Majorana fermions in T-shaped semiconductor nanostructures

Y. Zhou^{*} and M. W. Wu^{\dagger}

Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Physics,

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, 230026, China

(Dated: March 14, 2021)

We investigate the Majorana fermions in a T-shaped semiconductor nanostructure with the Rashba spin-orbit coupling and a magnetic field in the proximity of an s-wave superconductor. It is found that the properties of the low-energy modes (including the Majorana and near-zero-energy modes) at the ends of this system are similar to those in the Majorana nanowire. However, very distinct from the nanowire, one Majorana mode emerges at the intersection of the T-shaped structure when the number of the low-energy modes at each end N is odd, whereas neither Majorana nor near-zero-energy mode appears at the intersection for even N. We also discover that the intersection Majorana mode plays an important role in the transport through the above T-shaped nanostructure with each end connected with a normal lead. Due to the presence of the intersection mode, the deviation of the zero-bias conductance from the ideal value in the long-arm limit Ne^2/h is more pronounced in the regime of odd N compared to the one of even N. Furthermore, when the magnetic field increases from the regime of odd N to the one of even N + 1, the deviation from the ideal value tends to decrease. This behavior is also very distinct from that in a nanowire, where the deviation always tends to increase with the increase of magnetic field.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Pm, 74.78.Na, 74.20.Rp, 74.45.+c

I. INTRODUCTION

Since Majorana fermions, particles which are their own antiparticles, are proposed theoretically in topological superconductors,^{1–11} the search of Majorana fermions has attracted much attention in the condensed matter community. Apart from the importance for fundamental physics, Majorana modes in topological superconductors are of great use for quantum computation due to their non-Abelian exchange statistics.^{2,12–14}

A promising proposal for engineering Majorana quasiparticles is based on a semiconductor nanowire with both spin-orbit coupling (SOC) and magnetic field in the proximity of an s-wave superconductor. $^{6-9}$ In a long one-dimensional nanowire, in which only the lowest subband is involved, Majorana modes emerge as one pair of zero-energy states located at the two ends of the nanowire in the parameter regime satisfying the condition $|V_Z| > \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \mu^2}$.⁶ Here V_Z , Δ and μ represent the Zeeman splitting induced by the magnetic field, proximity-induced superconducting gap and chemical potential, respectively. A characteristic feature of Majorana states is the conductance peak at zero bias.^{15–27} The value of this zero-bias peak is predicted to be quantized, i.e., $2e^2/h$ for a normal-superconductor surface¹⁵⁻²⁰ and e^2/h for a normal-superconductor-normal (NSN) structure, as the NSN structure consists of two normalsuperconductor surfaces.^{21,22} When the length of wire is comparable or shorter than the coherence length of Majorana modes, the interaction between the two end Majorana modes becomes important and leads to an energy splitting of these states.^{19,28} This effect can reduce the value of the zero-bias peak and can even make this peak split into two peaks at finite bias when the splitting

is large enough.^{18,19}

There are also a few works on Majorana fermions in multi-subband nanowires.^{20,21,29–34} This system supports multiple low-energy modes at each ends. The number of these modes N is determined by the Z topological invariant, which comes from the approximate chiral symmetry.^{9,20,30} In the weak superconducting-pairing limit, N is approximately equal to the number of the subbands in which only the states with one kind of spin are occupied.^{9,29,30} Without considering the SOC between different transverse subbands, the chiral symmetry is exact, and hence all the low-energy modes at the ends are the Majorana modes in the long-wire limit. Nevertheless, taking account of the inter-subband SOC, the chiral symmetry is weakly broken, and most of the lowenergy modes are split off and become the near-zeroenergy modes. The number of the left Majorana modes is determined by the Z_2 topological invariant, which corresponds to the parity of N.^{6,9,30} In the nontrivial (trivial) topological regime with odd (even) N, there is one (no) Majorana mode at each end. The presence of the Majorana mode for odd N is also according to the restriction from the particle-hole symmetry of the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) Hamiltonian. When the splittings of these low-energy modes are still negligible compared with the energy broadening from the leads, the near-zero-energy modes behave the same as the Majorana modes. Thus, the conductance still shows a peak at zero bias with peak value being Ne^2/h in an NSN structure. However, when the splitting induced by the inter-subband SOC becomes important, the behavior of the conductance becomes complex due to the interference between different low-energy modes and the zero-bias conductance can vary between 0 and Ne^2/h .²¹

So far, all works in this field focus on the two-terminal

Majorana nanowire. There is no report on the threeterminal Majorana nanostructure, eg., the T-shaped semiconductor nanostructure with the Rashba SOC and magnetic field in the proximity of superconductor. In fact, the three-terminal T-shaped structure built with normal conductor has been extensively investigated and shows very distinct electric and transport properties. In particular, a localized state appears at the intersection of the three-terminal structure and induces the Fano line shape in the bias dependence of the conductance. $^{35-42}$ Thus, it is expected that there are also some interesting features in the T-shaped Majorana nanostructure. Furthermore, the unique property of this system can be shown in a simple view. We take the case where both the main-arm and side-arm are one-dimensional chains as an example. Due to similarity of the Hamiltonian around the ends of the T-shaped Majorana nanostructure and nanowire, the Majorana modes should appear at all three ends of the T-shaped nanostructure in the nontrivial topological regime. Thus, the total number of zero-energy end states is three. However, it is known that Majorana modes must emerge in pairs, since one Majorana fermion only contains half the degrees of freedom of a normal fermion.^{10,11} Therefore, an additional unknown Majorana mode must exist. The main purpose of this work is to identify this additional Majorana mode and reveal its influence on the transport through the Tshaped Majorana nanostructure.

