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The theory of orbital magnetization is reconsidered through careful definition of additional quantities that incorporate a non-Hermitian effect due to anomalous operators that break the domain of definition of the Hermitian Hamiltonian. As a result, boundary contributions to the observable are rigorously and analytically taken into account. In this framework, we first extend the standard velocity operator definition in order to incorporate an anomaly of the position operator that is inherent in band theory, which results to an explicit boundary velocity contribution. Using the extended velocity, we define the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation which is an intensive quantity of periodic systems that properly counts the circulating micro-currents embodied in the wavefunctions’ structure (bulk and boundary contributions). A connection between the nth band electrons’ collective intrinsic circulation and the Wannier-based local and itinerant circulation contributions used in the modern theory of orbital magnetization is made. We develop a quantum mechanical formalism for the orbital magnetization of extended and periodic topological solids (insulators or semimetals) without any Wannier-localization approximation or heuristic extension [Caresoli, Thonhauser, Vanderbilt and Resta, Phys. Rev. B 74, 024408 (2006)]. It is rigorously shown that, as a result of the non-Hermitian effect, an emerging covariant derivative enters the one-band (adiabatically deformed) approximation k-space expression for the orbital magnetization. In the corresponding many-band (unrestricted) k-space formula, the non-Hermitian effect contributes an additional boundary quantity which is expected to give locally (in momentum space) giant contributions whenever band crossings occur along with Hall voltage due to imbalance of electron accumulation at the opposite boundaries of the material.

I. INTRODUCTION

Boundary effects are ubiquitous in condensed matter systems. However, how these effects influence bulk quantities such as the bulk orbital magnetization $\mathbf{M}$ seems to be still unclear. Circular dichroism measurements have confirmed the existence of surface states with non-trivial orbital moment textures in k-space due to Orbital Rashba Effect, while gigantic orbital magnetization values are predicted to occur in the vicinity of band crossings at the surfaces of sp alloys. A simple and direct method to link boundary properties with bulk quantities, if found, would conceptually give a direct realization of a bulk-boundary correspondence in a general sense.Hints of such a link have appeared but they have not yet been combined in a single theoretical framework for condensed matter systems. In the chemists’ community the link between boundary effects and “bulk” quantities seems to have been studied in detail and is formalized as surface integrals (fluxes) of certain generalized currents in the so-called atomic theorems that determine atom properties viewed as parts (fragments) of a molecule, for example the atomic dielectric polarization and atomic magnetic susceptibility having been determined within that method. In the mathematical physics community the connection between boundary effects and bulk quantities can be attributed to anomalous operators that break the domain of definition of the Hamiltonian operator, thereby leaving residues either in the Ehrenfest theorem or in the Hellmann-Feynman theorem; these can be converted into space coordinate surface integrals (for 3D systems) over the system’s boundaries. In this paper we rigorously take into account these boundary residues as non-Hermitian effects in order to model the boundary contributions to the orbital magnetization of non-interacting electrons.

In general, anomalous operators act on states that belong within a given Hilbert space, where the Hamiltonian is assumed Hermitian and the system is closed, and they produce states that are outside this given Hilbert space; this leads to emergent non-Hermiticity in the Hamiltonian which is precisely the above mentioned boundary residue.

One of the most common examples of such an anomalous operator (that leaves a boundary residue in the Ehrenfest theorem) is the position operator $\mathbf{r}$ whenever periodic boundary conditions at the end of the system are adopted for the wavefunctions. In Solid States Physics one usually bypasses this kind of anomaly as in Ref by redefining a proper (periodic) operator for the electrons’ position that does not leave any boundary residue and by working with its expectation value. In this work we deal with this problem in a direct way, that is we maintain the standard electrons’ expectation value of the position operator $\mathbf{r}$ by defining a proper (periodic) operator for the electrons’ position and by working with its expectation value. In this work we deal with this problem in a direct way, that is we maintain the standard electrons’ expectation value of the position operator $\mathbf{r}$ becomes undefined within the Bloch representation in the thermodynamic limit, its displacement $\Delta \mathbf{r}$ after a finite time interval is always a well-defined quantity as shown in Appendix (A) and simply extend the standard velocity operator term to include the non-Hermitian effect of the Hamiltonian operator. The expectation value of the added operator term is determined entirely from the boundaries of the system and it rigorously gives a boundary velocity contribution for the electron.
Therefore, having in mind the evolution of the quantum state under consideration as well as the position operator expectation value within the Schrödinger picture, we are led to define the velocity operator in an extended form as, $\mathbf{v}_{\text{ext}} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}_b$, where $\mathbf{v}$ is the standard velocity operator as given in the literature (which can be viewed as a bulk property) and $\mathbf{v}_b$ is the added boundary operator term that takes into account the non-Hermitian effect. In this fashion, the extended velocity operator expectation value $\langle \mathbf{v}_{\text{ext}} \rangle$ is always equal to the rate of change of the electrons’ position expectation value $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle$. 

In spite of the undefined expectation value of the latter circulation operator in periodic and extended systems, and to our surprise, we found out that it can always be decomposed into two distinct parts, namely, an intrinsic one that has a definite value and an extrinsic one that carries the undefined value. The intrinsic one has an intensive and bulk behavior that properly counts the local and circulating probability micro-currents embedded in the (generally) extended wavefunction’s structure with boundary contributions being explicitly taken into account due to the non-Hermitian effect.

Specifically, the expectation value of the intrinsic orbital circulation is found to have the following properties: (i) it does not depend on the system’s size and has a finite value within PBCs in the Bloch representation in the thermodynamic limit, (ii) it carries information about the electrons’ orbital circulating probability micro-currents which are encoded as structured wavefunction in real space (for free electrons and plane waves it becomes zero), (iii) its value does not depend on the position origin (as long as the shift of the origin can be attributed to a unitary transformation of the wavefunction) and (iv) it takes into account boundary contributions as a consequence of the non-Hermitian effect.

By then using the relation between the standard and the boundary velocity, a connection between the intrinsic circulation and the approximated Wannier-based method of the modern theory of orbital magnetization is made. This is accomplished for the $n$th band electrons’ collective intrinsic circulation evaluated with respect to Bloch eigenstates. Assuming that each Bloch eigenstate satisfies the periodic gauge, we expand it into the basis of localized bulk Wannier states and localized surface orbitals, and as a result the $n$th band electrons’ collective intrinsic circulation is found to have two distinct contributions, same as the ones given in Ref.22, namely a collective local circulation contribution (LC) plus a collective itinerant circulation contribution (IC), the latter being explicitly attributed to the boundary velocity. Using the relation between the boundary and the standard velocity, the IC can be recast in a form that can be evaluated as a bulk property.

In this framework we propose that the intrinsic circulation is the proper quantity that encodes the electrons’ intrinsic orbital behavior in periodic (or disordered) and extended systems, without the need of any approxima-
tion, and as such it must be employed in a rigorous quantum mechanical theoretical framework for calculating the orbital magnetization.

In this fashion, we exploit the intrinsic orbital circulation in order to model the orbital magnetization of non-interacting electrons and as such it is used to derive two quantum mechanical formulas, one as an $r$-space and another one as a “reciprocal” $k$-space formula, both being relaxed from any Wannier-localization approximation.

The $r$-space formula is derived for an extended system within PBCs over the terminated boundaries, giving therefore the bulk orbital magnetization.

In the derivation of the $k$-space expression we relax the PBCs constraint, and as a consequence, certain interesting features emerge. Namely, a covariant derivative enters the one-band (adiabatically deformed) approximation formula for the orbital magnetization as an emerging operator, and survives due to the non-Hermitian effect that is attributed to the anomalous momentum gradient operator $\partial_{k}$ that enters the static (off-diagonal) Hellmann-Feynman theorem that we derive in Appendix B. In the many-band (unrestricted) formula the non-Hermitian effect contributes an additional boundary quantity which explicitly depends on the off-diagonal matrix elements of the boundary velocity operator $v_b$ as well as on the boundary momentum gradient operator $k_b$ (defined in Eq. 34). The latter additional boundary quantity is expected to give locally (in momentum space) giant orbital magnetization contributions (due to its structure) whenever band crossings occurs along with Hall voltage as a consequence of boundary conditions that may generally break the standard Born-von Kármán periodicity.

The theoretical method we propose can be employed either for calculating the built-in orbital magnetization of solids in the absence of external fields or for calculating the induced orbital magnetization as a response to external fields, e.g. to an electric field. In this work we determine the built-in magnetization in solids when time reversal symmetry is assumed to be broken either from a staggered magnetic field that averages to zero over the unit cell or through spin-orbit coupling to a background of ordered local moments.

We have organized the paper as follows. In Sec. II we define the electrons’ extended velocity operator and the electrons’ intrinsic and extrinsic orbital circulations with the aid of the extended velocity operator. In Sec. III using the electrons’ intrinsic circulation we derive two quantum expressions for the bulk orbital magnetization of non-interacting electrons, one as an $r$-space and the other as a “reciprocal” $k$-space formula. We summarize and conclude in Sec. IV. Some details concerning analytic calculations and derivations are given in three Appendices.

II. DEFINITIONS

A. Extended velocity operator

By taking into account the evolution of the state under consideration, and by demanding that the velocity operator expectation value must always be equal with the rate of change of the electrons’ expectation value $\frac{d}{dt}\langle r \rangle$, it is necessary to define the velocity operator in an extended theoretical framework as,

$$v_{ext} = v + v_b$$

where,

$$v = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H(r,t), r]$$

is the standard velocity operator and

$$v_b = \frac{i}{\hbar} (H(r,t)^+ - H(r,t))r$$

is the boundary velocity operator.

The introduction of this new operator $v_b$ is motivated by Ref. 13-14 and its expectation value is not zero only whenever the position operator becomes anomalous due to the non-Hermitian effect, in which case there are paradoxes first noted in Ref. 15.

For closed systems $\langle \Psi(t) | \Psi(t) \rangle = 1$, the Hamiltonian is Hermitian $H(r,t)^+ = H(r,t)$ with respect to the states that belong within the domain of its definition and these states form the given Hilbert space. The non-Hermitian effect emerges whenever the state $r\Psi(r,t)$ does not belong within the given Hilbert space, that is $H(r,t)^+(r\Psi(r,t)) \neq H(r,t) (r\Psi(r,t))$, which is a characteristic property of all wavefunctions $\Psi(r,t)$ that satisfy PBCs over the system boundaries.

