

Longitudinal conductivity at integer quantum Hall transitions

Giovanna Marcelli¹, Lorenzo Pigozzi², and Marcello Porta³

¹Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università di Roma Tre, Largo S. L. Murialdo 1, 00146 Roma, Italy

²Institute of Science and Technology Austria, Am Campus 1, 3400 Klosterneuburg, Austria

³Mathematics Area, SISSA, Via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy

March 4, 2025

Abstract

We compute the longitudinal conductivity for a wide class of two-dimensional tight-binding models, whose Hamiltonian displays conical intersections of the Bloch bands at the Fermi level. Our setting allows to consider generic transitions between quantum Hall phases. We obtain an explicit expression for the longitudinal conductivity, completely determined by the number of conical intersections and by the shape of the cones. In particular, the formula reproduces the known quantized values obtained for graphene and for the critical Haldane model.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Model and main result	4
2.1	Periodic operators	4
2.2	The model	5
2.3	Linear response	7
2.4	Main result	10
3	Proof of Theorem 2.4	11
3.1	σ_{jl} as right derivative of f_{jl}	11
3.2	Complex time deformation	13
3.3	Singular and regular parts of \tilde{f}_{jj}	16
3.4	Final rewriting of σ_{jj}	18
A	Auxiliary results	24

1 Introduction

The Integer Quantum Hall Effect (IQHE) is a paradigmatic example of universal transport phenomenon in condensed matter physics. Experimentally observed in [25], since then it has been the focus of extensive research in theoretical and in mathematical physics. The IQHE can be explained via the formalism of linear response theory: when a gapped Hamiltonian is adiabatically perturbed by an electric field of small intensity, the resulting transverse conductivity, defined via Kubo formula, is quantized in integer multiples of e^2/h , with e the electric charge and h Planck's constant. The first theoretical works on the IQHE date back to the seminal papers [27, 41, 2]. Since then, mathematically rigorous results established the quantization of the Hall conductivity for general lattice models [9, 3] and the emergence of Hall plateaux as a consequence of disorder and Anderson localization [1]. Concerning the validity of Kubo formula from quantum dynamics, it can be proved as a consequence of the adiabatic theorem [4]. Actually, for the Hall effect, Kubo formula turns out to be exact, beyond linear response [24]; see also the recent generalization [31]. The validity of Kubo formula has been obtained for gapped models in the continuum [13, 29], and more recently for lattice systems in presence of strong disorder [11]. Concerning gapless models, the validity of Kubo formula for the edge transport properties of quantum Hall systems has been derived in [37]. In the last few years, the proof of quantization of the Hall conductivity has been extended to interacting fermions as well [22, 16, 7]. Also, the validity of Kubo formula has been justified in the many-body setting [6, 35, 19], and its exactness for quantum Hall systems has been proved in [8, 42].

It is a well-known fact that two local, gapped Hamiltonians associated with different values of the Hall conductivity cannot be smoothly deformed one into the other, without closing the spectral gap at some point in the interpolation; this gap closure is referred to as a quantum Hall phase transition. Understanding the nature of this phase transition is an interesting problem in condensed matter physics. Let us consider the simplest case, that is non-interacting and translation-invariant systems. There, the spectral properties of the Hamiltonian can be analyzed in momentum space, via Bloch theory. In many concrete situations, it is found that at the transition point the spectral gap closes with conical intersections of the Bloch bands. For instance, this is the case for the Haldane model [20], or for the model considered in [28]. Recently, it has been proved that conical intersections at the Fermi level arise generically [12] at Hall transitions, for a wide class of non-interacting, translation-invariant systems.

Models with conical intersections at the Fermi level are an example of semimetals, and display interesting transport properties. Let us consider the longitudinal conductivity, defined as the linear response of the average current, in the same direction of the applied electric field. This quantity is exactly zero for gapped systems, but might be non-zero for gapless models. Specifically, the longitudinal conductivity has been computed in a number of semimetallic systems, such as graphene [39], the critical Haldane model [20], or in [28]. In these works, it is found that the longitudinal conductivity, defined via Kubo formula, is equal to $n/16$, where n is the number of conical intersections at the Fermi level. More recently, this remarkable formula has also been rigorously established for weakly interacting fermions, in the case of graphene [15] and for the critical Haldane-Hubbard model [14, 17], using rigorous renormalization group methods and Ward identities.

In this paper, we compute the Kubo longitudinal conductivity for a general class of non-interacting lattice models. Besides translation-invariance, our main assumption (spelled out more precisely in Assumption 2.1) is the existence of conical intersections at the Fermi level for the Bloch bands, without any further hypothesis on the structure of the Bloch Hamiltonian. In particular, combined with [12], our theorem allows to determine the longitudinal conductivity at the generic transition between different Hall phases. The main result of this paper can be written as follows.

Under Assumption 2.1, the longitudinal conductivity in the direction $j = 1, 2$ is given by:

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{s_{1j}^2 + s_{2j}^2}{|\det S_l|}, \quad (1.1)$$

where n is the number of intersections between the Bloch bands at Fermi energy μ and $S_l = (s_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$, is a 2×2 invertible matrix that defines the shape of the cone near the l -th intersection, see (2.6) (we omit the dependence on the cone label l in s_{ij} to simplify the notation). In particular, for isotropic cones, the right-hand side of (1.1) equals $\frac{n}{16}$.

Expression (1.1) depends solely on the eigenvalue structure of the Bloch Hamiltonian near the Fermi level and not on the Bloch functions. This is somewhat opposite to what happens for the IQHE, where the transverse conductivity is determined by the topology of the Bloch functions, and not by the energy bands. Thus, the longitudinal conductivity at criticality is identified as a non-topological transport property. The proof of (1.1) is based on an adaptation of the strategy introduced in [15] for interacting graphene, and then applied in [14, 17] to the critical Haldane-Hubbard model. Here we consider non-interacting fermions, however for a large class of Bloch Hamiltonians, displaying conical intersections at the Fermi level, that allows to cover the generic case for quantum Hall transitions [12]. It is an interesting open problem to extend our result to the case of interacting systems.

A similar expression for the conductivity of two-dimensional systems exhibiting conical intersections of the Bloch bands at the Fermi level has been obtained in [10]. The setting is however different from the one of the present paper. In [10], the external field is introduced instantaneously, and the definition of conductivity involves a time-averaging assumption of the linear response. Furthermore, the assumptions of [10] are more restrictive than ours: time-reversal symmetry is needed, which rules out applications to the Hall effect, and stronger symmetry and regularity assumptions of the Bloch bands close to the conical intersections are required.

Finally, let us mention that it would be interesting to extend the methods of the present paper to study spin transport, in the context of the quantum spin Hall effect; see *e.g.* [33, 34, 30] for recent rigorous results in this direction.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the class of models considered, we introduce necessary mathematical framework, and we state our main result, Theorem 2.4. In Section 3 we give the proof of Theorem 2.4. Finally, in Appendix A we collect some technical auxiliary results.

Acknowledgements. G. M. and M. P. acknowledge support by the European Research Council through the ERC-StG MaMBoQ, n. 802901. G. M. acknowledges financial support from the In-

dependent Research Fund Denmark–Natural Sciences, grant DFF–10.46540/2032-00005B and from the European Research Council through the ERC CoG UniCoSM, grant agreement n.724939. M. P. acknowledges support from the MUR, PRIN 2022 project MaIQuFi cod. 20223J85K3. This work has been carried out under the auspices of the GNFM of INdAM.

2 Model and main result

2.1 Periodic operators

We consider quantum systems having a *crystalline structure*, namely their configuration space \mathcal{X} is invariant under translations by any vector in a Bravais lattice Γ . We address discrete models in 2-dimension, namely \mathcal{X} is a discrete set of points in \mathbb{R}^2 . It can be assumed that the Bravais lattice Γ is spanned over the integers by a basis $\{a_1, a_2\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

The Hilbert space for a quantum particle is

$$\mathcal{H} := \ell^2(\mathcal{X}).$$

The crystalline structure of the configuration space is lifted to a symmetry of the one-particle Hilbert space given by the unitary representation of the *translation operators* T_γ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$, where

$$(T_\gamma \psi)(x) := \psi(x - \gamma) \quad \text{for every } \psi \in \mathcal{H}.$$

An operator A acting on \mathcal{H} is called *periodic* if $[A, T_\gamma] = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. As is well-known, the analysis of periodic operators is simplified by the use of their (*modified*) *Bloch–Floquet representation* (see e. g. [40, Chapter 5] and references therein). At this point it is convenient to introduce some notation.

We introduce the dual lattice $\Gamma^* := \{k \in \mathbb{R}^2 : k \cdot \gamma \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } \gamma \in \Gamma\}$. We denote by \mathcal{C}_1 the *centered fundamental cell* of Γ , namely

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : x = \sum_{j=1}^2 \alpha_j a_j \text{ with } \alpha_j \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] \right\}.$$

Similarly, we define the *unit fundamental cell* of Γ^* by setting

$$\mathcal{C}_1^* := \left\{ k \in \mathbb{R}^2 : k = \sum_{j=1}^2 \beta_j a_j^* \text{ with } \beta_j \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] \right\},$$

where $\{a_1^*, a_2^*\}$ is the dual basis of $\{a_1, a_2\}$, i. e. $a_i^* \cdot a_j = 2\pi\delta_{i,j}$.

