

The Repulsion Between Localization Centers in the Anderson Model

Fumihiko Nakano¹

Published Online: May 11, 2006

In this note we show that, a simple combination of deep results in the theory of random Schrödinger operators yields a quantitative estimate of the fact that the localization centers become far apart, as corresponding energies are close together.

KEY WORDS: Anderson localization, localization center.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider a simple random system and its spectral region where the Anderson localization holds (i.e., we have dense point spectrum with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions). We study the “center” of these localized eigenfunctions and prove a repulsive property on the distribution of those in relation to their corresponding energies, that is, “as eigenvalues get closer, the corresponding localization centers become far apart” \cdots (*). A naive explanation which supports the observation (*) is :

- (1) Suppose we have two eigenvalues E_1, E_2 with their corresponding localization centers x_1, x_2 satisfy $|x_1 - x_2| \sim L$. Because eigenfunctions are exponentially localized, we can find a finite box Λ of size in the order of L surrounding x_1, x_2 , so that H_Λ has two eigenvalues close to E_1, E_2 . If the density of state is finite, eigenvalues of H_Λ would arrange in the order of $|\Lambda|^{-1}$ so that we could have $|E_1 - E_2| \geq |\Lambda|^{-1} \sim L^{-d}$.
- (2) (Carmona-Lacroix [ref. 3, p. 338]) Because locally we have no repulsion between eigenvalues (Molchanov, Minami^(11,12)), the overlap between the eigenfunctions should be small as the corresponding energies get closer.

¹ Faculty of Science, Department of Mathematics and Information Science, Kochi University, 2-5-1, Akebonomachi, Kochi, 780-8520, Japan; e-mail: nakano@math.kochiu.ac.jp

The phenomenon (*) has been observed in numerical calculations (ref. 3, p. 338). In ref. 12, Molchanov proves (*) in a special model on one space dimension, with a complicated statement. On the other hand, the observation (*) was used by Mott in the study of the ac-conductivity of random systems whose mathematical study is done recently (Kirsch-Lenoble-Pastur, Klein-Lenoble-Müller^(7,9)). The purpose of this paper is to obtain a quantitative statement of (*) which holds for almost surely. To study the same property for the averaged quantity would require more elaborate analysis as is done in ref. 9.

Our model is the standard tight binding Hamiltonian with random potential on \mathbf{Z}^d as was treated in ref. 11.

$$(H\varphi)(x) := \sum_{|y-x|=1} \varphi(y) + \lambda V_\omega \varphi(x), \quad \varphi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the coupling constant and $\{V_\omega(x)\}_{x \in \mathbf{Z}^d}$ is independent, identically distributed real-valued random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ whose common distribution is assumed to have a bounded density ρ . Under this assumption, the following facts are well-known. (1) $\sigma(H) = \Sigma := [-2d, 2d] + \text{supp } \rho$, a.s. (Kunz-Souillard⁽¹⁰⁾), (2) We can find a bounded interval $I(\subset \Sigma)$ such that the spectrum of H in I is almost surely pure point with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions (Anderson localization). I can be taken, for instance (Frölich-Spencer, von Dreifus-Klein, Aizenman^(1,5,15)), (i) (high disorder) $I = \Sigma$ if $\lambda \gg 1$, (ii) (extreme energy) away from the origin, (iii) (weak disorder) away from the spectrum of the free Laplacian if $|\lambda| \ll 1$, and (iv) band edges. Before stating our results, we define some notations.

