem 2.1: Note that

$$|N(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)| = \nu_\theta \leq |\mu_\theta^{pp}(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)| \leq |\mu_\theta(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)|,$$

where μ_θ is the spectral measure of $H_{v,\alpha,\theta}$ defined by

$$\langle \delta_0, \chi_B(H_{v,\alpha,\theta}) \delta_0 \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_B d\mu_\theta.$$

Moreover, $\int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mu_\theta(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)| d\theta = |N(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)|$. It follows that $|\mu_\theta(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)| = |\mu_\theta^{pp}(\Sigma_{v,\alpha}^\beta)|$ for a.e. θ . This completes the proof. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

L. Ge was partially supported by NSFC grant (12371185) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (the start-up fund), Peking University. SJ's work was supported by NSF DMS-2052899, DMS-2155211, and Simons 896624. She is also grateful to School of Mathematics at Georgia Institute of Technology where a part of this work was done. We would like to thank A. Avila, J. You and Q. Zhou for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Hadj Amor. Hölder continuity of the rotation number for quasi-periodic co-cycles in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **287(2)** (2009), 565-588.
- [2] S. Aubry and G. André. Analyticity breaking and Anderson localization in incommensurate lattices. *Ann. Israeli Phys. Soc.* **3** (1980), 133-164.
- [3] A. Avila. The absolutely continuous spectrum of the almost Mathieu operator. arXiv:0810.2965.
- [4] A. Avila. Global theory of one-frequency Schrödinger operators. *Acta Math.* **215** (2015), 1-54.
- [5] A. Avila. Almost reducibility and absolute continuity I. arXiv:1006.0704.

- [6] A. Avila. KAM, Lyapunov exponents, and the spectral dichotomy for typical one-frequency Schrodinger operators. arXiv:2307.11071.
- [7] A. Avila and D. Damanik. Absolute continuity of the integrated density of states for the almost Mathieu operator with non-critical coupling. *Invent. Math.* **172**(2) (2008), 439-453.
- [8] A. Avila, B. Fayad and R. Krikorian. A KAM Scheme for $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ cocycles with Liouvillean frequencies. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **21** (2011), 1001-1019.
- [9] A. Avila and S. Jitomirskaya, The Ten Martini Problem. *Ann. of Math.* **170** (2009) 303-342.
- [10] A. Avila and S. Jitomirskaya. Almost localization and almost reducibility. *J. Eur. Math. Soc* **12** (2010), 93-131.
- [11] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya and C. Sadel. Complex one-frequency cocycles. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **16** (2014), 1915-1935.
- [12] A. Avila and R. Krikorian. Reducibility or non-uniform hyperbolicity for quasiperiodic Schrödinger cocycles. *Ann. of Math.*, **164** (2006), 911-940.
- [13] A. Avila, Y. Last, M. Shamis and Q. Zhou. On the abominable properties of the almost Mathieu operator with well approximated frequencies. *Duke. Math. J.* **173** (2024), 603-672.
- [14] A. Avila, J. You and Q. Zhou. Sharp phase transitions for the almost Mathieu operator. *Duke Math. J.* **14** (2017), 2697-2718.
- [15] A. Avila, J. You and Q. Zhou. Dry Ten martini problem for noncritical almost Mathieu operator. arXiv:2306.16254.
- [16] J.E. Avron, D. Osadchy and R. Seiler. A topological look at the quantum Hall effect. *Physics today.* (2003), 38-42.
- [17] J. Avron and B. Simon. Singular continuous spectrum for a class of almost periodic Jacobi matrices. *Bulletin of the American mathematical society* **6**(1) (1982), 81-85.aj
- [18] J. Bourgain. Green's function estimates for lattice Schrödinger operators and applications. *Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.* **158** (2005).
- [19] J. Bourgain. Hölder regularity of integrated density of states for the almost Mathieu operator in a perturbative regime. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **51**, 83-118 (2000).
- [20] J. Bourgain, M. Goldstein. On nonperturbative localization with quasiperiodic potential, *Ann. of Math.* **152** (2000), 835-879.
- [21] J. Bourgain and S. Jitomirskaya. Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential. *J. Stat. Phys.* **108** (2002), 1203-1218.
- [22] J. Bourgain and S. Jitomirskaya. Absolutely continuous spectrum for 1D quasiperiodic operators, *Invent. Math.* **148** (2002), 453-463.
- [23] J, Bellissard, R. Lima and D. Testard. A metal-insulator transition for the almost Mathieu model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **88** (1983), 207234.
- [24] A. Cai, C. Chavaudret, J. You, Q. Zhou. Sharp Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent of finitely differentiable quasi-periodic cocycles. *Math. Z.* 291, 931-958 (2019).
- [25] M. Choi, G. Elliott and N. Yui. Gauss polynomials and the rotation algebra. *Invent. Math.* **99** (1990), 225-246.