In this paper, we investigate the low-energy spectrum and transport properties of a T-shaped Majorana nanostructure. We discover that, distinct from the behavior in nanowires, where all Majorana modes appear at the two ends, a Majorana mode shows up at the intersection of the three-terminal T-shaped structure in the case with odd low-energy modes (including the zero-energy and near-zero-energy modes) at the three ends. However, neither Majorana nor near-zero-energy mode appears at the intersection in the case with even low-energy modes at the three ends. We further show that, the presence of the intersection Majorana mode enhances the deviation of the zero-bias conductance from its ideal value in the long-arm limit. Also considering that the regime with the intersection Majorana mode can appear at lower magnetic field compared to that without it, the deviation from the ideal value tends to decrease with the increase of magnetic field in this case. This behavior is also distinct from the transport property through a Majorana nanowire, where the deviation always shows increasing trend with increasing magnetic field.²¹

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we set up the tight-binding Hamiltonian of a T-shaped Majorana nanostructure and calculate the low-energy spectrum and identify the Majorana states. In Sec. III, we derive the formula of current between different ends of the T-shaped structure and present the numerical results of electric conductance. Finally, we conclude in Sec. IV.



FIG. 1: Schematic view of a *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure with each end connected with a normal lead.

II. HAMILTONIAN AND ENERGY SPECTRUM

A. Hamiltonian

We consider a T-shaped semiconductor nanostructure with the Rashba SOC and proximity-induced superconducting pairing in the presence of a magnetic field perpendicular to the plane of this structure, as sketched in Fig. 1. Note that the leads plotted in this figure are excluded in this section but included in calculating the transport properties in the next section. The tight-binding Hamiltonian of this structure can be written as^{29,32,34}

$$H_{\text{eff}} = H_0 + H_{\text{SC}}, \qquad (1)$$

$$H_0 = \sum_{i\sigma} (\sigma V_{\text{Z}} + V_i - \mu) c^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} c_{i\sigma} - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma} t c^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} + i E_R \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma \sigma'} (v^y_{ij} \sigma^x_{\sigma\sigma'} - v^x_{ij} \sigma^y_{\sigma\sigma'}) c^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma'}, \quad (2)$$

$$H_{\rm SC} = \sum_{i} \Delta c_{i+}^{\dagger} c_{i-}^{\dagger} + \text{H.c..}$$
(3)

Here t represents the hoping energy; $V_i = 4t$ denotes the on-site energy; $\langle i, j \rangle$ represents a pair of the nearest neighbors; σ^l for l = x, y are the Pauli matrices; $v_{ij}^l = \mathbf{e}_l \cdot \mathbf{d}_{ij}$ with $\mathbf{d}_{ij} = (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)/|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$; E_R represents the Rashba SOC constant.

It is convenient to rewrite the above Hamiltonian into the following $\rm form^{43}$

$$H_{\rm eff} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \bar{\Phi}_i^{\dagger} H_{\rm BdG}(i,j) \bar{\Phi}_j, \qquad (4)$$

where $\bar{\Phi}_i^{\dagger} = \left(c_{i\uparrow}^{\dagger}, c_{i\downarrow}^{\dagger}, c_{i\downarrow}, -c_{i\uparrow}\right)$ denotes the Nambu spinor and

$$H_{\rm BdG}(i,j) = \begin{pmatrix} H_0(i,j) & \Delta \delta_{ij} \\ \Delta^* \delta_{ij} & -\sigma_y H_0^*(i,j)\sigma_y \end{pmatrix}$$
(5)

represents the BdG Hamiltonian.⁴³ By diagonalizing the matrix form of BdG Hamiltonian (labelled by \hat{H}_{BdG}),



FIG. 2: (Color online) Isolated *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructures with $W = W_s = 1$, $\mu = E_0$ and $V_Z = 0.4t$. (a) Low energy spectra for $L = L_s = 100$ and 200. *n* labels the eigenvalues of H_{eff} staring with zero energy. The curves are only plotted as a guide for the eye. (b) (c) Magnitude of the wave functions of the lowest two eigenstates for $L = L_s = 200$.

one obtains the energy spectrum and eigenstates of this system.

B. Low-energy spectrum and Majorana states

In this subsection, we present the numerical results of the low-energy spectrum and eigenstates. We choose $\Delta = E_R = 0.2t$ unless otherwise specified. We first discuss the simplest *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure with $W = W_s = 1$. Evidently, there is only one subband in this case. As mentioned in the introduction, due

to the similarity of this system and the one-dimensional nanowire, the Majorana modes are expected to appear at all three ends of the T-shaped nanostructure in the nontrivial topological regime, i.e., $\sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\mu - E_0)^2} <$ $|V_{\rm Z}| < \sqrt{\Delta^2 + (\mu - E_0 - 4t)^2}$, where E_0 represents the energy of bulk states at $k_{\parallel} = 0$ with k_{\parallel} being the momentum along the free propagating direction.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, there must be addition Majorana mode(s) to ensure that the total number of Majorana modes are even. To confirm the above claim, we plot the low-energy spectrum of this structure with $L = L_s = 100$ and 200 for $\mu = E_0$ and $V_{\rm Z} = 0.4t$, which belongs to the nontrivial topological regime, in Fig. 2(a). Here only the ones in the positive eigenenergy regime are shown due to the particle-hole symmetry of the BdG Hamiltonian. It is seen that there are two eigenstates with extremely small energy and their energies decrease almost exponentially with the increase of the arm length. This indicates that both states are strict zero-energy states in the long-arm limit. Considering one zero-energy fermonic state corresponds to one pair of Majorana fermions,^{10,11} one finds that there are four (two pairs of) Majorana modes in total. This means that there is indeed an additional unknown Majorana mode. To identify this additional Majorana mode, we further plot the magnitude of the wave functions of the two zero-energy eigenstates for $L = L_s = 200$ in Figs. 2(b) and (c), respectively. The results show that the additional Majorana mode is located exactly at the intersection. Note that both zero-energy eigenstates include the contribution from all four Majorana modes, since the Majorana states are degenerate and the coupling between them is still finite in the finite-sized system. The emergence of the intersection Majorana mode can be understood through the analytic formula of the Majorana modes in this system (see Appendix A).

