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Two molecules are enantiomers if they are non-superimposable mirror images of each other. Electric dipole-allowed cyclic transitions $|1\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle \rightarrow |3\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle$ obey the symmetry relation $O^R = -O^S$, where $O = (\mu_{13} \cdot E_{23})(\mu_{23} \cdot E_{31})(\mu_{31} \cdot E_{12})$, and $R, S$ label the two enantiomers. Here we generalize the concept of topological frequency conversion to an isotropic ensemble of molecular enantiomers. We show that, within a rotating-frame, the pumping power between fields of frequency $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ is sensitive to enantiomeric excess, $P_{2\rightarrow1} = \hbar \omega_1 \omega_2 |C|^2 \pi (N_R - N_S)$, where $N_i$ is the number of enantiomers $i$ and $|C|^2 \propto \text{sgn} O^R$ is an isotropically averaged Chern number. Connections with chiroptical microwave spectroscopy are made.

Introduction.— In the mid nineteenth century, Louis Pasteur discovered that molecules can possess handedness, or chirality, an attribute that influences how they interact with their surroundings [1]. The two species of a chiral molecule, referred to as enantiomers, are nonsuperimposable mirror images of each other and, while they feature many identical physicochemical properties (up to very small parity violation corrections [2]), they can also exhibit drastically different behavior when exposed to chiral environments or stimuli. Thus, enantioselectivity plays a crucial role in biological activity as well as in the synthesis, purification, and characterization of pharmaceuticals [3–5]. Traditionally, optical rotation and circular dichroism have served as optical tools to obtain enantioselective information; however, these techniques rely on the weak interaction between molecules and the magnetic component of the optical field. To bypass these limitations, techniques that rely solely on electric dipole interactions [6] have been recently advocated. For instance, many efforts are currently invested in photoelectron circular dichroism [7–9]. Yet, others focus on nonlinear optical signals that depend on the sign of the electric fields with which the molecules interact [10, 11] including photoexcitation circular dichroism [12], the use of synthetic chiral fields [13–16], and microwave three-wave mixing [17–21]. More precisely, the latter technique can be understood through cyclic three-level models [22–28] where the product of three light-matter couplings [hereafter referred to as the Kral-Shapiro (KS) product] differs by a $\pi$ phase between the two enantiomers. This remarkable symmetry has been exploited to propose cyclic population transfer schemes [22, 28] or the use of cross-polarized terahertz pulses [29] to prepare the enantiomers in different energy configurations or orientations for separation. This symmetry has also been utilized to suggest an enantioselective generalization of the Stern-Gerlach [30] or spin Hall [31] experiments, where spatial separation of enantiomers, rather than spins, is achieved using artificial gauge fields [32–34]. The analogy between enantiomer and spin labels is intriguing and surprisingly underexplored, and serves as the motivation of our present work. More specifically, we wish to demonstrate an enantioselective analogue to the Quantum Spin Hall Effect (QSHE) [35].

On the other hand, since the pioneering work of Thouless, Kohmoto, Nightingale, and den Nijs in relation to the Quantum Hall Effect (QHE) [36], notions of symmetry-protected topological phases (SPTPs) have been at the heart of condensed matter research, and have only been exacerbated in the past fifteen years with the discovery of topological insulators [37]. These notions guarantee that certain response properties of so-called topologically non-trivial systems are largely independent of material specification, instead depending only on products of universal constants and integer quantities known as topological invariants. The discrete nature of these properties implies that they are robust against material imperfections, thus making them attractive for metrology, among other applications. While topological protection was originally identified in translationally invariant 2D systems, its scope has been enlarged through the use of Floquet engineering in systems of different dimensionality [38–41]. Of particular interest is a elegant construction due to Martin, Refael, and Halperin [42], where quantized "current" is observed. In this Letter, we design a novel spectroscopic scheme that generalizes TFC to the microwave spectroscopy of an isotropic ensemble of chiral molecules. The resulting signal is proportional to enantiomeric excess (EE), with a simple prefactor $|C|^2 \propto \text{sgn} O^R$.

