

SHARP ARITHMETIC DELOCALIZATION FOR QUASIPERIODIC OPERATORS WITH POTENTIALS OF SEMI-BOUNDED VARIATION.

SVETLANA JITOMIRSKAYA AND ILYA KACHKOVSKIY

ABSTRACT. We obtain the sharp arithmetic Gordon's theorem: that is, absence of eigenvalues on the set of energies with Lyapunov exponent bounded by the exponential rate of approximation of frequency by the rationals, for a large class of one-dimensional quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators, with no (modulus of) continuity required. The class includes all unbounded monotone potentials with finite Lyapunov exponents and all potentials of bounded variation. The main tool is a new uniform upper bound on iterates of cocycles of bounded variation.

1. INTRODUCTION AND THE MAIN RESULT

Gordon's trick [7] has been used to prove absence of point spectra for one-dimensional differential and finite difference operators since [3] (see also [5]). Roughly, it requires infinitely many pinned triple almost repetitions of growing blocks of the potential. It has been particularly useful for the study of quasiperiodic operators $H(x)$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ given by

$$(1.1) \quad (H(x)\psi)(n) = \psi(n+1) + \psi(n-1) + f(x+n\alpha)\psi(n).$$

For these operators, such almost repetitions are guaranteed, for all x , for frequencies $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ that are sufficiently well approximated by the rationals¹ if f is uniformly continuous. Since for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ the spectrum of $H(x)$ is absolutely continuous and absence of point spectrum is Baire generic [21], for continuous f it of course immediately follows that there is no point spectrum for α satisfying *some* Liouville-type condition. The advantage of a Gordon-type argument is that it quantifies the Liouvilness.

Moreover, Gordon's trick has also been successfully applied to operators (1.1) with discontinuous f , where the Baire generic argument of [21] does not directly apply. For discontinuous f , other than in the Sturmian case where there are additional considerations [6], the results usually hold only for a full Lebesgue measure set of phases x rather than all values of x , see, for example, [20]. An ultimate result of this kind was proved by Gordon [8] who showed absence of point spectrum for generic α for *any measurable* f . The result of [8] also specifies the required Liouvilness, but in a rather implicit way that, importantly, depends substantially on f , through the measure-theoretic rate of its growth and its measure-theoretic modulus of continuity.

At the same time, for Lipschitz f already the original Gordon's trick gives the Liouvilness requirement fully in terms of the Lyapunov exponent.

¹Conditions of this type are usually called Liouville.

Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ be a 1-periodic measurable function, satisfying

$$(1.2) \quad \int_0^1 \log(1 + |f(x)|) dx < +\infty.$$

Define the one-step and n -step transfer matrices associated to the Schrödinger eigenvalue equation $H(x)\psi = E\psi$ by

$$S^{f,E}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} E - f(x) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_n^{f,E}(x) := \prod_{k=n-1}^0 S^{f,E}(x + k\alpha).$$

Let

$$(1.3) \quad L(E) := L(\alpha, S^{f,E}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{[0,1]} \log \|S_n^{f,E}(x)\| dx.$$

be the Lyapunov exponent of the corresponding Schrödinger cocycle $(\alpha, S^{f,E})$. Due to (1.2) (see also (3.1)), $L(E)$ is well defined and finite².

Let $\frac{p_k}{q_k} \rightarrow \alpha$ be the sequence of the continued fraction approximants. Define the measure of Liouvilness³ $\beta(\alpha) \in [0, \infty]$ by

$$(1.4) \quad \beta(\alpha) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log q_{k+1}}{q_k}.$$

For Lipschitz f , the Gordon-based arguments provide a proof that E cannot be an eigenvalue of $H(x)$ entirely though the interplay between $L(E)$ and $\beta(\alpha)$. Classical results [3] showed, effectively, that E cannot be an eigenvalue if $L(E) < C\beta(\alpha)$. It has been conjectured in [10, 20] and proved in [4, 15, 16] that for the Maryland and almost Mathieu models the *sharp arithmetic* condition is $L(E) < \beta(\alpha)$. It is indeed “sharp” because for the almost Mathieu operator, there exist examples of eigenvalues with $L(E) = \beta(\alpha)$ [2], and it was proved that the spectrum is pure point for a.e. x if $L(E) > \beta(\alpha)$. The latter result was recently established for all type I operators, a large open set of analytic potentials [9] and is conjectured to be universal for all analytic potentials. The sharp arithmetic condition for singular continuous spectrum (i.e. absence of eigenvalues in the regime of positive Lyapunov exponents) was proved, effectively, for all Lipschitz f , in [4] (see also [1, footnote 3]). However, as soon as the Lipschitz modulus of continuity is relaxed, the current results become less effective [13], for example depending also on the Hölder exponent for Hölder f .

