IRREDUCIBILITY OF THE FERMI VARIETY FOR DISCRETE PERIODIC SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS AND EMBEDDED EIGENVALUES

WENCAI LIU

ABSTRACT. Let H_0 be a discrete periodic Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$:

$$H_0 = -\Delta + V,$$

where Δ is the discrete Laplacian and $V : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is periodic. We prove that for any $d \geq 3$, the Fermi variety at every energy level is irreducible (modulo periodicity). For $d = 2$, we prove that the Fermi variety at every energy level except for the average of the potential is irreducible (modulo periodicity) and the Fermi variety at the average of the potential has at most two irreducible components (modulo periodicity). This is sharp since for $d = 2$ and a constant potential V, the Fermi variety at V-level has exactly two irreducible components (modulo periodicity). In particular, we show that the Bloch variety is irreducible (modulo periodicity) for any $d \geq 2$.

As applications, we prove that when V is a real-valued periodic function, the level set of any extrema of any spectral band functions, spectral band edges in particular, has dimension at most $d-2$ for any $d \geq 3$, and finite cardinality for $d = 2$. We also show that $H = -\Delta + V + v$ does not have any embedded eigenvalues provided that v decays super-exponentially.

1. Introduction and main results

Periodic elliptic operators have been studied intensively in both mathematics and physics, in particular for their role in solid state theory. One of the difficult and unsolved problems is the (ir)reducibility of Bloch and Fermi varieties [3–5, 17, 19, 20, 30, 42, 54, 56]. Besides its own importance in algebraic geometry, the (ir)reducibility is crucial in the study of spectral properties of periodic elliptic operators, e.g., the structure of spectral band edges and the existence of embedded eigenvalues by a local defect [1, 22, 37, 38, 55]. We refer readers to a survey [34] for the history and most recent developments.

In this paper, we will concentrate on discrete periodic Schrödinger operators on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Given $q_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, d$, let $\Gamma = q_1\mathbb{Z} \oplus q_2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \cdots \oplus q_d\mathbb{Z}$. We say

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14H10 (primary); 47A75, 35J10 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. analytic variety, algebraic variety, Fermi variety, Bloch variety, irreducibility, extrema, band function, band edge, embedded eigenvalue, unique continuation, periodic Schrödinger operator.

that a function $V:\mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{C}$ is Γ-periodic (or just periodic) if for any $\gamma\in\Gamma$, $V(n+\gamma)=V(n)$.

Let Δ be the discrete Laplacian on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, namely

$$(\Delta u)(n)=\sum_{||n'-n||_1=1}u(n'),$$

where $n=(n_1,n_2,\cdots,n_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, $n'=(n'_1,n'_2,\cdots,n'_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and

$$||n'-n||_1=\sum_{i=1}^d|n_i-n'_i|.$$

We consider the discrete Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$,

$$H_0=-\Delta+V, \tag{1}$$

where V is periodic.

In this paper, we always assume the greatest common factor of $q_1,q_2,\cdots,q_d$ is 1, V is periodic and H_0 is the discrete periodic Schrödinger operator given by (1).

Let $\{\mathbf{e}_j\}$, $j=1,2,\cdots d$, be the standard basis in $\mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\mathbf{e}_1=(1,0,\cdots,0),\mathbf{e}_2=(0,1,0,\cdots,0),\cdots,\mathbf{e}_d=(0,0,\cdots,0,1).$$

Definition 1. *The Bloch variety $B(V)$ of $H_0=-\Delta+V$ consists of all pairs $(k,\lambda)\in\mathbb{C}^{d+1}$ for which there exists a non-zero solution of the equation*

$$(-\Delta u)(n)+V(n)u(n)=\lambda u(n),n\in\mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{2}$$

satisfying the so called Floquet-Bloch boundary condition

$$u(n+q_j\boldsymbol{e}_j)=e^{2\pi i k_j}u(n),j=1,2,\cdots,d,\text{ and } n\in\mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{3}$$

where $k=(k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_d)\in\mathbb{C}^d$.

Definition 2. *Given $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$, the Fermi surface (variety) $F_\lambda(V)$ is defined as the level set of the Bloch variety:*

$$F_\lambda(V)=\{k:(k,\lambda)\in B(V)\}.$$

Our main interest in the present paper is the irreducibility of Bloch and Fermi varieties as analytic sets.

Definition 3. *A subset $A\subset\mathbb{C}^k$ is called an analytic set if for any $x\in A$, there is a neighborhood $U\subset\mathbb{C}^k$ of x, and analytic functions $f_1,f_2,\cdots,f_p$ in U such that*

$$A\cap U=\{y\in U:f_1(y)=0,f_2(y)=0,\cdots,f_p(y)=0\}.$$

Definition 4. *An analytic set A is said to be irreducible if it can not be represented as the union of two non-empty proper analytic subsets.*

It is widely believed that the Bloch/Fermi variety is always irreducible for periodic Schrödinger operators (1), which has been formulated as conjectures:

Conjecture 1. *[34, Conjecture 5.17] The Bloch variety $B(V)$ is irreducible (modulo periodicity).*

Conjecture 2. *[34, Conjecture 5.35] [37, Conjecture 12] Let $d \geq 2$. Then $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^d$ is irreducible, possibly except for finitely many $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Conjectures 1 and 2 have been mentioned in many articles [3–5, 20, 30, 38]. It seems extremely hard to prove them, even for "generic" periodic potentials. See Conjecture 13 in [37] for a "generic" version of Conjecture 2.

In this paper, we will first prove both conjectures. For any $d \geq 3$, we prove that the Fermi variety at every level is irreducible (modulo periodicity). For $d = 2$, we prove that the Fermi variety at every level except for the average of the potential is irreducible (modulo periodicity). In particular, the Bloch variety is irreducible (modulo periodicity) for any $d \geq 2$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d \geq 3$. Then the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^d$ is irreducible for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Denote by $[V]$ the average of V over one periodicity cell, namely

$$[V] = \frac{1}{q_1 q_2 \cdots q_d} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq n_1 \leq q_1 - 1 \\ \cdots\cdots \\ 0 \leq n_d \leq q_d - 1}} V(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d).$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $d = 2$. Then the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^2$ is irreducible for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ except for $\lambda = [V]$. Moreover, if $F_{[V]}(V)/\mathbb{Z}^2$ is reducible, it has exactly two irreducible components.*

The special situation with the Fermi variety at the average level in Theorem 1.2 is not surprising. When $d = 2$, for a constant function V, $F_{[V]}(V)/\mathbb{Z}^2$ has two irreducible components.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $d \geq 2$. Then the Bloch variety $B(V)$ is irreducible (modulo periodicity).*

Remark 1.
- *We should mention that in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, V is allowed to be a complex-valued periodic function.*
- *It is easy to show that Conjecture 1 holds for $d = 1$. See p.18 in [20] for a proof.*

Significant progress in proving those Conjectures has been made for $d = 2, 3$. When $d = 2$, Corollary 1.3 was proved by Bättig [2]. In [20], Gieseker, Knörrer and Trubowitz proved that $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^2$ is irreducible except for finitely many values of λ, which immediately implies Corollary 1.3 for $d = 2$. When $d = 3$, Theorem 1.1 has been proved by Bättig [4].

For continuous (rather than discrete) periodic Schrödinger operators, Knörrer and Trubowitz proved that the Bloch variety is irreducible (modulo periodicity) when $d = 2$ [30].

When the periodic potential is separable, Bättig, Knörrer and Trubowitz proved that the Fermi variety at any level is irreducible (modulo periodicity) for $d = 3$ [5].

In [2–5, 20, 30], proofs heavily depend on the construction of toroidal and directional compactifications of Fermi and Bloch varieties.

A new approach will be introduced in this paper. Instead of compactifications, we focus on studying the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ arising from the eigen-equation (2) and (3) after changing the variables. We develop an approach to study the irreducibility of a class of Laurent polynomials. Firstly, we show that the algebraic variety of every factor of the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ must meet either $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$ or $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = 0, z_d = \infty$. Secondly, we prove that "asymptotics" of the Laurent polynomial at $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$ and $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = 0, z_d = \infty$ are irreducible. This allows us to conclude that the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ has at most two non-trivial factors. Finally, we use degree arguments to show that the only case that $\mathcal{P}$ has two factors is $d = 2$ and $\lambda = [V]$, which completes the proof. We mention that the irreducibility of the Laurent polynomial allows a difference of monomials (see Def. 6), same issue applies to the calculations of "asymptotics". This creates an extra difficulty in the degree arguments. We introduce a polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1$ based on the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ by multiplying a proper monomial. Delicately playing between the polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1$ and the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ is another significant ingredient to make the whole proof work.

Although the proof is written for Laurent polynomials coming from the Fermi variety of discrete periodic Schrödinger operators, it works for a larger class of Laurent polynomials. Some ideas developed in the proof have been extended to study the irreducibility of the Bloch variety in more general settings [14].

Irreducibility is a powerful tool to study a lot of aspects of the spectral theory for elliptic periodic operators. Let $Q = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_d$. Assume that V is a real valued periodic potential. Thus $H_0 = -\Delta + V$ is a self-adjoint operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and its spectrum

$$\sigma(H_0) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{Q} [a_m, b_m] \tag{4}$$

is the union of the spectral band $[a_m, b_m]$, $m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$, which is the range of a band function $\lambda_m(k)$, $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We note that $\lambda_m(k)$ is a periodic function.

The structure of extrema of band functions plays a significant role in many problems, such as homogenization theory, Green's function asymptotics and Liouville type theorems. We refer readers to [9, 12, 16, 33, 34] and references therein for more details.

