

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

The Fibonacci Hamiltonian

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/04p6f10m>

Journal

Inventiones Mathematicae, 206(3)

ISSN

0020-9910

Authors

Damanik, D
Gorodetski, A
Yessen, W

Publication Date

2016-12-01

DOI

10.1007/s00222-016-0660-x

Peer reviewed

THE FIBONACCI HAMILTONIAN

DAVID DAMANIK, ANTON GORODETSKI, AND WILLIAM YESSEN

ABSTRACT. We consider the Fibonacci Hamiltonian, the central model in the study of electronic properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals, and provide a detailed description of its spectrum and spectral characteristics (namely, the optimal Hölder exponent of the integrated density of states, the dimension of the density of states measure, the dimension of the spectrum, and the upper transport exponent) for all values of the coupling constant (in contrast to all previous quantitative results, which could be established only in the regime of small or large coupling).

In particular, we show that the spectrum of this operator is a dynamically defined Cantor set and that the density of states measure is exact-dimensional; this implies that all standard fractal dimensions coincide in each case. We show that all the gaps of the spectrum allowed by the gap labeling theorem are open for all values of the coupling constant. Also, we establish strict inequalities between the four spectral characteristics in question, and provide the exact large coupling asymptotics of the dimension of the density of states measure (for the other three quantities, the large coupling asymptotics were known before).

A crucial ingredient of the paper is the relation between spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian and dynamical properties of the Fibonacci trace map (such as dimensional characteristics of the non-wandering hyperbolic set and its measure of maximal entropy as well as other equilibrium measures, topological entropy, multipliers of periodic orbits). We establish exact identities relating the spectral and dynamical quantities, and show the connection between the spectral quantities and the thermodynamic pressure function.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Transversality	13
3. Transport Exponents	18
4. The Density of States Measure	29
5. The Optimal Hölder Exponent	37
6. Strict Inequalities Between Spectral Characteristics	39
7. Extensions and Generalizations	41
Acknowledgments	43
References	43

Date: April 1, 2014.

D. D. was supported in part by a Simons Fellowship and NSF grant DMS-1067988.

A. G. was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1301515 and IIS-1018433.

W. Y. was supported by the NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship, DMS-1304287.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. Along with the almost Mathieu operator, this particular operator is the most heavily studied Schrödinger operator, with dozens of mathematics papers and hundreds of physics papers devoted to it. There are several reasons for this extensive interest in the spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. The first and perhaps most important reason is that this operator is a central model in mathematical physics. Namely it is relevant in the study of electronic properties of quasicrystals. Quasicrystals are materials that were first discovered by Shechtman in 1982, and this discovery led to a paradigm shift in materials science. In diffraction experiments they produce patterns consisting of sharp bright spots, the so-called Bragg peaks, while at the same time these diffraction patterns display symmetries that conclusively prove that the arrangement of atoms in the sample cannot be periodic. This came as a surprise as it had been believed that Bragg peaks can only be observed in the diffraction of materials for which the arrangement of atoms is periodic. It therefore took the scientific community a while until this discovery was properly digested and accepted, and it was finally published in the 1984 paper [90]. Shechtman has received numerous honors and distinctions for this discovery, including the 2011 Nobel Prize in Chemistry.

Since the 1980's mathematicians have studied appropriate models of quasicrystals. Naturally, the choice of these models is guided by the distinctive property of real-life quasicrystals, namely that of having a pure point diffraction which in turn displays symmetries that rule out periodicity. The central examples of the commonly accepted mathematical quasicrystal models are the Fibonacci tilings or sequences in one dimension and the Penrose tilings in two dimensions. Indeed, these examples belong to all classes of models that are typically considered in their respective dimension. In particular, they may be generated both by inflation and by a cut-and-project scheme.

Mathematical quasicrystal models are studied from many perspectives, including dynamical systems, harmonic analysis, spectral theory, discrete geometry, combinatorics, and algebra; compare [5, 7, 80]. The study of electronic or quantum transport in quasicrystals, which is the perspective we take in this paper, naturally leads to the consideration of Schrödinger operators with potentials modeling a quasicrystalline environment. Choosing the environment given by the Fibonacci tiling or sequence, this leads to the discrete one-dimensional Schrödinger operator

$$(1) \quad [H_{\lambda,\omega}u](n) = u(n+1) + u(n-1) + \lambda\chi_{[1-\alpha,1)}(n\alpha + \omega \bmod 1)u(n),$$

acting in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, where $\lambda > 0$ is the coupling constant, $\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$ is the frequency, and $\omega \in \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is the phase. In particular, α is the inverse of the golden ratio

$$(2) \quad \varphi = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}.$$

Alternatively, the potential can be generated by the Fibonacci substitution $a \mapsto ab$, $b \mapsto a$; compare [24, 26, 28]. The operator family (1) is what is usually called the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. It was proposed and initially studied by Kohmoto et al. [63] and by Ostlund et al. [82], prior to the publication of [90], as a quasi-periodic model that can be solved exactly by renormalization group techniques. The relevance to quasicrystals was only established and discussed later. The first papers on the model in the mathematics literature belong to Casdagli [20] and Sütő [97].

The second reason for the extensive interest in this operator family is that it has exciting spectral properties. Independently of the relevance of the model to physics, the Fibonacci Hamiltonian also serves as a paradigm for many spectral phenomena that had been considered exotic prior to the 1980's. For example, it persistently displays Cantor spectrum, zero-measure spectrum, purely singular continuous spectral measures, and anomalous transport. That these properties are even possible for a physically relevant model was surprising prior to discovery, and the fact that these properties can be rigorously established only adds to the importance of the model. Specifically, it is often difficult to answer questions about the spectrum and the spectral type for a given Schrödinger operator with an aperiodic and non-decaying potential (periodic and decaying potentials are well understood; compare, e.g., [94] and [47]). In many cases one rather resorts to statements about members in families of operators that hold generically or with probability one. The operator families corresponding to the Fibonacci and almost Mathieu cases are special in that quite detailed and difficult questions about these operators can be answered for all members of the respective family. Establishing this has been the objective of many publications in the past three decades focusing on these two operator families; see, for example, the surveys [24, 26, 27, 28, 59, 61].

In this paper we show that the spectrum of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian is a dynamically defined Cantor set and that the density of states measure is exact-dimensional; this implies that all standard fractal dimensions coincide in each case. We show that all the gaps of the spectrum allowed by the gap labeling theorem are open for all values of the coupling constant. Also, we consider the optimal Hölder exponent of the integrated density of states, the dimension of the density of states measure, the dimension of the spectrum, and the upper transport exponent, establish strict inequalities between them, and provide the exact large coupling asymptotics of the dimension of the density of states measure (for the other three quantities, the large coupling asymptotics were known before). We also provide the explicit relations between these spectral characteristics and the dynamical properties of the Fibonacci trace map (such as dimensional characteristics of the non-wandering hyperbolic set and its measure of maximal entropy as well as other equilibrium measures, topological entropy, multipliers of periodic orbits). We establish exact identities relating the spectral and dynamical quantities, and show the connection between the spectral quantities and the thermodynamic pressure function. Our results not just improve but complete our understanding of many spectral characteristics and properties of Fibonacci Hamiltonian. In the rest of the introduction we provide the exact statement of the results and discuss them in the context of previously known facts.

1.1. The Spectrum of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. The spectrum of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian $H_{\lambda,\omega}$ is independent of ω and may therefore be denoted by Σ_λ . This follows from strong operator convergence and the minimality of an irrational rotation of the circle. It was shown by Sütő in [98] that Σ_λ is a Cantor set of zero Lebesgue measure for every $\lambda > 0$. The zero-measure property in turn rules out any absolutely continuous spectrum for $H_{\lambda,\omega}$. Complementing this, Damanik and Lenz showed that $H_{\lambda,\omega}$ has no eigenvalues [38], and hence for all parameter values, all spectral measures are purely singular continuous. This answers the basic qualitative spectral questions about this operator family.

Our first result shows that actually Σ_λ is a *dynamically defined*¹ Cantor set, that is, it belongs to a special and heavily studied class of Cantor sets that have strong self-similarity properties (see [83] for the formal definition and a detailed discussion of the properties of dynamically defined Cantor sets).

Theorem 1.1. *For every $\lambda > 0$, Σ_λ is a dynamically defined Cantor set. In particular, for every $E \in \Sigma_\lambda$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\dim_H((E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon) \cap \Sigma_\lambda) = \dim_B((E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon) \cap \Sigma_\lambda) = \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda = \dim_B \Sigma_\lambda.$$

Here, $\dim_H(S)$ (resp., $\dim_B(S)$) denotes the Hausdorff (resp., box counting) dimension of the Borel set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$. Stating the identities above contains the implicit assertion that the box counting dimension of the set in question exists.

This result was previously known for $\lambda \geq 16$ [20] and $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small [31]. Knowing that the spectrum is a dynamically defined Cantor set not only establishes the equality of all standard fractal dimensions of the set (and shows that this common dimension is bounded away from zero and one), it also serves as the starting point for further studies. For example, higher-dimensional separable models may be considered and their spectra turn out to be given by the sum of the one-dimensional spectra; compare, for example, [32, 36]. This leads to a study of sums of dynamically defined Cantor sets, which is an extensively investigated problem about which much is known (see, e.g., [55, 81] and references therein).

1.2. Transport Exponents. Given that the operator $H_{\lambda,\omega}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum for all parameter values, the RAGE Theorem (see, e.g., [86, Theorem XI.115]) suggests that when studying the Schrödinger time evolution for this Schrödinger operator, that is, $e^{-itH_{\lambda,\omega}}\psi$ for some initial state $\psi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, one should consider time-averaged quantities. For simplicity, let us consider initial states of the form δ_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since a translation in space simply results in an adjustment of the phase, we may without loss of generality focus on the particular case $\psi = \delta_0$. The time-averaged spreading of $e^{-itH_{\lambda,\omega}}\delta_0$ is usually captured on a power-law scale as follows; compare, for example, [46, 68]. For $p > 0$, consider the p -th moment of the position operator,

$$\langle |X|_{\delta_0}^p \rangle(t) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |n|^p |\langle e^{-itH_{\lambda,\omega}} \delta_0, \delta_n \rangle|^2$$

We average in time as follows. If $f(t)$ is a function of $t > 0$ and $T > 0$ is given, we denote the time-averaged function at T by $\langle f \rangle(T)$:

$$\langle f \rangle(T) = \frac{2}{T} \int_0^\infty e^{-2t/T} f(t) dt.$$

Then, the corresponding upper and lower transport exponents $\tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^+(p)$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^-(p)$ are given, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^+(p) &= \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \langle |X|_{\delta_0}^p \rangle(T)}{p \log T}, \\ \tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^-(p) &= \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \langle |X|_{\delta_0}^p \rangle(T)}{p \log T}. \end{aligned}$$

¹Sometimes the term “regular” is also used.

The transport exponents $\tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^\pm(p)$ belong to $[0, 1]$ and are non-decreasing in p (see, e.g., [46]), and hence the following limits exist:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}_l^\pm &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^\pm(p), \\ \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^\pm(p).\end{aligned}$$

Ballistic transport corresponds to transport exponents being equal to one, diffusive transport corresponds to the value $\frac{1}{2}$, and vanishing transport exponents correspond to (some weak form of) dynamical localization. In all other cases, transport is called anomalous. The Fibonacci Hamiltonian has long been the primary candidate for a model exhibiting anomalous transport, going back at least to the work of Abe and Hiramoto [1]. Many papers have been devoted to a study of the transport properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian; see, for example, [15, 23, 25, 37, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 60, 66]. For example, it is known that all the transport exponents defined above are strictly positive for all $\lambda > 0$, $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$; see [37]. On the other hand, upper bounds for all the transport exponents were shown in [44] for $\lambda > 8$ (see also [15] for a somewhat weaker result). The exact large coupling asymptotics of $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm$ were identified in [45], where it was shown that

$$(3) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm \cdot \log \lambda = 2 \log \varphi,$$

uniformly in $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$. In particular, the Fibonacci Hamiltonian indeed gives rise to anomalous transport for sufficiently large coupling. The behavior in the weak coupling regime was studied in [35], where it was shown that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$1 - c\lambda^2 \leq \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm \leq 1,$$

uniformly in $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.

While it is of clear interest to identify the asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm$ in the large and small coupling regimes, and in particular show that the asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\alpha}_u^+$ coincides with that of $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-$, the following questions remain. What can we say for a given value of λ ? Can we for example give an explicit expression for $\tilde{\alpha}_u^+$ or $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-$? Can we even show that $\tilde{\alpha}_u^+$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-$ coincide for the given value of λ (and ω)?

We will address these questions in this paper. An explicit description of $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm$ will be given in Theorem 1.6 stated later in this introduction (it will require the trace map formalism, which will be recalled in Subsection 1.4). A particular consequence of the description given there is that the desired identity holds:

Theorem 1.2. *For every $\lambda > 0$, $\tilde{\alpha}_u^+(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-(\lambda)$ are equal and independent of $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.*

The interpretation of this statement is that, for all values of the coupling constant and the phase, the fastest part of the wavepacket travels uniformly on a power-law scale. That is, there aren't two different sequences of time scales along which the "front of the wavepacket" moves at two different power-law rates. To the best of our knowledge this is the first time this phenomenon has been rigorously established for a model for which $\tilde{\alpha}_u^+(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-(\lambda)$ take fractional values. The reason for this is that it is usually very difficult to identify transport exponents exactly (if they take fractional values) and hence most results only establish estimates for them.

1.3. Density of States Measure and Gap Labeling. Let us recall the definition of the density of states measure and some derived quantities. By the spectral theorem, there are Borel probability measures $\mu_{\lambda,\omega}$ on \mathbb{R} such that

$$\langle \delta_0, g(H_{\lambda,\omega})\delta_0 \rangle = \int g(E) d\mu_{\lambda,\omega}(E)$$

for all bounded measurable functions g . The *density of states measure* ν_λ is given by the ω -average of these measures with respect to Lebesgue measure, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \delta_0, g(H_{\lambda,\omega})\delta_0 \rangle d\omega = \int g(E) d\nu_\lambda(E)$$

for all bounded measurable functions g . By general principles, the density of states measure is non-atomic and its topological support is Σ_λ . The fact that Σ_λ has zero Lebesgue measure therefore implies that ν_λ is singular continuous for every $\lambda > 0$. The density of states measure can also be obtained by counting the number of eigenvalues per unit volume, in a given energy region, of restrictions of the operator to finite intervals (which explains the terminology). Indeed, for any real $a < b$,

$$\nu_\lambda(a, b) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \#\{\text{eigenvalues of } H_{\lambda,\omega}|_{[1,L]} \text{ that lie in } (a, b)\},$$

uniformly in ω ; compare [56]. Here, for definiteness, $H_{\lambda,\omega}|_{[1,L]}$ is defined with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

We will be interested in the optimal Hölder exponent γ_λ of ν_λ . That is, γ_λ is the unique number in $[0, 1]$ such that the following two properties hold.

- (1) For any $\gamma < \gamma_\lambda$ and any sufficiently small interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have $\nu(I) < |I|^\gamma$;
- (2) For any $\tilde{\gamma} > \gamma_\lambda$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $|I| < \varepsilon$ and $\nu(I) > |I|^{\tilde{\gamma}}$.

The optimal Hölder exponent of the density of states measure is studied for other popular discrete Schrödinger operators in numerous papers; see, for example, [3, 14, 52, 53, 54] and references therein. For the Fibonacci case in the regime of small or large coupling, it was studied in [34]. In particular, it was shown that $\gamma_\lambda \rightarrow 1/2$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma_\lambda \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ (the explicit rate at which it does so is recalled in Theorem 1.10 below). In all these works only estimates and asymptotics for the optimal Hölder exponent were established. In this paper, we will express the optimal Hölder exponent in the Fibonacci case explicitly, for any value of the coupling constant, in terms of dynamical quantities related to the Fibonacci trace map (the explicit formula is provided in Theorem 1.6 below). For small values of the coupling constant λ , this will allow us to give an exact formula for γ_λ as a function of λ ; see Corollary 5.2.

The distribution function of the density of states measure is called the integrated density of states and denoted by N_λ . Thus, for $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$N_\lambda(E) = \int \chi_{(-\infty, E]} d\nu_\lambda = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \#\{\text{eigenvalues of } H_{\lambda,\omega}|_{[1,L]} \text{ that are } \leq E\},$$

uniformly in ω .

Since Σ_λ is the topological support of ν_λ , it follows that N_λ is constant on each gap of Σ_λ , where any connected component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \Sigma_\lambda$ is called a gap of Σ_λ . This value may be used as the label of the gap in question. The gap labeling theorem (see, e.g.,

[11, 62]) provides a set that is defined purely in terms of the underlying dynamical system generating the ergodic family of potentials in question (in our case this is either the irrational rotation of the circle by the (inverse of the) golden ratio, or the shift transformation on the subshift generated by the Fibonacci substitution), to which all gap labels must belong. This general gap labeling theorem specializes in the Fibonacci case to the following statement (see, e.g., [12, Eq. (6.7)]):

$$(4) \quad \{N_\lambda(E) : E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Sigma_\lambda\} \subseteq \{\{m\varphi\} : m \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{1\}$$

for every $\lambda > 0$. Here $\{m\varphi\}$ denotes the fractional part of $m\varphi$, that is, $\{m\varphi\} = m\varphi - \lfloor m\varphi \rfloor$. Notice that the set of possible gap labels is indeed λ -independent and only depends on the value of φ from the underlying circle rotation. Since φ is irrational, the set of gap labels is dense.

