ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 3 No. 1 2010

ARTUR AVILA, YORAM LAST AND BARRY SIMON

BULK UNIVERSALITY AND CLOCK SPACING OF ZEROS FOR ERGODIC JACOBI MATRICES WITH ABSOLUTELY CONTINUOUS SPECTRUM

mathematical sciences publishers

ANALYSIS AND PDE
Vol. 3, No. 1, 2010

BULK UNIVERSALITY AND CLOCK SPACING OF ZEROS FOR ERGODIC JACOBI MATRICES WITH ABSOLUTELY CONTINUOUS SPECTRUM

ARTUR AVILA, YORAM LAST AND BARRY SIMON

By combining ideas of Lubinsky with some soft analysis, we prove that universality and clock behavior of zeros for orthogonal polynomials on the real line in the absolutely continuous spectral region is implied by convergence of $\frac{1}{n}K_n(x,x)$ for the diagonal CD kernel and boundedness of the analog associated to second kind polynomials. We then show that these hypotheses are always valid for ergodic Jacobi matrices with absolutely continuous spectrum and prove that the limit of $\frac{1}{n}K_n(x,x)$ is $\rho_\infty(x)/w(x)$, where ρ_∞ is the density of zeros and w is the absolutely continuous weight of the spectral measure.

1. Introduction

Given a finite measure, $d\mu$, of compact and not finite support on $\mathbb{R}$, one defines the orthonormal polynomials $p_n(x)$ (or $p_n(x,d\mu)$ if the μ-dependence is important) by applying Gram–Schmidt to $1, x, x^2, \ldots$. Thus, p_n is a polynomial of degree exactly n with leading positive coefficient so that

$$\int p_n(x)p_m(x)\,d\mu(x) = \delta_{nm}. \tag{1-1}$$

For background on these orthogonal polynomials on the real line (OPRL), see [Szegő 1939; Freud 1971; Simon 2010].

Associated to μ is a family of Jacobi parameters $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, $a_n > 0$, b_n real, determined by the recursion relation ($p_{-1}(x) \equiv 0$):

$$xp_n(x) = a_{n+1}p_{n+1}(x) + b_{n+1}p_n(x) + a_n p_{n-1}(x). \tag{1-2}$$

The $\{p_n(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, d\mu)$ (since $\operatorname{supp} d\mu$ is compact) and (1-2) says that multiplication by x is given in this basis by the tridiagonal Jacobi matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & a_1 & 0 & \cdots \\ a_1 & b_2 & a_2 & \cdots \\ 0 & a_2 & b_3 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1-3}$$

MSC2000: 26C10, 42C05, 47B36.
Keywords: orthogonal polynomials, clock behavior, almost Mathieu equation.
Y. Last was supported in part by grant 1169/06 from the Israel Science Foundation; B. Simon by grant DMS-0652919 from the NSF; and both by grant 2006483 from the United States–Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem.

If we restrict (as we normally will) to μ normalized by $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = 1$, then μ can be recovered from J as the spectral measure for the vector $(1, 0, 0, \dots)^t$. Favard's theorem says there is a one-to-one correspondence between sets of bounded Jacobi parameters, that is,

$$\sup_n |a_n| = \alpha_+ < \infty, \qquad \sup_n |b_n| = \beta < \infty, \tag{1-4}$$

and probability measures with compact and not finite support under this $\mu \to J \to \mu$ correspondence.

We will use this to justify spectral theory notation for things like supp $d\mu$ which we will denote $\sigma(d\mu)$ since it is the spectrum of J, $\sigma(J)$. We will use $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(d\mu)$ for the essential spectrum, and if

$$d\mu(x) = w(x)\,dx + d\mu_{\text{s}}(x), \tag{1-5}$$

where $d\mu_{\text{s}}$ is Lebesgue singular, then we define

$$\Sigma_{\text{ac}}(d\mu) = \{x \mid w(x) > 0\}, \tag{1-6}$$

determined up to sets of Lebesgue measure 0, so $\Sigma_{\text{ac}} \neq \varnothing$ means $d\mu$ has a nonvanishing a.c. part.

We will also suppose

$$\inf_n a_n = \alpha_- > 0, \tag{1-7}$$

which is no loss since it is known [Dombrowski 1978] that if the inf is 0, then $\Sigma_{\text{ac}} = \varnothing$, and we will only be interested in cases where $\Sigma_{\text{ac}} \neq \varnothing$.

One of our concerns in this paper is the zeros of $p_n(x, d\mu)$. These are not only of intrinsic interest; they enter in Gaussian quadrature and also as the eigenvalues of $J_{n;F}$, the upper left $n \times n$ corner of J, and so are relevant to statistics of eigenvalues in large boxes, a subject on which there is an enormous amount of discussion in both the mathematics and the physics literature.

These zeros are all simple and real. The measure $d\nu_n$ is the normalized counting measure for the zeros:

$$\nu_n(S) = \frac{1}{n}\,\#\text{ of zeros of } p_n \text{ in } S. \tag{1-8}$$

In many cases, $d\nu_n$ converges to a weak limit $d\nu_\infty$ called the density of zeros or density of states (DOS). If this weak limit exists, we say that the DOS exists. It often happens that $d\nu_\infty$ is $d\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}$, the equilibrium measure for $\mathfrak{e} = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(d\mu)$. This is true, for example, if $\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}$ is equivalent to $dx \restriction \mathfrak{e}$ and $\Sigma_{\text{ac}} = \mathfrak{e}$, a theorem of Widom [1967] and Van Assche [1986] (see also [Stahl and Totik 1992; Simon 2007]). If $d\nu_\infty$ has an a.c. part, we use $\rho_\infty(x)$ for $d\nu_\infty/dx$ and we use $\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}(x)$ for $d\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}/dx$. More properly, $d\nu_\infty$ is the *density of states measure* (so $\int_{-\infty}^x d\nu_\infty$ is the *integrated density of states*) and $\rho_\infty(x)$ the *density of states*.

We are especially interested in the fine structure of the zeros near some point $x_0 \in \sigma(d\mu)$. We define $x_j^{(n)}(x_0)$ by

$$x_{-2}^{(n)}(x_0) < x_{-1}^{(n)}(x_0) < x_0 \leq x_0^{(n)}(x_0) < x_1^{(n)}(x_0) < \cdots, \tag{1-9}$$

requiring these to be all of the zeros near x_0. It is known that if x_0 is not isolated from $\sigma(d\mu)$ on either side, that is, if for all $\delta > 0$,

$$(x_0 - \delta, x_0) \cap \sigma(d\mu) \neq \varnothing \neq (x_0, x_0 + \delta) \cap \sigma(d\mu), \tag{1-10}$$

then for each fixed j,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_j^{(n)}(x_0) = x_0. \tag{1-11}$$

We are interested in clock behavior, named after the spacing of numerals on a clock — meaning equal spacing of the zeros nearby to x_0:

Definition. We say that there is *quasiclock behavior* at $x_0 \in \sigma(d\mu)$ if and only if for each fixed $j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{x_{j+1}^{(n)}(x_0) - x_j^{(n)}(x_0)}{x_1^{(n)}(x_0) - x_0^{(n)}(x_0)} = 1. \tag{1-12}$$

We say there is *strong clock behavior* at x_0 if and only if the DOS exists and for each fixed $j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n(x_{j+1}^{(n)}(x_0) - x_j(x_0)) = \frac{1}{\rho_\infty(x_0)}. \tag{1-13}$$

Obviously, strong clock behavior implies quasiclock behavior. Thus far, the only cases where it is proven there is quasiclock behavior, one has strong clock behavior but, as we will explain in Section 7, we think there are examples where one has quasiclock behavior at x_0 but not strong clock behavior. Before this paper, all examples known with strong clock behavior have $\rho_\infty = \rho_\mathfrak{e}$, but we will find several examples where there is strong clock behavior with $\rho_\infty \neq \rho_\mathfrak{e}$ in Section 7. In that section, we will say more about:

Conjecture. For any μ, quasiclock behavior holds at a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(d\mu)$.

In this paper, one of our main goals is to prove this result for ergodic Jacobi matrices. A major role will be played by the Christoffel–Darboux (CD) kernel, defined for $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ by

$$K_n(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \overline{p_j(x)}\, p_j(y), \tag{1-14}$$

the integral kernel for the orthogonal projection onto polynomials of degree at most n in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, d\mu)$; see Simon [2008a] for a review of some important aspects of the properties and uses of this kernel. We will repeatedly make use of the CD formula:

$$K_n(x, y) = \frac{a_{n+1}[\,\overline{p_{n+1}(x)}\, p_n(y) - \overline{p_n(x)} p_{n+1}(y)]}{\bar{x} - y}; \tag{1-15}$$

the Schwarz inequality:

$$|K_n(x, y)|^2 \le K_n(x, x) K_n(y, y); \tag{1-16}$$

and the reproducing property:

$$\int K_n(x, y) K_n(y, z)\, d\mu(y) = K_n(x, z). \tag{1-17}$$

It is a theorem [Simon 2009] that if the DOS exists, then

$$\frac{1}{n+1} K_n(x, x)\, d\mu(x) \xrightarrow{\text{weak}} d\nu_\infty(x), \tag{1-18}$$

and, in general, $\dfrac{1}{n+1} K_n(x, x)\, d\mu(x)$ has the same weak limit points as $d\nu_n$. This suggests that a.c. parts converge pointwise; that is, one hopes that for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$,

$$\frac{1}{n+1} K_n(x_0, x_0) \to \frac{\rho_\infty(x_0)}{w(x_0)}. \tag{1-19}$$

This has been proven for regular measures (in the sense of [Stahl and Totik 1992]; see also [Simon 2007]) with a local Szegő condition in a series of papers, of which the seminal ones are [Máté et al. 1991; Totik 2000]. We will prove it for ergodic Jacobi matrices.

We say *bulk universality* holds at $x_0 \in \operatorname{supp} d\mu$ if and only if uniformly for a, b in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\frac{K_n(x_0 + a/n,\ x_0 + b/n)}{K_n(x_0, x_0)} \to \frac{\sin(\pi\rho(x_0)(b-a))}{\pi\rho(x_0)(b-a)}. \tag{1-20}$$

We use the term *bulk* here because (1-20) fails at edges of the spectrum [Lubinsky 2008a]. We also note that when (1-20) holds, typically (and in all cases below) for z, w complex, one has

$$\frac{K_n(x_0 + z/n,\ x_0 + w/n)}{K_n(x_0, x_0)} \to \frac{\sin(\rho(x_0)(w-\bar{z}))}{\rho(x_0)(w-\bar{z})}. \tag{1-21}$$

Freud [1971] proved bulk universality for measures on $[-1, 1]$ with $d\mu_{\mathrm{s}} = 0$ and strong conditions on $w(x)$. Because of related results (but with variable weights) in random matrix theory, this result was reexamined and proven in multiple interval support cases with analytic weights by Kuijlaars and Vanlessen [2002]. A significant breakthrough was made by Lubinsky [2009], whose contributions we return to shortly.