The (*modified*) *Bloch–Floquet transform* is initially defined on compactly supported functions $\psi \in \ell_c^2(\mathcal{X})$ as

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}\psi)(k, y) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_1^*|^{1/2}} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} e^{-ik \cdot (y - \gamma)} (T_\gamma \psi)(y) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (2.1)$$

Notice that for fixed $k \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the function $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}\psi)(k, \cdot)$ is periodic with respect to the translations by vectors in Γ , hence it can be considered as an element of $\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma) \cong \mathbb{C}^N$, where $N < \infty$ is the

cardinality of \mathcal{X}/Γ . On the other hand, for fixed $y \in \mathcal{X}$, the map $(\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}\psi)(\cdot, y)$ is *pseudoperiodic* with respect to the translations by vectors in Γ^* :

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}\psi)(k + \gamma^*, y) = (\varrho_{\gamma^*} \mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}\psi)(k, y) \quad \text{for all } \gamma^* \in \Gamma^*, \quad (2.2)$$

where $(\varrho_{\gamma^*}\varphi)(y) := e^{-i\gamma^* \cdot y} \varphi(y)$ for every $\varphi \in \ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)$, and $\Gamma^* \ni \gamma^* \mapsto \varrho_{\gamma^*}$ defines a unitary representation. It is useful to introduce the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_\varrho := \{\phi \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)) : \phi(k + \gamma^*) = \varrho_{\gamma^*} \phi(k) \text{ for all } \gamma^* \in \Gamma^*, \text{ for a.e. } k \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$$

equipped with the scalar product

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varrho} := \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \langle \phi(k), \psi(k) \rangle_{\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)}.$$

The map defined by (2.1) extends to a unitary operator $\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\varrho$. Its inverse transformation $\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}^{-1}: \mathcal{H}_\varrho \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is explicitly given by

$$(\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}^{-1}\varphi)(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_1^*|^{1/2}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk e^{ik \cdot x} \varphi(k, [x]),$$

where $[\cdot]$ comes from to the a.e. unique decomposition $\mathcal{X} \ni x = \gamma_x + [x]$, with $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$ and $[x] \in \mathcal{C}_1$. As anticipated before, this transform is advantageous in the analysis of periodic operators as they become *covariant fibered operator* acting in $\mathcal{H}_\varrho \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^2, \ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{\oplus} dk \ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)$. For a generic Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_\sharp we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\sharp)$ the set of all linear operators from \mathcal{H}_\sharp to itself. More specifically, given a periodic operator A acting in \mathcal{H} , then one has that

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}} A \mathcal{U}_{\text{BF}}^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{\oplus} dk A(k), \quad (2.3)$$

where each $A(k)$ is a element of $\mathcal{L}(\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^N)$, thus $A(k)$ is isomorphic to $N \times N$ matrix, and fulfills the *covariance* property

$$A(k + \gamma^*) = \varrho_{\gamma^*} A(k) \varrho_{\gamma^*}^{-1} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{R}^2, \gamma^* \in \Gamma^*. \quad (2.4)$$

2.2 The model

Our goal is to investigate the response of a crystalline quantum system to the application of an external constant electric field of small intensity. Let us describe the system at equilibrium. Let H be the Hamiltonian of the system, before the application of the electric field. The initial state of the system is defined by the *Fermi projector*

$$P_\mu := \chi_{(-\infty, \mu]}(H) \quad (2.5)$$

where μ is the *Fermi energy* and $\chi_{(-\infty, \mu]}$ is the characteristic function of the set $(-\infty, \mu]$.

We shall consider Hamiltonians satisfying the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1. (H₁) *The Hamiltonian H of the unperturbed system is a periodic self-adjoint operator acting in \mathcal{H} such that in Bloch–Floquet representation its fibration*

$$H: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^N), \quad k \mapsto H(k)$$

is a C^2 covariant map.

(H₂) *Let $\Lambda_+(k)$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $H(k)$ larger than μ and $\Lambda_-(k)$ is the largest eigenvalue of $H(k)$ smaller than μ . There are exactly n points $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ in \mathcal{C}_1^* such that for each ω_l there exists an invertible 2×2 matrix S_l and a vector $a_l \in \mathbb{R}^2$:*

$$\Lambda_{\pm}(k) = \mu \pm |S_l(k - \omega_l)| + a_l \cdot (k - \omega_l) + o(|k - \omega_l|) \quad \text{for } k \rightarrow \omega_l. \quad (2.6)$$

In addition, we require that there exists a positive constant C_ such that*

$$|S_l(k)| - a_l \cdot k \geq C_* |k| \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{R}^2, 1 \leq l \leq n. \quad (2.7)$$

With reference to Assumption (H₂), the points $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ are called the *Fermi points*.

Remark 2.2. (i) The conical crossing assumption in the sense of equality (2.6) is exactly the one singled out in [12, Eq. (1.2)], relevant for generic transitions between Hall phases.

(ii) Observe that neglecting the remainder $o(|k - \omega_l|)$ equation (2.6) describes a *cone* in the classes of quadric surfaces under affine transformations. Indeed, let us recall that a generic affine transformation in \mathbb{R}^3 is given by

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x \mapsto x' := Ax + b \quad (2.8)$$

where A is an invertible 3×3 matrix and b is a generic vector in \mathbb{R}^3 . The canonical equation of an affine cone is $(x'_1)^2 + (x'_2)^2 = (x'_3)^2$. We set

$$A = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} S_l & 0 \\ \hline -a_l & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -\mu \end{pmatrix},$$

where A is invertible since S_l is so, and we use in \mathbb{R}^3 the coordinates (k_1, k_2, z) while the new ones (k'_1, k'_2, z') are obtained under the affine transformation induced by the above choices for A and b . Clearly, $(z')^2 = (k'_1)^2 + (k'_2)^2$ if and only if $z = \mu \pm |S_l k| + a_l \cdot k$. A translation $(k_1, k_2) = k \mapsto k - \omega_l$ concludes this remark.

(iii) Let us show an explicit condition such that inequality (2.7) is satisfied. Defining $\lambda_* := \min \{ \lambda_1, \lambda_2 : \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_2 \text{ are eigenvalues of } S_l^* S_l \} > 0$. If $\sqrt{\lambda_*} - |a_l| > 0$ then inequality (2.7) holds true. Indeed, being V the unitary diagonalizing $S_l^* S_l$ we have that

$$|S_l k|^2 = \langle k, S_l^* S_l k \rangle = \langle V k, V S_l^* S_l V^{-1} V k \rangle \geq \lambda_* |V k|^2 = \lambda_* |k|^2.$$

Thus, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we conclude that

$$|S_l k| - a_l \cdot k \geq (\sqrt{\lambda_*} - |a_l|) |k| \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

- (iv) The class of models we are considering includes the Haldane model [20] on the critical curve in the parameter space $\{(\phi, M) : M = \pm 3\sqrt{3}t_2 \sin \phi\}$, where ϕ represents a magnetic flux and M corresponds to the intensity of a staggered, on-site potential (see *e.g.* [32] for a recent review of this model). For this model, there are at most two Fermi points ω_1, ω_2 , such that $\omega_1 = -\omega_2 \pmod{\Gamma^*}$, for which (2.6) holds true with $S_1 = S_2 = \frac{3t_1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, and choosing the Fermi energy $\mu = -3t_2 \cos \phi$.
- (v) We denote by $\Lambda_1(k), \dots, \Lambda_m(k)$ the eigenvalues of $H(k)$ smaller than μ *a.e.* in k and by $\Lambda_{m+1}, \dots, \Lambda_N(k)$ the eigenvalues bigger than μ *a.e.* in k (this labelling might include repetition of the eigenvalues according to their multiplicity). Notice that the number m does not depend on k due to Assumption 2.1.
- (vi) The eigenvalues $\Lambda_1(k), \dots, \Lambda_N(k)$ are continuous functions in k . In fact, they are roots of the characteristic polynomial of $H(k)$, denoted by $p_{H(k)}$. The coefficients of $p_{H(k)}$ are C^2 in k because $k \mapsto H(k)$ is C^2 according to hypothesis (H₁). Therefore, the map $k \mapsto (\Lambda_1(k), \dots, \Lambda_N(k))$ is continuous because the roots of a polynomial are continuous functions of its coefficients, see *e.g.* [21]. Then also the map $k \mapsto \Lambda_m(k) - \Lambda_{m+1}(k) \equiv \Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k)$ is continuous, and this will be used in Subsection 3.3.

2.3 Linear response

We couple the system to a spatially uniform electric field $E \in \mathbb{R}^2$, switched on adiabatically in time, via the Peierls' substitution. Denoting the adiabatic parameter with $0 < \eta < 1$, we define the vector potential $A(t)$, for all $t \leq 0$:

$$A(t) := - \int_{-\infty}^t ds E e^{\eta s} = - \frac{e^{\eta t}}{\eta} E. \quad (2.9)$$

Observe that $-\frac{d}{dt} A(t) = e^{\eta t} E$. Next, we define the position operator in the j -th direction with $1 \leq j \leq 2$ as

$$(X_j \psi)(x) := x_j \psi(x) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathcal{D}(X_j)$$

where $\mathcal{D}(X_j)$ is its maximal domain. Setting $X := (X_1, X_2)$, we introduce the gauge transformation

$$G(t) := e^{iA(t) \cdot X}, \quad (2.10)$$

and we define the time-dependent perturbed Hamiltonian $H(t)$ for all $t \leq 0$ as

$$H(t) = G(t) H G(t)^*. \quad (2.11)$$

Clearly, $H(-\infty) \equiv H$. The Hamiltonian $H(t)$ is translation-invariant. By the standard properties of the Bloch–Floquet transform, the fibered Hamiltonian is:

$$H(t, k) = H(k - A(t)). \quad (2.12)$$

Let us now discuss the evolution of the system, driven by the time-dependent electric field. The dynamics of the state is defined as the solution of the evolution equation:

$$\begin{cases} i \frac{d}{dt} \rho(t) = [H(t), \rho(t)], & t \leq 0 \\ \rho(-\infty) = P_\mu, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

where P_μ is defined in (2.5). We will be interested in the response of the current operator, whose j -th component is:

$$J_j(t) := i[H(t), X_j];$$

its Bloch-Floquet fibration reads:

$$J_j(t, k) = \partial_{k_j} H(t, k). \quad (2.14)$$

For every $1 \leq j, l \leq 2$, we shall introduce the conductivity matrix σ_{jl} as the linear response coefficient of the current operator $J_j(t)$, defined via Kubo formula [26]. This will be the starting point of our analysis; we will not discuss the problem of proving the validity of Kubo formula starting from quantum dynamics. In the following, we shall recall the formal derivation of Kubo formula, as an expansion in the electric field for the expectation of the current operator.

