

ON THE TIME-DECAY OF SOLUTIONS ARISING FROM PERIODICALLY FORCED DIRAC HAMILTONIANS

JOSEPH KRAISLER, AMIR SAGIV, AND MICHAEL I. WEINSTEIN

ABSTRACT. There is increased interest in time-dependent (non-autonomous) Hamiltonians, stemming in part from the active field of Floquet quantum materials. Despite this, dispersive time-decay bounds, which reflect energy transport in such systems, have received little attention.

We study the dynamics of non-autonomous, time-periodically forced, Dirac Hamiltonians: $i\partial_t\alpha = \mathcal{D}(t)\alpha$, where $\mathcal{D}(t) = i\sigma_3\partial_x + \nu(t)$ is time-periodic but not spatially localized. For the special case $\nu(t) = m\sigma_1$, which models a relativistic particle of constant mass m , one has a dispersive decay bound: $\|\alpha(t, x)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Previous analyses of Schrödinger Hamiltonians (e.g. [4, 30, 31]) suggest that this decay bound persists for small, spatially-localized and time-periodic $\nu(t)$. However, we show that this is not necessarily the case if $\nu(t)$ is not spatially localized. Specifically, we study two non-autonomous Dirac models whose time-evolution (and monodromy operator) is constructed via Fourier analysis. In a rotating mass model, the dispersive decay bound is of the same type as for the constant mass model. However, in a model with a periodically alternating sign of the mass, the results are quite different. By stationary-phase analysis of the associated Fourier representation, we display initial data for which the L_x^∞ time-decay rate are considerably slower: $\mathcal{O}(t^{-1/3})$ or even $\mathcal{O}(t^{-1/5})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the dynamics of non-autonomous, time-periodically forced Dirac equations

$$i\partial_t\alpha(t, x) = (i\sigma_3\partial_x + \nu(t))\alpha(t, x), \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\alpha(0, x) = f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2), \quad (1.1b)$$

Here $\nu(t)$ is a bounded T -periodic 2×2 Hermitian matrix-valued function, and σ_3 is the standard Pauli matrix; see (3.2). Note that the $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ norm is constant along solutions of (1.1), i.e.,

$$\|\alpha(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} = \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad (1.2)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. We investigate (for different choices of $\nu(t)$) whether, in what sense, and at what rate, solutions of the initial value problem (1.1) decay as time advances.

The simplest cases are perhaps misleading: when $\nu(t)$ commutes with $\sigma_3\partial_x$, i.e., when $\nu(t)$ is diagonal, then

$$\alpha(t, \cdot) = e^{i\int_0^t \nu(s) ds} e^{\sigma_3\partial_x t} f, \quad (1.3)$$

and the components of α are right- and left- traveling waves, each multiplied by a time-dependent phase. Each traveling wave propagates to infinity without distortion. Clearly (1.2) still holds, but the solution does not exhibit *dispersive time-decay*, e.g. a decay of its $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ norm as $t \rightarrow \infty$.¹

¹It is true, however, that for any spatially-localized initial data f , the amplitude tends to zero on any fixed compact set, due to the non-autonomous version of RAGE theorem [19]. This result, however, does not describe the rate of decay.

Our goal in this paper is to study time-parametrically forced Dirac equations (1.1) which exhibit dispersive decay and, in particular, to develop a quantitative understanding of the possible rates of decay. In view of the above example, *we focus on cases where*

$$[\nu(t), i\partial_x\sigma_3] \neq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

for a non-negligible set of $t \in [0, T]$. Best known is the case $\nu(t) = m\sigma_1$, which models a relativistic particle of constant mass m . Noncommutativity of σ_1 and σ_3 forbids factorization as in (1.3), but the initial-value problem can nevertheless be solved in this constant coefficient case by Fourier transform; if the initial conditions are sufficiently smooth, then one has “dispersive time-decay estimate” $\|\alpha(x, t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ [25].

But what if $\nu(t)$ is non-constant in time and does not commute with σ_3 ? This class of models arises in as the effective (homogenized) dynamics of Floquet materials, an emergent and very active area in the fields of condensed matter physics [10], photonics [43], and acoustics [55]; see the discussion below in Section 1.2. An understanding of dispersive decay rates for this class of Hamiltonians, $\mathcal{D}(t)$, appears to be open.

The question of dispersive decay bounds in *autonomous* Hamiltonian dynamics has been studied extensively, e.g. for time-independent Schrödinger Hamiltonians [36, 38, 39, 49] and Dirac Hamiltonians [16, 20, 21, 23, 22, 26, 32, 40, 41]. Much less is known for *non-autonomous* Hamiltonians. All existing results, to the best of our knowledge, concern Schrödinger equations in dimensions $d \geq 3$, and crucially all in the regime where the time-dependent term is a *perturbation of an autonomous Hamiltonian*, in some sense [4, 5, 30, 31]. In these settings, the authors recover “autonomous-like” decay rates in non-autonomous settings. See Sec. 1.3 for a more detailed review. Such methods are not expected to work for those cases where $\nu(t)$ is not localized in space.

We next introduce two solvable models where $\mathcal{D}(t+T) = \mathcal{D}(t)$ and $\nu(t)$ is not spatially localized, for which we can obtain dispersive estimates. For one of which, the decay rates are substantially slower compared to its autonomous analogs.

1.1. Models.

Sign-switching mass. Consider $\nu(t)$ which “switches” discontinuously and periodically between positive and negative masses, i.e.,

$$\nu(t) = \begin{cases} m\sigma_1, & t \in [jT, (j + \frac{1}{2})T), \\ -m\sigma_1, & t \in [(j + \frac{1}{2})T, (j + 1)T), \end{cases}, \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad m, T > 0.$$

Theorem 2.1 shows that, in sharp contrast with the theory of autonomous Dirac operators, the time-decay is *at most* of rate $t^{-1/3}$. Furthermore, for special choices of the mass parameter $m > 0$, the rate is exceptionally slow, at most $t^{-1/5}$ (Theorem 2.2).

Complex rotation. The second model we consider is a time-periodic “rotating mass”:

$$\nu(t) = m \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\omega t} \\ e^{-i\omega t} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = m [\cos(\omega t)\sigma_1 - \sin(\omega t)\sigma_2], \quad (1.5)$$

where m and ω are real positive constants. The dynamics associated with (1.5) can be mapped to the (non-rotating) massive Dirac equation (Theorem 2.5), which yields a $t^{-1/2}$ decay rate (Corollary 2.6), as in the constant mass Dirac equation [25]. Thus, here is an example of a time-dependent (and non-localized) $\nu(t)$, which satisfy the non-commutation condition (1.4), but exhibits an autonomous-like decay rate nonetheless.

Finally, we note that the case (1.5) is a time-periodic variant of an effective Hamiltonian, which was derived and studied in the study of defect modes in dislocated media [28, 27, 18, 17].

1.2. Physical motivation. Dirac equations were first introduced to provide a relativistic framework for quantum mechanics [24, 53]. Relevant to this work is the fact that (autonomous) Dirac Hamiltonians also arise in study of periodic (crystalline) media. Specifically, as the *effective (homogenized) Hamiltonians* describing wave-packets in periodic structures that are spectrally concentrated near *Dirac points* – linear (in 1D) or conical (in 2D) degeneracies in the band structure, a phenomenon occurring in graphene and related quantum/condensed-matter settings [9, 2, 18, 29, 27, 28].