The following theorem is a basic result of Freud [1971], rediscovered by Levin.[1]

Theorem 1.1 (Freud–Levin Theorem). *Bulk universality at x_0 implies strong clock behavior at x_0.*

Remarks.

1. The proof [Freud 1971; Levin and Lubinsky 2008; Simon 2008a] relies on the CD formula (1-15), which implies that if y_0 is a zero of p_n, then the other zeros of p_n are the points y solving $K_n(y, y_0) = 0$ and the fact that the zeros of $\sin(\pi\rho(x_0)(b-a))$ are at $b - a = j/\rho(x_0)$ with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.
2. Szegő [1939] proved strong clock behavior for Jacobi polynomials and Erdős and Turán [1940] for a more general class of measures on $[-1, 1]$. Simon has a series on the subject [2005; 2006a; 2006b; Last and Simon 2008]. The last of these papers was one motivation for [Levin and Lubinsky 2008].

It is also useful to define

$$\rho_n = \frac{1}{n} w(x_0) K_n(x_0, x_0), \tag{1-22}$$

so (1-19) is equivalent to

$$\rho_n \to \rho_\infty(x_0). \tag{1-23}$$

We say *weak bulk universality* holds at x_0 if and only if, uniformly for a, b on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\frac{K_n(x_0 + a/(n\rho_n), x_0 + b/(n\rho_n))}{K_n(x_0, x_0)} \to \frac{\sin(\pi(b-a))}{\pi(b-a)}, \tag{1-24}$$

[1] See [Levin and Lubinsky 2008]. Lubinsky (private communication) has emphasized to us that this part of the paper is due to Levin alone — hence our name for the result.

the form in which universality is often written, especially in the random matrix literature. Notice that

$$\text{weak universality} + (1\text{-}23) \;\Rightarrow\; \text{universality}. \tag{1-25}$$

Notice also that (1-24) could hold in case where ρ_n does not converge as $n \to \infty$. The same proof that verifies Theorem 1.1 implies:

Theorem 1.2 (Weak Freud–Levin Theorem). *Weak bulk universality at x_0 implies quasiclock behavior at x_0.*

With this background in place, we can turn to describing the main results of this paper: five theorems, proven one per section in Sections 2–6.

The first theorem is an abstraction, extension, and simplification of Lubinsky's second approach to universality [2008b]. Lubinsky [2009] found a beautiful way of going from control of the diagonal CD kernel to the off-diagonal (i.e., to universality). It depended on the ability to control limits not only of $(1/n)K_n(x_0, x_0)$ but also $(1/n)K_n(x_0+a/n,\ x_0+a/n)$ — what we call the Lubinsky wiggle. We will especially care about the *Lubinsky wiggle condition*:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{K_n(x_0+a/n,\ x_0+a/n)}{K_n(x_0, x_0)} = 1 \tag{1-26}$$

uniformly for $a \in [-A, A]$ for each A. In addition to this, Lubinsky [2009] needed a simple but clever inequality and, most significantly, a comparison model example where one knows universality holds. For $[-1, 1]$, he took Legendre polynomials (that is, $d\mu = (1/2)\chi_{[-1,1]}(x)\,dx$). In extending this to more general sets, one uses approximation by finite gap sets as pioneered by Totik [2001]. Simon [2008b] then used Jacobi matrices in isospectral tori for a comparison model on these finite gap sets, while Totik [$\geq$ 2010] used polynomials mappings and the results for $[-1, 1]$.

For ergodic Jacobi matrices, where $\sigma(d\mu)$ is often a Cantor set, it is hard to find comparison models, so we will rely on a second approach developed by Lubinsky [2008b] that seems to be able to handle any situation that his first approach can and which does not rely on a comparison model. Our first theorem, proven in Section 2, is a variant of this approach. We need a preliminary definition.

Definition. Let $d\mu$ be given by (1-5). A point x_0 is called a *Lebesgue point* of $d\mu$ if $w(x_0) > 0$ and

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} (2\delta)^{-1} \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0+\delta} |w(x) - w(x_0)|\,dx = 0, \tag{1-27}$$

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} (2\delta)^{-1} \mu_{\mathrm{s}}(x_0-\delta, x_0+\delta) = 0. \tag{1-28}$$

Standard maximal function methods [Rudin 1987] show that Lebesgue almost every $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(d\mu)$ is a Lebesgue point.

Theorem 1. *Let x_0 be a Lebesgue point of μ. Suppose that*:

(i) *The Lubinsky wiggle condition* (1-26) *holds uniformly for $a \in [-A, A]$ and any $A < \infty$.*

(ii) *We have*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} K_n(x_0, x_0) > 0. \tag{1-29}$$

(iii) *For any ε, there is $C_\varepsilon > 0$ so that for any $R < \infty$, there is an N so that for all $n > N$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| < R$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{n+1} K_n\Big(x_0 + \frac{z}{n}, x_0 + \frac{\bar{z}}{n}\Big) \leq C_\varepsilon \exp(\varepsilon |z|^2). \tag{1-30}$$

Then weak bulk universality, and so, quasiclock behavior, holds at x_0.

Remarks. 1. If one replaces the right-hand side of (1-30) by

$$C \exp(A|z|), \tag{1-31}$$

then the result can be proven by following Lubinsky's argument in [2008b]. He does not assume (1-31) directly but rather hypotheses that he shows imply it (but which are invalid when the support of $d\mu$ is a Cantor set).

2. Because our Theorem 3 below is so general, we doubt there are examples where (1-30) holds but (1-31) does not, but we feel our more general abstract result is clarifying.

3. The strategy we follow is Lubinsky's, but the tactics differ and, we feel, are more elementary and illuminating.

In [Lubinsky 2008b], the only examples where the wiggle condition can be verified are the situations where Totik [$\geq$ 2010] proves universality using Lubinsky's first method. To go beyond that, we need the following, proven in Section 3:

Theorem 2. *Let $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$. Suppose for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$, condition* (iii) *of Theorem 1 holds and*

(iv) $\lim_{n\to\infty}(1/(n+1))K_n(x_0, x_0)$ *exists and is strictly positive.*

Then condition (i) *of Theorem 1 holds for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$.*

Of course, (iv) implies condition (ii). So we obtain:

Corollary 1.3. *If* (iii) *and* (iv) *hold for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$, then for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$, we have weak universality and quasiclock behavior.*

By (1-25), we see:

Corollary 1.4. *If* (iii) *and* (iv) *hold for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$, and if the DOS exists and the limit in* (iv) *is $\rho_\infty(x)/w(x)$, then for a.e. $x \in \Sigma$, we have universality and strong clock behavior.*

Next, we need to examine when (1-30) holds. We will not only obtain a bound of the type (1-31) but one that does not need to vary N with R and is universal in z. We will use transfer matrix techniques and notation.

Given Jacobi parameters, $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we define

$$A_j(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{z-b_j}{a_j} & -\frac{1}{a_j} \\ a_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1-32}$$

so that (1-2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_n(x) \\ a_n p_{n-1}(x) \end{pmatrix} = A_n(x) \begin{pmatrix} p_{n-1}(x) \\ a_{n-1} p_{n-2}(x) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1-33}$$

We normalize, placing a_n on the lower component, so that

$$\det(A_j(z)) = 1. \tag{1-34}$$

The transfer matrix is then defined by

$$T_n(z) = A_n(z) \dots A_1(z), \tag{1-35}$$

so

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_n(x) \\ a_n p_{n-1}(x) \end{pmatrix} = T_n(x) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1-36}$$

If $\tilde{p}_n$ are the OPRL associated to the once stripped Jacobi parameters $\{a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and

$$q_n(x) = -a_1^{-1} \tilde{p}_{n-1}(x) \tag{1-37}$$

with $q_0 = 0$, then

$$T_n(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p_n(z) & q_n(z) \\ a_n p_{n-1}(z) & a_n q_{n-1}(z) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1-38}$$

Here is how we will establish (1-30) and (1-31):

Theorem 3. *Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that*

$$\sup_n \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \|T_j(x_0)\|^2 \le C < \infty. \tag{1-39}$$

Then for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and all n,

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \left\| T_j\Big(x_0 + \frac{z}{n+1}\Big) \right\|^2 \le C \exp(2C\alpha_-^{-1}|z|). \tag{1-40}$$

Moreover, if

$$\sup_n \|T_n(x_0)\|^2 = C < \infty, \tag{1-41}$$

then for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and n,

$$\left\| T_n\Big(x_0 + \frac{z}{n+1}\Big) \right\| \le C^{1/2} \exp(C\alpha_-^{-1}|z|). \tag{1-42}$$

Remarks. 1. Our proof is an abstraction of ideas of Avila and Krikorian [2006], who only treated the ergodic case.

2. α_- is given by (1-7).

3. There is a conjecture, called the Schrödinger conjecture [Maslov et al. 1993], that says (1-41) holds for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(d\mu)$.

Our last two theorems below are special to the ergodic situation. Let Ω be a compact metric space, $d\eta$ a probability measure on Ω, and $S\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ an ergodic invertible map of Ω to itself. Let A, B be continuous real-valued functions on Ω with $\inf_\omega A(\omega) > 0$. Let

$$\alpha_+ = \|A\|_\infty, \qquad \beta = \|B\|_\infty, \qquad \alpha_- = \|A^{-1}\|_\infty^{-1}. \tag{1-43}$$

For each $\omega \in \Omega$, J_ω is the Jacobi matrix with

$$a_n(\omega) = A(S^{n-1}\omega), \qquad b_n(\omega) = B(S^{n-1}\omega). \tag{1-44}$$

Equation (1-43) is consistent with (1-4) and (1-7). Usually one only takes Ω, a measure space, and A, B bounded measurable functions, but by replacing Ω by $([\alpha_-, \alpha_+] \times [-\beta, \beta])^\infty \equiv \widetilde{\Omega}$ and mapping $\Omega \to \widetilde{\Omega}$ by $\omega \mapsto (A(S^n\omega), B(S^n\omega))_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$, we get a compact space model equivalent to the original measure model. We use $d\mu_\omega$ for the spectral measure of J_ω and $p_n(x, \omega)$ for $p_n(x, d\mu_\omega)$.

The canonical example of the setup with a.c. spectrum is the almost Mathieu equation. Let α be a fixed irrational, λ a nonzero real, and $\Omega = \partial\mathbb{D}$ the unit circle $\{e^{i\theta} \mid \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}$. Then take

$$a_n = 1, \qquad b_n = 2\lambda \cos(\pi\alpha n + \theta),$$

(so $S(e^{i\theta}) = e^{i\theta}e^{i\pi\alpha}$, $d\eta(\theta) = d\theta/2\pi$). If $0 \neq |\lambda| < 1$, it is known [Avila 2008; Avila and Damanik 2008; Avila and Jitomirskaya 2008; Jitomirskaya 2007] that the spectrum is purely a.c. and is a Cantor set. It is also known [Jitomirskaya 2007] that if $|\lambda| \geq 1$, there is no a.c. spectrum.