Model.— Consider a chiral molecule hosting a three-
level system as shown in Fig. 1. The ground state |1⟩ and the two excited states |2⟩, |3⟩, with energies ℏε1, ℏε2, ℏε3, are coupled to each other using a set of three orthogonally-polarized time-dependent electric fields

\[
E_{21}(t) = E_{21}(t) \cos(\Omega_{21}t), \\
E_{32}(t) = E_{32}(t) \cos(\Omega_{32}t), \\
E_{31}(t) = E_{31}(t) \sin(\Omega_{31}t),
\]

where the frequencies \(\Omega_{21} = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1 - \delta\), \(\Omega_{32} = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_2 - \delta\), \(\Omega_{31} = \epsilon_3 - \epsilon_1 - 2\delta\), are slightly detuned from the system’s natural frequencies, and the field amplitudes \(E_{21}(t), E_{32}(t), E_{31}(t)\) are slowly modulated. As we shall see, it is crucial that the three fields are polarized along three mutually orthogonal directions, so that the non-linear optical signal survives orientational averaging [43]. Assuming that \(|\mu_{ij} E_{ij}(t)/2| \ll \hbar \Omega_{ij}\), the Hamiltonian for this laser-dressed system, after making the rotating wave approximation, is

\[
H(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \hbar \epsilon_i - \sum_{i>j} \mu_{ij} E_{ij}(t) \left( e^{-i(\Omega_{ij} t + \phi_{ij})} / 2 \right) |i\rangle \langle j| + \text{h.c.},
\]

where \(\mu_{ij}\) is the transition-dipole moment for \(|j\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle\), and \(\phi_{21} = \phi_{32} = 0\) and \(\phi_{31} = \pi/2\). The associated time-dependent wavefunction of the system is \(|\psi(t)\rangle\).

Next, we consider the rotating frame

\[
U(t) = e^{-i(\epsilon_2-\Omega_{21}t)} |1\rangle \langle 1| + e^{-i(\epsilon_2+\Omega_{32}t)} |3\rangle \langle 3| + e^{-i(\epsilon_2+\Omega_{31}t)} |2\rangle \langle 2|,
\]

such that \(|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t)|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle\). In this frame, \(i\hbar |\dot{\psi}(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H}(t)|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle\), with the effective Hamiltonian:

\[
\mathcal{H}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
-2h\delta & -\mu_{21} & i\mu_{31} \\
-\mu_{21} & 0 & -\mu_{32} \\
i\mu_{31} & -\mu_{32} & 2h\delta
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

This analysis is similar to Ref. where the In the complex basis \(|+\Pi\rangle, |0\rangle, |−\Pi\rangle\), where \(|\pm\Pi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|1\rangle \pm i|3\rangle)\) and \(|0\rangle = |2\rangle\), Eq. 4 becomes

\[
\mathcal{H}(t) = -\frac{\mu_{21}}{2} E_{21}(t) L_z - \frac{\mu_{32}}{2} E_{32}(t) L_y - \frac{\mu_{31}}{2} E_{31}(t) L_z - \delta \left( \frac{L_+^2 + L_-^2}{2\hbar} \right)
\]

where \(L_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, L_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\), are the angular momentum operators for a spin-1 particle and \(L_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hbar \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \hbar \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\).

In the long time limit, \(t \to \infty\), the time-averaged energy-absorption rate, or average power, is

\[
P_{av}(\omega_i) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt \mathcal{P}_{av}(\omega_i),
\]

where \(P_{av}(\omega_i)\) is the average power at the modulation frequency \(\omega_i\).

Let \(|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle\) denote the \(l\)-th adiabatic state of \(\mathcal{H}(t)\), where \(\mathcal{H}(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle = \epsilon_i(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle\) (Fig. 2). The total wavefunction in the rotating frame can be written as \(|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle = \sum_i \tilde{c}_i(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle\). Near the adiabatic
limit where \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) are much smaller than the instantaneous energy gap of \( \mathcal{H}(t) \), and if the system is initiated in the \( l \)-th adiabatic state, i.e., \( |\psi(0)\rangle = |\epsilon_i(0)\rangle \), the total wavefunction to first order in the modulation frequencies is

\[
|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle = e^{-i\omega t} |\epsilon_i(t)\rangle - i\hbar \sum_{\ell \neq i} \frac{|\epsilon_\ell(t)\rangle\langle\epsilon_\ell(t)|\omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega\epsilon}|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle}{\epsilon_i(t) - \epsilon_\ell(t)},
\]

where

\[
\phi_i(t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \epsilon_i(t') - i\hbar \langle\epsilon_i(t)|\omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega\epsilon}|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle,
\]

and \( \omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2) \). If \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) are incommensurate, i.e., \( \omega_1/\omega_2 \) is irrational, \( \mathcal{H}(t) \) is not periodic. However, if we write \( \mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}(\theta) = \mathcal{H}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \) with \( \theta_i = \omega_i t \operatorname{mod} 2\pi \), we notice that \( \mathcal{H}_{\theta}(t) \) is quasiperiodic, \( \mathcal{H}(\theta_1 + 2\pi, \theta_2) = \mathcal{H}(\theta_1, \theta_2 + 2\pi) = \mathcal{H}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \), and the domain of \( \mathcal{H}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \) is a two-dimensional torus \( T = [0, 2\pi) \times [0, 2\pi) \). To first order in \( \omega \), the expected quantities \( \langle \partial_{\omega_1} \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle \) and \( \langle \partial_{\omega_2} \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle \) for \( |\psi(t)\rangle \) given in Eq. 8a are