Recently, there has been a significant experimental and theoretical progress in the study of *Floquet materials*, crystalline materials whose effective transport properties are controlled by time-periodic driving. Within the class of Floquet materials are *Floquet topological insulators*, which exhibit changes in topological phase in response to appropriate time-forcing [10, 46]. In such materials, non-autonomous Dirac equations are the appropriate low-energy/homogenized model [1, 3, 33, 47, 48]. In a class of physically relevant models, the time-periodic driving is *uniform in space*.² Thus, the natural models in the context of Floquet media are those where the time-periodic forcing cannot be thought of as localized in space, as in [4, 5, 30, 31]. Finally, we remark that dispersive time-decay rates play a role in analysis of the metastability of bound states when subjected to parametric (periodic or more general) forcing. See, for example, [50, 33] for perturbative analyses of general models and [6, 12, 13, 15, 14] for non-perturbative studies in exactly solvable Schrödinger time-periodic Hamiltonians.

1.3. Broader discussion of literature on dispersive time-decay bounds. Dispersive decay estimates is a standard topic in the analysis of PDEs. The literature concerning *autonomous* (time-independent) Schrödinger or Dirac equations is extensive; see [36, 38, 39, 49] and the references therein. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no work on dispersive decay estimates in time-dependent Dirac equations, in any spatial dimension.

Time-decay estimates for autonomous *Dirac* equations received extensive attention; see, for example, [16, 20, 21, 23, 22, 26, 32, 40, 41]. Such estimates play a role in the weakly nonlinear scattering and stability theory of *semilinear* Dirac equations [8, 44].

Most relevant to this work is the massive one-dimensional Dirac equation studied by Erdogan and Green [25]: denoting by P the $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ projection onto the continuous spectral part of a massive Dirac operator with a rapidly decaying potential $D \equiv i\sigma_3\partial_x + m\sigma_1 + V(x)$, then

$$\left\| e^{iDt} P \langle D \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\langle D \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ is a smoothing operator, defined via functional calculus. Furthermore, an improved $t^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ holds in the generic case where no threshold resonances exist [25].

There are significantly fewer results on time-decay bounds for *non-autonomous* dispersive equations. All concern Schrödinger Hamiltonians $H(t) = -\Delta + V(t, x)$, in dimensions $d \geq 3$, where the $H(t)$ is a small and spatially localized perturbation of a Schrödinger operator $H^0 = \Delta + U(x)$ [4, 5, 30, 31]. In settings where time-decay bounds for $\exp(-iH^0t)$ restricted to its continuous spectral

²An example of an experimental setting is the study of electronic conductance in materials such as the hexagonal quantum material graphene. The spatial support of the time-periodic forcing corresponds to the finite region of the material, where an external laser beam drives its electrons [42, 45, 54]. Our Hamiltonian reflects the modeling assumption that uniform time-dependent forcing is applied to an area which is large compared with the material's lattice constant.

part are known, persistence of these time-decay bounds is proved by perturbation theory. The analysis is based on a study of the *Floquet Hamiltonian* [35]: $K \equiv i\partial_t - H(t)$, acting on functions of both space and time. In our specific setting, we explicitly construct the monodromy operator as a Fourier integral (see, e.g. (2.5)) and study it by oscillatory integral methods. Further, the perturbative approach does not apply in our setting since our time-dependent perturbation is not spatially localized.

1.4. Structure of the paper. The main results (Theorems 2.1, 2.2, and 2.5) are presented in Section 2, together with numerical observations and conjectures. We present key notations in Sec. 3. The proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 are presented in Sec. 5, followed by the proof of Theorem 2.5 in Sec. 6.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grants DMS-1908657 and DMS-1937254 (MIW), Simons Foundation Math + X Investigator Award #376319 (MIW), and the Binational Science Foundation Research Grant #2022254 (MIW, AS). AS would like to thank the Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics at Columbia University for hosting him during the writing of this manuscript.

2. MODELS, APPROACHES, AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. The mass-switching model. First, consider a switching-mass model for $\alpha(t, x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$ of the form

$$i\partial_t \alpha = (i\sigma_3 \partial_x + \sigma_1 \nu(t)) \alpha, \quad \nu(t) = \begin{cases} m, & t \in [2j, 2j+1), \\ -m', & t \in [2j+1, 2j+2), \end{cases} \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $m > 0$ denotes a “mass” parameter. We denote by $\mathcal{U}(t)$ the solution operator for the dynamical system (2.1).

The Hamiltonian $H(t) = i\sigma_3 \partial_x + \sigma_1 \nu(t)$ is periodic in t , and without loss of generality we take the period time to be $T = 2$.

Hence, the dynamics are determined by dynamics by the *monodromy operator*, $M = \mathcal{U}(2)$, which maps data at $t = 0$, $\alpha(0) = f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$, to the solution $\alpha(2) = Mf \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C})$, at time $t = 2$.

Let $\mathcal{U}_+(t)$ denote the solution map for the IVP on the interval $0 \leq t < 1$ and let $\mathcal{U}_-(t)$ the solution map for the IVP on the interval $1 \leq t < 2$. Then,

$$Mf \equiv \mathcal{U}(2) = \mathcal{U}_-(1)\mathcal{U}_+(1). \quad (2.2)$$

Further, $\mathcal{U}(2n) = M^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that M is a unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2)$.

In Section 4 we use that $H(t)$ is invariant continuous translations in x to express M via the Fourier transform:

$$(Mf)(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(\xi; m) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2i\theta(\xi; m)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\theta(\xi; m)} \end{pmatrix} P^*(\xi; m) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{i\xi x} d\xi. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, \hat{f} , the Fourier transform of $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ is given by (3.1). The expression (2.3) involves a phase function or “dispersion relation” $\theta(\xi)$ is given by

$$\theta(\xi; m) = \arctan \left(\frac{\xi \sin(\omega(\xi))}{\sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \cos^2(\omega(\xi))} \right), \quad \omega(\xi; m) = \sqrt{m^2 + \xi^2} \quad (2.4)$$

and $P(\xi; m)$ a 2×2 unitary matrix with entries displayed in (4.2). Thus, bounding $\|\mathcal{U}(2n)\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty}$ for $n \gg 1$ boils down to analyzing the rapidly oscillatory integral

$$(M^n f)(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(\xi; m) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2in\theta(\xi; m)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2in\theta(\xi; m)} \end{pmatrix} P^*(\xi; m) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{i\xi x} d\xi. \quad (2.5)$$

We study (2.5) by stationary phase methods for initial data f , where \hat{f} is supported in a neighborhood of momentum $\xi = 0$. A key tool is van der Corput's Lemma (Lemma 5.1), which relates time-decay bounds to lower bounds on derivatives of the phase function, $\theta(\xi, m)$. We shall see that the dependence of $\theta(\xi, m)$ on the mass parameter m is such that decay bounds for $M^n f$ depend on m . Let $\Sigma \subset (0, \infty)$ be the vanishing set of the third derivative of $\theta(0; m)$

$$\Sigma \equiv \{m \in (0, \infty) \mid \theta'''(0; m) = 0\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Lemma 5.2 below states that the set Σ is discrete, and hence the condition $m \notin \Sigma$ is generic. Our main result is that for $m \notin \Sigma$, the sharp dispersive decay rate is *at most* $t^{-1/3}$. Hence, for this piecewise constant mass-switching model, sharp time-decay rates must be slower than those associated with the constant mass Dirac equation.

Theorem 2.1. *Consider the system (2.1) with the monodromy operator M , as in (2.3), with $m \notin \Sigma$, see (2.6). Let $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ be any function with Fourier transform supported in a sufficiently small (m -dependent) neighborhood of the origin. Then for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\|M^n f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.7)$$

Furthermore, for such initial data f , there exist $s_0, C \neq 0$ such that for $x_n \equiv ns_0$,

$$|(M^n f)(x_n)| = C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x) dx \right) \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{2/3}}\right), \quad (2.8)$$

where the leading error term depends on $\partial_\xi \hat{f}(\xi = 0)$.

