Odd-frequency pairing and proximity effect in Kitaev chain systems including topological critical point
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In this paper, we investigate the relation between odd-frequency pairing and proximity effect in non-uniform Kitaev chain systems with a particular interest in the topological critical point (TCP). First, we correlate the odd-frequency pairing and Majorana fermion in a semi-infinite Kitaev chain, where we find that the odd-frequency pair amplitude coincides with the local density of states at low frequencies. Second, we demonstrate that, contrary to the standard view, the odd-frequency pair amplitude spreads into the bulk of a semi-infinite Kitaev chain at the TCP. Finally, we show that odd-frequency Cooper pairs cause the proximity effect in a normal metal/diffusive normal metal/Kitaev chain junction even at the TCP. Our results hold relevance to the investigation of odd-frequency pairing and topological superconductivity in more complicated systems that involve Rashba nanowire with magnetic fields.

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconductors are characterized by Cooper pairs which result from the pairing between electrons. They are described by pair amplitude that is antisymmetric due to Fermi-Dirac statistics. These statistics allow the pair amplitude to be an even function of the time coordinates, or even-frequency in the frequency domain, of the paired electrons. In its most general form, however, Fermi-Dirac statistics also allows the pair amplitude to be odd under the exchange of time coordinates, or odd-frequency in the frequency domain.8

The realization of odd-frequency pairing has been predicted to occur in bulk systems, although experimental demonstration has remained so far elusive.9,10 On the other hand, odd-frequency pairing can be induced in junctions with even-frequency superconductors, where translational symmetry breaking being the key ingredient.11 Interestingly, it has been shown that odd-frequency pairing can be enhanced due to the presence of zero energy surface Andreev bound states (ZESABS) in junctions with unconventional superconductors such as spin-singlet $d$-wave or spin-triplet $p$-wave.6,7 One of the remarkable phenomena allowed by odd-frequency pairing in these systems is the so-called anomalous proximity effect,12 which would be otherwise suppressed. This effect occurs because odd-frequency spin-triplet $s$-wave pairing is robust against impurity scattering and produces a zero-energy peak (ZEP) in the local density of states (LDOS).13–15 This effect is in contrast to the conventional proximity effect realized in junctions with spin-singlet $s$-wave superconductor.16

Up to now, the proximity effect of unconventional superconductors has been studied theoretically based on the so-called quasiclassical approximation11,16,17. In this approach, we integrate the energy scale apart from the Fermi energy $E_F$ and the length scale of the physical quantity is governed by the coherence length $\xi = h k_F / |\Delta|$ with pair potential $\Delta$ in a superconductor. This approximation is justified when $k_F \xi \gg 1$ and $E_F \gg |\Delta|$ are satisfied. The pair potential $\Delta$ felt by quasiparticle can be described by the direction of the motion of quasiparticle on the Fermi surface. The quasiclassical approximation has been applied for non-uniform unconventional superconductors and superfluid $^3$He, and many essential concepts like ZESABS are successfully derived.9,12 In this regard, the theory employed to investigate the anomalous proximity effect has been based on this quasiclassical approximation.11,16

However, quite often, it is indispensable to characterize the properties of $p$-wave junctions beyond the quasiclassical approximation. This is because the regime, where quasiclassical approximation does not work, is achieved by controlling external parameters. The control of parameters can change the topological non-trivial regime (the topological regime) with ZESABS to the trivial regime (the non-topological regime) without ZESABS in the $p$-wave superconductor junction.

The minimal model to express a spin-triplet $p$-wave superconductor covering from the topological to the non-topological regime is the Kitaev model which consists of a one-dimensional chain of spinless fermions.18 In this model, the chemical potential drives a transition between the topological (metallic) to the non-topological (insulating) regimes. The quasiclassical theory is available only for the topological regime far from the topological critical point (TCP) which is the border between the topological and non-topological phases. It is a challenging problem to study the odd-frequency pairing realized in this model beyond quasiclassical approximation for the reasons explained in the previous paragraph. In this paper, we investigate the odd-frequency pairing beyond the quasiclassical approximation in junctions based on the Kitaev chain by applying the recursive Greens function method.21

First, we address the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency pairing in the semi-infinite Kitaev chain. In the topological regime far from the TCP, $k_F \xi \geq 1$ is satisfied. However, near the TCP, this relation does not hold anymore and the scale of the coherence length becomes the same order of $1/k_F$. We demonstrate the change of the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency pairing towards TCP. Since the Majorana fermion is strictly relevant to the odd-frequency pairing21, we compare the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency spin-triplet pair amplitude at low frequency, that of LDOS at zero-energy, and that of the wave function of Majorana fermion. We find that the odd-frequency pair amplitude, localized at the edge in the topological regime, increases and spreads into the bulk regime and takes a constant value in bulk at the TCP.

Second, we study the anomalous proximity effect in a normal metal/diffusive normal metal/Kitaev chain (N/DN/KC)
junction. In particular, we focus on the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency spin-triplet s-wave pair amplitude both in DN and KC near the TCP and compare it to the even-frequency spin-triplet p-wave pair amplitude. We demonstrate that the magnitude of the odd-frequency pair amplitude has a maximum in the KC region near the DN/KC boundary and it decreases towards the TCP.

We also calculate the LDOS of quasiparticle in DN and zero bias voltage conductance. In the topological regime, LDOS has a zero-energy peak and a quantized zero-bias conductance peak (ZBCP). We study the peak width of ZBCP as a function of the length of $L$ and the strength of impurity potential in DN. Just at TCP, LDOS still has a ZEP; however, the ZBCP disappears and the conductance at zero bias voltage is no more quantized. Since TCP corresponds to the metal-insulator transition point (MITP), to show the nature of the proximity effect around the MITP, we also calculate the spatial dependence of the even-frequency spin-singlet s-wave pair amplitude in a normal metal / diffusive normal metal / spin-singlet s-wave superconductor (N/DN/S) junction around the MITP where the conventional proximity effect occurs.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sects. II–III, we introduce the Kitaev chain and method. In Sect. IV we calculate the spatial dependence of odd-frequency pairing in the semi-infinite Kitaev chain. In Sect. V we study the proximity effect in the regime including TCP in the N/DN/KC junction.

II. KITAEV CHAIN

We consider inhomogeneous systems based on the Kitaev chain, which models 1D p-wave superconductivity. It can be described by the following Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H} = -t \sum_j \left( c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j \right) - \mu \sum_j c_j^\dagger c_j + \sum_j \left( \Delta c_j^\dagger c_{j+1}^\dagger + \text{H.c.} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $c_j^\dagger (c_j)$, $t$, $\mu$, and $\Delta$ are a creation (an annihilation) operator at site $j$, hopping between nearest neighboring sites, chemical potential measured from Fermi energy, and pair potential, respectively, and H.c. denotes Hermitian conjugate.

The macroscopic phase of the pair amplitude is chosen to be zero. Equation (1) does not include the spin index because we can regard the Kitaev chain as a spinless state by considering a fully polarized spin-triplet pairing like $|\uparrow \uparrow \rangle$ ($|\downarrow \downarrow \rangle$) spin state.