\[
\langle \partial_{\omega_1} \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle = \langle \partial_{\theta_1} \mathcal{H}(\theta) \rangle = \partial_{\theta_1} \epsilon_i(\theta) - i\hbar \omega_2 \Omega_i(\theta) \quad (9a)
\]

\[
\langle \partial_{\omega_2} \mathcal{H}(t) \rangle = \langle \partial_{\theta_2} \mathcal{H}(\theta) \rangle = \partial_{\theta_2} \epsilon_i(\theta) + i\hbar \omega_1 \Omega_i(\theta) \quad (9b)
\]

where \( \Omega_i(\theta) = i\langle \partial_{\theta_1} \epsilon_i(\theta)|\partial_{\theta_2} \epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle \) h.c. is the Berry curvature of the \( l \)-th adiabatic band (see Supplemental Material Section I, SM-I [45])

According to the mean-value theorem for incommensurate \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) [48], the linear flow of \( \theta \) covers the torus densely for long enough times. Thus, the time average of the function \( F(t) \) is the same as the average of \( F(\theta) \) over the entire torus \( T \):

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt' F(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_T d\theta F(\theta). \quad (10)
\]

Substituting Eqs. 9a-9b into Eq. 7b gives rise to the average power lost by the fields at \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) when the system is initiated in the \( l \)-th band, \( \mathcal{P}_{av}(\omega_1) = -\mathcal{P}_{av}(\omega_2) = -\frac{i\hbar \omega_1 \omega_2 C_l}{2\pi} \). Here the average of \( \partial_{\theta_1} \epsilon_i(\theta) \) is zero since \( \epsilon_i(\theta) \) is quasiperiodic in \( \theta \), and \( C_l = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta} d\theta \Omega_i(\theta) \) is the Chern number of the \( l \)-th band. Thus, the average energy-pumping rate between the two modulation fields \( \mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1} = [\mathcal{P}_{av}(\omega_2) - \mathcal{P}_{av}(\omega_1)]/2 \) is quantized,

\[
\mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1} = \frac{i\hbar \omega_1 \omega_2 C_l}{2\pi}, \quad (11)
\]

or in other words, after one period of the \( \omega_2 \) modulation, \( C_l \) photons with frequency \( \omega_1 \) are produced. The very off-resonant nature of this process guarantees that the molecule does not retain energy and the energy transfer process occurs only between the fields.

**Enantioselective TFC.** — For \( \delta = 0 \), \( \mathcal{H}(\theta) \) (see Eq. 5), resembles half of the Bernevig-Hughes-Zhang Hamiltonian [49], except that the Pauli matrices are replaced with the spin-1 angular momentum operators. As expected, \( \mathcal{H}(\theta) \) is topologically non-trivial for \( |m| < 2 \), where the Chern numbers for the lower (\( L \)) and upper (\( U \)) adiabatic bands remarkably acquire the value,

\[
C_l = 2\text{sgn}(m)\text{sgn}(\mathcal{O}) = -C_U, \quad (12)
\]

and that for the middle (\( M \)) band is \( C_M = 0 \) (for an analytical proof, see SM-II [45]). \( \mathcal{O} = \langle \mu_{21} \cdot E_{21} \rangle|\langle \mu_{13} \cdot E_{13} \rangle|\langle \mu_{32} \cdot E_{32} \rangle \) is the KS product which obeys the enantioselective symmetry relation \( \mathcal{O}^g = -\mathcal{O}^S \), and we have assumed \( E_{ij} = E_{ji} \). The aforementioned symmetry holds for systems with broken inversion symmetry, which chiral molecules fulfill. Therefore \( C_L^g = -C_L^S \), and the TFC for the two enantiomers initiated in the lower (upper) adiabatic band at \( t = 0 \) is expected to have the same magnitude but opposite sign, i.e., \( \mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1}^g = -\mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1}^S \). This results beg us to consider the fruitful analogy between enantiomer label and spin degrees of freedom. Just like in the QSHE, where the transverse conductivity for opposite spins bears opposite signs, so does the TFC for opposite enantiomers. Eq. 12 is the central result of this letter and relates a fundamental topological invariant from chiroptical spec-
Figure 3: Topological phase diagram. The value of \( C_L^R \) is calculated taking the magnitudes of the light-matter couplings to be equal, i.e., \( |\mu_{12} \cdot E_{21}| = |\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32}| = |\mu_{31} \cdot E_{31}| = \hbar D \), while the laser-driving parameters \( m \) and \( \delta \) are varied. We obtain \( C_L^R = 2 \text{sgn}(m) \text{sgn}(C_R^S) \) at the vicinity of \( \delta = 0 \), where \( C_R^S = -C_L^S \) is the Kral-Shapiro product, which is enantioselective.

