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Shingo Kobayashi, 1, 2 Youichi Yamakawa, 3, 1 Ai Yamakage, 2, 1 Takumi Inohara, 2 Yoshihiko Okamoto, 2, 1 and Yukio Tanaka 2

1Institute for Advanced Research, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan
2Department of Applied Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan
3Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan

Multiple line nodes in energy-band gaps are found in semimetals preserving mirror-reflection symmetry. We classify possible configurations of multiple line nodes with crossing points (crossing line nodes) under point-group symmetry. Taking the spin-orbit interaction (SOI) into account, we also classify topological phase transitions from crossing-line-node Dirac semimetals to other topological phases, e.g., topological insulators and point-node semimetals. This study enables one to find crossing-line-node semimetal materials and their behavior in the presence of SOI from the band structure in the absence of SOI without detailed calculations. As an example, the theory applies to hexagonal rare-earth trihydrides with the HoD3 structure and clarifies that it is a crossing-line-node Dirac semimetal hosting three line nodes.

I. INTRODUCTION

The degeneracy (node) of the energy spectrum in the Brillouin zone is a topological object. Gapless semimetals are the realization of topological nodes in condensed matter physics [1–7]. Interestingly, semimetals hosting topological nodes exhibit novel transport and response phenomena for external electromagnetic fields [8–11]. For instance, in Weyl semimetals, which have point nodes in the Brillouin zone, electric current flows perpendicular to an electric field (anomalous Hall effect) and parallel to a magnetic field (chiral magnetic effect [12]) due to the topological structure of the nodes.

Since topological invariants crucially depend on the spatial dimension [13–16], node structures other than point nodes are expected to induce topological responses distinct from those in Weyl semimetals. The line node [17–20] is one of these intriguing topological electronic states. Many line-node semimetal materials [27–42] have been proposed and some measurements have actually seen line nodes in semimetals [43–50]. Moreover, exotic magnetic transports [51–54] in line-node semimetals has been recently reported. In addition, superconductivity is also found in the noncentrosymmetric line-node semimetal PbTaSe2 [55–59]. Line-node semimetals have great potential for diverse developments in materials science.

In contrast to point nodes, there are many types of configurations of line nodes, i.e., single, spiral [60, 61], chain [62], separate multiple [63–67], nexus [65–67], and crossing [68, 69] line nodes. In this work, we focus on crossing-line-node semimetals, as shown in Fig. 1 and study a general theory for it from the viewpoint of crystalline symmetry. The configuration of the crossing line nodes is uniquely determined for a given level scheme of conduction and valence bands under a point-group symmetry. The spin-orbit interaction (SOI) may open a gap in the line nodes but the crossing points possibly remain gapless, i.e., a Dirac semimetal may be realized. We also clarify whether the resulting states are Dirac semimetals or (topological) insulators. Applying the obtained results, one can find Dirac semimetals and topological insulators from line-node semimetals and can derive their topological indices from the band calculation in the absence of SOI.

As an example, we apply the present theory to a hexagonal hydride, YH3 [space group P3c1 (No. 165)], with the HoD3 structure [73]. YH3 has been focused on as a switchable mirror [74], i.e., the metal-insulator transition takes place at x = 2.85 from a reflecting cubic crystal to a transparent hexagonal one. From optical measurements [75–78], the gap has been evaluated to be 2.8 eV or slightly smaller. On the other hand, early band calculations predicted that the hexagonal YH3 is a semimetal rather than an insulator [79–81]. Subsequent studies discussed another lower symmetric structure [82], weak [83–85] and strong [86–88] correlation effects giving rise to a finite gap in YH3. Although the actual material is insulating, we study the gapless electronic structure of the YH3 without correlation effects, as a representative of...
HoD$_3$-structure materials, and its topological properties in detail since the electronic structure has been established so it is useful for further investigations. The YH$_3$ with HoD$_3$ structure is shown to be a semimetal hosting three crossing line nodes. A tiny energy gap ($\sim$ 4 meV) is induced in the line nodes by SOI. This gap is characterized by the topological indices of $(1;000)$.

II. CROSSING LINE NODES PROTECTED BY POINT GROUP SYMMETRIES

In general, a band crossing located on high-symmetry planes/lines is stable toward band repulsion if each energy band belongs to different eigenstates of crystalline symmetry. In particular, in mirror-reflection symmetric systems without SOI, a band crossing forms a stable Dirac line node (DLN) when it lies on a mirror-reflection plane and two energy bands have different mirror-reflection eigenvalues. Generalizing this approach to all point groups, we investigate crossing line nodes protected by point groups: $C_{nv}$, $D_{nh}$, $D_{nd}$, $T_d$, $T_h$, and $O_h$ ($n = 2, 3, 4, 6$) and their possible topological phase transitions to topological insulators and Dirac semimetals.

Here, we consider a level scheme consisting of one-dimensional (1D) irreducible representations (IRRs) $(\Gamma_{1a}, \Gamma_{1b})$ of the lowest conduction and highest valence bands. We focus on mirror-reflection symmetry-protected DLNs encircling time-reversal invariant momenta (TRIM). According to the Schoenflies symbols, mirror reflections are labeled as $\sigma_h$, $\sigma_v$, and $\sigma_d$, which represent horizontal, vertical, and diagonal mirror-reflection operations in point groups, respectively. When conduction and valence bands cross on a $\sigma_m$ ($m = h, v, d$)-symmetric plane, the band crossing is stable if 1D IRRs $\Gamma_{1a}$ and $\Gamma_{1b}$ have different eigenvalues of $\sigma_m$ from each other, i.e., the character of $\sigma_m$ is $-1$ in $\Gamma_{1a} \times \Gamma_{1b}$. Furthermore, the number of crossing lines corresponds to the number of equivalent $\sigma_m$ planes. For example, in $C_{nv}$-symmetric systems, possible crossing-line-node configurations are $v^2$, $d^2$, and $v^2d^2$ for $\{(A_1, B_2), (A_2, B_1)\}$, $\{(A_1, B_1), (A_2, B_2)\}$, and $\{(A_1, A_2), (B_1, B_2)\}$, respectively, where $v^i$ ($d^j$) labels $i$ line nodes protected by $\sigma_v$ ($\sigma_d$) symmetry. Table I shows possible crossing line nodes for each point group, and the correspondence with the level schemes is shown in Appendix A. The symmetry-adapted effective Hamiltonian for 1D IRRs are also described in Appendix B. The study of crossing line nodes for 1D IRRs can be generalized to crossing line nodes for higher dimensional IRRs. In that case, it is necessary to take into account the effect of multibands. Nevertheless, when we choose a basis diagonalizing $\sigma_m$, the mechanism for protecting line nodes is the same as in the 1D IRR case: namely, a line node on a $\sigma_m$-symmetric plane is stable if two bands forming the line node have the different eigenvalues of $\sigma_m$. In particular, a level scheme consisting of 2D (3D) IRRs $(\Gamma_{2(3)a}, \Gamma_{2(3)b})$ leads to two (three) line nodes at most on a $\sigma_m$-symmetric plane. Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Line nodes</th>
<th>SOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{nv}$, $C_{nh}$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{3d}$</td>
<td>$d^3$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{nd}$ ($n = 2, 4, 6$)</td>
<td>$d^n$</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{2v}$</td>
<td>$v(xz), v(zy)$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{2h}$</td>
<td>$h(xz), h(zy), (hxy), h^3$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{3h}$</td>
<td>$h, v^3$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{nh}$ ($n = 4, 6$)</td>
<td>$v^{n/2}, d^{n/2}$</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_d$</td>
<td>$d^6$</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_h$</td>
<td>$h^3$</td>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_h$</td>
<td>$h^3, d^6$</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Possible crossing line nodes and topological phase transitions for each point group (PG) for 1D IRRs. In the second column, $m^i$ ($m = h, v, d$) indicates $i$ line nodes protected by $\sigma_m$. The third column shows the effect of the SOI, where the DLNs encircle a TRIM. TI and NI stand for the topological insulator and normal insulator, respectively. DP stands for Dirac points, which are located on the $(n \geq 3)$-fold rotational axes. For the case of I, the SOI makes a gap on the crossing DLNs, but we cannot determine whether the system becomes a TI or NI from the point group symmetries. For the TI, the topological indices $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3)$ are obtained from Eqs. [1] and [2]. The configurations of $d^3$ ($v^3$), $d^3v^3$, $h^3d^3$, $d^6$, and $h^3d^6$ are depicted in Figs. [1(a)–1(e)], respectively.