The following result shows that for mass parameter values in the discrete set Σ , an even slower rate of decay is attained for the same collection of initial data.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume the setup of Theorem 2.1, but now with $m \in \Sigma$. Then for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\|M^n f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/5}} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.9)$$

Furthermore, for such initial data f , there exist constants $C, s_1 \neq 0$ such that for $x_n \equiv ns_1$

$$|(M^n f)(x_n)| = C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x) dx \right) \frac{1}{n^{1/5}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^{2/5}}\right). \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.3. *Since the initial conditions f appearing in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are in Schwartz class, the time-decay bounds (2.7) and (2.9) hold with M^n replaced by $M^n \langle \partial_x \rangle^{-r}$ for any $r \geq 0$. Thus, any general dispersive time-decay bound must have a rate slower or equal to $t^{-1/3}$ and $t^{-1/5}$, depending on the mass parameter.*

2.2. Numerical observations and conjectures. Consider an oscillatory integral such as (2.5) which depends on a parameter n . The behavior of the phase function impacts the decay of the integral as n tends to infinity. If the phase function is linear, then the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma ensures that the integral tends to zero as n tends to infinity, with however no information on the rate of decay. On the other hand, if the phase has critical points, or at distinguished points derivatives of the phase of higher order vanish, then one can apply the method of stationary phase, or more generally Van der Corput's Lemma 5.1 and obtain a quantitative information on the decay rate. The $t^{-1/3}$ or $t^{-1/5}$ time-decay rates for a generic and exceptional masses, respectively, are due to the existence of an inflection point in the dispersion relation $\theta(\xi)$, see (2.4). It is straightforward to show that $\theta''(0; m) = \theta^{(4)}(0; m) = 0$ for all m values (Appendix B). Additionally, Fig. 1a shows that $\theta'''(0; m) = 0$ for a discrete set of “exceptional” m values, an assertion that can be verified by using the continuity of $\theta'''(0, m)$.




FIGURE 1. (A) $\theta^{(3)}(0)$ as a function of $m > 0$, where the dispersion relation $\theta(\xi)$ is given in (2.4). (B) $\theta^{(3)}(0)$ and $\theta^{(5)}(0)$ overlaid.

Are there similar inflection points for larger values of ξ ? Numerically, Fig. 2 demonstrates that when $m = 1$ (a generic case, since $1 \notin \Sigma$), there is a discrete sequence of Fourier-momenta $\{\xi_l\}$, tending to infinity, such that $\theta''(\xi_l; 1) = 0$ and $\theta'''(\xi_l; 1) \sim \xi_l^{-2} \rightarrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Then, assuming the observed decay of $\theta'''(\xi_l, 1)$, Van der Corput's Lemma implies for data f whose Fourier transform is localized near ξ_l , one has $\|M^n f\|_\infty \lesssim (\xi_l^{-2} n)^{-1/3} \|f\|_1$. Thus, for *general* L^1 data, we conjecture:

Conjecture 2.4. *Consider the Dirac equation (2.1) with $m = 1$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that³*

$$\left\| M^n \langle \partial_x \rangle^{-(2/3+\varepsilon)} \right\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon n^{-\frac{1}{3}}.$$

2.3. The rotating-mass model. Consider the Dirac equation

$$i\partial_t \phi = \mathcal{D}_\omega(x) \phi = (i\sigma_3 \partial_x + \nu_\omega(t)) \phi, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.11a)$$

³The additional $\varepsilon > 0$ smoothing arises in a dyadic partition argument; see for example, Section 6.1.




FIGURE 2. The dispersion relation $\theta(\xi)$, see (2.4), for $m = 1$. **(A)** $\theta''(\xi)$ (blue) and $\theta'''(\xi)$ (orange). Each has an increasing sequence of zeroes. **(B)** Denoting the zeroes of θ'' as $(\xi_l)_{l=1}^\infty$, we plot $\theta'''(\xi_l)$ (blue, stars) on a log-log grid, and a polynomial fit (orange, solid) which yields that $|\theta'''(\xi_l)| \lesssim \xi_l^{-2}$.

where

$$\nu_\omega(t) \equiv m \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\omega t} \\ e^{-i\omega t} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = m [\cos(\omega t)\sigma_1 - \sin(\omega t)\sigma_2]. \quad (2.11b)$$

Let $u \mapsto \mathcal{U}_\omega(t)u$ denote the (unitary) time evolution operator associated to the dynamics Equation (2.11). Our main technical result is that $\mathcal{U}_\omega(t)$ can be expressed in terms of the constant-mass Dirac time-evolution:

Theorem 2.5. $\mathcal{U}_\omega(t)$ has the following Fourier integral representation:

$$\mathcal{U}_\omega(t)u(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} e^{it\omega\sigma_3/2} e^{-i\mathcal{D}_0(\xi+\omega/2)t} \hat{u}(\xi) d\xi. \quad (2.12)$$

Here, $\mathcal{D}_0(\xi) = (\xi\sigma_3 + m\sigma_1)$ is the symbol of the constant mass operator, and

$$e^{it\omega\sigma_3/2} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{+i\omega t/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\omega t/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The above equivalence allows us to show that the time-decay of the constant mass equation dictates the same rate of decay to the time-harmonic (2.11):

Corollary 2.6. For any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\omega(t)\langle \partial_x \rangle^{-3/2-\varepsilon}\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-1/2}. \quad (2.13)$$

3. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

- The Fourier transform of a function $\alpha \in L^2(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ by

$$\hat{\alpha}(\xi) = \mathcal{F}[\alpha](\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\xi x} \alpha(x) dx, \quad (3.1)$$

and its inverse is given by

$$\check{\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{+i\xi x} \beta(\xi) d\xi.$$

- The Laplace transform of a function $\alpha \in L^1((0, \infty))$ is defined

$$\mathcal{L}[\alpha](s) = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-st} \alpha(t) dt,$$

for $\text{Re } s > 0$.

- The Pauli matrices are defined by $\sigma_0 = I$,

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

- Convention: Our Hamiltonians depend on a ‘‘mass parameter’’, m . We shall occasionally, when convenient and when there is no ambiguity, suppress the m dependence.

4. THE MONODROMY MAP (2.3) OF THE SWITCHING MASS MODEL

We begin with a derivation of Equation (2.3) for $\mathcal{U}(2) = \mathcal{U}_-(1)\mathcal{U}_+(1)$; see eq. (2.2). Let

$$h(i\partial_x, m) \equiv (i\partial_x \sigma_3 + m \sigma_1).$$

Starting with eq. (2.1), we have via Fourier transform, that $\hat{\alpha}(\xi, t)$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t \hat{\alpha} &= h(-\xi, m) \hat{\alpha}, & 0 \leq t < 1, \\ i\partial_t \hat{\alpha} &= h(-\xi, -m) \hat{\alpha}, & 1 \leq t < 2. \end{aligned}$$