Definition 1

- (1) $\Lambda_L(x) = \{y \in \mathbf{Z}^d : |y_j - x_j| \leq \frac{L}{2}, j = 1, 2, \dots, d\}$ is the finite box in \mathbf{Z}^d of length $L > 0$ with its center $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{Z}^d$. For simplicity, $\Lambda_L := \Lambda_L(0)$. $\partial\Lambda := \{y \in \Lambda : \exists z \notin \Lambda, |y - z| = 1\}$ be the boundary of the box Λ . H_Λ is the restriction of H on Λ with Dirichlet boundary condition. $G_\Lambda(E; x, y) := \langle \delta_x, (H_\Lambda - E)^{-1} \delta_y \rangle_{l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)}$ is the matrix element of the resolvent $(H_\Lambda - E)^{-1}$ where $\delta_x(z) = 1(z = x), 0(z \neq x)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)}$ is the inner product in $l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$. $|\Lambda| = \#\Lambda$ is the volume of a box $\Lambda(\subset \mathbf{Z}^d)$ and $|I| = b - a$ is the width of an interval $I = (a, b)(\subset \mathbf{R})$. χ_Λ is the characteristic function of a box Λ .
- (2) We say the box $\Lambda_L(x)$ is (γ, E) -regular iff $E \notin \sigma(H_{\Lambda_L(x)})$ and for any $y \in \partial\Lambda_L(x)$,

$$|G_{\Lambda_L(x)}(E; x, y)| \leq e^{-\gamma L/2}.$$

- (3) For $\phi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$, let $X(\phi)$ be the set of its localization centers given by

$$X(\phi) := \left\{ x \in \mathbf{Z}^d : |\phi(x)| = \max_{y \in \mathbf{Z}^d} |\phi(y)| \right\}.$$

This notion is due to Germinet-De Bièvre.⁽²⁾ Since $\phi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$, $X(\phi)$ is a finite set. Moreover, for the set $\{E_j(\omega)\}_{j \geq 1}$ of eigenvalues of H counting multiplicity, we take the corresponding eigenfunctions $\{\phi_j(\omega)\}_{j \geq 1}$ and let $X(E_j(\omega)) := X(\phi_j(\omega))$.

- (4) For a finite box Λ and $\phi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$, we say ϕ is localized in Λ iff $X(\phi) \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$. For an eigenvalue $E_j(\omega)$ of H , we say $E_j(\omega)$ is localized in Λ iff $X(E_j(\omega)) \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$.

Let $I(\subset \Sigma)$ be the bounded interval where the initial length scale estimate of the multiscale analysis holds:

Assumption 1. We have an interval $I(\subset \Sigma)$ with

$$\mathbf{P}(\text{for } \forall E \in I, \Lambda_{L_0} \text{ is } (\gamma, E) \text{ - regular}) \geq 1 - L_0^{-p}$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, $p > 2d$ and some $L_0 > 0$ sufficiently large.

I can be taken in regions mentioned in the paragraph preceding Definition 1 in this section. This condition, together with Wegner’s estimate, guarantee to apply the multiscale analysis, and from which the following fact is deduced⁽¹⁵⁾: we can find $\alpha = \alpha(p, d)$, $1 < \alpha < 2$ such that, putting

$$\Lambda_k(x) = \Lambda_{L_k}(x), \quad L_k = L_{k-1}^\alpha, \quad 1 < \alpha < 2, \quad x \in \mathbf{Z}^d,$$

we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{\text{For all } E \in I \text{ either } \Lambda_k(x) \text{ or } \Lambda_k(y) \text{ is } (\gamma, E) \text{ - regular}\} \geq 1 - L_k^{-2p} \quad (1)$$

for any x, y with $|x - y| > L_k$. The first result implies the distribution of localization centers are “thin” in \mathbf{Z}^d .