III. EFFECT OF SOI

In systems with SOI, mirror-reflection symmetry-protected line nodes are generally unstable [33] except for nonsymmorphic systems [19] [39] since the mirror-reflection eigenvalues for spin up and down are different, i.e., $\Gamma_{1a}$ with spin up hybridizes with $\Gamma_{1b}$ with spin down. This instability potentially leads to different topologically nontrivial phases such as Dirac/Weyl semimetals and topological insulators. The criteria for realizing these topological phases depend intrinsically on the level schemes and the number of line nodes encircling a TRIM, as we shall show in the following.

In the presence of SOI, the energy bands are labeled by the double representations, and 1D IRRs without SOI all become 2D IRRs after taking the product with the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ representation $E_{1/2}$. Therefore, after including SOI,
the crossing points of multiple line nodes on the $C_{nv}$-symmetric line remains as a Dirac point if each crossing energy band belongs to different double representations within $C_{nv}$, i.e., when $(\Gamma'_{1a}, \Gamma'_{1b})$ in $C_{nv}$ are compatible with the 1D IRRs of $(\Gamma_{1a}, \Gamma_{1b})$, and $\Gamma'_{1a} \times E_{1/2}$ and $\Gamma'_{1b} \times E_{1/2}$ are different. Note that the $C_{nv}$-symmetry-protected Dirac points occur independently of the presence of spatial-inversion symmetry. The same criterion is applicable to higher dimensional IRRs if $\Gamma_{(2n+1)a} \times E_{1/2}$ is decomposed into 2D IRRs, and two different 2D IRRs cross on a $C_{nv}$-symmetric line. However, we do not completely predict the presence of Dirac points from the level schemes since the multibands are labeled again after including the SOI. Off the $C_{nv}$-symmetric line, antisymmetric SOI may turn line nodes into Weyl points. The presence/absence of the Weyl points depends totally on the form of the SOI. It is beyond the scope of the paper to discuss such Weyl points.

If the SOI opens a gap on line nodes or an effect of breaking the crystalline symmetry destabilizes the Dirac point, the time-reversal-invariant systems potentially become topological insulators, depending on the band topology of the occupied states. For centrosymmetric systems with point groups $C_{nh}$, $D_{nh}$, $D_{3d}$, $T_h$, and $O_h$ ($n = 2, 4, 6$), we can adapt the parity criterion proved in Ref. [70] for the crossing line nodes, which allows us to determine the $Z_2$ topological number $(\nu_0; \nu_1; \nu_2; \nu_3)$ of the topological insulator from the number of DLNs in the system without the SOI: (see Appendix C for more details)

$$\nu_0 = \sum_{n_1, n_2, n_3 = 0, 1} N(\Gamma_{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}) \mod 2,$$

$$\nu_i = \sum_{n_i = 1; n_{i+1} = 0, 1} N(\Gamma_{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}) \mod 2,$$

where $N(\Gamma_{(n_1, n_2, n_3)})$ is the number of DLNs encircling the TRIM $\Gamma_{(n_1, n_2, n_3)} = n_1 b_1/2 + n_2 b_2/2 + n_3 b_3/2$ for $b_i$ the $i$-th primitive reciprocal lattice vector.

On the other hand, for noncentrosymmetric systems, we can partially determine the $Z_2$ topological numbers from the number of DLNs by adapting the mirror-parity criterion proved in Ref. [85] which is applicable to the DLN $h$ of $C_s$, $C_{3h}$, and $D_{3h}$, $v$ of $C_{2v}$, and $v^3$ of $C_{3v}$ and $D_{3h}$. For these cases, the strong index $\nu_0$ is given by Eq. [1]. The weak indices $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ are given by Eq. [2]. The weak third index $\nu_3$ is also determined from Eq. [2], except for $C_s$ and $C_{3h}$. For example, when a single DLN encircles a TRIM $\Gamma_{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}$ in the absence of SOI, the $Z_2$ topological numbers are given by $(1; n_1 n_2 n_3)$ for $h$ of $C_s$ and $C_{3h}$; $(1; n_1 n_2 n_3)$ for $h$ of $D_{3h}$, $v$ of $C_{2v}$, and $v^3$ of $C_{3v}$ and $D_{3h}$, where $\nu_3$ is determined for $C_{2v}$, $C_{3v}$, and $D_{3h}$ due to the presence of an additional mirror-reflection symmetry. Other noncentrosymmetric systems are outside the scope of the mirror-parity criterion and depend on the details of the SOI.

The obtained results enable us to predict the Dirac points and $Z_2$ topological invariants in the presence of SOI from the band structures in the absence of SOI, without calculating the inversion/mirror-reflection parities of the wave functions. As an example, in Table II, we show the results for four materials proposed in the literature.

### IV. APPLICATION TO RARE-EARTH TRIHYDRIDES

Applying the general theory, we show that a hexagonal rare-earth trihydride with the HoD$_3$ structure is a crossing-line-node semimetal with three line nodes. As a representative of the HoD$_3$-structure materials, we consider the hexagonal YH$_3$. Results for LuH$_3$ and ferromagnetic GdH$_3$ are shown in Appendix F. In the present work, the band structure is calculated using the WIEN2k code [90]. We used the full-potential linearized augmented plane-wave method within the generalized gradient approximation. $10 \times 10 \times 8$ k point sampling was used for the self-consistent calculation.

The gapless band structure in the hexagonal YH$_3$ was originally proposed by Dekker et al. [81] and is verified by our calculation, as shown in Fig. [2]. Nearly gapless band dispersions are found on the $\Gamma M$, $\Gamma K$, and $\Gamma A$ lines. The detailed calculation shown in Fig. [3] reveals that the band gap closes at $0.13 \, \text{Å}^{-1}$ on the $\Gamma M$ lines and at $0.14 \, \text{Å}^{-1}$ on the $\Gamma A$ lines while the gap opens by 4 meV on the $\Gamma K$ line. Moreover, the conduction and valence bands at the $\Gamma$ point are assigned to the $A_{2u}$ and $A_{2g}$ representations of $D_{3d}$, respectively. From the general theory, the system must host three crossing line nodes in the $A_{2g}$–$A_{2u}$ scheme. Three crossing line nodes are actually seen on the three mirror (METAL) planes. The location of the nodes is depicted in the inset of Fig. [2]. On the $\Gamma K$ line, a tiny band gap opens since the KFAC planes are not mirror planes. On other low-symmetry lines, the band gap is also weakly generated, on the order of $1 \, \text{meV}$. In other words, the system could behave as a Dirac-surface-node semimetal such as graphene networks [91] and BaMX$_3$ ($M = V$, Nb, Ta; $X = S, Se$) [92], except for the low-energy and low-temperature regime (less than 1 meV).

