

# CYCLIC VECTORS IN THE ANDERSON MODEL

To Elliott Lieb on his 60th birthday

BARRY SIMON<sup>1</sup>

*Division of Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy, California Institute of Technology,  
253-37 Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

Received 7 April 1993

We prove that for Anderson models in the localized regime, the vectors  $\delta_n$  are cyclic with probability one and, in particular, the spectrum is simple.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we'll discuss the Anderson model, by which we mean a family of operators  $h_\omega$  on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$  given by

$$(h_\omega u)(j) = \sum_{|n|=1} u(j+n) + V_\omega(j)u(j),$$

where  $|n| = \sum_{i=1}^\nu |n_i|$  and  $V_\omega(j)$  are independent, identically distributed random variables with distribution on  $d\lambda(E) = F(E) dE$ .

Let  $\delta_n$  be the vector in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$  with  $\delta_n(j) = 0$  if  $j \neq n$  and 1 if  $j = n$ .

Our goal is to prove:

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that  $[a, b]$  is an interval in  $\text{spec}(h_\omega)$  for a.e.  $\omega$  and that the spectrum is pure point there (with probability one). Then for a.e.  $\omega$ , each  $\delta_n$  is a cyclic vector for  $h_\omega$  on this interval.*

Such a result is often technically useful, which is our interest in it. It implies that  $h_\omega$  has simple spectrum. The most interesting question is whether this result holds without assuming that states are localized.

If  $\nu = 1$ , we know that the localization hypothesis holds for all  $F$  and all  $a, b$  [2, 3, 6, 5]. For  $\nu > 1$ , we know that for suitable  $F$  there are localized states for all  $[a, b]$  and for other  $F$  at some  $[a, b]$  [4, 1].

This paper is a birthday present for Elliott Lieb. We've written over a dozen papers together, many among my significant ones. Working with Elliott is always a stimulating and rewarding experience and I thank him for the pleasure of those collaborations.

<sup>1</sup>This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-9101715. The Government has certain rights in this material.

2. Proof of the Main Theorem

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any Jacobi matrix,  $h$ , the vectors  $\{h^j \delta_n\}_{j=0; n \text{ fixed}}^\infty$  are linearly independent.*

**Proof.** Suppose not. Let  $\sum_{j=0}^J \alpha_j h^j \delta_n = 0$  with  $J$  minimal. Let  $e$  be a root of  $\sum \alpha_j X^j$  so  $\sum \alpha_j h^j = (h - e)Q(h)$ . Since  $J$  is minimal,  $\psi = Q(h)\delta_n \neq 0$ . But  $(h - e)\psi = 0$  so  $h$  has an eigenfunction of compact support. Let  $C = \{m \mid \psi(m) \neq 0\}$ . Let  $M = \max\{m_1 \mid m \in C\}$ . Let  $\tilde{m}$  be a point with  $\tilde{m}_1 = M$ . Then  $(h\psi)(\tilde{m} + \delta_1) \neq 0$  but  $\psi(\tilde{m} + \delta_1) = 0$  so  $(h - e)\psi \neq 0$ ; that is,  $h$  has no eigenfunction of compact support. Thus, we have the required contradiction.  $\square$

Given  $h$  and  $n$ , define  $\eta_m(h, n)$  to be the orthonormal set given by Gram-Schmidt from  $h^j \delta_n$ , that is

$$\eta_m(h, n) = \left[ h^m \delta_n - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (\eta_j(h, n), h^m \delta_n) \eta_j \right] / N,$$

where  $N = \left\| h^m \delta_n - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \dots \right\|$ . To prove the theorem, we need only show that for each  $m, k$  and a.e.  $\omega$ :

$$\sum_{j=0}^\infty |(P_{(a,b)}(h_\omega) \delta_m, \eta_j(h_\omega, k))|^2 = 1$$

(this is clearly a measurable set).

