

Reply to Comment on *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 176601 (2021) by Lee and Yang

Peng-Lu Zhao,^{1,2} Xiao-Bin Qiang,^{1,2} Hai-Zhou Lu,^{1,2,*} and X. C. Xie^{3,4,5}

¹*Shenzhen Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering and Department of Physics, Southern University of Science and Technology (SUSTech), Shenzhen 518055, China*

²*Shenzhen Key Laboratory of Quantum Science and Engineering, Shenzhen 518055, China*

³*International Center for Quantum Materials, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁴*CAS Center for Excellence in Topological Quantum Computation, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

⁵*Beijing Academy of Quantum Information Sciences, West Building 3, No. 10, Xibeiwang East Road, Haidian District, Beijing 100193, China*

(Dated: May 26, 2023)

In this Reply, we respond to the comments in [1] on our *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 176601 (2021) “Coulomb instabilities of a three-Dimensional higher-order topological insulator”. We show the surface gap given in [1] is different from the expression derived by using the well-accepted approach and becomes divergent and singular at lower energies, thus is not suitable for depicting the phase transition from the 2nd-order to 1st-order topological insulator. We further show that a correct surface gap can describe the phase transition if the RG scheme treats the bulk gap as starting point. We justify our criteria in [2] for both the transitions from 2nd-order topological insulator to 1st-order topological insulator and normal insulator.

First of all, the results in [1] have verified the correctness of our calculations in [2] and shown the significance and broad interest of this topic. The comments in [1] question our criterion for the transition from the 2nd- to 1st-order topological insulator. A new criterion, the surface gap, is raised in [1], because the 2nd-order topological insulator has surface gaps while the 1st-order topological insulator has not.

The divergent and singular surface gap is not suitable for describing topological phase transition. We have two concerns on the surface gap in [1].

First, its expression [1]

$$m_{\text{surf}} = mD/B \quad (1)$$

is different from the one

$$m'_{\text{surf}} = mD/\sqrt{D^2 + B^2} \quad (2)$$

derived by using the well-accepted approach [3, 4] (see details in Appendix). Here, m , D , and B are model parameters in the Hamiltonian that we use in [2]

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_{\text{TI}} + H_{\text{D}}, \\ H_{\text{TI}} &= (m + B\mathbf{k}^2) \gamma_0 + v\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{k}, \\ H_{\text{D}} &= -D(k_x^2 - k_y^2) \gamma_5, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where H_{TI} describes a 1st-order topological insulator and the D term breaks time-reversal symmetry to open side-surface gaps on H_{TI} , to generate a 2nd-order topological insulator. Without the D term, the model reduces to the 1st-order TI and there is no surface gap, so the vanishing D is a better criterion for describing the transition from the 2nd- to 1st-order topological insulator.




FIG. 1. (a) The surface gap $m_{\text{surf}} \equiv mD/B$ defined in [1] as a function of ℓ . Larger ℓ means lower energy scale. Our results (black solid) recover those (red dashed) from Fig. 1(a) in [1]. (b) B/D decreases with increasing ℓ without bound. Inset: $B = 0$ around $\ell_c \approx 3.6$, leading to the singular m_{surf} . (c) m_{surf} becomes singular around $\ell_c \approx 3.6$. (d) For $\ell < 5$, $B/D < 1$, violating the assumption of $D \ll B$ made in the perturbation calculation of the surface gap in [1]. For all diagrams, the initial values, namely $m_0 = B_{\perp}^0 = 1$, $B_z^0 = 0.5$, $\alpha_0 = \gamma_0^2 = 0.1$, and $D_0 = 5$, are identical to the values specified in [1].

Second, the flow of the surface gap m_{surf} is shown in [1], but only up to $\ell = 1.3$, far away from the low-energy thermodynamic limit (i.e., $\ell \rightarrow \infty$). Fig. 1(a) shows that our results recover m_{surf} in [1] from $\ell = 0$ through 1.3. Strikingly, as we further increase ℓ , we notice a singular behavior around $\ell \sim 3.6$ for m_{surf} , as depicted in Fig. 1(c). As shown in the inset diagram of Fig. 1(b), this singular behavior of m_{surf} is caused by the vanishing of B at $\ell \sim 3.6$, so does the increased behavior of m_{surf} . Therefore, the claimed increased surface gap in [1]

* Corresponding author: luhz@sustech.edu.cn

is misleading. This singular behavior shows that m_{surf} of Eq. (1) is not suitable for describing the phase transition.