In the Kitaev chain, a topological phase can be expressed only by using the information of the energy band in a normal state [Fig. 1]. In the topological regime $|\mu| < 2t$, the chemical potential is located on the energy band. In the non-topological regime $|\mu| > 2t$, the Kitaev chain in normal states becomes an insulator. Here, we identify TCPs at $\mu = \pm 2t$, which are located at the boundaries between the topological and non-topological regime.

It has been demonstrated that the Kitaev model has a topological invariant, winding number $w$, given by:\ref{24,25}

$$w = -\frac{1}{4\pi i} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma H^{-1}(k) \partial_k H(k) \right] \text{dk} = \begin{cases} 1 & (|\mu| < 2t) \ , \\ 0 & (|\mu| > 2t) \ , \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\Gamma = \tau_x$ is a chiral operator satisfying $\{ \Gamma, H(k) \} = 0$ and $\tau_x$ is a Pauli matrix. $H(k)$ is defined as $H = (1/2) \sum_k [c_k^\dagger, c_k] H(k) [c_k^\dagger, c_k]^\dagger$ where $k$ and $c_k$ are a wave number and the Fourier transformed form of $c_j$ into momentum space, respectively. The winding number $w$ is zero for the non-topological phase and 1 for the topological phase. We stress that the winding number cannot be defined at the TCPs since the system at such points is gapless. Hence, the value of $w$ exhibits a discontinuous jump.

III. METHOD

In this section, we introduce the Green’s function method which is used to calculate the pair amplitudes and various physical quantities numerically. In particular we employ the retarded (advanced) Green’s functions in real space to be calculated as:\ref{25}

$$\tilde{G}^{R(A)}(E, j, j') = \left\{ \left( (E + (-i)\delta \epsilon) I - H \right)^{-1} \right\}_{j,j'},$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\delta \epsilon$ denotes a $2 \times 2$ matrix, $E$ is quasiparticle energy measured from the chemical potential, $\delta \epsilon$ is an infinitesimal positive number, $H$ is defined as $H = (1/2)[\ldots, c_1^\dagger, c_1, c_2, c_2, \ldots] H[\ldots, c_1^\dagger, c_1, c_2, c_2, \ldots]^\dagger$, and $I$ is an identity matrix with the same size as $H$. In the second equality of Eq. (3), we made use of electron-hole symmetry, where $G$ and $F$ correspond to the normal electron-electron and anomalous electron-hole components of the Green’s function $\tilde{G}$ in Eq. (3). In this work, we make use of Eq. (3) to investigate the induced odd- and even-frequency pair amplitudes, LDOS, and differential conductance.
The LDOS is obtained from the following expression:

$$\rho(E, j) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \left[ G_{j,j}^R(E) \right],$$

with $G_{j,j}^R$ given by Eq. (3).

In an N/DN/Kitaev chain, the Lee-Fisher formula allows us to calculate the differential conductance:

$$G_{NS}(E, j) = \frac{e^2}{2h} \text{Tr} \left[ -\tilde{G}_{j,j+1} \tilde{G}_{j+1,j} - \tilde{G}_{j,j+1} \tilde{G}_{j+1,j} \right. \\
\left. + \tilde{G}_{j,j} \tilde{G}_{j+1,j+1} + \tilde{G}_{j+1,j+1} \tilde{G}_{j,j} \right],$$

where $\tilde{G}_{j,j'} = (G_{j,j'}^A - G_{j,j'}^R)/2i$.

The pair amplitudes are investigated from Matsubara Green’s functions which can be obtained from Eq. (3) by replacing $E + (-i)\delta \rightarrow i\omega_n$. According to Fermi-Dirac statistics, the pair amplitudes obey,

$$F_{j,j',\sigma\sigma'}(i\omega_n) = -F_{j',j,\sigma\sigma'}(-i\omega_n),$$

where $\sigma$ and $\sigma'$ are spin of two electrons forming a Cooper pair. Equation (6) allows four types of symmetries for the pair amplitudes: even-frequency spin-singlet even-parity (ESE), odd-frequency spin-triplet even-parity (OTE), even-frequency spin-triplet odd-parity (ETO), and odd-frequency spin-singlet odd-parity (OSO). Kitaev chain has OTE and ETO pair amplitude because it represents a chain of spin-polarized electrons, which corresponds to spin-triplet, with $p$-wave pairing. In the Kitaev chain, the pair amplitudes are given as,

$$f_{\text{OTE}}(j) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{F}_{j,j}(i\omega_n) - \tilde{F}_{j,j}(-i\omega_n) \right],$$

$$f_{\text{ETO}}(j) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{F}_{j+1,j}(i\omega_n) - \tilde{F}_{j,j+1}(i\omega_n) \right. \\
\left. + \tilde{F}_{j+1,j}(-i\omega_n) - \tilde{F}_{j,j+1}(-i\omega_n) \right].$$

As a comparison, we also calculate the spin-singlet $s$-wave superconductor junction. Unlike the Kitaev chain, an $s$-wave superconductor has a spin degree of freedom. Therefore, the anomalous Green’s function $\tilde{F}_{j,j',\uparrow\downarrow}(i\omega_n)$ becomes $\tilde{F}_{j,j',\uparrow\downarrow}(i\omega_n)$. ESE pair amplitude is given as below.

$$f_{\text{ESE}}^{1\leftarrow 1}(j) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \tilde{F}_{j,j}(i\omega_n) + \tilde{F}_{j,j}(i\omega_n) \right].$$

IV. SEMI-INFINITE KITAEV CHAIN

In this section, we consider a semi-infinite Kitaev chain, as depicted in Fig. [2]a. We investigate the spatial dependence of odd-frequency correlations and its relation to Majorana fermion. It has been pointed out that Majorana fermion accompanies odd-frequency pairing. However, their spatial dependence has not been addressed yet. The relation is derived within the recursive Green’s function approach, and the details of the calculation can be found in Appendix B1.
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Figure 2(a) shows the $\mu$ dependence between the normal and anomalous components of Green’s functions [Eq. (3)] at the edge of the system ($j = 1$) using numerical calculation. The imaginary part of normal Green’s functions, $\text{Im}[G_{1,j}]$, corresponds to the LDOS of Majorana fermion; that of anomalous Green’s functions, $\text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$, stands for the imaginary of the odd-frequency pair amplitude. Our result indicates that $-\text{Im}[G_{1,j}] = \text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$ in the topological regime for $\omega_n/t = 10^{-5}$ as shown in Fig. 3(a). In particular, the relative error between $\text{Im}[G_{1,j}]$ and $\text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$ is $10^{-9}$ for $\mu = 0$. As observed in Fig. 3(a), $-\text{Im}[G_{1,j}]$ and $\text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$ take a maximum for $\mu = 0$ and decrease as $\mu$ increases. As $\mu$ approaches the TCP, which correspond to $\mu = 2$ in Fig. 3, these values are suppressed dramatically. In the non-topological regime, these values are small ($-\text{Im}[G_{1,j}] \sim 10^{-5}$ and $\text{Im}[F_{1,j}] \sim 10^{-7}$, respectively).