It is worth mentioning that the Fermi surface of the hole-doped system mainly consists of the 1s orbitals of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>LN w/ SOI</th>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT carbon</td>
<td>$h^3$</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$O_h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaN</td>
<td>$v^3$</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$D_{4h}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu$_3$NPd</td>
<td>$h^3$</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$O_h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaTe</td>
<td>$hv^2$</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$D_{4h}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YH$_3$</td>
<td>$d^3$</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>$D_{3d}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the H atoms (see the right panel of Fig. 2). At $E_F = -0.5$ eV, at which the carrier density is about $10^{20} \text{cm}^{-3}$; 90% of the total density of states comes from the 1s orbitals of H. This Fermi surface might lead to high-temperature superconductivity, as in hydrogen sulfide [92,94]. Indeed, YH$_3$ has been predicted to be a superconductor below 40 K under 17.7 GPa [95], although the crystal structure is not the HoD$_3$ structure but the fcc under pressure [96, 100].

As mentioned above, the crossing line nodes realize and encircle the Γ point, which has the $D_{3d}$-point-group symmetry. The conduction and valence bands at the Γ point are not degenerate, i.e., belong to the 1D IRRs of the $D_{3d}$ point group. Then, our general theory shown in Table I and Eqs. (1) and (2) tells us that the SOI induces a gap on the crossing line nodes. The resulting gapped state is a strong topological insulator of (1:000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E [\text{eV}]$</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_{2u}$</td>
<td>$A_2g$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 2. Energy band and density of states of hexagonal YH$_3$. The inset shows three crossing line nodes on the $M\bar{F}A\bar{L}$ planes, which corresponds to $d^3$ of $D_{3d}$ in Table I and Fig. 3(a). The solid (red) and dashed (blue) lines denote the density of states of the H and Y atoms, respectively.

FIG. 3. Energy bands of YH$_3$ near the crossing line nodes (a) without and (b) with SOI.

Notice that, strictly speaking, the system is semimetallic but the topological invariants are well defined since the direct gap opens at any momenta. The first-principles data, which are shown in Fig. 3(b), coincides with this prediction. The induced spin-orbit gap is estimated to be on the order of 1 meV. The SOI of the Y atom is small because it is not a heavy element. The SOI of the H atom is, obviously, negligible. Note that the Dirac point on the A point, which is located 0.7 eV below the Fermi level, still remains even in the presence of SOI, due to the nonsymmorphic symmetry of $P\bar{3}c1$ [3].

Finally, we construct a low-energy effective $k\cdot p$ Hamiltonian in the vicinity of the Γ point to describe the crossing line nodes and SOI, as follows: $H_0(k) = c(k)\sigma_0 s_0 + m(k)\sigma_3 s_0 + A(k^3_x - 3k_x k_y^2)\sigma_2 s_0 + O(k^4)$, $H_{\text{SOI}}(k) = \lambda_1 \sigma_1 s_z k_z + \lambda_2 \sigma_1 (s_x k_x + s_y k_y) + O(k^3)$, $c(k) = c_0 + c_1 k_x^2 + c_2 (k_x^2 + k_y^2)$, $m(k) = m_0 + m_1 k_x^2 + m_2 (k_x^2 + k_y^2)$. Here, $\sigma_i$ denotes the Pauli matrix for the orbitals ($\sigma_3 = \pm 1$ for the $A_{2g}$ and $A_{2u}$ orbitals, respectively). $s_i$ denotes the Pauli matrix for the spin. The parameters are determined to reproduce the crossing line nodes of the first-principles data: $c_0 = 0.01391 \text{eV}$, $c_1 = -0.5444 \text{eVA}^2$, $c_2 = 0.1185 \text{eVA}^2$, $m_0 = -0.15156 \text{eV}$, $m_1 = 8.082 \text{eVA}^2$, $m_2 = 8.314 \text{eVA}^2$, $A = 0.70 \text{eVA}^2$, $\lambda_1 = 0.01395 \text{eV}$, $\lambda_2 = 0.00621 \text{eV}$. As seen in Fig. 2, the band structure is nearly isotropic and particle-hole symmetric, hence the parameters approximately satisfy $m_1 \sim m_2$ and $c_i \ll m_i$. Calculating the surface states of the above effective model, we verify that YH$_3$ is a strong topological insulator of (1:000). We focus on the (001) surface. $k_z$ in the above Hamiltonian is regularized as $k_z \rightarrow \text{sin}(k_z c)/c$ and $k_z^2 \rightarrow 2[1 - \text{cos}(k_z c)]/c^2$. The obtained lattice Hamiltonian is solved by using the recursive Green’s function technique [101, 102], and the angle-resolved density of states on the (001) surface is shown in Fig. 4. The system is, as mentioned above, a semimetal but hosts gapless surface states around the Γ point, which is projected from the Γ point onto the surface, within the direct gap. This directly proves that the direct gap of YH$_3$ is characterized by the topological indices (1:000).

FIG. 4. Angle-resolved density of states $D(k_{||}, E)$ on the (001) surface of YH$_3$. 

$\bar{M} \rightarrow \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \bar{K}$
V. SUMMARY

We studied a general theory classifying crossing-line-node semimetals under point-group symmetries. The classification tells us the configuration of crossing line nodes for a given level scheme of conduction and valence bands. This also enables us to determine whether the crossing line nodes are gapped by the SOI from the configuration of the nodes. This will be quite important for materials development, i.e., one can predict materials being topological insulators and semimetals by exploring the band-calculation database in the absence of SOI, without any detailed calculations.

We found that the rare-earth trihydride YH$_3$, as a representative of HoD$_3$–structure materials, is a crossing-line-node semimetal, which hosts three line nodes on the mirror-reflection-invariant planes. Although YH$_3$ is known to probably be an insulator by correlation effects, the present study encourages us to address materials with the HoD$_3$ structure and promises to realize a new topological semimetal.

This study has extensively revealed the electronic states of crossing line nodes. There, on the other hand, remains an interesting issue: topological transports and responses in crossing-line-node semimetals. The configuration is distinct from those of other point, line, and surface nodal structures. Therefore, we expect new topological quantum phenomena in crossing-line-node semimetals, which should be clarified in future work.
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Appendix A: Tables of line node configurations for 1D IRRs

Tables [III][IV] and [V] show the correspondence between the level schemes and line node configurations building on the criteria, where $m^i$ and 0 indicate $i$ line nodes protected by $\sigma_m$ and the absence of a stable line node. After including the SOI, when crossing DLNs encircle a TRIM, they transform into normal (NI)/topological (TI) insulators or a Dirac point (DP). For the case of I, the SOI makes a gap on the crossing DLNs, but we cannot determine whether the system becomes a TI or NI from the point group symmetries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$D_{4h}$ ($n = 2, 4, 6$)</th>
<th>$D_{4d}$</th>
<th>$C_{2v}$</th>
<th>$C_{3v}$</th>
<th>$C_{4v}$ ($n = 2, 3)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>$A_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$d^R$/I</td>
<td>$d^R$/I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$d^R$/I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$d^R$/I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Line node configurations, level schemes, and the effect of SOI in $D_{4d}$ and $C_{2v}$ for 1D IRRs.