Theorem 1 (localization centers are thin). *Let $d_k = |\Lambda_k|^{-1}k^{-2}$, $E \in I$, $J_k = (E - \frac{d_k}{2}, E + \frac{d_k}{2}) \subset \mathbf{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Then for a.e. ω , we can find $k_0 = k_0(\omega)$ such that, if $k \leq k_0$, there are no eigenvalues of H in J_k localized in Λ_k .*

Remark 1. *Theorem 1 states that, for any $E \in I$, localization center run away from the origin, as the corresponding eigenvalue approaches E . It implies the distribution of the localization centers is thin, while the eigenvalues are dense in I . A naive explanation of this fact is: we have infinite number of eigenvalues near E while the number of states is proportional to the volume, by the finiteness of the density of states.*

Remark 2. *As the density of states obeys the Lifschitz tail asymptotics on the bottom of the spectrum, another estimate is obtained there: d_k can be replaced by $d_L = \left(a, a + \frac{1}{|\Lambda_L|^{2/d}}\right)$, $a = \inf \sigma(H)$ (Simon⁽¹⁴⁾):*

Remark 3. *Theorem 1 holds true for random Hamiltonians where the multiscale analysis is applicable and Wegner’s estimate holds.*

Theorem 2 (localization centers are repulsive). *Let $d_k = |\Lambda_k|^{-2}k^{-2}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. For a.e. ω , the following event occurs. For any $x \in \mathbf{Z}^d$, there exists $k_0 = k_0(\omega, x)$ such that for $k \geq k_0(\omega, x)$ and any interval $J \subset I$ with $|J| \leq d_k$, there is at most one eigenvalue of H in J localized in $\Lambda_k(x)$.*

Remark 4. *Theorem 2 implies: for a.e. ω and for any eigenvalue $E = E_j(\omega) \in I$ of H , we can find $k_1 = k_1(\omega, E_j(\omega))$ such that, for any $k \geq k_1$, we have no eigenvalues of H in $J_k = (E_j(\omega) - \frac{d_k}{2}, E_j(\omega) + \frac{d_k}{2})$, localized in $\Lambda_k(x)$ for any $x \in X(E_j(\omega))$ except $E_j(\omega)$ itself.*

Hence this theorem roughly states that, for a localization center x with energy E , any other localization center must be away from x at least in the distance of $L_k/2$, if the corresponding eigenvalues are within the distance of $|\Lambda_k|^{-2}$ from E . And this happens simultaneously for all eigenvalues in I almost surely.

Remark 5. *Theorem 2 also proves that eigenvalues in I are simple almost surely. Indeed, this is done by Klein-Molchanov⁽⁸⁾ by the argument similar to ours, but without relying on the multiscale analysis.*

Remark 6. *One of the essential ingredients of the proof of Theorem 2 is the estimate of the probability to have more than two eigenvalues on a given interval obtained by Minami [ref. 11, Lemma 2], which is also essential to prove the absence of repulsion of eigenvalues, and known to hold in the Anderson model only so far. Hence something different could be expected for the acoustic type operator, in which the level repulsion is known to occur (Grenkova-Molchanov-Sudarev⁽⁶⁾).*

Remark 7. *This result concerns the distribution of the localization centers which holds for almost surely. If one is interested in the fluctuation of those, by proceeding along the ideas in ref. 11, one could expect the Poisson-type behavior also for localization centers, under a suitable scaling. To verify this observation would be an interesting problem².⁽¹³⁾*

In the following section, we prove Theorem 1, 2, along the naive argument given at the beginning of this section, which is done by making use of the machinery developed by Germinet-De Bièvre, Damanik-Stollmann, Klein-Molchanov and Minami^(2,4,8,11): (i) If we have an (resp. at least two) eigenvalue in an interval $J \subset I$, the corresponding eigenfunction is exponentially small outside a box Λ surrounding its localization center.^(2,4) Then H_Λ has an (resp. at least two) eigenvalue in J .⁽⁸⁾ (ii) We estimate the event that H_Λ has an (resp. at least two) eigenvalue in J by Wegner's (resp. Minami's) estimate. Then the usual Borel-Cantelli argument gives the assertion. In Appendix, we collect lemmas used in these proofs borrowed from refs. 2, 4, 8, 11.

²The author would like to thank Rowan Killip to pointing this out.