Theorem 4. *Let $\{J_\omega\}_{\omega \in n}$ be an ergodic family with Σ_{ac}, the common essential support of the a.c. spectrum of J_ω, of positive Lebesgue measure. Then for a.e. pairs $(x, \omega) \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}} \times \Omega$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} |p_j(x, w)|^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{n} |q_j(x, w)|^2 \tag{1-45}$$

exist.

Theorem 5. *For a.e. (x, ω) in $\Sigma_{\text{ac}} \times \Omega$, the first limit in* (1-45) *is $\rho_\infty(x)/w_\omega(x)$, where ρ_∞ is the density of the a.c. part of the DOS.*

This is, of course, an analog of the celebrated results of Máté et al. [1991] (for $[-1, 1]$) and Totik [2000] (for general sets $\mathfrak{e}$ containing open intervals) for regular measures obeying a local Szegő condition.

Theorems 3–5 show the applicability of Theorem 2, and so lead to:

Corollary 1.5. *For any ergodic Jacobi matrix, we have universality and strong clock behavior for a.e. ω and a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}}$.*

In particular, the almost Mathieu equation has strong clock behavior for the zeros.

Remark. It is possible to show that for the almost Mathieu equation there is universality for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}}$ and *every* ω. Our current approach to this uses that the Schrödinger conjecture is true for the almost Mathieu operator, a recently announced result [Avila et al. $\geq$ 2010].

For $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, Theorem n is proven in Section $n + 1$. Section 7 has some further remarks.

2. Lubinsky's second approach

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1. We begin with two overall visions relevant to the proof. First, the *sinc kernel* $\sin \pi z/\pi z$ [Lund and Bowers 1992] enters as the Fourier transform of a suitable multiple of the characteristic function of $[-\pi, \pi]$.

Second, the ultimate goal of quasiclock spacing is that on a $1/n\rho_n$ scale, zeros are a unit distance apart, so on this scale

$$\#\text{ of zeros in } [0,n] \sim n. \tag{2-1}$$

Lubinsky's realization is that the Lubinsky wiggle condition and Markov–Stieltjes inequalities (see below) imply that the difference of the two sides of (2-1) is bounded by 1. This is close enough that, together with some complex variable magic, one gets unit spacing.

The complex variable magic is encapsulated in the following result whose proof we defer until the end of the section.

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be an entire function with the following properties*:

(a) $f(0) = 1$.

(b) $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |f(x)| < \infty$.

(c) $\displaystyle\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x)|^2\,dx \le 1$.

(d) *f is real on $\mathbb{R}$.*

(e) *All the zeros of f lie on $\mathbb{R}$ and if these zeros are labeled by $\cdots \le z_{-2} \le z_{-1} < 0 < z_1 \le z_2 \le \cdots$, with $z_0 \equiv 0$, then*

$$|z_j - z_k| \ge |j-k| - 1. \tag{2-2}$$

(f) *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is C_ε with*

$$|f(z)| \le C_\varepsilon e^{\varepsilon|z|^2}. \tag{2-3}$$

Then

$$f(z) = \frac{\sin(\pi z)}{\pi z}. \tag{2-4}$$

Remarks. 1. Equation (2-2) allows f a priori to have double zeros but not triple or higher zeros.

2. It is easy to see there are examples where (2-3) holds for some but not all ε and where (2-4) is false, so (2-3) is sharp.

Proof of Theorem 1 given Theorem 2.1. (This part of the argument is essentially in [Lubinsky 2008b].) Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and let

$$f_n(z) = \frac{K_n\big(x_0 + a/(n\rho_n), x_0 + (a+z)/(n\rho_n)\big)}{K_n(x_0,x_0)}. \tag{2-5}$$

By (1-29), (1-30), and (1-16), the f_n are uniformly bounded on each disk $\{z \mid |z| < R\}$, so by Montel's theorem, we have compactness that shows it suffices to prove that any limit point $f(z)$ has the form (2-4). We will show that this putative limit point obeys conditions (a)–(f) of Theorem 2.1.

The Lubinsky wiggle condition (1-26) implies (a). From the Schwarz inequality, (1-11) and the wiggle condition, we get

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |f(x)| = 1, \tag{2-6}$$

which is stronger than (b).

By (1-17),

$$\int\limits_{|y-x_0-(a/n\rho_n)|\le(R/n\rho_n)} |K_n(x,y)|^2 w(y)\,dy \;\le\; K_n(x,x) \tag{2-7}$$

for each $R < \infty$. Changing variables and using the Lebesgue point condition leads to

$$\int_{-R}^{R} |f(y)|^2\, dy \le 1, \tag{2-8}$$

which yields (c) (see Lubinsky [2008b] for more details). In this, one uses (1-29) and (1-30) to see that

$$0 < \inf \rho_n < \sup \rho_n < \infty. \tag{2-9}$$

That f is real on $\mathbb{R}$ is immediate; the reality of zeros follows from Hurwitz's theorem and the fact [Simon 2008a] that $p_{n+1}(x) - cp_n(x)$ has only real zeros for c real.

The Markov–Stieltjes inequalities [Markoff 1884; Freud 1971; Simon 2008a] assert that if $x_1, x_2, \dots$ are successive zeros of $p_n(x) - cp_{n-1}(x)$ for some c, then for $j \ge k+2$,

$$\mu([x_j, x_k]) \ge \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{K_n(x_\ell, x_\ell)}. \tag{2-10}$$

Using the fact that the z_j (including z_0) are, by Hurwitz's theorem, limits of x_j's scaled by $n\rho_n$ and the Lubinsky wiggle condition to control limits of $n\rho_n / K_n(x_\ell, x_\ell)$, one finds that (2-2) holds (see [Lubinsky 2008b] for more details). Here one uses that x_0 is a Lebesgue point to be sure that

$$\frac{1}{x_k - x_j} \int_{x_j}^{x_k} d\mu(y) \to w(x_0). \tag{2-11}$$

Finally, (1-30) implies (2-3). Thus, (2-4) holds. □

We now reduce the proof of Theorem 2.1 to using conditions (a)–(e) to improve the bound (2-3).

Proposition 2.2. (a) *Fix $a > 0$. If f is measurable, real-valued and supported on $[-a, a]$ with*

$$\int_{-a}^{a} f(x)^2\, dx \le 2a \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-a}^{a} f(x)\, dx = 2a, \tag{2-12}$$

then

$$f(x) = \chi_{[-a,a]}(x) \quad \text{a.e.} \tag{2-13}$$

(b) *If f is real-valued and continuous on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\widehat{f}$ is supported on $[-\pi, \pi]$ with*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)^2\, dx \le 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f(0) = 1, \tag{2-14}$$

then

$$f(x) = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x}. \tag{2-15}$$

(c) *If f is an entire function, real on $\mathbb{R}$ with* (2-14), *and for all $\delta > 0$, there is C_δ with*

$$|f(z)| \le C_\delta \exp((\pi + \delta)|\mathrm{Im}\, z|), \tag{2-16}$$

then (2-4) *holds.*

Proof. (a) Essentially this follows from equality in the Schwarz inequality. More precisely, (2-12) implies

$$\int_{-a}^{a} |f(x) - \chi_{[-a,a]}(x)|^2 \, dx \le 0. \tag{2-17}$$

(b) Apply Proposition 2.2 (a) to $(2\pi)^{1/2} \widehat{f}(k)$ with $a = \pi$.

(c) By the Paley–Wiener theorem, (2-16) implies that $\widehat{f}$ is supported on $[-\pi, \pi]$. □

Thus, we are reduced to going from (2-3) to (2-16).

By $f(0) = 1$, the reality of the zeros and (2-3), we have, by the Hadamard factorization theorem [Titchmarsh 1932, Section 8.24] that

$$f(z) = e^{Az} \prod_{j \neq 0} \Big(1 - \frac{z}{z_j}\Big) e^{z/z_j}, \tag{2-18}$$

with A real. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define $z_j(x)$ to be a renumbering of the z_j, so

$$\dots \le z_{-1}(x) < x \le z_0(x) \le z_1(x) \le \dots. \tag{2-19}$$

By $|z_j - z_k| \ge |k - j| - 1$, we see that

$$z_{n+1}(x) - x \ge n, \qquad x - z_{-(n+1)}(x) \ge n. \tag{2-20}$$

In particular, $(x - 1.1, x + 1.1)$ can contain at most $z_0(x)$, $z_{\pm 1}(x)$, $z_{\pm 2}(x)$. Removing the open intervals of size $2/10$ about each of the five points $|z_\ell(x) - x|$ ($\ell = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2$) from $[0, 1]$ leaves at least one $\delta > 0$, that is, we can pick $\delta(x)$ in $[0, 1]$ so for all j,

$$|z_j(n) - (x \pm \delta)| \ge \tfrac{1}{10}. \tag{2-21}$$

Moreover, by (2-20), for $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$|z_{\pm(n+2)}(x) - (x \pm \delta)| \ge n. \tag{2-22}$$

Since

$$\frac{|1 - (x + iy)/z_j|^2}{|(1 - (x + \delta/z_j)(1 - x - \delta)/z_j)|} \le 1 + \frac{(y^2 + \delta^2)}{|z_j - (x + \delta)||z_j - (x - \delta)|}, \tag{2-23}$$

we conclude from (2-18) that

$$\frac{|f(x + iy)|^2}{|f(x - \delta)||f(x + \delta)|} \le \Big[1 + \frac{y^2 + 1}{(1/100)}\Big]^5 \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \Big(1 + \frac{1 + y^2}{n^2}\Big)^2 \le C(1 + y^{10}) \Big(\frac{\sinh \pi \sqrt{y^2 + 1}}{\pi \sqrt{y^2 + 1}}\Big)^2. \tag{2-24}$$

Thus, for any ε, there is a C_ε with

$$|f(x + iy)| \le C_\varepsilon \exp((\pi + \varepsilon)|y|), \tag{2-25}$$

for every $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$, which is (2-16). This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Remark. It is possible to show, using the Phragmén–Lindelöf principle [Titchmarsh 1932], that if one assumes, instead of (2-3), the stronger $|f(z)| \le Ce^{|z|^\delta}$, then it is possible to weaken (2-2) to

$$|z_j| \ge |j| - 1, \tag{2-26}$$

for if (2-26) holds, then (2-18) implies that

$$|f(iy)| \le C(1+|y|)e^{\pi|y|}. \tag{2-27}$$

Applying Phragmén–Lindelöf to $(1-iz)^{-1}f(z)e^{i\pi z}$ on the sectors $\arg z \in [0,\pi/2]$ and $[\pi/2,\pi]$ proves that

$$|f(x+iy)| \le C(1+|z|)e^{\pi|y|}. \tag{2-28}$$

3. Doing the Lubinsky wiggle

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Egorov's theorem [Rudin 1987, p. 73], for every ε, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{L} \subset \Sigma$ with $|\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{L}| < \varepsilon$ (with $|\ | =$ Lebesgue measure) so that on $\mathcal{L}$, the sequence $\frac{1}{n+1}K_n(x,x) \equiv \tilde{q}_n(x)$ converges uniformly to a limit, which we call $\tilde{q}(x)$. If we prove that (1-26) holds for a.e. $x_0 \in \mathcal{L}$, then by taking a sequence of ε's going to 0, we get that (1-26) holds for a.e. $x_0 \in \Sigma$

By Lebesgue's theorem on differentiability of integrals of L^1-functions [Rudin 1987, Theorem 7.7] applied to the characteristic function of $\mathcal{L}$, for a.e. $x_0 \in \mathcal{L}$, we get

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}(2\delta)^{-1}|(x_0-\delta,x_0+\delta)\cap\mathcal{L}| = 1. \tag{3-1}$$

We will prove that (1-26) holds for all x_0 with (3-1) and with condition (iv) of Theorem 2.

