Geometric pumping and dephasing at topological phase transition
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A measure-preserving formalism is applied to topological spin/band models and yields observations about pumping. It occurs at topological phase transition (TPT), i.e., a $Z_2$-flip, suggesting that $Z_2$ can imply bulk effects. The model’s asymptotic behavior is analytically solved via ergodicity. The pumping probability is geometric, fractional, and has a ceiling of $\frac{1}{2}$. Intriguingly, theorems are proved about dephasing associated with this pumping, which is linked to the system’s dimension and the distinction between rational and irrational numbers. Experimental detection is discussed.

In Hamilton mechanics, the canonical coordinates $\{p,q\}$ are treated on equal footing, and the trajectory in phase space evolves in a measure-preserving fashion, known as Liouville theorem, which is the corner stone of classical statistics [1], ergodic theory [2], etc. In the search for a quantum counterpart, maps from phase space functions to Hilbert space operators [3] have been established, and Wigner-Weyl-Moyal-Groenewold scheme [3–5] has so far best corresponded to classical physics, peculiar for incompressibility. However, there is a noteworthy distinction. The incompressible flow that occurs in classical phase space arises from Hamilton’s equations [1], generic for conservative systems. For quantum, Wigner flow being incompressible demands specific features of Hamiltonian, i.e., higher-order (>2) derivatives of potentials must be vanishing [3, 6].

This poses a question: Just as Liouville’s Theorem follows from Hamilton’s equations, can measure-preservation result directly from Schrödinger equation (SE)? Wigner’s formulation [3, 7], above all, inherits the preservation result directly from Schrödinger equation. Partialials must be vanishing [3, 6].

Hamilton’s equations (SE) derivatives of potential being incompressible demands specific features of Hamiltonian, i.e., higher-order (>2) derivatives of potentials must be vanishing [3, 6].

FIG. 1. (color online): (a) 1D. $Z_2: 0 \to 0$, no pumping; $0 \to 1$, pumping. (b) 2D. $B_{z2}$ varies in a sector loop with angle $\Theta$ (not necessarily $\pi/2$). The half-filled circles stand for fraction occupancy.

| $\varphi(t) = e^{-i\int E_i(\tau) d\tau}|\uparrow\rangle$. (1) |

So $\varphi(t)$ sticks to $|\uparrow\rangle$ but might change from $|n_0\rangle$ to $|n_1\rangle$, which requires closing gap (Fig. 1(a)): if level-inversion happens ($Z_2$ is flipped), pumping occurs; if $Z_2$ does not change, e.g., $a = 1$, no pumping takes place.

Despite its simplicity, 1D clearly shows geometric characteristics: (1) pumping only depends on the $Z_2$’s change, insensitive to eigenvalues unless gap is closed; (2) the so
ution lacks characteristic energy scales (e.g., $\Delta/\omega$), instead, it holds for arbitrary $\omega$ and is not classified by adiabatic or diabatic regimes. Notably, 1D does not exhibit dephasing yet, i.e. the next time of closing the gap, the spin will be de-pumped back to the original state upto a phase (Fig. 1(a)). Thus, 1D is returnable.

Non-returning (to the initial ray) starts with 2D. Consider varying $B(t)$ in $x$-$z$ plane (Fig. 1(b)). There is an arc section with large $|B|$, which undergoes ideal adiabatic evolution; and two straight sections, which have exact solutions for handling the gap closing. We have the pumping probability after $n$ cycles

$$p_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\langle n_j | U | \varphi(t = 0) \rangle|^2. \quad (2)$$

We first determine the evolution operator $U$. We adopt the instantaneous eigenstates $|n_i\rangle$ ($i = 0, 1$) as the bases. That is, $(\cos(\Theta/2), \sin(\Theta/2) e^{i\Omega})^T \left( -\sin(\Theta/2), \cos(\Theta/2) e^{i\Omega} \right)^T,$ where $\Theta, \Omega$ are orientations of $B$. $(1, 0)^T$ always stands for the instantaneous ground state. For straight sections, rigorous solution exists as seen in 1D. For the arc, there could be geometric phases apart from the dynamic one. Overall, the evolution operator $U(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi)$ is obtained as (Appx.)

