Electronic transport in one-dimensional Floquet topological insulators via topological- and non-topological edge states
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Based on probing electronic transport properties, we propose an experimental test for the recently discovered rich topological phase diagram of one-dimensional Floquet topological insulators with Rashba spin-orbit interaction [Kennes et al., Phys. Rev. B 100, 041104(R) (2019)]. Using the Keldysh-Floquet formalism, we compute electronic transport properties of these nanowires, where we propose to couple the leads in such a way, as to primarily address electronic states with a large relative weight at one edge of the system. By tuning the Fermi energy of the leads to the center of the topological gap, we are able to directly address the topological edge states, granting experimental access to the topological phase diagram. Surprisingly, we find conductance values similar or even larger in magnitude to those corresponding to topological edge states, when tuning the lead Fermi energy to special values in the bulk, which coincide with bifurcation points of the dispersion relation in complex quasimomentum space. These peaks reveal the presence of narrow bands of states whose wave functions are linear combinations of delocalized bulk states and exponentially localized edge states, where the amplitude of the edge-state component is sharply peaked at the aforementioned bifurcation point, resulting in an unusually large relative edge-weight. We discuss the transport properties of these non-topological edge states and explain their emergence in terms of an intuitive yet quantitative physical picture. The mechanism giving rise to these states is not specific to the model we consider here, suggesting that they may be present in a wide class of systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main goals in the field of topological phases of matter is to connect the abstract notion of topological invariants with physical observables, as e.g. in the quantum Hall effect (QHE) [1,2] where the Hall conductance can be linked to the integer (TKNN) topological invariant. Floquet topological insulators (FTIs) are periodically driven systems in which nontrivial topological properties of the bandstructure can be induced by the drive, allowing for a high degree of controllability. Such systems have been realized in solid-state materials [3–31], cold atom systems [22–24], and solid-state materials [22–31]. Among the predicted topological properties are the emergence of Majorana edge modes [32–35] and parafermions [36] in one-dimensional (1D) FTIs, the photinduced QHE in 2D materials [37–41], topological surface states in 3D FTIs [42] and Weyl semimetals and fractional FTIs in coupled Rashba nanowires [43].

In the context of FTIs the topological invariant, which is associated with the topology of the quasienergy spectrum of the Floquet Hamiltonian, is not as meaningful as e.g. in the QHE case, as it is sensitive to the truncation of the Floquet Hamiltonian in Floquet space. If the driving frequency is small compared to the bandwidth of the static system (i.e. with vanishing driving amplitude) a large number of coupled Floquet replicas has to be taken into account, leading to a dramatic extension of the topological phase diagram with many stable topological edge states (TESs) [44]. Every additional Floquet replica leads to additional quasienergy bands and therefore additional gaps in the quasienergy spectrum at increasing quasi-momenta, which can potentially host TESs. Thus, by increasing the truncation order, the degenerate subspace of TESs, and thus the value of the topological invariant, grows indefinitely. Since gaps at large quasimomenta decrease rapidly in size, however, the corresponding TESs are increasingly less well localized, such that their contribution to observables which measure the local density of states (LDOS) at the edge of the system may be similar to trivial bulk states. Fixing a scale L on which the LDOS is probed one can thus converge the truncation until convergence in these observables is reached. It is in this sense, that the invariant itself is not as meaningful, as it (in contrast to observables) does not converge as a function of the cutoff in Floquet space.

In order to specifically address edge states with localization lengths on a scale \( L \) we propose to couple the leads only to the edge of the wire on a scale \( L \). We thus effectively probe the LDOS at the edge of the nanowire, which is large if well-localized edge states are present. This gives experimental access to the predicted phase diagram, which does not only contain information on the number of TESs at any given truncation order in Floquet space but is also supplemented by the corresponding localization lengths [44].

Edge state transport in FTIs has been studied using effective Floquet Boltzmann methods (taking into account occupations of TESs) in 2D systems [45], Floquet-Green’s function methods in 2D [46–49] and 1D systems [50] and Floquet scattering theory [51] in 2D systems. In contrast to these works, we compute the full ac-conductance (not just the dc-component) and we consider system sizes...
which are realistic for solid-state implementations. It is only on these scales that we find a significant contribution from non-topological edge states which are discussed further below.

The intrinsic non-equilibrium nature of FTIs poses many challenges. One such challenge is the fact that the occupation of Floquet states shows a high degree of dependence on details of fermionic and bosonic baths coupled to the system. We circumvent these difficulties by concentrating on observables, which do not depend on the occupation of states, but rather just on the spectral properties or LDOS. By employing the weak-coupling approximation we show that the differential conductance can be used to probe the LDOS in the driven case and is thus a convenient observable for our purposes.

A topic that has gained very little attention in the context of topological phases of matter concerns non-topological edge states (NTESs). These novel states live at energies which overlap with the bulk bands and are linear combinations of exponentially localized edge states and delocalized bulk states, where the amplitude of the edge state component is sharply peaked around special quasipatterns. Here, we report the discovery of (narrow) bands of such states in the model under consideration. Since the bulk- and edge state contributions to the wavefunction of these states are normalized with factors $1/\sqrt{N}, 1/\sqrt{\ell}$, where $N, \ell$ denote the number of unit cells of the nanowire and the localization length of the edge state component respectively, a significant portion of the weight of a NTES can still be located at the edge of a (large enough) system, making its contribution of the weight of a NTES much more pronounced than the signal due to the conventional (topological) edge states.

Predicting the existence and analyzing the properties of NTESs numerically is challenging because they are not linked to topological invariants and their contribution to observables is indistinguishable from pure bulk states until the system size $N$ considerably exceeds the localization length $\ell$ of the edge state component. We overcome this challenge by employing an efficient algorithm with complexity $O(N)$ (instead of the usual $O(N^2-3)$) for the computation of the differential conductance in the framework of the Keldysh-Floquet formalism, which allows us to treat extremely large system sizes of up to $N = 10^7$ unit cells. We attempt to explain the existence of NTESs in terms of an intuitive yet quantitative picture involving bifurcation points of the dispersion relation in the complex quasimomentum plane, discuss their contribution to the transport properties of the nanowire and thereby propose a method for observing them experimentally. Finally, we state those properties of the model under consideration which are responsible for the emergence of NTESs, opening a route for the systematic investigation of other models with regard to NTESs.