Moreover, further analysis of how the authors in [1] obtained Eq. (1) revealed that their perturbation calculation assumed $D \ll B$, which is not satisfied in the region where the increased gap is described by Eq. (1). Fig. 1(d) shows that for $\ell < 5$, $D > B$, and even more critically, $\ell \sim 3.6$, $D \gg B$, which conflicts with the use of Eq. (1) to describe the surface gap.

The surface gap vanishes if RG is properly handled—

Now we show that the surface gap vanishes in the low-energy limit as a result of the Coulomb interaction, if the RG flow of the bulk gap is properly handled. Our RG calculations show that B and D always flow to zero and bulk gap m diverges as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. The behaviors can be understood from the RG scheme, in which the linear- k term is the free-field Hamiltonian, while the k^0 term (m) and the k^2 terms (B and D) are treated as perturbations. Integrating out high-energy modes is equivalent to approaching the $k = 0$ point, resulting in two consequences. First, the k^2 -related B and D become less important and thus can be ignored as $k \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., $\ell \rightarrow \infty$). Second, the k^0 term m becomes more important thus diverges as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. However, the bulk gap m must be finite in a realistic system. Once m flows to comparable with the cutoff $\Lambda \sim 1/a$ of the system, it is not proper to view the linear- k term (i.e., $v|\mathbf{k}|$ in Eq. (3)) as the free-field Hamiltonian. Instead, one needs to view the m term as the starting Hamiltonian and all other terms as perturbations [5]. As a result, with increasing ℓ , m never flows, but B and D still decrease. According to Eq. (2), the gap in the low-energy limit becomes

$$m'_{\text{surf}}|_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} = \Lambda / \sqrt{1 + (B/D)^2}|_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4)$$

which shows that the surface gap does not change sign when the transition from the 2nd- to 1st-order topological insulator happens, instead, it just vanishes, if the divergent bulk gap is properly handled. More importantly, the transition is controlled by the unbounded increase of $|B/D|$ (see Fig. 1(b)), where both B and D are of the same k^2 order, so their tree-level scaling are cancelled, indicating that the Coulomb interaction is truly behind the transition.

A vanishing B does not influence the topology —

Although B also flows to zero, the vanishing B does not indicate the transition from the 1st-order topological insulator to normal insulator. To illustrate this, we note that the topology of the 1st-order topological insulator is described by the Pfaffian [6]

$$P(\mathbf{k}) = i \frac{m - Bk^2}{\sqrt{(m - Bk^2)^2 + v^2k^2}} \quad (5)$$

at $k = 0$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$, specifically,

$$P(k = 0) = \text{sgn}(m), \quad P(k \rightarrow \infty) = -\text{sgn}(B). \quad (6)$$

In other words, m only matters at $k = 0$ and B only matters as $k \rightarrow \infty$, respectively. Moreover, by approaching

to $k = 0$, the RG scheme cannot change B at $k \rightarrow \infty$, so it is safe to use only m to describe the change of the topology of the 1st-order topological insulator.

Conclusion— We have justified our criteria [2] for both of the transitions from 2nd-order topological insulator to 1st-order topological insulator and normal insulator. Nevertheless, we would like to emphasize that the transition from a second-order to a first-order topological insulator is an emergent phenomenon, which is supposed to happen only in the lowest-energy limit. The transition from the 2nd-order topological insulator to normal insulator needs a critical strength of the Coulomb interaction. More importantly, our RG calculations are at zero temperature. Finite temperatures may stabilize the higher-order topological insulator, which is a topic that deserves further exploration.