Although the expectation value of the boundary velocity operator Eq. (3) given by

$$\langle v_b \rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle (H(r,t)\Psi(t)) | r\Psi(t) \rangle - \langle \Psi(t) | H(r,t) r\Psi(t) \rangle$$

is by definition a bulk quantity, due to space-volume integration (assuming a 3D system) in position representation, it can always and equally evaluated as a boundary quantity due to symmetry of the integrands that allows an integration by parts.

In this respect, by working in position representation, for real scalar and vector potentials and after a straightforward integration by parts, the expectation value of Eq. (3) is given in the form

$$\langle v_b \rangle = -\iiint_S r \cdot (J_{pr}(r,t) \cdot dS) + \frac{ih}{2m} \iiint_S |\Psi(r,t)|^2 dS$$

with $S$ being the terminated boundary surface of the system where the boundary conditions are imposed, and
\( J_{pr}(r,t) = \text{Real}[\Psi(r,t)^* \mathbf{v} \Psi(r,t)] \) is the local probability current density (for a spinless electron).

The first term of Eq. \( \text{5} \) can be seen as a position-weighted probability flux through the boundaries of the system, while the second and purely imaginary part, cancels a possible imaginary remnant part of the standard velocity operator expectation which is given by

\[
\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle = \iint_{V} J_{pr}(r,t) dV - \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \oint_{S} |\Psi(r,t)|^2 dS.
\]  

(6)

By adding Eq. \( \text{6} \) and Eq. \( \text{7} \), that is \( \langle \mathbf{v}_{ext} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{v}_b \rangle \) we see that \( \langle \mathbf{v}_{ext} \rangle \) is always a real quantity as expected.

The boundary velocity operator can also be useful in the study of materials with strong spin-orbit coupling interaction if a modification of its expectation value form is made, that is, by taking into account the spin dependence of the standard velocity operator (as an outcome from the non-relativistic limit of the Dirac equation)

\[
\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{\hbar} \nabla V(r) \quad \text{that enters the local probability current density} \quad J_{pr}(r,t) = \text{Real}[\Psi(r,t)^* \mathbf{v} \Psi(r,t)]
\]  

which is now evaluated with respect to spinors.

With the aid of Eq. \( \text{11} \) – \( \text{13} \), the extended velocity operator can be recast in the form

\[
\mathbf{v}_{ext} = \frac{i}{\hbar} (H(r,t) + r - \mathbf{r} H(r,t)),
\]  

(7)

and the equality \( \langle \mathbf{v}_{ext} \rangle = \frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle \) holds irrespectively of the position operator behavior (hence irrespective of the boundary conditions). By the definition as given from Eq. \( \text{7} \) and by working in the position representation \( r^\dagger = r \), we can easily deduce that the extended velocity operator is always a Hermitian operator \( \mathbf{v}_{ext}^\dagger = \mathbf{v}_{ext} \) and its expectation value is always real, in agreement with a summation of Eq. \( \text{11} \) – \( \text{13} \) without the need of any specific boundary conditions to be imposed, which is true even for open systems where the Hamiltonian is not a Hermitian operator.

A simple and intuitive criterion to demonstrate the necessity of introducing the extended velocity operator as follows: Consider a stationary and extended plane wave state of a free electron of mass \( m \) with well-defined momentum \( \hbar \mathbf{k} \) in a finite volume \( V \). The system is assumed to be closed, that is the electrons’ wavefunction is normalized to unity at every instant \( t \) within the volume \( V \), \( \langle \Psi(t) | \Psi(t) \rangle = 1 \). In this fashion, the electrons’ displacement \( \Delta(r) \) must always be smaller than (or equal to) the systems’ size. Using the standard velocity definition

\[
\mathbf{v} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H(r,t), \mathbf{r}] \quad \text{the electrons’ displacement acquires the value} \quad \Delta(r) = \frac{\hbar \mathbf{k}}{m} t \quad \text{which will eventually lead the electron out of the system. This paradox is bypassed within the extended velocity operator definition, as it turns out that the boundary velocity contributes an equal magnitude and opposite sign than the bulk electrons’ velocity} \quad \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle \quad \text{resulting in zero displacement} \quad \Delta(r) = 0 \quad \text{at every instant} \quad t \quad \text{for the assumed stationary state. In fact, the extended velocity operator guarantees that every stationary state (irrespective of the static potentials) will always produce zero displacement for the electron, that is} \quad \frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}_{ext} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{v}_b \rangle = 0, \quad \text{as expected from the trivial fact that the position operator expectation value is a static quantity with respect to any stationary state.}
\]

In this fashion, we can develop a simple and direct method to link boundary effects with bulk properties as a form of a bulk-boundary correspondence in a general sense for every stationary state, namely \( \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_n = -\langle \mathbf{v}_b \rangle_n \) where \( n \) indexes the Hamiltonian eigenstate; this is an example, therefore, of boundary currents being rigorously related to the bulk band structure.

There are two important features of the extended velocity operator \( \mathbf{v}_{ext} \) that can be deduced from its off-diagonal matrix elements with respect to the (generally time-dependent) Hamiltonian instantaneous eigenstates \( |n(t)\rangle \). These are derived by direct application of Eq. \( \text{11} \) and Eq. \( \text{11} \) and are given by

\[
\langle m(t)| \mathbf{v}_b |n(t)\rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} (E_m(t) - E_n(t)) \langle m(t)| \mathbf{r} |n(t)\rangle
\]  

(8)

where, the off-diagonal matrix elements of the boundary velocity operator are explicitly calculated (after a straightforward integration by parts) as

\[
\langle m(t)| \mathbf{v}_b |n(t)\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \oint_{S} \mathbf{r} \left( (\Psi \psi_{m})^\dagger \psi_{n} + \psi_{m}^\dagger \mathbf{v} \psi_{n} \right) dS + \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \oint_{S} \psi_{m}^\dagger \psi_{n} dS,
\]  

(9)

\( \psi_{n} = \psi_{n}(r,t) = \langle \mathbf{r}|n(t)\rangle \) are the Hamiltonian’s instantaneous eigenfunctions and \( \mathbf{v} \) is the velocity operator given by Eq. \( \text{11} \). The latter Eq. \( \text{11} \) is essentially the off-diagonal counterpart of Eq. \( \text{11} \).

The two important features then follow. First, the off-diagonal position matrix elements in Eq. \( \text{11} \) will explicitly be involved in the many-band (unrestricted) formula of the orbital magnetization that we will derive in this article; therefore, boundary contributions due to the off-diagonal boundary velocity matrix elements will explicitly be taken into account. Second, the off-diagonal position matrix elements in Eq. \( \text{11} \) are proportional to the electrons’ transition dipole moment, therefore the emission and absorption of photons can be rigorously related with boundary properties owing to the off-diagonal boundary velocity matrix elements.

Generalizing the results of this subsection we point out that, whenever one defines an operator in an extended way \( \mathcal{O}_{ext} \) so that its expectation value \( \langle \mathcal{O}_{ext} \rangle \) is equal with the rate of change of the expectation value of a given Hermitian operator \( \mathcal{G} \), that is \( \langle \mathcal{O}_{ext} \rangle = \frac{d}{dt} \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \), the definition of \( \mathcal{O}_{ext} \) can be consistently given by the Ehrenfest theorem, as long as the boundary operator \( \mathcal{O}_b \) is taken
into account. The expectation value of the boundary operator $\langle \mathcal{O}_b \rangle$ is extremely sensitive to the boundary conditions of the wavefunction and takes a non zero value only whenever the given Hermitian operator $\mathbf{G}$ (entering the theorem) becomes anomalous due to the non-Hermitian effect. Specifically, by working in position representation, due to symmetry of the integrand, after a straightforward integration by parts, the expectation value $\langle \mathcal{O}_b \rangle$ is always cast in the form of a boundary integral (assuming real scalar and vector potentials) of a generalized current $\mathbf{J}_G$ flux as

$$
\langle \mathcal{O}_b \rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle \Psi(t) | \left( H(\mathbf{r}, t)^+ - H(\mathbf{r}, t) \right) \mathbf{G} | \Psi(t) \rangle
$$

$$
= \iint_S \mathbf{J}_G \, dS
$$

(10)

where the generalized current $\mathbf{J}_G$ is given by

$$
\mathbf{J}_G = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{n} \left( (\mathbf{v}\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t))^\dagger + (\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)^\dagger)\mathbf{v} \right) \mathbf{G} \Psi(\mathbf{r}, t).
$$

(11)

The wavefunction $\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ entering Eq. (11) can be either the electrons' two component spinor wavefunction for spinfull electron (and this will be nontrivially useful in solids with strong spin-orbit interaction) or the scalar wavefunction for spinless electron motion (where the generalized current has the same structure but the dagger operation $^\dagger$ being replaced by the complex conjugation $^\ast$ operation only) and $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit vector locally normal to the surface $S$. For the special case of $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{r}$ and either spinfull or spinless electron motion, by analytically calculating the directional velocity operator $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ action on $\mathbf{G} \Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ within Eq. (11) and Eq. (10), we recover Eq. (5). Alternatively, if we choose $\mathbf{G}$ to be the identity operator $\mathbb{I}$, then $\mathbf{J}_G$ becomes the usual probability current $\mathbf{J}_{pr}$ and for a closed system Eq. (11) becomes zero, which is consistent with the conservation of total probability (valid for states belonging within the Hilbert space of closed systems).

### B. Intrinsic and extrinsic orbital circulation

In order to define the electrons’ intrinsic and extrinsic orbital circulation for an extended and periodic system, we first choose to define a Hermitian circulation operator as

$$
\mathbf{C} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}_{ext} - \mathbf{v}_{ext} \times \mathbf{r})
$$

(12)

which is the electrons’ orbital circulation operator that employs the extended velocity operator; it is therefore designed to take into account the inherent anomaly of the position operator when computing circulating currents in periodic systems. The circulation operator always behaves as a Hermitian operator $\mathbf{C}^+ = \mathbf{C}$ irrespective of the wavefunctions' boundary conditions as evidenced from Eq. (12) and Eq. (11). With the aid of Eq. (11) – (3) and $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{r} = 0$, the circulation operator can be recast in the forms, $\mathbf{C} = \frac{i}{2\hbar} \mathbf{r} \times \left( H(\mathbf{r}, t)^+ + H(\mathbf{r}, t) \right) \mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}_b$. It is interesting to note that in the latter form of $\mathbf{C}$ the $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}_b$ term is an anti-hermitian operator that has imaginary expectation value which exactly cancels any remnant imaginary part of the $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}$ term expectation value. Direct calculation gives the orbital circulation operator $\mathbf{C}$ expectation value form, which is found to be,

$$
\langle \Psi(t) | \mathbf{C} | \Psi(t) \rangle = \text{Im} \left[ i \langle \Psi(t) | (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}) | \Psi(t) \rangle \right]
$$

$$
= \iint_V \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) \, dV
$$

(13)

where the quantum state under consideration $| \Psi(t) \rangle$ is normalized within the volume $V$ of the system. In spite of the cautious definition of the circulation operator in order to take into account the possible anomaly of the position operator for periodic systems, it is shown in Appendix A that its expectation value $\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle$ with respect to a Bloch eigenstate, does not quite lead to any theoretical progress as it becomes undefined for an extended system in the thermodynamic limit.