II. MODEL AND EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section we present the models of both the driven Rashba nanowire and the leads that carry current to and from the wire. Using the wide-band limit and Keldysh-Green’s functions, we compute the self-energy contribution of the leads to the wire Hamiltonian. The sum of the Hamiltonian and the self-energy defines the effective Hamiltonian, from which the spectral/transport properties are computed. If the scale of the lead-induced self-energy is small compared to the topological gap, the topological edge states are unaltered by this coupling and thus the topological properties of the wire Hamiltonian also manifest in the effective Hamiltonian.

A. Wire Hamiltonian

The model we consider here was introduced in [30] and a detailed study of its topological properties was conducted in [44]. This one-dimensional two-band Rashba nanowire features TESs if a transverse Zeeman field $\Delta Z$ and a periodic drive of the inter-band transition $t_F$ is applied. Denoting Pauli-matrices in band/spin space by $\gamma_i/\sigma_i$ respectively the single-particle Hamiltonian in quasimomentum space reads

$$h_k(t) = (\epsilon_k + \alpha \sin k\sigma_z)\gamma_z + \Delta Z \gamma_x + 2t_F \cos \omega t \gamma_x,$$

where $\epsilon_k = E_k + \Delta R$, and $E_k = W \sin^2 \frac{k}{2}$. Here, $W$ denotes the bandwidth, $-\pi < k < \pi$ is the quasimomentum, $\Delta_g$ is the (intrinsic) bandgap (not to be confused with the topological gap $\Delta$ that emerges in the quasienergiespectrum of the Floquet Hamiltonian), $\alpha$ is the Rashba constant and $\omega$ denotes the driving frequency. Such a model could be realized in curved bilayer graphene, where both lead and strength of the Rashba coupling can be controlled [56].

We perform the following exact unitary transformation in order to work in the rotating wave approximation (RWA) basis

$$h_k(t) \rightarrow \tilde{h}_k(t) = U^\dagger(t)h_k(t)U(t) - iU^\dagger(t)\dot{U}(t),$$

where $U(t) = e^{-i\frac{\Omega}{2} \gamma_t} = \sum_{\eta = \pm} \eta_\eta e^{-i\eta_\eta \frac{\omega}{2}}$ and $\eta = \frac{1 + \gamma_3}{2}$ is a projector on band $\eta$. At resonance, $(\omega = \Delta_g)$ the transformed Hamiltonian reads

$$\tilde{h}_k(t) = h_k^R + t_F(e^{i\Omega t} \eta_+ + e^{-i\Omega t} \eta_-)$$

with the RWA Hamiltonian

$$h_k^R = (E_k + \alpha \sin k\sigma_z)\gamma_z + \Delta Z \gamma_x + t_F \eta_x,$$

the effective driving frequency $\Omega = 2\omega$ and raising/lowering operators $\eta_\pm = \frac{\gamma_3 \pm \gamma_2}{2}$. The corresponding Floquet Hamiltonian reads

$$(\tilde{h}_k^R)|_W = (h_k^R - l\omega)\delta_{ll} + t_F(\delta_{l,l-2} \eta_+ + \delta_{l,l+2} \eta_-),$$
where \( l, l' \in \mathbb{Z} \). In the following we truncate this Hamiltonian symmetrically in Floquet space at \(|l|, |l'| \leq l_m\) and increase \( l_m \) until we find convergence in the observables that are computed from the effective Floquet Hamiltonian. Furthermore, we transform back from momentum to real space by substituting \( e^{\pm ik} \rightarrow \delta_{n,n+1} \) to obtain a \([4(2l_m+1)N]-dimensional\] tight-binding Hamiltonian with \(N\) unit cells and open boundary conditions. Note that we set the lattice spacing to unity here.

Finally, we note some properties of the Floquet Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (3): it features a local chiral symmetry \( S \) for every (symmetric) truncation \(-l_m \leq l, l' \leq l_m\), i.e. \( \hat{h}^F_{k\ell} S = -\hat{h}^S_k \) with the chiral symmetry operator \( S_{\ell\ell'} = \delta_{\ell\ell'}\eta_z\sigma_z \), where \( \ell = -l \), and is thus a representative of the BDI symmetry class. Also note, that this Hamiltonian can be decomposed into a sum of two commuting parts, acting only on the odd and even Floquet indices respectively. Both of these properties are crucial in determining the topological properties and computing the topological invariant of the system. Here, however, the coupling to leads destroys both of these features. Finally, we note that the Rashba-term breaks inversion-symmetry, i.e. \( \hat{h}^E_{\ell,k} = \sigma_x\hat{h}^F_k\sigma_x \neq \hat{h}^E_k \). As we will see, this property is crucial for the emergence of non-topological edge states.

B. Reservoirs and self-energy

We aim at probing the spectral properties of the Hamiltonian introduced in the previous section via electronic transport measurements. It is thus necessary to couple reservoirs to the wire which serve as leads for the current flowing to and from the system. The setup we have in mind is depicted in Fig. 1: we consider two reservoirs, one is called the probe (p) and the other the substrate (s) in the following. In order to induce a current these reservoirs are kept at chemical potentials \( \mu_s = \mu_0 \) and \( \mu_p = \mu_0 + eV \) with electric charge \( e \), voltage difference \( V \) and lead Fermi energy \( \mu_0 \). Additionally, we assume the zero temperature limit for both reservoirs. Note that this setup is unconventional in the sense that the transport does not occur along the wire, but rather via its edge.