The discussion above can be further analytically supported by evaluating the following expression,

$$\lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \left\{ \text{Im}[G_{1,j}] + \text{Im}[F_{1,j}] \right\}$$

$$\approx \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \left\{ \frac{-i\omega_n}{\omega_n^2 + \mu^2} \right\} \text{(Topological)}$$

$$= 0,$$}

which has been evaluated at $\Delta = t$ in the zero-frequency limit $\omega_n \to 0$. (See Appendix C for the detailed deviation of Eq. (10)). From Eq. (10), we conclude that in the topological regime, $\text{Im}[G_{1,j}] + \text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$ depends on $\mu$ in the topological regime at low-frequency. In the non-topological regime, $\text{Im}[G_{1,j}] + \text{Im}[F_{1,j}]$ converges faster to zero as $\mu$ increases.

Furthermore, we are interested in the Majorana wave function, which has been derived before and reads,

$$a_j = a_1 C^{j-1} \left\{ \cos \left[ \beta(j - 1) \right] + \frac{1}{\tan \beta} \sin \left[ \beta(j - 1) \right] \right\},$$

where $a_j$ is the Majorana wave function.
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FIG. 3. (a) Imaginary part of normal Green’s function Im[\(G_{1,1}\)] and anomalous Green’s function Im[\(\tilde{F}_{1,1}\)] are plotted as a function of \(\mu\) in the semi-infinite Kitaev chain. \(\omega_n\): Matsubara frequency, Im[\(\tilde{F}_{1,1}\)] : the odd-frequency spin-triplet x-wave pair amplitude. In the low \(\omega_n\) limit, \(-\text{Im}[G_{1,1}]\): the local density of states (LDOS) of Majorana fermion in topological phase with \(|\mu| < 2t\). \(\omega_n/t = 10^{-5}\); (b)(c) The site dependence of probability density of Majorana wave function \(|a_j|^2\), odd-frequency pair amplitude \(\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)]\) with \(\omega_n/t = 10^{-5}\), and LDOS \(\rho(E = 0, j)\) with \(\delta_e/t = 10^{-5}\). All of these quantities are normalized by their values at \(j = 1\). (b) \(\mu/t = 1.9\); (c) \(\mu/t = 2\); \(\Delta/t = 0.1\).

where \(C = \sqrt{t - \Delta}/\sqrt{t + \Delta}\) and \(\beta = \arctan(\sqrt{4t^2 - 4\Delta^2 - \mu^2/\mu})\). In Figs 3b,c, we compare the spatial dependence between the probability density \(|a_j|^2\) of Majorana wave function, the LDOS \(\rho(E = 0, j)\) [Eq. (4)], and the odd-frequency pair amplitude \(\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)]\) [Eq. (7)]. These three values are normalized by their values at \(j = 1\).

In Fig. 3b, these three values coincide with each other in the topological regime near the TCP. The spatial oscillations of them originate from Friedel oscillation with the length scale \(1/k_F\) because the existence of the boundary is a big perturbation to bulk condensation. The oscillation appears for \((\mu/2)^2 + \Delta^2 < t^2\). Notice that, even at the TCP, these three values coincide with each other [Fig. 3c] but their behavior exhibits a dramatic different dependence from that in the topological regime [Fig. 3b]. There is no oscillatory behavior and they increase as a function of \(j\) and becomes constant for \(j > 40\).

It has been thought that OTE pairing is localized at the edge. However, it is a surprising effect that the OTE pairing exists in the KC region far from the edge as shown in Fig. 3c. This result suggests the possibility of realizing odd-frequency superconductivity in bulk at the TCP in the semi-infinite system.

Now we explain for why OTE still exists in bulk. For \(|\mu| < 2t\), \(0 < \Delta < t\), and \(\omega_n/t = 10^{-5}\), the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency pair amplitude, based on Eq. (11), is obtained as

\[
\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)] = \text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(1)] e^{2j - \beta} \times \cos[\beta(j - 1)] + \frac{1}{\tan \beta} \sin[\beta(j - 1)]^2.
\]

(12)

To understand the exotic spatial dependence of the OTE pair amplitude at TCP, we choose \(\mu/t = 2\) and assume \(\Delta/t = \alpha\) (\(0 < \alpha < 1\)) and \(j \gg 1\). Then, we can express Eq. (12) as below:

\[
\frac{\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)]}{\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(1)]} \approx \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha}\right)^2,
\]

(13)

where \(\beta = \arctan(\alpha)\). Equation (12) shows that the \(\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)]\) is independent of \(j\) for \(\mu/t = 2\) and \(j \gg 1\). It is noted that we can analytically show that OTE pairing takes a constant value far from the edge at the TCP. By substituting \(\alpha = 0.1\) for Eq. (13), \(\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(j)]/\text{Im}[f_{\text{OTE}}(1)] \rightarrow 30.25\) is confirmed as shown in Fig. 3c. This result is remarkable and overturns the previous view that odd-frequency pairs are localized at the end of the system.

V. NORMAL METAL/DIFFUSIVE NORMAL METAL/KITAEV CHAIN JUNCTION

In this section, we consider an N/DN/KC junction as depicted in Fig. 2b and study the proximity effect. The Hamiltonian of the system is given by

\[
\mathcal{H} = -t \sum_j (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j) - \mu_N \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} c_j^\dagger c_j - \mu \sum_{L+1 \leq j \leq L} c_j^\dagger c_j + \sum_{L+1 \leq j \leq L} (\Delta c_j^\dagger c_j + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq L} V_j c_j^\dagger c_j, \tag{14}
\]

where \(V_j \in [-W, W]\) is the random potential at site \(j\), \(L\) is the length of DN, and \(\mu_N\) is chemical potential in N and DN.

We numerically calculate the spatial dependence of the pair amplitude in the topological regime, topological regime near TCP, and non-topological regime. In the topological regime, \(k_F \xi \geq 1\) is satisfied and the quasi-classical approximation
is applicable. In connection with physical observables, we also calculate the LDOS in DN and the differential conductance. These are calculated by the recursive Green’s function method [9] (See Appendix B for details). We take the impurity average of $10^5$ samples.

As a comparison, we also calculate the spatial dependence of the pair amplitude in an N/DN/S junction where the Hamiltonian is obtained from Eq. (14) by replacing $c^\dagger c \rightarrow \sum_{\sigma} c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}$ and $c_{j+1\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \rightarrow c_{j1\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j,\downarrow}$ with spin index $\sigma$. In both N/DN/KC and N/DN/S junctions, the superconducting region ($j \geq L + 1$) becomes insulating in the superconducting state for $|\mu| > 2t$. Then, it is noted that the TCP and MITP coincide in the KC region.

We first discuss the spatial dependence of pair amplitudes, which is shown in Fig. 4(a) in the N/DN/KC junction. In the topological regime far from the TCP, the OTE pair amplitude has a sharp peak at the boundary between DN and KC regime [Fig. 4(a)]. These values are $10^8$ times larger than those at $j = 150$. The OTE pair amplitude oscillates in the KC ($j \geq L + 1$). This oscillation, which is the same effect discussed in the semi-infinite Kitaev chain Sect. [V] Fig. 3(b)], comes from Friedel oscillation. On the other hand, it penetrates DN without oscillations in the topological regime [Fig. 4(a)].