Appendix B: Symmetry-adapted effective models

First of all, consider a level scheme consisting of 1D IRRs $\Gamma_{1a}$ and $\Gamma_{1b}$. The low-energy effective Hamiltonian is generally described by

$$H(k) = f_0(k)\sigma_0 + f_\sigma(k)\sigma_\sigma + f_+ (k)\sigma_+ + f_+ (k)^* \sigma_-,$$

(B1)

where $(\sigma_0, \sigma_\sigma)$ are the $2 \times 2$ identity and Pauli matrices in the orbital space and $\sigma_\pm = (\sigma_x \pm i\sigma_y)/2$. We assume that the Hamiltonian (B1) possesses time-reversal symmetry, which demands that $f_0(k)^* = f_0(-k)$, $f_\sigma(k)^* = f_\sigma(-k)$, and $f_+ (k)^* = f_+ (-k)$. The group operation on this Hamiltonian is defined by

$$U(g)^\dagger H(k)U(g) = H(D(g)k),$$

(B2)

where $U(g)$ is a unitary matrix in terms of $g$ in the orbital space and $D(g)$ represents a rotation matrix concerning $g$. 

---

*Table and text continued here...*
in the momentum space. Since we focus on the 1D IRRs, $U(g)$ becomes $\pm \sigma_0$ or $\pm \sigma_z$. In particular, the mirror-reflection operations $\sigma_h$, $\sigma_v$, and $\sigma_d$ are given as follows:

- $\sigma_h$ in $C_s$, $C_{nh}$, $D_{nh}$, $T_h$, and $O_h$:

  \[ U(\sigma_h)^\dagger H(k_x, k_y, k_z) U(\sigma_h) = H(k_x, k_y, -k_z). \]  

- $\sigma_v(yz)$ in $C_{2v}$ and $D_{2h}$; $\sigma_v$ in $C_{nv}$ and $D_{nh}$ ($n = 3, 4, 6$); $\sigma_d$ in $D_{1d}$ ($l = 2, 3, 4, 6$):

  \[ U(\sigma_{v(d)})^\dagger H(k_x, k_y, k_z) U(\sigma_{v(d)}) = H(-k_x, k_y, k_z). \]  

- $\sigma_v(xz)$ in $C_{2v}$ and $D_{2h}$; $\sigma_d$ in $C_{6v}$ and $D_{6h}$:

  \[ U(\sigma_{v(d)})^\dagger H(k_x, k_y, k_z) U(\sigma_{v(d)}) = H(k_x, -k_y, k_z). \]
TABLE V. Line node configurations, level schemes, and the effect of SOI in $T_d$, $T_h$, and $O_h$ for 1D IRRs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_d$</th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$A_2$</th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$d^6/4$</th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
<th>$d^6/4$</th>
<th>$A_2$</th>
<th>$0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_h$</td>
<td>$A_u$</td>
<td>$A_u$</td>
<td>$A_u$</td>
<td>$h^3/4T$</td>
<td>$A_u$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$h^3/4T$</td>
<td>$A_u$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_h$</td>
<td>$A_{1u}$</td>
<td>$A_{2u}$</td>
<td>$A_{1u}$</td>
<td>$A_{2u}$</td>
<td>$A_{1u}$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$d^6/4$</td>
<td>$A_{2u}$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $\sigma_d$ in $C_{4v}$, $D_{4h}$, $T_d$, and $O_h$:

$$U(\sigma_d)^T H(k_x, k_y, k_z) U(\sigma_d) = H(k_y, k_x, k_z). \quad (B6)$$

Assuming that the crossing energy bands appear around the $\sigma_m$ ($m = h, v, d$)-symmetric planes, the crossing line is stable if $f_+ = 0$ on the $\sigma_m$-symmetric planes because the $f_+$ term describes the band mixing between $\Gamma_{1a}$ and $\Gamma_{1b}$ and makes a gap. Thus, the stable DLNs requires that $U(\sigma_m) = \pm \sigma_z$, leading to $f_+(k_x, k_y) = -f_+(k_y, k_x)$, where $k_x$ and $k_y$ are the momenta parallel to and perpendicular to the $\sigma_m$-symmetric planes. This condition is consistent with the criterion in the main paragraph. Table VI shows the symmetry-adapted $f_+(k)$ for each line node configuration.

Next, consider a level scheme consisting of 2D (3D) IRRs ($\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$) [$\Gamma_3, \Gamma_3$]. To avoid cumbersome multiband effects, we ignore the level splitting and consider doubly (triply) degenerate conduction and valence bands as a starting point. In that case, the energy bands all form a DLN, and it is possible to decompose the effective Hamiltonian for 2D (3D) IRRs into two (three) $2 \times 2$ effective Hamiltonians in terms of 1D IRRs. As an example of 2D IRRs, we discuss the level scheme ($E, E$) for $C_{3v}$. The symmetry operators are defined as

$$U(\sigma_d) = \text{diag}[1, -1, 1, -1], \quad (B7)$$

$$U(C_3) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (B8)$$

Then, the symmetry-adapted effective Hamiltonian is given by

$$H(k) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0(k) & 0 & 0 & i\epsilon \Re[k^3_+ + k^3_-] \\ 0 & f_0(k) & -i\epsilon \Re[k^3_+ + k^3_-] & 0 \\ 0 & i\epsilon \Re[k^3_- + k^3_+] & g_0(k) & 0 \\ -i\epsilon \Re[k^3_- + k^3_+] & 0 & 0 & g_0(k) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (B9)$$

where $f_0(k) = c_0 + c_1 k^2_x + c_2 (k^2_y + k^2_z)$ and $g_0(k) = c_0 + c_1 k^2_x + c_2 (k^2_y + k^2_z)$. Here, $c_0$, $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $\epsilon$ are material dependent parameters. The effective Hamiltonian can be described by the block-diagonal form: $H_+^{\epsilon \sigma}(k) + H_-^{\epsilon \sigma}(k)$, where $H_+^{\epsilon \sigma}(k)$ is a $2 \times 2$ effective Hamiltonian with $f_+(k) = \pm i\epsilon \Re[k^3_+ + k^3_-]$. When $f_0$ and $g_0$ on the $\sigma_m$-symmetric planes, we obtain six DLNs and label this line node configuration as $2v^3$, where $\nu n^i$ represents $i$-th degenerate DLNs protected by $\sigma_m$, i.e., $n \times i$ line nodes appear on the $\sigma_m$-symmetric plane. To check the effect of band splitting, we include it as a perturbation: $H(k) + H'(k)$ with

$$H'(k) = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \Re[k^3_+] & v_1 \Im[k^2_+] & v_2 \Re[k^2_+] & v_2 \Im[k^2_+ + k^2_-] \\ v_1 \Im[k^2_+] & -v_1 \Re[k^2_+] & v_2 \Im[k^2_+] & v_2 \Re[k^2_+ - k^2_-] \\ v_2 \Re[k^2_+] & v_2 \Im[k^2_+] & v_1 \Re[k^2_+] & v_1 \Im[k^2_+ - k^2_-] \\ v_2 \Im[k^2_+] & v_2 \Re[k^2_+] & v_1 \Im[k^2_+ - k^2_-] & -v_1 \Re[k^2_+ + k^2_-] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (B10)$$