Let us recall the notion of trace per unit volume, $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$. For any $L \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$ we define:

$$\mathcal{C}_L := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : x = \sum_{j=1}^2 \alpha_j a_j \text{ with } \alpha_j \in \left[-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2} \right] \right\}.$$

Let $\chi_{\mathcal{C}_L} \equiv \chi_L$ be the characteristic function of the set \mathcal{C}_L . We define, for any operator⁽¹⁾ A acting in \mathcal{H} :

$$\mathcal{T}(A) := \lim_{\substack{L \rightarrow \infty \\ L \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_L|} \text{Tr}(\chi_L A \chi_L), \quad (2.15)$$

whenever the above limit exists. We are interested in the first-order term in the electric field in the expression:

$$\mathcal{T}(J_l(0)\rho(0)) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \text{Tr}(J_j(0, k)\rho(0, k)), \quad (2.16)$$

where we represented the trace per unit volume as an integral in momentum space, see *e.g.* [36, Lemma 3]. To do this, we write an expansion in the electric field for both $\rho(0)$ and $J_j(0)$. We shall adopt the notation $O_\eta(|E|^2)$ to denote (a possibly operator-valued) function which can be bounded in norm by a pre-factor $|E|^2$ but not uniformly in the adiabatic parameter η . Let $\rho_I(t)$ be the dynamics of the system in the interaction picture, $\rho_I(t) = e^{iHt} \rho(t) e^{-iHt}$. From (2.13) it follows that $\rho_I(t)$ satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} i \partial_t \rho_I(t) = [Q_I(t), \rho_I(t)], & t \leq 0 \\ \rho_I(-\infty) = P_\mu \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

⁽¹⁾ Since we are dealing with a discrete model, the operator $\chi_L A \chi_L$ is automatically trace class.

where $Q_I(t) := e^{iHt}(H(t) - H)e^{-iHt}$. Expanding in the electric field,

$$H(t, k) - H(k) = H(k - A(t)) - H(k) = \frac{e^{\eta t}}{\eta} J(k) \cdot E + O_\eta(|E|^2),$$

where we have used equalities (2.12), (2.14) and (2.9). Thus, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(0, k) &= \rho_I(0, k) = P_\mu(k) - i \int_{-\infty}^0 dt [Q_I(t, k), P_\mu(k)] + O_\eta(|E|^2) \\ &= P_\mu(k) - \frac{i}{\eta} \sum_{l=1}^2 E_l \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} [e^{iH(k)t} J_l(k) e^{-iH(k)t}, P_\mu(k)] + O_\eta(|E|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

For any k -dependent function F we use the shorthand notation $\partial_j F$ to denote $\partial_{k_j} F$. We get:

$$J_j(0, k) - J_j(k) = \partial_j H(k - A(0)) - \partial_j H(k) = \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{l=1}^2 \partial_{j_l}^2 H(k) E_l + O_\eta(|E|^2), \quad (2.19)$$

where we have used again (2.9) and (2.14). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(J_j(0)\rho(0)) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr}(J_j(0, k)\rho(0, k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr}(J_j(k)P_\mu(k)) + \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{l=1}^2 E_l \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr}(\partial_{j_l}^2 H(k)P_\mu(k)) \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{\eta} \sum_{l=1}^2 E_l \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr}\left(J_j(k) \left[e^{iH(k)t} J_l(k) e^{-iH(k)t}, P_\mu(k) \right]\right) \\ &\quad + O_\eta(|E|^2). \end{aligned}$$

It is convenient to introduce the momentum-space Heisenberg evolution as:

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto \tau_t(A(k)) := e^{iH(k)t} A(k) e^{-iH(k)t}. \quad (2.20)$$

The above formal expansion motivates the following definition of the conductivity matrix.

Definition 2.3. For all $1 \leq j, l \leq 2$ the conductivity matrix σ_{jl} is defined as

$$\sigma_{jl} := \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} (f_{jl}(\eta) + s_{jl}) \quad (2.21)$$

where

$$f_{jl}(\eta) := \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr}(J_j(k) [P_\mu(k), \tau_t(J_l(k))]) \quad (2.22)$$

$$s_{jl} := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr}(\partial_{j_l}^2 H(k)P_\mu(k)). \quad (2.23)$$

The term s_{jl} is often called the Schwinger term, and later we will show how to express it in terms of f_{jl} .

2.4 Main result

The next theorem gives an explicit expression for the longitudinal conductivity, that only depends on the conical structure of the energy bands at the Fermi level.

Theorem 2.4 (Main result). *Under Assumption 2.1, the longitudinal conductivity σ_{jj} is given by, for $j = 1, 2$:*

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{s_{l,1j}^2 + s_{l,2j}^2}{|\det S_l|} \quad (2.24)$$

where the scalar $s_{l,ij}$ is the ij -th element of the matrix S_l , appearing in the energy dispersion relation (2.6) of the two eigenvalues Λ_{\pm} , near the Fermi energy μ around the Fermi point ω_l .

Thus, the value of the longitudinal conductivity σ_{jj} only depends on the shape of each conical intersection of the Bloch bands at the Fermi level. Observe that these ones are not necessarily symmetric with respect the canonical axes k_1, k_2 (see also Remark 2.2(ii)).

Moreover, let us observe that if for every Fermi point ω_l with $1 \leq l \leq n$ the (real and invertible) matrix S_l is orthogonal, up to the renormalization constant $|\det S|^{-1/2}$, then each of the conical intersection contributes of $\frac{1}{16}$ to the quantized value of $\sigma_{jj} = \frac{n}{16}$. This is the case for the Haldane model on the critical curve and for graphene (see Remark 2.2(iv)). This is proven by the following elementary result, whose proof is postponed to Appendix A.

Lemma 2.5. *Let S be a 2×2 real invertible matrix. Then we have that*

$$\frac{s_{1j}^2 + s_{2j}^2}{|\det S|} = 1 \quad \text{for every } j = 1, 2 \quad (2.25)$$

if and only if $s_{11}^2 + s_{21}^2 = s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2$ and $(s_{11}, s_{21}) \cdot (s_{12}, s_{22}) = 0$, namely $S|\det S|^{-1/2}$ is an orthogonal matrix.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is inspired by the analogous universality results obtained in [15, 14, 17], for specific interacting models. The main contribution of the present work is to show that, in a non-interacting setting, the longitudinal conductivity is insensitive to the form of the Bloch Hamiltonian, and it only depends on the conical intersections of the Bloch bands at the Fermi level. Let us summarize the main steps of the proof.

- in Section 3.1 we rewrite σ_{jl} as the right derivative in 0 of the function $(0, \infty) \ni \eta \rightarrow f_{jl} \in \mathbb{R}$ defined in (2.22);
- in Section 3.2 we prove that this function f_{jj} can be seen as a restriction for positive η of a suitable even function $\tilde{f}_{jj}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, specified in (3.9). The definition of this function is obtained via a complex deformation in time, as in e. g. [16, 19];
- the η -dependence of \tilde{f}_{jj} can be studied in a more efficient way than for f_{jj} . In particular, in Section 3.3 we prove that all the contributions to $\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta)$ due to energies away from the Fermi level μ are smooth in η . Since $\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta)$ turns out to be even in η , these contributions vanish as $\eta \rightarrow 0$;

- we are left with computing the contribution to σ_{jl} associated with neighbourhoods of the conical intersections. As shown in Section 3.4, this contribution can be evaluated using the asymptotic form of the Bloch eigenvalues at the Fermi energy, recall (2.6).

In order to simplify the notation, C and c will denote general constants, which might change values at different points in the proofs.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.4

3.1 σ_{jl} as right derivative of f_{jl}

We start by rewriting the linear response coefficient σ_{jl} as the right derivative in 0 of the function f_{jl} , defined in (2.22).

Proposition 3.1. *Under Assumption 2.1 for any $j, l = 1, 2$ we have:*

$$s_{jl} = -f_{jl}(0^+) := -\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} f_{jl}(\eta). \quad (3.1)$$

As a consequence, the conductivity σ_{jl} can be written as

$$\sigma_{jl} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} (f_{jl}(\eta) - f_{jl}(0^+)). \quad (3.2)$$

The proof relies on estimates for the derivatives of the the Fermi projector, collected in the next lemma, whose proof is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumption 2.1 we have that $k \mapsto P_\mu(k)$ is C^2 in $\mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$. Also, there exists a finite constant C such that:*

$$\|\nabla_k P_\mu(k)\| \leq C \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{|k - \omega_l|} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}. \quad (3.3)$$

In particular, $\nabla_k P_\mu \in L^1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We shall rewrite the function $f_{jl}(\eta)$ by using an integration by parts in time t and then prove identity (3.1). First notice that $[P_\mu(k), H(k)] = 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$. In view of Assumption 2.1 and Lemma 3.2, H and P_μ are C^2 outside the Fermi points, thus by differentiating the previous identity we obtain that

$$[P_\mu(k), J_l(k)] = [P_\mu(k), \partial_l H(k)] = -[\partial_l P_\mu(k), H(k)] \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Therefore, for every $k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ we can rewrite the trace in (2.22) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(J_j(k) [P_\mu(k), \tau_t(J_l(k))]) &= \text{Tr}(J_j(k) \tau_t([P_\mu(k), J_l(k)])) \\ &= -\text{Tr}(J_j(k) \tau_t([\partial_l P_\mu(k), H(k)])) = -i \frac{d}{dt} \text{Tr}(J_j(k) \tau_t(\partial_l P_\mu(k))). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{jl}(\eta) &:= \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) [P_\mu(k), \tau_t(J_l(k))]) \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \frac{d}{dt} \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) \tau_t(\partial_l P_\mu(k))) \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) \tau_t(\partial_l P_\mu(k))) \Big|_{-\infty}^0 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt \eta e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) \tau_t(\partial_l P_\mu(k))),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where we have performed an integration by parts in time. Notice that the contributions coming from the boundary terms in time are well-defined since $\partial_l P_\mu \in \mathcal{B}_1$ by Lemma 3.2. In particular, the term at $t = -\infty$ vanishes, while for the term at $t = 0$ we observe that

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) \partial_l P_\mu(k)) = \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \partial_l \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) P_\mu(k)) - \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr} (\partial_{j_l}^2 H(k) P_\mu(k)) \tag{3.6}$$

where we have used an integration by parts in k . Since the trace is invariant under unitary conjugation and the fibered operators are covariant (2.4), by employing the k -dependent unitary $\mathcal{U}_k : \ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma) \ni \phi(y) \mapsto e^{ik \cdot y} \phi(y)$ one notes that the map $k \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) P_\mu(k)) = \operatorname{Tr} (\mathcal{U}_k J_j(k) P_\mu(k) \mathcal{U}_k^*)$ is Γ^* -periodic. Thus, the first summand on the right-hand side of (3.6) vanishes.