All (renormalized) single-particle states of the wire serve as channels for the current, we are however exclusively interested in the signal due to topological (and non-topological) edge states. These states are characterized by the fact that the weight of their wavefunctions is concentrated near the edges of the wire. If the probe only couples to the first \( L \ll N \) unit cells, the contribution of delocalized bulk states to the differential conductance is suppressed by a factor \( L/N \) compared to the topological and non-topological edge states. This is true both in the bulk, where the signal of non-topological edge states thus dominates over the background of delocalized bulk states, but also in the gap, where the topological edge states thus dominate over bulk states leaking into the gap (this is of course only relevant if the reservoir-induced broadening is of the order of the gapsize). Thus, in contrast to other works on transport in FTIs, here, (delocalized) bulk states will only contribute an insignificant background to the total differential conductance, which allows for the observation of states with large relative edge-weight at bulk energies, i.e. NTEs. Finally, we assume that the coupling between probe and wire is much weaker than the substrate-wire coupling (weak-coupling approximation). Under this assumption the differential conductance is independent of the occupation of single-particle states in the wire, as will be shown in the next section.

In order to describe the effect of the coupling between the wire and the reservoirs, we refer to the Keldysh-Floquet formalism (see Appendix A for a brief review), in which the influence of the reservoirs is encoded in the reservoir-induced self-energy \( \Sigma = \Sigma_s + \Sigma_p \) with individual contributions from the substrate and probe lead respectively. In the following we derive expressions for a single reservoir, dropping the s/p index for notational convenience.

Assuming the reservoirs to be non-interacting and static, i.e. not affected by the external driving, the diagrammatic expansion of the self-energy is given by \( \Sigma(t, t') = \mathcal{V}g(t, t')\mathcal{V} \), where the matrix elements of the vertex \( \mathcal{V} \) describe the overlap between single-particle states of reservoir and wire respectively, and where \( g \) denotes the (non-interacting) Green’s function of the reservoir. We define the hybridization function as \( \Gamma(E) = 2\pi\mathcal{V}^\dagger\delta(E - h)\mathcal{V} \) where \( h \) denotes the single-particle Hamiltonian of the reservoir. Since we are interested in the universal physics irrespective of microscopic details of the reservoirs and the reservoir-wire couplings, we employ the wide-band limit (WBL), i.e., we assume \( \Gamma \) to be independent of the energy argument, which is reasonable as long as the spectrum of the reservoir varies slowly on the scale on which \( E \) is evaluated.

Using the definitions of the non-interacting Green’s functions defined in Eqs. (A13)-(A15) and assuming the
WBL, we find the following expressions for the retarded, lesser and greater self-energy components:

\[
\Sigma^R(t, t') = -\frac{i}{2} \Gamma \delta(t - t'),
\]
\[
\Sigma^<(t, t') = i \Gamma \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t'+i\eta)} \Theta(E - E_t),
\]
\[
\Sigma^>(t, t') = i \Gamma \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t'-i\eta)} [\Theta(E - E_t) - 1],
\]

where we have replaced the Fermi-functions with step-functions \(\Theta\) due to the zero-temperature limit, and where \(e^{\pm E_0}\) are convergence factors.

We anticipate, that topological properties of the effective Hamiltonian will be lost, if the scale of \(\Gamma\) becomes comparable to the scale of the topological gap \(\Delta\), and thus assume \(\Gamma \ll \Delta\) in the following. This can of course only be ensured locally in parameter space, since the gap becomes arbitrarily small near the phase boundaries. In order to still achieve a smooth density of states we choose the scale of \(\Gamma\) on the order of (or larger than) the level spacing, i.e. \(\Gamma \gtrsim \omega/N\). For the large system sizes we are considering this scale is tiny, such that the detailed structure of \(\Gamma\) in band-, spin- and position space does not have a strong influence on the results presented in the following. We thus choose a particularly convenient structure, where the hybridization function is diagonal in position space, i.e. does not induce hopping between distinct unit cells \(\langle n | \Gamma | n' \rangle \sim \delta_{nn'}\). As we will see, this property of the hybridization function is crucial with regard to the efficient \((\mathcal{O}(N))\) numerical evaluation of the differential conductance. For the structure in band-spin space we consider two alternatives, the first being a uniform coupling of both bands and spin components \(\langle \eta \sigma | \Gamma | \eta' \sigma' \rangle \sim 1\) and the second being a diagonal structure in these subspaces \(\langle \eta \sigma | \Gamma | \eta' \sigma' \rangle \sim \delta_{\eta \eta'} \delta_{\sigma \sigma'}\). Any experimental configuration should lie somewhere between these two limiting cases.

**III. METHODS**

In this section we present the methods used for the computation of the observables that we will use in order to probe the LDOS at the edge of the nanowire. We give a derivation of the expression for the current flowing through the edge of the wire in terms of Floquet Green’s functions, assuming the geometry introduced in the previous section. Furthermore, we present the algorithm used for the computation of the Green’s functions, where we exploit the aforementioned diagonal structure of the hybridization function in position space in order to greatly reduce the computational effort and allow for the efficient treatment of extremely large system sizes of up to \(10^7\) unit cells.

### A. Differential conductance formula

The current flowing from the probe reservoir into the wire can be expressed as

\[
I(t) = -e \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \mathrm{Tr} \left\{ \nabla_{V} \Sigma^R(t, t') \right\} \big|_{V \to 0} = \frac{i e \Gamma}{2 \pi} e^{-i \mu_0 (t-t')} \delta_{\eta \eta'} \delta_{\sigma \sigma'}. \]

Denoting the differential conductance at zero bias voltage in units of the conductance quantum \(e^2/h\) as \(g(t)\) we find

\[
g(t) = -e^2 \frac{e}{\hbar} \nabla_{V} I(t) \big|_{V \to 0} = -e \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \mathrm{Tr} \nabla_{P} \Gamma P^R(t, t') \bigg|_{V \to 0}. \]

where we have used the identities in Eqs. [A9] and [A10], where \(G^R\) denotes the retarded Green’s function, which only depends on the spectral properties of the substrate-dressed wire, and where we have used natural units, setting Planck’s constant \(\hbar = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi}\) to unity.