To obtain the desired enantioselective TFC, both enantiomers need to be prepared in the lowest adiabatic bands in the rotating frame at \( t = 0 \). Suppose that before fields are turned on \( (\mu_{ij} \cdot E_{ij}(t) \to 0 \) as \( t \to -\infty \)), the molecules start at \( |1\rangle \). Under those circumstances, the eigenstates of Eq. 4 are the states \( |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle \) with eigenenergies \( \epsilon_{L,M,U}(-\infty) = -\delta, 0, \delta \), and the state of each molecule is \( |\epsilon_L(-\infty)\rangle \). If the electric fields are slowly turned on at a rate \( \omega_r \) that is much smaller than the instantaneous band gaps \( |\epsilon_1(t) - \epsilon_2(t)| \), both enantiomers are prepared in \( |\epsilon_L(0)\rangle \). Note that the modulating frequencies \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) must also be much smaller than \( |\epsilon_1(t) - \epsilon_2(t)| \) at all times. Chirped laser fields for \( t < 0 \) satisfy this constraint. The adiabatic protocol we choose is \( E_{ij} \to E_{ij}\alpha(t) \) and \( \omega_1, 2 \to \omega_1, 2\beta(t) \), where the ramp-up functions slowly vary at the rate \( \omega_r = 2 \times 10^{-13} \) a.u.
result \( \langle C_R^R \rangle = 1.333 \pm 0.001 \), which we conjecture to be \( \langle C_L^R \rangle = \frac{4}{3} \), although we cannot analytically prove it. Then, the expected pumping rate for an isotropic ensemble containing \( N_R \) \( R \)-molecules and \( N_S \) \( S \)-molecules is

\[
\mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1} = \frac{\hbar \omega_1 \omega_2}{2\pi} \langle C_R^R \rangle (N_R - N_S).
\]

which is zero for a racemic mixture, but otherwise, reveals the EE \( N_R - N_S \). Notice that in line with other nonlinear chiroptical signals that depend on electric but not magnetic dipole contributions [6], Eq. (16) contains no background achiral signal, unlike traditional circular dichroism, where both enantiomers have the same electric dipole and magnetic dipole absorption strengths for circularly polarized light [50].

Let us briefly discuss potential sources of noise in the proposed enantioselective TFC. First, the linewidths of microwave transitions are on the order of 10–100 kHz [51], which are smaller than the adiabatic state preparation gap \( \delta \approx 1 \text{ MHz} \), as well as the light–matter interactions \( |\boldsymbol{\mu}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ij}|/\hbar \approx 10 \text{ MHz} \), inducing the topological gap, or even the smallest difference in energies in the power spectrum (see, Fig. 5, \( \Omega_{31 \pm 1} - \Omega_{31 \pm 2} \approx 1 \text{ MHz} \)). Thus, the described protocol should be resilient to the finite linewidths of these transitions. Another source of imperfections stems from laser shot noise. Assuming that the laser beam waist area is \( \sim 1 \text{ cm}^2 \) and considering the field strength above the shot noise for a time interval \( t^* \) is \( \sim 10^9 \) (see SM-IV [45]). From the power spectrum (Fig. 5), we find that for the same time interval, that the minimal magnitude of the change in the photon number due to the TFC is

\[
\left( \frac{|\mathcal{P}_{2 \rightarrow 1} (\Omega_{31 \pm 1})|}{\hbar \Omega_{31 \pm 1}} \right) \approx 100 \times |N_R - N_S|.
\]

Therefore, as long as the magnitude of the enantiomer excess \( |N_R - N_S| \) is much larger than \( \sim 10^7 \), the signal should be detectable above the shot noise. These arguments indicate that an experimental observation of enantioselective TFC should be realizable and could be used for chiral discrimination.