2. PROOF OF THEOREMS

We first set

$$E_j = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{For some } E \in I \text{ and some } x, y \in \Lambda_{3L_{j+1}} \text{ with } \Lambda_j(x) \cap \Lambda_j(y) = \emptyset, \\ \Lambda_j(x), \Lambda_j(y) \text{ are both } (\gamma, E) - \text{singular}\}$$

$$\Omega_k = \bigcap_{j \geq k} E_j^c.$$

Then by (1),

$$\mathbf{P}(\Omega_k) \geq 1 - C_1(\alpha, d, p)L_k^{2d\alpha-2p} \tag{2}$$

for some $C_1 = C_1(\alpha, d, p)$. In what follows, we take and fix any $0 < \gamma' < \gamma$, and $k_0(\alpha, d, \gamma), k_1(\alpha, d, \gamma, \gamma'), L_0(\gamma')$ and C_2 are positive constants given in Appendix.

Lemma 1. *Let $J = (a, b) \subset I$ and let $\epsilon_{L_k} = C_2 e^{-\gamma' L_k/2}$. If $k \geq k_0(\alpha, d, \gamma) \vee k_1(\alpha, d, \gamma, \gamma'), L_k \geq L_0(\gamma')$, the following estimates hold.*

(1) \mathbf{P} (we have an eigenvalue of H in J localized in Λ_k)

$$\leq \|\rho\|_\infty (|J| + 2\epsilon_{L_k}) |\Lambda_{3L_k}| + C_1(\alpha, d, p)L_k^{2d\alpha-2p}.$$

(2) \mathbf{P} (we have at least 2 eigenvalues of H in J localized in Λ_k)

$$\leq \pi^2 \|\rho\|_\infty^2 |\Lambda_{3L_k}|^2 (|J| + 2\epsilon_{L_k})^2 + C_1(\alpha, d, p)L_k^{2d\alpha-2p}.$$

Proof. (1) Let

$$A_k := \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{we have an eigenvalue of } H \text{ in } J \text{ localized in } \Lambda_k\}.$$

Let $\omega \in A_k \cap \Omega_k$. Then we have an eigenvalue $E \in J$ localized in Λ_k and since $j \geq k_0 \vee k_1, L_k \geq L_0$, the corresponding eigenfunction ϕ satisfies

$$\|(1 - \chi_{3L_k})\phi\| \leq e^{-\gamma' L_k/2}$$

by Lemma 3. Then the argument of the proof of Lemma 4 shows that $H_{\Lambda_{3L_k}}$ has an eigenvalue in $(a - \epsilon_{L_k}, b + \epsilon_{L_k})$. By Wegner's estimate³

$$\mathbf{P}(\#\{E_j(\Lambda) \in J\} \geq 1) \leq \|\rho\|_\infty |\Lambda| \cdot |J|,$$

we have $\mathbf{P}(A_k \cap \Omega_k) \leq \|\rho\|_\infty |\Lambda_{3L_k}| (|J| + 2\epsilon_{L_k})$.

³ $\overline{\{E_j(\Lambda)\}_{j=1}^{|\Lambda|}}$ is the set of eigenvalues of H_Λ .

(2) Let

$B_k := \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{we have at least 2 eigenvalues of } H \text{ in } J \text{ localized in } \Lambda_k\}$

By the same argument in the proof of Lemma 1(1), if $\omega \in B_k \cap \Omega_k$, $H_{\Lambda_{3L_k}}$ has at least two eigenvalues in $(a - \epsilon_{L_k}, b + \epsilon_{L_k})$. By Minami's estimate [ref. 11, Lemma 2], [ref. 8, Appendix]:

$$\mathbf{P}(\{\#\{E_j(\Lambda) \in J\} \geq 2\}) \leq \pi^2 \|\rho\|_\infty^2 |\Lambda|^2 |J|^2,$$

we have $\mathbf{P}(B_k \cap \Omega_k) \leq \pi^2 \|\rho\|_\infty^2 |\Lambda_{3L_k}|^2 (|J| + 2\epsilon_{L_k})^2$.

Proof of Theorem 1

We consider the following event.