The corresponding spatial dependence of the ETO pair amplitude is shown in Fig. 4(d). It does not have an oscillatory behavior in the KC region and becomes constant far from the boundary. Although the ETO pair amplitude penetrates DN, its magnitude 0.44 at $j = 25$ is small compared to that of the OTE pair amplitude which is 19.28. Therefore, we conclude that our study indeed verifies the existence of the proximity effect driven by the OTE pairing in the KC junction.

Next, we look at the topological regime near the TCP. As $\mu$ approaches the TCP, the peak height of the OTE pair amplitude is suppressed and the period of its oscillations in KC is longer [Fig. 4(h)]. At the TCP, the magnitude of the odd-frequency pair amplitude is dramatically suppressed. Its peak height is reduced to 1.4% of that for $\mu/t = 1.999$. However, the proximity effect for DN still occurs, as seen in Fig. 4(c), while the corresponding ETO pair amplitude hardly penetrates DN shown in Fig. 4(f). Also, the OTE and ETO pair amplitudes are mixed in the KC region at the TCP as shown in Fig. 4(f).

In the non-topological regime, the OTE pair amplitude is
FIG. 5. (a–c) LDOS in DN for energy $E$: $j = 20$; (d–f) differential conductance for bias voltage $eV$: $j = -10$; in the N/DN/KC junction: $\mu_{N}/t = 0.5$, $\Delta/t = 0.1$, $\alpha_{n}/t = 10^{-8}$, $L = 20$, and $W/t = 1$. (a,d) topological regime: $\mu/t = 0, 0.5, 1$; (b,e) topology regime near TCP: $\mu/t = 1.95, 1.99, 1.999$; (c,f) TCP: $\mu/t = 2$; non-topological regime: $\mu = 2.1$.

dramatically suppressed up to $\sim 10^{-3}$. On the other hand, although the magnitude of the ETO pair amplitude is reduced with the increase of $\mu$ in the non-topological (insulating) regime, the ETO pair amplitude does not become zero in the KC region shown in Fig. 4(f). Notice that the qualitative behavior of the spatial dependence of the ETO pairing in the KC region, as shown in Figs 4(d–f), is insensitive to the change of $\mu$.

To establish a comparison with a junction coupled to a conventional spin-singlet $s$-wave superconductor, in this part, now we discuss the spatial dependence of the ESE pairing in Figs 4(g–i). When the spin-singlet $s$-wave superconductor is in the metallic regime far from the MITP, the ESE pair amplitude has a rapid oscillation in the S region and penetrates DN without oscillations [Fig. 4(g)]. Near the MITP [Fig. 4(h)], the pair amplitude has more oscillations at the DN/KC interface while the oscillating period is longer in the S region. At the MITP, the oscillatory behavior of the spatial dependence of the ESE pair amplitude in S disappears as shown in Fig. 4(i) because $k_F$ becomes zero. In the insulating regime, although the magnitude of the ESE pair amplitude in S is suppressed with the increase of $\mu$, its value is still nonzero similar to that of ETO pair amplitude in N/DN/KC junction [Fig. 4(j)]. By contrast to the ETO pair amplitude, the ESE component can penetrate DN even in the insulating regime.

To summarize what we have discussed so far, the spatial dependence of the OTE pairing is very different from that of the ETO pair amplitude. The OTE pairing is localized near the boundary between DN/KC in the topological phase and its maximum value is suddenly reduced at the TCP. It almost disappears in the non-topological phase. This feature is also very different from ESE pairing in N/DN/S junction. It is natural to consider that the dramatic suppression of the odd-frequency pair amplitude in DN at the TCP is relevant to the topological transition specific to the Kitaev chain. This is because the odd-frequency pairing is enhanced in the topological phase due to the emergence of Majorana fermion which is a particular type of ZESABS.

To establish a relation between odd-frequency pairing and experimental observables, we now investigate the LDOS and differential conductance as shown in Fig. 5. In Figs 5(a–c) we present the $\rho(E, j)/N_0$ [Eq. (4)] in the DN region of the N/DN/KC junction, where $N_0$ denotes the density of states at the Fermi level in an infinite ballistic normal metal case without impurity scattering. In the topological regime [Fig. 5(a)], the LDOS has a sharp ZEP [21]. This peak is correlated with the enhancement of the OTE shown in Fig. 4(a) due to Majorana fermion. The peak height and width decrease as $\mu$ approaches the TCP [Fig. 5(b)]. However, the zero-energy density of states slightly exists at the TCP [Fig. 5(c)] due to the existence of the odd-frequency pairing shown by a red line in Fig. 5(c). This result corresponds to the previous result using the quasi-classical approximation [22]. In the non-topological regime, the LDOS has no zero energy states [Fig. 5(c)]. This consequence is correlated with the absence of odd-frequency pairing shown by a blue line in Fig. 5(c).

Figures 5(d–f) provide the bias voltage dependence of differential conductance [Eq. (5)] in the N/DN/KC junction; Fig. 5(d) shows in the topological regime, Fig. 5(e) is in the topological one near the TCP, and Fig. 5(f) is at the TCP and in the non-topological regime. In the topological regime, the conductance has a peak at zero voltage and its value is always quantized [Fig. 5(e)] due to the existence of ZESABS and chiral symmetry [23]. As $\mu$ approaches the TCP, the peak width becomes narrower [Fig. 5(e)]. At the TCP, the ZBCP is not quantized [Fig. 5(f)] because the gapless state allows a value other than $2e^2/h$ [23]. Also, in the non-topological regime, the differential conductance has no value at zero voltage. To real-


TABLE I. Anomalous proximity effect to the DN region in N/DN/KC junction. The columns represent the focused regime, the penetration of the OTE pair amplitude, that of the ETO pair amplitude, the existence of the zero-energy peak (ZEP), and the characteristic of the ZBCP, respectively. ○ (×) [△] means that the penetration and spatial oscillation of the pair amplitude, the ZEP, and the ZBCP, respectively, (doesn’t) [slightly] exists. ⊙ means that the strong resonance occurs at the interface between DN and KC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>OTE Penetration</th>
<th>Spatial oscillation</th>
<th>ETO Penetration</th>
<th>Spatial oscillation</th>
<th>ZEP of LDOS</th>
<th>ZBCP Quantization</th>
<th>Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topological</td>
<td>⊙</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>⊙</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topological near TCP</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>⊙</td>
<td>⊙</td>
<td>narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-topological</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Conventional proximity effect to the DN region in N/DN/S junction. The columns represent the focused regime, the penetration of the ESE pair amplitude, that of the ETO pair amplitude, the existence of the ZEP, and the characteristic of the ZBCP, respectively. The usage of the mark is similar to Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime</th>
<th>ESE Penetration</th>
<th>Spatial oscillation</th>
<th>ZEP of LDOS</th>
<th>ZBCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallic near MITP</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITP</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulating</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The half-width at half maximum (HWHM) of the ZBCP is essential for the effect of impurity scattering. This is because it is roughly consistent with the Thouless energy, which varies with the influence of impurity scattering. To clarify the effect of impurity scattering in DN, we calculate the HWHM of the ZBCP in Fig. 6. See Eq. (B2) for how to calculate the HWHM. Figure 6(a) shows the HWHM as a function of the length L of the DN region; Fig. 6(b) represents that to the intensity W of the impurity scattering. These results reveal that the HWHM of ZBCP is proportional to \( \exp(c_1 L + c_2 W) \), where \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) are negative constants. This means that the specificity of zero-bias conductance becomes more pronounced as the impurity scattering increases. The HWHM of the ZEP of the LDOS is calculated in Appendix D.