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\Theta/2) e^{-i\Phi} & -\sin(\Theta/2) e^{-i(\Omega-\Phi)} \\ \sin(\Theta/2) e^{i(\Omega-\Phi)} & \cos(\Theta/2) e^{i\Phi} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\Phi$ is the combined phase for straight and arc sections, which can be continuously tuned by $B_0$. Note that the opposite $\Phi$ in diagonal terms (i.e., $SU(2)$ rather than $U(2)$) are consequences of time-reversal $TH(t)T^{-1} = -H(t)$ (Appx.). The form of $U$ is independent of gauge, as befits an evolution operator. In this setting, pumping takes place at the “corner”, but the phase accumulated elsewhere has an influence.

We seek $p_{n \to \infty}$, the limiting behavior after a number of cycles. We will see this limit converges almost everywhere (a.e.). It is straightforward to show $p_n(\Theta) = p_n(-\Theta)$ and $p_n(\Phi) = p_n(\Phi + \pi)$, so we adopt $\Phi \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ and $\Theta \in [0, \pi]$. For 1D, it varies $\Phi$ and fixes $\Theta = \pi$ or 0, and $p_n$ is integer for arbitrary $\Phi$. For 2D ($0 < \Theta < \pi$), “fraction” pumping possibly occurs. Analytic solution for $p_{\infty}$ seems hopeless as the sum in Eq. 2 will become very complicated. Fortunately, $p_{\infty}$ can be computed with an approach based on the notion of measure-preserving and “ergodicity”.

First, we compare the classical evolution operator $T_i(p, q)$ with $U$. Intuitively, the $T_i$ update particles’ momenta and positions; formally, they constitute a set of transformations $\{T_i | t \in \mathbb{R} \}$ that act on the space $\{p, q\}$, preserving the symplectic measure $dp \wedge dq$ (as guaranteed by Liouville theorem), and satisfying semigroup law $T_{t+s} = T_t \circ T_s$. Taking the evolution over discrete time steps $s$, the semigroup law yields $T_i = T_n^s$ for $t = ns$.

On the other hand, evolution $U$ represents the evolution of $B$ completing a loop, serving as a “time step”. $U$ is a matrix of $SU(2)$ group, satisfying $U^{m+n} = U^m U^n$. It will rotate $H$ and preserve $SU(2)$’s Haar measure $m(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi) = 2 \sin(2\Theta) d\Phi d\Omega$ (also its subgroups’). We observe the following correspondence:

$$T_n^s(p, q) \sim U^n(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi); \quad dp \wedge dq \sim m(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi). \quad (4)$$

The step number $n$ is taken as time parameter. The phase-space coordinates $(p, q)$ correspond to 3-dimensional state coordinates $(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi)$, referring to the spin orientation and phases. The symplectic measure $dp \wedge dq$ corresponds to the Haar measure $m$.

The correspondence for the time averages for an observable $f$ is given by

$$\bar{f} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T_n^i(p, q)) \sim \bar{f} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n} f_n p_n, \quad (5)$$

where $f$ is certain observable to be averaged. Eq. 4 and 5 together define a correspondence, different from Wigner’s scheme, which puts the emphasis on assigning definite values of $(p, x)$ simultaneously to a quantum state. [3, 7]

Certain distinctions favor the new application. In classical evolution, the measure preserving of $T_i(p, q)$ requires a conservative system (e.g., time-independent Hamilton). Here, it suffices to require $U$ being unitary, which is directly due to SE and intact with being non-conservative. Besides, $T_i(p, q)$ is a general affine transformation, which does not guarantee a finite measure for the probability space $\{p, q\}$, for instance, when the orbit is unbounded. On the other hand, $U$ is an $SU(2)$-action, automatically satisfies that. The importance for finite measure will become evident shortly.

Next, we recall the concept of ergodicity.

Definition 1. Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, m)$ be a probability space. A measure-preserving transformation $T$ of $(X, \mathcal{B}, m)$ is called ergodic if the only members of $B$ of $\mathcal{B}$ with $T^{-1}B = B$ satisfy $m(B) = 0$ or $m(B) = 1$.

Here, $\mathcal{B}$ denotes a $\sigma$-algebra of set $X$, and $m$ is a measure function normalized to 1 as required by probability space. In physical view, we can interpret $B$ ($m(B) > 0$) as the initial setting of an ensemble. For each step of an evolution $T_i$, we add the newly covered region to $B$, obtaining $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} T^{-i}B$. After sufficient many steps, an invariant $T^{-1}B = B$ indicates the maximum region of the phase space that may be reached. Therefore, $m(B) = 1$ means the system can eventually cover every part of the phase space, i.e., either right on or arbitrarily close to any point. It also suggests the choice of starting points makes no difference to an ergodic system when distant past and future are included.