However, the same sharp arithmetic condition works for a.e. x for the Maryland model [15] and some other discontinuous f [5]. Moreover, for all Lipschitz monotone f pure point spectrum was proved in the authors’ recent work under the complementary arithmetic condition $L(E) > \beta(\alpha)$, all this suggesting that the sharp arithmetic condition for absence of point spectrum of the form $L(E) < \beta(\alpha)$ is *universal* for operators (1.1).

This universality is what we prove in this paper, for a large class of f .

²One can also check that (1.2) is necessary for $L(E)$ to be finite for all $E \in \mathbb{R}$.

³The quantity $\beta(\alpha) + 1$ is sometimes referred to as the irrationality measure of α .

For a 1-periodic $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$(1.5) \quad \text{Var } f := \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |f(x_{j+1}) - f(x_j)| : 0 = x_0 < x_1 \dots < x_n = 1 \right\}.$$

For $B \geq 0$, let also

$$(1.6) \quad [f]_B(x) := \begin{cases} f(x), & |f(x)| \leq B; \\ B, & |f(x)| > B. \end{cases}$$

We say that a 1-periodic function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is of *semi-bounded variation* if

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{V}(f) := \sup_{B \geq 1} \frac{1}{B} \text{Var}[f]_B < +\infty.$$

In particular, all 1-periodic functions monotone on $[0, 1)$ are of semi-bounded variation.

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, let $H(x)$ be defined by (1.1). Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is a 1-periodic function of semi-bounded variation and satisfies (1.2). Then, for almost every $x \in [0, 1)$, the set*

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

can only support singular continuous spectrum of $H(x)$.

We have two immediate corollaries

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is 1-periodic, non-decreasing on $[0, 1)$, and satisfying (1.2). Then the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds.*

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is 1-periodic with $\text{Var}(f) < +\infty$. Then, the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds.*

Corollary 1.2 is the second part of the arithmetic phase transition theorem for quasiperiodic operators with γ -monotone potentials, in which case it establishes also the singular continuous spectrum for a.e. x , since a large class of discontinuous f , we have $L(E) > 0$ for on a set of full spectral measure [22, 23]. The pure point part of the transition theorem has been recently obtained in [11]. The fact that $L(E) = \beta(\alpha)$ is the exact transition point (at least, for a full measure set of phases) justifies the word “sharp” in the title.

1.1. Acknowledgements. SJ’s work was supported by NSF DMS–2052899, DMS–2155211, and Simons 896624. IK’s work was supported by NSF DMS–1846114, DMS–2052519, and the 2022 Sloan Research Fellowship.

2. SOME PRELIMINARIES: DISCREPANCY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR THE GORDON’S ARGUMENT

2.1. Discrepancy and Koksma’s inequality. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [0, 1]$ be real numbers. Following [14, Definition 1.2], define their *discrepancy* by

$$(2.1) \quad D_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup_{0 < t \leq 1} \left| \frac{\#\{k : x_k \in [0, t)\}}{n} - t \right|.$$

Koksma's inequality (see, for example, [14, Theorem 2.5.1]) states that, for any function f on $[0, 1]$ of bounded variation, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \left| \int_0^1 f(x) dx - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(x_k) \right| \leq \text{Var}(f) D_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Let

$$\alpha = [a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots] = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{\dots}}}$$

be an irrational number represented by a continued fraction expansion. As usual, denote the continued fraction approximants to α by truncating the above continued fraction:

$$\frac{p_k}{q_k} := [a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k] = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{\dots + \frac{1}{a_k}}}}$$

The following well known estimate is contained in [14, Section 2.3], see also [18, 19].

Proposition 2.1. *In the above notation, for irrational α we have*

$$(2.3) \quad D_{q_k}(\{x\}, \{x + \alpha\}, \dots, \{x + (q_k - 1)\alpha\}) \leq \frac{2}{q_k}.$$

As a consequence,

$$(2.4) \quad D_n(\{x\}, \{x + \alpha\}, \dots, \{x + (n - 1)\alpha\}) = o(1), \quad n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The rate of decay in (2.4) highly depends on α (but can be chosen uniformly in x). It can be obtained by finding a sequence $q_k \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $n = s_k q_k + r_k$ with $r_k = o(n)$ (for example, making a choice in a way that $s_k \rightarrow +\infty$).

2.2. An abstract Gordon's theorem. A sharp Gordon's theorem (that is, the one that involves the condition $\beta(\alpha) > L(E)$ rather than, say, $\beta(\alpha) > CL(E)$) was first presented in [4] to treat the singular continuous part of the arithmetic spectral transition for the almost Mathieu operator (see also [1, footnote 3]). In this subsection, we will state Proposition 2.2, which is an abstract versions of such theorem. For the convenience of the reader, we also include the proof, even though it can be easily extracted from the cited results. The proof of Theorem 1.1, therefore, reduces to verifying the assumptions of Proposition 2.2.