Next, we transform the retarded Green’s function into the RWA basis \([G^R(t, t') = U(t) G^R(t, t') U^\dagger(t')]|\) and substitute this form into Eq. [13]. Using the cyclic property of the trace we find

\[
g(t) = -\mathfrak{Im} \sum_{\eta = \pm} \left( \langle \eta \sigma | \Gamma | \eta \sigma \rangle + e^{i \mu_0 t} \langle \eta \sigma | \Gamma | \eta \sigma \rangle \right) \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' e^{i \mu_0 (t-t')} G^R(t, t'), \]

where \(\bar{\eta} = -\eta\) and where we have defined the effective chemical potential \(\mu_\eta = \mu_\eta - \eta \frac{\omega}{2}\). Expressing the real-time Green’s function via its frequency-Floquet space analogue [see Eq. [A23]] and performing the integration
over \( t' \), we find
\[
g(t) = -\frac{3}{2} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-i\omega_{tt'}l} \sum_{\eta = \pm} \langle \chi_{l}^{\eta} \chi_{l+1}^{\bar{\eta}} \rangle_{0}^R = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-i\omega_{tt'}l} g_{l},
\]
where \( l = -l \) and where the components \( g_{l} = g_{l}^{*} \) are given by
\[
g_{l} = \frac{1}{2l} \sum_{\eta = \pm} \text{Tr} \left\{ P_{\eta} \Gamma_{l} P_{\eta} \left[ \left( \bar{\Gamma}_{l}^{R} \right)^{*} \bar{\Gamma}_{l+1,0}^{R} - \bar{\Gamma}_{l+1,0}^{R} \right] \right\}
\]
\[
+ P_{\eta} \Gamma_{l} P_{\eta} \left[ \left( \bar{\Gamma}_{l-1,0}^{R} \right)^{*} \bar{\Gamma}_{l,0}^{R} - \bar{\Gamma}_{l,0}^{R} \right].
\]
(17)

Note that since we have assumed the probe hybridization function to be diagonal in position space, the trace only picks out the diagonal elements (in position space) of the Green’s functions. It thus suffices to compute these diagonal elements, which is computationally much more feasible for the large system sizes we are aiming at. Furthermore, we would like to stress, that since the differential conductance as a function of the lead Fermi energy \( \mu \) is given by the sum of two terms, which are symmetric with respect to \( \mu = \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \) respectively, the chiral symmetry that is present in the Floquet Hamiltonian in the RWA basis is no longer present in this observable, i.e. the differential conductance is neither symmetric with respect to \( \mu - \frac{\pi}{2} \rightarrow (\mu + \frac{\pi}{2}) \), nor with respect to \( \mu + \frac{\pi}{2} \rightarrow -(\mu + \frac{\pi}{2}) \).

Finally, we give rough estimates for the bulk and TES-contribution to the differential conductance at resonance, i.e. with the Fermi energy tuned to the gap center: Every single-particle Floquet state \( \psi \) with quasienergy \( \epsilon \) roughly contributes \( \sim \langle \psi | \Gamma_{l}^{R} | \psi \rangle \frac{\Gamma_{l}^{R}}{(\epsilon - \pi)^{2} + \frac{1}{4}} \) to the total (time-averaged) differential conductance. For a TES with localization length \( \ell \) we find \( \langle \psi_{\text{TES}} | \Gamma_{l}^{R} | \psi_{\text{TES}} \rangle \sim \frac{\ell^{2}}{\ell^{2}}, \) i.e. \( g_{\text{TES}} \sim \frac{\ell^{2}}{\ell^{2}} \). For a (delocalized) bulk state we find \( \langle \psi_{\text{bulk}} | \Gamma_{l}^{R} | \psi_{\text{bulk}} \rangle \sim \frac{L^{2}}{\ell^{2}} \), and \( \Gamma_{l}^{R} \sim \ell^{2} \). Integrating all of these contributions from the topological gap \( \Delta \) up to the bandwidth \( B \approx \omega_{m} \gg \Delta \) (assuming a finite driving frequency \( \omega \)) and assuming a uniform density of states \( \sim \frac{N_{m}}{B} \approx \frac{N}{\omega} \) we find \( g_{\text{bulk}} \sim \frac{\ell^{2}}{\omega \Delta} \). We thus conclude, that the TES contribution to the total differential conductance at resonance dominates over the bulk contribution if \( \Delta \gg \ell^{2} \), which can always be achieved for small enough broadening \( \Gamma_{s} \). Note that in this estimate \( \Gamma_{l/s} \) denote the scale of the matrix elements of the hybridization functions, not the hybridization functions themselves, and that we have assumed convergence in Floquet space, i.e. \( l_{m} \gg \frac{W}{\omega} \).

### B. Inversion algorithm

As was shown in the previous section, in order to compute the differential conductance, we need to compute the diagonal blocks \( G_{nn}^{R} \) (in position space) of the retarded Green’s function. The retarded Floquet Green’s function is given by the inverse of the matrix \( T = E - \bar{\Gamma}_{s}^{R} \), where \( \bar{\Gamma}_{s}^{R} \) denotes the substrate hybridization function in the RWA basis. Because we assumed the hybridization function to be diagonal in position space, \( T \) has a block-tridiagonal structure, i.e. \( T_{nn} = a \), \( T_{nn+1} = b \), \( T_{nm} = 0 \) if \( |n - m| > 1 \) and \( n, m = 1, \ldots, N \). Here, \( a, b, b^{\dagger} \) are \( |4(2m+1)| \)-dimensional matrices which can easily be read off from the definitions of the truncated Floquet Hamiltonian and the hybridization function.

There exist algorithms with an \( O(N) \) complexity (see e.g. \[57\]) for computing the main diagonal of the Green’s function for a 1D tridiagonal (effective) Hamiltonian with a single channel. In the following, we present a multi-channel generalization of this algorithm.