To proceed, we quote the following theorems of ergodic theory. Theorem 1.2 is known as Birkhoff Ergodic theorem (p.34 of [2]).
Theorem 1.1. Let $G$ be a compact group and $T(x) = ax$ a rotation of $G$. Then $T$ is ergodic iff $\{a^n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is dense in $G$. In particular, if $T$ is ergodic, then $G$ is abelian.

Theorem 1.2. Let $T: (X, \mathcal{B}, m) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{B}, m)$ be measure preserving and $f \in L^1(m)$. Then $(1/n) \sum_i f(T^i(x))$ converges almost everywhere to a function $f^* \in L^1(m)$. Also $f^* \circ T = f^*$ a.e. and if $m(X) < \infty$, then $\int f^* dm = \int f dm$.

Theorem 1.1 implies that the non-abelian SU(2) cannot be ergodic with itself. However, it admits that an abelian sub-group is ergodic, because $\{T^n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is dense if $T$ is not the root of unity. Theorem 1.2 implies that if $T$ is ergodic, an auxiliary $f^*$ could be introduced to evaluate the (Lebesgue) integration of the original $f$. The function $f^*$ gives the probabilities of finding the system in certain phase region. Since $f^* \circ T = f^*$ (similar to translation invariant), the auxiliary function is a constant $\rho$ a.e. given ergodicity and $m < \infty$. Thus, finite $m$ is indispensable.

We aim to find the ergodic subgroup for SU(2). Compare the evolution matrix $U$ in Eq. 3 with the SU(2) matrix in Euler angles $(\phi, \theta, \psi)$

$$R(\phi, \theta, \psi) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i \frac{\phi}{2}} & i \sin(\frac{\phi}{2}) e^{i \frac{\psi}{2}} \\ -i \sin(\frac{\phi}{2}) e^{-i \frac{\psi}{2}} & e^{i \frac{\phi}{2}} \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

We obtain the mapping $(\phi, \theta, \psi) \leftrightarrow (\Theta, \Phi, \Omega)$

$$\phi = 2\Phi + \Omega - \frac{\pi}{2}, \ \theta = \Theta, \ \psi = -\Omega + \frac{\pi}{2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Compare with the rotation matrix $R(\alpha, \beta, \delta)$ with an arbitrary axis $(\alpha, \beta)$ denote the axis orientation, and $\delta$ designates the rotation angle.

$$R(\alpha, \beta, \delta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\delta}{2}) - i \sin(\frac{\delta}{2}) \cos(\alpha) & -i \sin(\frac{\delta}{2}) \sin(\alpha) e^{-i \beta} \\ -i \sin(\frac{\delta}{2}) \sin(\alpha) e^{i \beta} & \cos(\frac{\delta}{2}) + i \sin(\frac{\delta}{2}) \cos(\alpha) \end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

which satisfies $R(\alpha, \beta, \delta) R(\alpha, \beta, \delta') = R(\alpha, \beta, \delta + \delta')$ and forms the abelian subgroup we are looking for. We have the relation $(\alpha, \beta, \delta) \leftrightarrow (\phi, \theta, \psi)$

$$\cos(\delta/2) = \cos(\theta/2) \cos(\frac{\phi + \psi}{2}),$$

$$\cos^2 \alpha = \frac{\cos^2(\theta/2) \sin^2(\frac{\phi + \psi}{2})}{1 - \cos^2(\theta/2) \cos^2(\frac{\phi + \psi}{2})},$$

$$\beta = \frac{\phi - \psi}{2} + n\pi, n = 0, 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Intuition for the abelian subgroup is available (Fig. 2): a vector is rotating around a fixed axis and the pumping is due to the projection to the $-z$. With the geometric relation $\sin(\zeta/2) = \sin(\alpha) \sin(\eta/2)$, we find

$$p_\infty = \frac{\int_0^\pi \sin^2(\frac{\zeta}{2}) \rho \ d\eta}{\int_0^\pi \rho \ d\eta} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sin^2(\frac{\Omega}{2})}{1 - \cos^2(\frac{\Omega}{2}) \cos^2(\Phi)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

In above, $\sin^2(\zeta/2)$ is due to spin having $\sin(\zeta/2)$ projection to spin down. Compared with the numerical evaluation of Eq. 2, the two match perfectly. Note that near $\Theta = 0$ or $\pi$, $p_\infty$ tend to be independent of $\Phi$.