We then turn to the multi-subband T-shaped Majorana nanostructure. The number of the low-energy modes N at each end of this structure can be obtained following the similar approach in the multi-subband nanowire.^{6,9,20,30} It is determined by the Z topological invariant from the approximate chiral symmetry.^{9,20,30} In most of the parameter regime investigated here, the superconducting pairing is much weaker than the chemical potential and Zeeman splitting. In these cases, Nis approximately equal to the number of the subbands in which only the states with one kind of spin are occupied. However, as the inter-subband SOC weakly breaks the chiral symmetry, most of these low-energy modes are only the near-zero-energy modes instead of the Majorana modes.^{9,30} The number of the Majorana modes is determined by the Z_2 topological invariant, which corresponds to the parity of $N.^{6,9,30}$ One (no) Majorana mode appears at each end in the nontrivial (trivial) topological regime with odd (even) N.

In Fig. 3, we plot the phase diagram of the *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure with $W = W_s = 4$. Here the regions with the same color share the same *N*. The solid curves represent the transition points of the Z_2 topo-



FIG. 3: (Color online) Phase diagram in an isolated *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure with $W = W_s = 4$ as function of the Zeeman splitting V_Z and the chemical potential μ . N represents the number of the low-energy modes at each end. The black squares indicate the chemical potential and Zeeman splitting used in Fig. 4.

logical invariant, which are obtained from the gap closing condition of the bulk energy spectrum at $k_{\parallel} = 0$ or $\pi/a.^{6,34}$ It is observed that these solid regime boundaries show some anti-crossings, eg., between the regimes with N = 0 and 2. This effect comes from the anti-crossings between the energy spectra of bulk states in different subbands, which is induced by the inter-subband SOC. This kind of anti-crossings are also observed in the phase diagram in the quasi-1D nanowire with magnetic field perpendicular to the nanowire plane.^{9,32} Around these anti-crossings, the inter-subband SOC cannot be treated perturbatively, thus the Z topological invariant and Ncannot be well defined. This indicates that there are no strict boundaries between the relevant regimes. Here we only plot dashed curves at the positions where the bulk gap at $k_{\parallel} = 0$ or π/a reaches a finite minimum as rough boundaries to separate these regimes inside these anticrossings.

Now we examine the existence of the Majorana or nearzero-energy modes in different regimes for $W = W_s = 4$. We choose $\mu = 0.4t$ and $V_Z = 0.8t$, 1.2t and 2.3t, which belong to the regimes with N = 1, 2 and 3, respectively, as indicated by the squares in Fig. 3. The energy spectra in these three cases are plotted in Figs. 4(a), (c) and (e), respectively. In the insets of these figures, we also schematically plot the occupation of the four lowest spin bands, in which the $m\sigma$ band represents the spinmajority ($\sigma = -$) or -minority ($\sigma = +$) band of the *m*th transverse subband. We first focus on the case with N = 1, where only the spin-majority band of the lowest subband (1-) is occupied. It is seen that both the en-



FIG. 4: (Color online) Isolated *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructures with $W = W_s = 4$. $\mu = 0.4t$; $V_Z = 0.8t$ (a) (b), 1.2t (c) (d), 2.3t (e) (f). (a) (c) (e) Low-energy spectra for different arm lengths $L = L_s$. The dots and squares represent the results with and without the inter-subband SOC, respectively. The curves are only plotted as a guide for the eye. In the insets, we also schematically plot the occupation of the four lowest spin bands. (b) (d) (f) Magnitude of the wave functions of the low-energy eigenstates with n = 2 for $L = L_s = 200$.

ergy spectrum [Fig. 4(a)] and the wave functions of the low-energy states [the one with n = 2 for $L = L_s = 200$ is shown in Fig. 4(b)] in this case are similar to those in the *T*-shaped nanostructure with $W = W_s = 1$ discussed above: there are four (two pairs of) Majorana modes in total and one appears at the intersection.

Then we turn to the case with N = 2 [curves with dots in Fig. 4(c)], where the spin-majority bands of the lowest two subbands (1 - and 2 -) are occupied. It is shown that there are three low-energy eigenstates. In the long-arm limit, their energies become very close to each other and all saturate to the order of $10^{-3}t$. This indicates that they are only the near-zero-energy states but not the Majorana states. It is also seen that, after removing the inter-subband SOC (curves with squares),⁴⁵ the energies of all the low-energy states decrease with the increase of arm length and hence recover the behavior of the Majorana modes. This further justifies that the small splitting of these near-zero-energy states is due

to the inter-subband SOC, in consistence with the above discussions based on the topological invariant. The absence of the Majorana modes also agrees with the fact that the regime with even N belongs to the trivial topological phase. Moreover, we also plot the wave function of the eigenstate with n = 2 for $L = L_s = 200$ in Fig. 4(d). The wave functions of the other two low-energy eigenstates are similar to this one. One finds that all low-energy eigenstates are constructed by the near-zero-energy modes at the ends and hence the intersection near-zero-energy mode does not appear.

The behavior for N = 3 [curves with dots in Fig. 4(e)], in which the 1-, 2- and 3- bands are occupied, is more complex. It is found that there are five low-energy eigenstates. The lowest two tend to be zero energy with increasing length and the other three saturate to the order of $10^{-3}t$, indicating two zero-energy eigenstates and three near-zero-energy ones in the long-arm limit. The presence of the Majorana fermions is consistent with the fact that the regime with odd N belongs to the nontrivial topological phase. The finite splitting of the near-zeroenergy states also comes from the inter-subband SOC, as indicated by the comparison of the energy spectra with (curves with dots) and without the inter-subband SOC (curves with squares). We further examine the wave functions of the zero-energy eigenstates and plot the one with n = 2 in Fig. 4(f). It is shown that there is also a Majorana mode at the intersection, just similar to the case with N = 1. In addition, we verify that there is no near-zero-energy mode at the intersection in this case. Based on the above discussions, one can conclude that one intersection Majorana mode appears in the case with odd N, while there is neither Majorana nor near-zero-energy mode at the intersection in the case with even N.