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2022YFA1403700), the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Grant No. 2021ZD0302400), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11925402), Guangdong province (Grants No. 2020KCXTD001 and No. 2016ZT06D348), the Science, Technology and Innovation Commission of Shenzhen Municipality (Grants No. ZDSYS20170303165926217, No. JAY20170412152620376, and No. KYT-DPT20181011104202253). The numerical calculations were supported by Center for Computational Science and Engineering of SUSTech.

Appendix A: Gap of the surface states

We show the detailed calculations of the surface gap in the (100) plain, we focus on the gap instead of the whole dispersion of the surface states, and thus set $k_y = k_z = 0$. By replacing k_x with $-i\partial_x$, The Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = (m + B\partial_x^2) \tau_z \sigma_0 - iv\partial_x \tau_x \sigma_x + D\partial_x^2 \tau_y \sigma_0 \quad (A1)$$

We directly solve the surface models by the method used in [3, 4]. First, we take a trial wave-function

$$\psi = \psi_\lambda e^{\lambda x}, \quad (A2)$$

the secular equation for energy E is given by

$$\det |H(k_x = -i\lambda) - E| = 0, \quad (A3)$$

which gives four solutions of λ ,

$$\lambda_\alpha = \pm \sqrt{\frac{X + (-1)^\alpha \sqrt{X^2 - 4Y}}{2(B^2 + D^2)}}, \quad (A4)$$

where $X = v^2 - 2Bm$, and $Y = (B^2 + D^2)(m^2 - E^2)$. For a $\beta\lambda_\alpha$, the corresponding two eigenstates for $H(k_x = -i\lambda)$ with eigenvalue $(-1)^\alpha E$ are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\alpha\beta 1} &= [iv\beta\lambda_\alpha, iD\lambda_\alpha^2, 0, Z_\alpha]^T, \\ \psi_{\alpha\beta 2} &= [iD\lambda_\alpha^2, iv\beta\lambda_\alpha, Z_\alpha, 0]^T \end{aligned} \quad (A5)$$

where $Z_\alpha = B\lambda_\alpha^2 + m - E$, T represents the transpose. The general wave functions are given by

$$\Psi = \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \sum_{\beta=\pm} \sum_{\gamma=1,2} C_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \psi_{\alpha\beta\gamma} e^{\beta\lambda_\alpha x}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

We consider a semi-infinite boundary conditions:

$$\Psi(x=0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(x=+\infty) = 0. \quad (\text{A7})$$

$\Psi(x=+\infty)$ requires that only terms with $\beta = -$ are kept because we assumed that λ_α have positive real parts.

For $\beta = +$, to have nonzero $C_{\alpha\beta}$ of $\Psi(x=0) = 0$, the secular equation leads to

$$v^2 (m - E - B\lambda_1\lambda_2)^2 = D^2 (m - E)^2 (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where the condition $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ is assumed. Substituting Eq. (A8) into Eq. (A4), the dispersion of surface state are given by

$$E_\pm = \pm mD / \sqrt{D^2 + B^2}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

-
- [1] Y.-W. Lee and M.-F. Yang, Comment on ‘‘Coulomb Instabilities of a Three-Dimensional Higher-Order Topological Insulator’’, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 219701 \(2023\)](#).
 - [2] P.-L. Zhao, X.-B. Qiang, H.-Z. Lu, and X. C. Xie, Coulomb Instabilities of a Three-Dimensional Higher-Order Topological Insulator, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 176601 \(2021\)](#).
 - [3] W.-Y. Shan, H.-Z. Lu, and S.-Q. Shen, Effective continuous model for surface states and thin films of three-dimensional topological insulators, [New J. Phys. **12**, 043048 \(2010\)](#).
 - [4] H.-Z. Lu, W.-Y. Shan, W. Yao, Q. Niu, and S.-Q. Shen, Massive Dirac fermions and spin physics in an ultrathin film of topological insulator, [Phys. Rev. B **81**, 115407 \(2010\)](#).
 - [5] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (CRC Press, 2019).
 - [6] S.-Q. Shen, W.-Y. Shan, and H.-Z. Lu, Topological insulator and the Dirac equation, [SPIN **01**, 33 \(2011\)](#).