In a first step we perform a (block-)\( UDL \) decomposition of the inverse of the Green’s function, i.e. \( T = UDL \), where the matrices \( U \) and \( L \) take the following forms:
\[
U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & U_{1} & 1 \\ & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & 1 \\ \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)
\]
\[
L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & L_{1} & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & 1 & L_{N_{1}} \\ \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)
\]

with all other matrix elements being zero. Here, \( D \) is a block-diagonal matrix \( D = \text{diag}(\{D_{1}\}_{1=1}^{N}) \). The \( (|4(2m+1)|)-\text{dimensional} \) matrices \( U_{i}, L_{i} \) and \( D_{i} \) can be computed in \( O(N) \)-time given \( a, b, b^{\dagger} \) using the following recursion relations:
\[
D_{N} = a, \quad (22)
\]
\[
D_{i-1} = a - bD_{i-1}^{-1}b^{\dagger}, \quad (23)
\]
\[
U_{i} = bD_{i-1}^{-1}, \quad (24)
\]
\[
L_{i} = D_{i+1}^{-1}b^{\dagger}. \quad (25)
\]

Next, we compute the inverses of \( U \) and \( L \), which are given by
\[
U^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & U_{1}U_{2} & \ldots & (\pm 1)^{N_{1}-1}U_{1} \ldots U_{N_{1}} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & U_{N_{2}} \\ \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)
\]
\[
L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -U_{1} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \\ \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)
\]
and

\[
L^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & & & & & \\
& -L_1 & & & & \\
& & \ddots & & & \\
& & & \ddots & & \\
& & & & -L_{N-2} & 1 \\
(-1)^{N-1}L_{N-1} & \ldots & L_1 & \ldots & L_{N-1}L_{N-2} & -L_{N-1} & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(27)

where, again, all other matrix elements are zero. Multiplying the inverses back together we find that the diagonal blocks of \( G = T^{-1} = L^{-1}D^{-1}U^{-1} \) obey the following recursion relation

\[
G_{11} = D_{11}^{-1},
\]

\[
G_{n+1,n+1} = D_{n+1}^{-1} + L_n G_{nn} U_n
\]

(29)

\[
= D_{n+1}^{-1} + D_{n+1}^{-1} b \Gamma g \alpha D_{n+1}^{-1}.
\]

(30)

The algorithm thus consists of the following steps:

1. Iterate Eqs. (22) and (23) \( N \) times, saving only the last \( L \) matrices \( \{D_1, \ldots, D_L\} \).

2. Compute the first \( L \) diagonal blocks of the Green’s functions via Eqs. (28)-(30).

The complexity of this algorithm is \( \mathcal{O}(N^3) \) (due to step 1.), while the memory cost only scales as \( \mathcal{O}(L^2) \). This allows us to efficiently and numerically accurately treat extremely large system sizes of up to \( N = 10^7 \) unit cells, which is necessary in order to rule out finite-size artefacts and to observe significant signals from the non-topological edge states.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we analyze the differential conductance defined in the previous section. Our goal here is twofold: (a) we want to extract the topological phase diagram, i.e. address the TESs which live in the topological gap, and (b) probe the system at finite energies relative to the gap center, which reveals the NTESs.

In order to achieve goal (a) we tune the Fermi energy to the center of the topological gap, vary the driving amplitude and Zeeman energy, and compute the differential conductance in this two-dimensional phase space. We compare these results to the previously predicted topological phase diagram (see [44]). In a second step, in order to achieve goal (b), we keep the driving amplitude constant and vary the Fermi level and Zeeman energy, probing NTESs at finite energies relative to the gap center. We discuss the properties of the NTESs and explain their emergence in terms of an intuitive yet quantitative picture.

FIG. 2: Components of the differential conductance \( \mathcal{L}_g \) at \( \mu_0 = \frac{\Gamma}{2} \) as a function of \( t_F \) and \( \Delta_Z \) for the case of a hybridization function which uniformly mixes between band- and spin-indices. The vertical lines in the upper left subplot indicate the values of \( t_F \) \( [t_F = 0.1(0.5) \Omega] \) for the dashed (dotted) line respectively that are used in all corresponding plots of Fig. 5 (dashed line) and Fig. 6 (dotted line) respectively. The dot on the dashed line represents the values of \( t_F \) and \( \Delta_Z \) used in Fig. 7.

All simulations are performed for \( N = 10^7 \) unit cells and with a cutoff in Floquet space at \( l_m = 5 \), at which point we find convergence in all quantities to the percent regime. We set \( \Gamma_s = 10^{-3} \Omega \) and \( L = 500 \). For the bandwidth and Rashba constant we choose \( W = 20 \Omega \) and \( \alpha = \frac{\Gamma}{2} \Omega \). To enhance the fine structure that is present in the data we present results in terms of the quantity

\[
\mathcal{L}_g l \equiv \log \left( \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma_p} |g_l| \right),
\]

i.e. we first rescale the absolute value of the Fourier components of the differential conductance by the ratio of substrate to probe broadening, such that the contribution of a well localized state at resonance is of order unity. Subsequently, we take the logarithm of this quantity. This is convenient since the (scaled) differential conductance varies over several orders of magnitude depending on the system parameters.

A. Topological phase diagram and TESs

In order to address the TESs, the Fermi energy of the reservoirs \( \mu_0 \) must be tuned to the center of the topological gap that emerges in the spectrum of the truncated
Floquet Hamiltonian. Choosing a symmetric truncation in the RWA basis this corresponds to $\mu_0 = \frac{\omega}{2} = \frac{\Omega}{4}$ in the canonical basis. The effective Fermi energy entering the formula for the differential conductance Eqs. (18) and (19) is thus $\mu_\eta = 0$ and $\mu_\eta = \omega$ for $\eta = \pm$ respectively.