We have summarized our obtained results in Table I. As a reference, we also show the conventional proximity effect in N/DN/S junction in Table II.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency spin-triplet s-wave pairing in Kitaev chain junctions. First, in the semi-infinite Kitaev chain, the magnitude of the odd-frequency pair amplitude, localized near the edge, decreases towards topological critical points (TCP). Contrary to the common understanding of odd-frequency pairing being generated only at interfaces, we have found, both numerically and analytically, that the odd-frequency pair amplitude spreads into the bulk and takes a constant value at the TCP. In the topological regime, we found that there is a coincidence of the spatial dependence of the odd-frequency pair amplitude with that of the local density of states (LDOS) at zero energy.
in a semi-infinite Kitaev chain. This result implies that there is a one-to-one correspondence with the wave function of Majorana fermion and the odd-frequency pair amplitude at the low-frequency limit.

Second, we have also studied the proximity effect in a normal metal/diffusive normal metal/Kitaev chain (N/DN/KC) junction. The magnitude of the odd-frequency pair amplitude has a maximum in the KC region near DN/KC boundary and it decreases towards TCP. We have found that the spatial dependence of the OTE pair amplitude is very different from that of the ETO pair amplitude. The OTE pair amplitude is localized near the boundary between DN/KC and suddenly reduced at the TCP. The dramatic suppression of the odd-frequency pair amplitude in DN at the TCP is relevant to the topological transition since odd-frequency pairing is generated from zero energy Andreev bound states which is nothing but a topological edge state called Majorana fermion. Even at the TCP, the OTE pairing causes the proximity effect. Moreover, the zero-bias conductance is quantized in the topological regime and the LDOS has a zero-energy peak (ZEP) in DN. At the TCP, the height of the ZEP of LDOS is suppressed and the zero-bias conductance is no more quantized.

In conclusion, we have investigated the behavior of the odd-frequency pairing in the Kitaev chain. Our study motivates further investigation in more complicated systems containing Rashba nanowires with the magnetic field and s-wave superconductivity, where Kitaev chain can be realized.
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Appendix A: General Solution of Majorana Wave Function

We briefly explain the Majorana wave function [Sect. IV Eq. (11)]. We consider the semi-infinite Kitaev chain as shown in Fig. 2(a). In this system, the analytical solution of a Majorana wave function is derived by Hegde et al. [25]. The Hamiltonian of this system is written as follows:

\[ H = -t \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( c_j^+ c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^+ c_j \right) - \mu \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( c_j^+ c_j - \frac{1}{2} \right) + z \left( c_{j+1}^+ c_j + c_j^+ c_{j+1} \right) + \text{H.c.} \]  (A1)

By using the Majorana operators

\[ \hat{a}_j = c_j + c_j^+, \quad \hat{b}_j = i(c_j^+ - c_j), \]  (A2)

the Majorana representation of the Hamiltonian [Eq. (A1)] is obtained as

\[ H_M = -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left[ (t - \Delta) \hat{a}_j \hat{b}_{j+1} - (t + \Delta) \hat{b}_j \hat{a}_{j+1} \right] - \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{a}_j \hat{b}_j. \]  (A3)

With Heisenberg equation \[ \{ \hat{b}_j, H \} = 0 \], the site relation of Majorana wave function is given by

\[ (t + \Delta) a_{j+1} + (t - \Delta) a_{j-1} + \mu a_j = 0, \]  (A4)

where we replace the Majorana wave function \( a_j \) for the Majorana operator \( \hat{a}_j \). The application of Z-transform

\[ Z \left[ a_j \right] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^{-j} a_j, \]  (A5)

\[ Z \left[ a_{j+1} \right] = z \left[ a_j \right] - a_1, \]  (A6)

\[ Z \left[ a_{j-1} \right] = z^{-1} \left[ a_j \right], \]  (A7)

and to Eq. (A4) gives

\[ Z \left[ a_j \right] = \frac{a_1 z^2}{z^2 + \frac{\mu}{\Delta} z + \frac{t - \Delta}{1 + \Delta}}. \]  (A8)

The inverse transform of this provides the Majorana wave function for \( 0 < \Delta < t \)

\[ a_j = a_1 C^{j-1} \left\{ \cos \left( \beta (j - 1) \right) + \frac{1}{\tan \beta} \sin \left( \beta (j - 1) \right) \right\}, \]  (A9)

where \( C = \sqrt{t - \Delta} / \sqrt{t + \Delta} \) and \( \beta = \arctan \left( \sqrt{t^2 - 4 \Delta^2 - \mu^2} / \mu \right) \).

Appendix B: Numerical Calculation Method

1. Recursive Green’s function

To obtain LDOS, differential conductance, and pair amplitude, we use the recursive Green’s function method in Sects. IV and V. This method is useful in the actual numerical calculation. The Green’s function in a finite system is defined as follows:

\[ G = (z I - H)^{-1}, \]  (B1)

where \( I \) is an identity matrix with the same size as \( H \). When \( N \) denotes the number of sites and \( f \) represents the spin and the electron-hole degree of freedom, \( z, H, \) and \( G \) become \( f N \times f N \) matrices. In the Kitaev chain, \( f = 2 \) holds. \( z \) is defined as

\[ z = \begin{cases} E - i \delta_E & \text{(Advanced Green’s function)} \\ E + i \delta_E & \text{(Retarded Green’s function)} \\ i \omega_n & \text{(Matsubara Green’s function)} \end{cases}, \]  (B2)
where \( E \) stands for energy, \( \delta_e \) denotes an infinitesimal positive number, and \( \omega_{2n} \) is a Matsubara frequency. We express the Hamiltonian as follows:

\[
H = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{u} & \hat{I} & & O \\
\hat{I}^\dagger & \hat{u} & \hat{I} & & \\
& \hat{I} & \ddots & \ddots & \hat{I} \\
& & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & & \hat{I}^\dagger & \hat{u} \\
O & & & &
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B3)
\]

where \( \hat{I} \) denotes a \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix and \( O \) stands for a zero matrix. Also, we write the Green’s function of the Hamiltonian [Eq. (B3)] as follows:

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1} & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,2} & \cdots & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,N} \\
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{2,1} & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{2,2} & \cdots & \vdots \\
& \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,1} & \cdots & \cdots & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,N}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B4)
\]

where the superscript \((N)\) of \( \hat{G}^{(N)}_{i,j} \) denotes the number of sites in the system.