Since different Pauli matrices anti-commute

$$\sigma_3 h(-\xi, m) = h(-\xi, -m) \sigma_3. \quad (4.1)$$

The eigenpairs of $h(\xi, m)$ are:

$$\lambda_{\pm}(\xi) = \pm \omega(\xi), \quad \mathbf{v}_{\pm}(\xi) = \frac{1}{n_{\pm}(\xi)} \begin{pmatrix} m \\ \xi \pm \omega(\xi) \end{pmatrix},$$

where, as in (2.4), $\omega(\xi; m) = \sqrt{\xi^2 + m^2}$, and $n_{\pm}(\xi) = 2\omega(\xi)(\omega(\xi) \pm \xi)$ are normalization factors such that $\|\mathbf{v}_{\pm}(\xi)\| = 1$. Let $V(\xi) = V(\xi, m) = [v_+(\xi) \ v_-(\xi)]$ denote the 2×2 matrix whose columns are $\mathbf{v}_+(\xi)$ and $\mathbf{v}_-(\xi)$. Since $h(-\xi, m)$ is Hermitian, $V(\xi, m)$ is unitary. Hence,

$$h(-\xi, m)V(\xi) = V(\xi)\sigma_3\omega(\xi) \quad \text{or} \quad h(-\xi, m) = V(\xi)\sigma_3\omega(\xi)V(\xi)^*$$

Further, the commutation relation eq. (4.1) implies

$$h(-\xi, -m)\sigma_3V(\xi) = \sigma_3V(\xi)\sigma_3\omega(\xi) \quad \text{or} \quad h(-\xi, -m) = \sigma_3V(\xi)\sigma_3\omega(\xi)V(\xi)^*\sigma_3.$$

The Fourier transform of the monodromy map, $\widehat{M}(\xi)$, is given by the product of unitary matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}(\xi) &= e^{-ih(-\xi, -m)} e^{-ih(-\xi, m)} \\ &= (\sigma_3V(\xi)e^{-i\sigma_3\omega(\xi)}V(\xi)^*\sigma_3)(V(\xi)e^{-i\sigma_3\omega(\xi)}V(\xi)^*) \\ &= (\sigma_3V(\xi)e^{-i\sigma_3\omega(\xi)}V(\xi)^*)^2 \equiv \mathcal{M}^2(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

A direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\xi; m) &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega(\xi)) + i\xi \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi)) & -im \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi)) \\ im \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi)) & -\cos(\omega(\xi)) + i\xi \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi)) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= i\xi \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi))\sigma_0 + \cos(\omega(\xi))\sigma_3 + m \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi))\sigma_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}(\xi; m)$ are

$$\mu_{\pm}(\xi; m) = i\xi \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi)) \pm \sqrt{\cos^2(\omega(\xi)) + m^2 \operatorname{sinc}^2(\omega(\xi))}.$$

Note that $\mu_{\pm}(\xi)$ lie on the unit circle, as expected since $\widehat{M}(\xi) = \mathcal{M}^2(\xi)$ is unitary. Moreover, direct computation of $\mu_{\pm}^2(\xi)$, the eigenvalues of $\widehat{M}(\xi)$, shows that they are complex conjugate of one another.⁴ Hence, we can write $\mu_{\pm}(\xi; m) = \exp[\pm i\theta(\xi; m)]$, where $\theta(\xi; m)$ is given, after some algebra, by (2.4). The corresponding eigenvectors are given by

$$\mathbf{p}_{\pm}(\xi; m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N(\xi; m)}} \begin{pmatrix} im \operatorname{sinc}(\omega(\xi; m)) \\ \cos(\omega(\xi; m)) \mp \sqrt{\cos^2(\omega(\xi; m)) + m^2 \operatorname{sinc}^2(\omega(\xi; m))} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2)$$

where normalization factor $N(\xi)$ ensures $\|\mathbf{p}_{\pm}\| = 1$. Defining the change of basis matrix $P(\xi; m) = (\mathbf{p}_+(\xi; m) \ \mathbf{p}_-(\xi; m))$, it is clear that $P(\xi)$ is unitary and we have the Fourier representation of the monodromy given by

$$\widehat{M}(\xi; m) = P(\xi; m) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2i\theta(\xi; m)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\theta(\xi; m)} \end{pmatrix} P^*(\xi; m).$$

Finally, inverting the Fourier transform, we obtain (2.3) as desired.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

Our proof of the dispersive time-decay bounds (Theorems 2.1 and 2.2) relies on the classical van der Corput Lemma [52] :

Lemma 5.1. *Let λ be a smooth function and f a smooth, compactly supported function. Suppose there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$, such that $|\lambda^{(k)}(z)| \geq \lambda_0$. Then there exists a constant, c_k , depending only on k , such that*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) e^{i\lambda(z)} dz \right| \leq c_k \lambda_0^{-1/k} \|f'\|_{L^1}. \quad (5.1)$$

By van der Corput Lemma, the decay properties of oscillatory integrals such as (2.5) are intimately related to the points where the phase function, $\theta(\xi; m)$, and its derivatives vanish. By a direct calculation (see Appendix B), $\theta''(0; m) = 0$ for all $m \in (0, \infty)$. The following lemma shows that $\theta'''(0; m) \neq 0$ for all but a discrete set of values of m .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\theta(\xi; m)$ be given by (2.4). Then the vanishing set*

$$\Sigma = \{m \in (0, \infty) \mid \theta'''(0; m) = 0\}$$

is discrete. Writing $\Sigma = \{m_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, there exist $M > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m_k = (k + k_0 + 1/2)\pi + \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$ for all $k \geq M$.

⁴This is to be expected by ODE theory [11]: since the right-hand side of the Fourier transformed (1.1) has zero trace for all $t \in [0, T]$, the Floquet exponents have to sum up to 0. Since $\widehat{M}(\xi; m)$ is unitary, the Floquet *multipliers* therefore are complex conjugates of each other.

Proof. We have the explicit formula for the third derivative of θ evaluated at $\xi = 0$ from Lemma B.1

$$\theta'''(0, m) = \frac{1}{m^3} [-2 \sin^3(m) + 3m \cos(m) - 3 \sin(m) \cos^2(m)]. \quad (5.2)$$

Hence, $\theta'''(0, m)$ vanishes if and only if $\cos(m) - (3m)^{-1} \sin(m) \cos^2(m) - 2(3m)^{-1} \sin(m) = 0$. By analyticity, this equation has a discrete set of solutions. Furthermore, if we consider m large, the solutions are precisely $m_k = (k + \frac{1}{2})\pi + \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$, for $k \geq M$, where M is sufficiently large. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.2.

5.1. Proof of the time-decay bound (2.7) of Theorem 2.1. Fix $m \notin \Sigma$. By definition (2.6), $\theta''(0; m) = 0$ and $\theta'''(0, m) \neq 0$. Since $\theta'''(\xi; m)$ is continuous in ξ , there exist $c > 0, \delta > 0$ such that

$$|\theta'''(\xi; m)| > c = c(m) > 0, \quad \text{for } \xi \in (-2\delta, 2\delta). \quad (5.3)$$

For the remainder of the proof we suppress the m -dependence of θ and its derivatives. Let $\xi \mapsto \hat{f}(\xi)$ be smooth and supported in $[-\delta, \delta]$ and introduce a smooth cutoff function $\xi \mapsto \chi(\xi)$, such that $\chi(\xi) \equiv 1$ for $|\xi| \leq \delta$ and $\chi(\xi) \equiv 0$ for $|\xi| > 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} M^n f &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} [\chi(\xi) P(\xi)] \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2in\theta(\xi)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2in\theta(\xi)} \end{pmatrix} [\chi(\xi) P^*(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi)] e^{i\xi x} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi(\xi) P(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2in\theta(\xi)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2in\theta(\xi)} \end{pmatrix} \hat{\phi}(\xi) e^{i\xi x} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P^\chi(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2in\theta(\xi)} \hat{\phi}_+(\xi) \\ e^{-2in\theta(\xi)} \hat{\phi}_-(\xi) \end{pmatrix} e^{i\xi x} d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where $P(\xi)$ is given in (4.2),

$$P^\chi(\xi) \equiv \chi(\xi) P(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\phi}(\xi) = (\hat{\phi}_+, \hat{\phi}_-)^T \equiv (P^\chi)^*(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi). \quad (5.4)$$