Let $V: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and $q_n \rightarrow +\infty$. We will say that V has β -repetitions along $\{q_n\}$ if, for n large enough,

$$(2.5) \quad \max_{1 \leq s < q_n} |V(s) - V(s + q_n)| \leq e^{-\beta q_n}, \quad \max_{1 \leq s < q_n} |V(s) - V(s - q_n)| \leq e^{-\beta q_n}.$$

For a Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ with the potential V

$$(2.6) \quad (H\psi)(n) = \psi(n + 1) + \psi(n - 1) + V(n)\psi(n),$$

define one-step transfer matrices

$$A_n(E) := \begin{pmatrix} E - V(n) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the multi-step transfer matrices by

$$M_{n,k}(E) := \begin{cases} A_{n-1}(E)A_{n-2}(E) \cdots A_k(E), & k \leq n; \\ M_{k,n}^{-1}(E), & k > n. \end{cases}$$

Note that we have

$$M_{n,k}(E) = M_{n,\ell}(E)M_{\ell,k}(E), \quad \text{for } k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Define also

$$M_n(E) := M_{n,0}(E).$$

A sequence $q_n \rightarrow +\infty$ will be called λ -telescopic for V at E if the following bounds are satisfied for large enough n :

$$(2.7) \quad \|M_{2q_n, q_n+s+1}\| \|M_{s,0}\| \leq e^{\lambda q_n}, \quad \text{for } s = 0, \dots, q_n - 1;$$

$$(2.8) \quad \|M_{-q_n, -q_n+s-1}\| \|M_{s, q_n}\| \leq e^{\lambda q_n}, \quad \text{for } s = 0, \dots, q_n - 1.$$

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose that V has β -repetitions along a λ -telescopic sequence at E with $\beta > \lambda > 0$. Then E is not an eigenvalue of H .*

Proof. The argument in the proof is by now standard (see [4, 13, 17]). While most of the proofs involve additional assumptions, the actual arguments can be stated in terms of β -repetitions and λ -telescopic sequences defined above. For the convenience of the reader, we include the complete argument. Since E is fixed, we will drop it from the notation. Let also $P := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We have

$$M_{-q_n} - M_{q_n}^{-1} = M_{-q_n,0} - M_{0,q_n} = \sum_{s=0}^{q_n-1} (V(s - q_n) - V(s)) M_{-q_n, -q_n+s-1} P M_{s, q_n},$$

$$M_{2q_n} - M_{q_n}^2 = (M_{2q_n, q_n} - M_{q_n}) M_{q_n} = \sum_{s=0}^{q_n-1} (V(s + q_n) - V(s)) M_{2q_n, q_n+s+1} P M_{s,0} M_{q_n}.$$

Using (2.5), (2.7), and (2.8), we arrive to, for every $v \in \mathbb{C}^2$:

$$(2.9) \quad \|M_{-q_n} - M_{q_n}^{-1}\| \leq q_n e^{-(\beta-\lambda)q_n}; \quad \|(M_{2q_n} - M_{q_n}^2)v\| \leq q_n e^{-(\beta-\lambda)q_n} \|M_{q_n} v\|.$$

Suppose that $\psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is a non-trivial solution to $Hu = Eu$. Let $v := \begin{pmatrix} \psi(0) \\ \psi(-1) \end{pmatrix}$, and assume that $\|v\| = 1$. Since $|\psi(n)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \|M_{q_n} v\|, \|M_{-q_n} v\|, \|M_{2q_n} v\| < 1/2$$

for n large enough. The characteristic equation

$$M_{q_n} - (\text{tr } M_{q_n})I + M_{q_n}^{-1} = 0,$$

applied to v , implies

$$(2.11) \quad |\text{tr } M_{q_n}| \leq \|M_{q_n} v\| + \|M_{-q_n} v\| + \|M_{-q_n} - M_{q_n}^{-1}\| < 1$$

for n large enough, in view of (2.9) and (2.10). However, another characteristic equation

$$M_{q_n}^2 - (\operatorname{tr} M_{q_n})M_{q_n} + I = 0,$$

also applied to v , implies

$$\|M_{2q_n} v\| \geq \|M_{q_n}^2 v\| - \|(M_{2q_n} - M_{q_n}^2)v\| \geq 1 - |\operatorname{tr} M_{q_n}| \|M_{q_n} v\| - \|(M_{2q_n} - M_{q_n}^2)v\| > 1/2,$$

again, for n large enough in view of (2.9), (2.11), (2.10), which contradicts the last estimate in (2.10). ■

3. A UNIFORM UPPER BOUND FOR COCYCLES OF BOUNDED VARIATION

Let $M: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ be a 1-periodic matrix-valued measurable function. A quasiperiodic cocycle (over an irrational rotation) is a pair (α, M) , where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. The n -th iteration of the cocycle (α, M) is defined by

$$(\alpha, M)^n = (n\alpha, M_n), \quad \text{where} \quad M_n(x) = \prod_{k=n-1}^0 M(x + k\alpha),$$

and the (maximal) Lyapunov exponent is defined by

$$(3.1) \quad L(\alpha, M) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{[0,1]} \log \|M_n(x)\| dx = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \int_{[0,1]} \log \|M_n(x)\| dx.$$