**Conclusion.** — In summary, we have presented an enantioselective TFC setup for an ensemble of chiral molecules. Owing to the dependence of the topological invariant on the sign of the KS product (Eq. 12), which differs by a phase of \( \pi \) for the two enantiomers, the quantized time-averaged energy-pumping rate is of opposite sign for the \( R \)- and \( S \)-molecules, just like transverse conductivity is of opposite sign for up and down spins in the QSHE. We show that the computed signal survives orientational averaging for any sample with EE and vanishes for a racemic mixture. An intriguing consequence of Eq. 11 is that as long as the timescale separations required by the model are fulfilled, the chemical identity of
the probed molecules (e.g., through the strengths of the transition dipole moments) in the rotating frame is erased by the signal, leading to a universal nonlinear optical response which acknowledges the enantiomeric excess only. This characteristic is reminiscent to the very accurate determination of the quantum of conductance with a wide range of QHE systems. Thus, from a metrological standpoint, the generality of the enantioselective TFC can be exploited to accurately measure EE by running a linear fit of the pumping rate $P_{2 \rightarrow 1}$ for a series of experiments where $\omega_1$ (or $\omega_2$) is varied. Furthermore, if one is only concerned with $|EE|$, there is no need to calibrate the signal with an enantiopure sample beforehand.

While concepts of topology have been very productive in the exploration of new condensed matter physics phenomena, most of them are restricted to periodic solids (see Ref. [52, 53] for a few molecular exceptions). TFC [40, 42] is a powerful tool that opens doors to the application of those concepts to 0D systems such as finite molecular systems. In particular, this work reveals that laser-dressed chiral molecules support SPTPs that are not adiabatically connected to their non-laser-dressed counterparts.
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S1. ADIABATIC PERTURBATION THEORY

For completeness, we briefly review adiabatic perturbation theory. Let $|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_i \tilde{c}_i(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle$ be the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE) $i\hbar\partial_t|\psi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H}(t)|\psi(t)\rangle$, where $\{\epsilon_i(t)\}$ are the adiabatic eigenstates satisfying $\mathcal{H}(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle = \epsilon_i(t)|\epsilon_i(t)\rangle$. Employing the TDSE, the following differential equation is obtained for $\tilde{c}_i(t)$,

$$i\hbar \dot{\tilde{c}}_i(t) = \epsilon_i(t)\tilde{c}_i(t) - i\hbar \sum_{l' \neq i} \langle \epsilon_l(t)|\omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega l}|\epsilon_{l'}(t)\rangle \tilde{c}_{l'}(t),$$

(S1)

where we used $\dot{a}_l(t) = \hbar \omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega l} a_l(t)$. Solving for $a_l(t)$, the $O(\hbar \omega)$ wavefunction is,

$$|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle = \sum_l |\epsilon_l(t)\rangle - i\hbar \sum_{l' \neq l} \langle \epsilon_l'(t)|\omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega l}|\epsilon_{l'}(t)\rangle \epsilon_l(t) - \epsilon_{l'}(t)$$

(S5)

Calculating $P_{av}(\omega_1)$ and $P_{av}(\omega_2)$

Here, $\langle \tilde{\psi}(t)|\partial_{\omega_1}\mathcal{H}(t)|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle$ and $P_{av}(\omega_i)$ are derived when the system is initiated in the adiabatic state $|\epsilon_i(0)\rangle$ and evolved near the adiabatic limit. Employing Eq. S5 for $|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle$, and making the change of variables $(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, the following expression to $O(\hbar \omega)$ is obtained:

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}(t)|\nabla_{\omega l}\mathcal{H}(t)|\tilde{\psi}(t)\rangle = \langle \epsilon_l(\theta)|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{H}(\theta)|\epsilon_l(\theta)\rangle - \left\{i\hbar \sum_{l' \neq l} \langle \epsilon_l(\theta)|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{H}(\theta)|\epsilon_{l'}(t)\rangle \langle \epsilon_{l'}(t)|\omega \cdot \nabla_{\omega l}|\epsilon_l(\theta)\rangle \epsilon_l(\theta) - \epsilon_{l'}(\theta) \right\} + h.c \}$$

(S6)

where $\omega \times \hat{n} = (\omega_2, -\omega_1)$ and $\Omega_l(\theta) = i(\partial_{\theta_1}\epsilon_l(\theta)|\partial_{\theta_2}\epsilon_l(\theta)) + h.c.$ is the Berry curvature of the $l$-th band.