Pumping driven by phonons or photons requires matching the energy quanta $\hbar \omega \sim \Delta$, and a “whole” quasi-particle can be excited. The pumping we discover, known as geometric pumping, is independent of energy scales (in this case, both $\omega$ and $\Delta_{\min} \rightarrow 0$), and the pumping rate takes a geometric form

$$p_G = \frac{1}{2} \sin(\Theta/2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

if we perform $\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} d\Phi$ on Eq. 10. ($\Phi$ contains a fast dynamic phase, which can take all possible values in a statistic sense.) Besides, geometric pumping probability has a ceiling of $\frac{1}{2}$, a reminiscent of the principle of maximum entropy ($S_{\text{max}} = \ln 2$). The pumping will be quantized if $\Theta$ is quantized (as shortly seen in the band model) and it is apparently different from the adiabatic pumping [17]. An example (spin-rotation) considered by Aharonov and Anandan [18] was a special case of $\Theta = \pi$, which had restricted to a cyclic situation. Deriving Eq. 10 does not require $\omega \rightarrow 0$, but only $\omega < \mu_0 B_0$, for the pumping part arises from an exact solution (straight sections) and the approximation is merely for non-pumping regions (arc), in which the non-adiabatic transition rate decays $\sim \exp(-\mu_0 B_0/\hbar \omega)$ [15].

Definition 2: The point $(\Theta, \Phi, \Omega)$ is stable of order $N$ for a natural number $N$, if $U^N(\Theta, \Phi, \Omega)$ is diagonal. If the point is not stable for arbitrary $N$, it is unstable.

Note that pumping only takes place at unstable points, because the Hamiltonian specified by stable $(\Theta, \Phi, \Omega)$ allows spin to evolve back to the original state after finite cycles. This is reflected by the fact that $p_\infty$ diverges at
FIG. 3. (color online): (a) Stable points up to order $N = 17$ for $\Theta = \pi/2$. If $N \to \infty$, stable points form a dense subset over $\Theta$. (b) Global view of stable points in $(\Theta, \Phi)$ phase space. The plotted lines are a portion of the stable curves, which are actually super-dense. (a) can be generated by a cutting line at $\Theta = \pi/2$. The points on boundaries (i.e., $\Phi = \pm \pi/2$ and $\Theta = 0, \pi$) are stable.

A stable point. Because, if the sequence includes every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_\infty$ is given by Eq. 10; if $n = mN (m \in \mathbb{N})$ and $N$ is the order of stable point, we obtain a subsequence $\{p_n\}$ to make $p_\infty = 0$, a distinct result from Eq. 10. In fact, $p_\infty$ can yield many different values by choosing $\{p_n\}$ mod$(N) = l$ and $l = 0, 1, 2...$. Thus, Eq. 10 only converges for unstable points. For stable points of order $N$, spin hops among $N$ states and is non-ergodic; while for unstable points, evolution is ergodic and Eq. 10 holds.

Next we present two main theorems describing properties of geometric pumping. Theorem 2.1 implies that pumping (unstable points) will take place a.e. in the parameter space, so its occurrence is robust; Theorem 2.2 reveals that the system’s dimension makes a difference.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $A$ (resp. $\bar{A}$) denote the set of stable (resp. unstable) points $(\Theta, \Phi)$.

(a) Points with $\Theta \in \{0, \pi\}$ or $\Phi = \pm \pi/2$ are stable.

(b) Fix $\Theta$ in the open interval $(0, \pi)$. Then:
   (i) $\{ \Phi \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \notin A \}$ is dense in $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.
   (ii) $\{ \Phi \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \in \bar{A} \}$ is dense in $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.

(c) Fix $\Phi$ in the open interval $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. Then:
   (i) $\{ \Theta \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \notin A \}$ is dense in $[0, \pi]$.
   (ii) $\{ \Theta \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \in \bar{A} \}$ is dense in $[0, \pi]$.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $(\Phi)$, $(\Theta, \Phi)$ and $(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi)$ denote the points in 1D, 2D and 3D phase space.