We consider two different types of reservoirs with regard to the structure in band-/spin-space of the corresponding hybridization functions: uniform mixing of both band-/spin-indices, and no mixing. There is one intrinsic difference between these two cases, which is the fact that for a diagonal hybridization function there are no terms in the effective Floquet Hamiltonian coupling even and odd Floquet indices, i.e. $G_{l,l'}^{\eta} = 0$ if $l - l'$ is an odd integer. From the differential conductance formula Eqs. (18) and (19) one can see that in this case the odd Fourier components of the differential conductance identically vanish. This is related to the fact that, without mixing, the effective Hamiltonian in the RWA basis is $\Omega$-periodic, while the mixing terms introduce an $\omega$-periodicity upon being transformed into the RWA basis.

Varying $t_F, \Delta_Z \in (0, \Omega]$ we compute the components $E_{l,l'}^{\eta}$ for the uniform mixing case and $E_{l,l'}^{\eta}$ for the diagonal case and show the corresponding data in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 respectively. Comparing these two figures we conclude that, besides the fact that band-mixing reservoirs induce $\omega$-periodic terms in the (otherwise $\Omega$-periodic) differential conductance, there is no qualitative difference between (a) the uniform mixing and non-mixing cases, and (b) between the various Fourier components in each of these two cases.

Next, we compare the differential conductance data to the topological phase diagram. For technical details on the calculation of the latter the reader is referred to [44]. Note that here, the aforementioned decomposition into even/odd Floquet indices is therefore meaningful.

The total phase diagram is then given by the sum of the two diagrams corresponding to the given odd/even truncations. Fig. 4 shows a phase diagram which together constitute a truncation at $l_m = 5$. Note that there are two types of phase boundaries in Fig. 4 which correspond to phase transitions of type A (black lines) and type B (orange lines) respectively. Type A phase transitions correspond to gap closings at the center of the Brillouin zone (BZ),
i.e. at \( k = 0 \), where the change of the topological invariant is given by odd integer, while phase transitions of type \( B \) correspond to gap closings at finite quasimomenta, where the change of the topological invariant is given by an even integer.

Comparing Figs. 2 and 3 with Fig. 4 one can clearly see that all type \( A \) phase boundaries and some of the type \( B \) phase boundaries are reproduced in the conductance data. Furthermore, regions with strongly localized TESs are associated with a larger conductance compared to regions with weakly localized or no TESs. We have thus quantitatively related the topological phase diagram, computed from topological invariants, and the observable transport properties of this Floquet system. Furthermore, we note that the microscopic details of the reservoirs only quantitatively influence the simulation results. The two cases we consider here are of course idealized limits and in experiments we anticipate to see some intermediary behaviour. In what follows we consider the uniformly mixing case.

### B. Finite energy conductance and non-topological edge states

Since TESs can only exist inside of topological gaps, tuning the Fermi energy away from the value used in the previous section, one expects to see no additional peaks with comparable height to the TES peak. Fixing

---

**FIG. 5**: Components of the differential conductance \( L_g \) at \( t_F = 0.1 \, \Omega \) as a function of \( \mu_0 \) and \( \Delta_Z \), corresponding to the dashed vertical line in Fig. 2. The arrows on top of the upper plots indicate the positions of the TES peaks. A cut of the data along the horizontal line is shown in Fig. 7.

**FIG. 6**: Components of the differential conductance \( L_g \) at \( t_F = 0.5 \, \Omega \) as a function of \( \mu_0 \) and \( \Delta_Z \), corresponding to the dotted vertical line in Fig. 2. The arrows on top of the upper plots indicate the positions of the TES peaks.

**FIG. 7**: Components of the differential conductance \( L_g \) at \( t_F = 0.1 \, \Omega \) and \( \Delta_Z = 0.3 \, \Omega \) as a function of \( \mu_0 \), corresponding to the horizontal line in Fig. 5. Arrows indicate some of the maxima of bands of NTESs.
A phase transition points, a central TES peak and a gap surrounding this peak.

Finally, the diagonally traversing peaks, which often show even stronger signals than the TES peak, must be interpreted as narrow bands of states with a large relative edge weight, living at finite energy relative to the gap center. These are what we call non-topological edge states. Cuts along the dashed line in Fig. 5 are shown in Fig. 7 clearly demonstrating the strong signal of the NTESSs (strongest peaks are marked by arrows) and the fact that they do not correspond to discrete states, but rather to extended (albeit narrow) bands.

Subplot (a) of Fig. 8 shows a section of the quasienergy spectrum of the truncated Floquet Hamiltonian in momentum space at $t_F = 0.1 \, \Omega$ and $\Delta_Z = 0.3 \, \Omega$. In subplot (b) we show the corresponding part of the conductance data $\mathcal{L}_{g_0}$ [also shown in Fig. 7]. Note that, as discussed above, we do not expect the differential conductance to respect the chiral symmetry of the Floquet Hamiltonian, which explains why the lineshape is not symmetric with respect to $\mu_0 = \frac{\Omega}{2}$. We report that the NTESS peaks coincide with extremal points of bands, i.e. with bifurcation points of the dispersion relation, which occur both at $k = 0$ and at finite momenta. Those NTESSs which are related to bifurcation points at finite momenta are also visible in Figs. 5 and 6 as peaks which do not follow straight lines in $\Delta_Z - \mu_0$ space, but rather follow curved trajectories. In the following we will concentrate our discussion on those NTESSs, which are related to $k = 0$ bifurcation points, since those are easier to analyze and usually show stronger signals.

C. Emergence of NTESSs

In this section we attempt to explain the emergence of NTESSs in terms of a theory explaining all the properties we observed in the previous section.