The expression $\frac{1}{n+1}K_n\big(x+\frac{a}{n}+\frac{\bar{z}}{n}, x+\frac{a}{n}+\frac{z}{n}\big)$ is analytic in z, so by a Cauchy estimate and a real,

$$\left|\frac{d}{da}\tilde{q}_n\Big(x+\frac{a}{n}\Big)\right| \le \sup_{|z|\le 1}\frac{1}{n+1}\left|K_n\Big(x+\frac{a}{n}+\frac{\bar{z}}{n}, x+\frac{a}{n}+\frac{z}{n}\Big)\right| = \sup_{|z|\le 1}\left|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x+\frac{a}{n}+\frac{z}{n}\Big)\right|. \tag{3-2}$$

By a Schwarz inequality, for $x,y\in\mathbb{C}$,

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\,|K_n(x,y)| \le (\tilde{q}_n(x)\tilde{q}_n(y))^{1/2}. \tag{3-3}$$

Thus, using the assumed (1-30), for any x_0 for which (1-30) holds and any $A<\infty$, there are N_0 and C so for $n \ge N_0$,

$$\left|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big)-\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{b}{n}\Big)\right| \le C|a-b|, \tag{3-4}$$

for all a,b with $|a|\le A$, $|b|\le A$.

Since each $\tilde{q}_n$ is continuous and the convergence is uniform on $\mathcal{L}$, $\tilde{q}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{L}$. Thus, we have for each $A<\infty$,

$$\sup\left\{\left|\tilde{q}\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big)-\tilde{q}(x_0)\right| \;\middle|\; |a|<A,\ x_0+\frac{a}{n}\in\mathcal{L}\right\} \to 0, \tag{3-5}$$

as $n\to\infty$. By the uniform convergence theorem,

$$\sup\left\{\left|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big)-\tilde{q}_n(x_0)\right| \;\middle|\; |a|<A,\ x_0+\frac{a}{n}\in\mathcal{L}\right\} \to 0. \tag{3-6}$$

We next note that (3-1) implies

$$\sup_{|b|\le A} n \operatorname{dist}\Big(x_0 + \frac{b}{n}, \mathcal{L}\Big) \to 0; \tag{3-7}$$

equivalently, for any ε, there is an N_1 so for $n \ge N_1$ and $|b| < A$, there exists $|a| < A$ (a will be n-dependent) so that $|a-b| < \varepsilon$ and $x_0 + a/n \in \mathcal{L}$. We have

$$\Big|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{b}{n}\Big) - \tilde{q}_n(x_0)\Big| \le \Big|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{b}{n}\Big) - \tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big)\Big| + \Big|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big) - \tilde{q}_n(x_0)\Big|, \tag{3-8}$$

where $|b-a| < \varepsilon$ and $x_0 + a/n \in \mathcal{L}$. By (3-4), if $n \ge \max(N_0, N_1)$, the first term is bounded by $C\varepsilon$ and, by (3-7), the second term goes to zero, that is,

$$\sup_{|b|<A} \Big|\tilde{q}_n\Big(x_0+\frac{b}{n}\Big) - \tilde{q}_n(x_0)\Big| \to 0. \tag{3-9}$$

Since $\tilde{q}_n(x_0) \to \tilde{q}(x_0) \ne 0$, we have

$$\sup_{|b|<A} \Big|\frac{\tilde{q}_n(x_0+b/n)}{\tilde{q}_n(x_0)} - 1\Big| \to 0, \tag{3-10}$$

as $n \to \infty$, which is (1-26). □

4. Exponential bounds for perturbed transfer matrices

In this section, our goal is to prove Theorem 3. As noted in the Introduction, our approach is an extension of a theorem of Avila and Krikorian [2006, Lemma 3.1] exploiting that one can avoid using cocycles and so go beyond the apparent limitation to ergodic situations. The argument here is related to but somewhat different from variation of parameters techniques [Jitomirskaya and Last 1999; Killip et al. 2003] and should have wide applicability.

Proof of Theorem 3. Fix n and define, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

$$\tilde{A}_j = A_j\Big(x_0 + \frac{z}{n+1}\Big), \tag{4-1}$$

$$A_j = A_j(x_0), \tag{4-2}$$

$$T_j = A_j \dots A_1, \qquad \tilde{T}_j = \tilde{A}_j \dots \tilde{A}_1. \tag{4-3}$$

(Note that $\tilde{A}_j$ and $\tilde{T}_j$ depend on n as well as j.)

Note that, by (1-32),

$$\tilde{A}_j - A_j = a_j^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} z/(n+1) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4-4}$$

so that

$$\|\tilde{A}_j - A_j\| \le \alpha_-^{-1} \quad \frac{|z|}{n+1}. \tag{4-5}$$

Write

$$T_j^{-1}\tilde{T}_j = (T_j^{-1}\tilde{A}_j T_{j-1})(T_{j-1}^{-1}\tilde{A}_{j-1}T_{j-2})\dots(T_1^{-1}\tilde{A}_1 T_0)$$
$$= (1+B_j)(1+B_{j-1})\dots(1+B_1), \tag{4-6}$$

where

$$B_k = T_k^{-1}(\tilde{A}_k - A_k)T_{k-1}. \tag{4-7}$$

Here we used

$$A_k T_{k-1} = T_k. \tag{4-8}$$

Since T_k has determinant 1 (see (1-34)), we have

$$\|T_k^{-1}\| = \|T_k\|. \tag{4-9}$$

So, by (4-5),

$$\|B_k\| \le \|T_k\|\,\|T_{k-1}\|\alpha_-^{-1}\frac{|z|}{n+1}. \tag{4-10}$$

Thus, since

$$\|1+B_j\| \le 1+\|B_j\| \le \exp(\|B_j\|), \tag{4-11}$$

Equation (4-6) implies that

$$\|\tilde{T}_j\| \le \|T_j\|\exp\Big(\alpha_-^{-1}|z|\Big[\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=1}^{j}\|T_k\|\,\|T_{k-1}\|\Big]\Big). \tag{4-12}$$

By the Schwarz inequality, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=1}^{j}\|T_k\|\,\|T_{k-1}\| \le \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=0}^{j}\|T_k\|^2 \le \frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\|T_k\|^2. \tag{4-13}$$

Using (1-39) and (4-12), we find

$$\|\tilde{T}_j\| \le \|T_j\|\exp(C\alpha_-^{-1}|z|). \tag{4-14}$$

This clearly holds for $j = 0$ also. Squaring and summing,

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|\tilde{T}_j\|^2 \le \Big(\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\|T_j\|^2\Big)\exp(2C\alpha_-^{-1}|z|), \tag{4-15}$$

which is (1-40).

Note that (1-41) implies (1-39) so that (1-42) is just (4-14). □

We note that the argument above can also be used for more general perturbative bounds. For example, suppose that

$$C_1 \equiv \sup_n \|T_n(x_0)\| < \infty, \tag{4-16}$$

for a given set of Jacobi parameters. Let $a_n' = a_n + \delta a_n$ and $b_n' = b_n + \delta b_n$ with

$$C_2 \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\delta a_n| + |\delta b_n| < \infty \tag{4-17}$$

and

$$\alpha_-' = \inf a_n' > 0. \tag{4-18}$$

Defining $\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{T}_n$ at energy x_0 but with $\{a_n', b_n'\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ Jacobi parameters, one gets

$$\|\tilde{A}_k - A_k\| \le C_3[\alpha_-^{-1} + (\alpha_-')^{-1}](|\delta a_k| + |\delta b_k|) \tag{4-19}$$

for some universal constant C_3. Thus

$$\|B_k\| \le C_3 C_1^2 [\alpha_-^{-1} + (\alpha_n')^{-1}](|\delta a_k| + |\delta b_k|) \tag{4-20}$$

and

$$\|\tilde{T}_n\| \le C_1 \exp(C_1^2 C_2 C_3 [\alpha_-^{-1} + (\alpha_-')^{-1}]), \tag{4-21}$$

providing another proof of a standard ℓ^1 perturbation result.

5. Ergodic Jacobi matrices and Cesàro summability

In this section, our goal is to prove Theorem 4. We fix an ergodic Jacobi matrix setup. We will need to use certain special solutions:

Theorem 5.1 [Deift and Simon 1983]. *For any Jacobi matrix with $\Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(d\mu_\omega)$ (which is a.e. ω-independent) of positive measure, for a.e. pair $(x, \omega) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}} \times \Omega$ (a.e. with respect to $dx \otimes d\eta(\omega)$), there exist sequences $\{u_n^\pm(x, \omega)\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ such that*

$$T_n(x,\omega)\begin{pmatrix} u_1^\pm(x,\omega) \\ a_0 u_0^\pm(x,\omega)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{n+1}^\pm(x,\omega) \\ a_n u_n^\pm(x,\omega)\end{pmatrix}, \tag{5-1}$$

with the following properties:

(i) $u_n^-(x,\omega) = \overline{u_n^+(x,\omega)}$;

(ii) $a_n(u_{n+1}^+ u_n^- - u_{n+1}^- u_n^+) = -2i$;

(iii) $|u_n^+(x,\omega)| = |u_0^+(x, S^n\omega)|$;

(iv) $\int |u_n^+(x,\omega)|^2 \, d\eta(\omega) < \infty$;

(v) $u_0^\pm$ *is real.*

Of course, by (iii), the integral in (iv) is n-independent. For later purposes (see Section 6), we will need an explicit formula for this integral. In fact, we will need explicit formulae for u_0, u_{-1} in terms of the m-function.