Fix  $\tilde{\omega}$  so that  $h_{\tilde{\omega}}$  has point spectrum on  $(a, b)$  and so that the same is true for  $\omega^\lambda = \tilde{\omega}_0 + \lambda \delta_m$  for a.e.  $\lambda$  with  $F(\tilde{\omega}_m + \lambda) \neq 0$ . Let  $d\mu_\lambda$  be the spectral measure of the vector  $\delta_m$  and operator  $h_{\omega^\lambda}$ .

Let  $G_{ij}(e) = (\delta_i, (h_{\tilde{\omega}} - e)^{-1} \delta_j)$ . As  $e \rightarrow -\infty$ ,

$$G_{ij}(e) = (-e)^{|i-j|} (1 + o(|e|^{-1})),$$

so  $G$  is not identically zero.  $G$  is the Stieltjes transform of a signed measure so it has boundary values for a.e.  $e \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $G_{ij}(e + i0)$ . Moreover, since  $G$  is not identically zero,

$$A_{ij} = \{e \mid G_{ij}(e + i0) = 0 \text{ or } \lim G_{ij}(e + i\epsilon) = \infty \text{ or the limit does not exist}\}$$

has Lebesgue measure zero.

By the argument of Simon-Wolff [6],  $\int (1 + \lambda^2)^{-1} d\mu_\lambda(E) d\lambda \equiv d\eta(E)$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t.  $dE$ . Thus, for a.e.  $\lambda$ :

$$d\mu_\lambda(A_{m,k} \cup B) = 0 \tag{1}$$

where

$$B = \{\text{eigenvalues of } h_{\tilde{\omega}}\}.$$

If we also restrict to those  $\lambda$  with  $d\mu_\lambda$  pure point on  $(a, b)$ ,  $d\mu_\lambda(B) = 0$  implies each eigenvalue  $e$  of  $h_{\omega,\lambda}$  with  $(\delta_m, P_e \delta_m) \neq 0$  has  $\dim(P_e) = 1$ ; so if we also prove that  $(\delta_k, P_e \delta_k) \neq 0$ , then  $\text{Ran } P_e$  is in the cyclic subspace generated by  $h_{\omega,\lambda}$  on  $\delta_k$  and thus  $P_{(a,b)} \delta_m$  is in that cyclic subspace also, as was to be proven.

Now,

$$(\delta_k, (h_{\omega,\lambda} - z)^{-1} \delta_m) = (\delta_k, (h_\omega - z)^{-1} \delta_m) - \lambda (\delta_k, (h_\omega - z)^{-1} \delta_m) (\delta_m, (h_{\omega,\lambda} - z)^{-1} \delta_k). \quad (2)$$

Let  $e$  be any pure point of  $d\mu_\lambda$  on  $(a, b)$ . By (1),  $(\delta_k, (h_\omega - z)^{-1} \delta_m)$  with  $z = e + i\epsilon$  has a non-zero finite limit as  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ . Multiplying (2) by  $i\epsilon$  and taking  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ ,

$$(\delta_k, P_e \delta_m) = -\lambda G_{km}(e + i0) (\delta_m, P_e \delta_m).$$

It follows that  $(\delta_k, P_e \delta_m) \neq 0$  so  $P_e \delta_k \neq 0$ , as was to be proven.  $\square$

### References

- [1] M. Aizenman and S. Molchanov, "Localization at large disorders and at extreme energies: An elementary derivation", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **157** (1993) 245–278.
- [2] F. Delyon, H. Kunz and B. Souillard, "One-dimensional wave equations in disordered media", *J. Phys.* **A16** (1983) 25–42.
- [3] F. Delyon, Y. Lévy and B. Souillard, "Anderson localization for multi-dimensional systems at large disorder or large energy", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **100** (1985) 463–470.
- [4] J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, "Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **88** (1983) 151–184.
- [5] S. Kotani and B. Simon, "Localization in general one-dimensional random systems, II. Continuum Schrödinger operators", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **112** (1987) 103–119.
- [6] B. Simon and T. Wolff, "Singular continuous spectrum under rank one perturbations and localization for random Hamiltonians", *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **39** (1986) 75–90.