III. ELECTRIC CONDUCTANCE

A. Formalism

In this section, we discuss the transport properties through the *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure and, more importantly, identify the role of the intersection Majorana modes in it. Here we connect each end of this structure with a normal lead, as indicated in Fig. 1. We also add barriers between the leads and the *T*-shaped structure to reduce the broadening of energy level and hence avoid the states above the bulk gap contributing to the low-energy transport. The Hamiltonian of the leads (including the barriers) is similar to H_0 in the *T*-shaped structure and can be written as

$$H_{\eta} = \sum_{i\sigma} (\sigma V_{Z} + V_{i} - \mu) d^{\dagger}_{\eta i\sigma} d_{\eta i\sigma} - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma} t d^{\dagger}_{\eta i\sigma} d_{\eta j\sigma} + i E_{R} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \atop \sigma \sigma'} (v^{y}_{ij} \sigma^{x}_{\sigma \sigma'} - v^{x}_{ij} \sigma^{y}_{\sigma \sigma'}) d^{\dagger}_{\eta i\sigma} d_{\eta j\sigma'}, \qquad (6)$$

where $\eta = 1, 2, 3$ represents the left, central and right leads (see Fig. 1), the on-site energy V_i is chosen to be $4t + V_b$ with V_b being the barrier height in the barrier region and 4t otherwise. The hoping between the leads and the *T*-shaped structure is described by

$$H_T = \sum_{\substack{\eta\langle i,j \rangle \\ \sigma\sigma'}} T^{\eta}_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} d^{\dagger}_{\eta i\sigma} c_{j\sigma'}, \tag{7}$$

$$T^{\eta}_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} = -t\delta_{\sigma\sigma'} + iE_R(v^y_{ij}\sigma^x_{\sigma\sigma'} - v^x_{ij}\sigma^y_{\sigma\sigma'}).$$
(8)

The electric current flowing away from the lead η can be written as

$$I_{\eta}(t) = e\partial_t \langle \mathcal{N}_{\eta}(t) \rangle = \frac{ie}{\hbar} \langle [H(t), \mathcal{N}_{\eta}(t)] \rangle \tag{9}$$

with $\mathcal{N}_{\eta}(t) = \sum_{i} d^{\dagger}_{\eta i \sigma}(t) d_{\eta i \sigma}(t)$. Using the Green's functions in the Nambu spinor basis (see Appendix B) and following the similar way deriving the current through normal mesoscopic nanostructures,⁴⁶ one obtains

$$I_{\eta} = \frac{e}{h} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \sum_{\eta'\beta} P_{\eta\eta'}^{e\beta}(\varepsilon) [f_{\eta e}(\varepsilon) - f_{\eta'\beta}(\varepsilon)], \qquad (10)$$

in which

$$P^{\alpha\beta}_{\eta\eta'}(\varepsilon) = \operatorname{Tr}\left\{\hat{G}^{r}(\varepsilon)\hat{\Gamma}^{\beta}_{\eta'}(\varepsilon)\hat{G}^{a}(\varepsilon)\hat{\Gamma}^{\alpha}_{\eta}(\varepsilon)\right\}.$$
 (11)

Here $\hat{G}^{r,a}(\varepsilon)$ are the retarded and advanced Green's functions in the *T*-shaped nanostructure connected with leads [see Eq. (B2)]; $\hat{\Gamma}^{\alpha}_{\eta}(\varepsilon)$ is the self-energy from the electric ($\alpha = e$) or hole part ($\alpha = h$) in the lead η [see Eq. (B3)]. It is noted that this formula of current is just equivalent to the one obtained from the transfer matrix approach.^{21,47}

At zero temperature, Eq. (10) can be reduced into

$$I_{\eta} = \frac{e}{h} \sum_{\eta'\beta} \int_{\chi_{\beta}\mu_{\eta'}}^{\mu_{\eta}} d\varepsilon \ P_{\eta\eta'}^{e\beta}(\varepsilon), \tag{12}$$

where $\chi_{\beta} = 1$ (-1) for $\beta = e$ (h) and μ_{η} is the chemical potential in lead η . The differences between chemical potentials in different leads are determined by the bias $eV_1 = \mu_1 - \mu_3$ and $eV_2 = \mu_2 - \mu_3$. In this investigation, we focus on two quantities: (i) the differential conductance between terminal 1 and 3 when no current flows through terminal 2, i.e., $G_1 = \frac{dI_1}{dV_1}\Big|_{I_2=0}$; (ii) the differential conductance between terminal 2 and 3 when no current flows through terminal 1, i.e., $G_2 = \frac{dI_2}{dV_2}\Big|_{I_1=0}$. Generally speaking, these two quantities cannot be obtained through a simple analytic formula but can only calculated through a self-consistent numerical scheme. We take G_1 as an example to explain this scheme: (1) for certain V_1 , μ_η and I_η can be determined self-consistently using the conditions $I_2 = 0$ and $\sum_{\eta} I_{\eta} = 0$; (2) for the bias slightly deviating from V_1 , termed as V'_1 , one obtains the corresponding current I'_1 in a similar way; (3) the differential conductance is obtained from $(I'_1 - I_1)/(V'_1 - V_1)$.

When all arms of the *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructure are very long, the transmissions between different leads (i.e., $P_{\eta\eta'}^{e\beta}$ for $\eta \neq \eta'$) become negligible around zero energy due to the presence of the superconducting gap and hence only the Andreev reflection contributes to the transport. In this case, Eq. (12) becomes simpler,

$$I_{\eta} = \frac{e}{h} \int_{-\mu_{\eta}}^{\mu_{\eta}} d\varepsilon \ P_{\eta\eta}^{eh}(\varepsilon).$$
 (13)

Further using $P_{11}^{eh}(\varepsilon) = P_{33}^{eh}(\varepsilon)$, which comes from the left-right symmetry of this structure, one obtains the conductance G_1

$$G_1 = e^2/2h \left[P_{11}^{eh} \left(eV_1/2 \right) + P_{11}^{eh} \left(-eV_1/2 \right) \right].$$
(14)

Nevertheless, the conductance G_2 in this case still needs to be obtained through a self-consistent scheme.