Hence, $M^n f$ is the sum of four terms, each of the form:

$$I_{jk}(x; n) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} P_{jk}^\chi(\xi) [e^{\pm 2in\theta(\xi)} \hat{\phi}_\pm(\xi)] d\xi = \left(\check{P}_{jk}^\chi * u_\pm \right) (x; n) \quad (j, k = 1, 2), \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$u_\pm(x, n) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} e^{\pm 2in\theta(\xi)} \hat{\phi}_\pm(\xi) d\xi. \quad (5.6)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |(M^n f)(x)| &\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |I_{jk}(x; n)| = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \left(\check{P}_{jk}^\chi * u_\pm \right) (x; n) \right| \\ &\leq \|\check{P}_{jk}^\chi\|_{L^1} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |u_\pm(x; n)| \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

We complete our bound on $M^n f$ using the following estimate on the oscillatory integral (5.6):

Lemma 5.3.

$$\|u_\pm(\cdot, n)\|_\infty = \sup_x \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\pm 2in\theta(\xi) + i\xi x} \hat{\phi}_\pm(\xi) d\xi \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/3}} \|\phi_\pm\|_{L^1}. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. Using Fubini's Theorem and Hölder inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{+2in\theta(\xi) + i\xi x} \hat{\phi}_{\pm}(\xi) d\xi \right| &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{+2in\theta(\xi) + i\xi(x-y)} \phi_{\pm}(y) dy d\xi \right| \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{+2in\theta(\xi) - i\xi(x-y)} \chi(\xi) d\xi \right) \phi_{\pm}(y) dy \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{in(\xi s + 2\theta(\xi))} \chi(\xi) d\xi \right| \|\phi_{\pm}\|_{L^1} \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{\pm} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ since ϕ_{\pm} are Schwartz class. Defining the phase function

$$\Theta(\xi, s) \equiv \xi s + 2\theta(\xi), \quad (5.9)$$

where $\theta(\xi)$ is defined in (2.4). Choose $s_0 = -2\theta'(0)$ so that $\partial_{\xi}\Theta(0, s_0) = 0$. Furthermore, since $\theta(\xi)$ is an odd function, we have $\partial_{\xi\xi}\Theta(0, s_0) = 0$. By van der Corput's Lemma, there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of ϕ_{\pm} , such that

$$\sup_x \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\pm 2in\theta(\xi) + i\xi x} \hat{\phi}_{\pm}(\xi) d\xi \right| \leq C \frac{\|\partial_{\xi}\chi\|_{L^1}}{(cn)^{1/3}} \|\phi_{\pm}\|_{L^1},$$

where $c = c(m)$ was chosen to satisfy the bound $|\theta''(\xi)| > c > 0$ on the support of $\hat{\phi}_{\pm}$. \square

Substituting the bound of Lemma 5.3 into (5.7), we obtain $\|M^n f\|_{\infty} \lesssim n^{-1/3} \|\phi\|_{L^1} \|\check{P}_{jk}^{\chi}\|_{L^1}$. Since $\|\check{P}_{jk}^{\chi}\|_{L^1}$ is finite and independent of n and the data f , we have $\|M^n f\|_{\infty} \lesssim n^{-1/3} \|\phi\|_{L^1}$. Finally, $\hat{\phi} = (P^{\chi})^* \hat{f}$ and so by Young's inequality $\|\phi\|_{L^1} = \|\check{P}^{\chi} * f\|_{L^1} \leq \|\check{P}^{\chi}\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^1}$. Therefore, $\|M^n f\| \lesssim n^{-1/3} \|f\|_{L^1}$. The proof of (2.7) in Theorem 2.1 is now complete.

5.2. Proof of the asymptotic expansion (2.8). We next further prove that for similar choice of initial data, f , the time-decay upper bound in (2.7) is attained. For this, we employ the asymptotic expansion (A.1) given in Lemma A.1.

As above in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we choose $s_0 = -2\theta'(0)$. Once again, $\partial_{\xi}\Theta(0, s_0) = 0$ and $\partial_{\xi\xi}\Theta(0, s_0) = 0$, and furthermore we find via (5.9) and (2.4), that $\partial_{\xi\xi\xi}\Theta(0, s_0) = \theta'''(0) \neq 0$. Thus, for every time $t = nT$, there is a point $x = ns_0$ in which we can apply the asymptotic expansion Lemma A.1 to (2.5), the integral representation of $M^n f(x)$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} [M^n f](ns_0) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(\xi) \begin{pmatrix} e^{+2in\theta(\xi)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2in\theta(\xi)} \end{pmatrix} P^*(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{i\xi ns_0} d\xi \\ \text{[Lemma A.1]} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} P^{\chi}(0) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\phi}_+(0) \\ \hat{\phi}_-(0) \end{pmatrix} \text{Ai}(0) |\theta'''(0)|^{1/3} e^{\pm 2i\theta(0)n} \frac{1}{(3n)^{1/3}} + O(n^{-2/3}) \\ \text{[eq. (5.4)]} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} P^{\chi}(0) (P^{\chi})^*(0) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{f}_1(0) \\ \hat{f}_2(0) \end{pmatrix} \text{Ai}(0) |\theta'''(0)|^{1/3} e^{\pm 2i\theta(0)n} \frac{1}{(3n)^{1/3}} + O(n^{-2/3}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x) dx \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_2(x) dx \end{pmatrix} \text{Ai}(0) |\theta'''(0)|^{1/3} e^{\pm 2i\theta(0)n} \frac{1}{(3n)^{1/3}} + O(n^{-2/3}). \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 3. Log-log plot of $\theta^{(5)}(0, m_k)$ which shows that $\theta^{(5)}(0, m_k) \sim m_k^{-3}$.

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2.2. The proof for the case of exceptional mass parameters, $m \in \Sigma = \{m_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, is analogous to that of Theorem 2.1. Recall that by definition, $\theta'''(0; m_k) = 0$. Also, since $\theta(\xi)$ is an odd smooth function, $\theta^{(4)}(0; m) = 0$ for all $m > 0$. Furthermore, Figure 3 presents strong numerical evidence for $\theta^{(5)}(0, m_k)$ not vanishing along the sequence m_k .

Hence, the upper bound part of the proof follows in the exact same way as in Theorem 2.1, only with an upper bound of the form

$$\|u_{\pm}(\cdot, n)\|_{\infty} = \sup_x \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\pm 2in\theta(\xi) + i\xi x} \hat{\phi}_{\pm}(\xi) d\xi \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/5}} \|\phi_{\pm}\|_{L^1},$$

instead of the analogous result in Lemma 5.3, which is proven by Van der Corput Lemma (Lemma 5.1) in an analogous way.

The expansion argument is identical to that of Sec. 5.2. The only difference that, because the phase $\Theta(\xi, s_0)$ is now *triplely* degenerate at $\xi = 0$, we use the asymptotic expansion (A.2) given in Lemma A.1 instead, and the proof follows.