(a) In 1D $(\Theta = 0, \pi)$, $\bar{A} = \emptyset$, i.e., $m(A) = 0$, $m(\bar{A}) = 1$.

(b) In 2D or 3D, almost every $(\Theta, \Phi)$ or $(\Theta, \Omega, \Phi)$ is $\bar{A}$, i.e., for Lebesgue measure $m(\bar{A}) = 1$, $m(A) = 0$.

**Proof.** By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, the matrix $\mathcal{U}$ is a root of its characteristic polynomial $X^2 - X \text{tr} \mathcal{U} + \det \mathcal{U}$ in matrix space. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{U}^2 = 2 \cos(\Theta/2) \cos(\Phi) \cdot \mathcal{U} - \mathbb{I}. \quad (12)$$

Substituting $\mathcal{U} = i \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ yields

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^2 = \lambda \tilde{\mathcal{U}} + \mathbb{I}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^{n+2} = \lambda \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^{n+1} + \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^n \quad (13)$$

with

$$\lambda = -i \text{Tr}(\mathcal{U}) = -2i \cos(\Theta/2) \cos(\Phi), \quad (14)$$

Taking an indeterminate $X$, the Fibonacci polynomials $F_n(X)$ and $E_n(X)$ are defined recursively by

$$P_{n+2}(X) = XP_{n+1}(X) + P_n(X) \quad (15)$$

with respective recursion bases

$$F_0 = 0, \quad F_1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad E_0 = 1, \quad E_1 = 0.$$ 

Thus $E_n = F_{n-1}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For example, $F_2(\lambda) = \lambda$, $F_3(\lambda) = \lambda^2 + 1$, $F_4(\lambda) = \lambda^3 + 2\lambda$, etc. Induction with Eq. 13 confirms the expression

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^n = F_n(\lambda) \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{U}} + E_n(\lambda) \cdot \mathbb{I} \quad (16)$$

Being stable $\Leftrightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^n)_{1,2} = 0$. The off-diagonal term is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^n = e^{-i\Phi} \sin(\Theta/2). \quad (17)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the finite set of roots of all the Fibonacci polynomials of degree up to $n$. Then the countable set $\mathcal{F} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{F}_n$ is dense in $2i[-1, 1]$. More formally stated: as $n$ tends to infinity, the set $\mathcal{F}_n$ converges to $2i[-1, 1]$ in the Hausdorff metric on sets [19, Th. 1.1].

Theorem 2.1(a): If $\Theta = 0$ or $\pi$, $\sin(\Theta/2) = 0$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^n)_{1,2} = 0$. Thus these points are stable, independent of $\Phi$. If $\Phi = \pm \pi/2$, we have $\lambda = 0$. We also have $F_{2n}(0) = 0$, they are all stable points of order 2 independent of $\Theta$.

Theorem 2.1(b): Fix $\Theta \in (0, \pi)$. In particular, note $\cos \frac{\Theta}{2} > 0$. Now consider $\phi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the inverse cosine function is continuous at $\cos \phi$, there is a number $\delta > 0$ such that $|\cos \phi - \cos \Phi| < \delta$ implies $|\phi - \Phi| < \varepsilon$. Since $2i \cos \frac{\Theta}{2} \cos \varphi \in 2i[-1, 1]$ and the set $\mathcal{F}$ of roots of Fibonacci polynomials is dense in $2i[-1, 1]$, there is a root $2i \cos \frac{\Theta}{2} \cos \Phi \in 2i[-1, 1]$ with

$$|\cos \frac{\Theta}{2} \cos \varphi - \cos \frac{\Theta}{2} \cos \Phi| < \delta \cos \frac{\Theta}{2}.$$ 

Thus $(\Theta, \Phi) \notin A$ for $|\phi - \Phi| < \varepsilon$, as required for (i). Finally, since $\{ \Phi \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \notin A \}$ is a countable subset of $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, its complement $\{ \Phi \mid (\Theta, \Phi) \in \bar{A} \}$ is a dense subset, yielding (ii).

Theorem 2.1(c): is similar to Theorem 2.1(b).