Motivated, however, by classical mechanics, either by rigid body dynamics or by continuous medium (hydrodynamical) theories, we find out that the expectation value of the circulation operator $\langle \mathbf{C} \rangle$ can always be decomposed into two distinct parts. Namely, an intrinsic circulation part $\langle \mathbf{C}_{intr} \rangle$ that always has an intensive and bulk behavior (with well defined value within Bloch representation in the thermodynamic limit) and an extrinsic circulation part $\langle \mathbf{C}_{extr} \rangle$ that has an extensive and position origin-dependent behavior (with undefined value within Bloch representation in the thermodynamic limit). The definitions of the intrinsic and extrinsic circulations are given by

$$
\langle \Psi(t) | \mathbf{C}_{intr} | \Psi(t) \rangle = \text{Im} \left[ i \langle \Psi(t) | (\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle) \times \mathbf{v} | \Psi(t) \rangle \right]
$$

$$
= \iint_V (\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle) \times \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) \, dV
$$

(14)

and

$$
\langle \Psi(t) | \mathbf{C}_{extr} | \Psi(t) \rangle = \text{Im} \left[ i \langle \Psi(t) | \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle \times \mathbf{v} | \Psi(t) \rangle \right]
$$

$$
= \iint_V \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle \times \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) \, dV
$$

(15)

respectively, where $V$ is the volume of the system and $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle = \iint_V | \Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) |^2 \, dV$ is the position operator expectation value that takes an undefined value within Bloch representation in the thermodynamic limit (as shown in Appendix A).

The intrinsic circulation $\langle \mathbf{C}_{intr} \rangle$ has no ambiguity and is a position origin-independent quantity whenever the shift of the position origin causes a $\mathbb{U}(1)$ transformation for the scalar wavefunction (assuming a spinless
electron). The origin-independence is a consequence of
the combined transformation (under a shift of the posi-
tion origin) of the operator \((r - \langle r \rangle) \times \mathbf{v}\) and the \(U(1)\)
transformation of the wavefunction that compensates each
other. For spinful electrons the velocity operator ac-
dquires spin-dependence and as long as the shift of the
position origin can be described by an \(SU(2)\) transfor-
mation of the spinor wavefunction the intrinsic circulation
remains a position origin-independent quantity without
any ambiguity.

The electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation as given by
Eq. (14) has an inherited boundary contribution which is
revealed when taking into account Eq. (1) and Eq. (5) –6. In the special case of a stationary state \(|\Psi_n(t)\rangle\) the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation has the explicit boundary dependence given in

\[
\langle \Psi_n(t) | C_{\text{intr}} | \Psi_n(t) \rangle = \int_V r \times J_{pr(n)}(r) dV - \langle r \rangle_n \times \int_S r (J_{pr(n)}(r) dS). \tag{16}
\]

Assuming an extended Bloch eigenfunction \(\Psi_n(r, t, k)\)
that obeys PBCs over the boundaries of the system (and
normalized within its volume \(V\)), and in spite of the pos-
tion operator (undefined) expectation value \(\langle r \rangle\) that ex-
plicitly enters Eq. (14), we find after a straightforward
calculation shown in Appendix A that the electrons’
intrinsic orbital circulation takes a well-defined value at
the infinite volume limit \(V \to \infty\) which is given by

\[
\langle \Psi_n(t, k) | C_{\text{intr}} | \Psi_n(t, k) \rangle = \int_{V_{\text{cell}}} \left( r - \frac{\langle u_n(k) | r | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}} \right) \times \frac{J_{pr(n)}(r, k)}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}} dV \tag{17}
\]

with \(u_n(r, k)\) the cell periodic eigenfunctions, where all
space integrals have been truncated (due to symmetry of
the integrands) and evaluated within a unit cell of
volume \(V_{\text{cell}}\), the local probability current density
being determined with respect to a Bloch eigenstate. It is
evident by Eq. (17) that the intrinsic circulation is a bulk
and intensive quantity of a periodic and extended sys-
tem. On the contrary, the extrinsic circulation as given by
Eq. (15), takes an undefined value for a periodic and
extended system (owing to the position operator expecta-
tion value); it is therefore not a proper quantity to model
any bulk or boundary property of such a periodic and
extended system.

We note that, in deriving Eq. (17) we have as-
sumed a normalization constant that was
absorbed in the cell periodic states \(|u_n(k)\rangle\). In
this fashion and in the infinite volume limit, the
normalization constant acquires such a value that
\(\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}} \to 0\) in virtue of the normalization
condition \(\langle \Psi_n(k) | \Psi_n(k) \rangle = \langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}} = 1\); where
\(N\) is the total number of the unit cells enclosed within
the volume \(V\) of the system. Despite the fact that
\(\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}} \to 0\), the intrinsic circulation as given
by Eq. (17) is a well defined quantity as the normali-
zation constant appearing in the denominator in the
\(\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}\) term, also appears in the numerator
in the \(\langle u_n(k) | r | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}\) and \(J_{pr(n)}(r, k)\) terms, and
these cause its cancellation. As a consequence, the in-
trinsic orbital circulation of a periodic system does not
depend on the volume size of the system (via the nor-
malization constant) and is a well defined quantity in
the thermodynamic limit.

Summarizing, and with Eq. (14) as well as
Eq. (17) in mind, we can conclude that the quantity
\((r - \langle r \rangle) \times J_{pr}(r, t)\) is a well defined local intrinsic
circulation density, even if it is evaluated with respect to an
extended Bloch state in the thermodynamic limit where
the electrons’ position expectation value acquires an un-
defined value.

At this point it is useful to make a connection be-
tween the one electrons’ intrinsic circulation as given by
Eq. (14) and the decomposition of the \(n\)th band col-
lective electrons’ circulation that was made in a rather
ambiguous way, namely, to local circulation (LC) and
itinerant circulation (IC) in the seminal work of Ref.22
in order to model the orbital magnetization of normal ins-
ulators within a quantum mechanism. Therein, they started
from the assumption that each electrons’ eigenstate can be represented by an exponentially local-
ized Wannier function (thus the Bloch states that they
used satisfy the periodic gauge \(\Psi_n(k + G) = \Psi_n(k)\)
and have zero Chern invariant) and they began their calcu-
lation with a collective circulation computed with re-
spect to these Wannier functions, turning at the end of
their calculation to the Bloch eigenstates. In the present
work we follow an opposite route, that is we start our
calculation from the one electrons’ intrinsic circulation
Eq. (14) without any gauge assumptions (restrictions)
with respect to the Bloch eigenstates, and using those
states as building blocks in the many-body Slater de-
terminant wavefunction we determine analytically the
electrons’ (ground state) collective orbital magnetization.
By then taking into account the above mentioned rela-
tion between the standard and the boundary velocity for
stationary states \(\langle v \rangle_n = -\langle v_b \rangle_n\), the electrons’ intrinsic
circulation with respect to a Bloch eigenstate \(\Psi_n(r, t, k)\)
was given by

\[
\langle \Psi_n(k) | C_{\text{intr}} | \Psi_n(k) \rangle = \text{Im}[i \langle \Psi_n(k) | r \times v | \Psi_n(k) \rangle] + \text{Im}[i \langle r | v_n | \Psi_n(k) \rangle | v_b | \Psi_n(k) \rangle] \tag{18}
\]

In order to establish the connection with Ref.22 method
we assume that the Bloch eigenstates \(\Psi_n(r, t, k)\) enter-
ing Eq. (18) satisfy the periodic gauge and we expand it as

\[
|\Psi_n(k)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_n e^{i k \mathbf{R}_n} |n, \mathbf{R}_n\rangle
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_t} e^{i k \mathbf{R}_t} |n, \mathbf{R}_t\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}_s} e^{i k \mathbf{R}_s} |n, \mathbf{R}_s\rangle \tag{19}
\]
where $N$ is the number of primitive cells of the system, $|n, R_j\rangle$ is the $n$th band Wannier function in the bulk cell $R$ and $|n, R_S\rangle$ is the $n$th surface localized orbital on the surface cell $R_S$. By then taking into account that the expectation value of the boundary velocity \( \langle \Psi_n(k) | v_b | \Psi_n(k) \rangle \) is determined by a boundary integral, that is, only the boundary localized orbitals $|n, R_S\rangle$ enter into the expansion of the expectation value

\[
\langle \Psi_n(k) | v_b | \Psi_n(k) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{R_S} \sum_{R'_S} e^{i k \cdot (R_S - R'_S)} \langle n, R'_S | v_b | n, R_S \rangle,
\]

we calculate the $n$th band collective electrons' intrinsic circulation given by

\[
C_{n(coll)} = \frac{V}{(2\pi)^3} \iiint_{BZ} \langle \Psi_n(k) | C_{intr} | \Psi_n(k) \rangle d^3k \quad \text{where}
\]

$V$ is the volume of the system, which takes the form

\[
C_{n(coll)} = \sum_R \langle n, R | r \times v | n, R \rangle
\]

\[+ \sum_{R'_S} \sum_{R'_S} \sum_{R''_S} \delta_{R'_S - R''_S} \langle n, R'_S | r | n, R_S \rangle \times \langle n, R_S | v_b | n, R_S \rangle. \tag{21}
\]

Assuming then that the crystal has inversion symmetry in the bulk $\langle n, -R | r | n, R \rangle = -\langle n, R | r | n, R \rangle$, that is $\sum_R \langle n, R | r | n, R \rangle = 0$, as well as that for $R'_S \neq R_S$ the matrix elements $\langle n, R + R_S - R'_S | r | n, R \rangle$ can be taken as zero, the $n$th band electrons' collective intrinsic circulation takes the approximate form

\[
C_{n(coll)} = \sum_R \langle n, R | r \times v | n, R \rangle \tag{22}
\]

\[+ \sum_{R_S} \langle n, R_S | r | n, R_S \rangle \times \langle n, R_S | v_b | n, R_S \rangle,
\]

where the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (22) gives the electrons' $n$th band collective local circulation contribution (LC) and the second term the collective itinerant circulation contribution (IC) as given respectively in Ref.22.