Between \( \hat{G}^{(i)}_{i,i+1} \) and \( \hat{G}^{(i+1)}_{i+1,i+1} \),

\[
\hat{G}^{(i+1)}_{i+1,i+1} = \left( \hat{z} - \hat{u} - i \hat{G}^{(i)}_{i,i} \hat{I} \right)^{-1}, \quad (B5)
\]

holds. With an initial value, \( \hat{G}^{(1)}_{1,1} = (\hat{z} - \hat{u})^{-1} \), \( \hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,N} \) is obtained by repeating Eq. (B5). Similarly,

\[
\hat{G}^{(i+1)}_{i+1,1} = (\hat{z} - \hat{u} - i \hat{G}^{(i)}_{i+1,i} \hat{I} \hat{I}^\dagger)^{-1} \quad (B6)
\]

is established between \( \hat{G}^{(i)}_{i,1} \) and \( \hat{G}^{(i+1)}_{i,1} \).

We describe how to obtain Eq. (B5) below. We divide the Hamiltonian as follows:

\[
H = \begin{bmatrix}
H_A & H_B \\
H_C & H_D
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B7)
\]

where

\[
H_A = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{u} & \hat{I} & & \\
\hat{I}^\dagger & \hat{u} & \hat{I} & \\
& \hat{I} & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & \ddots & \ddots \\
& & & \hat{I}^\dagger & \hat{u} \\
O & & & \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B8)
\]

By using these matrices, the Green’s function becomes

\[
G = (zI - H)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
zI_A - H_A & -H_B \\
-H_C & zI_D - H_D
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (B12)
\]

where \( I_A \) and \( I_D \) are identity matrices with the same size as \( H_A \) and \( H_D \), respectively. The relation of the inverse matrix for the Block matrix provides

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix}
A & B \\
C & D
\end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix}
A^{-1} + A^{-1}BS^{-1}CA^{-1} & -A^{-1}BS^{-1} \\
-S^{-1}CA^{-1} & S^{-1}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1} & \cdots & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,N} \\
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{2,1} & \cdots & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{2,N} \\
& \ddots & \ddots \\
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,1} & \cdots & \hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,N}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (B13)
\]

where \( A = zI_A - H_A \), \( B = -H_B \), \( C = -H_C \), \( D = zI_D - H_D \), and \( S = D - CA^{-1}B \). Thus, the recurrence relation Eq. (B5) is transformed as follows:

\[
\hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,N} = \left( D - CA^{-1}B \right)^{-1} \left( \hat{z} - \hat{u} - i \hat{G}^{(N-1)}_{N-1,N-1} \hat{I} \hat{I}^\dagger \right)^{-1}. \quad (B14)
\]

We consider connecting \( \hat{G}^{(M)}_{M,M} \) and \( \hat{G}^{(N)}_{N,1} \). The connected Green’s function is written as

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix}
\cdots \\
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M,M} & \hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M,M+1} \\
\cdots & \cdots \\
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,M} & \cdots
\end{bmatrix}. \quad (B15)
\]

Then, the required local Green’s functions are obtained as follows:

\[
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M,M} = \left( \hat{G}^{(M)}_{M,M} \right)^{-1} \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1}, \quad (B16)
\]

\[
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,M+1} = \left( \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1} \right)^{-1} \hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,M}, \quad (B17)
\]

\[
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,M} = \hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,1} \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1}, \quad (B18)
\]

\[
\hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,M} = \hat{G}^{(M+N)}_{M+1,1} \hat{G}^{(N)}_{1,1}. \quad (B19)
\]
where $\tilde{t}$ is a hopping matrix between connected two sites.

To obtain the Green’s function at the right end of the semi-infinite system, we briefly explain the Möbius transformation. There are right-hand and left-hand Möbius transformations. Here, we consider only the left-hand transformation. We define the left-hand transformation as

$$
\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \cdot Y \equiv (AY + B)(CY + D)^{-1},
$$

where $A, B, C, D,$ and $Y$ are $N \times N$ matrices. The following coupling law

$$
E \cdot (F \cdot Y) = (EF) \cdot Y,
$$

holds for Möbius transformation, where $E$ and $F$ are $2N \times 2N$ matrices.

We express the relation between $G_{N,N}^{(N)}$ and $G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)}$ by Möbius transformation as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
G_{N,N}^{(N)} &= \left( \tilde{z} - \tilde{u} - \tilde{t} \right) G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)} \tilde{t}^{-1} \\
&= \tilde{t}^{-1} \left( \tilde{z} - \tilde{u} \right) \tilde{t}^{-1} - \tilde{t} G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)} \tilde{t}^{-1} \\
&= \left[ \tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{t}^{-1} \right] \left( \tilde{z} - \tilde{u} \right) \tilde{t}^{-1} - \tilde{t} G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)} \tilde{t}^{-1},
\end{align*}
$$

where we choose $A = \tilde{\Omega}, B = \tilde{t}, C = -\tilde{t}^\dagger, D = (\tilde{z} - \tilde{u})\tilde{t}^{-1},$ and $Y = G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)}$ in Eq. (B20). We define the left part of the Möbius transformation in Eq. (B22) as

$$
X = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Omega} & \tilde{t}^{-1} \\ -\tilde{t}^\dagger & (\tilde{z} - \tilde{u})\tilde{t}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.
$$

By repeating to fix the form of Möbius transformation in Eq. (B22) and using Eq. (B21), $G_{N,N}^{(N)}$ is transformed as

$$
\begin{align*}
G_{N,N}^{(N)} &= X \cdot G_{N-1,N-1}^{(N-1)} \\
&= X \cdot \left( \tilde{t} \cdot G_{N-2,N-2}^{(N-2)} \right) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= X^{N-1} \cdot \tilde{t}^{(1)}.
\end{align*}
$$

The eigenvalue decomposition of $X$ is given as follows:

$$
X = Q \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Lambda}_1 & \tilde{\Lambda}_2 \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_2 & \tilde{\Lambda}_3 \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1},
$$

$$
\tilde{\Lambda}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}_1 & \\ \tilde{\lambda}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}_3 \\ \tilde{\lambda}_4 \end{bmatrix},
$$

where the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3,$ and $\lambda_4$ of $X$ satisfy $|\lambda_1| < |\lambda_2| < |\lambda_3| < |\lambda_4|$. Here, it is noted that degeneracies of eigenvalues are removed by introducing the infinitesimal imaginary number of the energy of Green’s function. By substituting Eq. (B25) for Eq. (B24) and using the coupling law

Eq. (B21), $G_{N,N}^{(N)}$ becomes

$$
G_{N,N}^{(N)} = Q \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Lambda}_1^{N-1} & \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{N-1} \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{N-1} & \tilde{\Lambda}_3^{N-1} \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} \cdot \tilde{t}^{(1)}. \tilde{G}_{1,1}^{(1)}
$$

By performing Möbius transformation with $A = \tilde{\Lambda}_1^{N-1}, B = \tilde{\Omega}, C = \tilde{\Omega}, D = \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{N-1}, Y = Q^{-1} \cdot \tilde{t}^{(1)} \cdot \tilde{G}_{1,1}^{(1)}, G_{N,N}^{(N)}$ is transformed as

$$
G_{N,N}^{(N)} = Q \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Lambda}_1^{N-1} & \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{N-1} \end{bmatrix} \left( \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{N-1} \right)^{-1}.
$$

For a general $2 \times 2$ matrix

$$
Y = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix},
$$

we can be confirmed. Taking the limit $N \to \infty$ in Eq. (B28), we obtain the Green’s function $G_{L\infty}$ of the right end on the left semi-infinite system as follows:

$$
G_{L\infty} = Q \tilde{\Omega} \tilde{\Omega}
$$

The Green’s function $G_{R\infty}$ is obtained by exchanging $\tilde{t} \leftrightarrow \tilde{t}^\dagger$ in $X$ given in Eq. (B23). Combining Eqs. (B5), (B6), (B16)-(B19), and (B31), we can get Green’s function of a required site.