We begin by noting that at type A phase transition points, i.e. gap closings at quasimomentum $k = 0$, the NTESSs emerge at energies corresponding to the (former) gap-center. We thus suspect that their physics is related to properties of the Hamiltonian at the center of the BZ. We note that at $k = 0$ the Floquet Hamiltonian takes the following form

\[
\hat{H}_{k=0}^F = (\Delta_Z \sigma_x + t_F \eta_x - \omega) \delta_{l'} + t_F (\delta_{l,l' - 2} \eta_+ + \delta_{l,l' + 2} \eta_-). \tag{32}
\]

One can easily see, that the corresponding spectrum is given by $E_i^F = \pm \Delta_Z + f_i(t_F, \omega)$, where $f_i$ are universal functions that only depend on the truncation of the Floquet Hamiltonian. Since the spectrum is symmetric with respect to $k \rightarrow -k$, every (non-flat) band features a local extremal point, and thus a bifurcation point, at $k = 0$. Furthermore, at type A phase transition points the gap closes and two of the eigenvalues $E_i^F$ vanish identically. This suggest, that NTESSs emerge
near these eigenvalues of the Floquet Hamiltonian at \( k = 0 \), which also happen to be bifurcation points of the dispersion relation. The results shown for the special case of \( \Omega_{r} = 0.1 \Omega, \Delta_{2} = 0.3 \Omega \) in Fig. 8 clearly support this claim. Note however, that the converse in not true, i.e. not every bifurcation point is associated with a band of NTESs.

To better understand the connection between eigenstates of the finite-size tight-binding Hamiltonian and the physics of momentum space we consider a half-infinite system in real space with unit cells \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and vanishing boundary conditions of all components of the wavefunction on the 0th unit cell. A (delta-function) normalizable eigenstate \( \psi_{i}(n) \) at energy \( \epsilon \) of the corresponding Hamiltonian \( h_{k} \) can be constructed as follows: We first determine the (complex) roots \( k_{i} \) of the polynomial \( \det (h_{k} - \epsilon) \) and the corresponding eigenvectors \( \chi_{k} \) obeying \( h_{k} \chi_{k} = \epsilon \chi_{k} \). We then construct the linear combination \( \psi_{i}(n) = \sum_{i} c_{i} e^{i k_{i} n} \chi_{k} \), where we only include roots with \( \Im k_{i} \geq 0 \) in order to ensure (delta)-normalizability. Finally, we impose the vanishing boundary condition at the 0th unit cell on the coefficients \( c_{i} \), i.e. we solve the linear system of equations \( \sum_{i} c_{i} \chi_{k} = 0 \). If such a set of coefficients exists, we found an eigenstate of the (real-space) half-infinite Hamiltonian at energy \( \epsilon \).

The number of boundary conditions that need to be fulfilled is equal to the dimension of the Hamiltonian \( D \) [for our model we have \( D = 4(2l_{m} + 1) \)]. The number of roots \( k_{i} \) is given by 2\( D \), where, due to hermiticity, every root on the upper half-plane has a partner on the lower half-plane with equal real part, i.e. \( D = M_{0} + M \) where \( M_{0} \) denotes the number of purely real roots (note that if \( k \in \mathbb{R} \) is a root, so is \(-k\)) and \( 2M \) denotes the number of roots with finite imaginary part. The number of available roots for the construction of a normalizable state (i.e. roots which obey \( \Im k \geq 0 \)) is thus given by \( 2M_{0} + M = D + M_{0} \), which implies that there is a \( M_{0} \)-fold degeneracy at energy \( \epsilon \) if this energy intersects with \( M_{0} \) bands.

At energies which do not intersect with all bands (in our model this is always the case due to chiral symmetry) the degenerate subspace of eigenstates will contain at least one state with a finite contribution \( e^{i k_{i} n} \chi_{k} \), with \( \Im k \geq 0 \), i.e. an edge state component. In general, there is no reason why the coefficient associated with this component would be large compared to the coefficients corresponding to purely oscillating roots. This may, however, not be true near bifurcation points, i.e. points where several roots meet at the origin of the complex \( k \)-plane. As one approaches such a point from the side with a larger value of \( M_{0} \) the eigenvectors \( \chi_{k} \) corresponding to the smallest inflowing real roots (i.e. those which meet in the origin at the bifurcation point) gradually become collinear, making it necessary to give some edge state component an increasingly larger weight in order to still fulfill the boundary condition. After crossing the degeneracy point the two real roots which met at the origin start to flow out into the upper and lower half planes respectively, reducing the degeneracy by one and providing an additional edge state component. Note that this mechanism relies on the aforementioned breaking of inversion symmetry: if the system were inversion-symmetric, i.e. \( h_{-k} = h_{k} \), the eigenvectors \( \chi_{\pm k} \) would always be collinear and nothing abrupt would happen at bifurcation points. Indeed, for vanishing Rashba constant \( \alpha \), where inversion symmetry is restored, we report the absence of NTES peaks in the conductance data.

The Floquet model we consider here is too intricate for a detailed analytic examination of the properties near bifurcation points (for \( l_{m} = 5 \) we have \( D = 44 \) quasenergy bands and thus 88 roots). For this reason we conclude our analysis here and leave more general discussions of NTESs (both corresponding to bifurcation points at \( k = 0 \) and also finite momenta) as subject for future works [68]. We would like to stress however, that our discussion of the origin of NTESs in the model under consideration solely rests on the breaking of inversion symmetry, suggesting that this is the only requirement for a multi-channel 1D model to feature NTESs.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work we proposed an experimental test for the topological properties of a one-dimensional Floquet topological insulator based on electronic transport probing the local density of states at the edge of the system. As a testbed we used a recently studied model involving Rashba spin-orbit coupling, a static Zeeman term and a coherent drive of the inter-band transition for which the topological phase diagram is known. Using the Keldysh-Floquet formalism and the weak-coupling approximation we derived an expression for the differential conductance between the wire and additional leads coupled to it. These expressions only contain the effective Hamiltonian, rendering them independent of the occupation of Floquet states. In order to evaluate the differential conductance we generalized an inversion algorithm for tridiagonal matrices to the multichannel case, allowing us to compute the conductance for large system sizes (up to \( 10^{7} \) unit cells) efficiently.