We will say that M is of bounded variation if all its matrix elements $M_{ij} = M_{ij}(x)$ satisfy $\operatorname{Var} M_{ij} < +\infty$, see (1.5). Our goal is to establish the following uniform upper bound on the iterates of linear cocycles of bounded variation.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $M: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is 1-periodic and of bounded variation. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \alpha, M) > 0$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$ one has*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \|M_n(x)\| \leq L(\alpha, M) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1].$$

Remark 3.2. In the continuous case, the result follows in a standard way by subadditivity, unique ergodicity of the irrational rotation, and compactness. In the case of bounded almost continuous cocycles⁴, the bound was obtained in [12]. Here we show that bounded variation is sufficient.

We will need several preliminaries in order to proceed with the proof. The sequence $\log \|M_n(x)\|$ forms a sub-additive cocycle with $\frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \log \|M_n(x)\| dx$ converging to $L(\alpha, M)$. We will consider iterations of this cocycle over pieces of the trajectory of length m as a subadditive cocycle over the rotation $x \mapsto x + m\alpha$. For large m , the interaction between these iterations behaves like an additive cocycle, for which uniform upper bounds follow from applying Koksma's inequality and monotonicity under truncations. It will be convenient to state the following straightforward lemma separately.

⁴that is, continuous outside a set whose closure has measure zero

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$h \in L^1[0, 1]; \quad -\infty \leq h(x) \leq B, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1).$$

Let also

$$\{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}\} \subset [0, 1), \quad D := D_n^*(r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}).$$

Suppose that, for some $A \geq B$, we have $\text{Var}[h]_A < +\infty$. Then

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h(r_j) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} [h]_A(r_j) \leq \int_0^1 [h]_A(x) dx + D \text{Var}[h]_A.$$

Proof. The first inequality in (3.2) follow from the definition of h_A and the fact that $A \geq B$. The second inequality follows from Koksma's inequality (2.2). ■

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $g_m(x) := \frac{1}{m} \log \|M_m(x)\|$. From subadditivity of the original cocycle, we have (in the first inequality, without loss of generality)

$$+\infty > \int_0^1 g_m(x) dx \geq \int_0^1 g_{2m}(x) dx \geq L(\alpha, M), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since M is bounded, we have

$$(3.3) \quad g_m(x) \leq C_1 = C_1(M), \quad \forall x \in [0, 1), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

and, since $\|M_m(\cdot)\|$ is of bounded variation and $[\log |\cdot|]_A$ is a Lipschitz function, we also have

$$(3.4) \quad \text{Var}[g_{m_0}]_A \leq C_2 = C_2(m_0, \alpha, M, A).$$

We will prove the upper bound by an $\varepsilon/4$ -argument. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and find some $m_0 > 0$ and $A = A(m_0) > C_1$ such that

$$(3.5) \quad \int_0^1 g_{m_0}(x) dx - L(\alpha, M) < \varepsilon/4, \quad \int_0^1 [g_{m_0}]_A(x) dx - \int_0^1 g_{m_0}(x) dx \leq \varepsilon/4.$$

Note that the left hand sides of both inequalities are non-negative, and all terms are finite. Use Proposition 2.1 to find $k_0 = k_0(A, m_0, \alpha, M)$ large enough so that

$$(3.6) \quad D_k := D_k^*(x, x+m_0\alpha, x+2m_0\alpha, \dots, x+(k-1)m_0\alpha) < C_2^{-1}\varepsilon/4, \quad \forall k \geq k_0, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1).$$

Let $n = km_0$ with $k \geq k_0$. Then, by expressing $M_n(x)$ as a product of $M_k(\cdot)$, one can apply Lemma 3.3 combined with (3.5), (3.6) and obtain

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \|M_n(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} g_{m_0}(x + jm_0\alpha) \leq \int_0^1 [g_{m_0}]_A(x) dx + C_2 D_k \\ \leq L(\alpha, M) + 3\varepsilon/4.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem for n divisible by m_0 . In order to consider the general case, let $n = km_0 + m$ large enough so that $k \geq k_0$ and $0 \leq m < m_0$. Then

$$\log \|M_n(x)\| \leq \log \|M_{km_0}(x)\| + mg_m(x + km_0\alpha) \leq km_0(L(\alpha, M) + 3\varepsilon/4) + m_0 C_1.$$

After dividing by n and using the fact that $n \geq km_0$, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \|M_n(x)\| \leq L(\alpha, M) + 3\varepsilon/4 + \frac{m_0 C_1}{n} \leq L(\alpha, M) + 3\varepsilon/4 + \frac{C_1}{k}.$$

The proof can now be completed by choosing $k > 4C_1/\varepsilon$. ■

Remark 3.4. In Theorem 3.1, we only used the properties of the scalar sub-additive cocycle g_m . It is easy to restate the result completely in these terms. Let $\{g_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a sub-additive real scalar cocycle over a circle rotation. Suppose that $g_0(x)$ is bounded from above and $\text{Var}[g_m]_A < +\infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose also that $L(g) > -\infty$. Then the same conclusion holds: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \alpha, g) > 0$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$ one has

$$\frac{1}{n} g_n(x) \leq L(\alpha, g) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1).$$

Since we only used the fact that $D_k \rightarrow 0$, the arguments apply to all ergodic circle maps, rather than just rotations.