In Ref.22 and 23, they notice that the itinerant circulation (IC) contribution that involves only the surface WFs can always be calculated as a bulk quantity that involves the bulk WFs, and they emphasize that this is quite remarkable and one of their central results. Their finding is explained whenever in the starting Eq. (13) we use the bulk expression Eq. (1) for the boundary velocity expectation value and at the same time replace $\langle H(r) \Psi_n(k) | r \Psi_n(k) \rangle$ with its equal $\langle \Psi_n(k) | r H(r) \Psi_n(k) \rangle$, which is true for all stationary states according to Eq. (1). Therefore, with the aid of the extended velocity operator and the intrinsic circulation definitions, we can elucidate and rigorously explain the origin of the heuristic partitioning of the orbital magnetization as given in Ref.22 and 23.

A physically and intuitively important feature of the intrinsic orbital circulation is that it is a quantity that properly counts the circulating probability microcurrents embodied in the wavefunction’s structure. In order to clarify this feature in a simple manner let as consider two spinless and free electron motions in 3D space: one electron with well defined linear momentum $\hbar k$ and another one with partially well defined linear momentum vector, e.g. only its $z$ component $\hbar k_z \mathbf{e}_z$ (with $k_x$ and $k_y$ being undetermined). We assume that each electron is in an extended state motion that is normalized within a volume $V$. The free electron motion with well defined linear momentum vector $\hbar \mathbf{k}$, hence with a plane wave form for the wavefunction, has a local probability current density that is a homogeneous vectorial quantity proportional to $\hbar \mathbf{k}/m$. On the contrary, the free electron motion with partially well defined linear momentum $\hbar k_z \mathbf{e}_z$ has a local probability current density that is an inhomogeneous vectorial quantity with a constant $z$ component proportional to $\hbar k_z/m$. Using Eq. (14), we can easily find that the intrinsic orbital circulation of the free electron motion with well defined linear momentum $\hbar \mathbf{k}$ is zero (due to the homogeneous local probability current density), while the intrinsic orbital circulation of the free electron with partially well defined linear momentum $\hbar k_z \mathbf{e}_z$ is non-vanishing (due to the inhomogeneous local probability current density) and takes contributions only from the $x$ and $y$ non-constant components of the local probability current density that may constitute a vortex circulating probability microcurrent field on the planes normal to $\mathbf{e}_z$ (with a free electron vortex state offering an example).

Considering such a structured wavefunction, its phase is indeterminate on the dislocation lines (in 3D space) where the modulus of the wavefunction gets a zero value. The intrinsic orbital circulation of the electron as given by Eq. (13) becomes zero, namely, \[\iint_V \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) dV - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle \times \iint_V \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) dV = 0\] whenever, in the simplest scenario, the local probability current density is zero (the gradient of the wavefunction’s phase is zero) or whenever the local probability current density is a homogeneous quantity (the gradient of the wavefunction’s phase has a constant and well-defined value), therefore the wavefunction is structureless. On the contrary, in structured wavefunctions the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation is generally not zero and has two competing contributions as given in Eq. (14), which are explicitly dependent on the local probability current density field. The bigger the difference of these two competing contributions the bigger the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation, which occurs for example whenever the internal structure of the wavefunction has such a symmetry that makes some of the components of \[\iint_V \mathbf{J}_{pr}(\mathbf{r}, t) dV \] become zero. The lat-
ter symmetry feature is found in the free electron motion that are described by vortex states\(^{32,33}\) where the electron has well defined linear momentum \(\hbar k_{\perp} e_z\) only in the \(z\) direction and at the same time has a well defined canonical orbital angular momentum along the same direction (characterized by the azimuthal index \(l\)). Due to the rotational (azimuthal) symmetry of the wavefunction, the azimuthal component of \(\int_{V} J_{pr}(r,t) dV\) becomes zero.

Structured wavefunctions appear naturally in motions under external potentials, e.g. in atomic orbitals with mechanical angular momentum or in Landau states in a magnetic field. In this respect, we generally expect that the ionic environment will in principle produce structured and extended cell periodic electronic wavefunctions \(u_n(r,k)\), with the dislocation lines being periodically ordered in the bulk owing to the periodicity of \(u_n(r,k)\), while spiraling probability micro-currents around those lines can be taken into account by Eq. (14) and Eq. (17). Intrinsic orbital circulation is the starting point quantity for the microscopical understanding of the orbital magnetization origin and as such will be used in the following to model the orbital magnetization in band theory without the need of any Wannier-localization approximation.

III. ORBITAL MAGNETIZATION QUANTUM FORMULAS

In this section we use the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation presented in Sec. II in order to derive quantum mechanical formulas for the orbital magnetization of non-interacting electrons by accounting for the circulating probability micro-currents. The formulas we derive are applicable either to conventional or to topological crystalline materials, under periodic or realistic boundary conditions for the electrons’ wavefunctions, while any Wannier localization assumptions are absent.

In a system of non-interacting electrons we can define the (single-eigenstate) orbital magnetization \(M_n(k)\) per electron as

\[
M_n(k) = \frac{m_n(k)}{V} = \frac{e}{2cV} \langle \Psi_n(t,k) | C_{\text{intr}} | \Psi_n(t,k) \rangle
\]

(23)

where \(m_n(k)\) is the electrons’ orbital magnetic moment, \(\Psi_n(t,k)\) is a Bloch eigenstate, \(V\) is the volume of the system, \(c\) is the speed of light and \(e < 0\) is the electron charge.

A. \(r\)-space orbital magnetization quantum formula

In the derivation of the \(r\)-space formula we do not take into account the realistic boundary contributions to the orbital magnetization due to the realistic wavefunctions’ boundary conditions; rather we provide a formula that has a bulk character. Namely, we calculate the orbital magnetization within PBCs which are imposed on the wavefunction over a “terminated” boundary surface of the (3D) material in the thermodynamic limit.

Using Eq. (17) for the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation and Eq. (23) for the orbital magnetization per electron, as well as the collective electrons’ ground state magnetization (assumed to be evaluated with respect to a many-body Slater determinant wavefunction) given by

\[
M = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \int_{\text{BZ}} f_n(k,\mu) m_n(k) d^3k
\]

where \(f_n(k,\mu)\) is the Fermi energy and \(m_n(k)\) is the occupation function, the bulk orbital magnetization of spinless and non-interacting electrons is given by

\[
M = \frac{e}{2c(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \int_{\text{BZ}} f_n(k,\mu) \left( \int_{V_{cell}} \left( r - \frac{\langle u_n(k) | r | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}} \right) \times \frac{J_{pr(n)}(r,k)}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{\text{cell}}} dV \right) d^3k
\]

(24)

where all expectation value position-integrals are truncated (due to symmetry) and carried out within a primitive cell of volume \(V_{cell}\) as shown in Appendix A. The orbital magnetization \(r\)-space formula is the first major result in this work and the integrand of Eq. (24) can be seen as a local orbital magnetization density with respect to real space.

We re-emphasize that, although the position operator that enters Eq. (14) has by itself an undefined expectation value \(\langle r \rangle\) within Bloch representation, its problematic behavior does not show up and it effectively behaves as a well defined operator when it appears within Eq. (14) and subsequently within Eq. (24). Therefore, the position operator does not have to be “sandwiched” between the ground-state projector and its complement as done in Ref.\(^31\) in order to get a well defined local expression for the electrons’ orbital magnetization with respect to periodic and extended states, but this can be realized in a straightforward manner with Eq. (24).

As evidenced from Eq. (24), the orbital magnetization acquires significant value whenever the difference between the two competing contributions gets as large as possible. We therefore expect that the orbital magnetization will have significant contributions from those states that possess some kind of rotational symmetry within the unit cell that results in
generalization of it. The first two terms on the right hand
where
A
of the emergent non-Hermitian effect.
interaction where the spin degree of freedom is essential,
non-relativistic limit velocity operator ac-
spin dependence. In crystals with strong spin-orbit in-
interaction, the non-relativistic limit velocity operator ac-
which is inherited in the local probability current den-
malized within the volume of the material) in the form
|Ψn⟩ (n,k) = Real[Ψn(r,k)† vΨn(r,k)] that enters Eq. (24). Therefore, in materials with strong spin-orbit inter-
for each electron, the standard velocity operator as given

B. k-space orbital magnetization quantum formula

In this subsection we are deriving an orbital magnetiza-
formula that is valid for general boundary conditions
the electrons’ wavefunction. Boundary contributions
will explicitly being taken into account as a consequence
the emergent non-Hermitian effect.
In order to derive the k-space formula we assume
that, each electrons’ motion is described from a (gen-
extended and stationary form eigenstate (normal-
with the thermodynamic limit assumed), thus we are
in the collective orbital magnetization formula for non-
many-body Slater determinant wavefunction. The formula
we derive will explicitly incorporate k derivatives
in the thermodynamic limit assumed), thus we are
cautious from the very beginning against possible k-
dependent ambiguities of our final result. For this
reason we consider the dynamical phase as well as an
arbitrary k-dependent phase (due to gauge freedom)
for the wavefunctions from the very beginning of our
derivation. Therefore, the Bloch type quantum eigen-
states that we consider (for each electron) have the form
|Ψn(t,k)⟩ = eik.r e iΘn(t,k) |Ψn(k)⟩, where Θn(t,k) is
the dynamical phase augmented by an additional k-
dependent gauge phase. The Θn(t,k) phase has explicit
form given by Θn(t,k) = − ℏ En(k)t + Λn(k).