In general, a dense set of possible gap labels is indicative of a Cantor spectrum and hence a common (and attractive) stronger version of proving Cantor spectrum is to show that the operator “has all its gaps open.” For example, the Ten Martini Problem for the almost Mathieu operator is to show Cantor spectrum, while the Dry Ten Martini Problem is to show that all labels correspond to gaps in the spectrum. The former problem has been completely solved [2], while the latter has not yet been completely settled (it remains open for the case of critical coupling and non-Liouville frequency; see [2, 4, 21] and references therein). Indeed, it is in general a hard problem to show that all labels given by the gap labeling theorem correspond to gaps and there are only few results of this kind.

Here we show the stronger (or “dry”) form of Cantor spectrum for the Fibonacci Hamiltonian and establish complete gap labeling:

Theorem 1.3. *For every $\lambda > 0$, all gaps allowed by the gap labeling theorem are open. That is,*

$$(5) \quad \{N_\lambda(E) : E \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Sigma_\lambda\} = \{\{m\varphi\} : m \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{1\}.$$

Raymond proved (5) for $\lambda > 4$ [85] and Damanik and Gorodetski proved (5) for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small [32]. In [32] it was also shown that all gaps open linearly as the coupling constant is turned on. It was conjectured in [32] that (5) holds for every $\lambda > 0$, and Theorem 1.3 proves this conjecture.

Our next result concerns the exact-dimensionality of the density of states measure for every value of the coupling constant.

Theorem 1.4. *For every $\lambda > 0$, the density of states measure ν_λ is exact-dimensional. Namely, for every $\lambda > 0$, the limit (called the scaling exponent of ν_λ at E)*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\log \nu_\lambda(E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon)}{\log \varepsilon}$$

ν_λ -almost everywhere exists and is constant.

In [33] Damanik and Gorodetski had shown the exact-dimensionality of ν_λ for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small. A particular consequence of the exact-dimensionality of ν_λ is that virtually all the known characteristics of dimension type of the measure coincide. In particular, the following four dimensions associated with the measure ν_λ , those most relevant to quantum dynamics, coincide (namely with the almost

everywhere value of the limit above):

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_H \nu_\lambda &= \inf\{\dim_H(S) : \nu_\lambda(S) = 1\}, \\ \dim_H^- \nu_\lambda &= \inf\{\dim_H(S) : \nu_\lambda(S) > 0\}, \\ \dim_P \nu_\lambda &= \inf\{\dim_P(S) : \nu_\lambda(S) = 1\}, \\ \dim_P^- \nu_\lambda &= \inf\{\dim_P(S) : \nu_\lambda(S) > 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\dim_P(S)$ denotes the packing dimension of the Borel set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$. These four dimensions are called the upper and lower Hausdorff dimension and the upper and lower packing dimension of ν_λ , respectively; compare; for example, [51].

1.4. Trace Map Dynamics and Transversality. There is a fundamental connection between the spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian and the dynamics of the *trace map*

$$(6) \quad T : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad T(x, y, z) = (2xy - z, x, y).$$

The function $G(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xyz - 1$ is invariant² under the action of T , and hence T preserves the family of cubic surfaces³

$$(7) \quad S_\lambda = \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xyz = 1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{4} \right\}.$$

It is therefore natural to consider the restriction T_λ of the trace map T to the invariant surface S_λ . That is, $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$, $T_\lambda = T|_{S_\lambda}$. We denote by Λ_λ the set of points in S_λ whose full orbits under T_λ are bounded (it is known that Λ_λ is equal to the non-wandering set of T_λ ; see).

Denote by ℓ_λ the line

$$(8) \quad \ell_\lambda = \left\{ \left(\frac{E - \lambda}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1 \right) : E \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that $\ell_\lambda \subset S_\lambda$. The key to the fundamental connection between the spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian and the dynamics of the trace map is the following result of Sütő [97]. An energy $E \in \mathbb{R}$ belongs to the spectrum Σ_λ of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian if and only if the positive semiorbit of the point $(\frac{E-\lambda}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1)$ under iterates of the trace map T is bounded. This connection shows that spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian can be studied via an analysis of the dynamics of the trace map.

Another very important ingredient is the following. For every $\lambda > 0$, Λ_λ is a locally maximal compact transitive hyperbolic set of $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$; see [18, 20, 31]. This fact allows one to use powerful tools from hyperbolic dynamics in exploring the connection between the operator and the trace map. Actually, this realization is the driving force behind all of the recent advances (roughly those dating back to 2008, starting with [29]). To fully exploit this, one needs that the stable manifolds of points in Λ_λ intersect the line of initial conditions, ℓ_λ , transversally. This crucial fact was known for λ sufficiently large [20] or sufficiently small [31], but open in the intermediate regime. As a consequence, many of the recent results could only be shown in the regimes of small and large coupling.

Theorem 1.5. *For every $\lambda > 0$, ℓ_λ intersects $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda)$ transversally.*

²It is usually called the Fricke-Vogt invariant.

³The surface S_0 is known as Cayley cubic.

Here, ℓ_λ denotes the line of initial conditions given in (8) and $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda)$ denotes the collection of stable manifold of points in the locally maximal compact transitive hyperbolic set Λ_λ of $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$.

Theorems 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 are consequences of Theorem 1.5. In fact, each of the statements in Theorems 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 was previously known for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small [31, 32, 33]; but more precisely, these statements were shown in each case to hold for all values of the coupling constant between zero and the specific value where a breakdown of transversality first occurs (or ∞ if no such value exists). Since transversality is easily seen to hold for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small [31], one could derive the desired statements unconditionally in the small coupling regime. For this reason, proving the absence of a breakdown of transversality had been one of the major goals in the study of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian, and Theorem 1.5 finally accomplishes this goal.

It is interesting to note that the proof of Theorem 1.5 is not a straightforward construction of an invariant cone field but rather uses the fact that the trace map is polynomial as well as spectral arguments (the fact that Σ_λ does not have isolated points).

1.5. Connections between Spectral Characteristics and Dynamical Quantities. Recall that we are primarily interested in the following four quantities associated with the Fibonacci Hamiltonian: the upper transport exponents $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$, the dimension of the spectrum $\dim_H \Sigma_\lambda$, the dimension of the density of states measure $\dim_H \nu_\lambda$, and the optimal Hölder exponent of the integrated density of states γ_λ . Our next main result establishes explicit identities connecting the four spectral/quantum dynamical quantities of interest with dynamical quantities associated with the trace map. In this theorem, $\mu_{\lambda, \max}$ denotes the measure of maximal entropy of $T_\lambda|_{\Lambda_\lambda}$ and μ_λ denotes the equilibrium measure of $T_\lambda|_{\Lambda_\lambda}$ that corresponds to the potential $-\dim_H \Sigma_\lambda \cdot \log \|DT_\lambda|_{E^u}\|$. Recall from (2) that φ denotes the golden ratio.

Theorem 1.6. *For every $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$(9) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda) = \frac{\log \varphi}{\inf_{p \in \text{Per}(T_\lambda)} \text{Lyp}^u(p)},$$

$$(10) \quad \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda = \frac{h_{\mu_\lambda}}{\text{Lyp}^u \mu_\lambda},$$

$$(11) \quad \dim_H \nu_\lambda = \dim_H \mu_{\lambda, \max} = \frac{h_{\text{top}}(T_\lambda)}{\text{Lyp}^u \mu_{\lambda, \max}} = \frac{\log \varphi}{\text{Lyp}^u \mu_{\lambda, \max}},$$

$$(12) \quad \gamma_\lambda = \frac{\log \varphi}{\sup_{p \in \text{Per}(T_\lambda)} \text{Lyp}^u(p)}.$$

As mentioned earlier, Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of (9). Another consequence of (9) is that we can derive explicit lower bounds for $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ by simply estimating $\inf_{p \in \text{Per}(T_\lambda)} \text{Lyp}^u(p)$ from above using specific choices of periodic points. By the same token, these specific choices of periodic points will also lead to upper bounds for γ_λ due to (12). For example, this leads to the following pair of explicit lower and upper bounds (the period p of the periodic point leading to this bound is given in parentheses).




FIGURE 1. The two bounds for $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ and γ_λ from Corollary 1.7.

Corollary 1.7. *For every $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$(13) \quad \gamma_\lambda \leq \frac{4 \log \varphi}{\log(4\lambda^2 + \sqrt{16\lambda^4 + 56\lambda^2 + 45} + 7) - \log 2} \leq \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda) \quad (p = 6)$$

$$(14) \quad \gamma_\lambda \leq \frac{6 \log \varphi}{\log(\lambda^4 + \sqrt{(\lambda^4 + 8\lambda^2 + 18)^2 - 4 + 8\lambda^2 + 18}) - \log 2} \leq \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda) \quad (p = 4)$$

The graphs of these two functions are shown in Figure 1. We see that for $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$, (13) is better for small λ , while (14) is better for large λ , whereas the opposite is true for γ_λ .

In fact, a better upper bound for γ_λ can be derived via a different family of periodic points (of period two). The associated Lyapunov exponents can also be given explicitly; for the corresponding expression, see Corollary 5.2. The upper bounds resulting from the Lyapunov exponents of the families of period two (left implicit here) and period six (given above) are given in Figure 2.

1.6. Thermodynamical Formalism and Relations between Spectral Characteristics. By general principles, we have

$$\gamma_\lambda \leq \dim_H \nu_\lambda \leq \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda.$$

This is obvious since Σ_λ supports the measure ν_λ , and the almost everywhere scaling exponent of ν_λ is at least as big as one that works at every point. On the other hand, there is no inequality that relates $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ to one of the other three quantities, which holds for general operators.⁴ The following theorem shows that for the Fibonacci Hamiltonian and every value of the coupling constant, the four quantities satisfy strict inequalities.

Theorem 1.8. *For every $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$(15) \quad \gamma_\lambda < \dim_H \nu_\lambda < \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda < \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda).$$

⁴For example, in our case at hand it turns out that $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ is strictly larger than the other three quantities, while for random potentials, $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ is strictly smaller than each of them.




FIGURE 2. Upper bounds for γ_λ via periodic points of period 2 and 6.

The particular inequality $\dim_H \nu_\lambda < \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda$ in (15) establishes a conjecture of Barry Simon, which was made based on an analogy with work of Makarov and Volberg [73, 74, 99]; see [33] for a more detailed discussion. This inequality was shown in [33] for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, and hence the conjecture had been partially established there. Our result here settles it in the generality in which it was stated.⁵

The inequality

$$(16) \quad \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda < \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$$

in (15) is related to a question of Yoram Last. He asked in [68] whether in general $\dim_H \Sigma_\lambda$ bounds $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ from above and conjectured that the answer is no. The inequality (16) confirms this. This realization is not new. It was shown in [45] (resp., [35]) that (16) holds for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently large (resp., for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small). What we add here is that it holds for all $\lambda > 0$.

The identities in Theorem 1.6 are instrumental in our proof of Theorem 1.8. Indeed, once the identities (9)–(12) are established, Theorem 1.8 can be proved using the thermodynamic formalism, which we will describe next. Define $\phi : \Lambda_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi(x) = -\log \|DT_\lambda(x)|_{E^u}\|$ and consider the pressure function (sometimes called the Bowen function) $P : t \mapsto P(t\phi)$, where $P(\psi)$ is the topological pressure.⁶ This function has been heavily studied; the next statement summarizes some known results; compare [16, 65, 84, 88, 100, 101].

Proposition 1.9. *Suppose that $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ is a topological Markov chain defined by a transitive 0–1 matrix A , and $\phi : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Hölder continuous function. Then, the following statements hold.*

$$(1) \text{ Variational principle: } P(t\phi) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \{h_\mu + t \int \phi d\mu\}.$$

⁵The conjecture does not appear anywhere in print, but it was popularized by Barry Simon in many talks given by him in the past four years.

⁶There are many classical books on the thermodynamical formalism; for example, [16, 88, 100]. We also refer the reader to the recent introductory texts [8, 58, 89].

- (2) For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique invariant measure $\mu_t \in \mathfrak{M}$ (the equilibrium state) such that $P(t\phi) = h_{\mu_t} + t \int \phi d\mu_t$.
- (3) $P(t\phi)$ is a real analytic function of t .
- (4) If ϕ is cohomological to a constant, then $P(t\phi)$ is a linear function; if ϕ is not cohomological to a constant, then $P(t\phi)$ is strictly convex and decreasing.
- (5) For every $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the line $h_{\mu_{t_0}} + t \int \phi d\mu_{t_0}$ is tangent to the graph of the function $P(t\phi)$ at the point $(t_0, P(t_0\phi))$.
- (6) Denote by \mathfrak{M} the space of σ_A -invariant Borel probability measures. The following limits exist:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int \phi d\mu_t = \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \int \phi d\mu_t = \inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu.$$

The graph of the function $t \mapsto P(t\phi)$ lies strictly above each of the lines $t \cdot \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu$ and $t \cdot \inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu$.

Now let us return to our case where $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ is conjugate to $T_\lambda|_{\Lambda_\lambda}$ and the potential is given by $\phi(x) = -\log \|DT_\lambda(x)|_{E^u}\|$ (suppressing the conjugacy). In Section 6 we prove that this potential is not cohomological to a constant. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the tangent line to the graph of $P(t)$ at the point $(t, P(t\phi))$. Since $P(t)$ is decreasing, there exists exactly one point of intersection of the tangent line with the t -axis, at the point $t_0 = -\frac{h_{\mu_t}}{\int \phi d\mu} = \frac{h_{\mu_t}}{Lyap^u \mu_t} = \dim_H \mu_t$. The last equality here is due to [75]. In particular, $\dim_H \mu_{\max} = \dim_H \nu_\lambda$ is given by the point of intersection of the tangent line to the graph of $P(t)$ at the point $(0, h_{\text{top}}(T_\lambda))$ with the t -axis. Also, due to Theorem 1.6 the line $h_{\text{top}}(T_\lambda) + t \cdot \inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu$ intersects the t -axis at the point γ_λ , and the line $h_{\text{top}}(T_\lambda) + t \cdot \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu$ intersects the t -axis at the point $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$. Finally, due to [77], the graph of $P(t)$ intersects the t -axis at the point $\dim_H \Sigma_\lambda$. These observations are illustrated in Figure 3 and explain where the strict inequalities in Theorem 1.8 come from once it is shown that ϕ is not cohomological to a constant (we do that in Section 6).

1.7. Large Coupling Asymptotics. For each of the four quantities in question, the large coupling asymptotics are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.10. *We have*

$$(17) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda) \cdot \log \lambda = 2 \log \varphi,$$

$$(18) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda \cdot \log \lambda = \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) \approx 1.83156 \log \varphi,$$

$$(19) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H \nu_\lambda \cdot \log \lambda = \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{4} \log \varphi \approx 1.80902 \log \varphi,$$

$$(20) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_\lambda \cdot \log \lambda = 1.5 \log \varphi.$$

Only (19) is new here, the other results are stated for completeness and comparison purposes. Indeed, (17) was shown in [44, 45], (18) was shown in [29], and (20) was shown in [34]. Thus, our proof of (19) in this paper completes our understanding of the large coupling asymptotics of the four quantities of interest.

Our results open the door for numerous extensions and generalizations. We briefly discuss some of them in Section 7.




FIGURE 3. Pressure function and spectral characteristics of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian.

2. TRANSVERSALITY

Recall that an invariant closed set Λ of a diffeomorphism $f : M \rightarrow M$ is *hyperbolic* if there exists a splitting of the tangent space $T_x M = E_x^s \oplus E_x^u$ at every point $x \in \Lambda$ such that this splitting is invariant under Df , the differential Df exponentially contracts vectors from the stable subspaces $\{E_x^s\}$, and the differential of the inverse, Df^{-1} , exponentially contracts vectors from the unstable subspaces $\{E_x^u\}$. A hyperbolic set Λ of a diffeomorphism $f : M \rightarrow M$ is *locally maximal* if there exists a neighborhood U of Λ such that

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^n(U).$$

It is known that for $\lambda > 0$, Λ_λ is a locally maximal hyperbolic set of $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$; see [18, 20, 31].

Recall from (8) that we denote the line of initial conditions by ℓ_λ . It is easy to check that $\ell_\lambda \subset S_\lambda$. An energy $E \in \mathbb{R}$ belongs to the spectrum Σ_λ of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian if and only if the positive semiorbit of the point $(\frac{E-\lambda}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1)$ under iterates of the trace map T is bounded; see [97].

It is known that the stable manifolds of points in Λ_λ intersect the line ℓ_λ transversally if $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently small [31] or if $\lambda \geq 16$ [20]. It is also known, based on [10], that if tangential intersections occur in the intermediate regime, they cannot occur at more than finitely many points. This, however, is not sufficient to state uniformly for all values of the coupling constant some of the results that are known to hold in the small and the large coupling regimes. The purpose of this section is to prove that transversality holds for all values of the coupling constant, and some of the immediate consequences; namely, we prove Theorem 1.5, and its consequences – Theorems 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. In what follows, given a curve $\eta : K \rightarrow K^n$, with $K = \mathbb{R}$ or $K = \mathbb{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, η^* denotes the image of the curve.

As we have already mentioned, transversality is known for all $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small. Let us now assume that $\lambda_0 > 0$ is such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, transversality holds, while at λ_0 , $\ell_{\lambda_0} \cap W^s(\Lambda_{\lambda_0})$ contains tangential intersections. From [10] it is known that such tangencies must be isolated; by compactness of $\ell_\lambda \cap W^s(\Lambda_\lambda)$, there is at most a finite number of such tangencies.

Let p be a point of such a tangency and let U be an open neighborhood of p in S_{λ_0} such that all the points of $\ell_{\lambda_0} \cap W^s(\Lambda_{\lambda_0}) \cap U$ except p are transversal. Notice that for each λ , $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and ℓ_λ lie on the surface S_λ . Let us first analytically project the family of laminations $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and curves ℓ_λ , onto S_{λ_0} , which will include, respectively, the lamination $W^s(\Lambda_{\lambda_0})$ and the line ℓ_{λ_0} .