2. Calculation of peak width

![FIG. 7. The definition of the peak width. In this paper, the peak width is defined as HWHM (Half-Width-at-Half-Maximum).](image)

We describe how to calculate the peak width shown in Sect. [8] Fig. [6]. Figure [7] shows the definition of the peak width.
width as half-width at half maximum (HWHM). It is now possible to calculate the output \( f(x) \) from the input \( x \) by using the recursive Green’s function method, where

\[
x = \begin{cases} 
E/\Delta & \text{(for LDOS)} \\
eV/\Delta & \text{(for conductance)} 
\end{cases}, \quad (B32) \\
\rho(E, j)/N_0 & \text{(for LDOS)} \quad (B33)
\]

However, it is difficult to know the analytical functional form of \( f(x) \). Then, we calculate the HWHM numerically. We find a solution that satisfies

\[
f(x) = \frac{1}{2} f(0). \quad (B34)
\]

We define a new function \( g(x) \) that shifts \( f(x) \) by half of the peak height as

\[
g(x) \equiv f(x) - \frac{1}{2} f(0). \quad (B35)
\]

The solution of \( g(x) = 0 \) is HWHM and is calculated by using the false position method as shown in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1 False position method**

1. Initial value: \( a_0, b_0 \). Solution: \( c \in [a_0, b_0] \)
2. for \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) do
3. \( c_k = \frac{a_k g(b_k) - b_k g(a_k)}{g(b_k) - g(a_k)} \);
4. if \( g(b_k)g(c_k) < 0 \) then
5. \( a_{k+1} = c_k \);
6. \( b_{k+1} = b_k \);
7. else
8. \( b_{k+1} = c_k \);
9. \( a_{k+1} = a_k \);
10. end if
11. if \( |g(c_k)| < \delta \) or \( |a_{k+1} - b_{k+1}| < \epsilon \) then
12. break
13. end if
14. end for

We briefly explain the false position method. First, initial values \( a_0, b_0 \) are determined so that only one solution exists in \([a_0, b_0] \). Second, let \( c_0 \) be the intersection of the straight line passing through the points \((a_0, g(0))\) and \((b_0, g(b_0))\) with the \( x \)-axis [Fig. 8(a)]. When \( g(a_0)g(c_0) < 0 \), there is a solution in \([a_0, c_0] \) and then we set \( a_1 = a_0, b_1 = c_0 \) [corresponding to Fig. 8(b)]. When \( g(c_0)g(b_0) < 0 \), on the other hand, there is a solution in \([c_0, b_0] \) and then we set \( a_1 = c_0, b_1 = b_0 \).

Third, the intersection of the straight line, passing through the points \((a_1, g(a_1))\) and \((b_1, f(g_1))\) with \( x \)-axis, is defined as \( c_1 \) [Fig. 8(c)]. Finally, we obtain the solution by repeating the same operation. In actual numerical calculations, we set initial values: \( a_0 = 0, b_0 = 1, \) and parameters for convergence determination: \( \delta = 10^{-12}, \epsilon = 10^{-14} \).

**Appendix C: Proof of \(-\text{Im}[G_{1,1}] = \text{Im}[\tilde{F}_{1,1}] \) for \( \Delta = t \) in Semi-infinite Kitaev Chain**

In this section, we prove Eq. (10)

\[-\text{Im} [G_{1,1}] = \text{Im} [\tilde{F}_{1,1}], \]

for \( \Delta = t \) in Sect. IV We rewrite Eq. (B6)

\[\tilde{G}^{(i+1)} = \left( \hat{\bar{\gamma}} - i\tilde{G}^{(i)}\bar{\mu} \right)^{-1}, \quad (C1)\]

where

\[
\hat{\bar{\gamma}} = \begin{bmatrix} i\omega_n & 0 \\ 0 & i\omega_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mu} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mu & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{bmatrix}, \quad (C2)
\]

\[
\tilde{t} = \begin{bmatrix} -t & \Delta \\ -\Delta & t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (C3)
\]

We express \( \tilde{G}^{(i)} \) as \( \tilde{G}_t \) and \( \hat{\bar{\gamma}} \) as \( \tilde{\gamma} - \tilde{\mu} \). Since \( \tilde{t} \) is a singular matrix, we cannot calculate the leftmost Green’s function of the semi-infinite system by simple diagonalization of \( X \) in Eq. (B23). Then, we first calculate \( \tilde{G}_{t+1} \) with Eq. (C1):

\[\tilde{G}_{t+1} = \left( \tilde{\bar{\gamma}} - i\tilde{G}_{t}\tilde{\mu} \right)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} v_{11} - g_i & -g_i \\ -g_i & v_{22} - g_i \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{v_{11}v_{22} - (v_{11} + v_{22})g_i} \begin{bmatrix} v_{22} - g_i & g_i \\ g_i & v_{11} - g_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (C4)\]

where \( g_i \) is defined as

\[g_i = t^2 \left[ (\tilde{G}_t)_{11} - (\tilde{G}_t)_{12} - (\tilde{G}_t)_{21} + (\tilde{G}_t)_{22} \right]. \quad (C5)\]
Equations (C4) and (C5) provide the relation:

\[
\frac{g_{i+1}}{t^2} = \frac{v_{11} + v_{22} - 4g_i}{v_{11}v_{22} - (v_{11} + v_{22})g_i}
= \frac{1}{v_{11} + v_{22}} \left( 4 + \frac{(v_{11} - v_{22})^2}{v_{11}v_{22} - (v_{11} + v_{22})g_i} \right).
\]

(C6)

Let us consider separately for \( \mu = 0 \) and \( \mu \neq 0 \) below.