By taking into account the above Bloch type eigenstate
for each electron, the standard velocity operator as given
by Eq. (2), and the Schrödinger equation that evolves
the quantum eigenstate, the action of the standard ve-
operator on the Bloch type eigenstate is given, as
analytically derived in Appendix [11] by

\begin{align}
    v |Ψn(t,k)⟩ &= \frac{-1}{\hbar} e^{ik.r} e^{i\Theta_n(t,k)} \left( H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) \right) |\partial_k u_n(k)⟩ + \frac{1}{\hbar} \partial_k E_n(k) |Ψ_n(t,k)⟩.
\end{align}

(26)

where
H_k(r,k) = e^{-i k.r} H(r) e^{i k.r}. In view of Eq. (25), the orbital magnetic moment for each electron is given by

\begin{align}
    m_n(k) &= -\frac{e}{2\epsilon\hbar} \text{Im} \left[ i \langle u_n(k) | (r - ⟨r⟩_n) × (H_k(r,k) - E_n(k)) |\partial_k u_n(k)⟩ \right].
\end{align}

(27)

The action of the operator \( ⟨r - ⟨r⟩_n⟩ |u_n(k)⟩ \) on the eigenstate \( |u_n(k)⟩ \) is given, as analytically derived in Appendix [11] by

\begin{align}
    (⟨r - ⟨r⟩_n⟩ |u_n(k)⟩ &= (i\partial_k - A_{nn}(k)) |u_n(k)⟩ \\
    &= - \sum_{m \neq n} (A_{mn}(k) - ⟨u_m(k) | r | u_n(k)⟩) |u_m(k)⟩
\end{align}

(28)

where \( A_{nn}(k) = i ⟨u_n(k) | \partial_k u_n(k)⟩ \) is the Berry connection and \( A_{mn}(k) = i ⟨u_m(k) | \partial_k u_n(k)⟩ \) the non-Abelian generalization of it. The first two terms on the right hand side of Eq. (28) can be recast in the form,

\begin{align}
    (i\partial_k - A_{nn}(k)) |u_n(k)⟩ &= i\tilde{∂}_k |u_n(k)⟩
\end{align}

(29)

where
\( \tilde{∂}_k = (1 - |u_n(k)⟩ ⟨u_n(k)|) \partial_k \) (30)

is the one-band covariant derivative that will explicitly enter the final many-body orbital magnetization formula as an emerging operator, and as such has never shown up in the literature of modern theory of orbital magnetization. Both sides of Eq. (28) transform covariantly with respect to gauge transformations of the form \( |u_n(k)⟩ → e^{iΛ_n(k)} |u_n(k)⟩ \), and this feature guarantees the gauge invariance of the final k-space formula that we derive.

Due to the algebraic complexity of analytically per-
forming the operator \((\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_n)\) action on the right within Eq. (27), and by taking into account that the operator \((\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_n)\) is by definition Hermitian (without the need of any specific boundary conditions to be imposed) owing to the position representation that we are working in \((\mathbf{r}^+ = \mathbf{r})\) and to the reality of the position operator expectation value \((\mathbf{r}_n)\), we let it act on the left to the eigenstate \((u_n(\mathbf{k}))\) which gives

\[
\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_n\rangle = -i \langle \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle

- \sum_{m \neq n} \langle u_m(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{A}_{nm}(\mathbf{k}) - \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{r} |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\rangle
\]

(31)

where we have used \(A_{nm}(\mathbf{k})^* = A_{nm}(\mathbf{k})\) as well as \(\langle u_m(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{r} |u_n(\mathbf{k})\rangle^* = \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{r} |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\).

As rigorously shown in Appendix C, the off-diagonal matrix elements \((A_{nm}(\mathbf{k}) - \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{r} |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) entering Eq. (31) are purely boundary-dependent quantities that emerge due to the non-Hermitian effect, and as such they are analytically taken into account in the quantum theory of orbital magnetization for the first time. They turn out to be given by the form

\[
(A_{nm}(\mathbf{k}) - \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{r} |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle) = \frac{S_{nm}(\mathbf{k})}{(E_n(\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{k}))}
\]

(32)

where \(S_{nm}(\mathbf{k})\) are non-Hermitian boundary terms that are defined by

\[
S_{nm}(\mathbf{k}) = \hbar \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{v}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle + \langle u_m(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{k}_b |u_n(\mathbf{k})\rangle
\]

(33)

with \(\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{k}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) being the off-diagonal matrix elements of the boundary momentum gradient “operator” defined as

\[
\mathbf{k}_b = (H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k})^+ - H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k})) \partial \mathbf{k}.
\]

(34)

The matrix elements of the boundary velocity operator \(\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{v}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) and the boundary momentum gradient operator \(\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{k}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle\), thus \(S_{nm}(\mathbf{k})\) also, are bulk quantities owing to their definitions

\[
\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{v}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[ \langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle | \mathbf{r} | u_m(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right.

- \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) | \mathbf{r} | u_m(\mathbf{k}) \rangle\]

(35)

and

\[
\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{k}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \partial \mathbf{k} u_m(\mathbf{k})

- \langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) \partial \mathbf{k} | u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle.
\]

(36)

respectively.

But, in position representation and after an integration by parts, both the above off-diagonal matrix elements are always transformed (due to symmetry of the integrands) to boundary quantities given by

\[
\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{v}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \left( \mathbf{v} u_n^* + u_n^* \mathbf{v} \right) \mathbf{r} u_m d\mathbf{S}

= -\frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{r} \left( \mathbf{v} u_n^* u_m + u_n^* \mathbf{v} u_m \right) d\mathbf{S}

+ \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \iint_{\mathbf{S}} u_n^* u_m d\mathbf{S}
\]

(37)

and

\[
\langle u_n(\mathbf{k})| \mathbf{k}_b |u_m(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \frac{i\hbar}{2} \iiint_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \left( \mathbf{v} u_n^* + u_n^* \mathbf{v} \right) \partial \mathbf{k} u_m d\mathbf{S}
\]

(38)

respectively, where \(u_m = u_m(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k})\) are the cell-periodic eigenfunctions. We note that Eq. (37) and Eq. (38) are not zero only whenever the position operator \(\mathbf{r}\) and the momentum gradient operator \(\partial \mathbf{k}\) become anomalous respectively.

Using Eq. (27) and Eq. (31) - (32) we find the second major result in this work, namely the \(\mathbf{k}\)-space orbital magnetic moment of each electron \(m_n(\mathbf{k})\) that is given by

\[
m_n(\mathbf{k}) = -\frac{e}{2\hbar} \text{Im} \left[ \langle \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n u_n(\mathbf{k}) | \times (H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) - E_n(\mathbf{k})) \rangle \partial \mathbf{k} u_n(\mathbf{k}) \right]

- \frac{e}{2\hbar} \sum_{m \neq n} \text{Im} \left[ \frac{1}{(E_n(\mathbf{k}) - E_m(\mathbf{k}))} S_{nm}(\mathbf{k}) \times \langle u_m(\mathbf{k}) | H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) - E_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \partial \mathbf{k} u_n(\mathbf{k}) \right]
\]

(39)

where we have used that \(\langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) - E_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \partial \mathbf{k} u_n(\mathbf{k}) = (H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) - E_n(\mathbf{k})) \partial \mathbf{k} u_n(\mathbf{k})\).

The electrons’ orbital magnetic moment formula Eq. (39) satisfies the two basic invariant properties, namely it is invariant with respect to gauge transformations of the form \(u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow e^{i\Lambda_n(\mathbf{k})} u_n(\mathbf{k})\) and with respect to shift of the zero of the Hamiltonian \(H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) \rightarrow H_k(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{k}) + c\) in this respect the many body orbital magnetization formula that we derive further below will share the same invariant properties.

At this point it is useful to make some remarks that may be important. In the modern theory of orbital mag-
netization, they implement by heuristic argument the many-band covariant derivative in order to make their final orbital magnetization formulas gauge invariant. In a different context, namely in the study of the polarization current produced by a homogeneous but time-dependent electric field, the many-band covariant derivative is also implemented in the time-dependent Schrödinger equation in order to consider in a gauge invariant manner the action of the position operator on the time-dependent and cell-periodic states.

As it will explicitly be shown in the next subsection a boundary contribution that is encoded by the one-band covariant derivative is hidden within the first term of the right hand side of Eq. (39) and it is attributed to the emerging momentum gradient operator anomaly.

Although it is the combination of the two terms \((\mathbf{A}_{nm}(k) - \langle u_n(k) | r | u_m(k) \rangle)\) that rigorously and explicitly gives the boundary contributions within the second term of the right hand side of Eq. (39), if we assume an approximation where the off-diagonal position matrix elements \(\langle u_n(k) | r | u_m(k) \rangle\) as given by Eq. (30) can be dropped out (which is a good assumption for conventional insulators), the right hand side of Eq. (39) will explicitly be expressed with respect to the many-band covariant derivative which will appear as an emerging operator within our formulation; the latter many-band covariant derivative is frequently used in the literature of the orbital magnetization by a heuristic manner that is based on the gauge invariance argument.

1. One-band formula

In the one-band formula we assume that each one of the off-diagonal matrix elements

\[
\mathbf{M} = -\frac{e}{2\hbar(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \iint_{BZ} f_n(k, \mu) \Im \left[ \langle \partial_k u_n(k) | (H_k(r, k) - E_n(k)) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle \right] d^3k
\]

which satisfies the two basic invariant properties, namely, it is gauge invariant and invariant with respect to shift of the zero of the Hamiltonian.

Although it seems that we have dropped out any boundary contributions of the orbital magnetization by approximating the off-diagonal matrix elements \(\mathbf{S}_{nm}(k)\) values as zero, there still exists an explicit boundary contribution within Eq. (40) which is attributed to the one-band covariant derivative. Specifically, if we use the definition of the one-band covariant derivative as given by Eq. (30) we can recast the integrand of Eq. (40) in the following form

\[
\langle \partial_k u_n(k) | (H_k(r, k) - E_n(k)) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle \\
= \langle \partial_k u_n(k) | (H_k(r, k) - E_n(k)) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle \\
- i \mathbf{A}_{nn}(k) \times \langle u_n(k) | H_k(r, k) - E_n(k) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle.
\]

The second term on the right hand side of Eq. (41) gives a non-zero boundary contribution to the orbital magnetization only whenever the non-Hermitian effect with respect to the momentum gradient operator emerges, that
is
\[
\langle u_n(k) | H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) [\partial_k u_n(k)] =
- \langle u_n(k) | H_k(r,k)^+ - H_k(r,k) [\partial_k u_n(k)]
= - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \iint_S n \cdot (v u_n)^* + u_n^* \cdot v \partial_k u_n \, dS \neq 0
\] (42)
where \( u_n = u_n(r,k) \) are the cell-periodic eigenfunctions. If we further assume within a stricter approximation that the position operator \( r \) and the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) are separately normal operators, that is the expectation value of the boundary momentum gradient operator \( \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_n(k) \rangle \) is zero, \( \langle u_n(k) | H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) [\partial_k u_n(k)] = 0 \), we can replace the covariant derivative entering Eq. (41) with the normal derivative that yields the orbital magnetization formula that was derived in Ref.22 but with the correct opposite sign between the Hamiltonian operator and the energy.