Since the three $\sigma_m$-symmetric planes are equivalent, we focus on the $\sigma_v$-symmetric plane of $k_x = 0$, on which the eigenvalues of $H(k) + H'(k)$ are

$$\epsilon_1(\pm k) = \frac{f_0 + g_0}{2} + v_1 k_y^2 \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{f_0 - g_0}{2}\right)^2 + v_1^2 k_y^2}, \quad (B11)$$

$$\epsilon_2(\pm k) = \frac{f_0 + g_0}{2} - v_1 k_y^2 \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{f_0 - g_0}{2}\right)^2 + v_1^2 k_y^2}. \quad (B12)$$

The energy bands are plotted in Fig. 5. The small band splitting does not break the $2v^3$ line node structure when $v_1 > v_2$ [see Fig. 5(a)]. On the other hand, for large $v_1$, $2v^3$ changes to $v^3$ due to the change in band structure [see Fig. 5(b)]. Thus, although there exist at most two line nodes on a $\sigma_v$-symmetric plane, we can engineer the line node configuration from $2v^3$ to $v^3$ or 0 by the band splitting $H'(k)$. In a similar manner, we can construct symmetry-adapted effective models for 3D IRRs. For example, consider the level scheme consisting of $(\Gamma_2, \Gamma_{1u})$ of $O_h$. In this case, the Hamiltonian is block-diagonalized as $H_{h_2}(k) + H_{h_3}(k) + H_{h_4}(k)$, where $H_{h_3}(k)$ is a $2 \times 2$ effective Hamiltonian with $f_+(k) = v_k k_y k_z$. Thus, we obtain nine DLNs, labeled by $3h^3$. After including the effect of band splitting, $3h^3$ changes to $2h^3$, $h^3$, or 0. In general, the decomposition of level schemes $(\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3)$ into $H_{m}(k)$ is possible if $\Gamma_{2s} \times \Gamma_{2s} \in \Gamma_{2s}$ includes a 1D IRR whose character of $m^i$ is $-1$. We list possible decompositions for level schemes with 2D and 3D IRRs in Table VII. Our method derives symmetry-adapted effective
TABLE VI. Symmetry-adapted \( f_+^{(i)}(k) \) for each line node configuration in point groups (PGs), where \( k_{\pm} = k_x \pm ik_y \). We show \( f_+^{(i)}(k) \) for \( d^n \) of \( D_{nd} \) when \( U(C^*_0) \) is given by \( U(C^*_0) = \pm \sigma_0 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Line nodes</th>
<th>( f_+^{(i)}(k) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_s,C_{3nh} )</td>
<td>( h )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{3d} )</td>
<td>( d^3 )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{nd} ) ( (n = 2, 4, 6) )</td>
<td>( d^n )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{2v} )</td>
<td>( (xz); (yz); (yz)(xz) )</td>
<td>( k_{yz}, k_{z}; k_x k_y )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{3v} )</td>
<td>( v^3 )</td>
<td>( \text{Re} [k_x^3] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{4v} )</td>
<td>( v^3; d^2; v^2 d^2 )</td>
<td>( \text{Im} [k_x^3]; \text{Re} [k_y^3]; \text{Re} [k_z^3]; \text{Im} [k_x^3] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{6v} )</td>
<td>( v^3; d^3; v d^3 )</td>
<td>( k_y; k_x; k_z )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{2h} )</td>
<td>( (xz); (yz); (xy); (xz)(yz); (yz)(xy); (yz)(xz)(xy) )</td>
<td>( k_y k_x; k_x k_z; k_y k_z; k_x k_y k_z )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{3h} )</td>
<td>( h; v^3; h v^3 )</td>
<td>( k_z; k_x \text{Re} [k_x^3]; k_x \text{Re} [k_y^3] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{4h} )</td>
<td>( h; v^2; d^3; v^2 d^3 )</td>
<td>( k_z; k_y \text{Re} [k_x^3]; k_y \text{Re} [k_y^3]; k_z \text{Re} [k_y^3] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{6h} )</td>
<td>( h; v^3; d^3; v^3 d^3 )</td>
<td>( k_z; k_x \text{Re} [k_x^3]; k_x \text{Re} [k_y^3] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_d )</td>
<td>( d^6 )</td>
<td>( k_x k_y k_z )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_h )</td>
<td>( h^3 )</td>
<td>( k_x k_y k_z; (k_x^2 - k_y^2)(k_y^2 - k_z^2); k_x k_y k_z; (k_x^2 - k_y^2)(k_y^2 - k_z^2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O_h )</td>
<td>( h^3; d^6; h^3 d^6 )</td>
<td>( k_x k_y k_z; (k_x^2 - k_y^2)(k_y^2 - k_z^2); k_x k_y k_z; (k_x^2 - k_y^2)(k_y^2 - k_z^2) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 5. Evolution from double line nodes \( 2v^3 \) to single line node \( v^3 \). The energy bands of the effective model for 2D IRRs defined by Eqs. (B11) and (B12) with parameters \((c_0, c_2, c_4, c_2, k_z) = (-1, 1, 1, -1, 0)\), \( v_1 = 0.5 \) and \( v_2 = 0.3 \) for (a). \( v_1 = 2.5 \) and \( v_2 = 0.3 \) for (b).

models in a comprehensive fashion, but accidental line nodes often occur off mirror-reflection symmetric planes.

Finally, we mention the cases that level schemes connect and the sewing matrix defined by, respectively, \( A_j(k) \) and \( B_j(k) \) are the non-Abelian Berry connection and the sewing matrix defined by, respectively,

\[
[A(k)]_{mn} = -i \langle k, m | \partial_k | k, n \rangle, \quad [B_j(k_l, k_i)]_{mn} = \langle k, m | B_j | k - G_j, n \rangle |_{k_j = \pi}.
\]

and valence bands with opposite mirror-reflection eigenvalues. That is, on the \( \sigma_m \)-symmetric plane, the topological number can be given by counting the number of occupied states with \( \sigma_m = \lambda \) outside and inside of the nodal loops:

\[
Q_\lambda = n^\lambda_{\text{occ, } \lambda} - n^\lambda_{\text{occ, } -\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z},
\]

where \( n^\lambda_{\text{occ, } \lambda} \) is the number of occupied states with \( \sigma_m = \lambda \) outside (inside) a nodal loop. In the following, we consider time-reversal-invariant systems and show the \( Z_2 \) topological number of line nodes, which is associated with the \( Z_2 \) topological number of TIs.