- [26] H. Cao, Y. Shi and Z. Zhang. Localization and regularity of the integrated density of states for Schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^d with C^2 -cosine like quasi-periodic potentials. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **404** (2023), 495-561.
- [27] H. Cao, Y. Shi and Z. Zhang. On the spectrum of quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators on \mathbb{Z}^d with C^2 -cosine type potentials. arXiv:2310.07407.
- [28] D. Damanik. Schrödinger operators with dynamically defined potentials. *Ergod. Theor. Dyn. Syst.* **37(6)** (2017), 1681-1764.
- [29] E. Dinaburg and Ya. Sinai. The one dimensional Schrödinger equation with a quasi-periodic potential. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **9** (1975), 279-289.
- [30] L. H. Eliasson. Reducibility and point spectrum for linear quasi-periodic skew products, Doc. Math, Extra volume ICM 1998 II, 779–787.
- [31] B. Fayad and R. Krikorian. Rigidity results for quasiperiodic $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -cocycles. *J. Mod. Dyn.* **3** (2009), 497-510.
- [32] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, and P. Wittwer. Localization for a class of one dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **132** (1990), 5-25.
- [33] Y. Forman and T. Vandenboom. Localization and Cantor spectrum for quasiperiodic discrete Schrödinger operators with asymmetric, smooth, cosine-like sampling functions. arXiv:2107.05461v1.
- [34] S. Ganeshan, J. H. Pixley and S. Das Sarma. Nearest neighbor tight binding models with an exact mobilityedge in one dimension. *Physical Review Letters* **114(14)** (2015), 146601.
- [35] L. Ge. On the almost reducibility conjecture. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **34** (2024), 32-59.
- [36] L. Ge. Kotani theory for minimal finite-range operator. Preprint.
- [37] L. Ge, S. Jitomirskaya and J. You. Kotani theory, Puig’s argument and stability of The Ten Martini Problem. arXiv:2308.09321.
- [38] L. Ge, S. Jitomirskaya and J. You. In preparation.
- [39] L. Ge, S. Jitomirskaya, J. You and Q. Zhou. Multiplicative Jensen’s formula and quantitative global theory of one-frequency Schrödinger operators. arXiv:2306.16387.
- [40] L. Ge, S. Jitomirskaya and X. Zhao. Stability of the Non-Critical Spectral Properties I: Arithmetic Absolute Continuity of the Integrated Density of States. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **402(1)** (2023), 213–229.
- [41] L. Ge and J. You. Arithmetic version of Anderson localization via reducibility. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **30(5)** (2020), 1370-1401.
- [42] L. Ge, J. You and X. Zhao. Hölder regularity of the integrated density of states for quasi-periodic long-range operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **392** (2022), 347-376.
- [43] L. Ge, J. You and X. Zhao. Arithmetic version of anderson localization for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators with even cosine type potentials. arXiv:2107.08547.
- [44] L. Ge, J. You and Q. Zhou. Exponential dynamical localization: Criterion and applications. *Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Super. (4)* **56**, (2023), 91-126.
- [45] L. Ge, J. You and Q. Zhou. Structured quantitative almost reducibility and its applications. arXiv:2407.05490.
- [46] L. Ge, X. Xu and Y. Wang. The Dry Ten Martini Problem for C^2 costype quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. Preprint.