2. Many-band formula
In the many-band formula we don’t a priori make any assumption with respect to the behavior of the position operator \( r \) and the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \), thus no restrictions for the wavefunctions’ boundary conditions are made, in order to derive a general formula applicable to non-interacting electrons within topological materials, insulators or semimetals. In this respect, the many-band orbital magnetization formula of non-interacting electrons within a periodic solid is given by

\[
M = -\frac{e}{2c\hbar(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \int_{BZ} f_n(k, \mu) \text{Im} \left[ \left( \partial_k u_n(k) \times (H_k(r,k) - E_n(k)) [\partial_k u_n(k)] \right) \right] d^3k
-\frac{e}{2c\hbar(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \sum_{m \neq n} \int_{BZ} f_n(k, \mu) \text{Im} \left[ \frac{1}{(E_n(k) - E_m(k))} S_{nm}(k) \times \langle u_m(k) | H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) [\partial_k u_n(k)] \rangle \right] d^3k
\] (43)

which is valid for arbitrary boundary conditions on the wavefunctions \( u_m(r,k) \). The orbital magnetization many-band formula Eq. (43) is the major result of this work; it rigorously provides within a quantum mechanical theoretical framework, and without any Wannier-localization approximation or heuristic extension, the way to model the orbital magnetization of periodic topological solids.

The energy differences in the denominator of the second term in the right hand side of Eq. (43) captures the possible local (in momentum space) gigantic orbital magnetization contributions in the vicinity of band crossings. These gigantic orbital magnetization contributions are predicted to occur only whenever band crossings exist along with an imbalance of electron accumulation at the opposite boundary surfaces of the material that creates a Hall voltage.

In order to verify the need of the presence of a Hall voltage, we will show that within PBSs for the wavefunctions (thus no electron accumulation occurs) no gigantic local contribution of the orbital magnetization is possible even if the material is topological. Within PBSs the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) does not break the domain of definition of the Hamiltonian, that is the wave functions \( u_n(r,k) \) and \( \partial_k u_n(r,k) \) both satisfy periodic boundary conditions. The latter periodicity of \( \partial_k u_n(r,k) \) can be deduced from the periodicity \( u_n(r+L,k) = u_n(r,k) \), where \( L \) is the length of the material, by differentiating both sides with respect to the momentum \( k \) (which is treated as an independent parameter in the assumed thermodynamic limit) that gives \( \partial_k u_n(r+L,k) = \partial_k u_n(r,k) \). In this fashion, each one of the matrix elements \( \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_m(k) \rangle \) is zero due to symmetry, and any emergence of the non-Hermitian effect owing to the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) anomaly is prohibited. We point out that the absence of this non-Hermitian effect is invariant with respect to twisted boundary conditions of the form \( u_n(r+L,k) = e^{i\int (L,k) u_n(r,k)} \) as long as the system is closed.

By recasting the \( \langle u_m(k) | H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) [\partial_k u_n(k)] \rangle \) term entering the right hand side of Eq. (43) in the form
\[
\langle u_m(k) | H_k(r,k) - E_n(k) [\partial_k u_n(k)] =
(E_m(k) - E_n(k)) \langle u_m(k) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle
- \langle u_m(k) | k_b | u_n(k) \rangle \),
\] (44)
and by having in mind that under periodic boundary conditions the boundary momentum gradient “operator” \( k_b \) as given by Eq. (43) has zero matrix elements, that is \( \langle u_m(k) | k_b | u_n(k) \rangle = 0 \) as well as \( \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_n(k) \rangle = 0 \), the multi-band and unrestricted orbital magnetization formula Eq. (43) takes the form
where we have used that \( S_{nm}(k) = \hbar \langle u_n(k) | v_b | u_m(k) \rangle \) as evidenced from Eq. (33), and we have also replaced the one-band covariant derivative with the normal one due to \( \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_n(k) \rangle = 0 \) in accordance with Eq. (11) and Eq. (12).

It is now clear from Eq. (15) that, whenever Hall voltage is zero owing to periodic boundary conditions, the orbital magnetization cannot acquire local gigantic values, even if the material is topological with non-trivial band structure crossings, while whenever imbalance of electron charge is accomplished, local gigantic orbital magnetization contributions near the band crossings are predicted to occur.

It is worth comparing the orbital magnetization formula of periodic solids that is given by Eq. (15) with the one that was proposed in Ref. 23 by a heuristic argument. Eq. (15) is relaxed from any Wannier localization approximation as well as from the periodic gauge approximation, and it is therefore valid for topological materials as long as the electrons’ wavefunctions satisfy periodic boundary conditions (zero Hall voltage) over the materials’ boundaries. The heuristic extension of the orbital magnetization formula by an additional term, assumed to be proportional to the chemical potential, that was made in Ref. 23 in order to model the orbital magnetization of Chern insulators and metals, is rigorously given by the second term of the right hand side of Eq. (15). This term has explicit boundary contributions due to the off-diagonal matrix elements of the boundary velocity operator \( v_b \) which are not zero due to the emerging non-Hermitian effect of the position operator \( r \) that becomes anomalous within periodic boundary conditions.

\[ M = \frac{e}{2\pi c h(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \int_{BZ} f_n(k, \mu) \text{Im} \left[ \langle \partial_k u_n(k) | \times (H_k(r, k) - E_n(k)) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle \right] d^3k \]

\[ + \frac{e}{2\pi c h(2\pi)^3} \sum_{E_n \leq \mu} \sum_{m \neq n} \int_{BZ} f_n(k, \mu) \text{Im} \left[ \langle u_n(k) | v_b | u_m(k) \rangle \times \langle u_m(k) | \partial_k u_n(k) \rangle \right] d^3k \]  

(45)

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have reconsidered the modern theory of orbital magnetization through careful definition of additional quantities that rigorously and analytically take into account the boundary contributions to the observable. These contributions are shown to originate from non-Hermitian effects that emerge whenever the position operator \( r \) and the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) that enter the Ehrenfest and the Hellman-Feynman theorems respectively become anomalous breaking the domain of definition of the Hamiltonian operator. In this theoretical framework, we have first extended the standard velocity operator definition in order to incorporate the anomaly of the position operator that is inherited in band theory, which results to an explicit boundary velocity contribution.

Using the extended velocity, we have defined the electrons’ intrinsic orbital circulation within Bloch representation which we have shown that is an intensive and well defined quantity of periodic solids that properly counts the circulating micro-currents embodied in the wavefunctions’ bulk and boundary structure. Using the defined electrons’ intrinsic circulation, we have made a rigorous connection between the \( n \)th band electrons’ collective intrinsic circulation and the local (LC) and itinerant circulation (IC) contributions, that are used within Wannier-localization and periodic gauge approximation in the modern theory of orbital magnetization.

With these concepts in hand, we have been able to rigorously reconsider the modern theory of orbital magnetization and derive quantum mechanical expressions for the orbital magnetization of non-interacting electrons that move within extended and topological solids (insulators or semimetals), without any Wannier-localization approximation or heuristic extension been made.

We have rigorously shown that, in the one-band approximation \( \mathbf{k} \)-space formula, a one-band covariant derivative enters the magnetization formula as an emerging operator due to the non-Hermitian effect that is attributed to the anomaly of the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \); the one-band covariant derivative can be replaced by the normal derivative only whenever PBCs are satisfied.

In the many-band and unrestricted \( \mathbf{k} \)-space formula of the orbital magnetization, the non-Hermitian effect has been shown to contribute an additional boundary term that is originated from the anomalies of the position operator \( r \) and the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \). This additional boundary term, is expected to give local gigantic orbital magnetization contributions in the vicinity of band crossings in topological materials (insulators or semimetals) whenever band crossings exist along with Hall voltage due to imbalance of electron accumulation at the opposite boundaries of the materials. These local gigantic orbital magnetization contributions are encoded by the emerging non-Hermitian effect of the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) that becomes anomalous whenever PBCs for the electrons’ wavefunctions are broken. On the contrary, whenever Hall voltage is zero the electrons’ wavefunctions satisfy PBCs, the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) has a well defined behavior and, as a consequence, gigantic boundary contributions are not possible. By making a comparison between our derived formula and the one that had heuristically been given (in order to model the orbital magnetization of Chern insulators and
metals) in Ref.23, we have shown a previously unnoticed fact, namely that, within periodic boundary conditions, the orbital magnetization has explicit boundary contributions encoded by the off-diagonal matrix elements of the boundary velocity operator which are not zero due to the emerging non-Hermitian effect of the position operator that becomes anomalous within PBCs.

It is important to re-emphasize that all boundary contributions that emerge due to non-Hermitian effects can equally be calculated as bulk properties whenever the integrations by parts are not performed.

Appendix A: Position expectation value \( \langle r \rangle_n \), displacement \( \Delta \langle r \rangle \), orbital circulation \( \langle C \rangle_n \), and intrinsic orbital circulation \( \langle C_{intr} \rangle_n \)

In the following all calculations are performed for one electron states within Bloch representation.

1. Explicit calculation of \( \langle r \rangle_n \)

For simplicity and without the loss of generality we assume 1D configuration (while the generalization to 3D is straightforward). We assume a closed system \( \langle \Psi(t)|\Psi(t) \rangle = 1 \) of length \( L_x \) with PBSs for the wave function over the edges. We calculate the electrons’ position expectation value \( \langle \Psi(t)|x|\Psi(t) \rangle \) with respect to a Bloch eigenstate \( |\Psi_n(t,k)\rangle = e^{-i/\hbar}E_n(k)t e^{ikx}|u_n(k)\rangle \). The length \( L_x \) of the system is equal to \( L_x = N_x \alpha_x \), where \( \alpha_x \) is the primitive cell length and \( N_x \) the number of the primitive cells of the system. The Bloch state \( |\Psi_n(t,k)\rangle \) is normalized within the length \( L_x \) of the system, thus \( \langle \Psi_n(k)|\Psi_n(k)\rangle = N_x \langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} = 1 \), where \( \langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} \) is calculated within one primitive cell and a normalization constant is assumed to be absorbed in the cell periodic state \( |u_n(k)\rangle \). The electrons’ position expectation value is a quantity that is position origin-dependent quantity and is given by

\[
\langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle = \int_0^{L_x} x |u_n(x,k)|^2 dx \quad (A1)
\]

where the lower limit of the space integration is the starting point of the 1D system that coincides with the position-origin point.