S2. ANALYTICAL EVALUATION OF CHERN NUMBERS

Here, we analytically compute the Chern numbers for the bands of the system in the main text when
\( \delta = 0 \). We follow the procedure described in [S1]. We first consider the three-level Hamiltonian:

\[
\mathcal{H}(\theta) = \sum_{s = \pm 1} s h_3(\theta)|s\rangle\langle s| + \left\{ [h_1(\theta) - is h_2(\theta)]|s\rangle\langle 0| + \text{h.c.} \right\},
\]

(S7)

where \( h_1(\theta), h_2(\theta), h_3(\theta) \) are real valued. Next, we invoke the unitary transformation

\[
U(\theta) = \sum_{s = 0, \pm 1} e^{is\alpha(\theta)}|s\rangle\langle s|,
\]

such that \( \tan \alpha(\theta) = h_2(\theta)/h_1(\theta) \), to define the real valued Hamiltonian,

\[
\mathcal{H}'(\theta) = U(\theta)\mathcal{H}(\theta)U^\dagger(\theta) = \sum_{s = \pm 1} s h_3(\theta)|s\rangle\langle s| + \sqrt{h_1^2(\theta) + h_2^2(\theta)}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \text{h.c.},
\]

(S8)

A set of eigenstates for \( \mathcal{H}'(\theta) \) can be defined as \( |\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle = \sum_{s = 0, \pm 1} c_{l,s}(\theta)|s\rangle \), where the coefficients \( c_{l,s}(\theta) \) are real. The eigenstates of \( \mathcal{H}(\theta) \) are

\[
|\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle = U^\dagger(\theta)|\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle = \sum_{s = 0, \pm 1} c_{l,s}(\theta)e^{-is\alpha(\theta)}|s\rangle.
\]

(S9)

The Berry connection for the \( l \)-th band is

\[
A_i(\theta) = i\langle \epsilon_i(\theta)|\nabla_\theta|\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle = \nabla_\theta \alpha(\theta) \sum_{s = \pm 1} sc_{l,s}^2(\theta),
\]

(S10)

where we used the fact that

\[
\sum_{s = 0, \pm 1} c_{l,s}(\theta)\nabla_\theta c_{l,s}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\theta \sum_{s = 0, \pm 1} |c_{l,s}|^2 = 0.
\]

The Berry curvature is defined as the z-component of the curl of the Berry connection, i.e., \( \Omega_i(\theta) = (\nabla_\theta \times A_i(\theta)) \cdot \hat{z} \). Note that there are singularities in the Berry curvature when

\[
\nabla_\theta \alpha(\theta) = \frac{h_1(\theta)\nabla_\theta h_2(\theta) - h_2(\theta)\nabla_\theta h_1(\theta)}{h_1^2(\theta) + h_2^2(\theta)}
\]

is undefined; they occur at the critical points where \( h_1(\theta) = h_2(\theta) = 0 \).

Considering Eqs. 5 and 6 from the main text and taking \( \delta = 0 \), the values \( h_1(\theta), h_2(\theta), h_3(\theta) \) are

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_1(\theta) &= -\frac{\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21} \sin(\theta_1)}{2\sqrt{2}}, \\
    h_2(\theta) &= -\frac{\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32} \sin(\theta_2)}{2\sqrt{2}}, \\
    h_3(\theta) &= -\frac{1}{2} \mu_{31} \cdot E_{31} [m - \cos(\theta_1) - \cos(\theta_2)],
\end{align*}
\]

(S11)

and the aforementioned singularities occur at the \( \theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \) values \( \theta_{00} = (0, 0), \theta_{0\pi} = (0, \pi), \theta_{\pi0} = (\pi, 0) \), and \( \theta_{\pi\pi} = (\pi, \pi) \). Physically, these critical points indicate geometric conditions where certain components of light-matter coupling vanish.

Using Stokes theorem, it can be written as a contour integral of the Berry curvature; however, the singularities must be removed. To motivate the general procedure, first consider the case where the Berry connection \( A_i(\theta) \) contains only one singularity. The curve \( \partial_R \) can be drawn, such that it defines an infinitesimal region containing the singularity (region I) and the rest of the torus (region II) (see Fig. S1). Applying a gauge transformation \( |\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\phi(\theta)}|\epsilon_i(\theta)\rangle \) in region I can remove the singularity, \( A_i(\theta) \rightarrow A'_i(\theta) = A_i(\theta) - \nabla_\theta \phi(\theta) \), while the Berry curvature is unaffected [S1, S2]. Taking \( \nabla_\theta \phi(\theta) = A_i(\theta) \) achieves this desired result. The Chern numbers can then be written as the

\[ C_i = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_T d\theta \Omega_i(\theta). \]

(S12)
summation of contour integrals for each region:

\[ C_l = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \frac{d\theta}{R} \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \frac{d\theta}{R} \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \frac{d\theta}{R} \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \frac{d\theta}{R} \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \oint \frac{d\theta}{R} \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta). \]  \hspace{1cm} (S13)

In going from the first to the second line, we applied Stokes theorem in region I by traversing \( \partial R \) in a counterclockwise fashion, and in region II by doing so in a clockwise way (see Fig. S1).