6. ANALYSIS OF THE ROTATING MASS MODEL (2.11); PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5

To obtain the formulas in Theorem 2.5 we apply both the Fourier (in x) and Laplace (in t) transforms to the solution $(\alpha_1(t, x), \alpha_2(t, x))^{\top}$ of (2.11), and solve the corresponding algebraic system exactly. Let

$$\Phi_j(\xi, s) \equiv \mathcal{L}[\mathcal{F}[\alpha_j]](\xi, s), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

The transformed (2.11) is

$$is\Phi_1(\xi, s) - i\hat{u}_1 = +\xi\Phi_1(\xi, s) + m\Phi_2(\xi, s - i\omega), \quad (6.1)$$

$$is\Phi_2(\xi, s) - i\hat{u}_2 = -\xi\Phi_2(\xi, s) + m\Phi_1(\xi, s + i\omega), \quad (6.2)$$

where (\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2) is the initial data. By the replacement $s \mapsto s + i\omega$ in the (6.1) we obtain $\Phi_1(\xi, s + i\omega)$ in terms of $\Phi_2(\xi, s)$. Subsequently substituting this expression into the (6.2) gives a single equation for $\Phi_2(\xi, s)$ which is easily solved. Finally an expression for $\Phi_1(\xi, s)$ is then obtained from (6.1)

and the expression for $\Phi_2(\xi, s)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1(\xi, s) &= \frac{(s - i\omega/2)}{(s - i\omega/2)^2 + (p(\xi))^2} \hat{u}_1(\xi) - \frac{p(\xi)}{(s - i\omega/2)^2 - (p(\xi))^2} \left(\frac{im\hat{u}_2(\xi) + i(\xi + \omega/2)\hat{u}_1(\xi)}{p(\xi)} \right), \\ \Phi_2(\xi, s) &= \frac{(s + i\omega/2)}{(s + i\omega/2)^2 + (p(\xi))^2} \hat{u}_2(\xi) + \frac{p(\xi)}{(s + i\omega/2)^2 - (p(\xi))^2} \left(\frac{i(\xi + \omega/2)\hat{u}_2(\xi) - im\hat{u}_1(\xi)}{p(\xi)} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $p(\xi) = \sqrt{(\xi + \omega/2)^2 + m^2} > 0$. Inverting the Laplace transform first and then the Fourier transform we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(x, t) &= e^{i\omega t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} \left(\cos(p(\xi)t) \hat{u}_1(\xi) - \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} [im\hat{u}_2(\xi) + i(\xi + \omega/2)\hat{u}_1(\xi)] \right) \frac{d\xi}{2\pi}, \\ \phi_2(x, t) &= e^{-i\omega t/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} \left(\cos(p(\xi)t) \hat{u}_2(\xi) + \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} [i(\xi + \omega/2)\hat{u}_2(\xi) - im\hat{u}_1(\xi)] \right) \frac{d\xi}{2\pi}.\end{aligned}$$

This can be written succinctly in the matrix form

$$\phi(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} U(\xi, t) \hat{\phi}_0(\xi) d\xi, \quad (6.3a)$$

with the matrix $U(\xi, t)$ defined

$$U(\xi, t) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\omega t/2} \left(\cos(p(\xi)t) - i(\xi + \omega/2) \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} \right) & -ime^{i\omega t/2} \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} \\ -ime^{-i\omega t/2} \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} & e^{-i\omega t/2} \left(\cos(p(\xi)t) + i(\xi + \omega/2) \frac{\sin(p(\xi)t)}{p(\xi)} \right) \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.3b)$$

We note that $U(\xi, t) = e^{it\omega\sigma_3/2} e^{-i\mathcal{D}_0(\xi+\omega/2)t}$ where $e^{-i\mathcal{D}_0(\xi)t}$ is the Fourier propagator of the constant mass Dirac equation. This relation combined with Equation (6.3) proves the theorem.

6.1. Proof of Corollary 2.6. The following argument appears in [25, 41], and is included here briefly, for completeness. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. This estimate follows by considering Equation (2.12)

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{U}_\omega(t) \langle \partial_x \rangle^{-3/2-\varepsilon} u(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} &= \sup_x \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} e^{it\omega\sigma_3/2} e^{-i\mathcal{D}_0(\xi+\omega/2)t} \langle \xi \rangle^{-3/2-\varepsilon} \hat{u}(\xi) \frac{d\xi}{2\pi} \right| \\ &= \sup_x \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{K}(x-y, t) u(y) dy \right| \leq \|\mathcal{K}(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} \cdot \|u\|_{L^1},\end{aligned}$$

where the kernel $\mathcal{K}(r, t)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{K}(r, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi r} e^{it\omega\sigma_3/2} e^{-i\mathcal{D}_0(\xi+\omega/2)t} \langle \xi \rangle^{-3/2-\varepsilon} \frac{d\xi}{2\pi}. \quad (6.4)$$

Thus the proof of the estimate Equation (2.13) reduces to showing that the kernel function $\mathcal{K}(r, t)$ has the desired decay. This follows from a van der Corput Lemma-type argument, applied to dyadic cutoff functions, similar to [25, Theorem 2.3]. We sketch the proof here.

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\psi_j \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } \psi_j \subset [2^{j-1} - \omega/2, 2^{j+1} - \omega/2]$ and let $\psi_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be supported in a small neighborhood around $-\omega/2$ such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j = 1, \quad \|\psi_j\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^j, \quad \|\partial_\xi \psi_j\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1.$$

By inserting this partition of unity under the integral sign in (6.4) we see

$$|\mathcal{K}(r, t)| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-3j/2} 2^{-\varepsilon j} I_j, \quad (6.5)$$

where

$$I_j = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\pm i(\sqrt{(\xi + \omega/2)^2 + m^2} + \omega/2)t - irx} \psi_j(\xi) d\xi \right|.$$

By an application of the Van der Corput lemma, 5.1, along with the inequality

$$\left| \partial_{kk} \left[t(\sqrt{(\xi + \omega/2)^2 + m^2} + \omega/2) + kr \right] \right| = \frac{tm^2}{((\xi + \omega/2)^2 + m^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \gtrsim t2^{-3(j+2)},$$

which holds on $\text{supp } \psi_j$, we observe

$$I_j \leq C \min \left(\|\psi\|_{L^1}, |t|^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{\frac{3}{2}j} \|\partial_{\xi} \psi\|_{L^1} \right).$$

Corollary 2.6 then follows from combining the bounds above with the decomposition (6.5).

APPENDIX A. STATEMENT AND PROOFS OF ASYMPTOTIC EXPANSIONS

In this appendix we provide the statement and proof of two asymptotic expansions used in the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2. Expansion (A.1) is adapted from [34, Equation 7.7.29].

Lemma A.1. *Let λ be a smooth function and f a smooth and compactly supported.*

(1) *If $\lambda'(0) = \lambda''(0) = 0$, but $\lambda'''(0) \neq 0$, then as $\omega \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) e^{i\omega\lambda(z)} dz = 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \text{Ai}(0) f(0) \left(\frac{2}{|\lambda'''(0)|} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \omega^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(\omega^{-2/3}), \quad (A.1)$$

where $\text{Ai}(x)$ is the Airy function (of the first kind).

(2) *If $\lambda^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, but $\lambda^{(5)}(0) \neq 0$, then as $\omega \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) e^{i\omega\lambda(z)} dz = e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \frac{2}{5} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{5}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{5}\right) \left(\frac{120}{|\lambda^{(5)}(0)|} \right)^{-\frac{1}{5}} f(0) \omega^{-\frac{1}{5}} + O(\omega^{-\frac{2}{5}}), \quad (A.2)$$

where $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^{\infty} t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$ is the usual Gamma Function.