It is well known and widely believed that generically the band functions are Morse functions. The following conjecture gives a precise description.

Conjecture 3. *[34, Conjecture 5.25] [36, Conjecture 5.1] [12, Conjecture 5] Generically (with respect to the potentials and other free parameters of the operator), the extrema of band functions*

(1) *are attained by a single band;*
(2) *are isolated;*
(3) *are nondegenerate, i.e., have nondegenerate Hessians.*

The statement (1) of Conjecture 3 was proved in [29]. Some progress has been made towards Conjecture 3 at the bottom of the spectrum [27] or small potentials [9]. Recently, a celebrated work of Filonov and Kachkovskiy [16] proves that for a wide class (not "generic") of 2D periodic elliptic operators (continuous version), the global extrema of all spectral band functions are isolated.

As an application of the irreducibility[1] (Theorem 1.2) and Theorem 2.5 in Section 2, we are able to prove a stronger version (work for all extrema) of Filonov and Kachkovskiy's results [16] in the discrete settings. The advantage for discrete cases is that the Fermi variety is algebraic in Floquet variables $e^{2\pi i k_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d$ which allows us to use Bézout's theorem to do the proof.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $d = 2$. Let λ_* be an extremum of $\lambda_m(k)$, $k \in [0,1)^2, m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$. Then the level set*

$$\{k \in [0,1)^2 : \lambda_m(k) = \lambda_*\} \tag{5}$$

has cardinality at most $4(q_1 + q_2)^2$.

In particular, Theorem 1.4 shows that any extremum of any band function can only be attained at finitely many points, which is a stronger version (not "generic") than the statement (2) of Conjecture 3.

It is worth pointing out that Theorem 1.4 may not hold for discrete periodic Schrödinger operators on a diatomic lattice in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ [16].

Theorem 1.5. *Let $d \geq 3$. Let λ_* be an extremum of $\lambda_m(k)$, $k \in [0,1)^d, m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$. Then the level set*

$$\{k \in [0,1)^d : \lambda_m(k) = \lambda_*\}$$

has dimension at most $d - 2$.

Since the edge of each spectral band is an extremum of the band function, immediately we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1.6. *Let $d = 2$. Then both level sets*

$$\{k \in [0,1)^2 : \lambda_m(k) = a_m\} \text{ and } \{k \in [0,1)^2 : \lambda_m(k) = b_m\}$$

have cardinality at most $4(q_1 + q_2)^2$.

[1] Indeed, a much weaker assumption is sufficient for our arguments. See Remark 10.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $d \geq 3$. Then both level sets*

$$\{k \in [0,1)^d : \lambda_m(k) = a_m\} \text{ and } \{k \in [0,1)^d : \lambda_m(k) = b_m\}$$

have dimension at most $d-2$.

Remark 2. *The statements in Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.7 are sharp for periodic Schrödinger operators on a particular lattice in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ [52].*

The results of Corollary 1.6 without the explicit bound of the cardinality and Corollary 1.7 were announced by I. Kachkovskiy [24] during a seminar talk at TAMU, as a part of a joint work with N. Filonov [15]. During Kachkovskiy's talk, we realized that we could provide the approach to study the upper bound of dimensions of level sets of extrema based on the Fermi variety. In private communication, we were made aware that the proof from [15] extends to Theorem 1.4 without the explicit bound of the cardinality and Theorem 1.5. However, their approach is very different and is based on the arguments from [16].

We are going to talk about another application. Let us introduce a perturbed periodic operator:

$$H = H_0 + v = -\Delta + V + v, \tag{6}$$

where $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is a decaying function.

The (ir)reducibility of the Fermi variety is closely related to the existence of eigenvalues embedded into the spectral band of perturbed periodic operators [37, 38]. We postpone the full set up and background to Section 2, and formulate one main theorem before closing this section. Based on the irreducibility (Theorems 1.1 and 1.2), the arguments in [37], and a unique continuation result for the discrete Laplacian on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we are able to prove that

Theorem 1.8. *Assume that V is real and periodic. If there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$ such that the complex-valued function $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfies*

$$|v(n)| \leq C e^{-|n|^\gamma}, \tag{7}$$

then $H = -\Delta + V + v$ does not have any embedded eigenvalues, i.e., for any $\lambda \in \bigcup_{m=1}^{Q} (a_m, b_m)$, λ is not an eigenvalue of H.

Finally, we mention that the irreducibility results established in this paper provide opportunities to explore more applications [44].

2. Main results

Definition 5. *Let $\mathbb{C}^\star = \mathbb{C} \backslash \{0\}$ and $z = (z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_d)$. The Floquet variety is defined as*

$$\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V) = \{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : z_j = e^{2\pi i k_j}, j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, k \in F_\lambda(V)\}. \tag{8}$$

In other words, $z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$ if the equation

$$(-\Delta u)(n) + V(n)u(n) = \lambda u(n), n \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{9}$$

with the boundary condition

$$u(n + q_j \mathbf{e}_j) = z_j u(n), j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \tag{10}$$

has a non-trivial function. Introduce a fundamental domain W for Γ:

$$W = \{n = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 \leq n_j \leq q_j - 1, j = 1, 2, \cdots, d\}.$$

By writing out $H_0 = -\Delta + V$ as acting on the Q dimensional space $\{u(n), n \in W\}$, the eigen-equation (9) and (10) translates into the eigenvalue problem for a $Q \times Q$ matrix $\mathcal{D}(z)$. Let $\mathcal{M}(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{D}(z) - \lambda I$ and $\mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$ be the determinant of $\mathcal{M}(z, \lambda)$. We should mention that $\mathcal{D}(z)$, $\mathcal{M}(z, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$ depend on the potential V. Since the potential is fixed, we drop the dependence during the proof.

For $k \in \mathbb{C}^d$, let $P(k, \lambda) = \mathcal{P}(e^{2\pi i k_1}, e^{2\pi i k_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i k_d}, \lambda)$. Therefore,

$$F_\lambda(V) = \{k \in \mathbb{C}^d : P(k, \lambda) = 0\}. \tag{11}$$

One can see that $\mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$ is a polynomial in the variables λ and

$$z_1, z_1^{-1}, z_2, z_2^{-1}, \cdots, z_d, z_d^{-1}.$$

In other words $\mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$ is a Laurent polynomial of λ and $z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_d$. Therefore, the Floquet variety $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$, which equals to $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda) = 0\}$, is an algebraic set[2]. It implies that both $B(V)$ and $F_\lambda(V)$ are analytic sets. See Section 4 for more details. Since the identity (3) is unchanged under the shift: $k \to k + \mathbb{Z}^d$, it is natural to study $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^d$.

In our proof, we focus on studying the Floquet variety $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$ to benefit from its algebraicity.

A Laurent polynomial of a single term is called monomial, i.e., $C z_1^{a_1} z_2^{a_2} \cdots z_k^{a_k}$, where $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, and C is a non-zero constant.

Definition 6. *We say that a Laurent polynomial $h(z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_k)$ is irreducible if it can not be factorized non-trivially, that is, there are no non-monomial Laurent polynomials $f(z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_k)$ and $g(z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_k)$ such that $h = fg$.*

Remark 3. *When h is a polynomial, the definition of irreducibility in Def. 6 differs the traditional one[3] (because of the monomial). For example, the polynomial $z^2 + z$ is irreducible according to Def. 6. This will not create any trouble since all polynomials arising from this paper do not have factors z_j, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, k$.*

Based on above notations and definitions, we have the following simple facts.

[2]Usually, an algebraic set is defined as common zeros of a collection of polynomials. Here, we call $X \subset (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d$ an algebraic set even through X is the zeros of a Laurent polynomial.

[3]A polynomial h is called irreducible if there are no non-constant polynomials f and g such that $h = fg$.

Proposition 2.1. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. We have*

1. *The Fermi variety/surface $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^d$ is irreducible if and only if $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$ is irreducible;*
2. *If the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ (as a function of z) is irreducible, then $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$ is irreducible.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let $d \geq 3$. Then for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ (as a function of z) is irreducible. In particular, the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^d$ is irreducible for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Theorem 2.3. *Let $d = 2$. Then the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ (as a function of z) is irreducible for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ except for $\lambda = [V]$, where $[V]$ is the average of V over one periodicity cell. Moreover, if $\mathcal{P}(z,[V])$ is reducible, $\mathcal{P}(z,[V])$ has exactly two distinct non-trivial irreducible factors (each factor has multiplicity one).*

Remark 4.
- *By* (11) *and Prop.2.1, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 follow from Theorems 2.2 and 2.3.*
- *Denote by* $\mathbf{0}$ *the zero* Γ*-periodic potential. From* (41) *below, one can see that if $\mathcal{P}(z,[V])$ is reducible ($d = 2$), then $F_{[V]}(V) = F_0(\mathbf{0})$.*

Corollary 2.4. *Let $d \geq 2$. Then the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ (as a function of both z and λ) is irreducible. In particular, the Bloch variety $B(V)$ is irreducible (modulo periodicity).*

Remark 5. *Reducible Fermi surfaces are known to occur for periodic graph operators, even at all energy levels, e.g., [17, 55].*

Our next topic is about the extrema of band functions.

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that V is a real valued periodic potential. Let λ_* be an extremum of a band function $\lambda_m(k)$, for some $m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$. Then we have*

$$\{k \in \mathbb{R}^d : \lambda_m(k) = \lambda_*\} \subset \{k \in \mathbb{R}^d : P(k,\lambda_*) = 0, |\nabla_k P(k,\lambda_*)| = 0\}, \tag{12}$$

where ∇ is the gradient.

By Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, one has that for any fixed λ, $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ ($P(k,\lambda)$) is a minimal defining function of $\mathcal{F}_\lambda(V)$ ($F_\lambda(V)$). Therefore, Theorem 2.5 implies (see p.27 in [8])

Corollary 2.6. *Let λ_* be an extremum of a band function $\lambda_m(k)$, $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for some $m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$. Then $\{k \in \mathbb{R}^d : \lambda_m(k) = \lambda_*\}$ is a subset of the singular points of the Fermi variety $F_{\lambda_*}(V)$.*

The last topic we are going to discuss is the existence of embedded eigenvalues for perturbed discrete periodic operators (6).

For $d = 1$, the existence/absence of embedded eigenvalues has been understood very well [28, 40, 43, 45, 49, 53]. Problems of the existence of embedded eigenvalues in higher dimensions are a lot more complicated. The techniques of the generalized Prüfer transformation and oscillated integrals developed for $d = 1$ are not available.

In [37], Kuchment and Vainberg introduced a new approach to study the embedded eigenvalue problem for perturbed periodic operators. It employs the analytic structure of the Fermi variety, unique continuation results, and techniques of several complex variables theory.

Condition 1: Given $\lambda \in \bigcup(a_m, b_m)$, we say that λ satisfies Condition 1 if any irreducible component of the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)$ contains an open analytic hypersurface of dimension $d-1$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 2.7. *[37] Let $d = 2, 3$, and H_0 and H be continuous versions of* (1) *and* (6) *respectively. Assume that there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 4/3$ such that*

$$|v(x)| \leq Ce^{-|x|^\gamma}.$$

Assume Condition 1 for some $\lambda \in \bigcup(a_m, b_m)$. Then this λ can not be an eigenvalue of $H = -\Delta + V + v$.

For λ in the interior of a spectral band, the irreducibility of the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)$ implies Condition 1 for this λ. See Lemma 8.1. The restriction on $d = 2, 3$ and the critical exponent $4/3$ arise from a quantitative unique continuation result. Suppose u is a solution of

$$-\Delta u + \tilde{V}u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $|\tilde{V}| \leq C$, $|u| \leq C$ and $u(0) = 1$. From the unique continuation principle, u cannot vanish identically on any open set. The quantitative result states [6]

$$\inf_{|x_0|=R} \sup_{|x-x_0|\leq 1} |u(x)| \geq e^{-CR^{4/3}\log R}. \tag{13}$$

A weaker version of (13) was established in [48] and [18], namely, there is no non-trivial solution of $(-\Delta + \tilde{V})u = 0$ such that

$$|u(x)| \leq e^{-c|x|^{4/3+\varepsilon}} \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0. \tag{14}$$

For complex potentials $\tilde{V}$, the critical exponent $4/3$ in (13) is optimal in view of the Meshkov's example [48]. It has been conjectured (referred to as Landis' conjecture, which is still open for $d \geq 3$) that the critical exponent is 1 for real potentials. See [11, 26, 46] and references therein for the recent progress of the Landis' conjecture. However, the unique continuation principle for discrete Laplacians is well known not to hold (see e.g., [23, 39]). This issue turns out to be the obstruction to generalize Kuchment-Vainberg's approach to discrete periodic Schrödinger operators [35].

Fortunately, we realize that a weak unique continuation result is sufficient for Kuchment-Vainberg's arguments in [37]. Such a unique continuation result is not difficult to establish for discrete Schrödinger operators on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Actually, the critical component can be improved from "4/3" to "1". Therefore, we are able to establish the discrete version of Theorem 2.7 for any dimension.

Theorem 2.8. *Assume V is a real valued periodic function. Let $d \geq 2$, H_0 and H be given by* (1) *and* (6) *respectively. Assume that there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$ such that*

$$|v(n)| \leq Ce^{-|n|^\gamma}. \tag{15}$$

Assume Condition 1 for some $\lambda \in \bigcup_{m=1}^{Q}(a_m, b_m)$. Then this λ can not be an eigenvalue of $H = -\Delta + V + v$.

Remark 6.
- *It is well known that for general periodic graphs even compactly supported solutions can exist (see e.g. [39]).*
- *It is known that a compactly supported perturbation of the operator on a graph might have an embedded eigenvalue. If this case happens, under the assumption on irreducibility of the Fermi variety, Kuchment and Vainberg proved that the corresponding eigenfunction is compactly supported (invalid the unique continuation) [38]. Shipman provided examples of periodic graph operators with unbounded support eigenfunctions for embedded eigenvalues (the Fermi variety is reducible at every energy level) [55].*

Our approach does not work at the band edges a_m and b_m. Fortunately, for higher dimensions ($d \geq 2$), there are a lot of overlaps among spectral bands, which is predicted by the Bethe-Sommerfeld conjecture. Both continuous and discrete versions of the Bethe-Sommerfeld conjecture have been well understood [10, 13, 21, 31, 51].

Assume that V is zero, which can be viewed as a Γ-periodic function for any Γ. Denote by $[a_m, b_m]$, $m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$, the spectral bands of $-\Delta$. Clearly,

$$\bigcup_{m=1}^{Q}[a_m, b_m] = \sigma(-\Delta) = [-2d, 2d].$$

Lemma 2.9. *[21, Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3] Let $d \geq 2$. Then*
- *for any $\lambda \in (-2d, 2d) \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda \in (a_m, b_m)$ for some $1 \leq m \leq Q$,*
- *if at least one of q_j's is odd, then $0 \in (a_m, b_m)$ for some $1 \leq m \leq Q$.*

For $d = 2$, Lemma 2.9 was also proved in [13].

Theorem 1.8 and Lemma 2.9 imply

Corollary 2.10. *Assume that there exist some $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$ such that*

$$|v(n)| \leq Ce^{-|n|^\gamma}.$$

Then $\sigma_{\mathrm{p}}(-\Delta + v) \cap (-2d, 2d) = \emptyset$.

Remark 7. *Under a stronger assumption that v has compact support, Isozaki and Morioka proved that $\sigma_{\rm p}(-\Delta + v) \cap (-2d, 2d) = \emptyset$ [22].*

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The proof of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 is entirely self-contained. We recall the discrete Floquet-Bloch transform in Section 3. In Section 4, we do preparations for proofs. Section 5 is devoted to proving Theorems 2.2 and 2.3. Sections 6 and 7 are devoted to proving Theorems 2.8 and 2.5 respectively. In Section 8, we prove Theorems 1.4, 1.5 and 1.8.

3. Discrete Floquet-Bloch transform

In this section, we recall the standard discrete Floquet-Bloch transform. We refer readers to [31, 34] for details.

Let

$$\bar{W} = \left\{0, \frac{1}{q_1}, \frac{2}{q_1}, \cdots, \frac{q_1 - 1}{q_1}\right\} \times \cdots \times \left\{0, \frac{1}{q_d}, \frac{2}{q_d}, \cdots, \frac{q_d - 1}{q_d}\right\} \subset [0, 1]^d.$$

Define the discrete Fourier transform $\hat{V}(l)$ for $l \in \bar{W}$ by

$$\hat{V}(l) = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{n \in W} V(n) e^{-2\pi i l \cdot n},$$

where $l \cdot n = \sum_{j=1}^d l_j n_j$ for $l = (l_1, l_2, \cdots, l_d) \in \bar{W}$ and $n = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For convenience, we extend $\hat{V}(l)$ to $\bar{W} + \mathbb{Z}^d$ periodically, namely for any $l \equiv \tilde{l}$ mod $\mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\hat{V}(l) = \hat{V}(\tilde{l}).$$

The inverse of the discrete Fourier transform is given by

$$V(n) = \sum_{l \in \bar{W}} \hat{V}(l) e^{2\pi i l \cdot n}.$$

For a function $u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, its Fourier transform $\mathscr{F}(u) = \hat{u} : \mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$\hat{u}(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} u(n) e^{-2\pi i n \cdot x}.$$

For any periodic function V and any $u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, one has

$$\widehat{Vu}(x) = \sum_{l \in \bar{W}} \hat{V}(l) \hat{u}(x - l).$$

We remark that $\hat{u}$ is the Fourier transform for $u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $\hat{V}$ is the discrete Fourier transform for $V(n)$, $n \in W$. Let

$$\mathcal{B} = \prod_{j=1}^d [0, \frac{1}{q_j}).$$

Let $L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})$ be all functions with the finite norm given by

$$||f||_{L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})}=\sum_{l\in W}\int_{\mathcal{B}}|f(x,l)|^2dx.$$

Define the unitary map $U:\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)\to L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})$ by

$$(U(u))(x,l)=\hat{u}(x+l)$$

for $x=(x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_d)\in\mathcal{B}$ and $l\in\bar{W}$. For fixed $x\in\mathcal{B}$, define the operator $\tilde{H}_0(x)$ on $\ell^2(\bar{W})$:

$$(\tilde{H}_0(x)u)(l)=\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d}-2\cos(2\pi(l_j+x_j))u(l)\right)+\sum_{j\in\bar{W}}\hat{V}(l-j)u(j), \tag{16}$$

where $l=(l_1,l_2,\cdots,l_d)\in\bar{W}$. Let $\hat{H}_0:L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})\to L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})$ be given by

$$(\hat{H}_0u)(x,l)=\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d}-2\cos(2\pi(l_j+x_j))u(x,l)\right)+\sum_{j\in\bar{W}}\hat{V}(l-j)u(x,j). \tag{17}$$