Let us consider the complexified surfaces $S_{\mathbf{u}}$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$, where \mathcal{U} is a small neighborhood of λ_0 in \mathbb{C} . That is,

$$S_{\mathbf{u}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xyz - 1 = \frac{\mathbf{u}^2}{4} \right\}.$$

Let us write \hat{S}_λ for the complexification of the real surface S_λ .

By the complex-analytic version of the implicit function theorem, there exists a family of biholomorphisms $\pi(\cdot, \mathbf{u}) : S_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow \hat{S}_{\lambda_0}$ in a neighborhood of p in \mathbb{C}^3 such that $\pi(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ is the identity, π depends holomorphically on \mathbf{u} , and for all real \mathbf{u} , $\pi(\cdot, \mathbf{u})$ maps the real part of $S_{\mathbf{u}}$ to S_{λ_0} .

Now let O be an open neighborhood of p in \mathbb{R}^3 and let $U_\lambda = S_\lambda \cap O$. Via $\pi(\cdot, \lambda)$, $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda) \cap U_\lambda$ is smoothly projected into U_{λ_0} . Let us denote the resulting laminations by \mathcal{F}_λ , and the lamination $W^s(\Lambda_{\lambda_0}) \cap U_{\lambda_0}$ by \mathcal{F}_{λ_0} . By abuse of notation, let us denote the projection of ℓ_λ via $\pi(\cdot, \lambda)$ by the same symbol, ℓ_λ .

Notice that the laminations \mathcal{F}_λ consist of real-analytic leaves (see [9, Section 5]), and can be included into a $C^{1+\epsilon}$ invariant foliation. Let κ be a parameter in the space of leaves of this foliation, such that the leaves of \mathcal{F}_λ depend continuously on κ in the C^2 topology. Moreover, each leaf of \mathcal{F}_λ has a canonical continuation in λ that depends holomorphically on λ (for further details, see [17, Section 2]).

Let us denote by $\phi_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ the leaves of \mathcal{F}_λ . By $\phi_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)} \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_0}$ we denote the leaf that admits the tangency with ℓ_{λ_0} at p . We will verify that the laminations \mathcal{F}_λ satisfy the following properties.

- (i) *The leaves $\phi_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ as well as ℓ_λ admit holomorphic continuations, $\hat{\phi}_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ and $\hat{\ell}_\lambda$, respectively, in such a way that for all λ , all intersections between $\hat{\ell}_\lambda$ and $\hat{\phi}_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ are real.*
- (ii) *For every λ in a neighborhood of λ_0 , the lamination \mathcal{F}_λ is locally homeomorphic to a product of an interval by a Cantor set.*
- (iii) *Let γ be a transversal to the lamination \mathcal{F}_λ . For all κ_1, κ_2 , there exists $\Delta(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) > 0$ such that for all λ sufficiently close to λ_0 and the leaves $\phi_\lambda^{(\kappa_1)}, \phi_\lambda^{(\kappa_2)}$ in \mathcal{F}_λ , the distance along γ between $\gamma \cap \phi_\lambda^{(\kappa_1)}$ and $\gamma \cap \phi_\lambda^{(\kappa_2)}$ is not smaller than Δ .*

Verification of (i). The curves ℓ_λ are complexified in a natural way (i.e. first complexify the original line of initial conditions, ℓ_λ , before projection by $\pi(\cdot, \lambda)$, and then project). As for the leaves of the foliation: it is known that stable manifolds

admit a suitable complexification as complex submanifolds of the complexified invariant surface \hat{S}_λ (see [9]).

To verify that all intersections should be real, we appeal to the argument given by Sütő in [97]: an energy E belongs to the spectrum if and only if the forward orbit of the corresponding point on the line of initial conditions is bounded under the trace map. In fact, we only need the implication one way: boundedness of the forward orbit implies inclusion in the spectrum. Sütő considered only real values for the energy (the parameter of the line of initial conditions), since the spectrum is real. But the same argument applies verbatim to complex-valued energies.

On the other hand, a point has a bounded forward orbit if and only if it belongs to a stable manifold of Λ_λ (this is known and has been used since Casdagli's work [20]; an explicit proof was given in [39, Corollary 2.5], see also [78]). Since the spectrum is real and the (complexified) line of initial conditions maps \mathbb{R} into the real subspace of the invariant surface, all intersection points must be real. Now use the fact that π preserves the real subspace. \square

Verification of (ii). This holds since the nonwandering set Λ_λ for the trace map restricted to S_λ , $\lambda > 0$, is a hyperbolic horseshoe (see [18, 20, 31]). \square

Verification of (iii). This follows from a compactness argument (the lamination depends continuously on λ ; restrict λ to some compact interval around λ_0 , and note that, by definition, no two distinct leaves of the lamination \mathcal{F}_{λ_0} intersect). \square

We will need the following simple lemma, stated here without proof, that could be derived from, for example, [57, Theorem 1.14].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $\phi, \ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ are real-analytic, admitting complex-analytic continuations $\hat{\phi}, \hat{\ell} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, such that $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\ell}$ are injective immersions. Suppose further that at some $p \in \mathbb{C}$, $\hat{\phi}^*$ is tangent to $\hat{\ell}^*$ at p and this tangency is isolated. Then there exists an open neighborhood U of p in \mathbb{C}^2 and a biholomorphism $\zeta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2 = \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$ with \mathbb{D} being the unit disc centered at the origin in \mathbb{C} , with the following properties.*

- (1) $\zeta(p) = (0, 0)$.
- (2) $\zeta(\Re(U)) \subseteq \Re(\mathbb{D}^2)$.
- (3) ζ maps the connected component of $\hat{\ell}^* \cap U$ that contains p onto \mathbb{D} .
- (4) There exists a holomorphic function $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that the image of the connect component of $\hat{\phi}^* \cap U$ that contains p is the graph of f .

We will consider separately the case when the tangency at p is quadratic, and when it is of higher order.

Lemma 2.2. *If the tangency at p between $\hat{\phi}_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$ and $\hat{\ell}_{\lambda_0}$ is of order greater than two, then there exists $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$ such that ℓ_λ contains a point of tangency with some leaf of the lamination \mathcal{F}_λ .*

Proof. Let us assume that the tangency at p between $\hat{\phi}_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$ and $\hat{\ell}_{\lambda_0}$ is of order $k > 2$. Let ζ_0 be a rectifying biholomorphism as in Lemma 2.1. Then in a neighborhood of p , ζ_0 maps $\hat{\ell}_{\lambda_0}^*$ onto \mathbb{D} and $\zeta_0(\hat{\phi}_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)})$ is the graph of a holomorphic function over \mathbb{D} . Let us denote this function by $\hat{f}_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$ and its restriction onto \mathbb{R} by $f_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$. Then $f_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$ has a root of multiplicity k at the origin.




FIGURE 4.

Now by holomorphic dependence on λ of each leaf of the family \mathcal{F}_λ , as well as of $\hat{\ell}_\lambda$, we can construct a family of rectifying biholomorphisms $\{\zeta_\lambda\}$ depending holomorphically on λ for every λ sufficiently close to λ_0 with the same properties as ζ_0 (less the tangency).

Thus $\zeta_\lambda(\mathcal{F}_\lambda)$ gives a family of laminations in a neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 , such that for each leaf $\phi_\lambda^{(\kappa)} \in \zeta_\lambda(\mathcal{F}_\lambda)$, $\hat{\phi}_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ is given as the graph of an analytic function $\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ over \mathbb{D} . Notice that the resulting functions $f_\lambda^{(\kappa)}$ depend holomorphically on λ and continuously on κ in the C^2 topology. In particular, $\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)} \rightarrow \hat{f}_{\lambda_0}^{(\kappa_0)}$ uniformly as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$.

Hurwitz's theorem implies that for every λ sufficiently close to λ_0 , $\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ has precisely $k > 2$ zeros (counting multiplicity) in a neighborhood of the origin, and these zeros approach the origin as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$. Since, by our standing assumptions, for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ these zeros form transverse intersections, they all must be simple. Thus when $\lambda < \lambda_0$, there are precisely $k > 2$ distinct zeros of $\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ in a neighborhood of the origin which approach the origin as $\lambda \nearrow \lambda_0$. Furthermore, by our assumptions, these zeros are all real.

Since the biholomorphism ζ_λ maps \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2 , we obtain a family of analytic functions $f_\lambda^{(\kappa)} : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over an open interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \in J$, with the following properties.

Since $k \geq 3$, for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$ and sufficiently close to λ_0 , there exist two non-degenerate compact intervals, $J_\lambda^{(1)}$ and $J_\lambda^{(2)}$ with disjoint interiors, such that the endpoints of each are given by zeros of $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$, on the interior of $J_\lambda^{(1)}$, $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)} < 0$ and on the interior of $J_\lambda^{(2)}$, $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)} > 0$, and $|J_\lambda^{(i)}| \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \nearrow \lambda_0$, $i = 1, 2$.

By continuity, the derivative of $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ is bounded uniformly in λ on the interval J . In particular it follows that if $M_\lambda^{(i)}$ denotes the maximum of $|f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}|$ over $J_\lambda^{(i)}$, then $M_\lambda^{(i)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \nearrow \lambda_0$.

Now fix some $\lambda' < \lambda_0$ sufficiently close to λ_0 as above. There exists α among the parameters κ such that if $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)}$ is the continuation of $f_{\lambda_0}^{(\alpha)}$, then we have the following. By assumption (iii), there exists $\Delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [\lambda', \lambda_0]$, we have $|f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)} - f_\lambda^{(\alpha)}| > \Delta_0$ on the interval $J_\lambda^{(i)}$. Furthermore, there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that for all $\lambda \in [\lambda', \lambda_0)$, either $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ is negative on the interior of $J_\lambda^{(i)}$ and $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)} > f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ on $J_\lambda^{(i)}$, or $f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ is positive on the interior of $J_\lambda^{(i)}$ and $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)} < f_\lambda^{(\kappa_0)}$ on $J_\lambda^{(i)}$. Let us consider the latter case, the former being completely similar.




FIGURE 5.

It follows that there exists $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \in (\lambda', \lambda_0)$ such that for all $\lambda \in [\lambda', \lambda_1)$, the maximum of $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)}$ over $J_\lambda^{(i)}$ is positive and for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_2, \lambda_0)$, the maximum of $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)}$ over $J_\lambda^{(i)}$ is negative. As a result, there exists $\lambda \in (\lambda', \lambda_0)$ such that $f_\lambda^{(\alpha)}$ is nonpositive on $J_\lambda^{(i)}$ and has a zero $q \in J_\lambda^{(i)}$, and hence q is a point of tangency (see Figure 4). \square

We can now apply Lemma 2.2 to conclude that the tangency at p must either be quadratic, or for some $\lambda < \lambda_0$, ℓ_λ intersects \mathcal{F}_λ tangentially at some point. On the other hand, by assumption, tangencies cannot occur for $\lambda < \lambda_0$. Thus the tangency at p must be quadratic.

Assume that we have a quadratic tangency at p between ℓ_{λ_0} and some leaf ϕ_{λ_0} of the Cantor lamination $W^s(\Lambda_{\lambda_0})$. Assume for a moment that the leaf ϕ_{λ_0} is not a

boundary of the lamination. Since for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ the tangency unfolds, it could either unfold as shown in Figure 5 (a)-(b), or as in (c)-(d); in either case, arbitrarily close to ϕ_{λ_0} there exists a leaf of the foliation such that for some $\lambda < \lambda_0$, this leaf intersects the line tangentially.

Assume now that ϕ_{λ_0} is a boundary of the lamination. Since there are no isolated points in the spectrum, in this case we either have an unfolding shown in Figure 5 (e)-(f) or (g)-(h).

If the tangency unfolds as shown in Figure 5 (e)-(f), then as before, arbitrarily close to ϕ_{λ_0} there exists a leaf such that for some $\lambda < \lambda_0$, the intersection of the line with this leaf is tangential.

Now suppose that the tangency unfolds as shown in Figure 5 (g)-(h). In this case the interval along ℓ_λ bounded by the intersection points $\phi_\lambda \cap \ell_\lambda$, as shown in the picture, corresponds to a gap in the spectrum. We know that for all sufficiently small couplings λ , all the gaps allowed by the gap labeling theorem are open (see the discussion preceding the statement of Theorem 1.3). On the other hand, by assumption, for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$, the line ℓ_λ intersects the stable lamination transversally; this allows for continuation of the open gaps from the small coupling regime to all $\lambda < \lambda_0$ with all gaps remaining open; see [32, Theorem 4.3]. In particular, this also guarantees that for any gap in the spectrum at $\lambda < \lambda_0$, its two boundary points correspond to the intersection of ℓ_λ with two stable manifolds of two distinct periodic points (for further details on gap opening, see [32, Section 3]). Thus an intersection of ℓ_λ for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ with a stable manifold cannot form a gap, precluding the unfolding of a tangency as shown in Figure 5 (g)-(h).

This shows that the tangency at p cannot be quadratic. Together with Lemma 2.2, this proves Theorem 1.5. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Given Theorem 1.5, the result follows from [31, Corollary 2] and its proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The result is a consequence of Theorem 1.5 and [32, Theorem 4.3]. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The assertion of the theorem can be obtained from Theorem 1.5 and [33, Theorem 1.1]; compare the discussion in Remark (e) on [33, p. 978] of the role of λ_0 in the formulation of [33, Theorem 1.1]. \square

3. TRANSPORT EXPONENTS

In this section we prove the identity (9). We begin by establishing some results about the dynamics of the trace map.

Proposition 3.1. *For every $\lambda > 0$, all unstable manifolds of $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$ are transversal to the circle $C_\lambda := \{z = 0\} \cap S_\lambda$.*

Proof. We know that for every $\lambda > 0$ and every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the curve $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda)$ has the following properties:

- 1) $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda)$ is transversal to the plane $\{z = c\}$ for any $c \in (-1, 1)$;
- 2) If we consider ℓ_λ as a complex line in \mathbb{C}^3 , then $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda) \cap \{z = 0\}$ consists of F_{k-1} points, and all of them are in the real subspace.

Indeed, both statements follow from standard results in Floquet theory. Namely, the z -component of $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda(E))$ is, as a function of $E \in \mathbb{C}$, equal to one-half times the discriminant of a discrete Schrödinger operator with a periodic potential of period F_{k-1} (see, e.g., [97]).⁷ Thus, the values of E for which $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda(E)) \in \{z = c\}$ are precisely the E 's for which one-half the discriminant takes on the value c . If $c \in (-1, 1)$, then due to, for example, [94, Theorem 5.4.2], there are precisely F_{k-1} many of them, say $E_1, \dots, E_{F_{k-1}}$, and for every $j \in \{1, \dots, F_{k-1}\}$, E_j is real, and the derivative of the discriminant at E_j is non-zero.

It is known that all unstable manifolds of $T_\lambda : S_\lambda \rightarrow S_\lambda$ are transversal to C_λ if λ is sufficiently small. Indeed, this is true for $\lambda = 0$ and extends to small values of λ by continuity. Suppose that Proposition 3.1 does not hold and denote by $\lambda^* > 0$ the smallest value of the coupling constant such that one of the unstable manifolds of T_{λ^*} has a tangency with C_{λ^*} . Notice that this tangency cannot be quadratic. Namely, due to Theorem 1.5 the line ℓ_λ is transversal to the stable manifolds of T_{λ^*} , and therefore for any sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the curve $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*})$ contains an arc that is C^2 -close to an arc of the unstable manifold near the point of tangency. But in this case this arc would have a point of quadratic tangency with a plane $\{z = \varepsilon\}$ for some small ε , and this contradicts the properties of the curve $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*})$ above.

Therefore the tangency between $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*})$ and C_{λ^*} must be of order $m > 2$. There exists a (complex) neighborhood $U \subset S_{\lambda^*}$ of the point of tangency and a biholomorphic change of coordinates $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$, where \mathbb{D} is a unit disc in \mathbb{C} , such that $F(U \cap \{z = 0\}) = \mathbb{D} \times \{0\}$, the point of tangency is mapped into 0, and the arc of the unstable manifold in U is mapped into the graph of a holomorphic function $g : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $g(0) = 0$ is a zero of order $m > 2$. A holomorphic version of the Inclination Lemma (which follows, for example, from the graph transform construction from [57, Lemma 7.5]) implies that for each sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there is a connected component of the intersection $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*}) \cap U$ such that its image under F is a graph of a holomorphic function $f_k : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $f_k \rightrightarrows g$. Due to the Hurwitz Theorem, for all large $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, the function f_k must have $m > 2$ zeros in \mathbb{D} , and due to the properties of $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*})$, all these zeros must be simple and real. But this once again leads to the existence of a tangency between the curve $T_{\lambda^*}^k(\ell_{\lambda^*})$ and the plane $\{z = \varepsilon\}$ for some small ε (due to the same arguments that were used in the proof of Lemma 2.2 above), which is a contradiction. \square

For $E \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define $x_k(E)$ by

$$T^k \left(\frac{E - \lambda}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1 \right) = T^k(\ell_\lambda(E)) = (x_{k+1}(E), x_k(E), x_{k-1}(E)).$$

Then, for $k \geq 0$, x_k is a polynomial of degree F_k , where $F_0 = F_1 = 1$, $F_{k+1} = F_k + F_{k-1}$, $k \geq 1$. For $\delta > 0$, set

$$\sigma_k^\delta = \{E \in \mathbb{C} : |x_k(E)| \leq 1 + \delta\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For every $\lambda > 0$, there exists $\delta(\lambda) > 0$ such that for every $\delta \in [0, \delta(\lambda))$ and every $k \geq 0$, σ_k^δ has precisely F_k connected components. Denote these connected components by $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$, $j = 1, \dots, F_k$. Each $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$ is symmetric about the real*

⁷In the theory of periodic Schrödinger operators, the discriminant is the trace of the transfer matrix over one period.

line, intersects \mathbb{R} in a compact non-degenerate interval, and contains precisely one $E_k^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_k(E_k^{(j)}) = 0$.