Thus, to conclude that $s_{jl} = -f_{jl}(0^+)$ we are left to show that

$$\operatorname{R}(\eta) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt \eta e^{\eta t} \operatorname{Tr} (J_j(k) \tau_t(\partial_l P_\mu(k))) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0^+. \tag{3.7}$$

Observe that the operator $\partial_j P_\mu$ is off-diagonal with respect to the decomposition induced by P_μ , namely:

$$\partial_j P_\mu(k) = P_\mu(k) \partial_j P_\mu(k) (\mathbb{1} - P_\mu(k)) + \operatorname{adj} \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$$

where “+adj” means that the adjoint of the sum of all operators to the left is added. Therefore, in view of the spectral decomposition, by using Remark 2.1(v) and denoting by $P_j(k)$ the projector associated with $\Lambda_j(k)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq N$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_t(\partial_j P_\mu(k)) &= e^{iH(k)t} \partial_j P_\mu(k) e^{-iH(k)t} \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{q=m+1}^N e^{i(\Lambda_l(k) - \Lambda_q(k))t} P_l(k) \partial_j P_\mu(k) P_q(k) + \operatorname{adj}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{R}(\eta) &= \operatorname{Re} \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{q=m+1}^N \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 \eta e^{\eta t} e^{i(\Lambda_l(k) - \Lambda_q(k))t} \operatorname{Tr} (J_l(k) P_l(k) \partial_j P_\mu(k) P_q(k)) \\
&= \operatorname{Re} \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{q=m+1}^N \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \frac{\eta}{\eta + i(\Lambda_l(k) - \Lambda_q(k))} \operatorname{Tr} (J_l(k) P_l(k) \partial_j P_\mu(k) P_q(k)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ denotes the real part of the scalar to which it is applied. In view of Assumption 2.1 and Lemma 3.2, we have:

$$\left| \frac{\eta}{\eta + i(\Lambda_l - \Lambda_q)} \text{Tr}(J_l P_l(k) \partial_j P_\mu(k) P_q(k)) \right| \leq N \max_{k \in \mathcal{C}_1^*} \|\partial_j H(k)\| |\nabla_k P_\mu| \in L^1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$$

and the claim (3.7) follows from dominated convergence theorem. \square

3.2 Complex time deformation

In this subsection we will prove that f_{jj} in (2.22) can be seen as a restriction for positive η of the function $\tilde{f}_{jj}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined in (3.9). The proof is based on the complex-deformation argument similar to the one used in [16, 19], here applied to the case of non-interacting fermions.

For the subsequent analysis, it is convenient to adopt the following notations:

$$P_b(k) := P_\mu(k) \quad P_a(k) := \mathbb{1} - P_\mu(k), \quad (3.8)$$

where a stands for a -bove the Fermi energy and b for b -elow (or equal to) it. Consequently, for any fibered operator $A: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^N)$ we set:

$$A^{ab}(k) := P_a(k) A(k) P_b(k), \quad A^{ba}(k) := P_b(k) A(k) P_a(k).$$

Proposition 3.3. *Under Assumption 2.1, consider, for every $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$:*

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta) := -\frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{+\infty} dt \cos(\eta t) \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \text{Tr}(\tau_{it}(J_j(k))^{ab} J_j(k)^{ba}). \quad (3.9)$$

The function \tilde{f}_{jj} is an extension to $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ of f_{jj} , namely

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta) = f_{jj}(\eta) \quad \text{for } \eta > 0.$$

In particular, the longitudinal conductivity can be expressed as:

$$\sigma_{jj} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} (\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta) - \tilde{f}_{jj}(0^+)). \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. We start by rewriting f_{jj} in (2.22) as:

$$f_{jj}(\eta) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \text{Tr}([\tau_t(J_j(k)), J_j(k)] P_b(k)), \quad (3.11)$$

where we have used that

$$[J_j(k) P_b(k), \tau_t(J_j(k))] = J_j(k) [P_b(k), \tau_t(J_j(k))] - [\tau_t(J_j(k)), J_j(k)] P_b(k).$$

Then, we rewrite the trace inside the integral in (3.11) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}([\tau_t(J_j(k)), J_j(k)]P_b(k)) &= \\
&= \text{Tr}(P_b(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))J_j(k)P_b(k)) - \text{Tr}(P_b(k)J_j(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_b(k)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(P_b(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_a(k)J_j(k)P_b(k)) + \text{Tr}(P_b(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_b(k)J_j(k)P_b(k)) \\
&\quad - \text{Tr}(P_b(k)J_j(k)P_b(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_b(k)) - \text{Tr}(P_b(k)J_j(k)P_a(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_b(k)) \\
&= \text{Tr}(P_b(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_a(k)J_j(k)P_b(k)) - \text{Tr}(P_b(k)J_j(k)P_a(k)\tau_t(J_j(k))P_b(k)) \\
&= \text{Tr}\left(\tau_t(J_j(k))^{ba}J_j(k)^{ab}\right) - \text{Tr}\left(J_j(k)^{ba}\tau_t(J_j(k))^{ab}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the cyclicity of trace. Thus, defining

$$F(\eta) := \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \text{Tr}\left(\tau_t(J_j(k))^{ba}J_j(k)^{ab}\right),$$

we obtain that

$$f_{jj}(\eta) = F(\eta) + \overline{F(\eta)} = 2\text{Re}(F(\eta)). \quad (3.12)$$

Introducing the following function

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto g_\eta(z) := \frac{e^{\eta z}}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \text{Tr}\left(\tau_z(J_j(k))^{ba}J_j^{ab}(k)\right),$$

we have that

$$F(\eta) = i \int_{-\infty}^0 dt g_\eta(t). \quad (3.13)$$

Since g_η is analytic, the Cauchy integral theorem implies that

$$\int_I dz g_\eta(z) + \int_{II} dz g_\eta(z) + \int_{III} dz g_\eta(z) = \oint_{\mathcal{C}} dz g_\eta(z) = 0, \quad (3.14)$$

where \mathcal{C} is the closed curve drawn in Figure 1 with $R > 1$. We shall prove that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{III} dz g_\eta(z) = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Indeed, parametrizing III as $\gamma : [0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by $s \mapsto -s + (s - R)i$, for some finite constant C_1 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
|g_\eta(\gamma(s))| &\leq C_1 e^{-\eta s} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \left\| e^{-H(k)(s-R)} P_b(k) \right\| \left\| e^{H(k)(s-R)} P_a(k) \right\| \\
&\leq C_1 e^{-\eta s} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk e^{(\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))(s-R)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Assumption 2.1(H₂). Thus, for some finite constant C_2 we get that

$$\left| \int_{III} dz g_\eta(z) \right| \leq C_2 \int_0^\infty ds \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \chi_{[0, R]}(s) e^{-\eta s} e^{(\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))(s-R)}. \quad (3.16)$$




Figure 1: Path used in the complex-time deformation.

The term on the right-hand side of (3.16) vanishes as $R \rightarrow \infty$ by applying Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Therefore, taking the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ of (3.14) and using (3.13) we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\eta) &= i \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_I dz g_\eta(z) = -i \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{II} dz g_\eta(z) \\
&= -\frac{1}{(2\pi^2)} \int_0^{+\infty} dt \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk e^{-i\eta t} \text{Tr} \left(\tau_{-it}(J_j(k))^{ba} J_j^{ab}(k) \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{(2\pi^2)} \int_0^{+\infty} dt \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk e^{-i\eta t} \text{Tr} \left(\tau_{it}(J_j(k))^{ab} J_j^{ba}(k) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where in the third equality we have parametrized II as $\gamma: [0, R] \ni t \mapsto -it$ and in the fourth one we have exploited the cyclicity of trace. Finally, we compute the complex conjugate of the trace term appearing in the last line of (3.17):

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\text{Tr} \left(\tau_{it}(J_j(k))^{ab} J_j^{ba}(k) \right)} &= \text{Tr} \left((J_j^{ba}(k))^* (\tau_{it}(J_j(k))^{ab})^* \right) = \\
&= \text{Tr} \left(P_a(k) J_j(k) P_b(k) e^{H(k)t} J_j(k) e^{-H(k)t} P_a(k) \right) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left(P_a(k) e^{-H(k)t} J_j(k) e^{H(k)t} P_b(k) J_j(k) P_a(k) \right) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left(\tau_{it}(J_j(k))^{ab} J_j^{ba}(k) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

employing the equality $\overline{\text{Tr}(A)} = \text{Tr}(A^*)$ and the cyclicity of the trace. \square

Remark 3.4. Let $B \subset \mathcal{C}_1^*$ be an open set. Notice that in the proof of Proposition 3.3 the complex time deformation holds also if in the expression of \tilde{f}_{jj} we replace the integration domain \mathcal{C}_1^* with B .

Obviously \tilde{f}_{jj} is an even function. If \tilde{f}_{jj} was differentiable, then its derivative in zero would vanish; hence, by Proposition 3.3 σ_{jj} would be zero. As we will see, differentiability in zero does not hold. However, we will use this observation to get rid of all the contributions to the conductivity associated with energies away from the Fermi level. We will be left with the contributions due to the Fermi points, which we will be able to explicitly determine.




Figure 2: Graphs of the smooth cut-off functions χ , $1 - \chi$.

3.3 Singular and regular parts of \tilde{f}_{jj}

First we single out from \tilde{f}_{jj} the singular part, denoted by $\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}$, which is due to the energies close to the Fermi energy μ . We proceed as follows.

- (i) Let $\delta > 0$ small enough, and let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $\chi(x) = 1$ if $x \leq 1$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ if $x \geq 2$, see e. g. Figure 2. We define:

$$\chi_{<}(k) := \chi(\delta^{-1}|H(k) - \mu|) \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{>}(k) := \mathbb{1} - \chi_{<}(k); \quad (3.18)$$

The function $\chi_{>}(k)$ introduces a smooth cutoff, supported away from the Fermi energy.

- (ii) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that expansions (2.6) for Λ_{\pm} hold true and the following condition is satisfied. Let:

$$d_F := \min \{|S_k(\omega_l - \omega_j)| : j, k, l = 1, \dots, n\}. \quad (3.19)$$

Let $\varepsilon < d_F$. We define the set B_ε as

$$B_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{l=1}^n B_\varepsilon^{(l)} \quad \text{with} \quad B_\varepsilon^{(l)} := \{k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* : 2|S_l(k - \omega_l)| < \varepsilon\}. \quad (3.20)$$

That is, B_ε is the union of n disjoint open sets, each of them containing exactly one Fermi point.