The following two Lemmas are well known.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $H_0=-\Delta+V$. Let $\hat{H}_0$ be given by* (17)*. Then*

$$\hat{H}_0=UH_0U^{-1}. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Straightforward computations. □

Given $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathscr{F}^x$ be the Floquet-Bloch transform on $\ell^2(W)$: for any vector on W, $\{u(n)\}_{n\in W}$,

$$[\mathscr{F}^xu](n')=\frac{1}{\sqrt{Q}}\sum_{n\in W}e^{-2\pi i\sum_{j=1}^d\left(\frac{n_j'}{q_j}+x_j\right)n_j}u(n),\quad n'\in W.$$

Lemma 3.2. *The operator $\tilde{H}_0(x)$ given by* (16) *is unitarily equivalent to the operator $-\Delta+V$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with the following boundary condition:*

$$u(n+q_j\boldsymbol{e}_j)=e^{2\pi iq_jx_j}u(n),j=1,2,\cdots,d,n\in\mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{19}$$

Proof. Denote by $\tilde{\tilde{H}}_0(x)$ the restriction of $-\Delta+V$ to W with boundary conditions (19). Direct computations imply that $\tilde{H}_0(x)=(\mathscr{F}^x)\tilde{\tilde{H}}_0(x)(\mathscr{F}^x)^*=(\mathscr{F}^x)\tilde{\tilde{H}}_0(x)(\mathscr{F}^x)^{-1}$. □

Assume V is real. For each $k\in[0,1)^d$, it is easy to see that $\tilde{H}_0(\frac{k_1}{q_1},\frac{k_2}{q_2},\cdots,\frac{k_d}{q_d})$ has $Q=q_1q_2\cdots q_d$ eigenvalues. Order them in non-decreasing order

$$\lambda_1(k)\leq\lambda_2(k)\leq\cdots\leq\lambda_Q(k).$$

We call $\lambda_m(k)$ the m-th (spectral) band function, $m=1,2,\cdots,Q$. Then we have

Lemma 3.3.
$$[a_m, b_m] = [\min_{k\in[0,1)^d} \lambda_m(k), \max_{k\in[0,1)^d} \lambda_m(k)]$$
and $a_m < b_m$, $m = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$.

4. Preparations

For readers' convenience, we collect some notations and define a few new notations here, which will be constantly used in the proofs.

(1) $\mathcal{D}(z)$ is the $Q \times Q$ matrix arising from the eigen-equation (9) and (10). $\mathcal{M}(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{D}(z) - \lambda I$ and $\mathcal{P}(z, \lambda) = \det(\mathcal{M}(z, \lambda))$.
(2) $z_j = e^{2\pi i k_j}$, $k_j = q_j x_j$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d$.
(3) Let
$$\rho^j_{n_j} = e^{2\pi i \frac{n_j}{q_j}},$$
where $0 \leq n_j \leq q_j - 1$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d$.
(4) $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{M}(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}, \lambda)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(z, \lambda) = \mathcal{P}(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}, \lambda)$.
(5) $\tilde{M}(x, \lambda) = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(e^{2\pi i x_1}, e^{2\pi i x_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i x_d}, \lambda)$ and
$$\tilde{P}(x, \lambda) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(e^{2\pi i x_1}, e^{2\pi i x_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i x_d}, \lambda).$$
(6) $P(k, \lambda) = \mathcal{P}(e^{2\pi i k_1}, e^{2\pi i k_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i k_d}, \lambda)$.
(7) For a polynomial $f(z)$, denote by $\deg(f)$ the degree of f.
(8) Let $\mathcal{P}_1(z, \lambda) = (-1)^Q z_1^{\frac{Q}{q_1}} z_2^{\frac{Q}{q_2}} \cdots z_d^{\frac{Q}{q_d}} \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$.

The following lemma is standard. We include a proof here for readers' convenience.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $n = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \in W$ *and* $n' = (n'_1, n'_2, \cdots, n'_d) \in W$. *Then* $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(z, \lambda)$ *is unitarily equivalent to* $A + B$, *where* A *is a diagonal matrix with entries*
$$A(n; n') = -\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d} \left(\rho^j_{n_j} z_j + \frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j} z_j}\right)\right) + \lambda\right) \delta_{n,n'} \tag{20}$$
and B
$$B(n; n') = \hat{V}\left(\frac{n_1 - n'_1}{q_1}, \frac{n_2 - n'_2}{q_2}, \cdots, \frac{n_d - n'_d}{q_d}\right).$$
In particular,
$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(z, \lambda) = \det(A + B).$$

Proof. Recall that $x_j = \frac{k_j}{q_j}$, $z_j = e^{2\pi i k_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, d$. Lemma 4.1 follows from Lemma 3.2 and (16). □

We note that B is independent of $z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_d$ and λ.

Here are some simple facts about $\mathcal{P}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_1$.

(1) $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ is symmetric with respect to z_j and z_j^{-1}, $j=1,2,\cdots,d$.
(2) $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ is a polynomial in the variables $z_1,z_1^{-1},z_2,z_2^{-1},\cdots,z_d,z_d^{-1}$ and λ with highest degrees $z_1^{\frac{Q}{q_1}},z_1^{-\frac{Q}{q_1}},z_2^{\frac{Q}{q_2}},z_2^{-\frac{Q}{q_2}}\cdots,z_d^{\frac{Q}{q_d}},z_d^{-\frac{Q}{q_d}}$ and λ^Q.
(3) $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(z,\lambda)$ is a polynomial in the variables $z_1,z_1^{-1},z_2,z_2^{-1},\cdots,z_d,z_d^{-1}$ and λ with highest degrees $z_1^{Q},z_1^{-Q},z_2^{Q},z_2^{-Q},\cdots,z_d^{Q},z_d^{-Q}$ and λ^Q.
(4) $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ is a polynomial of z and λ. $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ can not have a factor z_j, $j=1,2,\cdots,d$, namely

$$z_j\nmid\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda), j=1,2,\cdots,d. \tag{21}$$

Therefore, the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ is irreducible (as a function of z) if and only if the polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ (as a function of z) is irreducible in the traditional way, namely, there are no non-constant polynomials $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ such that $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)=f(z)g(z)$.

5. Proof of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3

Let

$$\tilde{h}_1(z)=z_1^Qz_2^Q\cdots z_d^Q\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_j\leq q_j-1\\ 1\leq j\leq q}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^d\frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j}z_j}\right), \tag{22}$$

and

$$\tilde{h}_2(z)=z_1^Qz_2^Q\cdots z_{d-1}^Qz_d^{-Q}\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_j\leq q_j-1\\ 1\leq j\leq q}}\left(\rho^d_{n_d}z_d+\sum_{j=1}^{d-1}\frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j}z_j}\right). \tag{23}$$

Since both $\tilde{h}_1(z)$ and $\tilde{h}_2(z)$ are unchanged under the action of the group μ, we have that there exist $h_1(z)$ and $h_2(z)$ such that

$$\tilde{h}_1(z_1,z_2,\cdots,z_d)=h_1(z_1^{q_1},z_2^{q_2},\cdots,z_d^{q_d}), \tag{24}$$

and

$$\tilde{h}_2(z_1,z_2,\cdots,z_d)=h_2(z_1^{q_1},z_2^{q_2},\cdots,z_d^{q_d}). \tag{25}$$

Lemma 5.1. *Both $h_1(z)$ and $h_2(z)$ are irreducible.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only show that $h_1(z)$ is irreducible. Suppose the statement is not true. Then there are two non-constant polynomials $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ such that $h_1(z)=f(z)g(z)$. Let

$$\tilde{f}(z)=f(z_1^{q_1},z_2^{q_2},\cdots,z_d^{q_d}),\tilde{g}(z)=g(z_1^{q_1},z_2^{q_2},\cdots,z_d^{q_d}).$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{f}(z)\tilde{g}(z) = z_1^Q z_2^Q \cdots z_d^Q \prod_{\substack{0\le n_j\le q_j-1\\ 1\le j\le q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\rho_{n_j}^j z_j}\right). \tag{26}$$

By the assumption that the greatest common factor of $q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_d$ is 1, we have for any n_j, n_j' with $0 \le n_j, n_j' \le q_j - 1$ and $(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \ne (n_1', n_2', \cdots, n_d')$,

$$\left\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\rho_{n_j}^j z_j} = 0\right\} \ne \left\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\rho_{n_j'}^j z_j} = 0\right\}. \tag{27}$$

By the fact that both $\tilde{f}(z)$ and $\tilde{g}(z)$ unchanged under the action μ, and (27), we have that if $\tilde{f}(z)$ (or $\tilde{g}(z)$) has one factor $\left(\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\rho_{n_j}^j z_j}\right)$, then $\tilde{f}(z)$ (or $\tilde{g}(z)$) will have a factor $\prod_{\substack{0\le n_j\le q_j-1\\ 1\le j\le q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\rho_{n_j}^j z_j}\right)$. This contradicts (26). □

Lemma 5.2. *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1(z, \lambda)$ (as a function of z) has at most two non-trivial factors (count multiplicity). In the case that $\mathcal{P}_1(z, \lambda)$ has two non-trivial factors, namely $\mathcal{P}_1(z, \lambda) = f(z)g(z)$, we have that*

- *the closure* [4] *of one component $Z_1 = \{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : f(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$,*
- *the closure of one component $Z_2 = \{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : g(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = 0, z_d^{-1} = 0$* [5]*.*

Proof. Let $f(z)$ be a factor of polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1(z, \lambda)$ and

$$Z_f = \{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : f(z) = 0\}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{f}(z) = f(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}).$$

Solving the equation $\det(A + B) = 0$ and by (20), we have that if $z_1 = z_0^2$, $z_2 = z_3 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = z_0$ and $z_0 \to 0$, then $z_d \to 0$ or $z_d^{-1} \to 0$. This implies that letting $z_1 = z_0^2$, $z_2 = z_3 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = z_0$ and $z_0 \to 0$, and solving the equation $f(z) = 0$, we must have either $z_d \to 0$ or $z_d^{-1} \to 0$. Therefore, the closure of Z_f meets either $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$ or $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = 0, z_d^{-1} = 0$.