Remark 3.3. (a) We will choose a consistent labeling, namely the one which ensures that $B_k^{(j)}(\delta) \cap \mathbb{R}$ lies to the left of $B_k^{(j')}(\delta) \cap \mathbb{R}$ if $j < j'$. In particular, we have $E_k^{(1)} < E_k^{(2)} < \dots < E_k^{(F_k)}$.

(b) Clearly, the zero $E_k^{(j)}$ does not depend on $\delta \in [0, \delta(\lambda))$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Since the coefficients of the polynomial x_k are real, we have $x_k(\bar{E}) = \overline{x_k(E)}$, and hence in particular $|x_k(\bar{E})| = |x_k(E)|$. This shows that σ_k^δ , and hence each of its connected components, is symmetric about the real line.

Recall that the free spectrum Σ_0 is equal to the interval $[-2, 2]$, which corresponds to the line segment

$$\ell_0^b = \left\{ \left(\frac{E}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1 \right) : E \in [-2, 2] \right\} \subset \ell_0.$$

To study the evolution of ℓ_0^b under the trace map, let us recall the following. The surface

$$\mathbb{S} = S_0 \cap \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| \leq 1, |y| \leq 1, |z| \leq 1\}$$

is homeomorphic to S^2 , invariant under T , smooth everywhere except at the four points $P_1 = (1, 1, 1)$, $P_2 = (-1, -1, 1)$, $P_3 = (1, -1, -1)$, and $P_4 = (-1, 1, -1)$, where \mathbb{S} has conic singularities, and the trace map T restricted to \mathbb{S} is a factor of the hyperbolic automorphism of $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ given by

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{A}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\theta_1 + \theta_2, \theta_1) \pmod{1}.$$

The semi-conjugacy is given by the map

$$(22) \quad F : (\theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto (\cos 2\pi(\theta_1 + \theta_2), \cos 2\pi\theta_1, \cos 2\pi\theta_2).$$

The map \mathcal{A} is hyperbolic, and is given by the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

From the explicit form (22) of the semi-conjugacy F , we see that

$$\tilde{\ell}_0^b = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : \theta_2 = 0, \theta_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]\} \subset \mathbb{T}^2$$

is mapped by F onto ℓ_0^b . Since $T^k(\ell_0^b) = F(A^k(\tilde{\ell}_0^b))$ and $A^k(\tilde{\ell}_0^b)$ is the line segment from

$$A^k \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

to

$$A^k \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} F_k \\ F_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

(modulo \mathbb{Z}^2), we see that $T^k(\ell_0^b)$ wraps $F_k/2$ times around \mathbb{S} . Now turn on λ . Since the surfaces S_λ and the lines of initial conditions ℓ_λ change continuously, $T^k(\ell_\lambda^b)$ still wraps $F_k/2$ times around the central part of S_λ . Here, ℓ_λ^b is the line segment on ℓ_λ that corresponds to the convex hull of Σ_λ via the map $E \mapsto (\frac{E-\lambda}{2}, \frac{E}{2}, 1)$. Moreover, the extremal values reached during each turn-around (of the second coordinate, say) are now at least $1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{4}$ in absolute value. This implies that (again considering the second coordinate, say, which determines $x_k(E)$) the value of $x_k(E)$ runs at least from $-1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{4}$ to $1 + \frac{\lambda^2}{4}$ and vice versa. In particular, for every $\delta \in (0, \frac{\lambda^2}{4})$, the preimage of $[-1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ under x_k consists of precisely F_k compact mutually

disjoint intervals. This shows that $\sigma_k^\delta \cap \mathbb{R}$ has exactly F_k connected components, each of which contains precisely one zero of x_k . Let us denote these F_k real zeros of x_k by $E_k^{(1)} < E_k^{(2)} < \dots < E_k^{(F_k)}$.

Let us argue that each $E_k^{(j)}$ is also the only zero of x_k in the complex connected component $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$ of σ_k^δ , which contains the real connected component that contains $E_k^{(j)}$. Suppose this fails. Since σ_k^δ is symmetric with respect to the reflection about the real axis, we can infer that if $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$ contains another zero of x_k , and hence another connected component of $\sigma_k^\delta \cap \mathbb{R}$, we find that the boundary of this connected component, on which x_k has constant modulus $1 + \delta$, contains a closed curve that bounds a bounded region containing points at which x_k has modulus strictly larger than $1 + \delta$ (e.g., points on the real line strictly between the two connected components of $\sigma_k^\delta \cap \mathbb{R}$ in question). Thus, we obtain a contradiction due to the maximum modulus principle. It follows that σ_k^δ , too, has precisely F_k connected components, each of which contains precisely one root of x_k , which is real. \square

Proposition 3.4. *For every $\lambda > 0$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that for every $k > k_0$ and every $p \in \Lambda_\lambda$, there exists $E_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_k(E_k) = 0$ and*

$$\frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| - \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{k} \log |x'_k(E_k)| \leq \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Denote as before $C_\lambda = \{z = 0\} \cap S_\lambda$. Fix a small $\delta > 0$. Then there exists $k' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $T^{k'}(W_\delta^u(p)) \cap C_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ and $T^{-k'}(W_\delta^s(p)) \cap \ell_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ for any $p \in \Lambda_\lambda$. Choose any $p \in \Lambda_\lambda$ and pick any point $\tilde{p} \in T^{-k'}(W_\delta^s(p)) \cap \ell_\lambda$. Let $\tau \subset \ell_\lambda$ be an interval that contains \tilde{p} and such that $T^{k'}(\tau)$ is a connected component of $T^{k'}(\ell_\lambda) \cap U_\delta(p)$. We will denote $\tau_{k'} = T^{k'}(\tau)$ and $\tau_{k'+n} = U_\delta(T^n(p)) \cap T(\tau_{k'+n-1})$ for $n \geq 1$.

Let k be sufficiently large, set $n = k - 2k'$. Then $T^{k'}(\tau_{k'+n})$ must have some intersections with C_λ . Take any point $p^{**} \in C_\lambda \cap T^{k'}(\tau_{k'+n})$. Then, $p^* := T^{-k}(p^{**}) \in \ell_\lambda$, so $p^* = \ell_\lambda(E_k)$ for some $E_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Let us estimate $\log |x'_k(E_k)|$. Since $W^u(\Lambda_\lambda)$ is transversal to C_λ by Proposition 3.1, and $T^{k'}(\tau_{k'+n})$ is C^1 -close to $T^{k'}(W_\delta^u(T^n(p)))$,

$$\left| \log |x'_k(E_k)| - \log \|DT^k(p^*)|_{\ell_\lambda}\| \right| < C_1,$$

where C_1 is some constant independent of k . On the other hand,

$$\left| \log \|DT^k(p^*)|_{\ell_\lambda}\| - \log \|DT^n(T^{k'}(p^*))|_{\tau_{k'}}\| \right| < C_2,$$

where C_2 is also independent of k . Using [64, Proposition 6.4.16] and the fact that $\tau_{k'+j}$ is C^1 -close to $W_\delta^u(T^j(\tau_{k'}))$ (see [79]) we conclude that

$$\left| \log \|DT^n(T^{k'}(p^*))|_{\tau_{k'}}\| - \log \|DT^n(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \right| < C_3,$$

also with a k -independent constant C_3 . But this implies that for large enough $k = n + 2k'$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{k} \log |x'_k(E_k)| - \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \right| < \varepsilon.$$

\square

Proposition 3.5. *For every $\lambda > 0$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $k > k_0$ and every $E_k \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x_k(E_k) = 0$, one can find $p \in \Lambda_\lambda$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| - \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{k} \log |x'_k(E_k)| \leq \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| + \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let us choose a ball $B_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of sufficiently large radius so that $\Lambda_\lambda \subset B_\lambda$, $W^s(\Lambda_\lambda) \cap \ell_\lambda \subset B_\lambda$, and $C_\lambda := \{z = 0\} \cap S_\lambda \subset B_\lambda$. There exist a neighborhood $U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (1) if $x \in B_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{O}^+(x) \cap U(\Lambda_\lambda) = \emptyset$, then $T^n(x) \notin B_\lambda$ for all $n > k_1$;
- (2) if $x \in U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and $T(x) \notin U(\Lambda_\lambda)$, then $\mathcal{O}^+(T(x)) \cap U(\Lambda_\lambda) = \emptyset$;
- (3) $U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ is inside of δ -neighborhood of Λ_λ , where δ small enough so that Anosov Closing Lemma type arguments (more specifically, Proposition 6.4.16 from [64]) can be applied.

Such a neighborhood $U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ can be constructed by taking a union of open rectangles around elements of a Markov partition for Λ_λ so that the usual properties of Markov partitions that allow one to use coding can be applied. Slightly abusing terminology we will refer to those rectangles as the elements of a Markov partition. This will ensure that property (2) holds. Property (1) holds for sufficiently large k_1 since Λ_λ is the set of bounded orbits of the map T_λ . Indeed, $\overline{B_\lambda} \setminus U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ is compact, and if (1) does not hold, one can find a sequence of points in $\overline{B_\lambda} \setminus U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ whose long finite orbits (both positive and negative) are also in that set. Any limit point would have to have a bounded orbit, but this is a contradiction since Λ_λ is the set of bounded orbits of the map T_λ .

Let $k' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be such that $\bigcap_{-k' \leq n \leq k'} T^n(B_\lambda \cap S_\lambda) \subset U(\Lambda_\lambda)$. In this case if $x_k(E_k) = 0$ for $k \gg \max(k_1, k')$, then $T^{k'}(\ell_\lambda(E_k)) \in U_\lambda$, and also $T^n(\ell_\lambda(E_k)) \in U_\lambda$ for $n = k' + 1, \dots, k - k_1$. By the choice of B_λ , we have $C_\lambda \subset B_\lambda$, and since $x_k(E_k) = 0$, we also have $T^k(\ell_\lambda(E_k)) \in C_\lambda \subset B_\lambda$. Set $P = T^{k'}(\ell_\lambda(E_k))$, $T^i(P) \in U(\Lambda_\lambda)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k - k_1 - k'$. Let $\bar{p} \in \Lambda_\lambda$ be any point that has the same symbolic dynamics over the finite time interval of length $k - k_1 - k'$. In other words, \bar{p} is such that $T^i(\bar{p})$ and $T^i(P)$ belong to the same element of the Markov partition of Λ_λ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - k' - k_1$. In this case $\text{dist}(T^i(\bar{p}), T^i(P)) \leq \delta$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - k' - k_1$. This implies (see Proposition 6.4.16 from [64]) that in fact $\text{dist}(T^j(\bar{p}), T^j(P)) \leq C\rho^{\min(j, m-j)}\delta$ for some $\rho < 1$, where $m = k - k' - k_1$ and $0 \leq j \leq m$. Distortion estimates imply now that

$$\left| \log \|DT^m(\bar{p})|_{E_{\bar{p}}^u}\| - \log \|DT^m(P)|_{T^{k'+k_1}(\ell_\lambda)}\| \right| \leq C,$$

where the constant C is independent of m . Take $p = T^{-k'}(\bar{p})$. Then, for some C' independent of m , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| - \log \|DT^m(\bar{p})|_{E_{\bar{p}}^u}\| \right| + \\ & \quad + \left| \log \|DT^k(\ell_\lambda(E_k))|_{\ell_\lambda}\| - \log \|DT^m(P)|_{T^{k'+k_1}(\ell_\lambda)}\| \right| \leq C' \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left| \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| - \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(\ell_\lambda(E_k))|_{\ell_\lambda}\| \right| \leq \frac{(C + C')}{k} \leq \varepsilon$$

if k is sufficiently large. Together with the fact that

$$\left| \log |x'_k(E_k)| - \log \|DT^k(\ell_\lambda(E_k))|_{\ell_\lambda}\| \right| < C_1$$

with C_1 independent of k , this proves Proposition 3.5. \square

Lemma 3.6. *We have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| = \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \text{Lyap}^u(p) = \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p).$$

That is, the limit on the left-hand side exists and equals the other two expressions.

Proof. Notice that we certainly have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \leq \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \text{Lyap}^u(p) \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p).$$

Let us show that

$$(23) \quad A := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \geq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p).$$

Fix an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. There exist $k_j \rightarrow \infty$ and $p_j \in \Lambda_\lambda$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k_j} \log \|DT^{k_j}(p_j)|_{E_{p_j}^u}\| \leq A + \varepsilon.$$

The specification property (see, for example, [64, Theorem 18.3.9]) implies that for any $\delta > 0$, we can find a sequence of periodic orbits $\{q_j\}$ such that

- 1) $T^{k_j+M}(q_j) = q_j$, where $M \in \mathbb{N}$ is independent of $j \in \mathbb{N}$;
- 2) $\text{dist}(T^i(q_j), T^i(p_j)) \leq \delta$ for $i = 0, \dots, k_j - 1$.

Now the quantitative version of the Anosov Closing Lemma (see, e.g., [64, Proposition 6.4.16]) implies that in fact for some $\rho < 1$,

$$\text{dist}(T^i(q_j), T^i(p_j)) \leq C\rho^{\min(i, k_j - i)}\delta.$$

The stable and unstable distributions of a two dimensional horseshoe are C^1 , see [64, Corollary 19.1.11]. Now smoothness of the unstable bundle $\{E_x^u\}_{x \in \Lambda_\lambda}$ allows us to use standard distortion estimates and hence to deduce that

$$\log \|DT^{k_j}(q_j)|_{E_{q_j}^u}\| \leq \log \|DT^{k_j}(p_j)|_{E_{p_j}^u}\| + C',$$

where the constant C' is independent of j . Hence for large enough k_j , we have

$$\text{Lyap}^u(q_j) = \frac{1}{k_j + M} \log \|DT^{k_j+M}(q_j)|_{E_{q_j}^u}\| \leq \frac{1}{k_j} \log \|DT^{k_j}(p_j)|_{E_{p_j}^u}\| + \varepsilon + \frac{C'}{k_j} \leq A + 3\varepsilon.$$

This implies that

$$\inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) \leq A + 3\varepsilon,$$

and since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrary small, we have

$$\inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) \leq A.$$

This completes the proof of the inequality (23).

Now we need to show that

$$(24) \quad B := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p).$$

Once again, fix an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Take a periodic point $p_0 \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)$, $T^m(p_0) = p_0$, such that

$$\text{Lyap}^u(p_0) \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) + \varepsilon.$$

For all sufficiently large k , we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p_0)|_{E_{p_0}^u}\| \leq \text{Lyap}^u(p_0) + \varepsilon \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) + 2\varepsilon,$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \leq \frac{1}{k} \log \|DT^k(p_0)|_{E_{p_0}^u}\| \leq \text{Lyap}^u(p_0) + \varepsilon \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Therefore

$$B = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \inf_{p \in \Lambda_\lambda} \log \|DT^k(p)|_{E_p^u}\| \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p) + 2\varepsilon,$$

and since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have $B \leq \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p)$. Together with (23) this completes the proof of Lemma 3.6. \square

As a direct corollary of Propositions 3.4 and 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 we get the following statement:

Proposition 3.7. *We have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \min_{j=1, \dots, F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})| = \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(\Lambda_\lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p).$$

That is, we have that the limit on the left-hand side exists and that it is equal to the right-hand side.

Recall that we considered above the sets σ_k^δ and their connected components $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$. Define further

$$\begin{aligned} r_k^{(j)}(\delta) &= \sup\{r > 0 : B(E_k^{(j)}, r) \subseteq B_k^{(j)}(\delta)\}, & r_k(\delta) &= \max_{j=1, \dots, F_k} r_k^{(j)}(\delta), \\ R_k^{(j)}(\delta) &= \inf\{R > 0 : B(E_k^{(j)}, R) \supseteq B_k^{(j)}(\delta)\}, & R_k(\delta) &= \max_{j=1, \dots, F_k} R_k^{(j)}(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

The identity (9) will follow from Proposition 3.7 and the following proposition.

Proposition 3.8. (a) *For every $\lambda > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta(\lambda))$, we have*

$$(25) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_u^- \geq \frac{\log \varphi}{\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{r_k(\delta)}}$$

and

$$(26) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_u^+ \leq \frac{\log \varphi}{\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{R_k(\delta)}}.$$

(b) *For every $\lambda > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta(\lambda)/2)$, we have*

$$(27) \quad \frac{1}{R_k(\delta)} \geq \left(\frac{\delta}{(1+\delta)(1+2\delta)} \right)^2 \left(\min_j |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})| \right)$$

and

$$(28) \quad \frac{1}{r_k(\delta)} \leq \frac{(2+3\delta)^2}{(1+\delta)(1+2\delta)^2} \left(\min_j |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})| \right)$$

for every $k \geq 0$.