1. \( Z_2 \) topological number in the absence of SOI

From previous studies [35 39 40], a DLN gives a non-trivial \( Z_2 \) topological number in terms of the Berry phase, which links to the drumhead surface state and polarization (see Appendix D). The Berry phase in spinless systems is defined by [35]

\[
\Phi_j(k_l, k_i) = \oint_C dk_j \text{tr} A_j(k) - i \text{tr} \ln B_j(k_l, k_i),
\]

where \( A_j(k) \) and \( B_j(k) \) are the non-Abelian Berry connection and the sewing matrix defined by, respectively,
Here, \( i, j, l = 1, 2, 3 \), \( |k, n⟩ \) is the Bloch function with band index \( n \), and the sewing matrix originates from a nontrivial periodic boundary condition:

\[
H(k) = B_j^\dagger H(k + G_j)B_j,
\]

instead of imposing the momentum dependence on a group operation. Using the Berry phase, the \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) topological number is given by

\[
(-1)^{\nu(k_i, k_l)} = e^{i\phi_j(k_i; k_l)},
\]

where \( \nu(k_i, k_l) \) takes values of 0 or 1 due to the constraints from the spatial-inversion or mirror-reflection symmetry. If \( \nu(k_i, k_l) = 1 \), a loop \( C \) encircles a band degeneracy, implying that an odd number of DLNs penetrate into the inner side of \( C \). In the following, we relate the \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) topological numbers to spatial-inversion or mirror-reflection eigenvalues at a high symmetric momentum. Note that a similar argument was discussed in Refs. 35 and 70. For simplicity, we assume in the following that the nontrivial boundary condition occurs only for the \( k_\perp \) direction, i.e., \( H(k_\perp, k_\parallel) = B_\parallel^\dagger H(k_\perp + G_\perp, k_\parallel)B_\parallel \), where \( k_\parallel \) is a momentum perpendicular to \( k_\perp \).

First of all, consider centrosymmetric systems. The Hamiltonian hosts the spatial-inversion symmetry as

\[
PH(k)P^\dagger = H(-k),
\]

where \( P \) is the spatial-inversion operator. Under the inversion operation, the non-Abelian Berry connection transforms as

\[
A(k) = -P(-k)^\dagger A(-k)P(-k) - iP(-k)^\dagger \partial_k P(-k),
\]

where \( P(k)|_{nm} = \langle k, m|P|=k, n⟩ \). As we consider the loop \( C = \{(k_\perp, \Gamma_\parallel) | -\pi \leq k_\perp \leq \pi \} \), where \( \Gamma_\parallel \) is a

---

### TABLE VII. Possible line node configurations for level scheme with 2D and 3D IRRs, where we ignore the effect of band splittings. \( nm^i \) represents \( n \)th-degenerate line nodes protected by \( \sigma_m \) on \( \sigma_m \)-symmetric planes, i.e., \( n \times i \) line nodes appear in total. Taking into account band splittings, the line node configurations change from \( nm^i \) to \((n - 1)m^i, (n - 2)m^i, \cdots, m^i \), or 0, depending on the magnitude of the band splittings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Level scheme</th>
<th>Line nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_{3h} )</td>
<td>( (E', E'') )</td>
<td>( 2h )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{4h} )</td>
<td>( (E_g, E_u) )</td>
<td>( 2h )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{6h} )</td>
<td>( (E_{1g(u)}, E_{2g(u)}), (E_{1(2)g}, E_{1(2)g}) )</td>
<td>( 2h )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{2d} )</td>
<td>( (E, E) )</td>
<td>( 2d^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{3d} )</td>
<td>( (E_g(u), E_g(u)), (E_g, E_u) )</td>
<td>( 2d^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{4d} )</td>
<td>( (E_i, E_i) )</td>
<td>( 2d^4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{6d} )</td>
<td>( (E_i, E_i) )</td>
<td>( 2d^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{3v} )</td>
<td>( (E, E) )</td>
<td>( 2v^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{4v} )</td>
<td>( (E, E) )</td>
<td>( 2v^3, 2v^2d^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{0v} )</td>
<td>( (E_i, E_i) )</td>
<td>( 2v^3d^3, 2v^3, 2d^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{3h} )</td>
<td>( (E', E''), (E', E'') )</td>
<td>( 2v^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{4h} )</td>
<td>( (E_g(u), E_g(u)) )</td>
<td>( 2v^2, 2d^2, 2v^2d^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_{6h} )</td>
<td>( (E_{1g(u)}, E_{1g(u)}), (E_{2g(u)}, E_{2g(u)}) )</td>
<td>( 2v^3d^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_d )</td>
<td>( (E, E) )</td>
<td>( 2d^5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_h )</td>
<td>( (E_g, E_u) )</td>
<td>( 2h^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O_h )</td>
<td>( (E_g, E_g) )</td>
<td>( 2d^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (T_{1g(u)}, T_{2g(u)}) )</td>
<td>( 3d^6 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (T_{1g(u)}, T_{2g(u)}) )</td>
<td>( 3h^3d^6 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (T_{1g(u)}, T_{2g(u)}) )</td>
<td>( 3h^3d^6 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRIM on the plane perpendicular to the $k_\perp$ direction, the integral of $A(k)$ becomes
\[
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_\perp trA_\perp(k_\perp, \Gamma_\parallel) = -\int_{0}^{\pi} dk_\perp trA_\perp(k_\perp, \Gamma_\parallel) + i \int_{0}^{\pi} dk_\perp trP(k_\perp, \Gamma_\parallel) \partial_{k_\perp} P(k_\perp, \Gamma_\parallel),
\]
which yields
\[
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dk_\perp trA_\perp(k) = i \ln \frac{det P(\pi, \Gamma_\parallel)}{det P(0, \Gamma_\parallel)} + 2\pi n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
Substituting Eq. (C10) into Eq. (C2), one obtains
\[
\Phi_\perp(\Gamma_\parallel) = i \ln \frac{det P(\pi, \Gamma_\parallel)}{det P(0, \Gamma_\parallel)} + 2\pi n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},
\]
where $[P(\pi, \Gamma_\parallel)]_{mn} \equiv \frac{1}{2} [P(\pi, \Gamma_\parallel)B_\perp(\Gamma_\parallel)]_{mn} = \langle (\pi, \Gamma_\parallel), m|PB_\perp(\Gamma_\parallel), n \rangle$. Therefore, when we choose the basis as $[P(\Gamma_\parallel)]_{nm} = \xi_n(\Gamma_\parallel)\delta_{mn}$, this results in
\[
(-1)^{\nu(\Gamma)} = \prod_{n \in occ} \xi_n(0, \Gamma_\parallel)\xi_n(\pi, \Gamma_\parallel),
\]
which relates the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number to the parity eigenvalues of the TRIMs. Here, $\xi_n(\Gamma)$ is the eigenvalue of $P$ at $\Gamma$ and takes $\pm 1$. For a surface $S_{in} = \{(k_j, k_i, k_i = \eta\pi) | -\pi \leq k_j, k_i \leq \pi \}$ ($\eta = 0, 1$, the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number of $C = \partial S_{in}$ is given by
\[
(-1)^{N(S_{in})} = \prod_{n_j, n_i = 0, 1} \prod_{n \in occ} \xi_n(\Gamma_{(n_j, n_i, n)}) \equiv \prod_{n_j, n_i = 0, 1} \prod_{n \in occ} \xi_n(\Gamma_{(n_j, n_i, n)}).
\]
where $N(S_{in})$ is the number of DLNs penetrating into $S_{in}$. Note that when a DLN crosses $\partial S_{in}$, we slightly modify the path with spatial-inversion symmetry. (See Fig. 5 as an example.)