We then define the singular and the regular parts of \tilde{f}_{jj} as:

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta) := -\frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{+\infty} dt \cos(\eta t) \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \text{Tr} \left(\tau_{it} ((\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<})(k))^{ab} (\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<})^{ba}(k) \right) \quad (3.21)$$

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{reg}}(\eta) := \tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta) - \tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta). \quad (3.22)$$

Proposition 3.5. *Under Assumption 2.1, the map $\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{reg}}$ is even and differentiable. In particular:*

$$\sigma_{jj} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} \left(\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta) - \tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(0^+) \right). \quad (3.23)$$




Figure 3: Graphical representation of the energy cutoff. The colored regions represent the region of the spectrum selected by $\chi_{\alpha_1} P_{\pm}$. In all the terms that we estimate a gap appears, which allows us to write the inequality (3.27).

Proof. For every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \{>, <\}$, let us define

$$I_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}(\eta) := \int_0^{+\infty} dt \cos(\eta t) \int_{\mathcal{C}_1^*} dk \operatorname{Tr} \left(\tau_{it} \left((\chi_{\alpha} J_j \chi_{\beta})(k) \right)^{ab} (J_j)(k)^{ba} \right). \quad (3.24)$$

Thus, we have that

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}(\eta) = I_{<, <}(\eta) + I_{<, >}(\eta) + I_{>, <}(\eta) + I_{>, >}(\eta). \quad (3.25)$$

We shall prove that the last three summands in (3.25) are differentiable; since they are even functions, they do not contribute to σ_{jj} . In view of the spectral decomposition, by using Remark 2.1(v) and denoting by $P_j(k)$ the projector associated with $\Lambda_j(k)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq N$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{<}(k) &= \sum_{|\Lambda_l(k) - \mu| < 2\delta} \chi(\delta^{-1} |\Lambda_l(k) - \mu|) P_l(k) \\ \chi_{>}(k) &= \sum_{|\Lambda_l(k) - \mu| > \delta} (1 - \chi(\delta^{-1} |\Lambda_l(k) - \mu|)) P_l(k). \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Thus, recalling that $P_b(k) = \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) < \mu} P_l(k)$ and $P_a(k) = \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) > \mu} P_l(k)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} P_a(k) e^{-H(k)t} \chi_{<}(k) &= \chi_{<}(k) \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) \in (\mu, \mu+2\delta)} e^{-\Lambda_l(k)t} P_l(k) \\ \chi_{>}(k) e^{H(k)t} P_b(k) &= \chi_{>}(k) \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) < \mu-\delta} e^{\Lambda_l(k)t} P_l(k) \\ P_a(k) e^{-H(k)t} \chi_{>}(k) &= \chi_{>}(k) \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) > \mu+\delta} e^{-\Lambda_l(k)t} P_l(k) \\ \chi_{<}(k) e^{H(k)t} P_b(k) &= \chi_{<}(k) \sum_{\Lambda_l(k) \in (\mu-2\delta, \mu)} P_l(k) e^{\Lambda_l(k)t}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, there exists $C > 0$ such that the following inequality hold true

$$\left\| t^p \tau_{it} \left((\chi_{\alpha} J_j \chi_{\beta})(k) \right)^{ab} \right\| \leq C e^{-\frac{\delta}{2}t} \quad \text{for all } \alpha_1, \alpha_2: \alpha_i \text{ equals } >, \text{ for any } t > 0 \text{ and } p \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (3.27)$$

Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem implies that $I_{<,>}, I_{>,<}, I_{>,>}$ are C^1 function in $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, only $I_{<,<}$ contributes to the conductivity σ_{ll} ; let us analyze this term. Observe that:

$$\tau_{it} \left((\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<})(k) \right)^{ab} = \sum_{\substack{\Lambda_l(k) \in (\mu, \mu+2\delta) \\ \Lambda_q(k) \in (\mu-2\delta, \mu)}} e^{(\Lambda_q(k) - \Lambda_l(k))t} \left(P_l(k) \chi_{<}(k) J_j(k) \chi_{<}(k) P_q(k) \right). \quad (3.28)$$

Let us define

$$g := \max_{k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus B_\varepsilon} (\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k));$$

since the map $\mathcal{C}_1^* \ni k \rightarrow \Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k)$ is continuous by Remark 2.2(vi) and has no zeros in $\mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus B_\varepsilon$, we have $g > 0$. Thus, for the right-hand side of (3.28) we get that

$$\Lambda_q(k) - \Lambda_l(k) \leq \Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k) \leq -g \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus B_\varepsilon.$$

Hence, by the previous argument, all the momenta in $I_{<,<}$ that are away from B_ε do not contribute to the longitudinal conductivity. This concludes the proof of (3.5). \square

3.4 Final rewriting of σ_{jj}

In this last subsection, we impose two additional conditions on the small positive parameters δ and ε , introduced previously respectively in Subsection 3.3(i) and (ii).

First, letting $\Lambda_1(k), \dots, \Lambda_N(k)$ the eigenvalues of $H(k)$, we choose $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon_\delta$ small enough so that

$$\text{if } k \in B_\varepsilon \quad \text{then} \quad \begin{cases} |\Lambda_j(k) - \mu| < \delta & \text{if } \Lambda_j(k) = \Lambda_-(k) \text{ or } \Lambda_j(k) = \Lambda_+(k) \\ |\Lambda_j(k) - \mu| > 2\delta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.29)$$

This condition implies that if $k \in B_\varepsilon$ then $\chi_{<}(k) = P_-(k) + P_+(k)$, where P_- and P_+ are the projectors associated to Λ_- and Λ_+ respectively.

Second, by Assumption 2.1, it is possible to choose ε sufficiently small in order to have two constants $m, M > 0$ such that

$$m|k - \omega_l| \leq \Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k) \leq M|k - \omega_l| \quad \text{for any } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}. \quad (3.30)$$

Moreover, at this point it is useful to point out that in view of Assumption 2.1(H₂) and by using Remark 2.2(vi) the map

$$B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto P_-(k) + P_+(k) \text{ is } C^2, \quad (3.31)$$

since the spectral subset $\{\Lambda_-(k) \cup \Lambda_+(k)\}$ is uniformly separated (by a distance at least δ assuming condition 3.29) by the rest of the spectrum of $H(k)$ for all $k \in B_\varepsilon$.

Starting from Proposition 3.5 we shall prove the final expression for the longitudinal conductivity σ_{jj} given by (2.24), by showing formulas being increasingly more explicit, and involving step by step only the expansions of the two eigenvalues around the Fermi points (2.6). To begin, we perform the time integration; this is the content of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Under Assumption 2.1, let \tilde{f}_{jj}^{sing} be defined as in (3.21) and let $P_-(k), P_+(k)$ be the projectors associated with the eigenvalues $\Lambda_-(k), \Lambda_+(k)$ respectively. Choosing ε and δ so that condition (3.29) holds, we have:*

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}^{sing}(\eta) = \frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{(\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k))}{\eta^2 + (\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k))^2} \text{Tr}(P_-(k)J_j(k)P_+(k)J_j(k)P_-(k)). \quad (3.32)$$

At the second step, we rewrite the expression for σ_{jj} involving only the eigenvalues Λ_\pm and their derivatives up to the second order around the Fermi points.

Proposition 3.7. *Under Assumption 2.1, we define the following function depending on $\eta > 0$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{jj}(\eta) := & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k)}{\eta^2 + (\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))^2} \\ & \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_j^2 \left((\Lambda_+(k) - \mu)^2 + (\Lambda_-(k) - \mu)^2 \right) - (\partial_j \Lambda_+(k))^2 - (\partial_j \Lambda_-(k))^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Then, by choosing ε satisfying conditions (3.29) and (3.30):

$$\sigma_{jj} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} (\zeta_{jj}(\eta) - \zeta_{jj}(0^+)). \quad (3.34)$$

The proofs of Propositions 3.6, 3.7 are deferred to Appendix A.

We would like to express σ_{jj} by only using the linearization of the eigenvalues around the Fermi energy. This is a delicate point, since the expression (3.34) includes the second order derivatives of the eigenvalues Λ_\pm . This issue is circumvented integrating by parts, as the next proposition shows.

Proposition 3.8. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold true, and let ε satisfy conditions (3.29) and (3.30). Then the longitudinal conductivity σ_{jj} can be written as*

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{l=1}^n \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 (|S_l(k - \omega_l)|)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2}, \quad (3.35)$$

where: ω_l is the l -th Fermi point; S_l is its associated matrix as in Assumption 2.1(H₂); and $B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$ is a neighborhood of ω_l as defined in (3.20).

Proof. It is useful to introduce the following auxiliary functions. For any $k \in B_\varepsilon$:

$$s(k) := (\Lambda_+(k) - \mu) + (\Lambda_-(k) - \mu) \quad d(k) := (\Lambda_+(k) - \mu) - (\Lambda_-(k) - \mu) \equiv \Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k),$$

in terms of which:

$$\Lambda_+(k) - \mu = \frac{s(k) + d(k)}{2}, \quad \Lambda_-(k) - \mu = \frac{s(k) - d(k)}{2}. \quad (3.36)$$

Notice that $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto s(k) = \text{Tr}((H(k) - \mu)(P_-(k) + P_+(k)))$ is C^2 by using (3.31) and Assumption 2.1(H₁). On the other hand, the function $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto d(k)$ is not C^1 since Λ_\pm are in general not C^1 . Furthermore, we claim that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_j d(k)| &\leq C \\ |\partial_j^2 d(k)| &\leq \frac{C}{|k - \omega_l|} \quad \text{for all } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)} \setminus \{\omega_l\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

where the neighborhood $B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$ of the Fermi point ω_l is defined in (3.20). We shall obtain the above inequalities by proving them for the eigenvalues Λ_\pm . Let us analyze only the eigenvalue Λ_- , the same argument applies to Λ_+ . In view of the identity $\Lambda_-(k) = \text{Tr}(H(k)P_-(k))$ we have that, for every $k \in B_\varepsilon \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$:

$$\partial_j \Lambda_-(k) = \text{Tr}(\partial_j H(k)P_-(k)), \quad (3.38)$$

where we have used that $\text{Tr}(H(k)\partial_j P_-(k)) = 0$, since the operator $\partial_j P_-(k)$ is off-diagonal with respect to decomposition induced by $P_-(k)$ itself. Thus, the first inequality in (3.37) follows from (3.38). Let us now prove the second inequality in (3.37). To this end, we observe that, for every $k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)} \setminus \{\omega_l\}$:

$$\left| \partial_j^2 \Lambda_-(k) \right| \leq \left| \text{Tr}(\partial_j^2 H(k)P_-(k)) \right| + \left| \text{Tr}(\partial_j H(k)\partial_j P_-(k)) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|k - \omega_l|},$$

where we have applied Lemma 3.2. Thus, the second inequality in (3.37) holds.