(c) For $\lambda > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \delta(\lambda)/2)$, we have

$$\tilde{\alpha}_u^- \geq \frac{\log \varphi}{\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \left(\min_{j=1, \dots, F_k} \left| x'_k(E_k^{(j)}) \right| \right)}.$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_u^+ \leq \frac{\log \varphi}{\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \left(\min_{j=1, \dots, F_k} \left| x'_k(E_k^{(j)}) \right| \right)}.$$

Proof. (a) The strategy of proving (25) and (26) is inspired by [35, 44, 45]. The Parseval identity implies (see, e.g., [66, Lemma 3.2])

$$(29) \quad 2\pi \int_0^\infty e^{-2t/T} |\langle \delta_n, e^{-itH} \delta_0 \rangle|^2 dt = \int_{-\infty}^\infty |\langle \delta_n, (H - E - \frac{i}{T})^{-1} \delta_0 \rangle|^2 dE,$$

and hence for the time averaged outside probabilities, defined by

$$(30) \quad \langle P(N, \cdot) \rangle(T) = \frac{2}{T} \int_0^\infty e^{-2t/T} \sum_{|n| \geq N} |\langle \delta_n, e^{-itH} \delta_0 \rangle|^2 dt,$$

we have

$$(31) \quad \langle P(N, \cdot) \rangle(T) = \frac{1}{\pi T} \sum_{|n| \geq N} \int_{-\infty}^\infty |\langle \delta_n, (H - E - \frac{i}{T})^{-1} \delta_0 \rangle|^2 dE.$$

The right-hand side of (31) may be studied by means of transfer matrices at complex energies, which are defined as follows. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we set

$$M(n; \omega, z) = \begin{cases} T(n; \omega, z) \cdots T(1; \omega, z) & n \geq 1, \\ T(n; \omega, z)^{-1} \cdots T(-1; \omega, z)^{-1} & n \leq -1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$T(\ell; \omega, z) = \begin{pmatrix} z - \lambda \chi_{[1-\alpha, 1]}(\ell\alpha + \omega \bmod 1) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The following statement follows from [45, Proposition 2]: For every $\lambda, \delta > 0$, there are constants C, ξ such that for every k , every $z \in \sigma_k^\delta$, and every $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$(32) \quad \|M(n; \omega, z)\| \leq Cn^\xi.$$

for $1 \leq |n| \leq F_k$. Combining ideas from the proof of [45, Proposition 2] and the proof of [32, Theorem 5.1], one can show the following for the exponent ξ in (32). If we denote the largest root of the polynomial $x^3 - (2 + \lambda)x - 1$ by a_λ (note that for small $\lambda > 0$, we have $a_\lambda \approx \varphi + c\lambda$ with a suitable constant c), then for any

$$(33) \quad \xi > 2 \frac{\log[(5 + 2\lambda)^{1/2}(3 + \lambda)a_\lambda]}{\log \varphi},$$

there is a constant C such that (32) holds for $z \in \sigma_k^\delta$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$.

Let us now consider $\lambda > 0$, $\delta \in (0, \delta(\lambda))$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the value of $j \in \{1, \dots, F_k\}$ with $r_k^{(j)}(\delta) = r_k(\delta)$. By definition, $E_k^{(j)}$ is the only zero of x_k in $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$.

For $\rho > 0$ arbitrary, consider

$$(34) \quad s = \frac{\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{r_k(\delta)}}{\log \varphi} + \rho.$$

Clearly, s is strictly positive. By definition of s , for suitably chosen $C_\delta > 0$, we have

$$(35) \quad C_\delta F_k^s \geq \frac{2}{r_k(\delta)}$$

for every $k \geq 0$.

Take $N = F_k$ and consider $T \geq C_\delta N^s$ (which in turn implies $T \geq \frac{2}{r_k(\delta)}$ by (35)). Due to the Parseval formula (29), we can bound the time-averaged outside probabilities from below as follows,

$$(36) \quad \langle P(N, \cdot) \rangle(T) \gtrsim \frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\max \{ \|M(N; \omega, E + i/T)\|, \|M(-N; \omega, E + i/T)\| \})^{-2} dE.$$

See, for example, the proof of [42, Theorem 1] for an explicit derivation of (36) from (29).

To bound the integral from below, we integrate only over those $E \in (E_k^{(j)} - r_k(\delta), E_k^{(j)} + r_k(\delta))$ for which $E + i/T \in B(E_k^{(j)}, r_k(\delta)) \subset B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$. Since $\frac{1}{T} \leq \frac{r_k(\delta)}{2}$, the length of such an interval I_k is larger than $cr_k(\delta)$ for some suitable $c > 0$. For $E \in I_k$, we have

$$\|M(N; \omega, E + i\varepsilon)\| \lesssim N^\xi \lesssim T^{\frac{\xi}{s}}.$$

Therefore, (36) together with (32) gives

$$(37) \quad \langle P(N, \cdot) \rangle(T) \gtrsim \frac{r_k}{T} T^{-\frac{2\xi}{s}} \gtrsim T^{-2-\frac{2\xi}{s}},$$

where $N = F_k$, $T \geq C_\delta N^s$, for any $k \geq k_0$.

Now let us take any sufficiently large T and choose k maximal with $C_\delta F_k^s \leq T$. Then,

$$C_\delta F_k^s \leq T < C_\delta F_{k+1}^s \leq 2^s C_\delta F_k^s.$$

It follows from (37) that

$$\left\langle P \left(\frac{1}{2C_\delta^{1/s}} T^{\frac{1}{s}}, \cdot \right) \right\rangle(T) \geq \langle P(F_k, \cdot) \rangle(T) \gtrsim T^{-2-\frac{2\xi}{s}}$$

for all sufficiently large T . It follows from the definition of $\tilde{\beta}^-(p)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_u^-$ that

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\delta_0}^-(p) \geq \frac{1}{s} - \frac{2}{p} \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{s} \right)$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_u^- \geq \frac{1}{s} = \left(\frac{\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{r_k(\delta)}}{\log \varphi} + \rho \right)^{-1},$$

by (34). Since $\rho > 0$ can be taken arbitrarily small, this proves (25).

Let us recall [44, Lemma 4]: Given any $\delta > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{C}$, a necessary and sufficient condition for $\{x_k(E)\}_{k \geq -1}$ to be unbounded is that

$$(38) \quad |x_{K-1}(E)| \leq 1 + \delta, \quad |x_K(E)| > 1 + \delta, \quad |x_{K+1}(E)| > 1 + \delta$$

for some $K \geq 0$. This K is unique. Moreover, in this case we have

$$(39) \quad |x_{K+k}(E)| \geq (1 + \delta)^{F_k} \text{ for } k \geq 0.$$

By definition of $R_k(\delta)$, we have

$$\sigma_k^\delta \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im} z| \leq R_k(\delta)\}.$$

We set

$$(40) \quad s' = \frac{\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{R_k(\delta)}}{\log \varphi} - \rho'$$

for $\rho' > 0$ small enough so that $s' > 0$ (Proposition 3.7 shows that it is possible to find such a ρ' since the right-hand side in that proposition is positive as Λ_λ is a hyperbolic set), and then choose some suitable $C'_\delta > 0$, so that we have

$$R_k(\delta) < C'_\delta F_k^{-s'},$$

for every $k \geq 0$. In particular,

$$(41) \quad \sigma_k^\delta \cup \sigma_{k+1}^\delta \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im} z| < C'_\delta F_k^{-s'}\}.$$

For each $\varepsilon = \operatorname{Im} z > 0$, one obtains lower bounds on $|x_k(E + i\varepsilon)|$ which are uniform for $E \in [-K, K] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Namely, given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose k minimal with the property $C'_\delta F_k^{-s'} < \varepsilon$. By (41), we infer that $|x_k(E + i\varepsilon)| > 1 + \delta$ and $|x_{k+1}(E + i\varepsilon)| > 1 + \delta$. Since $|x_{-1}(E + i\varepsilon)| = 1 \leq 1 + \delta$, we must have the situation of [44, Lemma 4] (as recalled above) for some $K \leq k$. In particular, for $k' > k$, (39) shows that

$$|x_{k'}(E + i\varepsilon)| \geq (1 + \delta)^{F_{k'} - k}.$$

This motivates the following definitions. Fix some small $\delta > 0$. For $T > 1$, denote by $k(T)$ the unique integer with

$$\frac{F_{k(T)-1}^{s'}}{C'_\delta} \leq T < \frac{F_{k(T)}^{s'}}{C'_\delta}$$

and let

$$N(T) = F_{k(T) + \lfloor \sqrt{k(T)} \rfloor}.$$

Thus, for every $\tilde{\nu} > 0$, there is a constant $C_{\tilde{\nu}} > 0$ such that

$$(42) \quad N(T) \leq C_{\tilde{\nu}} T^{\frac{1}{s'}} T^{\tilde{\nu}}.$$

It follows from [44, Theorem 7] and the argument above that⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P(N(T), \cdot) \rangle(T) &\lesssim \exp(-cN(T)) + T^3 \int_{-K}^K \left(\max_{3 \leq n \leq N(T)} \|M(n; \omega, E + \frac{i}{T})\|^2 \right)^{-1} dE \\ &\lesssim \exp(-cN(T)) + T^3 (1 + \delta)^{-2F_{\lfloor \sqrt{k(T)} \rfloor}}. \end{aligned}$$

(We can estimate the norm on the left half-line in a completely analogous way.) From this bound, we see that $\langle P(N(T), \cdot) \rangle(T)$ goes to zero faster than any inverse power of T . Therefore we can apply [44, Theorem 1] and obtain from (42) that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_u^+ \leq \frac{1}{s'} + \tilde{\nu} = \left(\frac{\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{R_k(\delta)}}{\log \varphi} - \rho' \right)^{-1} + \tilde{\nu}.$$

Since we can take $\rho' > 0$ and $\tilde{\nu} > 0$ arbitrarily small, (26) follows.

⁸This estimate obviously works for $\omega = 0$ since then the trace and the norm are directly related. For general ω , one can use the arguments developed in [25]. The central idea is that the trace of words of length F_k occurring in the Fibonacci sequence is the same for all but one word and is given by $2x_k$. If the word in question is the ‘‘bad’’ one, we can simply shift by one to see a good word, derive the estimate there and divide by C^2 , where C bounds the norm of a one-step transfer matrix.

(b) Let $\lambda > 0$ and choose $\delta \in (0, \delta(\lambda)/2)$. Fix k and j , and consider the connected component $B_k^{(j)}(2\delta)$ of $\sigma_k^{2\delta}$. Since $B_k^{(j)}(2\delta)$ contains exactly one zero of x_k , it follows from the maximum modulus principle and Rouché's Theorem that

$$x_k : \text{int}(B_k^{(j)}(2\delta)) \rightarrow B(0, 1 + 2\delta)$$

is univalent, and hence

$$x_k^{-1} : B(0, 1 + 2\delta) \rightarrow \text{int}(B_k^{(j)}(2\delta))$$

is well-defined and univalent as well. Consequently, the following mapping is a Schlicht function:

$$F : B(0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad F(z) = \frac{x_k^{-1}((1 + 2\delta)z) - E_k^{(j)}}{(1 + 2\delta)[(x_k^{-1})'(0)]}.$$

That is, F is a univalent function on $B(0, 1)$ with $F(0) = 0$ and $F'(0) = 1$.

The Koebe Distortion Theorem (see [22, Theorem 7.9]) implies that

$$(43) \quad \frac{|z|}{(1 + |z|)^2} \leq |F(z)| \leq \frac{|z|}{(1 - |z|)^2} \text{ for } |z| \leq 1.$$

Evaluate the bound (43) on the circle $|z| = \frac{1+\delta}{1+2\delta}$. For such z , we obtain

$$\frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{(2 + 3\delta)^2} \leq |F(z)| \leq \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{\delta^2}.$$

By definition of F this means that

$$|x_k^{-1}((1 + 2\delta)z) - E_k^{(j)}| \leq \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{\delta^2} (1 + 2\delta) |(x_k^{-1})'(0)|$$

and

$$|x_k^{-1}((1 + 2\delta)z) - E_k^{(j)}| \geq \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{(2 + 3\delta)^2} (1 + 2\delta) |(x_k^{-1})'(0)|$$

for all z with $|z| = \frac{1+\delta}{1+2\delta}$. In other words, if $|z| = 1 + \delta$, then

$$(44) \quad |x_k^{-1}(z) - E_k^{(j)}| \leq \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)^2}{\delta^2} |(x_k^{-1})'(0)|$$

and

$$(45) \quad |x_k^{-1}(z) - E_k^{(j)}| \geq \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)^2}{(2 + 3\delta)^2} |(x_k^{-1})'(0)|.$$

Note that as z runs through the circle of radius $1 + \delta$ around zero, the point $x_k^{-1}(z)$ runs through the entire boundary of $B_k^{(j)}(\delta)$. Thus, since $|(x_k^{-1})'(0)| = |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|^{-1}$, (44) and (45) yield

$$B\left(E_k^{(j)}, \frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)^2}{(2 + 3\delta)^2} |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|^{-1}\right) \subseteq B_k^{(j)}(\delta) \subseteq B\left(E_k^{(j)}, \left(\frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{\delta}\right)^2 |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|^{-1}\right).$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)^2}{(2 + 3\delta)^2} |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|^{-1} \leq r_k^{(j)}(\delta) \leq R_k^{(j)}(\delta) \leq \left(\frac{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}{\delta}\right)^2 |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|^{-1}.$$

Thus,

$$\left(\frac{\delta}{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)}\right)^2 |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})| \leq \frac{1}{R_k^{(j)}(\delta)} \leq \frac{1}{r_k^{(j)}(\delta)} \leq \frac{(2 + 3\delta)^2}{(1 + \delta)(1 + 2\delta)^2} |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|,$$

which in turn implies

$$\left(\frac{\delta}{(1+\delta)(1+2\delta)}\right)^2 \left(\min_j |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|\right) \leq \frac{1}{R_k(\delta)} \leq \frac{1}{r_k(\delta)} \leq \frac{(2+3\delta)^2}{(1+\delta)(1+2\delta)^2} \left(\min_j |x'_k(E_k^{(j)})|\right).$$

This shows (27)–(28).

(c) The estimates in this part follow immediately from the estimates in parts (a) and (b). This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of (9) in Theorem 1.6. The identity is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.7 and 3.8. \square

4. THE DENSITY OF STATES MEASURE

In this section we discuss the density of states measure ν_λ . Specifically, we establish the identity (11) and the large coupling asymptotics (19).

The identity (11) was established in [33] for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small. An inspection of the proof given there shows that all that is needed to extend the identity to all $\lambda > 0$ is the transversality statement provided by Theorem 1.5. Thus, given that Theorem 1.5 has now been established, the identity (11) for all $\lambda > 0$ follows as an immediate consequence.

Proving (19) will require significantly more work. We begin with the following alternative identity for $\dim_H \nu_\lambda$, which we can prove for λ sufficiently large. Recall that each connected component of σ_k contains precisely one zero of x_k , denoted by $E_k^{(i)}$, $1 \leq i \leq F_k$.

Proposition 4.1. *For every $\lambda > 0$ we have*

$$(46) \quad \dim_H \nu_\lambda = \frac{\log \varphi}{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_k} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right)}.$$

Proof. Due to (11), we need to show that

$$\text{Lyap}^u(\mu_{\lambda, \max}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_k} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\text{Lyap}^u(\mu_{\lambda, \max}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_{k-1}} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_{k-1}} |x'_{k-1}(E_{k-1}^{(i)})| \right).$$

Recall that $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda(E)) = (x_{k+1}(E), x_k(E), x_{k-1}(E))$, and hence the z -component of $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda(E))$ is $x_{k-1}(E)$. Let $l_i \in \ell_\lambda$ be the points such that $\ell_\lambda(E_{k-1}^{(i)}) = l_i$. Due to the uniform in k transversality of $T_\lambda^k(\ell_\lambda)$ to the plane $\{z=0\}$ (which follows from Proposition 3.1 combined with the Inclination Lemma), we have $C^{-1} \|DT_\lambda^k(\bar{v}_i)\| \leq |x'_{k-1}(E_{k-1}^{(i)})| \leq C \|DT_\lambda^k(\bar{v}_i)\|$ for some uniform $C > 1$, where \bar{v}_i is a unit vector tangent to ℓ_λ at the point l_i . Therefore the statement can be reduced to the claim that

$$(47) \quad \text{Lyap}^u(\mu_{\lambda, \max}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_{k-1}} \log \left(\prod_{\{l_i \in \ell_\lambda : T_\lambda^k(l_i) \in \{z=0\}\}} \|DT_\lambda^k(\bar{v}_i)\| \right).$$

We will need the following statement from hyperbolic dynamics.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : M^2 \rightarrow M^2$ be a C^2 -diffeomorphism such that $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ is a topologically mixing locally maximal totally disconnected hyperbolic set, $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^n(U(\Lambda)) = \Lambda$. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subset U$ be such that γ_1 is transversal to $W^s(\Lambda)$, and γ_2 is transversal to $W^u(\Lambda)$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by $\{l_i\}_{i=1, \dots, N_k} \subset \gamma_1$ the set $f^{-k}(f^k(\gamma_1) \cap \gamma_2)$. Then,*

$$(48) \quad \text{Lyap}^u(\mu_{\max}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kN_k} \log \left(\prod_{\{l_i \in \gamma_1 : f^k(l_i) \in \gamma_2\}} |Df^k(\bar{v}_i)| \right),$$

where μ_{\max} is the measure of maximal entropy for $f|_{\Lambda} : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$, and \bar{v}_i is a unit vector tangent to γ_1 at the point l_i .

Proof. First of all, let us notice that if γ_1 is represented as a disjoint union of curves γ_1' and γ_1'' , and (48) holds for both γ_1' and γ_1'' , then it also holds for the initial curve γ_1 . Indeed, this just follows from the fact that if $\{a_n\}$, $\{b_n\}$, $\{x_n\}$, and $\{y_n\}$ are sequences of positive numbers such that $\frac{a_n}{b_n} \rightarrow c$ and $\frac{x_n}{y_n} \rightarrow c$ then $\frac{a_n + x_n}{b_n + y_n} \rightarrow c$. The same statement (due to the same argument) holds for the curve γ_2 .