- [47] A.Y. Gordon. The point spectrum of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk.* **31** (1976), 257-258.
- [48] A.Y. Gordon, S. Jitomirskaya, Y. Last and B. Simon. Duality and singular continuous spectrum in the almost Mathieu equation. *Acta Math.* **178** (1997), 169-183.
- [49] M. Goldstein and W. Schlag. Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations and averages of shifts of subharmonic functions. *Ann. of Math.* **154(1)** (2001), 155-203.
- [50] M. Goldstein and W. Schlag. Fine properties of the integrated density of states and a quantitative separation property of the Dirichlet eigenvalues. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **18** (2008), 755-869.
- [51] B.I. Halperin. Quantized Hall conductance, current-carrying edge states, and the existence of extended states in a two-dimensional disordered potential. *Phys. Rev. B* **25** (1982), 2185.
- [52] P.G. Harper. Single band motion of conduction electrons in a uniform magnetic field. *Pro. Phys. Soc.* **68(10)** (1955), 874-878.
- [53] A. Haro and J. Puig. A Thouless formula and Aubry duality for long-range Schrödinger skew-products. *Nonlinearity* **26(5)** (2013), 1163-1187.
- [54] R. Han. Dry Ten Martini Problem for the non-self-dual extended Harper's model. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **370** (2018), 197-217.
- [55] R. Han, S. Jitomirskaya and F. Yang, Anti-resonances and sharp analysis of Maryland localization for all parameters. arXiv:2205.04021.
- [56] Han R., Sharp localization on the first supercritical stratum for Liouville frequencies. arXiv:2405.07810.
- [57] R. Han and W. Schlag. Avila's acceleration via zeros of determinants, and applications to Schrödinger cocycles. arXiv:2212.05988.
- [58] M. Herman. Une méthode pour minorer les exposants de Lyapounov et quelques exemples montrant le caractère local d'un théorème d'Arnol'd et de Moser sur le tore de dimension 2. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **58(3)** (1983), 453-502.
- [59] H. Hiramoto and M. Kohmoto. Scaling analysis of quasiperiodic systems: Generalized harper model. *Physical Review B* **40(12)** (1989), 8225.
- [60] X. Hou and J. You. Almost reducibility and non-perturbative reducibility of quasiperiodic linear systems. *Invent. Math.* **190** (2012), 209-260.
- [61] O. Hurtado, A "lifting" method for exponential large deviation estimates and an application to certain non-stationary 1D lattice Anderson models, *J. Math. Phys.* **64**, 061902 (2023)
- [62] S. Jitomirskaya. Anderson localization for the almost Mathieu equation: a nonperturbative proof. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **165** (1994), no. 1, 49 – 57.
- [63] S. Jitomirskaya. Almost everything about the almost Mathieu operator, II in Proc. of XI Int. Congress of Math. Physics. *Int. Press, Somerville, Mass.* (1995), 373-382.
- [64] S. Jitomirskaya. Metal-Insulator Transition for the almost Mathieu operator. *Ann. of Math.* **150** (1999), 1159-1175.
- [65] S. Jitomirskaya. Singular continuous spectrum for critical almost Mathieu operators. To appear in *Advances in Mathematics*.
- [66] S. Jitomirskaya. One-dimensional quasiperiodic operators: global theory, duality, and sharp analysis of small denominators. ICM 2022, Plenary Lectures, 1090-1120.

- [67] S. Jitomirskaya. Dual Lyapunov exponents and operators of type I, to appear in Proceedings of $(WM)^2$ 22.
- [68] S. Jitomirskaya and I. Kachkovskiy. All couplings localization for quasiperiodic operators with monotone potentials, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **21** (2019), 777 – 795.
- [69] S. Jitomirskaya and I. Kachkovskiy. L^2 -reducibility and localization for quasiperiodic operators. *Math. Res. Lett.* **23** (2016), 431-444.
- [70] S. Jitomirskaya and I. Kachkovskiy. Sharp arithmetic localization for quasiperiodic operators with monotone potentials. arXiv:2407.00703.
- [71] S. Jitomirskaya, D.A. Koslover, M.S. Schulteis, Localization for a family of one-dimensional quasiperiodic operators of magnetic origin, *Ann. Henri Poincare* **6** (2005), 103–124.
- [72] S. Jitomirskaya and W. Liu. Universal hierarchical structure of quasi-periodic eigenfunctions. *Ann. of Math.* **187(3)** (2018), 721-776.
- [73] S. Jitomirskaya and W. Liu. Universal reflective-hierarchical structure of quasiperiodic eigenfunctions and sharp spectral transition in phase. To appear JEMS.
- [74] S. Jitomirskaya, W. Liu, Y. Shi, Anderson localization for multi-frequency quasiperiodic operators on \mathbb{Z}^d . *Geom. Funct. Anal.* (2020), 2, 457–481.
- [75] S. Jitomirskaya, W. Liu, S. Zhang, Arithmetic spectral transitions, IAS/Park City Mathematics Series: Harmonic Analysis and Applications **27**, 35-72.
- [76] S. Jitomirskaya and C.A. Marx. Analytic quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators and rational approximants. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **22** (2012), 1407-1443.
- [77] S. Jitomirskaya and C.A. Marx. Analytic quasi-periodic cocycles with singularities and the Lyapunov exponent of extended Harper’s model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **316** (2012), 237-267.
- [78] S. Jitomirskaya and B. Simon. Operators with singular continuous spectrum. III. Almost periodic Schrödinger operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **165** (1994), 201-205.
- [79] S. Jitomirskaya and F. Yang. *Singular continuous spectrum for singular potentials*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **351** (2017), 1127 – 1135.
- [80] S. Jitomirskaya and X. Zhu. Large deviations of the Lyapunov exponent and localization for the 1D Anderson model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **370** 1, 311324 (2019)
- [81] R. Johnson and J. Moser. The rotation number for almost periodic potentials. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **84**(1982), 403-438.
- [82] I. Kachkovskiy. Localization for quasiperiodic operators with unbounded monotone potentials, *J. Funct. Anal.* **277** (2019), no. 10, 3467 – 3490.
- [83] J. Kerdrboon and X. Zhu, Anderson Localization for Schrödinger Operators with Monotone Potentials over Circle Homeomorphisms, arxiv 2305.17599
- [84] S. Kotani. Generalized Floquet theory for stationary Schrödinger operators in one dimension. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **8(11)** (1997), 1817-1854.
- [85] S. Kotani and B. Simon. Stochastic Schrödinger Operators and Jacobi Matrices on the strip. *Comm. Math. Phys* **119** (1988), 403-429.
- [86] Y. Last. A relation between a.c. spectrum of ergodic Jacobi matrices and the spectra of periodic approximants. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **151**, 183–192 (1993).
- [87] Y. Last. Zero measure spectrum for the almost Mathieu operator. *Communications in mathematical physics*, **164**, 421–432, (1994).
- [88] W. Liu. Distributions of resonances of supercritical quasi-periodic operators. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* to appear.