Next, consider noncentrosymmetric systems. In this case, we use the mirror-reflection symmetry instead of the spatial-inversion symmetry. The mirror-reflection symmetry satisfies
\[
MH(k_\perp, k_\parallel)M^\dagger = H(-k_\perp, k_\parallel),
\]
where $M$ is the mirror-reflection operator. Under the mirror-reflection operation, the non-Abelian Berry connection transforms as
\[
A(k_\perp, k_\parallel) = -M(-k_\perp, k_\parallel)A(-k_\perp, k_\parallel)M(-k_\perp, k_\parallel) - iM(-k_\perp, k_\parallel) \partial_{k_\perp} M(-k_\perp, k_\parallel),
\]
where $[M(k_\perp, k_\parallel)]_{nm} = \langle (k_\perp, k_\parallel), m|M(-k_\perp, k_\parallel), n \rangle$. After integrating $A(k)$ along $C = \{(k_\perp, k_\parallel) | -\pi \leq k_\perp \leq \pi \}$ in a similar manner to the case of the spatial-inversion symmetry, it turns out that
\[
\Phi_{\perp}(k_\parallel) = i \ln \frac{det M(\pi, k_\parallel)}{det M(0, k_\parallel)} + 2\pi n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},
\]
where $\Phi_{\perp}$ is a TRIM outside (inside) the nodal ring on the plane of $k_\perp = 0$.

FIG. 6. The shape of loop $C = \partial S_{30}$ on the plane of $k_3 = 0$, where the red dots indicate the position of DLNs. Here, we assume the crossing line nodes encircle $\Gamma_{(0,0,0)}$ and change the path slightly in order to avoid the line node. Figure (a) represents the line node configuration $h$ of $C_{19}$, $C_{18}$, $D_{18}$, and $D_{2h}$ ($l = 2, 4, 6$), (b) $v^2d^2$ of $D_{4h}$, (c) $d^3$ of $D_{3d}$, and (d) $v^2d^3$ of $D_{6h}$.

In contrast with the spatial inversion cases, Eq. (C18) is applicable only if a DLN does not cross $\partial S_{in}$.

Finally, we mention the connection between the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number and $Q_\lambda$. When a Dirac nodal ring exists on the plane of $k_\perp = 0$ and encircles a TRIM, it follows from the definition of $Q_\lambda$ that
\[
(-1)^{Q_\lambda} = \prod_{n \in occ} \xi_n(0, \Gamma_{\parallel, >}) \xi_n(0, \Gamma_{\parallel, <}) = \prod_{k_\perp=0, \pi \in occ} \xi_n(k_\perp, \Gamma_{\parallel, >}) \xi_n(k_\perp, \Gamma_{\parallel, <}) = (-1)^{\nu(\Gamma_{\parallel, <})},
\]
where $\Gamma_{\parallel, >(<)}$ is a TRIM outside (inside) the nodal ring on the plane of $k_\perp = 0$. 

}\]
2. $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number of topological insulators

Taking into account the SOI, some cases become topological insulators. Here, we prove the criterion of topological insulators, connecting the number of DLNs with the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number of topological insulators. We start with the simplified expression: \[ \nu_{in} = \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_{j,i,n}(k_l = 0) + \Phi_{j,i,n}(k_l = \pi)}{2} \pmod{2} \quad \text{(C20)} \]

with
\[
\tilde{\Phi}_{j,i,n}(k_l) = \oint_C \, dk_j \, \text{tr} A_j(k)|_{k_z = \eta \pi} - i \ln B_j(k_l, \eta \pi),
\]
\[ \text{(C21)} \]

where $\eta = 0, 1$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_{j,i,n}(k_l)$ includes the spin degrees of freedom, i.e., $\Phi_{j,i,n}(k_l) = 2\Phi_j(k_l = \eta \pi, k_l)$ in the SOI-free limit. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number is obtained by $\nu_0 = \nu_1 + \nu_2 \pmod{2}$ and $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Note that Eq. \[ \text{(C20)} \]
is applicable to noncentrosymmetric systems only when the $k_z$ axis is perpendicular to the mirror-reflection symmetric plane. When we choose a loop $C$ that does not cross DLNs in systems without SOI, the systems have a gap along $C$ with and without the SOI. Hence, the topological number does not change even when the SOI is turned off. Therefore, Eq. \[ \text{(C20)} \]is rewritten as
\[
(-1)^{\nu_{in}} = \exp \left[ i \left( \Phi_{j,i,n}(k_l = 0) + \Phi_{j,i,n}(k_l = \pi) \right) \right] \]
\[ = \exp \left[ i \left( \Phi_j(0, \eta \pi) + \Phi_j(\pi, \eta \pi) \right) \right] \]
\[ = (-1)^{\nu(0, \eta \pi) + \nu(\pi, \eta \pi)} \]
\[ = (-1)^{N(S_{in})}, \quad \text{(C22)} \]

where $N(S_{in})$ represents the number of line nodes penetrating into the surface $S_{in} = \{(k_j, k_l, k_i = \eta \pi) - \pi \leq k_j, k_l \leq \pi\}$. Using the eigenvalues, Equation \[ \text{(C22)} \]immediately leads to
\[
\nu_{in} = N(S_{in}) \pmod{2}, \quad \text{(C23)}
\]
and Eqs. (1) and (2) in the main paper. Equation \[ \text{(C22)} \]is described by, for centrosymmetric systems,
\[
(-1)^{N(S_{in})} = \prod_{k_j, k_l = 0, \pi} \prod_{n \in \text{occ}} \xi_n(k_j, k_l, k_i = \eta \pi), \quad \text{(C24)}
\]
and, for noncentrosymmetric systems,
\[
(-1)^{N(S_{in})} = \prod_{k_j, k_l = 0, \pi} \prod_{n \in \text{occ}} \zeta_n(k_j, k_l, k_i = \eta \pi). \quad \text{(C25)}
\]

Concretely, consider a crossing DLN encircling $\Gamma_{(0,0,0)}$ in a centrosymmetric system. In this case, the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topological number \[ \text{(C20)} \]is calculated as $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu_3 = 0$ and $\nu_0 = \nu_20 = \nu_30 = N(\Gamma_{(0,0,0)}) \pmod{2}$, where $N(\Gamma_{(0,0,0)})$ is the number of line nodes encircling $\Gamma_{(0,0,0)}$. Thus, one obtains
\[
\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu_3 = 0, \quad \text{(C26)}
\]
\[
\nu_0 = N(\Gamma_{(0,0,0)}) \pmod{2}. \quad \text{(C27)}
\]

Therefore, when the SOI makes a gap, the systems with an odd number of DLNs become topological insulators.

Appendix D: Drumhead surface states

The one-dimensional $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant Eq. \[ \text{(C6)} \]partially guarantees the presence of drumhead surface states \[ \text{[7, 35]} \]. Here, we show an example of drumhead surface states for crossing-line-node semimetals.