For $\operatorname{Im} z > 0$, one defines $\tilde{u}_n^+(z,\omega)$ so as to solve the following equation equivalent to (5-1):

$$a_n \tilde{u}_{n+1}^+ + (b_n - z)\tilde{u}_n^+ + a_{n-1}\tilde{u}_{n-1}^+ = 0, \tag{5-2}$$

with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|\tilde{u}_n^+|^2 < \infty$. This determines $\tilde{u}_n^+$ up to a constant, and so

$$m(z,\omega) = -\frac{\tilde{u}_1^+(z,\omega)}{a_0\tilde{u}_0^+(z,\omega)} \tag{5-3}$$

is normalization-independent and, by (5-2), obeys

$$m(z,\omega) = \frac{1}{-z+b_1-a_1^2 m(z,S\omega)}. \tag{5-4}$$

(Note: We have suppressed the ω-dependence of a_n, b_n.)

As usual with solutions of (5-4),

$$m(z,\omega) = \int \frac{d\mu_\omega^+(x)}{x-z}, \tag{5-5}$$

where $d\mu_\omega^+$ is the measure associated to the half-line Jacobi matrix J_ω.

For a.e. $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$ and a.e. ω, $m(x+i0,\omega)$ exists and has

$$\operatorname{Im} m(x+i0,\omega) > 0 \qquad (\text{a.e. } x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}), \tag{5-6}$$

We normalize the solution u^+ obeying Theorem 5.1 by defining:

$$u_0^+(x,\omega) = \frac{1}{a_0[\operatorname{Im} m(x+i0,\omega)]^{1/2}}, \tag{5-7}$$

$$u_1^+(x,\omega) = -\frac{m(x+i0,\omega)}{[\operatorname{Im} m(x+i0,\omega)]^{1/2}}. \tag{5-8}$$

(We have listed all the formulae because [Deift and Simon 1983] only considers the case $a_n \equiv 1$.) The u_n^+ are then determined by the difference equation, and the u_n^- by condition (i).

Of course, we have

$$p_n = \frac{u_{n+1}^+ - u_{n+1}^-}{u_1^+ - u_1^-}, \tag{5-9}$$

since both sides obey the same difference equations with $p_{-1} = 0$ (since $u_0^+ = u_0^-$) and $p_0 = 1$.

By (5-9), to prove Theorem 4 we need to show that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(u_{j+1}^+ - u_{j+1}^-)^2 \tag{5-10}$$

exists. This follows from the existence of

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}|u_j^+|^2 \tag{5-11}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(u_j^+)^2. \tag{5-12}$$

From condition (iii) and the ergodic theorem (plus (iv)), the a.e. ω existence of the limit in (5-11) is immediate. In cases like the almost Mathieu equation with Diophantine frequencies where u_n^+ is almost periodic, one also gets the existence of the limit in (5-12) directly, but there are examples, like the almost Mathieu equation with frequencies whose dual has singular continuous spectrum, where the phase of u_n^+ is not almost periodic. So this argument does not work in general. In fact, we will eventually prove that for a.e. (x,ω) in $\Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}} \times \Omega$ (see Theorem 6.3):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (u_j^+)^2 = 0. \tag{5-13}$$

It would be interesting to have a direct proof of this (for the periodic case, see [Simon 2010]) rather than the indirect path we will take.

Define the 2×2 matrix

$$U_n(x,\omega) = \frac{1}{(-2i)^{1/2}} \begin{pmatrix} u_{n+1}^+(x,\omega) & u_{n+1}^-(x,\omega) \\ a_n u_n^+(x,\omega) & a_n u_n^-(x,\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5-14}$$

(where we fix once and for all a choice of $\sqrt{-2i}$). By condition (ii),

$$\det(U_n(x,\omega)) = 1 \tag{5-15}$$

and, by (5-1),

$$T_n(x,\omega) U_0(x,\omega) = U_n(x,\omega) \tag{5-16}$$

or

$$T_n(x,\omega) = U_n(x,\omega) U_0(x,\omega)^{-1}. \tag{5-17}$$

For now, we fix $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$ with

$$E([a_0(\omega)^2 \operatorname{Im} m(x+i0,\omega)]^{-1}) < \infty, \tag{5-18}$$

(known Lebesgue a.e. by Kotani theory; see [Simon 1983; Deift and Simon 1983]), so U_n can be defined and is in L^2.

Theorem 5.2. *Fix a matrix Q. For a.e. ω, the limit of matrices*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} T_j(x,\omega)^t \, Q \, T_j(x,\omega) \tag{5-19}$$

exists.

Proof of Theorem 4 given Theorem 5.2. Pick

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the 1,1 matrix element of $T_j(x,\omega)^t Q T_j(x,\omega)$ is $p_j(x,\omega)^2$, and the 2,2 element is $q_j(x,\omega)^2$. Since the limits in (1-45) exist, we are done. $\square$

Equation (5-17) plus condition (iv) will imply critical a priori bounds on $\|T_n(x,\,\cdot\,)\|_{L^1(d\eta)}$. It will be convenient to use the Hilbert–Schmidt norm on these 2×2 matrices.

Lemma 5.3. *We have*

$$\sup_n \int \|T_n(x,\omega)\|\, d\eta(\omega) < \infty. \tag{5-20}$$

Proof. Since $\det(U_n) = 1$,

$$\|U_n(x,\omega)^{-1}\| = \|U_n(x,\omega)\|. \tag{5-21}$$

Thus, by (5-17),

$$\|T_n(x,\omega)\| \le \|U_n(x,\omega)\|\,\|U_0(x,\omega)\|. \tag{5-22}$$

By the Schwarz inequality,

$$\sup_n \int \|T_n(x,\omega)\|\, d\eta(\omega) \le \sup_n \int \|U_n(x,\omega)\|^2\, d\eta(\omega) = \int \|U_0(x,\omega)\|^2\, d\eta(\omega) < \infty,$$

where we also have used condition (iv) and the equality

$$\|U_j(x,\omega)\| = \|U_0(x,S^j\omega)\|, \tag{5-23}$$

a consequence of condition (iii) and our use of Hilbert–Schmidt norms. □

Let $A_j(\omega)$ be the matrix (1-32) with $a_j = a_j(\omega)$, $b_j = b_j(\omega)$ and let

$$A(\omega) \equiv A_1(\omega), \tag{5-24}$$

so

$$A_j(\omega) = A(S^{j-1}\omega), \tag{5-25}$$

and the transfer matrix for J_ω is

$$T_n(\omega) = A(S^{n-1}\omega)\ldots A(\omega). \tag{5-26}$$

Now form the suspension

$$\widehat{\Omega} = \Omega \times \mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \tag{5-27}$$

and define $\widehat{S}\colon \widehat{\Omega} \to \widehat{\Omega}$ by

$$\widehat{S}(\omega, C) = (S\omega, A(\omega)C), \tag{5-28}$$

so

$$\widehat{S}^n(\omega, C) = (S^n\omega, T_n(\omega)C). \tag{5-29}$$

Theorem 5.4. *There exists an $\widehat{S}$-invariant probability measure $d\nu$ on $\widehat{\Omega}$ whose projection onto Ω is $d\eta$ and with*

$$\int \|C\|\, d\nu(\omega, C) < \infty. \tag{5-30}$$

Proof. Pick any probability measure μ_0 on $\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ with $\int \|C\|^k\, d\mu_0(C) < \infty$ for all k. For example, one could take $d\mu_0(C) = Ne^{-\|C\|^2} d\,\mathrm{Haar}(C)$ where N is a normalization constant. Let $\widehat{S}_*$ be induced on measures on $\widehat{\Omega}$ by $[\widehat{S}_*(\nu)](f) = \nu(f\circ \widehat{S})$. Let

$$\nu_n = \widehat{S}_*^n(\eta \otimes \mu_0). \tag{5-31}$$

Then the invariance of η under S_* implies the projection of ν_n is η and

$$\int \|C\|\,d\nu_n = \int \|T_n(\omega)C\|\,d\eta \otimes d\mu_0 \leq \Big(\int \|T_n(\omega)\|\,d\eta\Big)\Big(\int \|C\|\,d\mu_0\Big), \tag{5-32}$$

which, by (5-20), is uniformly bounded in n.

Let $\tilde{\nu}_n$ be the Cesàro averages of ν_n, that is,

$$\tilde{\nu}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \nu_j. \tag{5-33}$$

So, by (5-32),

$$\sup_n \int \|C\|\,d\tilde{\nu}_n < \infty, \tag{5-34}$$

so $\{\tilde{\nu}_n\}$ are tight, that is,

$$\lim_{K\to\infty} \sup_n \tilde{\nu}_n\{C \mid \|C\| \geq K\} \to 0,$$

which implies that $\tilde{\nu}_n$ has a weak limit point in probability measures on $\widetilde{\Omega}$. This weak limit point is invariant and, by (5-34), it obeys (5-30). □

Lemma 5.5. *Let $L < \infty$. Let*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_L = \{(\omega, C) \mid \|U_0(\omega)\| < L, \|C\| < L\}. \tag{5-35}$$

Then for any ε, there is a K so that for a.e. $(\omega, C) \in \widehat{\Omega}_L$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{j\in B(K,\omega,C)\\ 0\leq j\leq n-1}} \|T_j(\omega)C\|^2 \leq \varepsilon, \tag{5-36}$$

where

$$B(K,\omega,C) = \{j \mid \|T_j(\omega)C\| \geq K\}. \tag{5-37}$$

Proof. Since $U_0(\omega) \in L^2(d\eta)$, we have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \int_{\|U_0(\omega)\|\geq s} \|U_0(\omega)\|^2 d\eta(\omega) = 0, \tag{5-38}$$

so for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $s(\delta)$ so that the integral is less than δ.

Let $\widetilde{B}(\widetilde{K}, \omega)$ be defined by

$$\widetilde{B}(\widetilde{K}, \omega) = \{j \mid \|U_j(\omega)\| \geq \widetilde{K}\}. \tag{5-39}$$

By the Birkhoff ergodic theorem and (5-23) for a.e. ω,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{j\in \widetilde{B}(\widetilde{K},\omega)\\ 0\leq j\leq n-1}} \|U_j(\omega)\|^2 = \int_{\|U_0(\omega)\|\geq \widetilde{K}} \|U_0(\omega)\|^2 d\eta \leq \delta, \tag{5-40}$$

if $\widetilde{K} \geq s(\delta)$.

Given ε and L, let $\delta = \varepsilon/L^2$ and $K \geq L^2 s(\delta)$. Since

$$\|T_j(\omega)C\| \leq \|U_j(\omega)\| L^2 \tag{5-41}$$

if $(\omega, C) \subset \Omega_L$,

$$B(K,\omega,C) \subset \widetilde{B}\Big(\frac{K}{L^2},\omega\Big).$$

So, by (5-40) and (5-41),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{j\in B(K,\omega,C)\\ 0\le j\le n-1}} \|T_j(\omega)C\|^2 \le L^2\delta = \varepsilon, \tag{5-42}$$

which is (5-35). □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Without loss, suppose $\|Q\| \le 1$. Define on $\widehat{\Omega}$

$$f_n(\omega, C) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} C^t T_j(x,\omega)^t Q T_j(x,\omega) C. \tag{5-43}$$

If we prove that this has a pointwise limit for ν a.e. (ω, C), we are done: since η is the projection of ν, for η a.e. ω, there are some C for which (5-43) has a limit. But C is invertible, so $(C^t)^{-1} f_n C^{-1}$ has a limit, that is, (5-19) does.