Take $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$ into consideration first. Let A and B be given by Lemma 4.1. Then the off-diagonal entries of $-z_1 z_2 \cdots z_d(A+B)$ are all divisible

[4] The closure is taken in $\mathbb{C}_\infty^d = (\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\})^d$.

[5] $z_d^{-1} = 0$ means $z_d = \infty$. In the proof, we view z_d^{-1} as a new variable when $z_d = \infty$. This leads to our choice of notation z_d^{-1}.

by $z_1z_2\cdots z_d$, while the diagonal entries are

$$\left(z_1z_2\cdots z_d\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d}\frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j}z_j}\right)+\text{ functions divisible by } z_1z_2\cdots z_d\right), \tag{28}$$

where $0\leq n_j\leq q_j-1$. This shows the homogeneous component/polynomial of the lowest degree of $\det(-z_1z_2\cdots z_d(A+B))$ at $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_d=0$ is

$$\tilde{h}_1(z)=z_1^Qz_2^Q\cdots z_d^Q\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_j\leq q_j-1\\ 1\leq j\leq q}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d}\frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j}z_j}\right). \tag{29}$$

Claim 1: by the fact that $h_1(z)$ is irreducible by Lemma 5.1, one has that there exists at most one factor $f(z)$ of $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ such that the closure of $\{z\in(\mathbb{C}^\star)^d: f(z)=0\}$ meets $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_d=0$. Claim 1 immediately follows from some basic facts of algebraic geometry. For convenience, we include an elementary proof in the Appendix.

Similarly, the homogeneous component/polynomial of the lowest degree (with respect to $z_1,z_2,\cdots,z_{d-1},z_d^{-1}$) of $\det(-z_1z_2\cdots z_{d-1}z_d^{-1}(A+B))$ at $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_{d-1}=0, z_d^{-1}=0$ is

$$\tilde{h}_2(z)=z_1^Qz_2^Q\cdots z_{d-1}^Qz_d^{-Q}\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_j\leq q_j-1\\ 1\leq j\leq q}}\left(\rho^d_{n_d}z_d+\sum_{j=1}^{d-1}\frac{1}{\rho^j_{n_j}z_j}\right). \tag{30}$$

Since $h_2(z)$ is irreducible by Lemma 5.1, by a similar argument of the proof of Claim 1, , one has that there exists at most one factor $f(z)$ of $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ such that the closure of $\{z\in(\mathbb{C}^\star)^d: f(z)=0\}$ meets $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_{d-1}=0, z_d^{-1}=0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ has at most two non-trivial factors. When $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ actually has two factors, by the above analysis, the statements in Lemma 5.2 hold. □

Remark 8. *When $d=2$, Gieseker, Knörrer and Trubowitz proved that the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)/\mathbb{Z}^2$ has at most two irreducible components for any λ [20, Corollary 4.1]. Even for $d=2$, our approach is different. We show that every factor of $\mathcal{P}_1$ must meet either $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_d=0$ or $z_1=z_2=\cdots=z_{d-1}=z_d^{-1}=0$ by solving algebraic equations on properly choosing curves.*

We are ready to prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Without loss of generality, assume $[V]=0$. Assume $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ is reducible for some $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$. By Lemma 5.2, there are two non-constant polynomials $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ such that none of them has a factor z_1 or z_2 (by (21)), and

$$\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)=(-1)^{q_1q_2}z_1^{q_2}z_2^{q_1}\mathcal{P}(z_1,z_2,\lambda)=f(z_1,z_2)g(z_1,z_2). \tag{31}$$

Moreover, the closure of $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^2 : f(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = z_2 = 0$ and the closure of $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^2 : g(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = 0, z_2^{-1} = 0$.

Let

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \tilde{f}(z_1, z_2) = f(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}), \tilde{g}(z) = \tilde{g}(z_1, z_2) = g(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}).$$

Therefore, $\tilde{f}(z)$ and $\tilde{g}(z)$ are also polynomials and

$$\tilde{f}(z)\tilde{g}(z) = (-1)^{q_1 q_2} z_1^{q_1 q_2} z_2^{q_1 q_2} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(z_1, z_2, \lambda) = \det(-z_1 z_2 A - z_1 z_2 B). \tag{32}$$

By (29) and (30), we have there exists a non-zero constant K such that

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} c_i z_1^{a_i} z_2^{b_i}\right) + K \prod_{\substack{0 \le n_1 \le q_1 - 1 \\ 0 \le n_2 \le q_2 - 1}} \left(\frac{z_2}{\rho_{n_1}^1} + \frac{z_1}{\rho_{n_2}^2}\right), \tag{33}$$

where $a_i + b_i \geq q_1 q_2 + 1$, and

$$\tilde{g}(z) = z_2^k \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{c}_i z_1^{\tilde{a}_i} z_2^{-\tilde{b}_i}\right) + \prod_{\substack{0 \le n_1 \le q_1 - 1 \\ 0 \le n_2 \le q_2 - 1}} \left(\frac{1}{z_2 \rho_{n_1}^1} + z_1 \rho_{n_2}^2\right)\right], \tag{34}$$

where $\tilde{a}_i + \tilde{b}_i \geq q_1 q_2 + 1$ and $k = \max_{1 \le i \le \tilde{p}}\{q_1 q_2, \tilde{b}_i\}$ (this ensures that $g(z)$ is a polynomial and $g(z)$ does not have a factor z_2).

The matrix $z_1 z_2 A$ is given by

$$-\left(\rho_{n_1}^1 z_1^2 z_2 + \frac{z_2}{\rho_{n_1}^1} + \frac{z_1}{\rho_{n_2}^2} + \rho_{n_2}^2 z_2^2 z_1 + \lambda z_1 z_2\right) \delta_{n_1, n_1'} \delta_{n_2, n_2'}$$

and all the entries of $z_1 z_2 B$ only have a factor $z_1 z_2$. Therefore, by (32),

$$\deg(\tilde{f}) + \deg(\tilde{g}) = \deg(\tilde{f}\tilde{g}) = \deg(\det(-z_1 z_2 A - z_1 z_2 B)) \leq 3 q_1 q_2. \tag{35}$$

By (33), one has if $c_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots p$,

$$\deg(\tilde{f}) = q_1 q_2, \tag{36}$$

and if one of c_i, $i = 1, 2, \cdots p$, is nonzero,

$$\deg(\tilde{f}) \geq q_1 q_2 + 1. \tag{37}$$

By (34), one has

$$\deg(\tilde{g}) \geq k + q_1 q_2. \tag{38}$$

By (35)-(38) and the fact that $k = \max_{1 \le i \le \tilde{p}}\{q_1 q_2, \tilde{b}_i\} \geq q_1 q_2$, we must have $k = q_1 q_2$, $\tilde{b}_i \leq q_1 q_2$ and $c_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, p$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{f}(z) = K \prod_{\substack{0 \le n_1 \le q_1 - 1 \\ 0 \le n_2 \le q_2 - 1}} \left(\frac{z_2}{\rho_{n_1}^1} + \frac{z_1}{\rho_{n_2}^2}\right). \tag{39}$$

Reformulate (32), (34) and (39) as,

$$\frac{1}{z_2^{2q_1q_2}}\tilde{f}(z)\tilde{g}(z) = (-1)^{q_1q_2}\det\left[\frac{z_1}{z_2}(A+B)\right],$$

$$\frac{1}{z_2^{q_1q_2}}\tilde{f}(z) = K\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}}+\frac{z_1}{z_2\rho^2_{n_2}}\right),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{z_2^{q_1q_2}}\tilde{g}(z) = \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}}\tilde{c}_i z_1^{\tilde{a}_i}z_2^{-\tilde{b}_i}\right)+\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{1}{z_2\rho^1_{n_1}}+\rho^2_{n_2}z_1\right)\right],$$

where $\tilde{a}_i+\tilde{b}_i\geq q_1q_2+1$ and $\tilde{b}_i\leq q_1q_2$.

The matrix $\frac{z_1}{z_2}A$ is

$$-\left(\rho^1_{n_1}\frac{z_1^2}{z_2}+\frac{1}{z_2\rho^1_{n_1}}+\frac{z_1}{\rho^2_{n_2}z_2^2}+\rho^2_{n_2}z_1+\lambda\frac{z_1}{z_2}\right)\delta_{n_1,n_1'}\delta_{n_2,n_2'}$$

and every entry of $\frac{z_1}{z_2}B$ only has a factor $\frac{z_1}{z_2}$.