Proof. Recall that the Airy function $\text{Ai}(x)$ is defined as the solution to the boundary value problem

$$y''(x) - xy = 0, \quad y(0) = \frac{1}{3^{2/3}\Gamma(2/3)}, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} y(x) = 0.$$

By Fourier transforming the Airy equation with respect to x , we can verify that

$$\widehat{\text{Ai}}(\xi) = e^{-i\xi^3/3}.$$

Now suppose $f \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\lambda'(0) = \lambda''(0) = 0$, but $\lambda'''(0) \neq 0$. Then there exists $a \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $a(0) \neq 0$ and

$$\lambda(z) = \lambda(0) + z^3 a(z). \quad (A.3)$$

Introducing the change of variables

$$\zeta = z|\alpha(z)|^{1/3},$$

the integral of interest becomes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) e^{i\omega\lambda(z)} dz = e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\beta(\zeta)) e^{i\omega\zeta^3} \frac{d\zeta}{d\beta(\zeta)}(\beta(\zeta)) d\zeta. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\beta(\zeta)$ is the inverse change of variables, i.e., $\beta(\zeta(z)) = z$. By direct substitution into the definition of $\zeta(z)$, the only solution to the equation $\zeta = 0$ is $z = 0$, thus $\beta(0) = 0$. Since

$$\frac{d\zeta}{dz} = \frac{1}{3} z |a(z)|^{-2/3} + |a(z)|^{1/3},$$

To compute the limit as $z \rightarrow 0$, we use (A.3) and the inverse Function Theorem to get

$$\frac{d\zeta}{dz}(0) = \left[\frac{dz}{d\zeta}(0) \right]^{-1} = |a(0)|^{-1/3} = \left(\frac{|\lambda'''(0)|}{6} \right)^{-1/3} > 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and so the inverse change of variables $\beta(\zeta)$ is well-defined.

Going back to (A.4), we apply the Plancherel's theorem

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi) \overline{\hat{g}(\xi)} d\xi,$$

and the first order Taylor expansion of the Airy function

$$\text{Ai}(\xi) = \text{Ai}(0) + O(\xi),$$

to obtain

$$e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\beta(\zeta)) e^{i\omega\zeta^3} \frac{d\zeta}{d\beta(\zeta)}(\beta(\zeta)) d\zeta \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$= 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f \cdot \frac{d\zeta}{dz} \right) \circ \beta(y) \cdot \text{Ai} \left(\frac{y}{(3\omega)^{1/3}} \right) (3\omega)^{-1/3} dy \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$= 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f \cdot \frac{d\zeta}{dz} \right) \circ \beta(y) \cdot \left(\text{Ai}(0) + O(\omega^{-1/3}) \right) (3\omega)^{-1/3} dy \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$= 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \frac{\text{Ai}(0)}{(3\omega)^{1/3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f \cdot \frac{d\zeta}{dz} \right) \circ \beta(y) dy + O(\omega^{-2/3}) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$= 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} A(0) \frac{f(0) \cdot \frac{d\zeta}{dz}(0)}{(3\omega)^{1/3}} + O(\omega^{-2/3}) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$= 2\pi e^{i\lambda(0)\omega} \text{Ai}(0) f(0) \left(\frac{2}{|\lambda'''(0)|} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \omega^{-\frac{1}{3}} + O(\omega^{-2/3}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

This completes the proof of the doubly degenerate stationary phase (A.1).

Now, for the triply degenerate case (A.2), where $\lambda^{(j)}(0) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, 4$, but $\lambda^{(5)}(0) \neq 0$, write $\lambda(z) = \lambda(0) + a(z)z^5$, and define the analogous change of variables $\eta \equiv z|a(z)|^{1/5}$. Setting now $\beta(\eta)$ as the inverse change of variables, i.e., $\beta(\eta(z)) = z$, we can write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z) e^{i\omega\lambda(z)} dz = e^{i\omega\lambda(0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f \circ \beta(\eta) \cdot \frac{dz}{d\eta} \right) e^{i\omega\eta^5} d\eta.$$

Denoting $u(\eta) \equiv f \circ \beta(\eta) \cdot \frac{dz}{d\eta}$, here we can use the expansion from [34, Equation (7.7.30)], which to zeroth order reads

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(\eta) e^{i\omega\eta^4} d\eta &= \frac{2}{5} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{5}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{5}\right) u(0) \omega^{-\frac{1}{5}} + O(\omega^{-\frac{2}{5}}) \\ &= \frac{2}{5} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{5}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{5}\right) f(\beta(0)) \frac{dz}{d\eta}(\beta(0)) \omega^{-\frac{1}{5}} + O(\omega^{-\frac{2}{5}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here again, $\beta(0) = 0$ since the only solution to the equation $\eta(z) = 0$ is $z = 0$, here again using the Inverse Function Theorem, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u(\eta) e^{i\omega\eta^4} d\eta = \dots = \frac{2}{5} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{5}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{5}\right) \left(\frac{120}{|\lambda^{(5)}(0)|}\right)^{-\frac{1}{5}} f(0) \omega^{-\frac{1}{5}} + O(\omega^{-\frac{2}{5}}).$$

□

APPENDIX B. DERIVATIVES OF $\theta(\xi, m)$ AT $\xi = 0$.

This appendix tabulates the function $\theta(\xi, m)$ for the switching-mass model (2.1), and its derivatives at $\xi = 0$. All expressions can be obtained by direct differentiation of (2.4).

Lemma B.1. *For all $m > 0$*

$$\theta'(0, m) = \frac{\sin(m)}{m}, \tag{B.1}$$

$$\theta''(0, m) = 0, \tag{B.2}$$

$$\theta'''(0, m) = \frac{1}{m^3} [-2 \sin^3(m) + 3m \cos(m) - 3 \sin(m) \cos^2(m)], \tag{B.3}$$

$$\theta^{(4)}(0, m) = 0, \tag{B.4}$$

$$\theta^{(5)}(0, m) = \frac{3}{m^5} [-5m \cos(m) + 3 \sin(m) \cos^4(m) + 12 \sin(m) - 10m \cos^3(m) - 5m^2 \sin(m) - 4 \sin^3(m)]. \tag{B.5}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Ablowitz and J. T. Cole. “Tight-binding methods for general longitudinally driven photonic lattices: Edge states and solitons”. *Physical Review A* 96.4 (2017), p. 043868.
- [2] M. J. Ablowitz, S. D. Nixon, and Y. Zhu. “Conical diffraction in honeycomb lattices”. *Physical Review A* 79.5 (2009), p. 053830.
- [3] G. Bal and D. Massatt. “Multiscale invariants of Floquet topological insulators”. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* 20.1 (2022), pp. 493–523.
- [4] M. Beceanu. “New Estimates for a Time-dependent Schrödinger Equation”. *Duke Mathematical Journal* 159.3 (2011).
- [5] M. Beceanu and A. Soffer. “The Schrödinger equation with a potential in rough motion”. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 37.6 (2012), pp. 969–1000.
- [6] W. Borrelli, R. Carlone, and L. Tentarelli. “Complete ionization for a non-autonomous point interaction model in $d=2$ ”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 395.2 (2022), pp. 963–1005.
- [7] W. Borrelli and R. Frank. “Sharp decay estimates for critical Dirac equations”. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 373.3 (2020), pp. 2045–2070.