Using the periodicity of the cell periodic states \( u_n(x,k) \) we “transfer” all \( (N_x - 1) \) primitives cells in the position of the 1st primitive cell (adjacent to the position origin), which gives

\[
\langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle = N_x \int_0^{L_x} x |u_n(x,k)|^2 dx + \alpha_x (1 + 2 + 3 + ... + (N_x - 1)) \int_0^{\alpha_x} |u_n(x,k)|^2 dx = N_x \langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} + \alpha_x N_x (N_x - 1) \frac{1}{2} \langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} \quad (A2)
\]

where the cell subscript denotes that the space integrals are evaluated within the primitive cell located at the system’s edge. Using the normalization condition Eq. \( A2 \) takes the form

\[
\langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle = \alpha_x N_x \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{\langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell}}{\langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell}} - \frac{\alpha_x}{2} \right) \quad (A3)
\]

In the system’s infinite length limit \( L_x \rightarrow \infty \) and under the assumption that the primitive cell length \( \alpha_x \) is finite, the number of primitive cells enclosed within the system also becomes infinite \( N_x \rightarrow \infty \). As a result of the normalization condition we have that \( \langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} \rightarrow 0 \) due to the normalization constant that is absorbed in the cell periodic state. In this fashion, the electrons’ position expectation value as given by Eq. \( A3 \) takes an undefined value due to the first term of the right hand side. On the contrary, the second term within the curve brackets has a well-defined value even in the infinite length limit; the normalization constant that is absorbed in the cell-periodic states appears the same both in the denominator in the \( \langle u_n(k)|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} \) term and in the numerator in the \( \langle u_n(k)|x|u_n(k)\rangle_{cell} \) term and these cause its cancellation.

2. Explicit calculation of \( \Delta \langle r \rangle \)

We assume a position periodic and closed system of length \( L_x \). We will calculate the electrons’ displacement after a finite time interval \( T \) in the limit of infinite length \( L_x \rightarrow \infty \) and show that is a well-defined quantity. We assume that the electron is in an extended and time-dependent Bloch type state at every instant, that is, \( |\Psi(t,k(t))\rangle = e^{ikx} |u(t,k(t))\rangle \), where the state \( |u(t,k(t))\rangle \) has arbitrary time-dependence and is cell-periodic at every instant. The state is also normalized to unity at every instant.

Using similar reasoning as in Eq. \( A3 \) we find that the electrons’ displacement is given by
\[ \Delta \langle x \rangle = \langle u(t + T, k(t + T)) | x | u(t + T, k(t + T)) \rangle - \langle u(t, k) | x | u(t, k) \rangle \]
\[ = \frac{\langle u(t + T, k(t + T)) | x | u(t + T, k(t + T)) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u(t, k(t)) | u(t, k(t)) \rangle_{cell}} - \frac{\langle u(t, k(t)) | x | u(t, k(t)) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u(t, k(t)) | u(t, k(t)) \rangle_{cell}}. \]  \quad (A4)

Taking into account the normalization condition at every instant
\[ \frac{1}{N_x} = \langle u(t + T, k(t + T)) | u(t + T, k(t + T)) \rangle \]
\[ = \langle u(t, k(t)) | u(t, k(t)) \rangle \]

Eq. (A4) takes the form
\[ \Delta \langle x \rangle = \int_0^{t+T} \frac{d}{dt'} \left( \frac{\langle u(t', k'(t')) | x | u(t', k'(t')) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u(t, k(t)) | u(t, k(t)) \rangle_{cell}} \right) dt'. \]  \quad (A5)

Using the extended velocity operator \( v_{ext} \) defined in Eq. (7) in the main text, it turns out that the electron displacement in a position periodic system has to be evaluated as
\[ \Delta \langle x \rangle = \int_0^{t+T} \frac{d}{dt'} \left( \frac{\langle u(t', k'(t')) | v_{ext} | u(t', k'(t')) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u(t, k(t)) | u(t, k(t)) \rangle_{cell}} \right) dt'. \]  \quad (A6)

### 3. Explicit calculation of \( \langle C \rangle \)_n

We calculate the electrons’ circulation operator expectation value \( \langle C \rangle \) given by Eq. (13) of the main text with respect to a Bloch eigenstate
\[ |\Psi_n(t, k)\rangle = e^{-i \hbar E_n(k) t} e^{i k \cdot r} |u_n(k)\rangle. \]  For simplicity we assume a 2D system while the generalization to 3D is straightforward. The system has length \( L_x = N_x \alpha_x \) in the \( x \) direction and \( L_y = N_y \alpha_y \) in the normal \( y \) direction, where \( N = N_x N_y \) is the total number of primitive cells within the system and \( \alpha_x, \alpha_y \) is the area of the primitive cell. The Bloch eigenstate is normalized within the area \( L_x L_y \), therefore a normalization constant is assumed to be absorbed within the cell periodic states, \( \langle \Psi_n(k) | \Psi_{n}(k) \rangle = N_x N_y \langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell} = 1 \). The electrons’ circulation is given by
\[ \langle C \rangle_n = \int_0^{N_x \alpha_x} \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dx dy \]  \quad (A7)

where the local probability current density is evaluated with respect to the Bloch eigenstate, and is a cell-periodic quantity. We first carry out the integral
\[ \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy, \]  where we exploit the periodicity of the local probability current density and “transfer” \( (N_y - 1) \) primitive cells along the \( y \) direction on the \( y = 0 \) line which gives
\[ \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy = N_y \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy + (1 + 2 + \ldots + (N_y - 1)) \alpha_y \times \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy \]
\[ = N_y \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy + N_y \left( \frac{(N_y - 1)}{2} \alpha_y \right) \times \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy. \]  \quad (A8)

Exploiting the periodicity of the local probability current, we perform analogous calculation for the integral along the \( x \) direction which gives
\[ \int_0^{N_x \alpha_x} dx \left( \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dy \right) = N_x N_y \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dx dy \]
\[ + N_x N_y \left( \frac{(N_x - 1)}{2} \alpha_x + \frac{(N_y - 1)}{2} \alpha_y \right) \times \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) dx dy. \]  \quad (A9)

Using the normalization condition \( N_x N_y \langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell} = 1 \), Eq. (A7) with the aid of Eq. (A9) finally takes the form
\[ \langle C \rangle_n = \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) \frac{\langle u_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell} dx dy}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell}} \]
\[ + \left( \frac{(N_x - 1)}{2} \alpha_x + \frac{(N_y - 1)}{2} \alpha_y \right) \times \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, k) \frac{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell} dx dy}{\langle u_n(k) | u_n(k) \rangle_{cell}}. \]  \quad (A10)

where all space integrals are taken within one primitive cell adjacent to a system’s edge and located at the po-
tion origin. The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (A10) is always a well-defined quantity even in the thermodynamic limit. Therefore, in the thermodynamic limit the electrons’ circulation becomes infinite due to the second term of the right hand side of Eq. (A10).

4. Explicit calculation of $\langle C_{intr} \rangle_n$

We calculate the electrons’ intrinsic circulation (C_intr) given by Eq. (14) of the main text with respect to

$$\langle C_{intr} \rangle_n = \int_0^{N_x \alpha_x} \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k}) \, dx \, dy - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n \int_0^{N_x \alpha_x} \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k}) \, dx \, dy. \quad (A11)$$

The first term of the right hand side of Eq. (A11) is given by Eq. (A10). The electrons’ position expectation value $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n$ is given by the 2D generalization of Eq. (A2), that is,

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n = \left( \frac{N_x - 1}{2} \alpha_x + \frac{N_y - 1}{2} \alpha_y \right) + \frac{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | \mathbf{r} | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}} \quad (A12)$$

and the space integral of the local probability current density is easily truncated within one primitive cell adjacent to a system’s edge (located at the position origin) due to the cell periodicity of the probability current, thus giving

$$\int_0^{N_x \alpha_x} \int_0^{N_y \alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k}) \, dx \, dy = N_x N_y \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k}) \, dx \, dy = \frac{\mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k})}{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}} \, dx \, dy. \quad (A13)$$

Substituting Eq. (A10) and Eq. (A12) - (A13) into Eq. (A11) we finally obtain

$$\langle C_{intr} \rangle_n = \int_0^{\alpha_x} \int_0^{\alpha_y} \left( \mathbf{r} - \frac{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | \mathbf{r} | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}}{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}} \right) \times \frac{\mathbf{J}_{pr(n)}(x, y, \mathbf{k})}{\langle u_n(\mathbf{k}) | u_n(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{cell}} \, dx \, dy. \quad (A14)$$

### Appendix B: Action of the velocity operator $\mathbf{v}$ on a Bloch eigenstate $|\Psi_n(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$ and of the operator $(\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n)$ on a cell periodic state $|u_n(\mathbf{k})\rangle$

1. **Action of $\mathbf{v}$ on a Bloch eigenstate $|\Psi_n(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$**

At first we derive a general $\mathbf{k}$-derivative formula that gives the action of the standard velocity operator Eq. (20) on a Bloch type state of the form $|\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$, where $\mathbf{k}$ is a static wave vector (assumed to take continuous values). This is accomplished by taking into account the specific Bloch type form of the state $|\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$ as well as the time evolution of the state by $i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$, that is governed by a static Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{r})$.