Since $z_1^{\tilde{a}_i}z_2^{-\tilde{b}_i}\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}}+\frac{z_1}{z_2\rho^2_{n_2}}\right)$ with $\tilde{a}_i+\tilde{b}_i\geq q_1q_2+1$ will contribute to $z_1^iz_2^{-j}$ with $i+j\geq 3q_1q_2+1$ and $\det(\frac{z_1}{z_2}(A+B))$ can only have $z_1^{\tilde{i}}z_2^{-\tilde{j}}$ with $\tilde{i}+\tilde{j}\leq 3q_1q_2$, a degree argument (regard z_2^{-1} as a new variable) leads to $\tilde{c}_i=0$, $i=1,2,\cdots,\tilde{p}$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{g}(z) = \prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}}+\rho^2_{n_2}z_1z_2\right). \tag{40}$$

We conclude that we prove that if $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ is reducible, then by (32), (39) and (40), there exists a constant $K>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\det(-A-B)\\ &= \frac{K}{z_1^{q_1q_2}z_2^{q_1q_2}}\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{z_2}{\rho^1_{n_1}}+\frac{z_1}{\rho^2_{n_2}}\right)\prod_{\substack{0\leq n_1\leq q_1-1\\ 0\leq n_2\leq q_2-1}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}}+\rho^2_{n_2}z_1z_2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

We will prove that if (41) holds, then $\lambda=0$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}t_{n_1,n_2}(z_1,z_2) &= \rho^1_{n_1}z_1+\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}z_1}+\rho^2_{n_2}z_2+\frac{1}{\rho^2_{n_2}z_2}\\ &= \left(\rho^1_{n_1}z_1+\rho^2_{n_2}z_2\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{\rho^1_{n_1}\rho^2_{n_2}z_1z_2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then $t_{n_1,n_2}(z_1,z_2)+\lambda$ is the (n_1,n_2)-th diagonal entry of A.

Let $z_1 = -z_2$. By (41), one has

$$\det(A+B) \equiv 0. \tag{42}$$

and

$$t_{0,0}(z_1, z_2) \equiv 0. \tag{43}$$

Since q_1 and q_2 are coprime, for any $(n_1, n_2) \neq (0,0)$,

$$\rho^1_{n_1} z_1 - \rho^2_{n_2} z_1 \neq 0, \text{ for } z_1 \neq 0, \tag{44}$$

and hence t_{n_1,n_2} is not a zero function. Check the term of highest degree of $z_1(z_2)$ in $\det(A+B)$. By (20), (43) and (44), the term of highest degree (up to a nonzero constant factor) is

$$\lambda z_1^{q_1 q_2 - 1}. \tag{45}$$

By (42) and (45), $\lambda = 0$. We complete the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.3. The second part follows from (41). $\square$

For any $n = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+$, let $z^n = z_1^{n_1} z_2^{n_2} \cdots z_d^{n_d}$ and $|n| = \sum_{j=1}^d n_j$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.3. Without loss of generality, assume $[V] = 0$. Assume that $\mathcal{P}(z,\lambda)$ is reducible. Then there are two non-constant polynomials $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ such that none of them has a factor z_j, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$, and

$$(-1)^Q z_1^{\frac{Q}{q_1}} z_2^{\frac{Q}{q_2}} \cdots z_d^{\frac{Q}{q_d}} \mathcal{P}(z,\lambda) = f(z)g(z). \tag{46}$$

Let

$$\tilde{f}(z) = f(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}), \tilde{g}(z) = g(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}).$$

Therefore, $\tilde{f}(z)$ and $\tilde{g}(z)$ are also polynomials and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(z)\tilde{g}(z) =& (-1)^Q z_1^Q z_2^Q \cdots z_d^Q \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(z,\lambda) \\ =& \det(-z_1 z_2 \cdots z_d (A+B)). \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Moreover, the closure of $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : f(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$ and the closure of $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : g(z) = 0\}$ meets $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_{d-1} = 0$ and $z_d^{-1} = 0$.

By (29) and (30), we have for some non-zero constant K,

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} c_i z^{a_i} \right) + K \tilde{h}_1(z), \tag{48}$$

where $|a_i| \geq (d-1)Q + 1$, and

$$\tilde{g}(z) = z_d^k \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{c}_i \tilde{z}^{\tilde{a}_i} z_d^{-\tilde{b}_i} \right) + \tilde{h}_2(z) \right], \tag{49}$$

where $\tilde{z}=(z_1,z_2,\cdots,z_{d-1})$, $|\tilde{a}_i|+\tilde{b}_i\geq (d-1)Q+1$ and $k=\max_{1\leq i\leq \tilde{p}}\{Q,\tilde{b}_i\}$.

By (48), one has

$$\deg(\tilde{f})\geq \deg(\tilde{h}_1)=(d-1)Q. \tag{50}$$

By (49),

$$\deg(\tilde{g})\geq \deg(z_d^k\tilde{h}_2(z))\geq \deg(z_d^Q\tilde{h}_2(z))=dQ. \tag{51}$$

By (50), (51) and (47), one has

$$\deg(\det(z_1z_2\cdots z_d(A+B)))=\deg(\tilde{f}\tilde{g})\geq (2d-1)Q.$$

This is impossible since $\deg(\det(z_1z_2\cdots z_d(A+B)))\leq (d+1)Q$. $\square$

6. Proof of Theorem 2.8

Theorem 6.1. *[37, Lemma 17] Let Z be the set of all zeros of an entire function $\zeta(k)$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ and $\cup Z_j$ be its irreducible components. Assume that the real part $Z_{j,\mathbb{R}}=Z_j\cap\mathbb{R}^d$ of each Z_j contains a submanifold of real dimension $d-1$. Let also $g(k)$ be an entire function in $\mathbb{C}^d$ with values in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that on the real space $\mathbb{R}^d$ the ratio*

$$f(k)=\frac{g(k)}{\zeta(k)}$$

belongs to $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathcal{H})$. Then $f(k)$ extends to an entire function with values in $\mathcal{H}$.

The following lemma is well known, we include a proof here for completeness.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\hat{f}\in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\{f_n\}$ be its Fourier series, namely, for $n\in\mathbb{Z}^d$,*

$$f_n=\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\hat{f}(x)e^{-2\pi i n\cdot x}dx.$$

Then the following statements are true:

- i). *If $\hat{f}$ is an entire function and $|\hat{f}(z)|\leq Ce^{C|z|^r}$ for some $C>0$ and $r>1$, then for any $0<w<\frac{r}{r-1}$,*

  $$|f_n|\leq e^{-|n|^w},$$

  for large enough n.
- ii). *If $|f_n|\leq Ce^{-C^{-1}|n|^r}$ for some $C>0$ and $r>1$, then $\hat{f}$ is an entire function and there exists a constant C_1 (depending on C and dimension d) such that*

  $$|\hat{f}(z)|\leq e^{C_1|z|^{\frac{r}{r-1}}},$$

  for large enough $|z|$.

Proof. Fix any large $n = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Without loss of generality, assume $n_1 > 0$ and $n_1 = \max\{|n_1|, |n_2|, \cdots, |n_d|\}$. Then for any $\tilde{w} < \frac{1}{r-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|f_n| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \hat{f}(x) e^{-2\pi i n\cdot x} dx \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d-1}} e^{-2\pi i (n_2 x_2 + \cdots n_d x_d)} dx_2 \cdots dx_d \int_{\substack{z_1 = x - i n_1^{\tilde{w}} \\ x\in\mathbb{T}}} \hat{f}(z) e^{-2\pi i n_1 z_1} dz_1 \right| \\
&\leq C e^{C n_1^{r\tilde{w}}} e^{-2\pi n_1^{1+\tilde{w}}} \\
&\leq e^{-n_1^{1+\tilde{w}}},
\end{aligned}$$

for large $|n|$. This proves i).

Obviously,

$$\hat{f}(z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f_n e^{2\pi i n\cdot z}.$$

Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{f}(z)| &\leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} C e^{-C^{-1}|n|^r} e^{C|n||z|} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} C l^d e^{-C^{-1} l^r} e^{Cl|z|} \\
&\leq e^{C|z|^{\frac{r}{r-1}}},
\end{aligned}$$

for any large z. This completes the proof of ii). $\square$

Lemma 6.3. *Let f and g be entire functions on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Assume that for some $C_1 > 0, \rho > 0$,*

$$|f(z)| \leq C_1 e^{C_1|z|^\rho}, |g(z)| \leq C_1 e^{C_1|z|^\rho}. \tag{52}$$

Assume that $h = g/f$ is also an entire function on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then there exists a constant C such that

$$|h(z)| \leq C e^{C|z|^\rho}.$$

Remark 9. *Lemma 6.3 is well known, e.g., see Theorem 5 of Section 11.3 in [41] for $d = 1$ and p.37 in [32] for $d \geq 2$.*

The following Lemma can be obtained by a straightforward computation. For example, see Lyubarskii-Malinnikova [47] or p.49 in Bourgain-Klein [7].