If the Berry connection \( \mathbf{A}_l \) contains multiple singularities \( \theta_{ij} \), then local gauge transformations must be carried out in multiple regions to remove all of them. Then the Chern number results in

\[ C_l = -\sum_{ij} \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\partial R_{ij}} d\theta \cdot \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) \]  \hspace{1cm} (S14)

where the curves \( \{ \partial R_{ij} \} \) enclose an infinitesimal region around each of the singularities \( \theta_{ij} \). Therefore, the Chern number can be calculated by studying the behavior of \( \mathbf{A}_l(\theta) \) near the singularities.

Let \( \mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2) \) be a small displacement from the point \( \theta_{ij} \). Since \( \sin(x) \approx x \) and \( \sin(\pi + x) \approx -x \) as \( x \to 0 \), then

\[ \alpha(\theta_{00} + \mathbf{q}) \approx \beta, \]

\[ \alpha(\theta_{0\pi} + \mathbf{q}) \approx -\beta, \]

\[ \alpha(\theta_{\pi 0} + \mathbf{q}) \approx -\beta, \]

\[ \alpha(\theta_{\pi \pi} + \mathbf{q}) \approx \beta. \]  \hspace{1cm} (S15)

where \( \tan \beta = \frac{\mu_{32} E_{32} q_2}{\mu_{21} E_{21} q_1} \). The gradients \( \nabla_q \alpha(\theta) \) near the critical points can be readily evaluated in polar coordinates, \( |q| e^{i\gamma} = q_1 + i q_2 \),

\[ \nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{00} + \mathbf{q}) = -\nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{\pi 0} + \mathbf{q}) = -\nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{\pi \pi} + \mathbf{q}). \]

\[ \nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{0\pi} + \mathbf{q}) \approx 2\pi \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})]. \]  \hspace{1cm} (S16)

The line integral of \( \nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{00} + \mathbf{q}) \) over a small circle in the limit when \( |\mathbf{q}| \to 0 \),

\[ \oint_{|\mathbf{q}| \to 0} d\mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla_q \alpha(\theta_{00} + \mathbf{q}) \]

\[ = \left( \int_0^{\pi/2} d\gamma + \int_{\pi/2}^{3\pi/2} d\gamma + \int_{3\pi/2}^{2\pi} d\gamma \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21}}{\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32}} \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21}}{\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32}} \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21}}{\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32}} \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21}}{\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32}} \right) \]

\[ = 2\pi \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})]. \]  \hspace{1cm} (S17)

In the second line, we split the integral into three parts, noticing that the integral in the remaining infinitesimal regions around \( \gamma = \pi/2 \) and \( \gamma = 3\pi/2 \) vanish given that the integrand is finite, \( \int_{\pi/2}^{3\pi/2} d\gamma = 0 \). In the third line, we let \( x = \frac{\mu_{21} E_{21}}{\mu_{32} E_{32}} \tan \gamma \) and \( dx = \frac{\mu_{32} E_{32}}{\mu_{21} E_{21}} \sec^2 \gamma \, d\gamma \) and recognized that \( x \to \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})] \) as \( \gamma \to (\pi/2)^-, (3\pi/2)^- \) and \( x \to -\text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})] \) as \( \gamma \to (\pi/2)^+, (3\pi/2)^+ \).

The procedure of Eqs. (S16) and (S17) can be repeated for the other critical points, yielding

\[ \oint_{|\mathbf{q}| \to 0} d\mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla q_1 \alpha(\theta_{0\pi} + \mathbf{q}) = -2\pi \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})], \]

\[ \oint_{|\mathbf{q}| \to 0} d\mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla q_2 \alpha(\theta_{\pi 0} + \mathbf{q}) = -2\pi \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})], \]

\[ \oint_{|\mathbf{q}| \to 0} d\mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla q_1 \alpha(\theta_{\pi \pi} + \mathbf{q}) = 2\pi \text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})]. \]  \hspace{1cm} (S18)

Using Eqs. S10 and S14, the Chern number for the \( l \)-th band is
\[ C_l = -\text{sgn}[(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})] \sum_{s=\pm 1} s[c_{l,s}^2(\theta_{00}) - c_{l,s}^2(\theta_{0\pi}) - c_{l,s}^2(\theta_{\pi0}) + c_{l,s}^2(\theta_{\pi\pi})] \]  
\quad \text{(S19)}

For \(|m| < 2\) the Chern numbers for the upper, middle, and lower adiabatic states can be seen to yield,

\[ C_U = -2\text{sgn}[m(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})(\mu_{31} \cdot E_{31})], \]
\[ C_M = 0, \]
\[ C_L = 2\text{sgn}[m(\mu_{21} \cdot E_{21})(\mu_{32} \cdot E_{32})(\mu_{31} \cdot E_{31})]. \]  
\quad \text{(S20)}

For \(|m| > 2\), all \(C_l = 0\).