B. Numerical results

In this subsection, we present the numerical results of the conductance through the T-shaped Majorana structure in various parameter regimes. We choose $W = W_s =$ 4 and $\mu = 0.4t$ just as Fig. 4. We also set the barrier width $W_b = 2$ throughout this subsection. We first discuss the bias dependence of conductance for $V_Z = 0.8t$, which belongs to the regime with N = 1, as shown in Fig. 3. The conductance G_1 is plotted against bias with different arm lengths for the barrier height $V_b = 0.8t$ in Fig. 5(a). The behavior of G_2 is similar to this one and not shown here. It is seen that the conductance exhibits a Lorentzian peak at zero bias with the peak value being e^2/h for $L = L_s = 200$. This is just the typical behavior of Majorana fermion-assisted transport,²¹ indicating the arm has been long enough so that the interaction between different Majorana modes becomes negligible. The behaviors with shorter arm are more interesting. One observes a sharp valley at zero bias and double peaks at finite bias for $L = L_s = 100$ and 50. Note that these behaviors are very distinct from those in nanowires, which are plotted in Fig. 5(b) with the same parameters as the previous ones except $L_s = 0$ (i.e., the side-arm is removed). In that figure, one observes that the conductance shows the double-peak structure only for extremely short length L = 15. Obviously, the double-peak behavior appears at much longer length in the T-shaped structure compared with that in the nanowire.

Two reasons lead to the above distinct behaviors in these two structures. The first one is straightforward: due to the presence of the intersection Majorana mode, the distance of the adjoining Majorana modes L in the T-shaped structure is only about one half of that in the corresponding nanowire, whose total length is $2L + W_s$. This enhances the interaction between the adjoining Majorana modes and makes the split-peak structure appear at longer length. The second reason is more subtle: all the Majorana modes in the nanowire are located at the



FIG. 5: (Color online) Conductance G_1 in *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructures (a) and nanowires (b) versus bias V_1 with different lengths for the Zeeman splitting $V_Z = 0.8t$ (corresponding to N = 1) and barrier height $V_b = 0.8t$. (c) Conductance G_1 in *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructures (curves) and nanowires (dots) versus bias V_1 with different barrier heights for $V_Z = 1.2t$ (corresponding to N = 2) and L = 100.

ends and hence their self-energies from the leads are large, whereas the intersection Majorana mode in the *T*-shaped structure has a very small self-energy. The influence of this factor can be seen clearly in the limit where the selfenergy of the intersection Majorana mode is negligible compared with all the other quantities. In this limit, the conductance can be described by Eq. (C3) in Appendix C with $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_{1L}$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_{2L} = 0$ (the Majorana modes at left end and the intersection are numbered 1 and 2, respectively)

$$G_1(V_1) = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{\Gamma_1^2 e^2 V_1^2}{(e^2 V_1^2 - 4|\varepsilon_{12}|^2)^2 + \Gamma_1^2 e^2 V_1^2}.$$
 (15)

From this formula, one finds that $G_1(V_1)$ takes its minimum value 0 at zero bias and reaches its maximum value e^2/h at $eV_1 = \pm 2|\varepsilon_{12}|$ with $|\varepsilon_{12}|$ representing the interaction between the adjoining Majorana modes. This indicates that the conductance always shows the double-peak structure in this limit. In fact, the self-energy of the intersection Majorana mode is not so small in most cases and the behavior of the conductance in the *T*-shaped structure is usually between the above limit and the Lorentzian-peak behavior. Nevertheless, the small selfenergy of the intersection mode still facilitates the formation of the split-peak behavior and makes it appear at longer length.

Then we turn to the bias dependence of conductance for $V_{\rm Z} = 1.2t$, which corresponds to N = 2, i.e., there are two near-zero-energy modes at each ends. As discussed in Sec. II, the splitting of these modes is mainly from the inter-subband SOC and hence insensitive to the arm length as long as the arm is not too short. Thus, here we do not change the length as the previous case with N = 1, instead, we fix the length $L = L_s = 100$ and change the barrier height to show the typical transport behavior in this situation. We again only plot G_1 due to the similar behaviors between the conductances G_1 and G_2 . The results are plotted as curves in Fig. 5(b). It is seen that the conductance shows a peak at zero bias with the peak value being close to $2e^2/h$ for low barrier height $V_b = 0.8t$, whereas exhibits double peaks at finite bias when barrier height is large enough, e.g., $V_b = 2.4t$. The underlying physics is as follows. For low barrier height, the self-energies of the near-zero-energy states are larger than the splitting induced by the inter-subband SOC and hence all the near-zero-energy modes just act as the same as the Majorana modes. In this case, the conductance can be described by Eq. (C3) with $|\varepsilon_{12}| = 0$, $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_{1L}$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_{2L}$,

$$G_1(V_1) = \frac{e^2}{h} \left(\frac{\Gamma_1^2}{e^2 V_1^2 + \Gamma_1^2} + \frac{\Gamma_2^2}{e^2 V_1^2 + \Gamma_2^2} \right).$$
(16)

Evidently, G_1 in this case is just the summation of two Lorentzian functions with height e^2/h . For high barrier height, the self-energy of one of the low-energy modes at the end is much smaller than the splitting. Thus, the conductance can be described by Eq. (15) and shows the split-peak behavior. Moreover, we also plot the conductances through nanowires in the corresponding cases as dots. It is seen that they almost coincide with the corresponding ones in *T*-shaped structures. This is because in the case with N = 2, there is no low-energy states at the intersection and the properties of the low-energy states at the three ends in *T*-shaped structures are similar to those in nanowires. In addition, we also investigate the



FIG. 6: (Color online) Linear conductances G_1 and G_2 in *T*-shaped Majorana nanostructures (a) and G_1 in nanowires (b) versus Zeeman splitting with different lengths for the barrier height $V_b = 0.8t$.

conductance for higher N (not shown) and find that the above phenomena in the case with N = 1 (2) also appear in the case with N being other odd (even) number.