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\tilde{V} : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be bounded. Assume that u is a non-trivial solution of*

$$(-\Delta + \tilde{V})u = 0.$$

Then for some constant $C>0$,

$$\sup_{|n|=R}(|u(n)|+|u(n-1)|)\geq e^{-CR}.$$

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Suppose there exists $\lambda\in(a_m,b_m)$ such that $\lambda\in\sigma_p(H)$. Then there exists a non-zero function $u\in\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that

$$-\Delta u+Vu+vu=\lambda u,$$

or

$$(H_0-\lambda I)u=-vu. \tag{53}$$

Denote by the function on the right hand side by $\psi(n)$:

$$\psi(n)=-v(n)u(n).$$

Applying U on both sides of (53), one has

$$((\hat{H}_0-\lambda I)\hat{u})(x,l)=\hat{\psi}(x,l), \tag{54}$$

where $\hat{u}(x,l)\in L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})$. Therefore,

$$(\tilde{H}_0(x)-\lambda I)\hat{u}(x,l)=\hat{\psi}(x,l),l\in\bar{W}. \tag{55}$$

By the assumption (15) and Lemma 6.2, we have that for any $l\in\bar{W}$,

$$|\hat{\psi}(x,l)|\leq Ce^{C|x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}}. \tag{56}$$

From Lemma 3.2, one can see that essentially, $\tilde{M}(x,\lambda)$ is the $Q\times Q$ matrix corresponding to the operator $\tilde{H}_0(x)-\lambda I$ and $\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)$ is its determinant. Denote by $\tilde{B}(x,\lambda)$ the adjoint matrix of $\tilde{M}(x,\lambda)$. By the Cramer's rule, we have

$$(\tilde{H}_0(x)-\lambda I)^{-1}=\frac{\tilde{B}(x,\lambda)}{\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)}.$$

This concludes that

$$\hat{u}(x,l)=\frac{\tilde{B}(x,\lambda)\hat{\psi}(x,l)}{\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)},l\in\bar{W}.$$

When λ satisfies Condition 1, one can see that $\zeta(x)=\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 6.1. Since $\hat{u}(x,l)\in L^2(\mathcal{B}\times\bar{W})$, namely for any fixed $l\in\bar{W}$, $\hat{u}(x,l)\in L^2(\mathcal{B})$, by Theorem 6.1, one has that $\hat{u}(x,l)$ is an entire function in the variable x for any $l\in\bar{W}$. Since all the entries of $\tilde{H}_0(x)-\lambda I$ are consisted of $e^{2\pi i x_j}$ and $e^{-2\pi i x_j}$, we have that

$$||\tilde{B}(x,\lambda)||\leq Ce^{C|x|},|\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)|\leq Ce^{C|x|}. \tag{57}$$

By (56) and (57), one has that for any $l \in \bar{W}$, $\tilde{P}(x,\lambda)$ and $\tilde{B}(x,\lambda)\hat{\psi}(x,l)$ satisfy (52) with $\rho = 1$ and $\rho = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}$ respectively. By Lemma 6.3, we have that for any $l \in \bar{W}$,

$$|\hat{u}(x,l)| \leq Ce^{C|x|^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}}.$$

By Lemma 6.2, we have that for any w with $w < \gamma$,

$$|u(n)| \leq Ce^{-|n|^w}.$$

This is contradicted to Lemma 6.4.

□

7. Proof of Theorem 2.5

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Clearly, $(k, \lambda = \lambda_j(k))$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, Q$, is one branch of solutions of equation

$$P(k,\lambda) = \mathcal{P}(e^{2\pi i k_1}, e^{2\pi i k_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i k_d}, \lambda) = 0, \tag{58}$$

and

$$P(k,\lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^{Q}(\lambda_j(k) - \lambda). \tag{59}$$

Assume that $k_0 = (k_0^1, k_0^2, \cdots, k_0^d)$ satisfies $\lambda_m(k_0) = \lambda_*$. Let

$$D(k) = \mathcal{D}(e^{2\pi i k_1}, e^{2\pi i k_2}, \cdots, e^{2\pi i k_d}).$$

Clearly, $P(k,\lambda) = \det(D(k) - \lambda I)$. Considering the matrix $D(k_0)$, let $m_1 \geq 1$ be the multiplicity of its eigenvavlue λ_*.

Case 1: $m_1 = 1$.

It means $\lambda = \lambda_*$ is a single root of $P(k_0, \lambda) = 0$. Then $\partial_\lambda P(k_0,\lambda)|_{\lambda=\lambda_*} \neq 0$. By the implicit function theorem, $\lambda_m(k)$ is an analytic function in a neighborhood of k_0. Since $\lambda_* = \lambda_m(k_0)$ is an extremum, one has

$$\nabla_k \lambda_m(k)|_{k=k_0} = (0, 0, \cdots, 0). \tag{60}$$

Rewrite (59) as

$$P(k,\lambda_*) = (\lambda_m(k) - \lambda_*)T(k), \tag{61}$$

where $T(k)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of k_0. By (60) and (61), we have

$$\nabla_k P(k,\lambda_*)|_{k=k_0} = (0, 0, \cdots, 0). \tag{62}$$

Case 2: $m_1 \geq 2$.

We will show that (62) still holds in this case. Without loss of generality, we only prove that

$$\partial_{k_1} P(k,\lambda_*)|_{k=k_0} = 0. \tag{63}$$

In order to prove (63), it suffices to show that

$$\partial_{k_1} P(k_1, k_0^2, \cdots, k_0^d, \lambda_*)|_{k_1=k_0^1} = 0. \tag{64}$$

By the Kato-Rellich perturbation theory [25], there exists $\tilde{\lambda}_l(k_1)$, $l = 1, 2, \cdots, m_1$, such that in a neighborhood of k_0^1, $\tilde{\lambda}_l(k_1)$ is analytic, $\tilde{\lambda}_l(k_0^1) = \lambda_*$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_l(k_1)$ is an eigenvalue of $D(k_1, k_0^2, \cdots, k_0^d)$, $l = 1, 2, \cdots, m_1$. Moreover,

$$P(k_1, k_2^0, \cdots, k_d^0, \lambda_*) = T(k_1) \prod_{l=1}^{m_1} (\tilde{\lambda}_l(k_1) - \lambda_*), \tag{65}$$

where $T(k_1)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of k_0^1. Now (64) follows from (65). We complete the proof. $\square$

8. Proof of Theorems 1.4, 1.5 and 1.8

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 5.2, the polynomial $z_1^{q_2} z_2^{q_1} \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda)$ (as a function of z_1 and z_2) is square-free for any λ. By Bézout's theorem, we have that

$$\#\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^2 : \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*) = 0, |\nabla_z \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*)| = 0\} \leq 4(q_1 + q_2)^2,$$

and hence

$$\#\{k \in [0, 1)^2 : P(k, \lambda_*) = 0, |\nabla_k P(k, \lambda_*)| = 0\} \leq 4(q_1 + q_2)^2, \tag{66}$$

Now Theorem 1.4 follows from (12) and (66).

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By Lemma 5.2, $z_1^{\frac{Q}{q_1}} z_2^{\frac{Q}{q_2}} \cdots z_d^{\frac{Q}{q_d}} \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*)$ is square-free, then by the basic fact of analytic sets (e.g., Corollary 4 in p.69 [50]), the analytic set $\{z \in (\mathbb{C}^\star)^d : \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*) = 0, |\nabla_z \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*)| = 0\}$ has (complex) dimension at most $d - 2$. It implies that $\{k \in [0, 1)^d : P(k, \lambda_*) = 0, |\nabla_k P(k, \lambda_*)| = 0\}$ has dimension at most $d - 2$. Now Theorem 1.5 follows from (12).

$\square$

Remark 10. *In the proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5, we only use the fact that the polynomial $z_1^{\frac{Q}{q_1}} z_2^{\frac{Q}{q_2}} \cdots z_d^{\frac{Q}{q_d}} \mathcal{P}(z, \lambda_*)$ (as a function of z) is square-free.*

Lemma 8.1. *[38, Lemma 4] Let $d \geq 2$. Assume $\lambda \in (a_m, b_m)$ for some m. Then the Fermi variety $F_\lambda(V)$ contains an open analytic hypersurface of dimension $d - 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.8. For $d = 1$, $H_0 + v$ does not have embedded eigenvalues if $v(n) = \frac{o(1)}{|n|}$ as $n \to \infty$ [45]. Therefore, it suffices to prove Theorem 1.8 for $d \geq 2$.

By Lemma 8.1, if $\lambda \in \cup(a_m, b_m)$ and $F_\lambda(V)$ is irreducible, then λ satisfies Condition 1. For $d = 2$, if $F_\lambda(V)$ is irreducible, by Theorem 1.2, $\lambda = [V]$. By

(41), $\lambda = [V]$ satisfies the Condition 1. For $d \geq 3$, by Theorem 1.1, the Condition 1 holds for every $\lambda \in \cup(a_m, b_m)$. Now Theorem 1.8 follows from Theorem 2.8. $\square$

Appendix A. Proof of Claim 1

Proof. Otherwise, $\mathcal{P}_1(z,\lambda)$ has two non-trivial polynomial factors $f(z)$ and $g(z)$ such that both $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : f(z) = 0\}$ and $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : g(z) = 0\}$ meet $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$. Let

$$\tilde{f}(z) = f(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}), \tilde{g}(z) = g(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}).$$

Let $\tilde{f}_1(z)$ ($\tilde{g}_1(z)$) be the homogeneous component of the lowest degree of $\tilde{f}(z)$ ($\tilde{g}(z)$). Since both $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : f(z) = 0\}$ and $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^d : g(z) = 0\}$ meet $z_1 = z_2 = \cdots = z_d = 0$, one has that $\tilde{f}_1(z)$ and $\tilde{g}_1(z)$ are non-constant.

Since both $\tilde{f}(z)$ and $\tilde{g}(z)$ are polynomials of $z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}$, we have $\tilde{f}_1(z)$ and $\tilde{g}_1(z)$ are also polynomials of $z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}$ and hence there exist $f_1(z)$ and $g_1(z)$ such that

$$\tilde{f}_1(z) = f_1(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}), \tilde{g}_1(z) = g_1(z_1^{q_1}, z_2^{q_2}, \cdots, z_d^{q_d}).$$

By (28) and (29), one has

$$\tilde{f}_1(z)\tilde{g}_1(z) = \tilde{h}_1(z)$$

and hence

$$f_1(z)g_1(z) = h_1(z).$$

This is impossible since $h_1(z)$ is irreducible.