As an example, we examine two minimal models consisting of $A_{1g}$ and $A_{2u}$ orbitals ($A_{1g}$–$A_{2u}$ model) and of $A_{1g}$ and $B_{1g}$ orbitals ($A_{1g}$–$B_{1g}$ model) under the $D_{4h}$ point-group symmetry. The Hamiltonians for these models are explicitly shown in the next section \[ \text{[C]} \]. Line nodes appear on the $k_z = 0$ plane ($h$) in the former model \[ \text{[Fig. 7(a)]} \]while on the diagonal mirror planes ($k_x = \pm k_y$) but not on the vertical planes ($k_x, k_y = 0, \pi$) ($d^2$) in the latter model \[ \text{[Fig. 7(b)]} \]. The configurations, $h$ and $d^2$, of line nodes are consistent with the general theory discussed in the main manuscript. Moreover, the general formulae Eqs. \[ \text{(C17)} \]and \[ \text{(C19)} \]derived in the previous section tells us that the one-dimensional invariant $\nu_{[hkl]}(k_z)$, where the subscript $[hkl]$ denotes the direction of the integral path and $k_z$ is perpendicular to $[hkl]$, is obtained as follows: $\nu_{[001]}(k_z) = 1$ for the $A_{1g}$–$A_{2u}$ model and $\nu_{[110]}(k_z) = \nu_{[101]}(k_z) = 1$ for the $A_{1g}$–$B_{1g}$ model for $k_z$ located within the line nodes. Additionally, in the latter model, $\nu_{[100]}(k_z) = 0$ holds because there is no line node on the (100) and (010) planes. Correspondingly, there exist surface states on the (001) surface of the former model and on the (110) and (101) surfaces of the latter model while there is no surface state on the (100) and (010) surfaces in the latter model, as numerically verified below.

We show the angle-resolved density of states on two different surfaces for the two models by calculating the surface Green’s function \[ \text{[101, 102]} \]. There exists a drumhead surface state within the line node on both the (001) \[ \text{[Fig. 7(b)]} \]and (101) \[ \text{[Fig. 7(c)]} \]surfaces of the $A_{1g}$–$A_{2u}$ model. The $A_{1g}$–$B_{1g}$ model, on the other hand, has no surface state on the (100) surface, as shown in Fig. \[ \text{[7(e)]} \], because the two line nodes have completely overlapped on the (100) surface. On the other surfaces, e.g., the (110) surface shown in Fig. \[ \text{[7(f)]} \], surface states can emerge in the region in which the line nodes are not overlapping. This result is also consistent with the general theory.
Appendix E: Effective models

1. $A_{1g}-A_{2u}$ model in $D_{4h}$

$k \cdot p$ Hamiltonian:

$$H(k) = c(k)\sigma_0 + m(k)\sigma_z + v k_z \sigma_y,$$

with

$$c(k) = c_0 + c_1 k_x^2 + c_2 (k_x^2 + k_y^2),$$

$$m(k) = m_0 + m_1 k_x^2 + m_2 (k_x^2 + k_y^2),$$

up to the second order of the momentum $k$. The Hamiltonian is regularized on the cubic lattice into

$$H'(k) = c'(k)\sigma_0 + m'(k)\sigma_z + v \sin k_z \sigma_y,$$

with

$$c'(k) = c_0 + 2 c_1 (1 - \cos k_z) + 2 c_2 (2 - \cos k_x - \cos k_y),$$

$$m'(k) = m_0 + 2 m_1 (1 - \cos k_z) + 2 m_2 (2 - \cos k_x - \cos k_y).$$

In order to calculate the surface electronic states, we set the semi-infinite Hamiltonian as

$$H(k_1, k_2) = \sum_n c_n^t \epsilon_n c_n + \sum_n (c_n^t t c_{n+1} + c_{n+1}^t t^t c_n).$$

On the $(001)$ plane, for $k_1 = k_x$ and $k_2 = k_y$, the onsite and hopping matrices are given by

$$\epsilon_{001} = [c_0 + 2c_1 + 2c_2 (2 - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2)] \sigma_0 + [m_0 + 2m_1 + 2m_2 (2 - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2)] \sigma_z,$$

$$t_{001} = -c_1 \sigma_0 - m_1 \sigma_z - i \frac{v}{2} \sigma_y.$$

On the $(101)$ plane, for $k_1 = (k_x + k_z)/\sqrt{2}$ and $k_2 = k_y$, we have

$$\epsilon_{101} = [c_0 + 2c_1 + 2c_2 (2 - \cos k_2)] \sigma_0 + [m_0 + 2m_1 + 2m_2 (2 - \cos k_2)] \sigma_0,$$

and

$$t_{101} = \left[ (-c_1 - c_2) \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} + i(-c_1 + c_2) \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \right] \sigma_0 + \left[ (-m_1 - m_2) \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} + i(-m_1 + m_2) \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \right] \sigma_z + i \frac{v}{2} \sin \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{v}{2} \cos \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_y.$$

The parameters are set at $m_0 = -1$, $m_1 = 1.3$, $m_2 = 1.2$, $v = 1.1$, $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = 0.2$, $c_2 = 0.3$ in the calculation (Fig. 7).

2. $A_{1g}-B_{1g}$ model in $D_{4h}$

$$H(k) = c(k)\sigma_0 + m(k)\sigma_z + v (k_x^2 - k_y^2) \sigma_x,$$

$$H'(k) = c'(k)\sigma_0 + m'(k)\sigma_z + 2v (-\cos k_x + \cos k_y) \sigma_x,$$

$$\epsilon_{100} = [c_0 + 2c_1 (1 - \cos k_z) + 2c_2 (2 - \cos k_y)] \sigma_0 + [m_0 + 2m_1 (1 - \cos k_z) + 2m_2 (2 - \cos k_y)] \sigma_z + 2v \cos k_y \sigma_x,$$

$$t_{100} = -c_2 \sigma_0 - m_2 \sigma_z - v \sigma_x,$$

$$\epsilon_{110} = [c_0 + 2c_1 (1 - \cos k_z)] \sigma_0 + [m_0 + 2m_1 (1 - \cos k_z)] \sigma_z,$$

$$t_{110} = -2c_2 \cos \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_0 - 2m_2 \cos \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_z + 2i v \sin \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_x.$$
HoD$_3$-structured materials without correlations ubiquitously exhibit crossing line nodes in the band gap. We show the energy band structure of LuH$_3$, which has 14 $f$ electrons, with the HoD$_3$ structure as another example of a crossing-line-node semimetal. The lattice constant is taken from the calculated value in Ref. 103. The obtained first-principles band structure shown in Fig. 8 is quite similar to that for YH$_3$ (Fig. 2) without correlation effects, i.e., three crossing line nodes ($d^3$ of $D_{3d}$ in Table I) are realized. One more example is ferromagnetic GdH$_3$ with the HoD$_3$ structure, where Gd’s have $S = 7/2$ spins. The energy bands for spin up (majority) and for spin down (minority) are shown in Fig. 9. The $f$ electrons migrate from the Fermi level to higher-energy regions. The remaining spin-up state hosts three crossing line nodes, as with LuH$_3$ (Fig. 8), while the spin-down state is insulating. The resulting state is a crossing-line-node ($d^3$) half semimetal. Note that, in the actual material of GdH$_3$, the antiferromagnetic state is more stable [104] than the ferromagnetic state as the ground state and has been observed below $T_N = 1.8$ K [105, 106].

Appendix F: Rare-earth trihydrides
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