The unique transport properties in the T-shaped Majorana nanostructure can be seen more clearly in the magnetic-field dependence of the linear conductance (i.e., at zero bias). Since the effect of the inter-subband SOC on the transport in the T-shaped structure is similar to that in the nanowire addressed in the literature,²¹ here we focus on the case with $V_b = 0.8t$, where the splitting of the near-zero-energy states induced by the intersubband SOC is unimportant compared with their selfenergies, as shown in Fig. 5(c). We plot $G_1(0)$ and $G_2(0)$ as function of magnetic field for different arm lengths in Fig. 6(a). We first discuss the case in the long-arm limit, i.e., L = 800. As G_1 and G_2 coincide in this case, only G_1 is shown. It is seen that the linear conductance is very close to the ideal value Ne^2/h in all parameter regimes investigated in this work. This indicates that the splitting of the relevant low-energy modes is negligible compared with their self-energies.

The behavior becomes more interesting for shorter arm length. In the case with L = 200, both G_1 and G_2 take the ideal value Ne^2/h in the regimes for N = 1, 2 and 4, however, deviate much from their ideal value for N = 3. This phenomenon can be understood as follows. As said above, in the regime for odd N, the intersection Majorana mode emerges, which enhances the discrepancy between the zero-bias conductance and its ideal value. It is also known that, with the increasing magnetic field, the coherence length of the low-energy modes tends to increase, and hence the splitting of these states tends to increase.²⁸ Therefore, the pronounced deviation from the ideal value appears in the regime for N = 3, in which N is odd and the corresponding magnetic field is high. It is also shown that the deviation in G_2 is larger than G_1 . This can be understood by considering the magnitude of the wave function of the intersection Majorana mode in the side-arm is larger than that in the mainarm, as shown in its analytic solution with $W = W_s = 1$ [Eqs. (A4)-(A6)]. Note that the deviation from the ideal value in the regime for N = 3 is even larger than that for N = 4, although the latter one appears at higher magnetic field. Similar phenomenon is observed in the case with L = 50. In that case, one finds that the derivation for N = 1 is larger than that for N = 2. The above behaviors are very distinct from those in Majorana nanowires. In that system, as shown in Fig. 6(b), the deviation from the ideal value always tends to increase with the increase of magnetic field due to the decrease of the coherence length.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have investigated the Majorana fermions in a T-shaped semiconductor nanostructure with the Rashba SOC and proximity-induced superconducting pairing in the presence of a magnetic field perpendicular to the plane of this structure. We first discuss the low-energy spectrum of this system. We find that the properties of the low-energy modes (including the Majorana and near-zero-energy modes) at the ends of the T-shaped structure are similar to those in the Majorana nanowire. The number of the low-energy modes at each end N is approximately equal to the number of the Nsubbands in which only the states with one kind of spin are occupied and the number of the Majorana modes at each end is one (zero) for odd (even) N. Moreover, very distinct from the nanowire, it is discovered that one Majorana mode appears at the intersection of the T-shaped structure in the case with odd N to ensure that the total number of the Majorana modes is even. However, there is neither Majorana nor near-zero-energy mode at the intersection for even N.

We also investigate the transport properties through the above T-shaped nanostructure with each end connected with a normal lead. It is found that the deviation of the zero-bias conductance from its ideal value in the long-arm limit Ne^2/h is more pronounced in the regime for odd N compared to the one for even N. This is because the presence of the intersection Majorana mode reduces the distance between the adjoining Majorana modes and the self-energy of this intersection mode from the leads is very small. Moreover, the regime for odd N can appear at lower magnetic field than that for even one. Therefore, around the boundary between these two regimes, the deviation from the ideal value tends to decrease with increasing magnetic field. This behavior is also very distinct from that in the nanowire, where the deviation from the ideal value always tends to increase with increasing magnetic field due to the decrease of the coherence length of the low-energy modes.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11334014, the National Basic Research Program of China under Grant No. 2012CB922002 and the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant No. XDB01000000.

Appendix A: Wave functions of Majorana modes in one-dimensional *T*-shaped structure

In this appendix, we present the derivation of the wave functions of the Majorana modes in the one-dimensional *T*-shaped structure, i.e., $W = W_s = 1$. It is known that, in the nontrivial topological regime, one Majorana mode appears at each end of the one-dimensional nanowire. This indicates that there is one solution $\Phi_0(x)$ satisfying the BdG equation $H_{BdG}(x', x)\Phi_0(x) = 0$ and the boundary condition $\Phi_0(0) = 0$. Also from the particle-hole symmetry of the BdG Hamiltonian, any zero-energy solution can be written into the form $\Phi_\eta(x) = (u_\eta(x), i\hat{\sigma}_y u_\eta(x))^T$.²⁸ Thus, $u_0(x)$ corresponds to the above solution $\Phi_0(x)$. After performing the translation and rotation, one obtains the normalized wave function of the Majorana mode $u_\eta(x, y)$ at the end η of the *T*-shaped nanostructure (see Fig. 1),

$$u_1(x,y) = u_0(x+L)\delta_{y,0},$$
 (A1)

$$u_2(x,y) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} (\hat{I} + i\hat{\sigma}_z) u_0(-y + L) \delta_{x,0}, \quad (A2)$$

$$u_3(x,y) = i\hat{\sigma}_z u_0(-x+L)\delta_{y,0}.$$
 (A3)

Generally speaking, the wave function of the intersection Majorana mode $u_4(x, y)$ cannot be constructed in this way. However, for $W = W_s = 1$, the exact numerical calculation gives $u_4(x = 0, y = 0) = 0$ within the computational accuracy. Thus one obtains the form of the intersection Majorana mode,

$$u_4(x > 0, y = 0) = \frac{A}{2}u_0(x),$$
 (A4)

$$u_4(x < 0, y = 0) = \frac{iB}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z u_0(-x),$$
 (A5)

$$u_4(x=0, y>0) = \frac{C}{2}(\hat{I} - i\hat{\sigma}_z)u_0(y).$$
 (A6)

It can be verified that the above solution $u_4(x, y)$ indeed satisfies the BdG equation when A = -B = -C = 1.