For \( \mu = 0 \), the second term in Eq. (C6) disappears and \( g_i \) becomes

\[ g_i = g_\infty = \frac{2\alpha^2}{i\omega_n}. \]

(C7)

By taking the limit \( i \to \infty \), Eq. (C4) is transformed as follows:

\[ \tilde{G}_\infty = \frac{1}{z_{11}z_{22} - (z_{11} + z_{22})g_\infty} \begin{bmatrix} z_{22} - g_\infty & g_\infty \\ g_\infty & z_{11} - g_\infty \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{i\omega_n(\omega_n^2 + 4t^2)} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_n^2 + 2t^2 & -2t^2 \\ -2t^2 & \omega_n^2 + 2t^2 \end{bmatrix}. \]

(C8)

For \( \omega_n \to 0 \), \(-\text{Im}(\tilde{G}_\infty)_{11} \to \infty \) and \(-\text{Im}(\tilde{G}_\infty)_{21} \to \infty \) are confirmed; the former means the existence of Majorana fermion. From Eq. (C8), we obtain

\[ \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im}[G_{1,1}] + \text{Im}[F_{1,1}] \} = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im}[\{G_\infty\}_{1,1}] + \text{Im}[\{\tilde{G}_\infty\}_{2,1}] \} = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \frac{-\omega_n}{\omega_n^2 + 4t^2} = 0, \]

\[ \Leftrightarrow \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im}[G_{1,1}] \} = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im}[F_{1,1}] \}. \]

(C9)

For \( \mu \neq 0 \), denoting \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) as

\[ \alpha = v_{11} + v_{22} = 2i\omega_n, \]

\[ \beta = v_{11}v_{22} = -\omega_n^2 - \mu^2. \]

(C10)

Moreover, taking the limit \( i \to \infty \) in Eq. (C6), we obtain \( g_\infty \) as follows:

\[ \frac{g_\infty}{t^2} = \frac{\alpha - 4g_\infty}{\beta - \alpha g_\infty}, \]

\[ \Leftrightarrow g_\infty = \frac{\beta + 4t^2 \pm \sqrt{(\beta + 4t^2)^2 - 4\alpha^2t^2}}{2\alpha}. \]

(C11)

From Eq. (C4), \( \tilde{G}_\infty \) becomes

\[ \tilde{G}_\infty = \frac{1}{-\omega_n^2 - \mu^2 - \alpha g_\infty} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_n^2 - \mu - g_\infty & g_\infty \\ g_\infty & \omega_n + \mu - g_\infty \end{bmatrix}. \]

(C12)

We take the plus sign in Eq. (C12). From Eqs. (C10)–(C12), \( \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \alpha g_\infty \) and \( \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[g_\infty] \) are given as

\[ \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \alpha g_\infty = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ -\omega_n^2 - \mu^2 + 4t^2 \right\} \]

\[ + \sqrt{\left( -\omega_n^2 - \mu^2 + 4t^2 \right)^2 + 16\omega_n^2 t^2} \]

\[ = \begin{cases} 
-\mu^2 + 4t^2 \ (\text{Topological}) \\
0 \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}, \]

(C14)

\[ \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[g_\infty] = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \frac{1}{4} \left( -\omega_n - \frac{\mu^2 - 4t^2}{\omega_n} \right) \]

\[ + \sqrt{\left( -\omega_n - \frac{\mu^2 - 4t^2}{\omega_n} \right)^2 + 16t^2} \]

\[ = \begin{cases} 
-\infty \ (\text{Topological}) \\
0 \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}. \]

(C15)

With Eqs. (C13)–(C15),

\[ - \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[\{G_\infty\}_{1,1}] = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \frac{\omega_n - \text{Im}[g_\infty]}{\omega_n^2 + \mu^2 + \alpha g_\infty} \]

\[ = \begin{cases} 
\infty \ (\text{Topological}) \\
0 \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}, \]

(C16)

\[ \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[\{\tilde{G}_\infty\}_{2,1}] = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \frac{\text{Im}[g_\infty]}{-\omega_n^2 - \mu^2 - \alpha g_\infty} \]

\[ = \begin{cases} 
\infty \ (\text{Topological}) \\
0 \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}. \]

(C17)

can be confirmed. Equation (C16) is consistent with the presence of Majorana fermion in the topological regime and with the absence of that in the non-topological regime. As it is for the plus sign, we take the minus sign in Eq. (C12). The results show

\[ - \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[\{G_\infty\}_{1,1}] = \begin{cases} 
0 \ (\text{Topological}) \\
\infty \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}, \]

(C18)

\[ \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \text{Im}[\{\tilde{G}_\infty\}_{2,1}] = \begin{cases} 
0 \ (\text{Topological}) \\
\infty \ (\text{Non-topological}) 
\end{cases}. \]

(C19)

Equation (C13) contradicts the presence of Majorana fermion in the topological regime. Then, it is reasonable to take the plus sign in Eq. (C12). From Eqs. (C14), (C16), and (C17),
we obtain

$$\lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im} \left[ G_{1,1} \right] + \text{Im} \left[ F_{1,1} \right] \}$$

$$= \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im} \left[ \tilde{G}_{11} \right] \} + \text{Im} \left[ \left( \tilde{G}_{21} \right) \right]$$

$$= \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \left\{ \frac{-\omega_n}{\omega_n^2 + \mu^2} \right\} \text{ (Topological)}$$

$$\text{ (Non-topological)}$$

$$= 0,$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im} \left[ G_{1,1} \right] \} = \lim_{\omega_n \to 0} \{ \text{Im} \left[ F_{1,1} \right] \}. \quad (C20)$$

FIG. 9. HWHM of the ZEP of LDOS peak is plotted as a function of
(a) $L$; (b) $W$; of DN in N/DN/KC junction. $L$: the length of DN, $W$: the magnitude of random potential, $\Delta / t = 0.1$, $\mu_N = \mu = 0$, $j = L / 2$, and $\delta_e / t = 10^{-5}$. (a) $W = 1$; (b) $L = 20$.\n
FIG. 10. Standard deviation $\sigma$ of differential conductance in N/DN/KC junction is plotted as a function of bias voltage $eV$. It is independent of $j$ in N. $\mu_N / t = 0.5$, $\Delta / t = 0.1$, $\delta_e / t = 10^{-5}$, $j = -10$, and $W / t = 1$. Topological regime near TCP: $\mu = 1.99, 1.95, 1.999$.\n
Appendix D: Normal Metal/Diffusive Normal Metal/Kitaev Chain Junction

To study the effect on impurities in N/DN/KC junction in Sect. [V] we calculate HWHM of ZEP of LDOS for the length $L$ of DN [Fig. 9(a)] and for the intensity $W$ of impurity scattering [Fig. 9(b)]. These results show that HWHM of ZEP is proportional to $\exp(c_1 L + c_2 W)$.

To clarify the perfect resonance nature, we calculate the standard deviation $\sigma$ of differential conductance $G_{NS}$:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\text{max}}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\text{max}}} \left[ G_{NS}^{(l)} - G_{NS}^{(\text{avg})} \right]^2}, \quad (D1)$$

where $G_{NS}^{(l)}$ is the differential conductance calculated at the $l$th times and $G_{NS}^{(\text{avg})}$ is the average of the differential conductance with the sample impurities. The resulting standard deviation for various $\mu$ is shown in Fig. 10. The standard deviation is always zero at $eV = 0$ in the topological regime. This result means the absence of shot noise and strong resonance occurs independently of $\delta$. From the above, it is found that the zero-bias conductance is robust against impurity scattering within the numerical accuracy.