Next, let us notice that if (48) holds for some γ_1 , then it also holds for $f(\gamma_1) \cap U$ (and vice versa). Indeed, $N_k(\gamma_1) = N_{k-1}(f(\gamma_1) \cap U)$, and the expression $\log \left(\prod_{\{l_i \in \gamma_1 : f^k(l_i) \in \gamma_2\}} |Df^k(\bar{v}_i)| \right)$ differs from the expression $\log \left(\prod_{\{l_i \in f(\gamma_1) : f^{k-1}(l_i) \in \gamma_2\}} |Df^k(\bar{v}_i)| \right)$ by no more than $\text{const} \cdot N_k(\gamma_1)$. Combining these two observations, we see that it is enough to prove (48) for the case when γ_1 is a curve that is C^1 -close to a piece of unstable manifold of Λ inside a rectangle of a Markov partition, and γ_2 is a curve that is C^1 -close to a piece of stable manifold of Λ inside a rectangle of a Markov partition.

Moreover, we can further reduce the statement to the case when γ_1 is a piece of an unstable manifold in some element of Markov partition, and γ_2 is a piece of a stable manifold in some element of Markov partition. Indeed, let us consider C^1 -invariant stable and unstable foliations in $U(\Lambda)$ that include stable and unstable laminations $W^s(\Lambda)$ and $W^u(\Lambda)$ and the curves γ_1 and γ_2 , respectively. For the existence of these foliations, see [100]. Expansion of the differential of f along the line tangent to a leaf of the unstable foliation is a C^1 -function. Exponential instability of orbits near a hyperbolic set (see Proposition 6.4.16 from [64]) now implies that if (48) holds for pieces of stable and unstable manifolds as γ_1 and γ_2 , then it also holds for the initial curves γ_1 and γ_2 that were sufficiently C^1 -close to the pieces of stable and unstable manifolds.

From now on we can assume that γ_1 is a piece of an unstable manifold in some element of Markov partition, and γ_2 is a piece of a stable manifold in some element of Markov partition. The restriction $f|_{\Lambda}$ is conjugate to a topological Markov shift $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ with some transitive 0–1 matrix A of size $N \times N$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ be a transitive topological Markov chain and denote by ν_P the measure of maximal entropy (Parry measure). Fix any $\omega', \omega'' \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and admissible sequences*

... sequence₁ ω' – infinite to the left, and
 ω'' sequence₂ ... – infinite to the right.

We assume that at least one of the two one-sided sequences is not eventually periodic.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the collection X_k of all the sequences from Σ_A of the form

$$\dots \text{sequence}_1 \underbrace{\omega' \dots \omega''}_{k+1} \text{sequence}_2 \dots$$

(where $*$ indicates the origin) and set $S_k = \bigcup_{j=0}^{k-1} \sigma_A^j(X_k)$. Then

$$\nu_k := \frac{1}{\#S_k} \sum_{x \in S_k} \delta_x \rightarrow \nu_P \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Notice that Lemma 4.3 immediately implies (48) in the case when γ_1 and γ_2 are pieces of stable and unstable manifolds. Indeed, we can assume without loss of generality that γ_1, γ_2 do not contain any periodic points (otherwise we deform them slightly). Let $H : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Lambda$ be the conjugacy between σ_A and $f|_\Lambda$. Then $H_*(\nu_P) = \mu_{\max}$, and if $\phi : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then

$$\int \phi d(H_*(\nu_k)) = \frac{1}{\#S_k} \sum_{x \in S_k} \phi(H(x)) \rightarrow \int \phi d\mu_{\max},$$

and hence for $\phi(x) = \log |Df_x(\bar{v}_x)|$, where \bar{v}_x is a unit vector tangent to a leaf of the unstable foliation at the point x , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \phi d(H_*(\nu_k)) &= \frac{1}{kN_k} \log \left(\prod_{\{l_i \in \gamma_1 : f^k(l_i) \in \gamma_2\}} |Df^k(\bar{v}_i)| \right) \\ &\rightarrow \int \phi d\mu_{\max} \\ &= \text{Lyap}^u(\mu_{\max}) \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore (48) holds.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. First of all, let us recall the construction of the Parry measure ν_P . Due to the Perron-Frobenius Theorem, the matrix $A = (A_{ij})$ has only one eigenvector $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$ with positive entries. The eigenvalue $\lambda > 1$ that corresponds to \bar{v} is larger than the absolute value of any other eigenvalue of A . Denote by $\bar{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_N)$ the eigenvector of the transposed matrix A^T that corresponds to the eigenvalue λ . Without loss of generality we can normalize \bar{v} and \bar{u} in such a way that $v_1 u_1 + v_2 u_2 + \dots + v_N u_N = 1$. The Parry measure is the Markov measure with the stationary probability vector $\bar{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_N)$, $p_i = v_i u_i$, and the transition matrix (p_{ij}) , $p_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij} v_j}{\lambda v_i}$. An equivalent way to introduce the Parry measure is to define it on a cylinder $C = \{\omega \in \Sigma_A : \omega_0 = i_0, \dots, \omega_n = i_n\}$ by

$$\nu_P(C) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i_0 \dots i_n \text{ is not an admissible sequence;} \\ \frac{u_{i_0} v_{i_n}}{\lambda^n} & \text{if } i_0 \dots i_n \text{ is admissible.} \end{cases}$$

We need to show that for any continuous function $\phi : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$(49) \quad \int \phi d\nu_k = \frac{1}{\#S_k} \sum_{x \in S_k} \phi(x) \rightarrow \int \phi d\nu_P \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

It is enough to establish this convergence for functions of the form $\phi_C = \chi_C$, where $C = \{\omega \in \Sigma_A : \omega_r = i_r, \omega_{r+1} = i_{r+1}, \dots, \omega_s = i_s\}$ for some $r < s$ and

$i_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ since the linear combinations of these functions are dense in $C(\Sigma_A)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Consider a topological Markov chain $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ and fix some finite admissible sequence $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]$, $i_j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and $\omega', \omega'' \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. For a given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the collection of all admissible sequences $\omega_0, \dots, \omega_k$ of length $k+1$ such that $\omega_0 = \omega'$ and $\omega_k = \omega''$, and denote by $I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}(\omega', \omega'')$ the number of times the string $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]$ can be encountered in these sequences (counting different encounters in the same sequence as separate). If we denote $A^k = (A_{ij}^{(k)})$, then*

$$\frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} \rightarrow \frac{u_{i_0}v_{i_t}}{\lambda^t} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let us take $k \gg t$ and represent

$$I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}(\omega', \omega'') = I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'') + I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega''),$$

where $I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'')$ is the number of encounters of $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]$ starting in the beginning or in the tail part of length $[\ln k]$ of the sequences $\omega_0, \dots, \omega_k$, and $I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega'')$ is the number of encounters of $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]$ starting in the middle part (of length $k-2[\ln k]$) of these sequences. A rough estimate on $I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'')$ gives

$$I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'') \leq Ck^{\ln N} \ln k,$$

and hence in

$$\frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} = \frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} + \frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}},$$

we have $\frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{bound}}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

For a given l between $[\ln k]$ and $k - [\ln k]$, denote by I^l the number of admissible sequences $\omega_0, \dots, \omega_k$ such that $[\omega_l \omega_{l+1} \dots \omega_{l+t}] = [i_0 i_1 \dots i_t]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I^l}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} &= \sum_{\substack{\omega_0 = \omega', \omega_k = \omega'', \\ [\omega_l \omega_{l+1} \dots \omega_{l+t}] = [i_0 i_1 \dots i_t]}} \frac{A_{\omega_0 \omega_1} A_{\omega_1 \omega_2} \dots A_{\omega_{k-1} \omega_k}}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} \\ &= (A_{i_0 i_1} A_{i_1 i_2} \dots A_{i_{t-1} i_t}) \frac{A_{\omega' i_0}^{(l)} A_{i_t \omega''}^{(k-l-t)}}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $A_{i_0 i_1} A_{i_1 i_2} \dots A_{i_{t-1} i_t} = 1$ since $i_0 i_1 \dots i_t$ is an admissible sequence. We also know that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_{ij}^{(k)} \lambda^{-k} = u_j v_i$ (see, e.g., [100, Theorem 0.17]). Since there are only finitely many pairs (ij) , the limit here is uniform in i, j , and therefore we have

$$\frac{I^l}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} = \frac{(A_{\omega' i_0}^{(l)} \lambda^{-l}) (A_{i_t \omega''}^{(k-l-t)} \lambda^{-(k-l-t)})}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)} \lambda^{-k} \lambda^t} \approx \frac{u_{i_0} v_{\omega'} \cdot u_{\omega''} v_{i_t}}{u_{\omega''} v_{\omega'} \lambda^t} = \frac{u_{i_0} v_{i_t}}{\lambda^t},$$

uniformly for large k , and hence

$$\frac{I_{[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_t]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega'')}{kA_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=[\ln k]}^{k-\ln[k]} \frac{I^l}{A_{\omega'\omega''}^{(k)}} \rightarrow \frac{u_{i_0} v_{i_t}}{\lambda^t} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

This proves Lemma 4.4. \square

Notice that Lemma 4.4 implies (49) for the function ϕ_C . Indeed, if $\ln k \gg \max(|s|, |r|)$, then

$$I_{[i_r, i_1, \dots, i_s]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega'') \leq \sum_{x \in S_k} \phi_C(x) \leq I_{[i_r, i_1, \dots, i_s]}^{\text{int}}(\omega', \omega'') + Ck^{\ln N} \ln k,$$

and (49) follows since $\#S_k = kA_{\omega', \omega''}^{(k)}$ by the assumption that at least one of the one-sided sequences (\dots sequence₁ ω' , ω'' sequence₂ \dots) is not eventually periodic. This proves Lemma 4.3. \square

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

Now (47) follows directly from Lemma 4.2, and this proves Proposition 4.1. \square

For λ sufficiently large, the modulus of $x'_k(E_k^{(i)})$ may be estimated with the help of [29, Lemmas 5 & 6]. Namely, if m denotes the number of spectra σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, $E_k^{(i)}$ belongs to, then

$$(50) \quad S_l(\lambda)^m \leq |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \leq S_u(\lambda)^m,$$

where

$$(51) \quad S_l(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \left((\lambda - 4) + \sqrt{(\lambda - 4)^2 - 12} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad S_u(\lambda) = 2\lambda + 22.$$

Here, the first inequality in (50) requires $\lambda \geq 8$ and the second requires $\lambda > 4$.

Through the end of this section let us assume that $\lambda > 4$. In this case the Fricke-Vogt invariant implies that

$$(52) \quad \sigma_k \cap \sigma_{k+1} \cap \sigma_{k+2} = \emptyset.$$

The identity (52) is the basis for work done by Raymond [85]. Following [66], we call a band $I_k \subset \sigma_k$ a “type A band” if $I_k \subset \sigma_{k-1}$ (and hence $I_k \cap (\sigma_{k+1} \cup \sigma_{k-2}) = \emptyset$). We call a band $I_k \subset \sigma_k$ a “type B band” if $I_k \subset \sigma_{k-2}$ (and therefore $I_k \cap \sigma_{k-1} = \emptyset$). Then we have the following result (Lemma 5.3 of [66], essentially Lemma 6.1 of [85]).

Lemma 4.5. *For every $\lambda > 4$ and every $k \geq 1$,*

(a) *Every type A band $I_k \subset \sigma_k$ contains exactly one type B band $I_{k+2} \subset \sigma_{k+2}$, and no other bands from σ_{k+1} , σ_{k+2} .*

(b) *Every type B band $I_k \subset \sigma_k$ contains exactly one type A band $I_{k+1} \subset \sigma_{k+1}$ and two type B bands from σ_{k+2} , positioned around I_{k+1} .*

We denote by a_k the number of bands of type A in σ_k and by b_k the number of bands of type B in σ_k . By Raymond’s work, it follows immediately that $a_k + b_k = F_k$ for every k . In fact, we have the following result, which follows from Lemma 4.5 by an easy induction.

Lemma 4.6. *The constants $\{a_k\}$ and $\{b_k\}$ obey the relations*

$$(53) \quad a_k = b_{k-1}, \quad b_k = a_{k-2} + 2b_{k-2}$$

with initial values $a_0 = 1$, $a_1 = 0$, $b_0 = 0$, and $b_1 = 1$. Consequently, for $k \geq 2$,

$$(54) \quad a_k = b_{k-1} = F_{k-2}.$$

Let us also denote by $a_{k,m}$ the number of bands b of type A in σ_k with $\#\{0 \leq j < k : b \cap \sigma_j \neq \emptyset\} = m$ and by $b_{k,m}$ the number of bands b of type B in σ_k with $\#\{0 \leq j < k : b \cap \sigma_j \neq \emptyset\} = m$. Then, [29, Lemma 4] reads as follows:

Lemma 4.7. *We have*

$$(55) \quad a_{k,m} = b_{k-1,m-1}, \quad b_{k,m} = a_{k-2,m-1} + 2b_{k-2,m-1}$$

with initial values $a_{0,m} = 0$ for $m > 0$, $a_{0,0} = 1$, $a_{1,m} = 0$ for $m \geq 0$, $b_{0,m} = 0$ for $m \geq 0$, $b_{1,m} = 0$ for $m > 0$, and $b_{1,0} = 1$. Consequently,

$$(56) \quad a_{k,m} = b_{k-1,m-1} = \begin{cases} 2^{2k-3m-1} \frac{m}{k-m} \binom{k-m}{2m-k} & \text{when } \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{2k}{3} \rfloor; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In fact, for our purposes here the recursion (55) will be sufficient, and we won't make use of the explicit solution (56). Verifying the recursion (55) using the definition and Lemma 4.5 is straightforward.

Set

$$A_k = \sum_m m a_{k,m}, \quad B_k = \sum_m m b_{k,m}, \quad \text{and} \quad C_k = A_k + B_k.$$

Lemma 4.8. *We have*

$$(57) \quad A_k = B_{k-1} + F_{k-2},$$

$$(58) \quad B_k = A_{k-2} + 2B_{k-2} + F_{k-1},$$

$$(59) \quad C_k = C_{k-1} + C_{k-2} + 2F_{k-2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= \sum_m m a_{k,m} \\ &= \sum_m m b_{k-1,m-1} \\ &= \sum_m (m-1+1) b_{k-1,m-1} \\ &= B_{k-1} + b_{k-1} \\ &= B_{k-1} + F_{k-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (55) in the second step, (54) in the fifth step, and the definitions in the other steps. This establishes (57).

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &= \sum_m m b_{k,m} \\ &= \sum_m m (a_{k-2,m-1} + 2b_{k-2,m-1}) \\ &= \sum_m (m-1+1) a_{k-2,m-1} + 2 \sum_m (m-1+1) b_{k-2,m-1} \\ &= A_{k-2} + a_{k-2} + 2B_{k-2} + 2b_{k-2} \\ &= A_{k-2} + F_{k-4} + 2B_{k-2} + 2F_{k-3} \\ &= A_{k-2} + 2B_{k-2} + F_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (55) in the second step, (54) in the fifth step, the Fibonacci number recursion twice in the sixth step, and the definitions in the other steps. This establishes (58).

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_k &= A_k + B_k \\
&= B_{k-1} + F_{k-2} + A_{k-2} + 2B_{k-2} + F_{k-1} \\
&= B_{k-1} + C_{k-2} + B_{k-2} + F_k \\
&= C_{k-1} - A_{k-1} + C_{k-2} + B_{k-2} + F_k \\
&= C_{k-1} - F_{k-3} + C_{k-2} + F_k \\
&= C_{k-1} + C_{k-2} + 2F_{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used (57) and (58) in the second step, the definition and the Fibonacci number recursion in the third step, (57) in the fourth step, and the Fibonacci number recursion twice in the sixth step. This establishes (59). \square

Proposition 4.9. *We have*

$$(60) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_k}{kF_k} = \frac{4}{5 + \sqrt{5}}.$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi}{\frac{C_k}{kF_k}} = \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{4} \log \varphi \approx 1.80902 \log \varphi.$$

Proof. Set

$$\beta = \frac{4}{5 + \sqrt{5}} = \frac{2}{\varphi + 2}$$

and $R_k = C_k - \beta k F_k$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_k - R_{k-1} - R_{k-2} &= C_k - C_{k-1} - C_{k-2} - \beta k F_k + \beta(k-1)F_{k-1} + \beta(k-2)F_{k-2} \\
&= 2F_{k-2} - \beta F_{k-1} - 2\beta F_{k-2} \\
&= 2F_{k-2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{F_{k-1}}{F_{k-2}} - \beta \right) \\
&= 2F_{k-2} \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \left(\varphi + \left(\frac{F_{k-1}}{F_{k-2}} - \varphi \right) \right) - \beta \right) \\
&= 2F_{k-2} \frac{\beta}{2} \left(\varphi - \frac{F_{k-1}}{F_{k-2}} \right) \\
&= \beta (F_{k-2} \varphi - F_{k-1})
\end{aligned}$$

For the fifth step, note that

$$1 - \frac{1}{\varphi + 2} \varphi - \frac{2}{\varphi + 2} = 0.$$

By a standard estimate from the theory of continued fractions, this shows that

$$(61) \quad |R_k - R_{k-1} - R_{k-2}| < \frac{\beta}{F_{k-1}}.$$

Set $C = \max\{|R_1|, |R_2|\}$ and apply (61) repeatedly to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_1| &\leq C \\
|R_2| &\leq C \\
|R_3| &< 2C + \frac{\beta}{F_2} \\
|R_4| &< 3C + \frac{\beta}{F_2} + \frac{\beta}{F_3} \\
|R_5| &< 5C + 2\frac{\beta}{F_2} + \frac{\beta}{F_3} + \frac{\beta}{F_4} \\
|R_6| &< 8C + 3\frac{\beta}{F_2} + 2\frac{\beta}{F_3} + \frac{\beta}{F_4} + \frac{\beta}{F_5} \\
&\vdots \\
|R_k| &< F_{k-1}C + F_{k-2}\frac{\beta}{F_2} + F_{k-3}\frac{\beta}{F_3} + F_{k-4}\frac{\beta}{F_4} + \cdots + F_0\frac{\beta}{F_k} \\
&= F_k \left(\frac{F_{k-1}}{F_k}C + \frac{F_{k-2}}{F_k}\frac{\beta}{F_2} + \frac{F_{k-3}}{F_k}\frac{\beta}{F_3} + \frac{F_{k-4}}{F_k}\frac{\beta}{F_4} + \cdots + \frac{F_0}{F_k}\frac{\beta}{F_k} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies $|R_k| = O(F_k)$, and in particular

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_k}{kF_k} = 0.$$

In view of $R_k = C_k - \beta k F_k$, this establishes (60) and concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

We are now in a position to prove (19). This result will be an easy consequence of Proposition 4.1, the estimates (50), and Proposition 4.9.