- [8] N. Boussaïd and A. Comech. *Nonlinear Dirac equation: Spectral stability of solitary waves*. Vol. 244. American Mathematical Soc., 2019.
- [9] A. H. Castro Neto et al. “The electronic properties of graphene”. *Reviews of modern physics* 81.1 (2009), pp. 109–162.
- [10] J. Cayssol et al. “Floquet topological insulators”. *physica status solidi (RRL)–Rapid Research Letters* 7.1-2 (2013), pp. 101–108.
- [11] L. N. Coddington EA. *An introduction to ordinary differential equations*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [12] O. Costin, J. Lebowitz, and C. Stucchio. “Ionization in a 1-dimensional dipole model”. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* 20.07 (2008), pp. 835–872.
- [13] O. Costin, J. Lebowitz, and S. Tanveer. “Ionization of coulomb systems in by time periodic forcings of arbitrary size”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 296.3 (2010), pp. 681–738.
- [14] O. Costin et al. “Evolution of a Model Quantum System Under Time Periodic Forcing: Conditions for Complete Ionization”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 221 (2001), pp. 1–26.
- [15] O. Costin, R. D. Costin, and J. L. Lebowitz. “Nonperturbative time dependent solution of a simple ionization model”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 361 (2018), pp. 217–238.
- [16] P. D’Ancona and L. Fanelli. “Decay estimates for the wave and Dirac equations with a magnetic potential”. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 60.3 (2007), pp. 357–392.
- [17] A. Drouot. “The bulk-edge correspondence for continuous dislocated systems”. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier* 71.3 (2021), pp. 1185–1239.
- [18] A. Drouot, C. L. Fefferman, and M. I. Weinstein. “Defect modes for dislocated periodic media”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 377.3 (2020), pp. 1637–1680.
- [19] V. Enss and K. Veselić. “Bound states and propagating states for time-dependent Hamiltonians”. *Annales de l’IHP Physique théorique* 39.2 (1983), pp. 159–191.
- [20] B. M. Erdoğan, M. Goldberg, and W. R. Green. “Limiting absorption principle and Strichartz estimates for Dirac operators in two and higher dimensions”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 367.1 (2019), pp. 241–263.
- [21] M. B. Erdoğan, M. Goldberg, and W. R. Green. “The massless Dirac equation in two dimensions: zero-energy obstructions and dispersive estimates”. *Journal of Spectral Theory* 11.3 (2021), pp. 935–979.
- [22] M. B. Erdoğan, W. R. Green, and E. Toprak. “Dispersive estimates for massive Dirac operators in dimension two”. *Journal of Differential Equations* 264.9 (2018), pp. 5802–5837.
- [23] M. B. Erdoğan, W. R. Green, and E. Toprak. “Dispersive estimates for Dirac operators in dimension three with obstructions at threshold energies”. *American Journal of Mathematics* 141.5 (2019), pp. 1217–1258.
- [24] M. B. Erdoğan, W. R. Green, and E. Toprak. “What is the Dirac Equation?” *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 68.10 (2021).
- [25] M. B. Erdoğan and W. R. Green. “On the one dimensional Dirac equation with potential”. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 151 (2021), pp. 132–170.
- [26] M. B. Erdoğan, W. R. Green, and E. Toprak. “Dispersive estimates for massive Dirac operators in dimension two”. *Journal of Differential Equations* 264.9 (2018), pp. 5802–5837.
- [27] C. Fefferman, J. Lee-Thorp, and M. Weinstein. *Topologically protected states in one-dimensional systems*. Vol. 247. 1173. American Mathematical Society, 2017.

- [28] C. L. Fefferman, J. P. Lee-Thorp, and M. I. Weinstein. “Topologically protected states in one-dimensional continuous systems and Dirac points”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111.24 (2014), pp. 8759–8763.
- [29] C. L. Fefferman and M. I. Weinstein. “Wave packets in honeycomb structures and two-dimensional Dirac equations”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 326 (2014), pp. 251–286.
- [30] A. Galtbayar, A. Jensen, and K. Yajima. “Local time-decay of solutions to Schrödinger equations with time-periodic potentials”. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 116.1 (2004), pp. 231–282.
- [31] M. Goldberg. “Strichartz estimates for the Schrödinger equation with time-periodic $\text{Ln}/2$ potentials”. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 256.3 (2009), pp. 718–746.
- [32] W. R. Green et al. “The Massless Dirac Equation in Three Dimensions: Dispersive estimates and zero energy obstructions”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07675* (2024).
- [33] S. N. Hameedi, A. Sagiv, and M. I. Weinstein. “Radiative decay of edge states in Floquet media”. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* 21.3 (2023), pp. 925–963.
- [34] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I: Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1983.
- [35] J. S. Howland. “Scattering theory for Hamiltonians periodic in time”. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 28.3 (1979), pp. 471–494.
- [36] A. Jensen and T. Kato. “Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators and time-decay of the wave functions”. *Duke Math. J.* 46.1 (1979), pp. 583–611.
- [37] E. Kirr and M. Weinstein. “Diffusion of power in randomly perturbed Hamiltonian partial differential equations”. *Communications in mathematical physics* 255 (2005), pp. 293–328.
- [38] A. Komech and E. Kopylova. “Weighted energy decay for 1D Klein–Gordon equation”. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 35.2 (2010), pp. 353–374.
- [39] E. Kopylova and A. Komech. *Dispersion Decay and Scattering Theory*. Wiley, 2014.
- [40] H. Kovarik. “Spectral properties and time decay of the wave functions of Pauli and Dirac operators in dimension two”. *Advances in Mathematics* 398 (2022), p. 108244.
- [41] J. Kraissler, A. Sagiv, and M. I. Weinstein. “Dispersive decay estimates for Dirac equations with a domain wall”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06499*, to appear in *SIAM J Math Anal* (2023).
- [42] J. W. McIver et al. “Light-induced anomalous Hall effect in graphene”. *Nature physics* 16.1 (2020), pp. 38–41.
- [43] T. Ozawa et al. “Topological photonics”. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 91.1 (2019), p. 015006.
- [44] D. E. Pelinovsky and A. Stefanov. “Asymptotic stability of small gap solitons in nonlinear Dirac equations”. *Journal of mathematical physics* 53.7 (2012).
- [45] P. M. Perez-Piskunow et al. “Floquet chiral edge states in graphene”. *Physical Review B* 89.12 (2014), p. 121401.
- [46] M. S. Rudner and N. H. Lindner. “Band structure engineering and non-equilibrium dynamics in Floquet topological insulators”. *Nature reviews physics* 2.5 (2020), pp. 229–244.
- [47] A. Sagiv and M. I. Weinstein. “Effective gaps in continuous Floquet Hamiltonians”. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 54.1 (2022), pp. 986–1021.
- [48] A. Sagiv and M. I. Weinstein. “Near invariance of quasi-energy spectrum of Floquet Hamiltonians”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10685* (2023).
- [49] W. Schlag. “Dispersive estimates for Schrödinger operators: a survey”. *Mathematical aspects of nonlinear dispersive equations* 163 (2005), pp. 255–285.

- [50] A. Soffer and M. I. Weinstein. “Nonautonomous Hamiltonians”. *Journal of statistical physics* 93 (1998), pp. 359–391.
- [51] A. Soffer and X. Wu. “ L^p Boundedness of the Scattering Wave Operators of Schroedinger Dynamics with Time-dependent Potentials and applications”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14356* (2020).
- [52] E. M. Stein and T. S. Murphy. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*. Vol. 3. Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [53] B. Thaller. *The dirac equation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [54] Y. Wang et al. “Observation of Floquet-Bloch states on the surface of a topological insulator”. *Science* 342.6157 (2013), pp. 453–457.
- [55] H. Xue, Y. Yang, and B. Zhang. “Topological acoustics”. *Nature Reviews Materials* 7.12 (2022), pp. 974–990.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, AMHERST COLLEGE, AMHERST, MA 01002, USA

Email address: jkraisler@amherst.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, NEWARK, NJ 07102, USA

Email address: amir.sagiv@njit.edu

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 500 W120 STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10027, USA

Email address: miw2103@columbia.edu