Theorem 2.2(a): follows from Theorem 2.1(a).
Theorem 2.2(b): Since stable points correspond to roots of Fibonacci polynomials, there are only countably many of them, and they form a set of measure zero in the 2D or 3D phase spaces. Note that stability is independent of $\Omega$, which trivially increases the dimension by one. □

In fact, there exists a bijection between solution $A$ and rational number $Q \in [-1,1]$. Because every $\lambda$ is associated with a ratio $N/n$ (in sine function); every root must be associated with solutions of either $F_{2n}$ or $F_{2n+1}$. The roots for Fibonacci polynomials are as follows:

\[
F_{2n}(\lambda) = 0, \lambda = \pm 2i \sin \left(\frac{2N \pi}{2n} \right),
\]

\[
F_{2n+1}(\lambda) = 0, \lambda = \pm 2i \sin \left(\frac{(2N+1) \pi}{2(n+1)} \right),
\]

where $N = 0, 1, 2...n - 1$. Note that $F_{2n}$ (or $F_{2n+1}$) has $2n - 1$ roots that distribute in $2[-1,1]$. Thus the set of roots $\lambda$ is countable (has the same cardinality as $\mathbb{Q}$).

Theorem 2.1 describes such a situation that any finite interval of $\Phi$ (or $\Theta$) must contain $A$ and $\overline{A}$ elements (both infinitely many), similar to the distribution of sets $Q$ and $\mathbb{Q}$. We emphasize Eq. 10 only converges for $\overline{A}$ when the system is ergodic. The existence of the limit follows from Theorem II.11 of [16]. Thus, Fig. 2(b) represents curves that are discontinuous everywhere (do not be misled by the continuous appearance since the discontinuous points are super dense). As an example, stable points with $\Theta = \pi/2$ are plotted in Fig. 3(a).

Theorem 2.2 asserts when $D \geq 2$, the stable set $A$ must have zero measure. From Eq. 9, we find $A$ is a family of curves $\cos(\delta/2) = \cos(\Theta/2)\cos(\Phi)$ with every $\delta/\pi \in \mathbb{Q}$ (Fig. 3(b)).

Pumping (i.e., one channel is more likely than the other) is usually accompanied with dephasing; otherwise it becomes a coherent oscillation, e.g., Rabi cycles. If other) is usually accompanied with dephasing; otherwise it becomes a coherent oscillation, e.g., Rabi cycles. If

\[
\text{FIG. 4. (color online): Geometric pumping caused by band evolution in (a) topological insulator, (b) semi-metal. The pumping regions are highlighted.}
\]

It is easy to extend to a band model, in which geometric pumping still occurs. Consider two-band (spin-less) $H = \sum d_i(k; R(t))\sigma_i$, where $\sigma_i$ represents pseudo-spins (real spin can be restored by an expanded term $\sigma_i\otimes s_j$ [10]); $d_i$ plays the role of $B_i$ and is controlled by parameter $R(t)$ (e.g., time-dependent phonon amplitudes). TPT is required for making geometric pumping and $Z_2$’s definition varies with dimensions [8, 21]. In the case of 1D $k$ and 2D $d_i$, $Z_2$ is the winding number around the origin of space $d_i$; and band correspondence to $\Theta$ of spin model: TPT around $\Theta = \pi$; trivial gap closing at $\Theta = 0$. Because of the correspondence to $Z_2$, $\Theta$ in band models is quantized, taking values in two infinitesimal regions around 0 and $\pi$. From Fig. 2(b), note that near the two points, $p_\infty$ is constant with $\Phi$, thus robust with band details, only relies on TPT. The time-reversal transformation $TH^{-1} = -H$ used in derivation of Eq. 3 should be replaced by particle-hole symmetry $\Xi H \Xi^{-1} = -H$. The finite $m$ still satisfies in the new context.

We suggest observing geometric pumping in the vicinity of various TPT [22] (e.g., narrow-gap topological insulator or semi-metals [13, 14, 23, 24]). Under the influence of phonons, the gap is closed and opened, causing periodic TPT; or a semi-metal’s node position is changed. In both cases, it might cause geometric pumping (Fig. 4). Particularly, a mysterious charge pumping has been detected in a recent experiment on ZrTe$_5$ [13] where carriers were pumped into upper bulk Dirac bands with below gap pumping. This distinguishing feature is deeply beyond energy pumping, which provides an ideal scenario where the gap is much greater than the photon’s/h phonon’s $h\omega$ most of the time, i.e., the adiabatic limit of the Landau-Zener formula, where trivial pumping will be suppressed. The proposed geometric pumping provides a compelling implication to establish a general framework for both understanding existing light-topology quantum control experiments and implementing new ones with emerging THz spectroscopy [23–29].