By Proposition 3.7 the longitudinal conductivity is given by $\sigma_{jj} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\eta} (\zeta_{jj}(\eta) - \zeta_{jj}(0^+))$, where the function $\zeta_{jj}(\eta)$ is defined as in (3.33); we shall now rewrite this expression in terms of $s(k)$ and $d(k)$. For any f, g , whose first and second partial derivatives exist, we have:

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_j^2 (f^2 + g^2) - (\partial_j f)^2 - (\partial_j g)^2 = f \partial_j^2 f + g \partial_j^2 g. \quad (3.39)$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \partial_j^2 ((\Lambda_+(k) - \mu)^2 + (\Lambda_-(k) - \mu)^2) - (\partial_j \Lambda_+(k))^2 - (\partial_j \Lambda_-(k))^2 \\ &= (\Lambda_+ - \mu) \partial_j^2 (\Lambda_+ - \mu) + (\Lambda_- - \mu) \partial_j^2 (\Lambda_- - \mu) \\ &= \frac{s+d}{2} \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{s+d}{2} \right) + \frac{s-d}{2} \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{s-d}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (s \partial_j^2 s + d \partial_j^2 d), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we have used (3.36). Therefore, we obtain:

$$\zeta_{jj}(\eta) = -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{d(k)}{\eta^2 + d^2(k)} \left(s(k) \partial_j^2 s(k) + d(k) \partial_j^2 d(k) \right)$$

which implies:

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\eta \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{s(k) \partial_j^2 s(k)}{(\eta^2 + d^2(k)) d(k)} + \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 d(k)}{\eta^2 + d^2(k)} \right). \quad (3.40)$$

Observe that the contribution coming from the first term in the right-hand side of (3.40) vanishes. To see this, we preliminarily observe that:

$$\left| \frac{s(k) \partial_j^2 s(k)}{(\eta^2 + d(k)^2) d(k)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2} \quad \text{for any } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)},$$

where we have used that $|s(k)| \leq C|k - \omega_l|$ by (2.6), $|\partial_j^2 s(k)| \leq C$ in view of its C^2 regularity and (3.30) for every $k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$. Second, we note that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2} \leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_0^{C\varepsilon} d\rho \frac{\rho}{\eta^2 + m^2 \rho^2} = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\eta}{2m^2} \ln \left(1 + \left(\frac{Cm\varepsilon}{\eta} \right)^2 \right) = 0.$$

This proves the vanishing of the first term in the (3.40) vanishes. To conclude, we shall prove that only the linearization of $d(k)$ contributes to σ_{jj} . To this end, in view of (2.6) we observe that

$$d(k) = 2|S_l(k - \omega_l)| + r_l(k - \omega_l) \quad \text{for every } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}, \quad (3.41)$$

where $r_l(k - \omega_l) = o(|k - \omega_l|)$. Therefore:

$$\frac{1}{\eta^2 + d^2(k)} = \frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} + \frac{R_l(k - \omega_l)}{(\eta^2 + d^2(k))(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2)},$$

where $R_l(k - \omega_l) = o(|k - \omega_l|^2)$ for any $k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$. We claim that:

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 d(k) R_l(k - \omega_l)}{(\eta^2 + d^2(k))(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2)} = 0. \quad (3.42)$$

To prove this, we use that, in view of the second inequality in (3.37):

$$\left| \frac{\partial_j^2 d(k) R_l(k - \omega_l)}{(\eta^2 + d^2(k))(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2)} \right| \leq C \frac{f(|k - \omega_l|)}{|k - \omega_l| (\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2)} \quad \text{for every } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)} \setminus \{\omega_l\},$$

where $f(|k - \omega_l|) = o(1)$ as $k \rightarrow \omega_l$ and we have used (3.30). Then, (3.42) follows from:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{f(|k - \omega_l|)}{|k - \omega_l| (\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2)} &\leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_0^{C\varepsilon} d\rho \frac{f(\rho)}{\eta^2 + m^2 \rho^2} \\ &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^{\frac{C\varepsilon}{\eta}} d\hat{\rho} \frac{f(\hat{\rho}\eta)}{1 + \hat{\rho}^2} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where the last step follows from dominated convergence theorem. Thus, we obtain that:

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{l=1}^n \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 d(k)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2}. \quad (3.44)$$

To conclude, we are left with showing that we can replace $d(k)$ at the numerator with its linearization. To this end, we perform a double integration by parts, proving that the boundary terms do not contribute to σ_{jj} . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 d(k)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} &= \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} d\sigma(k) \frac{\nu_j \partial_j d(k)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \\ &\quad - \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \partial_j \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) \partial_j d(k) \\ &= \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} d\sigma(k) \frac{\nu_j \partial_j d(k)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \\ &\quad - \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} d\sigma(k) \nu_j \partial_j \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) d(k) \\ &\quad + \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) d(k), \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

where ν_j is the j -th component of the outward unit normal vector to $\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$ and $d\sigma(k)$ is the line element. Observe that the two boundary terms do not contribute to σ_{jj} . To see this, we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_j \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) d(k) \right| &\leq C \left| \frac{|S_l(k - \omega_l)| \partial_j |S_l(k - \omega_l)| d(k)}{(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2)^2} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \\ \left| \frac{\partial_j d(k)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right| &\leq \frac{C}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\partial_j |S_l(k - \omega_l)| \leq C$ and the first inequality in (3.37). Then, we use that:

$$\eta \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} d\sigma(k) \frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} = \eta \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} d\sigma(k) \frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4\varepsilon^2} \leq C \frac{\eta}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0^+,$$

where we have used the definition of $B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$ in (3.20). This proves the vanishing of the boundary terms in (3.45). Consider now the last term in (3.45). Using that:

$$\left| \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) r_l(k - \omega_l) \right| \leq C \frac{|r_l(k - \omega_l)|}{(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2)^2} \leq C \frac{f(|k - \omega_l|)}{(\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2) |k - \omega_l|},$$

where $f(|k - \omega_l|) = o(1)$ as $k \rightarrow \omega_l$, we have that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) r_l(k - \omega_l) = 0$$

as in (3.43). Therefore, we find:

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{l=1}^n \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \partial_j^2 \left(\frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \right) |S_l(k - \omega_l)|. \quad (3.46)$$

Equality (3.35) follows after performing a new double integration by parts in (3.46), and showing that all boundary terms vanish as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, which is done as above. This concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma concludes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 3.9. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 3.8, we have:*

$$\sigma_{jj} = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{s_{l,1j}^2 + s_{l,2j}^2}{|\det S_l|}. \quad (3.47)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.9. For the sake of readability, we shall omit the l -dependence of the matrix element $s_{ij} \equiv s_{l,ij}$. In view of equality (3.35), we compute:

$$\partial_j^2 (|S_l k|) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \left(\frac{(s_{\alpha j})^2}{|S_l k|} - \frac{(S_l k)_\alpha^2 (s_{\alpha j})^2}{|S_l k|^3} \right) - \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta}^{1,2} \frac{(S_l k)_\alpha (S_l k)_\beta (s_{\alpha j})(s_{\beta j})}{|S_l k|^3},$$

where $(S_l k)_\alpha$ is the α -th component of the vector $S_l k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\partial_j^2 (|S_l(k - \omega_l)|)}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} &= \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \left(\frac{(s_{\alpha j})^2}{|S_l(k - \omega_l)|} - \frac{(S_l(k - \omega_l))_\alpha^2 (s_{\alpha j})^2}{|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^3} \right) \\ &\quad - \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + 4|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta}^{1,2} \frac{(S_l(k - \omega_l))_\alpha (S_l(k - \omega_l))_\beta s_{\alpha j} s_{\beta j}}{|S_l(k - \omega_l)|^3} \\ &= \frac{1}{2|\det S_l|} \int_{|k| < \varepsilon} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + |k|^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \left(\frac{(s_{\alpha j})^2}{|k|} - \frac{k_\alpha^2 (s_{\alpha j})^2}{|k|^3} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2|\det S_l|} \int_{|k| < \varepsilon} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + |k|^2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta}^{1,2} \frac{k_\alpha k_\beta s_{\alpha j} s_{\beta j}}{|k|^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

where in the last equality we have used the change of variable $k \mapsto 2S_l(k - \omega_l)$, recalling also that $B_\varepsilon^{(l)} = \{k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* : 2|S_l(k - \omega_l)| < \varepsilon\}$. Observe that the second term on the right-hand side of (3.48) vanishes since the integrand is odd in k . Concerning the first term, we can rewrite it as:

$$\frac{1}{2|\det S_l|} \int_{|k| < \varepsilon} dk \frac{1}{\eta^2 + |k|^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \left(\frac{(s_{\alpha j})^2}{|k|} - \frac{k_\alpha^2 (s_{\alpha j})^2}{|k|^3} \right) = \frac{(s_{1j})^2 + (s_{2j})^2}{4|\det S_l|} \int_{|k| < \varepsilon} dk \frac{1}{(\eta^2 + |k|^2)|k|},$$

where we have implemented the change of variable $k_1 \leftrightarrow k_2$ in the second term in brackets above. In conclusion:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{jj} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{(s_{1j})^2 + (s_{2j})^2}{4|\det S_l|} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \eta \int_{|k| < \varepsilon} dk \frac{1}{(\eta^2 + |k|^2)|k|} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{(s_{1j})^2 + (s_{2j})^2}{4|\det S_l|} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \arctan \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta} \right) = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{(s_{1j})^2 + (s_{2j})^2}{|\det S_l|}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 4: Complex path used to prove Lemma 3.2. We denote the minimum of the spectrum of H as Sp_m .