Notice that if

$$h(\omega, C) = C^t Q C, \tag{5-44}$$

then $f_n(\omega, C)$ is a Cesàro average of $h(\widehat{S}^j(\omega, C))$, so we can almost use the ergodic theorem except we only know a priori that $\int \|h(\omega, C)\|^{1/2}\, d\nu < \infty$, not $\int \|h(\omega, C)\|\, d\nu < \infty$, so we need to use Lemma 5.5.

Fix L and consider $(\omega, C) \in \widehat{\Omega}_L$. Let

$$h_K(\omega, C) = \begin{cases} C^t Q C & \text{if } \|C\| \le K, \\ 0 & \text{if } \|C\| > K. \end{cases} \tag{5-45}$$

Then, since $\|Q\| \le 1$,

$$\|h_K(\widehat{S}^j(\omega,C)) - h(\widehat{S}^j(\omega,C))\| \le \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \notin B(K,\omega,C), \\ \|T_j(\omega)C\|^2 & \text{if } j \in B(K,\omega,C). \end{cases} \tag{5-46}$$

It follows that if

$$f_n^{(K)}(\omega, C) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h_K(\widehat{S}^j(\omega, C)), \tag{5-47}$$

then

$$\|f_n^{(K)}(\omega, C) - f_n(\omega, C)\| \le \text{sum on left side of (5-36)}.$$

So, by Lemma 5.5,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|f_n^{(K)}(\omega, C) - f_n(\omega, C)\| \le \varepsilon, \tag{5-48}$$

if

$$K \ge K(\varepsilon, L) \tag{5-49}$$

given by the lemma.

For any finite K, h_K is bounded, so the Birkhoff ergodic theorem and the invariance of ν imply, for a.e. (ω, C), $\lim f_n^{(K)}(\omega, C)$ exists. Thus (5-48) and (5-49) imply that $\lim f_n^{(K)}(\omega, C)$ forms a Cauchy sequence as $K \to \infty$ (among, say, integer values), and that its limit is also $\lim f_n(\omega, C)$, for a.e. (ω, C) in $\widehat{\Omega}_L$.

Since L is arbitrary and $\nu(\widehat{\Omega} \setminus \widehat{\Omega}_L) \to 0$ on account of $\int \|U_0(\omega)\|^2 \, d\nu < \infty$, we see that f_n has a limit for a.e. ω, C. ☐

6. Equality of the local and microlocal DOS

Our main goal in this section is to prove Theorem 5. We know from Theorem 4 that for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and $x_0 \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n+1} K_n(x_0, x_0) \to k_\omega(x_0) \tag{6-1}$$

some positive function. By Theorems 1 and 2, this implies that the spacing of zeros at a.e. Lebesgue point is

$$x_{j+1}^{(n)}(x_0) - x_j^{(n)}(x_0) \sim \frac{1}{n w_\omega(x_0) k_\omega(x_0)}. \tag{6-2}$$

Thus, for fixed K large, in an interval $(x_0 - K/n, x_0 + K/n)$, the number of zeros is $2Kw(x_0)k(x_0)$. On the other hand, if $\rho_\infty(x_0)$ is the density of states, for a.e. x_0 in the a.c. part of the support of $d\nu_\infty$, the number of zeros in $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ is approximately $2\delta n \rho(x_0)$. If δ were K/n, this would tell us that

$$w_\omega(x_0) k_\omega(x_0) = \rho_\infty(x_0), \tag{6-3}$$

which is precisely (1-23).

Of course, ρ_∞ is defined by first taking $n \to \infty$ and then $\delta \downarrow 0$, so we cannot set $\delta = K/n$, but (6-3) is an equality of a local density of zeros obtained by taking intervals with $O(n)$ zeros as $n \to \infty$ and a microlocal individual spacing as in (6-2).

So define

$$\rho_L(x_0, \omega) = w_\omega(x_0) k_\omega(x_0), \tag{6-4}$$

the microlocal DOS. Notice that we have indicated an ω-dependence of ρ_L because, at this point, we have not proven ω-independence. ω-independence often comes from the ergodic theorem — we determined the existence of $k_\omega(x_0)$ using the ergodic theorem, but unlike for ρ_∞, the underlying measure was only invariant, not ergodic, and indeed, k_ω, the object we controlled is *not* ω-independent.

Of course, once we prove $\rho_L = \rho_\infty$, ρ_L will be proven ω-independent, but we will, in fact, go the other way: we first prove that ρ_L is ω-independent, use that to show that if u is the Deift–Simon wave function, then the average of u^2 (not $|u|^2$) is zero, and use that to prove that $\rho_L = \rho_\infty$.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that J_ω is a family of ergodic Jacobi matrices. Let $\rho_L(x, \omega)$ be determined by* (6-1) *and* (6-4) *for $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Then for a.e. $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$, $\rho_L(x, \omega)$ is a.e. ω-independent.*

Proof. Since $\rho_L(x, \omega)$ is jointly measurable for $(x, \omega) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}} \times \Omega$, $\rho_L(x, \cdot)$ is measurable for a.e. x. Since S is ergodic, it suffices to prove that $\rho_L(x, S\omega) = \rho_L(x, \omega)$ for a.e. (x, ω).

Let $p_n(x, \omega)$ be the OPs for J_ω. Then the zeros of $p_{n-1}(x, S\omega)$ and $p_n(x, \omega)$ interlace. It follows, for any interval $I_{n,A}(x_0) = [x_0 - A/n, x_0 + A/n]$, that

$$\big|\#\text{ of zeros of } p_n(x, \omega) \text{ in } I_{n,A}(x_0) - \#\text{ of zeros of } p_{n-1}(x, S\omega) \text{ in } I_{n,A}(x_0)\big| \le 2. \tag{6-5}$$

If $\rho_L(x_0, S\omega) \neq \rho_L(x_0, \omega)$ and $A = k\rho_L(x_0, \omega)^{-1}$ with k large, it is easy to get a contradiction between (6-5) and (6-2). Thus, $\rho_L(x, \omega) = \rho_L(x, S\omega)$ as claimed. $\square$

Next, we need a connection between ρ_L and u. Recall from (5-9) that

$$p_n(x, \omega) = \frac{\operatorname{Im} u_{n+1}^+(x, \omega)}{\operatorname{Im} u_1^+(x, \omega)}, \tag{6-6}$$

while (5-8) and (5-5) give, respectively,

$$\operatorname{Im} u_1^+(x, \omega) = -[\operatorname{Im} m(x + i0, \omega)]^{1/2}, \tag{6-7}$$

$$\operatorname{Im} m(x + i0, \omega) = \pi w_\omega(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}}. \tag{6-8}$$

Thus, if we define

$$\operatorname{Av}_\omega(f_j(\omega)) \equiv \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j(\omega), \tag{6-9}$$

then

$$\rho_L(x, \omega) = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Av}_\omega([\operatorname{Im} u_j^+(x, \omega)]^2). \tag{6-10}$$

Note that $\operatorname{Im} u_j^+(x, \omega)$ is not $\operatorname{Im} u_0^+(x, S^j\omega)$, so we cannot write (6-10) as an integral. In fact, the ω-independence of the right side of (6-10) (because of ω-independence of the left side) will have important consequences.

To see where we are heading, we note the following result (see also [Damanik 2007, Theorem 5]).

Theorem 6.2 [Kotani 1997]. *For a.e. $x \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}}$,*

$$\rho_\infty(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int |u_0^+(x, \omega)|^2 \, d\eta(x). \tag{6-11}$$

Remarks. 1. Kotani [1997] and Damanik [2007] treat $a_n \equiv 1$, but it is easy to accommodate general a_n.

2. Kotani's theorem is not stated in this form but rather as (see Equation (22) in [Damanik 2007]):

$$\pi\rho_\infty(x) = \int \operatorname{Im} G_\omega(0, 0; x + i0) \, d\eta(\omega), \tag{6-12}$$

where G_ω is the whole-line Green's function. Because G_ω is reflectionless, G_ω is pure imaginary and

$$\operatorname{Im}(G_\omega(0, 0; x + i0)) = [2a_0^2 \operatorname{Im} m(x + i0, \omega)]^{-1} = \tfrac{1}{2} |u_0^+(x, \omega)|^2, \tag{6-13}$$

by (5-7).

Thus, the key to proving $\rho_L = \rho_\infty$ will be to show that

$$\operatorname{Av}_\omega([\operatorname{Im} u_j^+(x, \omega)]^2) = \operatorname{Av}_\omega([\operatorname{Re} u_j^+(x, \omega)]^2). \tag{6-14}$$

Note that (6-10) includes that the $\operatorname{Av}_\omega([\operatorname{Im} u_j^+]^2)$ exists and, by the ergodic theorem, $\operatorname{Av}_\omega(|u_j^+|^2)$ exists, so we know for a.e. $(x, \omega) \in \Sigma_{\text{ac}} \times \Omega$ that $\operatorname{Av}_\omega([\operatorname{Re} u_j^+(x, \omega)]^2)$ exists. We are heading towards:

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$ is such that $\rho_L(x,\omega)$ exists for a.e. ω and is ω-independent, and that*

$$\nu_\infty((-\infty, x]) \neq \tfrac{1}{2}. \tag{6-15}$$

Then for a.e. ω,

$$\mathrm{Av}_\omega((u_j^+(x,\omega))^2) = 0. \tag{6-16}$$

Proof of Theorem 5 given Theorem 6.3. (6-15) fails at most a single x in Σ_{ac}, so (6-16) holds for a.e. $(x,\omega) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}} \times \Omega$. Its real part implies (6-14), and so for a.e. (x,ω),

$$\mathrm{Av}_\omega([\mathrm{Im}\, u_j^+(x,\omega)]^2) = \tfrac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Av}_\omega(|u_j^+(x,\omega)|^2) = \tfrac{1}{2}\int |u_0^+(x,\omega)|^2\, d\eta(x), \tag{6-17}$$

by the ergodic theorem. By (6-10), (6-11), and the definition of ρ_L in (6-4) and the paragraphs preceding it, we see that the first limit in (1-45) is $\rho_\infty(x)/w_\omega(x)$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Fix $x \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}$ (at each stage, we work up to sets of Lebesgue measure 0). Define $\varphi(\omega) \in (0, 2\pi)$ by

$$\mathrm{Arg}(-m(x+i0,\omega)) = -\varphi(\omega). \tag{6-18}$$

Then $\varphi(\omega) \in (0,\pi)$ by $\mathrm{Im}\, m > 0$. Let (φ and s_n also depend on x)

$$s_n(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \varphi(S^{j-1}\omega). \tag{6-19}$$

