A comment has been recently posted on the arXiv [1] that discuss our recent work on encircling multiple exceptional points [2]. In that comment, the authors claim that our approach is prone to errors. In discussing their findings, they also indicate that a method presented by their team [3] (presumed to give correct results in all situations) was published prior to our work. First, we would like to note that both their work and ours were posted on the arXiv within a week from each other. Second and more importantly, as we will show below, their analysis and conclusion concerning the validity of our approach as presented in the comment article [1] are not correct. As we will demonstrate, a proper application of our method does indeed provide the correct results.

Let us first recall the example studied in [1]:

\[
H = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & z & 0 \\
z & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 2z
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(1)

which has the eigenvalues \( \pm \sqrt{1 + z^2} \) and \( 2z \). In our approach, one would first pick a sorting scheme based on some chosen criterion. For example, we can sort the eigenvalues based on their magnitude, real part or imaginary part. After that, the eigenvalues must be sorted at every point in the complex plane according to the chosen method. This will naturally lead to a set of branch lines that separate the different solutions based on the sorting scheme. One can then associate a permutation matrix with each line to describe the transition between the different solution branches. We refer the interested reader to [2] for the detailed description of that procedure. Let us now apply this approach here. In order to make our point, we follow [1] and sort the eigenvalues based on their real part. This results in the coloring scheme for the Riemann surfaces shown in Fig. 1(a). By projecting this on the complex domain \( z \), the surfaces are sorted by their real values and colored accordingly. For clarity, we have indicated the solution \( 2z \) by a plain sheet. (b) The corresponding branch lines in the complex plane along with their associated permutation matrices \( M_1, M_2, M_3 \). Also we show two test loops encircling EP \( 1 \), which we discuss in details in the text.

FIG. 1. Real parts of the Riemann sheets associated with the eigenvalue solutions of the Hamiltonian \( H \) of Eq. (1) are depicted in (a). At every point in the complex domain \( z \), the surfaces are sorted by their real values and colored accordingly. For clarity, we have indicated the solution \( 2z \) by a plain sheet. (b) The corresponding branch lines in the complex plane along with their associated permutation matrices \( M_1, M_2, M_3 \). Also we show two test loops encircling EP \( 1 \), which we discuss in details in the text.

two loops shown in Fig. 1(b). The starting point for
the larger loop is denoted by \( z_1 \). The loop crosses the
lines associated with the matrices \( M_{1,3,2} \) in that order.

Thus after one cycle, the exchange relation of the states
is given by the matrix product

\[
M_2 M_3 M_1 (s_1, s_2, s_3)^T = (s_2, s_1, s_3)^T.
\]

In simple terms, this means that state \( s_1 \) associated with the solution \( \sqrt{1 + z^2} \) will swap with state
\( s_2 \) associated with \( -\sqrt{1 + z^2} \), as expected. On the other
hand, state \( s_3 \) which is associated with the solution \( 2z \) remains on the same sheet, also as expected. Moving to the
smaller loop with the starting point \( z_2 \), we note that that it crosses only the line associated with \( M_1 \) which results
in \( M_1 (s_1, s_2, s_3)^T = (s_3, s_2, s_1)^T \). These are the expected
results since at point \( z_2 \), the states \( s_{1,2,3} \) belong to the
solutions \( \sqrt{1 + z^2}, 2z, -\sqrt{1 + z^2} \), respectively (because
\( \text{Re}[\sqrt{1 + z^2}] > \text{Re}[2z] > \text{Re}[−\sqrt{1 + z^2}] \)).

Interestingly, the authors in [1], make a comment also
about the efficiency of various approaches. It is not clear
to us how can one compare the efficiency of various meth-
ods without having a rigorous mathematical definition for
the term ‘efficiency’.

In summary, we have addressed the comments raised
in [1] and have shown that its conclusion is wrong. To illustrate this, we used the same example put forward in
[1] and demonstrated that our method provides indeed
the correct results.
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