Probing the center of the topological gap we reproduced the topological phase diagram via the conductance data as expected, thus demonstrating that transport experiments allow for a verification of topological properties in one-dimensional Floquet topological insulators. Surprisingly, we found unexpected peaks in the differential conductance at special energies corresponding to the bulk of the system, hinting at the presence of narrow bands of states centered around bifurcation points of the dispersion relation (i.e. extremal points of bands), which feature a large relative weight at the edge of the system. These states are linear combinations of delocalized bulk states and exponentially localized edge states, where the amplitude of the edge state component is sharply peaked at aforesaid bifurcation points. We explained the
emergence of these non-topological edge states in terms of an intuitive yet quantitative physical picture. Since this picture is not specific for the model we consider here (apart from a broken inversion-symmetry), we reason that the emergence of such states should be a more general phenomenon, which may be present in a larger class of systems.
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**Appendix A: Keldysh-Floquet formalism**

In this section we review some details of the Keldysh-Floquet formalism which are necessary for the computation of the transport properties. For more detailed references the reader is referred to e.g. [57-61].

1. **Contour-ordered Green’s function and Dyson equation**

The central object of interest in Keldysh formalism is the contour-ordered Green’s function

\[ G_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i \left\langle T_\gamma c_\alpha(t) c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\rangle. \]  

Here, the time arguments \( t, t' \) do not live on the real number line, but rather on the Keldysh contour, which is depicted in Fig. 9. The operators \( c_\alpha(t) / c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t) \) annihilate/create a fermion in the single-particle state \( \alpha \) at time \( t \). \( T_\gamma \) denotes the contour-ordering operator, which orders the succeeding operators with respect to the position of their time-arguments on the Keldysh contour, taking into account anti-commutation for fermionic operators and \( \langle \bullet \rangle \) denotes averaging with respect to the initial (equilibrium) density matrix.

The two time arguments \( t, t' \) of the contour-ordered Green’s function can live on either of the two branches of the Keldysh contour, defining four distinct but related Green’s functions:

- \( t \in \gamma_+ \), \( t' \in \gamma_+ \) : \( G^R_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i \left\langle T_\gamma c_\alpha(t) c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\rangle \),  
- \( t \in \gamma_+ \), \( t' \in \gamma_- \) : \( G^<_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = i \left\langle c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') c_\alpha(t) \right\rangle \),  
- \( t \in \gamma_- \), \( t' \in \gamma_+ \) : \( G^>_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i \left\langle c_\alpha(t) c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\rangle \),  
- \( t \in \gamma_- \), \( t' \in \gamma_- \) : \( G^K_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i \left\langle \tilde{T}_\gamma c_\alpha(t) c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\rangle \),

where \( T/\tilde{T} \) denote the usual time-/anti-time-ordering operators. The objects in Eqs. (A2)-(A5) are known as the chronological, lesser, greater and anti-chronological Green’s functions. In addition, we define:

\[ G^R_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i\Theta(t-t') \left\{ c_\alpha(t), c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\} \],  
\[ G^<_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = i\Theta(t'-t) \left\{ c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t'), c_\alpha(t) \right\} \],  
\[ G^K_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t') = -i \left\{ c_\alpha(t), c_{\alpha'}^\dagger(t') \right\} \],

which are known as the retarded, advanced and Keldysh Green’s functions. Note the following useful relations:

\[ G^R - G^K \]  
\[ G^< = (G^R - G^A)_{\alpha\alpha'}(t, t'), \]  
\[ G^A(t', t) = (G^R(t, t'))^\dagger. \]

Using a diagrammatic expansion in terms of the self-energy \( \Sigma \) one can derive the Dyson equation for the retarded Green’s function

\[ [i\partial_\gamma - \hat{h}(t)] G^R(t, t') = \delta(t-t') + \int dt_1 \Sigma^R(t, t_1) G^R(t_1, t') \]

with the single-particle Hamiltonian \( \hat{h}(t) \) and the retarded self-energy \( \Sigma^R \). Using Eqs. (A10) and (A11) and some approximation to \( \Sigma^R \), one can compute \( G^R - \Sigma^R \). The greater and lesser Green’s functions can then be computed as follows

\[ G^< \]  
\[ G^> \]

Finally, in order to compute the various components of the self-energy, we need to give explicit expressions for the corresponding free Green’s functions \( g \) for a static system:

\[ g^R(t, t') = \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t')} \]

\[ g^<(t, t') = \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t')} 2\pi i \delta(E-h)n_F(E), \]

\[ g^>(t, t') = \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t')} 2\pi i \delta(E-h) [n_F(E) - 1], \]

where \( h \) denotes the static single-particle Hamiltonian and \( n_F(E) \) denotes the Fermi function.
2. Floquet Green’s functions

We will now solve the Dyson equation for the retarded Green’s function for a time-periodic single-particle Hamiltonian $h(t) = h(t + T)$ with period $T = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_l}$. In order to keep the problem as simple as possible we assume a time-local self-energy $\Sigma^R(t, t') = \Sigma^R(\delta(t - t'))$. Using this restriction the Dyson equation [see Eq. (A10)] reads

$$[i\partial_t - h(t) - \Sigma^R] G^R(t, t') = \delta(t - t').$$

(A16)

Defining the Floquet Hamiltonian and Floquet Green’s function as

$$h_{ll'}^F = \int_0^T dt e^{i(t-t')\omega_l} h(t) - i\omega \delta_{ll'},$$

(A17)

$$G^R_{ll'}(E) = G^R_{ll'}(E + i\omega),$$

(A18)

$$G^R_{ll'}(E) = \frac{\int_0^T dt e^{i\omega t} \int dt' e^{iE(t-t')} G^R(t, t')}{2\pi}$$

(A19)

we can rewrite Eq. (A16) as follows

$$\sum_{ll'} \left( E\delta_{ll} - h_{ll}^F - \Sigma^R \delta_{ll} \right) G^R_{ll'}(E) = \delta_{ll'},$$

(A20)

whose solution reads

$$G^R_{ll'}(E) = \left( \frac{1}{E - h^F - \Sigma^R} \right)_{ll'}.$$  

(A21)

Having inverted the matrix in Eq. (A21) we can then express the real-time retarded Green’s function as

$$G^R(t, t') = \sum_{ll'} e^{-i\omega t} \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} e^{-iE(t-t')} G^R_{ll'}(E).$$

(A22)
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