4. ESTIMATES FOR SCALAR FUNCTIONS OF SEMI-BOUNDED VARIATION

In this section, we obtain some estimates for scalar functions of bounded variation, which will be used in obtaining β -repetitions and the λ -telescopic property later for Schrödinger cocycles.

4.1. Finite difference estimates. The original proofs of Gordon's theorem for quasiperiodic operators require some kind of uniform differentiability (e. g. Lipschitz property) of f in order to produce β -repetitions. The following lemma, as well as Corollaries 4.2 and 4.3, are motivated by the fact that every function of bounded variation is almost everywhere differentiable.

Lemma 4.1. *Let f be a 1-periodic function on \mathbb{R} , non-decreasing on $[0, 1)$, with*

$$|f(x)| \leq B, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $A > 0$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad |\{x \in [0, 1) : |f(x + \delta) - f(x)| > A\delta\}| \leq 2\delta + 6BA^{-1}.$$

Proof. The set

$$S := \{x \in (\delta, 1 - \delta) : f(x) < f(x) + A\delta\}$$

satisfies the trivial inclusion

$$S \subset \cup_{x \in S} [x, x + \delta] \subset [0, 1).$$

By Vitali's covering lemma, there exist finitely many $x_j \in S$ such that the intervals $[x_j, x_j + \delta]$ are disjoint, and the intervals $[x_j - \delta, x_j + 2\delta]$ cover S . Let

$$S' := \cup_j [x_j, x_j + \delta].$$

We have, using the fact that the intervals $[x_j, x_j + \delta]$ are disjoint and that f is non-decreasing:

$$|S| \leq 3|S'| = 3 \sum_j |[x_j, x_j + \delta]| < 3A^{-1} \sum_j (f(x_j + \delta) - f(x_j)) \leq 6A^{-1}B.$$

Since the remaining part of the set in (4.1) is contained in $[0, \delta] \cup [1 - \delta, 1)$, this completes the proof. ■

Corollary 4.2. *Let f be a 1-periodic function on \mathbb{R} with $\text{Var } f < +\infty$. Then a similar conclusion holds: For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $A > 0$, we have*

$$|\{x \in [0, 1): |f(x + \delta) - f(x)| > A\delta\}| \leq 4\delta + 6A^{-1} \text{Var } f.$$

Proof. The function f is a difference of functions of the kind considered in Lemma 4.1 whose absolute values are bounded by $\frac{1}{2} \text{Var } f$. ■

Corollary 4.3. *Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ be a 1-periodic function satisfying (1.2): that is,*

$$\int_0^1 \log(1 + |f(x)|) dx < +\infty.$$

For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $A, B > 0$, we have

$$(4.2) \quad |\{x \in [0, 1): |f(x + \delta) - f(x)| > A\delta\}| \leq 4\delta + 6A^{-1}e^B \text{Var}[f]_{e^B} + \frac{2}{B} \int_{\{x \in [0, 1): \log(1 + |f(x)|) > B\}} \log(1 + |f(x)|) dx.$$

Proof. If $\text{Var}[f]_{e^B} = +\infty$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, apply Corollary 4.2 to $[f]_{e^B}$ and estimate the measure of the set where $f(x) \neq [f]_{e^B}(x)$ or $f(x + \delta) \neq [f]_{e^B}(x + \delta)$ by Markov's inequality. ■

4.2. Multiplicative upper estimates. In this subsection, we discuss some applications of Koksma's inequality (2.2) which involve estimates of sums of functions of bounded variation over finite sets with known bounds on discrepancies. They are referred to as “multiplicative” since later they will be applied to the function $\log(1 + |f|)$. We start from the following restatement of Lemma 3.3. Recall, as defined in (1.6):

$$[h]_B(x) = \begin{cases} h(x), & |h(x)| \leq B; \\ B, & |h(x)| > B. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let*

$$\{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}\} \subset [0, 1), \quad D := D_n^*(r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}).$$

Suppose that $h \in L^1[0, 1)$ and, for some $B \geq 0$, we have $V = \text{Var}[h]_B < +\infty$. Then

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} [h]_B(x + r_j) \leq \int_0^1 [h]_B(x) dx + 2DV, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1).$$

As a consequence,

$$(4.4) \quad \left\{ x \in [0, 1): \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h(x + r_j) > \int_0^1 [h]_B(x) dx + 2DV \right\} \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} \{x \in [0, 1): h(x + r_j) > B\}.$$

As another consequence, the measure of the above set can be estimated by

$$\left| \left\{ x \in [0, 1) : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h(x + r_j) > \int_0^1 [h]_B(x) dx + 2DV \right\} \right| \leq \frac{n}{B} \int_{x \in [0, 1) : h(x) > B} h(x) dx.$$

Proof. Follows from applying Lemma 3.3 to $[h]_B$, in which case the exceptional set would be the set where $h(x + r_j) > B$ for some j .