This concludes the proof of (3.47). \square

A Auxiliary results

In this appendix we collect the proofs of some auxiliary results.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Let us recall that

$$\det S = \sqrt{s_{11}^2 + s_{21}^2} \sqrt{s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2} \sin \theta, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where θ is the angle between the vectors $(s_{11}, s_{21}), (s_{12}, s_{22})$. If the following conditions hold: $s_{11}^2 + s_{21}^2 = s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2$ and $(s_{11}, s_{21}) \cdot (s_{12}, s_{22}) = 0$, then $|\det S| = s_{11}^2 + s_{21}^2 = s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2$ and so equality (2.25) is implied. Viceversa, if (2.25) holds true, then $s_{11}^2 + s_{21}^2 = |\det S| = s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2$; thus, we get that $|\det S| = \sqrt{s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2} \sqrt{s_{12}^2 + s_{22}^2}$, and so by comparison with (A.1) we have that $\cos \theta = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. For any $k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ we can choose a specific complex path \mathcal{C} , as illustrated in Figure 4, by setting $\text{Sp}_m := \min\{\text{Sp}(H(k))\}$, to define the Fermi projector $P_\mu(k)$ via the Riesz formula:

$$P_\mu(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} dz (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The fact that \mathcal{C} does not depend on k implies that $P_\mu(k)$ is differentiable at every k which is not a Fermi point. Moreover, for every $1 \leq j \leq 2$ we have that

$$\partial_j P_\mu(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} dz (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \partial_j H(k) (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We shall estimate $\|\partial_j P_\mu(k)\|$ by using the particular choice for the closed curve \mathcal{C} and expression (A.3). Let us define $M := \max_{k \in \mathcal{C}_1^*} \|\partial_j H(k)\|$. Notice that for the contribution coming from

the path II we get that

$$\left\| \int_{II} dz (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \partial_j H(k) (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \right\| \leq M \int_{b-a}^{\mu} dx \|(x\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1}\|^2 \leq M \frac{\mu - b + a}{a^2},$$

where we have used that $\|(x\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1}\| = \text{dist}(\text{Sp}(H(k)), x)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{a}$. Similarly we can estimate the contributions coming from paths III, IV . While for the term coming from I we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_I dz (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \partial_j H(k) (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \right\| &\leq M \int_{-a}^a dy \frac{1}{y^2 + (\mu - \Lambda_-(k))^2} \\ &\leq M \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \frac{1}{y^2 + (\mu - \Lambda_-(k))^2} = \frac{M\pi}{\mu - \Lambda_-(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using equality (2.6) and inequality (2.7) we can find two positive constants c and C :

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - \Lambda_-(k) &= |S_j(k - \omega_j)| - a_j \cdot (k - \omega_j) + o(|k - \omega_j|) \geq \frac{C_*}{2} |k - \omega_j| \quad \text{if } |k - \omega_j| < c \\ \mu - \Lambda_-(k) &\geq C \quad \text{if } |k - \omega_j| \geq c \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

where C_* is introduced in (2.7). Then we have that

$$\frac{M\pi}{\mu - \Lambda_-(k)} \leq \frac{2M\pi}{C_*} \frac{1}{|k - \omega_j|} \leq \frac{2M\pi}{C_*} \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{|k - \omega_l|} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{C}_1^* \setminus \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}.$$

So we can find a positive constant C such that

$$\left\| \int_I dz (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \partial_j H(k) (z\mathbb{1} - H(k))^{-1} \right\| \leq \frac{M\pi}{\mu - \Lambda_-(k)} \leq C \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{|k - \omega_l|}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The proof is concluded by observing that the function $\frac{1}{|k - \omega_l|} \in L^1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$ for any $1 \leq l \leq n$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.6. First, by using Remark 3.4 we undo the complex deformation in time of $\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta)$ on the integration domain B_ε , rewriting it in real time. Thus, by also exploiting rewriting (3.11), for any $\eta > 0$ we have that

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt e^{\eta t} \text{Tr}(P_b(k) [\tau_t((\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<})(k)), (\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<})(k)] P_b(k)).$$

By using that $\chi_{<}(k) = P_-(k) + P_+(k)$ for every $k \in B_\varepsilon$ due to condition (3.29), we get that (here, we do not write the k -dependence for the sake of readability)

$$\begin{aligned} P_b [\tau_t(\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<}), \chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<}] P_b &= P_b \tau_t(\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<}) \chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<} P_b - P_b (\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<}) \tau_t(\chi_{<} J_j \chi_{<}) P_b \\ &= P_b \left(e^{i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) J_j \left(e^{-i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{-i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) (P_- + P_+) J_j (P_- + P_+) P_b \\ &\quad - P_b (P_- + P_+) J_j (P_- + P_+) \left(e^{i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) J_j \left(e^{-i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{-i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) P_b \\ &= e^{i\Lambda_- t} P_- J_j \left(e^{-i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{-i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) J_j P_- - P_- J_j \left(e^{i\Lambda_- t} P_- + e^{i\Lambda_+ t} P_+ \right) J_j e^{-i\Lambda_- t} P_- \\ &= e^{i(\Lambda_- - \Lambda_+) t} P_- J_j P_+ J_j P_- - e^{i(\Lambda_+ - \Lambda_-) t} P_- J_j P_+ J_j P_-, \end{aligned}$$

where we have exploited that $P_b(k)P_+(k) = 0$ and $P_b(k)P_-(k) = P_-(k)$ a. e. in k . Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta) &= \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \int_{-\infty}^0 dt \left(e^{(\eta+i(\Lambda_- - \Lambda_+))t} - e^{(\eta-i(\Lambda_- - \Lambda_+))t} \right) \text{Tr}(P_- J_j P_+ J_j P_-) \\ &= \frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \frac{(\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k))}{\eta^2 + (\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k))^2} \text{Tr}(P_-(k) J_j(k) P_+(k) J_j(k)).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.7. We start by defining the interval $I_e := (-\infty, \mu - 2\delta) \cup (\mu + 2\delta, \infty)$ and its characteristic function χ_{I_e} . Then we introduce the following fibered operators:

$$\tilde{H}(k) := (\Lambda_-(k) - \mu)P_-(k) + (\Lambda_+(k) - \mu)P_+(k) \equiv (H(k) - \mu)(P_-(k) + P_+(k)), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$P_e(k) := \chi_{I_e}(H(k)). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By (3.29) we get that $k \in B_\varepsilon$ implies that the eigenvalues $\Lambda_\pm(k) \in (\mu - \delta, \mu + \delta)$ and the other eigenvalues of $H(k)$ are in the interval I_e . Hence, we can write the identity $\mathbb{1}$ on $\ell^2(\mathcal{X}/\Gamma)$ as

$$\mathbb{1} = P_-(k) + P_+(k) + P_e(k) \quad \text{for every } k \in B_\varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Thus, by (3.31) we obtain that the map $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto P_e(k)$ is C^2 and by Assumption 2.1(H₁) the function $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto \tilde{H}(k)$ is C^2 as well.

Now we shall rewrite $\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}$ as the sum of the function ζ_{jj} defined in (3.33) and the map ξ defined in (A.15), which does not contribute to σ_{jj} , as shown below. In the following we omit the explicit dependence on the k -variable and the equalities have to be understood a. e. in $k \in B_\varepsilon$ (actually, we shall only exclude the Fermi points $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ in B_ε). We also use the shorthand notation:

$$\tilde{J}_j^{+-} := P_+(\partial_j \tilde{H})P_-, \quad \tilde{J}_j^{-+} := P_-(\partial_j \tilde{H})P_+.$$

In view of the identity $J_j = \partial_j H = \partial_j(H - \mu) = \partial_j(\tilde{H} + (H - \mu)P_e)$, we rewrite the trace term inside the integral in (3.32) as

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(P_- J_j P_+ J_j P_-) &= \text{Tr}(P_-(\partial_j(\tilde{H} + (H - \mu)P_e))P_+ J_j P_-) \\ &= \text{Tr}(P_-(\partial_j \tilde{H})P_+ J_j P_-) + \text{Tr}(P_-(\partial_j H)P_e P_+ J_j P_-) \\ &\quad + \text{Tr}(P_-(H - \mu)(\partial_j P_e)P_+ J_j P_-) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} P_+ J_j P_-),\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used that $P_e P_+ = 0$, $(\partial_j P_e)P_+ = -P_e(\partial_j P_+)$ together with $P_- P_e = 0$. By exploiting a similar argument applied to the remaining $J_j(k)$, we obtain that

$$\text{Tr}(P_- J_j P_+ J_j P_-) = \text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-}). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Now we rewrite the expression of $\text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-})$, by decoupling the contributions containing only P_- and the ones involving only P_+ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-}) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-}) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{+-} \tilde{J}_j^{-+}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_+ (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_-) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_+ (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_+) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) (1 - P_- - P_e) (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_-) + (m \leftrightarrow m+1) \tag{A.9} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H})^2) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_-) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_-) + (m \leftrightarrow m+1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (A.7) and the cyclicity of the trace, and the notation “ $+(m \leftrightarrow m+1)$ ” means that it is added the term given by substituting m with $m+1$ to all the summands to the left. To extract the function ζ_{jj} from $\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}$, we proceed by computing $\partial_j \tilde{H}$. By the very definition of \tilde{H} in (A.5), we have that

$$\partial_j \tilde{H} = (\partial_j \Lambda_-) P_- + (\Lambda_- - \mu) (\partial_j P_-) + (\partial_j \Lambda_+) P_+ + (\Lambda_+ - \mu) (\partial_j P_+).$$

Thus, we get that

$$P_- (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_- = (\partial_j \Lambda_-) P_-, \tag{A.10}$$

$$P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_e = 0, \tag{A.11}$$

since $P_- (\partial_j P_-) P_- = 0 = P_- (\partial_j P_+) P_-$ and $P_e (\partial_j P_-) P_e = 0 = P_e (\partial_j P_+) P_e$. Then, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-}) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((P_- + P_+) (\partial_j \tilde{H})^2) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H}) (P_- + P_+) (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_e) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_-)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_+)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((\partial_j \tilde{H})^2) - \text{Tr}(P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H})^2 P_e) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H}) P_e) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_-)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_+)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}((\partial_j \tilde{H})^2) - \text{Tr}(P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H})^2 P_e) - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_-)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_+)^2, \tag{A.12}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used in the first equality (A.10), in the second one (A.7) and in the third one (A.11). Next, we proceed by rewriting the first summand in (A.12) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}((\partial_j \tilde{H})^2) &= \partial_j \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \partial_j \tilde{H}) - \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \partial_j^2 \text{Tr}(\tilde{H}^2) - \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}) \tag{A.13} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \partial_j^2 ((\Lambda_- - \mu)^2 + (\Lambda_+ - \mu)^2) - \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the definition of \tilde{H} in (A.5). Plugging (A.13) into (A.12), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{J}_j^{-+} \tilde{J}_j^{+-}) &= \frac{1}{4} \partial_j^2 ((\Lambda_- - \mu)^2 + (\Lambda_+ - \mu)^2) - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_-)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \Lambda_+)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{H} \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}) - \text{Tr}(P_e (\partial_j \tilde{H})^2 P_e). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Recalling (3.32), up to this point we have proven that for any $\eta > 0$:

$$\tilde{f}_{jj}^{\text{sing}}(\eta) = \zeta_{jj}(\eta) + \xi(\eta),$$

where ζ_{jj} is defined in (3.33) and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(\eta) &:= \int_{B_\varepsilon} dk \Xi(\eta, k), \\ \Xi(\eta, k) &:= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{2(\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))}{\eta^2 + (\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))^2} \left(\text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k)^2 (\partial_j P_e(k))^2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k) \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}(k)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where we have used that $\tilde{H}(k) \partial_j P_e(k) = -\partial_j \tilde{H}(k) P_e(k)$ as $\tilde{H}(k) P_e(k) = 0$. We conclude the proof by showing that the function ξ is differentiable and that $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \xi'(\eta) = 0$, that is ξ does not contribute to the longitudinal conductivity σ_{jj} . We shall compute explicitly the derivative $\xi'(\eta)$ for $\eta \rightarrow 0$ on each $B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$ (whose disjoint union gives the whole set B_ε , recall (3.20)) with $1 \leq l \leq n$, by using the dominated convergence theorem. First, for a. e. in $k \in B_\varepsilon$ we observe that

$$\partial_\eta \Xi(\eta, k) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{4\eta(\Lambda_-(k) - \Lambda_+(k))}{(\eta^2 + (\Lambda_+(k) - \Lambda_-(k))^2)^2} \left(\text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k)^2 (\partial_j P_e(k))^2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k) \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}(k)) \right). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Second, we notice that there exists a constant C_1 :

$$\left| \text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k)^2 (\partial_j P_e(k))^2) \right| \leq C_1 |k - \omega_l|, \quad \left| \text{Tr}(\tilde{H}(k) \partial_j^2 \tilde{H}(k)) \right| \leq C_1 |k - \omega_l| \quad \text{a. e. } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

by using that in view of Assumption 2.1(H₂) there exists a constant C_2 such that $\|\tilde{H}(k)\| \leq C_2 |k - \omega_l|$ for a. e. $k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}$, and by exploiting the C^2 regularity of the maps $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto P_e(k)$ and $B_\varepsilon \ni k \mapsto \tilde{H}(k)$, as shown previously. Therefore, by also using condition (3.30), we have that there exists a constant C_3 such that

$$|\partial_\eta \Xi(\eta, k)| \leq \frac{C_3 \eta |k - \omega_l|^2}{(\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2)^2} \quad \text{for a. e. } k \in B_\varepsilon^{(l)}, \text{ for every } 1 \leq l \leq n. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

For any $a > 0$, let us introduce the function $F_a: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_a(x) := \frac{xa}{(x^2 + a^2)^2}$. It is easy to check that $\max_{x>0} F_a(x) = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{16a^2}$. Therefore, we can estimate the right-hand side of (A.18) as:

$$\frac{C_3 \eta |k - \omega_l|^2}{(\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2)^2} = \frac{C_3 |k - \omega_l|}{m} F_{(m|k - \omega_l|)}(\eta) \leq \frac{C_3 |k - \omega_l|}{m} \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{16(m|k - \omega_l|)^2} = \frac{3\sqrt{3} C_3}{16m^3 |k - \omega_l|}$$

which is integrable (uniformly in η). Thus, the dominated convergence theorem and inequality (A.18) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi'(\eta)| &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^n \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \partial_\eta \Xi(\eta, k) \right| \leq \sum_{l=1}^n \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk |\partial_\eta \Xi(\eta, k)| \\ &\leq C_3 \sum_{l=1}^n \int_{B_\varepsilon^{(l)}} dk \frac{\eta |k - \omega_l|^2}{(\eta^2 + m^2 |k - \omega_l|^2)^2} = \frac{n C_3 \eta}{2m^4} \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 m^2}{\eta^2} \right) + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2 m^2}{\eta^2}} - 1 \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \eta \rightarrow 0^+. \end{aligned}$$

□

References

- [1] M. Aizenman and G. M. Graf. Localization bounds for an electron gas. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **31**, 6783 (1998).
- [2] J. E. Avron, R. Seiler, and B. Simon. Homotopy and quantization in condensed matter physics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 51 (1983).
- [3] J. E. Avron, R. Seiler, and B. Simon. Charge deficiency, charge transport and comparison of dimensions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **159**, 399-422 (1994).
- [4] J. E. Avron, R. Seiler, and L. G. Yaffe. Adiabatic theorems and applications to the quantum Hall effect. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **110**, 33-49 (1987).
- [5] S. Bachmann, W. De Roeck, and M. Fraas. The adiabatic theorem in a quantum many-body setting. *Contemp. Math., Analytic Trends in Mathematical Physics* **741**, 43-58 (2020).
- [6] S. Bachmann, W. De Roeck, and M. Fraas. The adiabatic theorem and linear response theory for extended quantum systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **361**, 997-1027 (2018).
- [7] S. Bachmann, A. Bols, W. De Roeck, and M. Fraas. A Many-Body Index for Quantum Charge Transport. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **375**, 1249-1272, (2020).
- [8] S. Bachmann, W. De Roeck, M. Fraas, and M. Lange. Exactness of linear response in the quantum Hall effect. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 1113-1132 (2021).
- [9] J. Bellissard, A. van Elst, and H. Schulz-Baldes. The non-commutative geometry of the quantum Hall effect. *J. Math. Phys.* **35**, 5373 (1994).
- [10] E. Cancès, C. Fermanian Kammerer, A. Levitt, and S. Siraj-Dine. Coherent Electronic Transport in Periodic Crystals. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 2643–2690 (2021).
- [11] W. De Roeck, A. Elgart, and M. Fraas. Derivation of Kubo’s formula for disordered systems at zero temperature. *Invent. math.* **235**, 489–568 (2024).
- [12] A. Drouot. Ubiquity of conical points in topological insulators. *Journal de l’École polytechnique – Mathématiques* **8**, 507-532 (2021).

- [13] A. Elgart and B. Schlein. Adiabatic charge transport and the Kubo formula for Landau-type Hamiltonians. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **57**, 590-615 (2004).
- [14] A. Giuliani, I. Jauslin, V. Mastropietro, and M. Porta. Topological phase transitions and universality in the Haldane-Hubbard model. *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 205139 (2016).
- [15] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, and M. Porta. Universality of Conductivity in Interacting Graphene. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **311**, 317–355 (2012).
- [16] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, and M. Porta. Universality of the Hall Conductivity in Interacting Electron Systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **349**, 1107-1161 (2017).
- [17] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, and M. Porta. Quantization of the interacting Hall conductivity in the critical regime. *J. Stat. Phys.* **180**, 332-365 (2020).
- [18] G. M. Graf. Aspects of the integer quantum Hall effect. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.* **76**, 429-442 (2007).
- [19] R. L. Greenblatt, M. Lange, G. Marcelli, and M. Porta. Adiabatic Evolution of Low-Temperature Many-Body Systems. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **405**, 75 (2024).
- [20] F. D. M. Haldane. Model for a Quantum Hall Effect without Landau levels: condensed-matter realization of the “parity anomaly”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2015–2018 (1988).
- [21] G. Harris and C. Martin. Shorter Notes: The Roots of a Polynomial Vary Continuously as a Function of the Coefficients. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **100**, 390-392 (1987).
- [22] M. B. Hastings and S. Michalakis. Quantization of Hall conductance for interacting electrons on a torus. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **334**, 433-471 (2015).
- [23] J. Henheik and S. Teufel. Justifying Kubo’s formula for gapped systems at zero temperature: A brief review and some new result. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, **33**, No. 01, 2060004 (2021).
- [24] M. Klein and R. Seiler. Power-law corrections to the Kubo formula vanish in quantum Hall systems. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **128**, 141-160 (1990).
- [25] K. von Klitzing, G. Dorda, and M. Pepper. New Method for High-Accuracy Determination of the Fine-Structure Constant Based on Quantized Hall Resistance. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 494-497 (1980).
- [26] R. Kubo. Statistical-mechanical theory of irreversible processes I: General theory and simple applications to magnetic and conduction problems. *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **12**, 570–586 (1957).
- [27] R. B. Laughlin. Quantized Hall conductivity in two dimensions. *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 5632 (1981).

- [28] A. W. W. Ludwig, M. P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein. Integer quantum Hall transition: An alternative approach and exact results. *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 7526 (1994).
- [29] G. Marcelli. Improved energy estimates for a class of time-dependent perturbed Hamiltonians. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **112**, 51 (2022).
- [30] G. Marcelli and D. Monaco. From charge to spin: Analogies and differences in quantum transport coefficients. *J. Math. Phys.* **63**, 072102 (2022)
- [31] G. Marcelli and D. Monaco. Purely linear response of the quantum Hall current to space-adiabatic perturbations. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **112**, 91 (2022).
- [32] G. Marcelli, D. Monaco, M. Moscolari, and G. Panati. The Haldane model and its localization dichotomy. *Rend. Mat. Appl.* **39**, 307–327 (2018).
- [33] G. Marcelli, G. Panati, and C. Tauber. Spin conductance and spin conductivity in topological insulators: analysis of Kubo-like terms. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **20**, 2071–2099 (2019).
- [34] G. Marcelli, G. Panati, and S. Teufel. A new approach to transport coefficients in the quantum spin Hall effect. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 1069–1111 (2021).
- [35] D. Monaco and S. Teufel. Adiabatic currents for interacting electrons on a lattice. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **31**, 1950009 (2019).
- [36] G. Panati, C. Sparber, and S. Teufel. Geometric currents in piezoelectricity. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Analysis* **191**, 387–422 (2009).
- [37] M. Porta and H. P. Singh. Large Scale Response of Gapless $1d$ and Quasi- $1d$ Systems. Preprint arXiv: 2411.04023.
- [38] G. W. Semenoff. Condensed-Matter Simulation of a Three-Dimensional Anomaly, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 2449 (1984).
- [39] T. Stauber, N. M. R. Peres, and A. K. Geim. Optical conductivity of graphene in the visible region of the spectrum. *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085432 (2008).
- [40] S. Teufel. Adiabatic Perturbation Theory in Quantum Dynamics. No. 1821 in Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin (2003).
- [41] D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M. P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs. Quantized Hall conductance in a two-dimensional periodic potential. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 405 (1982).
- [42] M. Wesle, G. Marcelli, T. Miyao, D. Monaco, and S. Teufel. Exact linearity of the macroscopic Hall current response in infinitely extended gapped fermion systems. Preprint arXiv: 2411.06967.