- [89] W. Liu. Small denominators and large numerators of quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. To appear in Peking Math. J.
- [90] W. Liu and X. Yuan. Anderson localization for the almost Mathieu operator in the exponential regime. *J. Spectr. Theory* **5** (2015), 89-112.
- [91] X. Li, J. You, and Q. Zhou, Exact local distribution of the absolutely continuous spectral measure, Preprint
- [92] X. Ni, K. Chen, M. Weiner, D. J. Apigo, C. Prodan, A. Alù, E. Prodan, A. B. Khanikaev. Observation of Hofstadter butterfly and topological edge states in reconfigurable quasi-periodic acoustic crystals *Communications Physics* **2** 55 (2019).
- [93] Q. Niu, D.J. Thouless and Y.S. Wu. Quantized Hall conductance as a topological invariant. *Phys.Rev. B* **31** (1985), 3372.
- [94] J. Puig. Cantor spectrum for the almost Mathieu operator. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 244 (2004), 297-309.
- [95] J. Puig. A non-perturbative Eliasson's reducibility theorem. *Nonlinearity* **19**(2) (2006), 355-376.
- [96] R. Peierls. Zur theorie des diamagnetismus von leitungselektronen. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **80**(11-12)(1933), 763-791.
- [97] N. Rangamani. Exponential Dynamical Localization for Random Word Models. *Annales Henri Poincaré* **23** (2022), 4171-4193.
- [98] A. Rauh. Degeneracy of Landau levels in crystals. *Phys. Status Solidi B* **65** (1974), 131-135.
- [99] B. Simon. Fifteen problems in mathematical physics. *Perspectives in Mathematics: Anniversary of Oberwolfach* (1984), 423-454.
- [100] B. Simon. Schrödinger operators in the twenty-first century. *Mathematical Physics Imp. Coll. Press, London* (2000), 283-288.
- [101] Ya. G. Sinai. *Anderson localization for one-dimensional difference Schrödinger operator with quasi-periodic potential*. *J. Stat. Phys.* **46** (1987), 861-909.
- [102] C. Soukoulis and E. Economou. Localization in one-dimensional lattices in the presence of incommensurate potentials. *Physical Review Letters* **48**(15) (1982), 1043.
- [103] Y. Wang, X. Xia, J. You, Z. Zheng and Q. Zhou. Exact mobility edge for 1D quasiperiodic models. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **401** (2023), 2521-2567.
- [104] J. Wang, X. Xu, J. You and Q. Zhou. Absolute continuity of the integrated density of states in the localized regime. arXiv:2305.00457.
- [105] J. You. Quantitative almost reducibility and its applications, *Proceedings of ICM 2018*.
- [106] J. You and Q. Zhou. Embedding of analytic quasi-periodic cocycles into analytic quasi-periodic linear systems and its applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **323** (2013), 975-1005.
- [107] X. Zhu, Localization for random CMV matrices, *Journal of Approximation Theory*, Volume 298, 2024,106008

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

Email address: `gelingrui@bicmr.pku.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CA 94720, USA.

Email address: `sjitomi@berkeley.edu`