In summary, we show $Z_2$ can cause bulk effects, just surface. The pumping is a consequence of TPT; its rate $p_G = \frac{1}{2} \sin(\Theta/2)$ is geometric, not vanishing
with random $\Phi$ integral, and has a fractional upper limit $\rho_G = \frac{1}{2}$. The argument is supported by a spin/band model and its exact asymptotic behavior. The measure-preserving formalism defined by Eqs. 4, 5 could find broader application. The rational/irrational numbers have entered physics through the dephasing process when dimension $D > 1$. An intriguing question is whether a certain entropy can be defined therein.
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**APPENDIX**

**Derivation of evolution matrix $\mathcal{U}$.**

In the adiabatic limit, $U_c = \mathcal{R}\Lambda$, where $\mathcal{R}(\alpha, \beta, \delta)$ is a rotation matrix that aligns spin with $B$. Based on Fig. 1 and Eq. 7, $\mathcal{R}$ has $\alpha = \pi/2$, $\beta = \Omega + \pi/2, \delta = \Theta$. $\Lambda$ is a diagonal matrix due to the undetermined phase.

$$
\Lambda = \left( \begin{array}{cc}
    e^{-i\Gamma(\alpha, \beta, \delta)} & 0 \\
    0 & e^{i\Gamma'(\alpha, \beta, \delta)}
\end{array} \right),
$$

where $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma'$ are functions of rotation angles. $\mathcal{R}\Lambda$ forms a general $U(2)$ matrix. Time-reversal $\mathcal{T} = -i\sigma_y K$ and $K$ is complex conjugation. Then $\mathcal{T}U_c\mathcal{T}^{-1}$ is

$$
\mathcal{T}[\Xi e^{-i\int_0^t H(\tau) d\tau} \mathcal{T}^{-1} = \mathcal{I} + i \int_0^t \mathcal{T} H(\tau) \mathcal{T}^{-1} d\tau + ...
$$

(20)

In this case, time-ordering $\Xi$ affects little on the similarity transformation. Given $H(t) = -\sum B_i(t) \sigma_i$, we have $\mathcal{T} H(t) \mathcal{T}^{-1} = -H(t)$, and deduce (use $U_c = \mathcal{R}\Lambda$)

$$
\mathcal{T}U_c\mathcal{T}^{-1} = U_c, \quad \Gamma = \Gamma'.
$$

(21)

Then the total evolution operator

$$
\mathcal{U} = U_2U_cU_1 = \mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}^{-1}U_2\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{R}\Lambda)U_1.
$$

(22)

Note $\mathcal{R}^{-1} \ldots \mathcal{R}$ will transform to bases $|n_{0,1}\rangle$ of $(\cos(\frac{\Theta}{2}), \sin(\frac{\Omega}{2}) e^{i\Omega})^T$ and $(-\sin(\frac{\Theta}{2}) e^{-i\Omega}, \cos(\frac{\Omega}{2}))^T$ (the inevitable stringent points are put on the $S$-pole for both eigenstate branches). Then $U_2 = \mathcal{R}^{-1}U_2\mathcal{R}$ is diagonalized. Let’s define $\Gamma = \Phi_c, \Phi = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2 + \Phi_c,$ and

$$
U_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
    e^{-i\Phi_2} & 0 \\
    0 & e^{i\Phi_2}
\end{pmatrix}, \quad U_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
    e^{-i\Phi_1} & 0 \\
    0 & e^{i\Phi_1}
\end{pmatrix},
$$

(23)

From Eq. (22), we have

$$
\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{R}U_2\mathcal{U}U_1 = \mathcal{R}(\frac{\pi}{2} \Omega + \pi \Theta) \left( \begin{array}{cc}
    e^{-i\Phi} & 0 \\
    0 & e^{i\Phi}
\end{array} \right),
$$

(24)

which is just Eq. 3.

[20] The dephasing might appear to contradict with von Neumann entropy, which asserts that a pure state has $S = 0$, since $\mathcal{U}$ is unitary and will lead to a pure final state. This can be rationalized with project measurement that is appended after the $\mathcal{U}$ evolution and which renders the complete evolution nonunitary.