Under these conditions, the action of the position operator on the state $|\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{r} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = -i \partial_\mathbf{k} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle + i e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \partial_\mathbf{k} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle. \quad (B1)$$

Acting on both sites of Eq. (B1) with the Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{r})$ of the system, and taking into account that the Bloch eigenstate $|\Psi_n(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = e^{-i \frac{E_n(\mathbf{k})}{\hbar} t} e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} |u_n(\mathbf{k})\rangle$ in a 2D system identical to the one of the previous subsection. Therefore, we have to calculate Hamiltonian does not depend on the wavevector, that is $[H(\mathbf{r}), \partial_\mathbf{k}] = 0$, we find

$$H(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{r} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = -i \partial_\mathbf{k} (H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle) + i e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} H(\mathbf{r}) e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle \quad (B2)$$

where the Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{r})$ is defined by $H(\mathbf{r}) = e^{-i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} H(\mathbf{r}) e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}}$. The term $\partial_\mathbf{k} (H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle)$ of the right hand side of Eq. (B2) can be recast in the form

$$\partial_\mathbf{k} (H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle) = i \mathbf{r} H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle + e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \partial_\mathbf{k} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle \quad (B3)$$

where we have used

$$H(\mathbf{r}) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle,$$

as well as

$$\partial_\mathbf{k} \left( e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle \right) = -\hbar e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \frac{d}{dt} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle + e^{i \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \partial_\mathbf{k} |\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle$$
and
\[ -\hbar e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \frac{d}{dt} \Phi(t, \mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{r} \cdot \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \left( e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \Phi(t, \mathbf{k}) \right) = i \mathbf{r} H(\mathbf{r}) \Phi(t, \mathbf{k}). \]

Substituting Eq. (B3) into Eq. (B2) we find that the action of commutator \([H(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{r}]\) on the Bloch type state \(|\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle\) is given by
\[ [H(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{r}] |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = i e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \left( H_{t, \mathbf{k}} - i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}} \right) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle. \]

We expand the state
\[ |\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}\rangle = \sum_{m} |\Theta_{m, \mathbf{k}}\rangle |u_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle \]
for the action of the position operator on the eigenstate \(|\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}\rangle\) and then use the identity operator \(I\) on the right hand side has been eliminated.

The action of the commutator on a stationary Bloch type state of the form
\[ |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} e^{i\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}} |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle \]
where \(\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}\) is the dynamical phase with an additional \(\mathbf{k}\)-dependent gauge phase, that is, \(\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} E_{n}(\mathbf{k}) t + \Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k})\)
can be calculated by replacing \(|\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = e^{i\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}} |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) within Eq. (B4). This gives
\[ [H(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{r}] |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle = i e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} e^{i\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}} \left( H_{t, \mathbf{k}} - i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}} \right) |\Psi(t, \mathbf{k})\rangle. \]

We expand the state \(e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} e^{i\Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k})} \partial_{\mathbf{k}} |\Psi_{t, \mathbf{k}}\rangle\) on the complete basis of the eigenstates \(|u_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) using the identity operator \(I\) and the normalization condition \(\langle u_{n}(\mathbf{k})|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = 1\). This way we can deduce that the action of the standard velocity operator \(\mathbf{v}\) on a stationary Bloch type state is given from
\[ \mathbf{v} |\Psi_{t, \mathbf{k}}\rangle = -\frac{1}{\hbar} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} e^{i\Theta_{t, \mathbf{k}}} \left( H_{t, \mathbf{k}} - E_{n}(\mathbf{k}) \right) |\partial_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle + \frac{1}{\hbar} \partial_{\mathbf{k}} E_{n}(\mathbf{k}) |\Psi_{t, \mathbf{k}}\rangle. \]

The equation of the commutator of \(r\) and \(|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) takes the form
\[ r |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = i |\partial_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle - \partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k}) |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle + \sum_{m} i \langle \Psi_{m}(\mathbf{k})|\partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Psi_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle. \]

The expectation value of the position operator \(r\) with respect to the eigenstate \(|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) is given with the aid of Eq. (B9) in the form
\[ \langle u_{n}(\mathbf{k})| r |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = A_{n}(\mathbf{k}) - \partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k}) - i \langle \Psi_{n}(\mathbf{k})|\partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Psi_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle \]
where \(A_{n}(\mathbf{k}) = i \langle u_{n}(\mathbf{k})|\partial_{\mathbf{k}} u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) is the Abelian Berry connection.

Using the normalization condition \(\langle u_{n}(\mathbf{k})|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = 1\), the action of the expectation value “operator” \(\langle r \rangle_{n}\) on the eigenstate \(|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\) is given as
\[ \langle r \rangle_{n} |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = (A_{n}(\mathbf{k}) - \partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k})) |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle \]
\[ - (i \langle \Psi_{n}(\mathbf{k})|\partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Psi_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle. \]

Subtracting Eq. (B11) from Eq. (B9) we find the action of the position operator \(r - \langle r \rangle_{n}\) on the eigenstate \(|u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle\), that is
\[ (r - \langle r \rangle_{n}) |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = (i \partial_{\mathbf{k}} - A_{n}(\mathbf{k}) - \partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda_{n}(\mathbf{k})) |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle \]
\[ = - \sum_{m \neq n} i \langle \Psi_{m}(\mathbf{k})|\partial_{\mathbf{k}} \Psi_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{m}(\mathbf{k})\rangle |u_{n}(\mathbf{k})\rangle. \]
Using \( |\Psi_n(k)\rangle = e^{i k \cdot r} e^{i A_n(k)} | u_n(k)\rangle \) and the orthogonality relation \( \langle u_m(k) | u_n(k)\rangle = \delta_{mn} \), the action of the operator \( (\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n) \) on the eigenstate \( | u_n(k)\rangle \) finally takes the form

\[
(\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n)| u_n(k)\rangle = (i \partial_k - A_{nn}(k)) | u_n(k)\rangle \\
- \sum_{m \neq n} (A_{mn}(k) - \langle u_m(k) | \mathbf{r} | u_n(k)\rangle) | u_m(k)\rangle
\]

where \( A_{mn}(k) = i \langle u_m(k) | \partial_k u_n(k)\rangle \) is the non-Abelian Berry connection.

Correspondingly, the action of the operator \( (\mathbf{r} - \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle_n) \)

\[
(A_{nm}(k) - \langle u_n(k) | \mathbf{r} | u_m(k)\rangle) = A_{nm}(k) + \frac{i \hbar}{(E_n(k) - E_m(k))} (\langle u_n(k) | \mathbf{v} | u_m(k)\rangle + \langle u_n(k) | \mathbf{v}_b | u_m(k)\rangle)
\]

where, in turn, the boundary velocity operator matrix elements are given by

\[
\langle u_n(k) | \mathbf{v}_b | u_m(k)\rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle u_n(k) | (H(\mathbf{r})^+ - H(\mathbf{r})) | \mathbf{r} | u_m(k)\rangle.
\]

In order to calculate the matrix elements of the standard velocity operator \( \langle u_m(k) | \mathbf{v} | u_n(k)\rangle \) we develop an off-diagonal Hellmann-Feynman theorem starting from the eigenvalue equation

\[
\langle u_n(k) | (H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) - E_m(k)) | u_m(k)\rangle = 0.
\]

Assuming that the crystal momentum takes continuous values, we act with the momentum gradient operator \( \partial_k \) on both members of Eq. (C.3) obtaining

\[
\hbar \langle u_n(k) | \mathbf{v} | u_m(k)\rangle - \partial_k E_n(k) \delta_{mn} + \langle u_n(k) | (H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) - E_m(k)) | \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle = 0 \tag{C.4}
\]

where we have used that \( \partial_k H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) = \hbar \mathbf{v} \) and \( \langle \partial_k u_n(k) | u_m(k)\rangle = -\langle u_n(k) | \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle \).

Next, we take into account the possible anomaly of the momentum gradient operator due to the non-Hermitian effect, that emerges whenever the gradient operator \( \partial_k \) breaks the domain of definition \( \mathcal{D}_{H_k} \) of the Hamiltonian \( H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) \). In this framework, the wavefunctions \( u_m(\mathbf{r}, k) \) and \( \partial_k u_m(\mathbf{r}, k) \) fulfill different boundary conditions over the edges of the system, and as a result they don’t belong within the same domain of definition, that is, \( u_m(\mathbf{r}, k) \in \mathcal{D}_{H_k} \) while \( \partial_k u_m(\mathbf{r}, k) \notin \mathcal{D}_{H_k} \).

Therefore, whenever the non-Hermitian effect emerges, the term \( \langle u_n(k) | \langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) - E_m(k) \rangle | \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle \) entering Eq. (C.4) is not zero as a result of the following non-trivial inequality

\[
\langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) u_n(k) | \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle = \langle u_n(k) | H_k(\mathbf{r}, k)^+ \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle \\
\neq \langle u_n(k) | H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle
\]

owing to the eigenfunction \( \partial_k u_m(\mathbf{r}, k) \) that does not belong within the domain of the Hamiltonian operator that forms the given Hilbert space \( \mathcal{D}_{H_k} \).

We treat this non-Hermitian effect by expressing the term \( \langle u_n(k) | H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle \) as

\[
\langle u_n(k) | H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle = \langle H_k(\mathbf{r}, k) u_n(k) | \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle - D_{nm}(k) \tag{C.5}
\]

where the \( D_{nm}(k) \) term represents the non-Hermitian effect and is a boundary quantity. The abstract form of \( D_{nm}(k) \) is given by

\[
D_{nm}(k) = \langle u_n(k) | (H_k(\mathbf{r}, k)^+ - H_k(\mathbf{r}, k)) \partial_k u_m(k)\rangle \tag{C.6}
\]

which can be thought as the off-diagonal matrix element of the boundary momentum gradient “operator” defined as

\[
k_b = (H_k(\mathbf{r}, k)^+ - H_k(\mathbf{r}, k)) \partial_k.
\]

In this fashion, the explicit value (assuming a 3D system) of the off-diagonal matrix element of the boundary momentum gradient “operator”...
\[ D_{nm}(k) = \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_m(k) \rangle \] is always given after an integration by parts (within position representation) from a boundary integral over the system’s boundary surface

\[ S \] that has the form

\[ \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_m(k) \rangle = \frac{i\hbar}{2} \int_{S} n \cdot (v u_n) \, \partial_k u_m \, dS \] (C8)

where \( u_m = u_m(r, k) \) are the eigenfunctions, \( v \) is the standard velocity operator and \( n \) is the unitary vector that is locally normal to the surface \( S \).

Therefore, using Eq. (C4) and (C5), as well as \( n \neq m \), we deduce that the off-diagonal matrix elements of the standard velocity operator are given by

\[ \langle A_{nm}(k) - \langle u_n(k) | r | u_m(k) \rangle \rangle = \frac{i}{(E_n(k) - E_m(k))} \langle A_{nm}(k) - \langle u_n(k) | r | u_m(k) \rangle \rangle = \frac{i S_{nm}(k)}{(E_n(k) - E_m(k))}, \] (C10)

where \( S_{nm}(k) \) are the emerging non-Hermitian boundary effect terms that are given by

\[ S_{nm}(k) = \hbar \langle u_n(k) | v_b | u_m(k) \rangle + \langle u_n(k) | k_b | u_m(k) \rangle. \] (C12)