Proof of (19). By (46), we have

$$\dim_H \nu_\lambda = \frac{\log \varphi}{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_k} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right)}$$

for $\lambda \geq 16$. By (50), we have

$$S_l(\lambda)^{m(E_k^{(i)})} \leq |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \leq S_u(\lambda)^{m(E_k^{(i)})},$$

where $m(E_k^{(i)})$ denotes the number of spectra σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, $E_k^{(i)}$ belongs to, and $S_l(\lambda)$, $S_u(\lambda)$ are given in (51). Thus,

$$\log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{F_k} \log |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| = \sum_{m=\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil}^{\lfloor \frac{2k}{3} \rfloor} \sum_{m(E_k^{(i)})=m} \log |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})|,$$

and hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_k} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right) \in \left[\frac{4}{5 + \sqrt{5}} \log S_l(\lambda), \frac{4}{5 + \sqrt{5}} \log S_u(\lambda) \right]$$

by (60) in Proposition 4.9. We obtain

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H \nu_\lambda \cdot \log \lambda = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi \cdot \log \lambda}{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{kF_k} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{F_k} |x'_k(E_k^{(i)})| \right)} = \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{4} \log \varphi,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

5. THE OPTIMAL HÖLDER EXPONENT

In this section we provide an explicit expression for the optimal Hölder exponent of the integrated density of states for the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. It is based on the following dynamical result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $T : M^2 \rightarrow M^2$ be a $C^{1+\alpha}$ -diffeomorphism with a (topologically) zero-dimensional basic set Λ , and μ_{\max} be the measure of maximal entropy for $T|_\Lambda$. Let $L \subset M$ be a smooth curve transversal to $W^s(\Lambda)$ with parametrization $L : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M^2$ such that $L \cap W^s(\Lambda)$ is compact. Let R be an element of a Markov partition for Λ , and let $\pi : \Lambda \cap R \rightarrow L$ be a continuous projection along the stable manifolds. Set $\nu = L^{-1} \circ \pi(\mu_{\max}|_R)$, and denote by γ the optimal Hölder exponent of ν . Then,*

$$\gamma = \frac{h_{\text{top}}(T|_\Lambda)}{\sup_{p \in \text{Per}(T|_\Lambda)} \text{Lyap}^u(p)}.$$

In other words, we have the following:

- (1) For any $\gamma_0 < \gamma$ and any sufficiently small interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have $\nu(I) < |I|^{\gamma_0}$;
- (2) For any $\gamma_1 > \gamma$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $|I| < \varepsilon$ and $\nu(I) > |I|^{\gamma_1}$.

Proof. Fix any $\gamma_0 \in (0, \gamma)$ and suppose that $I = [E_0, E_1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is sufficiently small (we will determine the appropriate smallness condition later). Without loss of generality we can assume that $L(E_0), L(E_1) \in W^s(\Lambda)$ (otherwise we can decrease the size of I without changing its measure).

Consider the rectangle $R_I = \pi^{-1}(L(I)) \subset R$. Then, $\mu_{\max}(R_I) = \nu(I)$. Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be the smallest value such that $T^N(R_I) \cap \Lambda$ is not a subset of just one element of the Markov partition (and hence has size of order one). We claim that

$$C^{-1} \leq \left| \frac{\mu_{\max}(R_I)}{e^{-Nh_{\text{top}}(T|_\Lambda)}} \right| \leq C$$

with C uniform for all sufficiently small I . Indeed, consider the topological Markov chain $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ conjugate to $T|_\Lambda : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$. Then,

$$\mu_{\max}(R_I) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\text{Fix}(T^M) \cap R_I)}{\#\text{Fix}(T^M)}.$$

But for large M and N , we have

$$\#\text{Fix}(T^M) = \text{Tr}(A^M) = e^{Mh_{\text{top}}(T|_\Lambda)}(1 + o(1)),$$

since the largest eigenvalue of A is equal to $e^{h_{\text{top}}(T|_\Lambda)}$. At the same time the number of periodic orbits of period M with prescribed initial segment of length $N < M$ is given by

$$\#(\text{Fix}(T^M) \cap R_I) = e^{(M-N)h_{\text{top}}(T|_\Lambda)} \cdot O(1),$$

where $O(1)$ is bounded from above and away from zero uniformly in all $1 \ll N \ll M$, and hence $\mu_{\max}(R_I) = e^{-Nh_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})} \cdot O(1)$.

On the other hand, $|I| = E_1 - E_0$ is of order of the width of R_I . Pick any point $p \in \Lambda \cap R_I$ and consider $W_{\text{loc}}^u(p) \cap R_I$. Since a holonomy map along stable manifolds is C^1 , we have

$$|I| = |W_{\text{loc}}^u(p) \cap R_I| \cdot O(1).$$

The usual distortion argument shows also that

$$|W_{\text{loc}}^u(p) \cap R_I| = \frac{1}{\|DT^N(p)|_{E^u}\|} \cdot O(1),$$

and hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon < \gamma - \gamma_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \nu(I)}{\log |I|} &= \frac{-Nh_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda}) + O(1)}{-\log \|DT^N(p)\| + O(1)} \\ &> \frac{h_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})}{\text{Lyap}^u(p)} - \varepsilon \\ &\geq \frac{h_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})}{\sup_p \text{Lyap}^u(p)} - \varepsilon \\ &= \gamma - \varepsilon > \gamma_0 \end{aligned}$$

if N is large enough (which can be guaranteed by choosing sufficiently small $|I|$). Therefore $\nu(I) < |I|^{\gamma_0}$.

Let us now take an arbitrary $\gamma_1 > \gamma$. There exists a periodic point $q \in R$ such that

$$\frac{h_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})}{\text{Lyap}^u(q)} < \gamma_1.$$

For a given $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma_1 - \gamma)$, consider a narrow rectangle $R_I \subset R$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, $R_I = \pi^{-1}(L(I))$, such that $|I| < \varepsilon$ and $q \in R_I$. If $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the smallest number such that $T^N(R_I)$ does not belong to one element of the Markov partition, then

$$|I| = \frac{O(1)}{\|DT^N(q)|_{E_q^u}\|}$$

and

$$\nu(I) = \mu_{\max}(R_I) = e^{-Nh_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})} \cdot O(1).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\log \nu(I)}{\log |I|} = \frac{-Nh_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda}) + O(1)}{-N(\frac{1}{N} \log \|DT^N(q)|_{E_q^u}\| + O(1))} \leq \frac{h_{\text{top}}(T|_{\Lambda})}{\text{Lyap}^u(q)} + \varepsilon < \gamma_1,$$

and therefore $\nu(I) > |I|^{\gamma_1}$. \square

Proof of (12). The theorem follows as a special case from Theorem 5.1 since the density of states measure arises from the measure of maximal entropy for the trace map in the way required for Theorem 5.1 to be applicable. This was shown in [33] for small values of the coupling constant λ , and due to Theorem 1.5 the same holds for all $\lambda > 0$. \square

For small values of the coupling constant, $\sup_{p \in \text{Per}(f|_{\Lambda})} \text{Lyap}^u(p)$ is attained in the periodic points (of period 2 and 6) born from the singularities of the Cayley cubic, and therefore it can be calculated explicitly (see, e.g., the proof of [34, Lemma 3.3]). Hence we get the following

Corollary 5.2. *For $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, we have*

$$\gamma_\lambda = \frac{2 \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \right)}{\log \left(\frac{\sqrt{2} \sqrt{256I^2 + 16(2A+3\sqrt{2}B+\sqrt{2}AB+35)} I + 22A + 75\sqrt{2}B + 21\sqrt{2}AB + 250 + 16I + A + 2\sqrt{2}B + \sqrt{2}AB + 23}{2A + 2\sqrt{2}B - 2} \right)},$$

where $I = \frac{\lambda^2}{4}$, $A = A(I) = \sqrt{16I + 25}$, and $B = B(I) = \sqrt{8I - \sqrt{16I + 25} + 5}$.

These periodic points of period 2 lead to the curve in Figure 2 that is labeled as “Period two”.

6. STRICT INEQUALITIES BETWEEN SPECTRAL CHARACTERISTICS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.8, that is, we establish the strict inequalities in (15). They will be a consequence of the following general result.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ is a topological Markov chain defined by a transitive 0–1 matrix A (i.e., some power of A has only positive entries), and $\phi : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Hölder continuous function. If ϕ is not cohomological to zero (in other words, there are periodic orbits with different values of averages of ϕ over those orbits), then*

$$(62) \quad \inf_{p \in \text{Per}(f)} \left(\frac{1}{\pi(p)} \sum_{i=0}^{\pi(p)-1} \phi(f^i(p)) \right) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu < \int \phi d\mu_{\max} < \\ < \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \int \phi d\mu = \sup_{p \in \text{Per}(f)} \left(\frac{1}{\pi(p)} \sum_{i=0}^{\pi(p)-1} \phi(f^i(p)) \right),$$

where μ_{\max} is the measure of maximal entropy, \mathfrak{M} is the space of all probability Borel σ_A -invariant measures, and $\pi(p)$ is the period of a periodic point p .

Proof. First of all, due to Sigmund’s Theorem [91], the ergodic measures supported on periodic orbits are (weak-*) dense in \mathfrak{M} , which implies the equalities in (62). In order to show the strict inequalities in (62), we apply Proposition 1.9 in the case where $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \rightarrow \Sigma_A$ is conjugate to $T_\lambda|_{\Lambda_\lambda}$ and the potential is given by $\phi = -\log \|DT_\lambda|_{E^u}\|$.

Since by (5) the line $h_{\text{top}}(\sigma_A) + t \int \phi d\mu_{\max}$ is tangent to the graph of $P(t\phi)$ at $(0, h_{\text{top}}(\sigma_A))$, the strict convexity, which follows from (4), together with (6) implies Proposition 6.1. \square

In order to prove Theorem 1.8, we will show that Proposition 6.1 applies to the case at hand. This amounts to proving that there are periodic orbits in Λ_λ with different values of the averaged unstable multipliers [64, Proposition 20.3.10]. An averaged unstable multiplier of a periodic point p of period n is defined to be the n th root of the largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue of the differential $DT^n|_p$. Henceforth, we shall write simply *multiplier* for *averaged unstable multiplier*.

Proposition 6.2. *For every $\lambda > 0$, there exist two periodic points (not necessarily of the same period) in Λ_λ , such that their corresponding multipliers are distinct.*

This result is known for all $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently close to zero. Indeed, in that case one computes the multipliers for the period-six periodic point $p = (0, 0, a)$, with suitable $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p \in S_0$, and for the fixed point $q = (1, 1, 1)$ explicitly.

These multipliers are distinct, and a perturbation argument shows that for all $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, there exist a period-two periodic point and a period-six periodic point with different multipliers; see [33] for details.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. In [87] Baake and Roberts calculated a few periodic orbits, among which are two families of periodic points of period two and four, respectively. These are given, respectively, by

$$P_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(a, \frac{a}{2a-1}, a \right)$$

and

$$Q_b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(-\frac{1}{2}, b, -\frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Here, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. On each level surface S_λ , we can find points from these families. Namely, a and b simply need to be chosen in such a way that

$$(63) \quad I(P_a) = I(Q_b) = \frac{\lambda^2}{4},$$

where I is the Fricke-Vogt invariant. Note that $I(P_1) = I(Q_1) = 0$ and that $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} I(P_a) = \infty$ and $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} I(Q_b) = \infty$. Thus, by continuity, for each $\lambda \geq 0$, it is possible to find $a, b \in [1, \infty)$ so that (63) holds.

We claim that for every $\lambda \geq 0$, the multipliers of P_a and Q_b on S_λ are different. The proposition obviously follows from this claim.

Assume that this claim fails. Then there exist $a, b \in [1, \infty)$ so that $I(P_a) = I(Q_b) \geq 0$ and the multipliers of P_a and Q_b coincide. The identity $I(P_a) = I(Q_b)$ implies that

$$(64) \quad 2a^2 + \frac{a^2}{(2a-1)^2} - \frac{2a^3}{2a-1} = \frac{1}{2} + b^2 - \frac{b}{2}.$$

On the other hand, it was shown by Baake and Roberts that the unstable eigenvalue of $DT^2|_{P_a}$ is a root of the equation

$$(65) \quad \mu^2 - \frac{8a^2 - 2a + 1}{2a-1} \mu + 1 = 0,$$

while the unstable eigenvalue of $DT^4|_{Q_b}$ is a root of the equation

$$(66) \quad \mu^2 - (8(1-2b)b + 1)\mu + 1 = 0;$$

see [87, p. 850]. Due to Vieta's formulas, the roots of the equation $\mu^2 + (v^2 - 2)\mu + 1 = 0$ are squares of the roots of the equation $\mu^2 + v\mu + 1 = 0$. Thus, if the two multipliers in question coincide, it follows from (65) and (66) that

$$\left(\frac{8a^2 - 2a + 1}{2a-1} \right)^2 - 2 = -8(1-2b)b - 1,$$

or, equivalently,

$$(67) \quad \left(\frac{8a^2 - 2a + 1}{2a-1} \right)^2 - 2 = 16 \left(b^2 - \frac{b}{2} \right) - 1.$$

It follows from (64) and (67) that

$$\frac{(8a^2 - 2a + 1)^2}{(2a-1)^2} + 7 = 16 \frac{4a^4 - 6a^3 + 3a^2}{(2a-1)^2},$$

which in turn implies that

$$8a^3 - 4a + 1 = 0.$$

Write $P(a) = 8a^3 - 4a + 1$. The critical numbers of this polynomial of degree 3 are $\pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$. Thus, P is strictly increasing on $[1, \infty)$. Since $P(1) = 5$, P does not vanish for any $a \in [1, \infty)$; contradiction. This shows that the two multipliers cannot be equal, and the claim follows. \square

Remark 6.3. The two families of periodic points of period two and four, respectively, used in the proof of Proposition 6.2 are the ones that lead to the curves in Figures 1 and 2 which are labeled with period two and four, respectively.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The strict inequalities $\gamma_\lambda < \dim_H \nu_\lambda < \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ follow directly from Theorem 1.6, Proposition 1.9, and Proposition 6.2. The inequalities $\dim_H \nu_\lambda < \dim_H \Sigma_\lambda < \tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ follow from the strict convexity of the pressure function $P(t\phi)$ with $\phi = -\log \|DT_\lambda|_{E^u}\|$, the fact that $\dim_H \Sigma_\lambda$ is the only zero of $P(t\phi)$ (see [77]), and the expression for $\tilde{\alpha}_u^\pm(\lambda)$ from Theorem 1.6. \square

7. EXTENSIONS AND GENERALIZATIONS

While we have focused up to this point on the classical Fibonacci Hamiltonian, much of what we do extends either partly or fully to other types of operators. Also, we strongly believe that the results presented here provide an insight toward and an opportunity to approach some other more complicated models as well. In this section we briefly address some of these extensions and generalizations.

- **The Off-Diagonal Model.** In the present paper we consider the Fibonacci Hamiltonian in the form (1), which is usually called the *diagonal model* and which is the one most popular in the mathematics literature. In the physics literature the so-called off-diagonal model is usually considered. The spectral properties of the off-diagonal operator as well as the relation to the dynamics of the Fibonacci trace map are not any different from the diagonal one; see the appendix in [32] for a detailed discussion of the off-diagonal model. All the results presented in this paper for the diagonal model also hold for the off-diagonal one.
- **Potentials Generated by Primitive Invertible Substitutions.** Discrete Schrödinger operators with potentials generated by primitive invertible substitutions have spectral properties that are very much similar to the spectral properties of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian. For some of the spectral properties this was justified in [78]. We expect that all the qualitative statements (i.e., all the statements mentioned in the introduction except Corollary 1.7 and Theorem 1.10) of this paper can be generalized to this case also. As for the large coupling asymptotics, the calculations can be more complicated, but can likely be carried out for particular potentials (given the results obtained in [70, 71, 72, 76]).
- **Sturmian Potentials.** Sturmian potentials are natural generalizations of the Fibonacci potential. Namely, one simply replaces the specific value of α in (1) by a general irrational $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. It is known that the spectrum of a discrete Schrödinger operator with a Sturmian potential is a Cantor set of zero measure [13], but in most cases this Cantor set will not be dynamically defined [70, 71]. Nevertheless, there is a dynamical presentation of the spectrum in this case as well [13, 72, 85], and it would be interesting to see

whether the dynamical approach can add something to the recent results in [70, 71, 72, 76] that were obtained via the periodic approximation technique.