$\square$

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Constanza Rojas-Molina for drawing me attentions to [37] and the organizers of the Workshop "Spectral Theory of Quasi-Periodic and Random Operators" in CRM, November 2018, during which this research was started. I wish to thank Ilya Kachkovskiy and Peter Kuchment for comments on earlier versions of the manuscript, which greatly improved the exposition. I also wish to thank Rupert Frank and Simon Larson for inviting me to give a talk in the "38th Annual Western States Mathematical Physics Meeting". During the meeting, Rupert Frank's comments made me realize that proofs of the irreducibility work for complex valued potentials without any changes. This research was supported by NSF DMS-1700314/2015683, DMS-2000345 and DMS-2052572.

References

[1] K. Ando, H. Isozaki, and H. Morioka. Spectral properties of Schrödinger operators on perturbed lattices. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(8):2103–2171, 2016.

[2] D. Bättig. *A toroidal compactification of the two dimensional Bloch-manifold*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 1988.

[3] D. Bättig. A directional compactification of the complex Fermi surface and isospectrality. In *Séminaire sur les Équations aux Dérivées Partielles, 1989–1990*, pages Exp. No. IV, 11. École Polytech., Palaiseau, 1990.

[4] D. Bättig. A toroidal compactification of the Fermi surface for the discrete Schrödinger operator. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 67(1):1–16, 1992.

[5] D. Bättig, H. Knörrer, and E. Trubowitz. A directional compactification of the complex Fermi surface. *Compositio Math.*, 79(2):205–229, 1991.

[6] J. Bourgain and C. E. Kenig. On localization in the continuous Anderson-Bernoulli model in higher dimension. *Invent. Math.*, 161(2):389–426, 2005.

[7] J. Bourgain and A. Klein. Bounds on the density of states for Schrödinger operators. *Invent. Math.*, 194(1):41–72, 2013.

[8] E. M. Chirka. *Complex analytic sets*, volume 46 of *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989. Translated from the Russian by R. A. M. Hoksbergen.

[9] Y. Colin de Verdière. Sur les singularités de van Hove génériques. Number 46, pages 99–110. 1991. Analyse globale et physique mathématique (Lyon, 1989).

[10] B. E. J. Dahlberg and E. Trubowitz. A remark on two-dimensional periodic potentials. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 57(1):130–134, 1982.

[11] B. Davey, C. Kenig, and J.-N. Wang. On Landis' conjecture in the plane when the potential has an exponentially decaying negative part. *Algebra i Analiz*, 31(2):204–226, 2019.

[12] N. Do, P. Kuchment, and F. Sottile. Generic properties of dispersion relations for discrete periodic operators. *J. Math. Phys.*, 61(10):103502, 19, 2020.

[13] M. Embree and J. Fillman. Spectra of discrete two-dimensional periodic Schrödinger operators with small potentials. *J. Spectr. Theory*, 9(3):1063–1087, 2019.

[14] J. Fillman, W. Liu, and R. Matos. Irreducibility of the Bloch variety for finite-range Schrödinger operators. 2021.

[15] N. Filonov and I. Kachkovskiy. On spectral bands of discrete periodic operators. In preparation.

[16] N. Filonov and I. Kachkovskiy. On the structure of band edges of 2-dimensional periodic elliptic operators. *Acta Math.*, 221(1):59–80, 2018.

[17] L. Fisher, W. Li, and S. P. Shipman. Reducible fermi surface for multi-layer quantum graphs including stacked graphene. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13764*, 2020.

[18] R. Froese, I. Herbst, M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof. L^2-lower bounds to solutions of one-body Schrödinger equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 95(1-2):25–38, 1983.

[19] D. Gieseker, H. Knörrer, and E. Trubowitz. An overview of the geometry of algebraic Fermi curves. In *Algebraic geometry: Sundance 1988*, volume 116 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 19–46. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991.

[20] D. Gieseker, H. Knörrer, and E. Trubowitz. *The geometry of algebraic Fermi curves*, volume 14 of *Perspectives in Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.

[21] R. Han and S. Jitomirskaya. Discrete Bethe-Sommerfeld conjecture. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 361(1):205–216, 2018.

[22] H. Isozaki and H. Morioka. A Rellich type theorem for discrete Schrödinger operators. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 8(2):475–489, 2014.

[23] S. Jitomirskaya. Ergodic Schrödinger operators (on one foot). In *Spectral theory and mathematical physics: a Festschrift in honor of Barry Simon's 60th birthday*, volume 76 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 613–647. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[24] I. Kachkovskiy. A talk in the "Mathematical Physics and Harmonic Analysis Seminar" at Texas A&M University, May 22, 2020. Link: https://www.math.tamu.edu/seminars/harmonic/index.php.

[25] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.

[26] C. Kenig, L. Silvestre, and J.-N. Wang. On Landis' conjecture in the plane. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(4):766–789, 2015.

[27] W. Kirsch and B. Simon. Comparison theorems for the gap of Schrödinger operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 75(2):396–410, 1987.

[28] A. Kiselev, C. Remling, and B. Simon. Effective perturbation methods for one-dimensional Schrödinger operators. *J. Differential Equations*, 151(2):290–312, 1999.

[29] F. Klopp and J. Ralston. Endpoints of the spectrum of periodic operators are generically simple. volume 7, pages 459–463. 2000. Cathleen Morawetz: a great mathematician.

[30] H. Knörrer and E. Trubowitz. A directional compactification of the complex Bloch variety. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 65(1):114–149, 1990.

[31] H. Krueger. Periodic and limit-periodic discrete Schrödinger operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1108.1584*, 2011.

[32] P. Kuchment. *Floquet theory for partial differential equations*, volume 60 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1993.

[33] P. Kuchment. The mathematics of photonic crystals. In *Mathematical modeling in optical science*, volume 22 of *Frontiers Appl. Math.*, pages 207–272. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2001.

[34] P. Kuchment. An overview of periodic elliptic operators. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 53(3):343–414, 2016.

[35] P. Kuchment. Private communication. 2019.

[36] P. Kuchment and Y. Pinchover. Liouville theorems and spectral edge behavior on abelian coverings of compact manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(12):5777–5815, 2007.

[37] P. Kuchment and B. Vainberg. On absence of embedded eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators with perturbed periodic potentials. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(9-10):1809–1826, 2000.

[38] P. Kuchment and B. Vainberg. On the structure of eigenfunctions corresponding to embedded eigenvalues of locally perturbed periodic graph operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 268(3):673–686, 2006.

[39] P. A. Kuchment. On the Floquet theory of periodic difference equations. In *Geometrical and algebraical aspects in several complex variables (Cetraro, 1989)*, volume 8 of *Sem. Conf.*, pages 201–209. EditEl, Rende, 1991.

[40] P. Kurasov and S. Naboko. Wigner-von Neumann perturbations of a periodic potential: spectral singularities in bands. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 142(1):161–183, 2007.

[41] B. J. Levin. *Distribution of zeros of entire functions*, volume 5 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., revised edition, 1980. Translated from the Russian by R. P. Boas, J. M. Danskin, F. M. Goodspeed, J. Korevaar, A. L. Shields and H. P. Thielman.

[42] W. Li and S. P. Shipman. Irreducibility of the Fermi surface for planar periodic graph operators. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 110(9):2543–2572, 2020.

[43] W. Liu. Criteria for embedded eigenvalues for discrete Schrödinger operators. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN to appear*.

[44] W. Liu. Fermi isospectrality for discrete periodic Schrödinger operators. *arXiv:2106.03726*, 2021.

[45] W. Liu and D. C. Ong. Sharp spectral transition for eigenvalues embedded into the spectral bands of perturbed periodic operators. *J. Anal. Math.*, 141(2):625–661, 2020.

[46] A. Logunov, E. Malinnikova, N. Nadirashvili, and F. Nazarov. The Landis conjecture on exponential decay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07034*, 2020.

[47] Y. Lyubarskii and E. Malinnikova. Sharp uniqueness results for discrete evolutions. In *Non-linear partial differential equations, mathematical physics, and stochastic analysis*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 423–436. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2018.

[48] V. Z. Meshkov. On the possible rate of decrease at infinity of the solutions of second-order partial differential equations. *Mat. Sb.*, 182(3):364–383, 1991.
[49] S. Naboko and S. Simonov. Zeroes of the spectral density of the periodic Schrödinger operator with Wigner-von Neumann potential. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 153(1):33–58, 2012.
[50] R. Narasimhan. *Introduction to the theory of analytic spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 25. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966.
[51] L. Parnovski. Bethe-Sommerfeld conjecture. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 9(3):457–508, 2008.
[52] L. Parnovski. Private communication. 2021.
[53] F. S. Rofe-Beketov. A finiteness test for the number of discrete levels which can be introduced into the gaps of the continuous spectrum by perturbations of a periodic potential. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 156:515–518, 1964.
[54] W. Shaban and B. Vainberg. Radiation conditions for the difference Schrödinger operators. *Appl. Anal.*, 80(3-4):525–556, 2001.
[55] S. P. Shipman. Eigenfunctions of unbounded support for embedded eigenvalues of locally perturbed periodic graph operators. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 332(2):605–626, 2014.
[56] S. P. Shipman. Reducible Fermi surfaces for non-symmetric bilayer quantum-graph operators. *J. Spectr. Theory*, 10(1):33–72, 2020.

(W. Liu) Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3368, USA
Email address: `liuwencai1226@gmail.com; wencail@tamu.edu`