The factor 2 can be omitted if one replaces the definition of discrepancy by a translationally invariant one. ■

As mentioned above, Lemma 4.4 will be applied to the function

$$h(x) = \log F(x) = \log(1 + |f(x)|),$$

where f is of semi-bounded variation. Recall that the latter means

$$\mathcal{V}(f) := \sup_{B \geq 1} \frac{1}{B} \text{Var}[f]_B < +\infty.$$

In order to obtain a meaningful statement, we will need some estimates on $[\log(1 + |f|)]_B$. For $-\infty \leq B_1 < B_2 \leq +\infty$, define

$$[f]_{B_1, B_2}(x) = \begin{cases} B_1, & f(x) \leq B_1; \\ f(x), & B_1 < f(x) < B_2; \\ B_2, & f(x) \geq B_2. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $[f]_B = [f]_{-B, B}$ for $B \geq 0$. The following lemma is elementary and we omit the proof.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is 1-periodic, and $B_1 < B_2 < B_3$. Then*

$$\text{Var}[f]_{B_1, B_3} = \text{Var}[f]_{B_1, B_2} + \text{Var}[f]_{B_2, B_3}.$$

The next lemma shows that if f is of semi-bounded variation, then so is $\log(1 + |f|)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $F \geq 1$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$(4.5) \quad \text{Var}[\log F]_N \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil N/\log 2 \rceil} 2^{-j} \text{Var}[F]_{2^j, 2^{j+1}}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\text{Var}[\log F]_B \leq 2 \log(2) B \mathcal{V}(F), \quad \forall B \geq 1.$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from Lemma 4.5 and the fact that $\log(\cdot)$ has derivative bounded by 2^{-j} on $[2^j, 2^{j+1}]$. The second inequality follows from the estimate

$$\text{Var}[F]_{2^j, 2^{j+1}} \leq \text{Var}[F]_{2^{j+1}} \leq 2^{j+1} \mathcal{V}(F). \quad \blacksquare$$

Finally, the following lemma will be useful in obtaining factorizations of Schrödinger cocycles.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that f is of semi-bounded variation. Then $\frac{f}{1+|f|}$ has bounded variation.*

Proof. By considering positive and negative parts of f and in view of Lemma 4.5, one can assume without loss of generality that $f \geq 0$. We have

$$\mathrm{Var} \frac{f}{1+f} = \mathrm{Var} \frac{1}{1+f} = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \mathrm{Var} \left[\frac{1}{1+f} \right]_{2^{-(j+1)}, 2^{-j}}.$$

Since

$$\left(\frac{1}{1+t} \right)' = - \left(\frac{1}{1+t} \right)^2,$$

we have

$$\mathrm{Var} \left[\frac{1}{1+f} \right]_{2^{-(j+1)}, 2^{-j}} \leq 2^{-2j} \mathrm{Var}[f]_{2^{j-1}, 2^{j+1}-1} \leq 2^{-j} \mathcal{V}(f),$$

which completes the proof after summation. ■

5. FACTORIZED COCYCLES AND PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we will establish telescopic bounds for a class of cocycles that admit a factorization that allows to combine Theorem 3.1 with estimates of the kind obtained in Lemma 4.4, in order to obtain telescopic bounds. Afterwards, we will show that Schrödinger cocycles admit such factorization and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

5.1. Telescopic bounds for factorized cocycles. Let $M: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}_N(\mathbb{C})$ be a measurable 1-periodic function. We will assume that the following factorization takes place:

$$M(x) = F(x)G(x),$$

where $G: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}_N(\mathbb{C})$ is a 1-periodic matrix-valued function of bounded variation such that $L(\alpha, G) > -\infty$, and $F(x) \geq 1$ is a scalar function, satisfying

$$(5.1) \quad \int_0^1 \log F(x) dx < +\infty$$

and the variation estimate

$$(5.2) \quad \mathrm{Var}[\log F]_B < +\infty, \quad \forall B \geq 1.$$

Fix some finite subset of $[0, 1)$ with a uniform discrepancy bound

$$\{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}\} \subset [0, 1), \quad D_n^*(x + r_0, x + r_1, \dots, x + r_{n-1}) \leq D, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1).$$