- **Jacobi Matrices.** In general, discrete Schrödinger operators form a particular case of the operators given by Jacobi matrices. In the case where the coefficients of a Jacobi matrix are modulated by the Fibonacci sequence, their spectral properties were studied in [102]. Interestingly enough, the spectrum in this case does not have to be dynamically defined. Nevertheless, the relation to the dynamics of the Fibonacci trace map allows one to give a detailed description of the spectrum in this case, at least in some regimes, and our results can be used to provide a complete description throughout the entire parameter space.
- **CMV Matrices.** CMV matrices are the unitary analog of Jacobi matrices. That is, they are canonical models of unitary operators (just as Jacobi matrices are canonical models of self-adjoint operators) and they arise naturally in the study of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (while Jacobi matrices arise in the study of orthogonal polynomials on the real line); compare [92, 93]. In addition, CMV matrices have been effectively used to study quantum walks and the Ising model in one dimension; see [19, 40]. Choosing the coefficients defining a CMV matrix according to the Fibonacci sequence one obtains an interesting model that can be studied using the trace map formalism as well. Several results for this model were obtained in [39, 40], both from the perspective of orthogonal polynomials and the perspective of quantum walks and the Ising model. The results and tools developed in the present paper will allow one to take the analysis of the CMV case further.
- **Continuum Models.** Continuum Schrödinger operators with Fibonacci-type potentials were considered in [6, 30, 67, 69]. In this case there are many models (depending on the choice of single-site potentials). The trace map description of the spectrum is also available in this case (see [30]), and hence it is reasonable to expect that our results can be used.
- **Higher-Dimensional Separable Models.** Understanding the spectral properties of the operators associated with the standard two- and three-dimensional quasicrystal models is a major problem in the field which is currently out of reach. One of the ways to get some insight into the problem is to consider operators with separable potentials; for example, the Square (and Cubic) Fibonacci Hamiltonian and the labyrinth model [48, 49, 50, 95, 96]. In these models the spectrum of the higher dimensional operator is the sum (or product) of the spectra of the one dimensional ones. Since studying the sum of dynamically defined Cantor sets is a classical problem which has been extensively studied (see, for example, [55, 81] and references therein), we expect that the current results will be instrumental in understanding the spectral properties of separable models. There is recent work on these models that relies on the one-dimensional results in the small and large coupling regimes [32, 36], and the results of this paper will pave the way for a study of separable models that does not rely on the small and large coupling theory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Katrin Gelfert who explained to us how to use the thermodynamical formalism to prove Proposition 6.1, and to Eric Bedford, Tanya Firsova, Yulij Ilyashenko, and Mikhail Lyubich for useful discussions on polynomial dynamics.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Abe, H. Hiramoto, Fractal dynamics of electron wave packets in one-dimensional quasiperiodic systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **36** (1987), 5349–5352.
- [2] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya, The Ten Martini Problem, *Ann. of Math.* **170** (2009), 303–342.
- [3] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya, Almost localization and almost reducibility, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **12** (2010), 93–131.
- [4] A. Avila, J. You, Q. Zhou, in preparation.
- [5] M. Baake, U. Grimm, *Aperiodic Order. Vol. 1. A mathematical invitation*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **149**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [6] M. Baake, D. Joseph, P. Kramer, Periodic clustering in the spectrum of quasiperiodic Kronig-Penney models, *Phys. Lett. A* **168** (1992), 199–208.
- [7] M. Baake, R. Moody (editors), *Directions in Mathematical Quasicrystals*, CRM Monograph Series **13**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [8] L. Barreira, *Thermodynamic Formalism and Applications to Dimension Theory*, Progress in Mathematics **294**, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.
- [9] E. Bedford, J. Smillie, Polynomial diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{C}^2 : currents, equilibrium measure and hyperbolicity, *Invent. Math.* **103** (1991), 69–99.
- [10] E. Bedford, M. Lyubich, J. Smillie, Polynomial diffeomorphisms of \mathbb{C}^2 . IV: The measure of maximal entropy and laminar currents, *Invent. Math.* **112** (1993), 77–125.
- [11] J. Bellissard, Gap labelling theorems for Schrödinger operators, *From Number Theory to Physics (Les Houches, 1989)*, 538–630, Springer, Berlin, 1992.
- [12] J. Bellissard, A. Bovier, J.-M. Ghez, Gap labelling theorems for one-dimensional discrete Schrödinger operators, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **4** (1992), 1–37.
- [13] J. Bellissard, B. Iochum, E. Scoppola, D. Testard, Spectral properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **125** (1989), 527–543.
- [14] J. Bourgain, Hölder regularity of integrated density of states for the almost Mathieu operator in a perturbative regime, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **51** (2000), 83–118.
- [15] J. Breuer, Y. Last, Y. Strauss, Eigenvalue spacings and dynamical upper bounds for discrete one-dimensional Schrödinger operators, *Duke Math. J.* **157** (2011), 425–460.
- [16] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium States and the Ergodic Theory of Anosov Diffeomorphisms*, Lect. Notes in Math. **470**, Springer (1975).
- [17] G. Buzzard, K. Verma, Hyperbolic automorphisms and holomorphic motions in \mathbb{C}^2 , *Michigan Math. J.* **49** (2001), 541–565.
- [18] S. Cantat, Bers and Hénon, Painlevé and Schrödinger, *Duke Math. J.* **149** (2009), 411–460.
- [19] M.-J. Cantero, A. Grünbaum, L. Moral, L. Velázquez, Matrix-valued Szegő polynomials and quantum random walks, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **63** (2010), 464–507.
- [20] M. Casdagli, Symbolic dynamics for the renormalization map of a quasiperiodic Schrödinger equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **107** (1986), 295–318.
- [21] M. Choi, G. Elliott, N. Yui, Gauss polynomials and the rotation algebra, *Invent. Math.* **99** (1990), 225–246.
- [22] J. B. Conway, *Functions of One Complex Variable. II*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **159**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [23] D. Damanik, α -continuity properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **192** (1998), 169–182.
- [24] D. Damanik, Gordon-type arguments in the spectral theory of one-dimensional quasicrystals, in *Directions in Mathematical Quasicrystals*, American Mathematical Society, Providence (2000), 277–305.
- [25] D. Damanik, Dynamical upper bounds for one-dimensional quasicrystals, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **303** (2005), 327–341.

- [26] D. Damanik, Strictly ergodic subshifts and associated operators, in *Spectral Theory and Mathematical Physics: a Festschrift in Honor of Barry Simon's 60th Birthday*, 505–538, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **76**, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [27] D. Damanik, Schrödinger operators with dynamically defined potentials: A survey, in preparation.
- [28] D. Damanik, M. Embree, A. Gorodetski, Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators arising in the study of quasicrystals, preprint (arXiv:1210.5753).
- [29] D. Damanik, M. Embree, A. Gorodetski, S. Tcheremchantsev, The fractal dimension of the spectrum of the Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **280** (2008), 499–516.
- [30] D. Damanik, J. Fillman, A. Gorodetski, Continuum Schrödinger operators associated with aperiodic subshifts, to appear in *Ann. Henri Poincaré* (arXiv:1212.5844).
- [31] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, Hyperbolicity of the trace map for the weakly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *Nonlinearity* **22** (2009), 123–143.
- [32] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, Spectral and quantum dynamical properties of the weakly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **305** (2011), 221–277.
- [33] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, The density of states measure of the weakly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **22** (2012), 976–989.
- [34] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for the Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **323** (2013), 497–515.
- [35] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, Almost ballistic transport for the weakly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian, to appear in *Israel J. Math.* (arXiv:1307.0925).
- [36] D. Damanik, A. Gorodetski, B. Solomyak, Absolutely continuous convolutions of singular measures and an application to the Square Fibonacci Hamiltonian, preprint (arXiv:1306.4284).
- [37] D. Damanik, R. Killip, D. Lenz, Uniform spectral properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals. III. α -continuity, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **212** (2000), 191–204.
- [38] D. Damanik, D. Lenz, Uniform spectral properties of one-dimensional quasicrystals, I. Absence of eigenvalues, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **207** (1999), 687–696.
- [39] D. Damanik, P. Munger, W. Yessen, Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle with Fibonacci Verblunsky coefficients, I. The essential support of the measure, *J. Approx. Theory* **173** (2013), 56–88.
- [40] D. Damanik, P. Munger, W. Yessen, Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle with Fibonacci Verblunsky coefficients, II. Applications, *J. Stat. Phys.* **153** (2013), 339–362.
- [41] D. Damanik, A. Sütő, S. Tcheremchantsev, Power-law bounds on transfer matrices and quantum dynamics in one dimension II., *J. Funct. Anal.* **216** (2004), 362–387.
- [42] D. Damanik, S. Tcheremchantsev, Power-law bounds on transfer matrices and quantum dynamics in one dimension, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **236** (2003), 513–534.
- [43] D. Damanik, S. Tcheremchantsev, Scaling estimates for solutions and dynamical lower bounds on wavepacket spreading, *J. d'Analyse Math.* **97** (2005), 103–131.
- [44] D. Damanik, S. Tcheremchantsev, Upper bounds in quantum dynamics, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20** (2007), 799–827.
- [45] D. Damanik, S. Tcheremchantsev, Quantum dynamics via complex analysis methods: general upper bounds without time-averaging and tight lower bounds for the strongly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *J. Funct. Anal.* **255** (2008), 2872–2887.
- [46] D. Damanik, S. Tcheremchantsev, A general description of quantum dynamical spreading over an orthonormal basis and applications to Schrödinger operators, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **28** (2010), 1381–1412.
- [47] S. Denisov, A. Kiselev, Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators with decaying potentials, *Spectral Theory and Mathematical Physics: a Festschrift in Honor of Barry Simon's 60th Birthday*, 565–589, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **76**, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [48] S. Even-Dar Mandel, R. Lifshitz, Electronic energy spectra and wave functions on the square Fibonacci tiling, *Phil. Mag.* **86** (2006), 759–764.
- [49] S. Even-Dar Mandel, R. Lifshitz, Electronic energy spectra of square and cubic Fibonacci quasicrystals, *Phil. Mag.* **88** (2008), 2261–2273.
- [50] S. Even-Dar Mandel, R. Lifshitz, Bloch-like electronic wave functions in two-dimensional quasicrystals, preprint (arXiv:0808.3659).
- [51] K. Falconer, *Techniques in Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.

- [52] M. Goldstein, W. Schlag, Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations and averages of shifts of subharmonic functions, *Ann. of Math.* **154** (2001), 155–203.
- [53] M. Goldstein, W. Schlag, Fine properties of the integrated density of states and a quantitative separation property of the Dirichlet eigenvalues, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **18** (2008), 755–869.
- [54] S. Hadj Amor, Hölder continuity of the rotation number for quasi-periodic co-cycles in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **287** (2009), 565–588.
- [55] M. Hochman, P. Shmerkin, Local entropy averages and projections of fractal measures, *Ann. of Math.* **175** (2012), 1001–1059.
- [56] A. Hof, Some remarks on discrete aperiodic Schrödinger operators, *J. Statist. Phys.* **72** (1993), 1353–1374.
- [57] Y. Ilyashenko, S. Yakovenko, *Lectures on Analytic Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **86**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2008.
- [58] G. Iommi, The Bowen formula: Dimension theory and thermodynamic formalism, preprint.
- [59] S. Jitomirskaya, Ergodic Schrödinger operators (on one foot), in *Spectral Theory and Mathematical Physics: a Festschrift in Honor of Barry Simon's 60th Birthday*, 613–647, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **76**, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [60] S. Jitomirskaya, Y. Last, Power-law subordinacy and singular spectra. II. Line operators, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **211** (2000), 643–658.
- [61] S. Jitomirskaya, C. Marx, Dynamics and spectral theory of quasi-periodic Schrödinger type operators, in preparation.
- [62] R. Johnson, Exponential dichotomy, rotation number, and linear differential operators with bounded coefficients, *J. Differential Equations* **61** (1986), 54–78.
- [63] M. Kohmoto, L. P. Kadanoff, C. Tang, Localization problem in one dimension: Mapping and escape, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983), 1870–1876.
- [64] A. Katok, B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [65] G. Keller, *Equilibrium States in Ergodic Theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts **42**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [66] R. Killip, A. Kiselev, Y. Last, Dynamical upper bounds on wavepacket spreading, *Amer. J. Math.* **125** (2003), 1165–1198.
- [67] J. Kollar, A. Sütő, The Kronig-Penney model on a Fibonacci lattice, *Phys. Lett. A* **117** (1986), 203–209.
- [68] Y. Last, Quantum dynamics and decompositions of singular continuous spectra, *J. Funct. Anal.* **142** (1996), 406–445.
- [69] D. Lenz, C. Seifert, P. Stollmann, Zero measure Cantor spectra for continuum one-dimensional quasicrystals, preprint (arXiv:1308.3431).
- [70] Q.-H. Liu, J. Peyrière, Z.-Y. Wen, Dimension of the spectrum of one-dimensional discrete Schrödinger operators with Sturmian potentials, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **345** (2007), 667–672.
- [71] Q.-H. Liu, Y.-H. Qu, Z.-Y. Wen, The fractal dimensions of the spectrum of Sturm Hamiltonian, preprint (arXiv:1310.1473).
- [72] Q.-H. Liu, Z.-Y. Wen, Hausdorff dimension of spectrum of one-dimensional Schrödinger operator with Sturmian potentials, *Potential Anal.* **20** (2004), 33–59.
- [73] N. Makarov, Fine structure of harmonic measure, *St. Petersburg Math. J.* **10** (1999), 217–268.
- [74] N. Makarov, A. Volberg, On the harmonic measure of discontinuous fractals, preprint (1986).
- [75] A. Manning, A relation between Lyapunov exponents, Hausdorff dimension and entropy, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **1** (1981), 451–459.
- [76] L. Marin, Dynamical bounds for Sturmian Schrödinger operators, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **22** (2010), 859–879.
- [77] H. McCluskey, A. Manning, Hausdorff dimension for horseshoes, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **3** (1983), 251–260.
- [78] M. Mei, Spectra of discrete Schrödinger operators with primitive invertible substitution potentials, preprint (arXiv:1311.0954).
- [79] W. de Melo, Structural stability of diffeomorphisms on two-manifolds, *Invent. Math.* **21** (1973), 233–246.

- [80] R. Moody (editor), *The Mathematics of Long-Range Aperiodic Order*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute held in Waterloo, ON, August 21–September 1, 1995, NATO Advanced Science Institutes Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences **489**, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1997.
- [81] C. G. Moreira, J.-Ch. Yoccoz, Stable intersections of regular Cantor sets with large Hausdorff dimensions, *Ann. of Math.* **154** (2001), 45–96.
- [82] S. Ostlund, R. Pandit, D. Rand, H. Schellnhuber, E. Siggia, One-dimensional Schrödinger equation with an almost periodic potential, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983), 1873–1877.
- [83] J. Palis, F. Takens, *Hyperbolicity and Sensitive Chaotic Dynamics at Homoclinic Bifurcations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [84] W. Parry, M. Pollicott, Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics, *Astérisque* **187-188** (1990), 268 pp.
- [85] L. Raymond, A constructive gap labelling for the discrete Schrödinger operator on a quasiperiodic chain, preprint (1997).
- [86] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. III: Scattering Theory*, Academic Press, 1979.
- [87] J. Roberts, M. Baake, Trace maps as 3D reversible dynamical systems with an invariant, *J. Stat. Phys.* **74** (1994), 829–888.
- [88] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic Formalism. The Mathematical Structures of Classical Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **5**, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, 1978.
- [89] O. Sarig, Lecture Notes on Thermodynamic Formalism for Topological Markov Shifts, preprint.
- [90] D. Shechtman, I. Blech, D. Gratias, J. Cahn, Metallic phase with long-range orientational order and no translational symmetry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53** (1984), 1951–1953.
- [91] K. Sigmund, Generic properties of invariant measures for Axiom A diffeomorphisms, *Invent. Math.* **11** (1970), 99–109.
- [92] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle. Part 1. Classical Theory*, Colloquium Publications **54**, American Mathematical Society, Providence (2005).
- [93] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle. Part 2. Spectral Theory*, Colloquium Publications **54**, American Mathematical Society, Providence (2005).
- [94] B. Simon, *Szegő’s Theorem and its Descendants. Spectral Theory for L^2 Perturbations of Orthogonal Polynomials*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2011.
- [95] C. Sire, Electronic spectrum of a 2D quasi-crystal related to the octagonal quasi-periodic tiling, *Europhys. Lett.* **10** (1989), 483–488.
- [96] C. Sire, R. Mosseri, J.-F. Sadoc, Geometric study of a 2D tiling related to the octagonal quasiperiodic tiling, *J. Phys. France* **55** (1989), 3463–3476.
- [97] A. Sütő, The spectrum of a quasiperiodic Schrödinger operator, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **111** (1987), 409–415.
- [98] A. Sütő, Singular continuous spectrum on a Cantor set of zero Lebesgue measure for the Fibonacci Hamiltonian, *J. Stat. Phys.* **56** (1989), 525–531.
- [99] A. Volberg, On the dimension of harmonic measure of Cantor repellers, *Michigan Math. J.* **40** (1993), 239–258.
- [100] P. Walters, *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **79**, Springer, 1981.
- [101] P. Walters, A variational principle for the pressure of continuous transformations, *Amer. J. Math.* **97** (1975), 937–971.
- [102] W. Yessen, Spectral analysis of tridiagonal Fibonacci Hamiltonians, *J. Spectr. Theory* **3** (2013), 101–128.
- [103] W. Yessen, On the energy spectrum of 1D quantum Ising quasicrystal, to appear in *Ann. H. Poincaré* (arXiv:1110.6894).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA
E-mail address: damanik@rice.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, CA 92697, USA
E-mail address: asgor@math.uci.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA
E-mail address: yessen@rice.edu