Appendix B: Green's functions in Nambu spinor basis

Here we briefly discuss the Green's functions in the Nambu spinor basis.^{6,29,32,34} We first define the contourordered Green's functions in a isolated superconducting nanostructure in this basis as

$$g_{i\sigma j\sigma'}^{c,\alpha\beta}(t,t') = -i\langle T_c \,\tilde{c}_{\alpha i\sigma}(t)\tilde{c}_{\beta j\sigma'}^{\dagger}(t')\rangle \tag{B1}$$

with $\tilde{c}_{ei\sigma} \equiv c_{i\sigma}$ and $\tilde{c}_{hi\sigma} \equiv \sigma c_{i-\sigma}^{\dagger}$. After connecting this superconducting structure with normal leads, the contour-ordered Green's functions can be obtained through the Dyson equation

$$\hat{G}^{c}(t,t') = \hat{g}^{c}(t,t') + \int_{c} dt_{1} dt_{2} \hat{g}^{c}(t,t_{1}) \hat{\Sigma}^{c}(t_{1},t_{2}) \hat{G}^{c}(t_{2},t').$$
(B2)

Here symbols with hat (^) represent the corresponding quantities in the lattice and Nambu spinor space; $\hat{\Sigma}^{c}(t_{1}, t_{2})$ denotes the total self-energy from all leads

$$\Sigma_{i_{1}\sigma_{1},i_{2}\sigma_{2}}^{c,\alpha\beta}(t_{1},t_{2}) = \sum_{\substack{\eta j_{1}\sigma_{1}'j_{2}\sigma_{2}'\\ \times F_{j_{1}\sigma_{1}',j_{2}\sigma_{2}'}^{c,\eta,\alpha\alpha}(t_{1},t_{2})\delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (B3)}$$

in which

$$F^{c,\eta,\alpha\beta}_{j\sigma,j\sigma'}(t,t') = -i\langle T_c d_{\eta,\alpha,i\sigma}(t) d^{\dagger}_{\eta,\beta,j\sigma'}(t')\rangle, \quad (B4)$$

$$T^{\eta,\alpha}_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} = \begin{cases} T^{\prime}_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} & \alpha = e \\ \sigma\sigma' T^{\eta*}_{i-\sigma,j-\sigma'} & \alpha = h \end{cases}.$$
 (B5)

Similar to Eq. (B1), one can define the retarded, advanced, lesser and greater Green's functions in the isolated superconducting nanostructure $\hat{g}^{r,a,<,>}(t,t')$. Further performing the Fourier transformation, one obtains $\hat{g}^{r,a,<,>}(\varepsilon)$. It can be demonstrated that these Green's functions satisfy

$$(\varepsilon - \hat{H}_{\rm BdG} + i0^+)\hat{g}^r(\varepsilon) = 1, \qquad (B6)$$

$$(\varepsilon - \hat{H}_{BdG})\hat{g}^{<}(\varepsilon) = 0.$$
 (B7)

Since the investigated system is finite, the infinitesimal in Eq. (B6) can be neglected.^{48,49} Thus,

$$[\hat{g}^r(\varepsilon)]^{-1} - [\hat{g}^a(\varepsilon)]^{-1} = 0, \qquad (B8)$$

$$[\hat{g}^r(\varepsilon)]^{-1}\hat{g}^<(\varepsilon) = 0. \tag{B9}$$

Performing the Langreth rules⁴⁶ and the Fourier transformation on Eq. (B2) and further exploiting Eqs. (B8)and (B9), one obtains

$$\hat{G}^{<}(\varepsilon) = \hat{G}^{r}(\varepsilon)\hat{\Sigma}^{<}(\varepsilon)\hat{G}^{a}(\varepsilon), \qquad (B10)$$

$$\hat{G}^{r}(\varepsilon) - \hat{G}^{a}(\varepsilon) = \hat{G}^{r}(\varepsilon) [\hat{\Sigma}^{r}(\varepsilon) - \hat{\Sigma}^{a}(\varepsilon)] \hat{G}^{a}(\varepsilon).$$
(B11)

Note that the above relations are in the same form as those well-known relations for the Green's functions in the normal conductor.^{46,48} This indicates that the formula of current through the superconducting mesoscopic nanostructure can be derived following the similar way to the current through the normal nanostructure.⁴⁶

Appendix C: Approximate formula of conductance induced by two interacting Majorana modes

When only two Majorana modes contribute to the lowenergy transport, all Green's functions and self-energies can be reduced into the small space formed by these two modes. Then one obtains

$$\hat{G}^{r}(\varepsilon) = \left[\varepsilon - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varepsilon_{12} \\ \varepsilon_{12}^{*} & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma_{2} \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1}, (C1)$$
$$\hat{\Gamma}_{1}^{e}(\varepsilon) = \hat{\Gamma}_{1}^{h}(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{1L} & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma_{2L} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(C2)

Here ε_{12} represents the coupling between the two Majorana modes; Γ_i and Γ_{iL} stand for the total self-energy and the one from the left lead of the *i*-th Majorana mode, respectively. Substituting Eqs. (C1) and (C2) into Eqs. (11) and (14), one obtains

$$G_{1}(V_{1}) = \frac{e^{2}}{h} [(\Gamma_{1L}^{2} + \Gamma_{2L}^{2})e^{2}V_{1}^{2} + \Gamma_{1}^{2}\Gamma_{2L}^{2} + \Gamma_{1L}^{2}\Gamma_{2}^{2} + 8\Gamma_{1L}\Gamma_{2L}|\varepsilon_{12}|^{2}][(e^{2}V_{1}^{2} - 4|\varepsilon_{12}|^{2} - \Gamma_{1}\Gamma_{2})^{2} + (\Gamma_{1} + \Gamma_{2})^{2}e^{2}V_{1}^{2}]^{-1}.$$
(C3)