Define

$$(5.3) \quad P_s(x) := \left\| \prod_{j=n-1}^{s+1} M(x + r_j) \right\| \left\| \prod_{j=s}^0 M(x + r_j) \right\|.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $M(x)$, $F(x)$, $G(x)$, and $\{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}\}$ be as above. Define $P_s(x)$ by (5.3). Let n be large enough so that the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 holds for (α, G) . Suppose that $2D \mathrm{Var}[\log F]_B < \varepsilon$. Then*

$$\{x \in (0, 1): P_s(x) > e^{n(L(\alpha, M) + 2\varepsilon)}\} \subset \left\{ x \in [0, 1): \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log F(x + r_j) > L(\alpha, F) + \varepsilon \right\}.$$

The set in the right hand side is, in turn, contained in

$$\bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} \{x \in [0, 1): F(x + r_j) > e^B\}.$$

Proof. Follows from the direct applications of Theorem 3.1 for (α, M) and Lemma 4.4 for (α, F) (the scalar cocycle). ■

We will now describe a more concrete application relevant to Theorem 1.1. Let $\frac{p_k}{q_k}$ be a continued fraction approximant to α , and suppose that $\delta < \frac{1}{10q_k}$. For $s = 0, 1, \dots, q_k - 1$, define

$$R_s := \{x, x + \alpha, \dots, x + (s-1)\alpha, x + (s+1)\alpha + \delta, x + (s+2)\alpha + \delta, \dots, x + (q_k - 1)\alpha + \delta\}.$$

The set R_s has $q_k - 1$ elements. It is easy to see that have

$$D_{q_k-1}^*(R_s) \leq \frac{3}{q_k}.$$

Corollary 5.2. *Under the assumptions and using the notation of Lemma 5.1, let $n = q_k - 2$, $\{r_0, \dots, r_{q_k-2}\} = R_s$ defined above. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigcup_{s=0}^{q_k-1} \{x \in (0, 1): P_s(x) > e^{nL(\alpha, M) + 2\varepsilon}\} \subset \\ & \subset \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{q_k-1} \{x \in [0, 1): F(x + j\alpha) > e^B\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{q_k-1} \{x \in [0, 1): F(x + j\alpha + \delta) > e^B\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\left| \bigcup_{s=0}^{q_k-1} \{x \in (0, 1): P_s(x) > e^{nL(\alpha, M) + 2\varepsilon}\} \right| \leq \frac{2q_k}{B} \int_{\{x \in [0, 1): F(x) > e^B\}} \log F(x) dx.$$

Proof. Follows from applying Lemma 5.1 to all choices of R_s and combining all possible cases. ■

5.2. Schrödinger cocycles and the proof of Theorem 1.1. We are now ready to apply the general results to Schrödinger cocycles. Let

$$(5.4) \quad S^{f, E}(x) := \begin{pmatrix} E - f(x) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: F(x)G(x, E), \quad \text{where } F(x) := 1 + |f(x)|.$$

Corollary 5.3. *Define F, G as in (5.4), and that f satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1: that is,*

$$\mathcal{V}(f) = \sup_{B \geq 1} \frac{1}{B} \text{Var}[f]_B < +\infty, \quad \log F \in L^1[0, 1].$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that q_{n_j} is a sequence of denominators of the continued fraction expansion of α such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \left(\int_{\{x \in [0, 1): F(x) > e^{\varepsilon q_{n_j}/10}\}} \log F(x) dx \right) < +\infty.$$

Then there exists a full measure subset $X_{\text{tel}} \in [0, 1)$ such that, for every $x \in X_{\text{tel}}$ and every $E \in \mathbb{R}$, the sequence $\{q_{n_j}\}$ is $(L(\alpha, E) + \varepsilon)$ -telescopic for $V(n) = f(x + n\alpha)$.

Proof. Since $|\cdot|$ is Lipschitz, we have that $F(x) = 1 + |f(x)|$ also satisfies $\mathcal{V}(F) < +\infty$. From Lemma 4.6, the same holds for $\log F$. From Lemma 4.7, the matrix elements of G are of bounded variation, and therefore satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1. As a consequence, one can apply Lemma 5.1 and Corollary 5.2 with, say, $B = \frac{\varepsilon q_k}{10}$, combined with the Borel–Cantelli lemma. ■

Remark 5.4. An important ingredient of the proof is the fact that $F(x)$ in the factorization (5.4) does not depend on E , which allows to avoid considering an intersection of uncountably many full measure subsets. While $G(x, E)$ will be of bounded variation for all E , we do not require any control of the dependence of $n_0(\varepsilon, \alpha, M)$ with $M = G(\cdot, E)$ in Theorem 3.1 on E .

It remains to establish β -repetitions. We will use Corollary 4.3 in the following result.