$A_k = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{We have an eigenvalue of } H \text{ in } J_k \text{ localized in } \Lambda_k\}$.

By Lemma 1, if $k \geq k_0(\alpha, d, \gamma) \vee k_1(\alpha, d, \gamma, \gamma')$ and $L_k \geq L_0(\gamma')$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(A_k) \leq \|\rho\|_\infty |\Lambda_{3L_k}| (d_k + 2\epsilon_{L_k}) + C_1(\alpha, d, p) L_k^{2d(\alpha-1)-2p}$$

Since $d_k + 2\epsilon_{L_k} \leq 2d_k$ for sufficiently large k , $\sum_k \mathbf{P}(A_k) < \infty$. The Borel-Cantelli argument then proves the assertion of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 2

We consider the following events.

$B_k(x, J) = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{at least two eigenvalues of } H \text{ in } J \text{ localized in } \Lambda_k(x)\}$,
 $B_k(x) = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{at least two eigenvalues of } H \text{ in } J$
 for some $J(\subset I)$ with $|J| \leq d_k$ in $\Lambda_k(x)\}$.

Suppose $|J| \leq 2d_k$, $J \subset I$. Then by the argument in the proof of Lemma 1(2),

$$\mathbf{P}(B_k(x, J) \cap \Omega_k) \leq \pi^2 \|\rho\|_\infty^2 (3d_k)^2 \cdot |\Lambda_{3L_k}|^2$$

for k sufficiently large. Here we use the argument in [ref. 8, Lemma 2] and cover the interval I by those $J(i, d_k)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_k$ of width $2d_k$ such that the left end of $J(i + 1, d_k)$ coincides with the mid point of $J(i, d_k)$. Then $N_k \leq \frac{|I|}{2d_k} \cdot 2 = \frac{|I|}{d_k}$ and any interval (in I) of width less than d_k is contained by some $J(i, d_k)$. Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(B_k(x) \cap \Omega_k) \leq \pi^2 \|\rho\|_\infty^2 (3d_k)^2 \cdot \frac{|I|}{d_k} \cdot |\Lambda_{3L_k}|^2$$

for large k and therefore $\sum_k \mathbf{P}(B_k(x)) < \infty$ by (2). By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, $\Omega(x) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} B_k^c(x)$ satisfies $\mathbf{P}(\Omega(x)) = 1$ and for $\omega \in \Omega(x)$ we can find $k_0 = k_0(\omega, x)$ such that for any $k \geq k_0(\omega, x)$ and for any interval $J(\subset I)$ with $|J| \leq d_k$, we have at most one eigenvalue of H in J localized in $\Lambda_k(x)$. For $\omega \in \Omega' = \bigcap_{x \in \mathbf{Z}^d} \Omega(x)$, the event described in the statement of Theorem 2 occurs.

A.1. APPENDIX

In this section, we state Lemmas used in section 2, which are borrowed from refs. 2, 4, 8, 11. The following lemma is [ref. 2, Lemma 3.5].

Lemma 2 ([ref. 2, Lemma 3.5]). *We can find a constant $k_0 = k_0(\alpha, d, \gamma)$ such that, if $k \geq k_0$ and $\phi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$ satisfies $H\phi = E\phi$, then $\Lambda_{L_k}(x_\phi)$ is (γ, E) -singular.*

In what follows, we take and fix any γ' with $0 < \gamma' < \gamma$.

Lemma 3. *We can find a constant $k_1 = k_1(\alpha, d, \gamma, \gamma')$ such that, if $k \geq k_0(\alpha, d, \gamma) \vee k_1(\alpha, d, \gamma, \gamma')$, $\omega \in \Omega_k$ and if $\phi \in l^2(\mathbf{Z}^d)$ and satisfies $H\phi = E\phi$, $\|\phi\| = 1$ and localized in Λ_k ,*

$$\|(1 - \chi_{\Lambda_{3L_k}})\phi\| \leq e^{-\gamma' L_k/2}, \quad \gamma' < \gamma.$$

Lemma 3 is proved along the argument in [ref. 4, Step 3, Theorem 3.1].