Then, by (5-3) and condition (iii),

$$u_n^+(x,\omega) = e^{-is_n(\omega)} u_0^+(x, S^n\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{n+j}^+(x,\omega) = e^{-is_n(\omega)} u_j^+(x, S^n\omega). \tag{6-20}$$

It follows that for each fixed n,

$$\mathrm{Av}_\omega(\mathrm{Im}\, u_j^+((x, S^n\omega))^2) = \mathrm{Av}_\omega((\mathrm{Im}\, e^{is_n(\omega)} u_j^+(x,\omega))^2). \tag{6-21}$$

If s, x, y are real,

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{Im}(e^{is}(x+iy)))^2 &= (x\sin s + y\cos s)^2 \\ &= y^2 + (\sin^2 s)(x^2 - y^2) + xy(\sin 2s),\end{aligned} \tag{6-22}$$

and thus we can write for the left-hand side of (6-21)

$$\mathrm{Av}_\omega(\mathrm{Im}\, u_j^+((x, S^n\omega))^2) = \mathrm{Av}_\omega([\mathrm{Im}(u_j^+(x,\omega))]^2) + \sin^2 s_n(\omega) R(\omega) + \tfrac{1}{2}\sin(2s_n(\omega)) I(\omega), \tag{6-23}$$

where

$$R(\omega) = \mathrm{Av}_\omega(\mathrm{Re}((u_j^+(x,\omega))^2)), \quad I(\omega) = \mathrm{Av}_\omega(\mathrm{Im}((u_j^+(x,\omega))^2)), \tag{6-24}$$

(all such averages having been previously shown to exist).

We know that for a.e. (x,ω), for $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, the left side of (6-21) exists and is n-independent (and equal to $\rho_L(x,\omega)$). For such (x,ω), (6-23) implies that for all n,

$$\sin s_n(\omega)[\sin s_n(\omega) R(\omega) + \cos s_n(\omega) I(\omega)] = 0. \tag{6-25}$$

We want to consider two cases:

Case 1. For a positive measure set of ω,

$$s_2(\omega) = \pi, \quad s_4(\omega) = 2\pi, \quad s_6(\omega) = 3\pi, \dots. \tag{6-26}$$

Case 2. For a.e. ω, there is an $n(\omega)$ so

$$s_{2j}(\omega) = j\pi \quad (j = 1, \dots, n-1) \qquad s_{2n}(\omega) \neq n\pi. \tag{6-27}$$

In Case 1, for such ω, we have $s_n(\omega)/(n\pi) \to \frac{1}{2}$. It follows by standard Sturm oscillation theory [Johnson and Moser 1982] that $s_n(\omega)/(n\pi) \to \nu_\infty((-\infty, x])$ for almost every ω. Thus, the hypothesis (6-15) eliminates Case 1.

For Case 2, suppose first that n is odd, so $s_{2(n-1)}(\omega)$ is a multiple of 2π and (6-19), for $2n-1$ and $2n$ imply

$$\sin(\varphi_{2n-1})[\sin(\varphi_{2n-1})R + \cos(\varphi_{2n-1})I] = 0, \tag{6-28}$$

$$\sin(\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n})[\sin(\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n})R + \cos(\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n})I] = 0. \tag{6-29}$$

Since $\varphi_{2n-1} \in (0, \pi)$, $\sin(\varphi_{2n-1}) \neq 0$ and since $\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n} \in (0, 2\pi) \setminus \{\pi\}$, (for if it equals π, then $s_{2n} = n\pi$!), $\sin(\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n}) \neq 0$.

The determinant of equations (6-28)/(6-29) is

$$-\sin(\varphi_{2n-1}) \sin(\varphi_{2n-1} + \varphi_{2n}) \sin(\varphi_{2n}) \neq 0 \tag{6-30}$$

since

$$\sin(A)\cos(B) - \sin(B)\cos(A) = \sin(A - B). \tag{6-31}$$

Here $\neq 0$ in (6-30) comes from $\varphi_{2n} \in (0, \pi)$, so $\sin(\varphi_{2n}) \neq 0$.

The nonzero determinant means that (6-28)/(6-29) $\Rightarrow I = R = 0$, that is, $\mathrm{Av}_\omega((u_j^+)^2) = 0$ for a.e. ω. If n is even, $s_{2(n-1)}(\omega)$ is an odd multiple of π and all equations pick up minus signs, so the argument is unchanged. □

7. Concluding remarks

1. We have proven for general ergodic Jacobi matrices that for a.e. $(x, \omega) \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}} \times \Omega$,

$$\frac{1}{n+1} K_n(x, x; \omega) \to \frac{\rho_\infty(x)}{w_\omega(x)}. \tag{7-1}$$

Here ρ_∞ is the Radon–Nikodým derivative of the a.c. part of $d\rho_\infty$. Based on [Máté et al. 1991; Totik 2000], where results of this type are proven for regular measures, one expects

$$\rho_\infty(x) = \rho_{\mathfrak{e}}(x). \tag{7-2}$$

Here $\mathfrak{e}$ is the essential spectrum of J_ω and $\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}$ its equilibrium measure. Simon [2007, Theorem 1.15] proves

Theorem 7.1. *If Σ_{ac} is not empty, then* (7-2) *holds if and only if, for $\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}$ a.e. x, the Lyapunov exponent, $\gamma(x)$, obeys*

$$\gamma(x) = 0. \tag{7-3}$$

In particular, for examples where (7-3) fails on a set of positive Lebesgue measure in $\mathfrak{e}$ [Bjerklöv 2006; Bourgain 2002a; 2002b; Fedotov and Klopp 2005; 2006], (7-2) may not hold. On the other hand, for examples like the almost Mathieu equation where it is known that (7-3) holds on all of $\mathfrak{e}$ [Bourgain and Jitomirskaya 2002], (7-2) holds. The moral is that (7-2) holds some, but not all, of the time for ergodic Jacobi matrices.

2. Here is an interesting example that provides a deterministic problem where one has strong clock behavior but with a density of zeros, ρ_∞, which is not $\rho_{\mathfrak{e}}$. Let $d\mu$ be a measure on $[-2,2]$ of the form (N is a normalization constant)

$$d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{N}\biggl(\chi_{[-1,1]}(x)\,dx + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-n^2}\delta_{x_n}\biggr), \tag{7-4}$$

where $\{x_n\}$ is a dense subset of $[-2,2]\setminus(-1,1)$. Then, as in [Simon 2007, Example 5.8], ρ_∞ exists and is the equilibrium measure for $[-1,1]$ (not $\mathfrak{e}=[-2,2]$). Moreover, the method of [Lubinsky 2009] shows that for $x\in(-1,1)$,

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\,K_n(x,x) \to \frac{\rho_\infty(x)}{N^{-1}}. \tag{7-5}$$

Using either the method of this paper (that is, of [Lubinsky 2008b]) or the method of [Lubinsky 2009], one proves universality with ρ_∞.

3. Simon [2007, Example 5.8] provides a measure with $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(\mu)=[-2,2]$ but $\Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}=[-2,0]$ and where ν_n has multiple weak limits, including the equilibrium measures for $[-2,0]$ and for $[-2,2]$. By general principles [Stahl and Totik 1992], the set of limits is connected, so uncountable. One would like to prove that quasiclock behavior nevertheless holds for the a.c. spectrum of this model as this will provide a key test for the conjecture that quasiclock behavior always holds on Σ_{ac}.

4. What has sometimes been called the Schrödinger conjecture [Maslov et al. 1993] says that for any Jacobi matrix and a.e. $x\in\Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(\mu)$, we have a solution, u_n, with

$$0 < \inf_n |u_n| \le \sup_n |u_n| < \infty \tag{7-6}$$

and $u_{-1}=0$. Invariance of Σ_{ac} under rank one perturbations then proves that for a.e. $x\in\Sigma_{\mathrm{ac}}(\mu)$, the transfer matrix is bounded. Thus, Theorem 3 in the strong form would always be applicable.

5. While (6-15) is harmless since it only eliminates at most one x, one can ask if (6-16) holds even if (6-15) fails. Using periodic problems, it is easy to construct ergodic cases where $\arg u_n^+ = -\pi n/2$, so (6-25) provides no information on $I(\omega)$. Nevertheless, in these cases, one can show $R(\omega)=I(\omega)=0$. We have not been able to find an example where for a set of positive measure ω's, $s_{2n}(\omega)=n\pi$, $s_{2n+1}(\omega)=n\pi+\varphi$ with φ some fixed point in $(0,\pi)\setminus\{\pi/2\}$. In that case, it might happen that $R(\omega)\neq 0$, $I(\omega)\neq 0$. So it remains open if we need to exclude the x with (6-15).

6. While we could use soft methods in Section 3, at one point in our research we used an explicit formula for the derivative of $(1/n)K_n(x_0+a/n,\ x_0+a/n)$ as a function of a that may be useful in other contexts, so we want to mention it. We start with a variation of parameters formula (discussed, for example, in [Jitomirskaya and Last 1999; Killip et al. 2003]) that says that, in terms of the second kind polynomials

of (1-38),

$$p_n(x) - p_n(x_0) = (x - x_0) \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} (p_n(x_0)q_m(x_0) - p_m(x_0)q_n(x_0))\, p_m(x), \tag{7-7}$$

which implies

$$p_n'(x_0) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} (p_n(x_0)q_m(x_0) - p_m(x_0)q_n(x_0))\, p_m(x_0). \tag{7-8}$$

Since

$$\frac{d}{da}\frac{1}{n} K_n\Big(x_0 + \frac{a}{n}, x_0 + \frac{a}{n}\Big)\Big|_{a=0} = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j=0}^{n} 2p_j'(x_0)p_j(x_0), \tag{7-9}$$

this leads to

$$\frac{d}{da}\frac{1}{n} K_n\Big(x_0+\frac{a}{n}, x_0+\frac{a}{n}\Big)\Big|_{a=0} = \frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\Big[p_j(x_0)^2\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{j} p_k(x_0)q_k(x_0)\Big) - q_j(x_0)p_j(x_0)\sum_{k=0}^{j} p_k(x_0)^2\Big]. \tag{7-10}$$

As noted in [Simon 2008a], if $(1/n)\sum_{j=0}^{n} p_j(x_0)^2$ and $(1/n)\sum_{j=0}^{n} p_j(x_0)q_j(x_0)$ have limits and $\sup_n[(1/n)\sum_{j=0}^{n} q_j(x_0)^2] < \infty$, then the right side of (7-10) goes to 0.