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ with*

$$\mathcal{V}(f) < +\infty, \quad \log F \in L^1[0, 1).$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that q_{n_j} is a sequence of denominators of the continued fraction expansion of α such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \left(\int_{\{x \in [0, 1): F(x) > e^{\varepsilon q_{n_j}/10}\}} \log F(x) dx \right) < +\infty, \quad q_{n_{j+1}} \geq e^{\beta q_{n_j}}.$$

Then there exists a full measure subset $X_{\text{rep}} \in [0, 1)$ such that, for every $x \in X$ and every $E \in \mathbb{R}$, the potential $V(n) = f(x + n\alpha)$ has $(\beta - \varepsilon)$ -repetitions along q_{n_j} .

Proof. Apply (4.2) from Corollary 4.3 with $B = \frac{\varepsilon q_{n_j}}{10}$, $\delta = \pm \text{dist}(q_{n_j}\alpha, \mathbb{Z})$ and, say, $A = e^{\varepsilon q_{n_j}/5}$. ■

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now obtained directly by combining Proposition 2.2 with Corollaries 5.3 and 5.5. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Avila A., Jitomirskaya S., *The Ten Martini Problem*, Ann. Math. 170 (2009), no. 1, 303 – 342.
- [2] Avila A., Jitomirskaya S., Zhou Q., *Second phase transition line*, Math. Ann. 370 (2018), 271 – 285.
- [3] Avron J., Simon B., *Singular continuous spectrum for a class of almost periodic Jacobi matrices*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 6 (1982), no. 1, 81 – 85.
- [4] Avila A., You J., Zhou Q., *Sharp phase transitions for the almost Mathieu operator*, Duke Math. J. 166 (2017), no. 14, 2697 – 2718.
- [5] Damanik D., *Gordon-type Arguments in the Spectral Theory of One-dimensional Quasicrystals*, in: Directions in Mathematical Quasicrystals, vol. 13, edited by M. Baake and R. V. Moody. CRM Monograph Series. 277 – 304. Providence, RI: AMS, 2000.
- [6] Damanik D., Lenz D., *Uniform spectral properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals, IV. Quasi-Sturmian potentials*, J. Anal. Math. 90 (2003), 115 – 139.

- [7] Gordon A., *The point spectrum of the one-dimensional Schrödinger operator*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk 31 (1976), 257 – 258.
- [8] Gordon A., *Discrete Schrödinger operators with potentials defined by measurable sampling functions over Liouville torus rotations*, J. Fractal. Geom. 4 (2017), no. 4, 329 – 337.
- [9] Ge L., Jitomirskaya S., *Hidden subcriticality, symplectic structure, and universality of sharp arithmetic spectral results for type I operators*, preprint (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.08866>.
- [10] Jitomirskaya S., *Almost everything about the almost Mathieu operator, II*, in Proc. of XI Int. Congress of Math. Physics, Int. Press, Somerville, Mass. (1995), 373 – 382.
- [11] Jitomirskaya S., Kachkovskiy I., *Sharp arithmetic localization for quasiperiodic operators with monotone potentials*, preprint (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00703>.
- [12] Jitomirskaya S., Mavi R., *Dynamical bounds for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators with rough potentials*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2017), no. 1, 96 – 120.
- [13] Jitomirskaya S., Kocić S., *Spectral Theory of Schrödinger Operators over Circle Diffeomorphisms*, Int. Math. Res. Notices 2022 (2022), no. 13, 9810 – 9829.
- [14] Kuipers L., Niederreiter H., *Uniform Distribution of Sequences*, John Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- [15] Jitomirskaya S., Liu W., *Arithmetic spectral transitions for the Maryland model*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 70 (2017), no. 6, 1025 – 1051.
- [16] Jitomirskaya S., Liu W., *Universal hierarchical structure of quasiperiodic eigenfunctions*, Ann. of Math. 187 (2018), no. 3, 721 – 776.
- [17] Jitomirskaya S., Yang F., *Singular continuous spectrum for singular potentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. 351 (2017), 1127 – 1135.
- [18] Khinchin A., *Continued Fractions*, Dover Books on Mathematics, 1997.
- [19] Ravenstein T., *The Three Gap Theorem (Steinhaus Conjecture)*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A 45 (1988), no. 3, 360 – 370.
- [20] Simon B., *Almost periodic Schrödinger operators. IV. The Maryland model*, Ann. Physics 159 (1985), no. 1, 157 – 183.
- [21] Simon B., *Operators with singular continuous spectrum: I. General operators*, Ann. Math. 141 (1995), 131 – 145.
- [22] Simon B., Spencer T., *Trace class perturbations and the absence of absolutely continuous spectra*, Comm. Math. Phys. 125 (1999), no. 1, 113 – 125.
- [23] Damanik D., Killip R., *Ergodic potentials with a discontinuous sampling function are non-deterministic*, Math. Res. Lett. 12 (2005), 187 – 192.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CA 94720, USA.
Email address: sjitomi@berkeley.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, WELLS HALL, 619 RED CEDAR ROAD, EAST LANSING, MI 48824, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Email address: ikachkov@msu.edu