- * Electronic address: zya2538@mail.ustc.edu.cn
- [†] Electronic address: mwwu@ustc.edu.cn
- ¹ G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362 (1991).
- ² D. A. Ivanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 268 (2001).
- ³ A. Y. Kitaev, Phys.-Usp. **44**, 131 (2001).
- ⁴ L. Fu and C. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 096407 (2008).
- ⁵ J. D. Sau, R. M. Lutchyn, S. Tewari, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 040502 (2010).
- ⁶ J. D. Sau, S. Tewari, R. M. Lutchyn, T. D. Stanescu, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 82, 214509 (2010).
- ⁷ R. M. Lutchyn, J. D. Sau, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 077001 (2010).
- ⁸ Y. Oreg, G. Refael, and F. von Oppen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 177002 (2010).
- ⁹ T. D. Stanescu and S. Tewari, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 25, 233201 (2013).
- ¹⁰ M. Leijnse and K. Flensberg, Semicond. Sci. Technol. 27, 124003 (2012).
- ¹¹ J. Alicea, Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 076501 (2012).
- ¹² N. Read and D. Green, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 10267 (2000).
- ¹³ C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. 80, 1083 (2008).
- ¹⁴ J. Alicea, Y. Oreg, G. Refael, F. von Oppen, and M. P. A. Fisher, Nat. Phys. 7, 412 (2011).
- ¹⁵ K. T. Law, P. A. Lee, and T. K. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 237001 (2009).
- ¹⁶ K. Flensberg, Phys. Rev. B 82, 180516(R) (2010).
- ¹⁷ E. Prada, P. San-Jose, and R. Aguado, Phys. Rev. B 86, 180503(R) (2012).
- ¹⁸ P. A. Ioselevich and M. V. Feigel'man, New J. Phys. 15, 055011 (2013).
- ¹⁹ C.-H. Lin, J. D. Sau, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 86, 224511 (2012).
- ²⁰ M. Diez, J. P. Dahlhaus, M. Wimmer, and C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. B 86, 094501 (2012).
- ²¹ J. S. Lim, R. López, and L. Serra, New J. Phys. **14**, 083020 (2012).
- ²² P. Wang, S. Chen, and X. Gao, arXiv:1308.4752.
- ²³ V. Mourik, K. Zuo, S. M. Frolov, S. R. Plissard, E. P. A. M. Bakkers, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Science **336**, 1003 (2012).
- ²⁴ M. T. Deng, C. L. Yu, G. Y. Huang, M. Larsson, P. Caroff, and H. Q. Xu, Nano Lett. **12**, 6414 (2012).
- ²⁵ A. Das, Y. Ronen, Y. Most, Y. Oreg, M. Heiblum, and H. Shtrikman, Nat. Phys. 8, 887 (2012).
- ²⁶ H. O. H. Churchill, V. Fatemi, K. Grove-Rasmussen, M. T. Deng, P. Caroff, H. Q. Xu, and C. M. Marcus, Phys. Rev. B 87, 241401(R) (2013).
- ²⁷ D. Roy, C. J. Bolech, and N. Shah, arXiv:1303.7036.
- ²⁸ S. Das Sarma, J. D. Sau, and T. D. Stanescu, Phys. Rev.

- B 86, 220506(R) (2012).
- ²⁹ R. M. Lutchyn, T. D. Stanescu, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 127001 (2011); T. D. Stanescu, R. M. Lutchyn, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 144522 (2011).
- ³⁰ S. Tewari, T. D. Stanescu, J. D. Sau, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 86, 024504 (2012).
- ³¹ J. S. Lim, L. Serra, R. López, and R. Aguado, Phys. Rev. B 86, 121103(R) (2012).
- ³² A. C. Potter and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 83, 094525 (2011).
- ³³ R. M. Lutchyn and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 84, 214528 (2011).
- ³⁴ M. Gibertini, F. Taddei, M. Polini, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. B 85, 144525 (2012).
- ³⁵ R. L. Schult, D. G. Ravenhall, and H. W. Wyld, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 5476 (1989).
- ³⁶ L. A. Openov, Europhys. Lett. **55**, 539 (2001).
- ³⁷ Y.-K. Lin, Y.-N. Chen, and D.-S. Chuu, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 193316 (2001); Y.-K. Lin, Y.-N. Chen, and D.-S. Chuu, J. Appl. Phys. **91**, 3054 (2002).
- ³⁸ G. Goldoni, F. Rossi, and E. Molinari, Appl. Phys. Lett. 71, 1519 (1997).
- ³⁹ H. U. Baranger, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 11479 (1990).
- ⁴⁰ Y. P. Chen, X. H. Yan, and Y. E. Xie, Phys. Rev. B 71, 245335 (2005).
- ⁴¹ J. L. Bohn, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 4132 (1997).
- ⁴² J. G. Xu, L. Wang, and M. Q. Weng, J. Appl. Phys. **114**, 153701 (2013).
- ⁴³ P. G. de Gennes, Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys (W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1966).
- ⁴⁴ Note that the magnitude of the Zeeman splitting of the nontrivial topological regime has an upper limit in the tight-binding model,³⁴ which is distinct from the continuum model.
- ⁴⁵ The inter-subband SOC in the *T*-shaped structure contains the terms including v_{ij}^y in the Hamiltonian of the main-arm [see Eq. (2)] and the terms including v_{ij}^x in the Hamiltonian of the side-arm.
- ⁴⁶ H. Haug and A. -P. Jauho, *Quantum kinetics in Transport and Optics of Semiconductors* (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- ⁴⁷ C. J. Lambert, V. C. Hui, and S. J. Robinson, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 5, 4187 (1993).
- ⁴⁸ J. Maciejko, "An Introduction to Non-Equilibrium Many-Body Theory", available for download at http://www.physics.arizona.edu/~stafford/Courses/560A/ nonequilibrium.pdf.
- ⁴⁹ Y. Zhou and M. W. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 237401 (2013).