Acknowledgments

A. Avila thanks M. Flach and T. Tombrello for the hospitality of Caltech. B. Simon would like to thank E. de Shalit for the hospitality of Hebrew University. This research was partially conducted during the period Avila served as a Clay Research Fellow. We would like to thank H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss for useful comments.

References

[Avila 2008] A. Avila, "Absolutely continuous spectrum for the almost Mathieu operator", preprint, 2008. arXiv 0810.2965

[Avila and Damanik 2008] A. Avila and D. Damanik, "Absolute continuity of the integrated density of states for the almost Mathieu operator with non-critical coupling", *Invent. Math.* **172**:2 (2008), 439–453. MR 2009i:47066 Zbl 1149.47021

[Avila and Jitomirskaya 2008] A. Avila and S. Jitomirskaya, "Almost localization and almost reducibility", preprint, 2008. To appear in *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* arXiv 0805.1761

[Avila and Krikorian 2006] A. Avila and R. Krikorian, "Reducibility or nonuniform hyperbolicity for quasiperiodic Schrödinger cocycles", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **164**:3 (2006), 911–940. MR 2008h:81044

[Avila et al. $\geq$ 2010] A. Avila, B. Fayad, and R. Krikorian, "A KAM scheme for $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ cocycles with Liouvillean frequencies", in preparation.

[Bjerklöv 2006] K. Bjerklöv, "Explicit examples of arbitrarily large analytic ergodic potentials with zero Lyapunov exponent", *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **16**:6 (2006), 1183–1200. MR 2008b:47069 Zbl 1113.82028

[Bourgain 2002a] J. Bourgain, "On the spectrum of lattice Schrödinger operators with deterministic potential", *J. Anal. Math.* **87** (2002), 37–75. MR 2003m:47062

[Bourgain 2002b] J. Bourgain, "On the spectrum of lattice Schrödinger operators with deterministic potential, II", *J. Anal. Math.* **88** (2002), 221–254. MR 2004e:47046

[Bourgain and Jitomirskaya 2002] J. Bourgain and S. Jitomirskaya, "Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential", *J. Statist. Phys.* **108**:5-6 (2002), 1203–1218. MR 2004c:47073 Zbl 1039.81019

[Damanik 2007] D. Damanik, "Lyapunov exponents and spectral analysis of ergodic Schrödinger operators: a survey of Kotani theory and its applications", pp. 539–563 in *Spectral theory and mathematical physics*, edited by F. Gesztesy et al., Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **76**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007. MR 2008c:82040

[Deift and Simon 1983] P. Deift and B. Simon, "Almost periodic Schrödinger operators, III: The absolutely continuous spectrum in one dimension", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **90**:3 (1983), 389–411. MR 85i:34009b

[Dombrowski 1978] J. Dombrowski, "Quasitriangular matrices", *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **69**:1 (1978), 95–96. MR 57 #7232 Zbl 0379.47013

[Erdös and Turán 1940] P. Erdös and P. Turán, "On interpolation, III: Interpolatory theory of polynomials", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **41** (1940), 510–553. MR 1,333e

[Fedotov and Klopp 2005] A. Fedotov and F. Klopp, "Strong resonant tunneling, level repulsion and spectral type for one-dimensional adiabatic quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators", *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* (4) **38**:6 (2005), 889–950. MR 2008j:81037

[Fedotov and Klopp 2006] A. Fedotov and F. Klopp, *Weakly resonant tunneling interactions for adiabatic quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) **104**, 2006. MR 2007f:47039

[Freud 1971] G. Freud, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, New York, 1971.

[Jitomirskaya 2007] S. Jitomirskaya, "Ergodic Schrödinger operators (on one foot)", pp. 613–647 in *Spectral theory and mathematical physics: a Festschrift in honor of Barry Simon's 60th birthday*, edited by F. Gesztesy et al., Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **76**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007. MR 2008g:82055

[Jitomirskaya and Last 1999] S. Jitomirskaya and Y. Last, "Power-law subordinacy and singular spectra, I. Half-line operators", *Acta Math.* **183**:2 (1999), 171–189. MR 2001a:47033

[Johnson and Moser 1982] R. Johnson and J. Moser, "The rotation number for almost periodic potentials", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **84**:3 (1982), 403–438. MR 83h:34018 Zbl 0497.35026

[Killip et al. 2003] R. Killip, A. Kiselev, and Y. Last, "Dynamical upper bounds on wavepacket spreading", *Amer. J. Math.* **125**:5 (2003), 1165–1198. MR 2005a:81255 Zbl 1053.81020

[Kotani 1997] S. Kotani, "Generalized Floquet theory for stationary Schrödinger operators in one dimension", *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **8**:11 (1997), 1817–1854. MR 98m:34173

[Kuijlaars and Vanlessen 2002] A. B. J. Kuijlaars and M. Vanlessen, "Universality for eigenvalue correlations from the modified Jacobi unitary ensemble", *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2002** (2002), 1575–1600. MR 2003g:30043 Zbl 1122.30303

[Last and Simon 2008] Y. Last and B. Simon, "Fine structure of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials, IV. A priori bounds and clock behavior", *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **61**:4 (2008), 486–538. MR 2009d:42070

[Levin and Lubinsky 2008] E. Levin and D. S. Lubinsky, "Applications of universality limits to zeros and reproducing kernels of orthogonal polynomials", *J. Approx. Theory* **150**:1 (2008), 69–95. MR 2008k:42083 Zbl 1138.33006

[Lubinsky 2008a] D. S. Lubinsky, "A new approach to universality limits at the edge of the spectrum", pp. 281–290 in *Integrable systems and random matrices*, edited by J. Baik et al., Contemp. Math. **458**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008. MR 2010a:42097 Zbl 1147.15306

[Lubinsky 2008b] D. S. Lubinsky, "Universality limits in the bulk for arbitrary measures on compact sets", *J. Anal. Math.* **106** (2008), 373–394. MR 2009j:30085 Zbl 1156.42005

[Lubinsky 2009] D. S. Lubinsky, "A new approach to universality limits involving orthogonal polynomials", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **170**:2 (2009), 915–939. MR 2552113 Zbl 1176.42022

[Lund and Bowers 1992] J. Lund and K. L. Bowers, *Sinc methods for quadrature and differential equations*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1992. MR 93i:65004 Zbl 0753.65081

[Markoff 1884] A. Markoff, "Démonstration de certaines inégalités de M. Tchébychef", *Math. Ann.* **24**:2 (1884), 172–180. MR 1510283

[Maslov et al. 1993] V. P. Maslov, S. A. Molchanov, and A. Y. Gordon, "Behavior of generalized eigenfunctions at infinity and the Schrödinger conjecture", *Russian J. Math. Phys.* **1**:1 (1993), 71–104. MR 95a:81059

[Máté et al. 1991] A. Máté, P. Nevai, and V. Totik, "Szegő's extremum problem on the unit circle", *Ann. of Math.* (2) **134**:2 (1991), 433–453. MR 92i:42014

[Rudin 1987] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987. MR 88k:00002 Zbl 0925.00005

[Simon 1983] B. Simon, "Kotani theory for one-dimensional stochastic Jacobi matrices", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **89**:2 (1983), 227–234. MR 85d:60122 Zbl 0534.60057

[Simon 2005] B. Simon, "Fine structure of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials, II: OPUC with competing exponential decay", *J. Approx. Theory* **135**:1 (2005), 125–139. MR 2006g:42048

[Simon 2006a] B. Simon, "Fine structure of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials, I. A tale of two pictures", *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.* **25** (2006), 328–368. MR 2007k:42075

[Simon 2006b] B. Simon, "Fine structure of the zeros of orthogonal polynomials, III. Periodic recursion coefficients", *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **59**:7 (2006), 1042–1062. MR 2006k:42052

[Simon 2007] B. Simon, "Equilibrium measures and capacities in spectral theory", *Inverse Probl. Imaging* **1**:4 (2007), 713–772. MR 2008k:31003 Zbl 1149.31004

[Simon 2008a] B. Simon, "The Christoffel–Darboux kernel", pp. 295–335 in *Perspectives in partial differential equations, harmonic analysis and applications*, edited by D. Mitrea and D. Mitrea, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **79**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008. MR 2500498 Zbl 1159.42020

[Simon 2008b] B. Simon, "Two extensions of Lubinsky's universality theorem", *J. Anal. Math.* **105** (2008), 345–362. MR 2010c:42054 Zbl 1168.42304

[Simon 2009] B. Simon, "Weak convergence of CD kernels and applications", *Duke Math. J.* **146**:2 (2009), 305–330. MR 2009k:33027 Zbl 1158.33003

[Simon 2010] B. Simon, *Szegő's Theorem and its descendants: Spectral theory for L^2 perturbations of orthogonal polynomials*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2010.

[Stahl and Totik 1992] H. Stahl and V. Totik, *General orthogonal polynomials*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **43**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992. MR 93d:42029 Zbl 0791.33009

[Szegő 1939] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ. **23**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1939.

[Titchmarsh 1932] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of Functions*, Oxford University Press, 1932.

[Totik 2000] V. Totik, "Asymptotics for Christoffel functions for general measures on the real line", *J. Anal. Math.* **81** (2000), 283–303. MR 2001j:42021 Zbl 0966.42017

[Totik 2001] V. Totik, "Polynomial inverse images and polynomial inequalities", *Acta Math.* **187**:1 (2001), 139–160. MR 2002h:41017 Zbl 0997.41005

[Totik $\geq$ 2010] V. Totik, "Universality and fine zero spacing on general sets", in preparation.

[Van Assche 1986] W. Van Assche, "Invariant zero behaviour for orthogonal polynomials on compact sets of the real line", *Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Sér. B* **38**:1 (1986), 1–13. MR 88e:42049 Zbl 0622.33006

[Widom 1967] H. Widom, "Polynomials associated with measures in the complex plane", *J. Math. Mech.* **16** (1967), 997–1013. MR 35 #346 Zbl 0182.09201

Received 20 Oct 2009. Accepted 19 Nov 2009.

ARTUR AVILA: artur@math.sunysb.edu
CNRS UMR 7599, Laboratoire de Probabilités et Modèles Aléatoires, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Boîte Courrier 188, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France

and

Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, 22460-320 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
http://w3.impa.br/~avila/

YORAM LAST: ylast@math.huji.ac.il
Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University, 91904 Jerusalem, Israel

BARRY SIMON: bsimon@caltech.edu
Department of Mathematics, California Institute of Technology, MC 253-37, Pasadena, CA 91125, United States
http://www.math.caltech.edu/people/simon.html

Analysis & PDE

pjm.math.berkeley.edu/apde

See inside back cover or pjm.math.berkeley.edu/apde for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2010 is US $120/year for the electronic version, and $180/year for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, USA.

Analysis & PDE, at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

The handling of papers in APDE is managed by the editorial system EditFLOW from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY
mathematical sciences publishers
http://www.mathscipub.org
A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Typeset in LaTeX

ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 3 No. 1 2010