Sketch of proof

We divide $\Lambda_{3L_k}^c$ into annulus: $\Lambda_{3L_k}^c = \bigcup_{i \geq k} M_i$, $M_i = \Lambda_{3L_{i+1}} \setminus \Lambda_{3L_i}$, $i \geq k$. Then we have $\|(1 - \chi_{3L_k})\phi\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=k}^\infty \|\chi_{M_i}\phi\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=k}^\infty \sum_{x \in M_i} |\phi(x)|^2$. Since $\Lambda_{L_i}(x_\phi) \cap \Lambda_{L_i}(x) = \emptyset$ for any $x \in M_i$, $\Lambda_{L_i}(x)$ is (γ, E) -regular by Lemma 2.

Lemma 4. We can find positive constants $C_2, L_0 = L_0(\gamma')$ with the following property. If φ_1, φ_2 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} H\varphi_j &= E_j\varphi_j, \quad \|\varphi_j\| = 1, \quad E_j \in J = (a, b), \quad j = 1, 2, \\ \|(1 - \chi_{\Lambda_L})\varphi_j\| &\leq e^{-\gamma' L/2}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad L \geq L_0, \end{aligned}$$

then H_{Λ_L} has at least two eigenvalues in $(a - \epsilon_L, b + \epsilon_L)$ where $\epsilon_L = C_2 e^{-\gamma' L/2}$.

The proof is found in ref. 8: we orthonormalize $\varphi_j^\Lambda = \chi_\Lambda \varphi_j$, $j = 1, 2$ and estimate from below the trace of the spectral projection of H corresponding to the interval $(a - \epsilon_L, b + \epsilon_L)$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank Professors Abel Klein, Rowan Killip, Nariyuki Minami and a referee for their discussions and comments.

REFERENCES

1. M. Aizenman, Localization at weak disorder: Some elementary bounds. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **6**:1163–1182 (1994).
2. F. Germinet and S. De Bièvre, Dynamical localization for discrete and continuous random Schrödinger operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **194**:323–341 (1998).

3. R. Carmona and J. Lacroix, Spectral Theory of Random Schrödinger Operators, Birkhäuser (1990).
4. D. Damanik and P. Stollmann, Multi-scale analysis implies strong dynamical localization. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **11**(1):11–29 (2001).
5. J. Fröhlich and T. Spencer, Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **88**:151–184 (1983).
6. L. N. Grenkova, S. A. Molchanov and Ju. N. Sudarev, On the basic states of one-dimensional disordered structures. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **90**(1):101–123 (1983).
7. W. Kirsch, O. Lenoble and L. Pastur, On the mott formula for the a.c. conductivity and binary correlators in the strong localization regime of disordered systems. *J. Phys. A.* **36**(49):12157–12180 (2003).
8. A. Klein and S. Molchanov, Simplicity of eigenvalues in the Anderson model. *J. Stat. Phys.* **122**:95–99 (2006).
9. A. Klein, O. Lenoble and P. Muller, On Mott's formula for the aconductivity in the Anderson model, math-ph/0508007.
10. H. Kunz and B. Souillard, Sur le spectre des operateurs aux differences finies aleatoires. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **78**:201–246 (1980).
11. N. Minami, Local fluctuation of the spectrum of a multidimensional Anderson tight-binding model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **177**:709–725 (1996).
12. S. Molchanov, The local structure of the spectrum of the one-dimensional Schrödinger operator. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **78**:429–446 (1981).
13. R. Killip and F. Nakano, Eigenfunction statistics in the localized Anderson model, preprint.
14. B. Simon, Lifschitz tails for the Anderson model. *J. Stat. Phys.* **38**:65–76 (1985).
15. H. von Dreifus and A. Klein, A new proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **124**:285–299 (1989).