### S3. ISOTROPIC AVERAGING OF CHERN NUMBERS

Here, we describe the Monte Carlo integration method used to compute the distribution of lower band Chern numbers for the \(R\)-enantionmer. As stated in the main text, the orientationally averaged Chern number is computed as

\[ \langle \chi^R \rangle = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi d\chi d\phi d\theta C^R_l(\chi, \phi, \theta) \sin(\theta), \]  
\quad \text{(S21)}

where the molecule orientation with respect to the driving electric field is specified by the Euler angles \(\chi, \phi, \theta\). Consider the average of a function \(f(x, y, z)\) over the intervals \(x \in [a, b], y \in [c, d], z \in [l, m]\):

\[ f_{av} = \frac{1}{V} \int_a^b \int_c^d \int_l^m dx dy dz f(x, y, z), \]  
\quad \text{(S22)}

where \(V = (b - a)(d - c)(m - l)\) is the volume over which the function is integrated. \(f_{av}\) can be approximated by randomly selecting a large enough set of \(N\) points within \(V\) and calculating the average of the value of \(f(x, y, z)\):

\[ f_{av} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i, y_i, z_i). \]  
\quad \text{(S23)}

Thus,

\[ \int_a^b \int_c^d \int_l^m dx dy dz f(x, y, z) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{V}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i, y_i, z_i) \]  
\quad \text{(S24)}

For our calculations, we set \(f(\chi, \phi, \theta) = \langle C^R_l(\chi, \phi, \theta) \sin \theta \rangle\). Using the prescription of Eq. S24, Eq. S21 can be approximated as

\[ \langle C^R_L \rangle \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{V}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N C^R_l(\chi_i, \phi_i, \theta_i) \sin \theta_i \]

where \(V = 4\pi^3\). For the calculations in the main text, each Monte Carlo simulation consisted of \(N = 10^4\) randomly selected orientations from a uniform distribution of \(\chi, \phi, \theta\) values. In total, 1188 individual simulations were carried out, from which an average and standard deviation for \(\langle C^R_L \rangle\) were extracted (see Fig. S2). Employing a z-test with a 95% confidence interval, the expectation value was found to be \(\langle C^R_L \rangle = 1.311 \pm 0.001\). When \(\delta = 0\), the result we obtain is \(\langle C^R_L \rangle = 1.333 \pm 0.001\), which we conjecture to be \(\frac{4}{3}\).

### S4. LASER SHOT-NOISE

The laser shot noise is defined as the width of the photon distribution of the driving field. In the main text the laser field strength is assumed to be approximately \(E = 10^{-9}\) a.u., or \(500 \frac{V}{m}\). Assuming that the laser-beam waist area is \(A = 1 cm^2\), its power is given by,

\[ P = \frac{cA\epsilon_0 E^2}{8\pi} = 3 \times 10^8 m \times 1 cm^2 \times \frac{1 m^2}{100^2 cm^2} \times 8.85 \times 10^{-12} e^2 \times (500 \frac{V}{m})^2 \]
\[ = 3 mW \]  
\quad \text{(S25)}

where \(c\) is the speed of light and \(\epsilon_0\) is the permittivity of free space. The frequencies of the molecular transitions in the main text are on the order of \(v = 10\) GHz. Then the expected number of photons produced by the laser after a long enough time \(t^* = 2000 \times 2\pi/\omega_2\) which guarantees TFC is

\[ N = \frac{Pt^*}{h\nu} = 3 \times 10^{-3} W \times 8 \times 10^{-3} s \times 6.36 \times 10^{-34} J s \times 10^{10} s^{-1} = 4 \times 10^{18} \]
\quad \text{(S26)}

The photon distribution is taken to be Poissonian. The standard deviation of this distribution is \(\sqrt{N}\), so the laser shot noise is \(\sqrt{N} \sim 10^9\).
Figure S2: Isotropic averaging of Chern numbers. (a) A Monte Carlo simulation consists of choosing $10^4$ random orientations (specified by $\theta, \phi, \chi$) and evaluating $C_R^L$ for each of them. Each simulation outputs an average Chern number $\langle C_R^L \rangle$. (b) Distribution of $\langle C_R^L \rangle$ across 1188 simulations.
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