Superconductivity, charge density wave, and supersolidity in flat bands with tunable quantum metric
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Predicting the fate of an interacting system in the limit where the electronic bandwidth is quenched is often highly non-trivial. The complex interplay between interactions and quantum fluctuations driven by the band geometry can drive a competition between various ground states, such as charge density wave order and superconductivity. In this work, we study an electronic model of topologically-trivial flat bands with a continuously tunable Fubini-Study metric in the presence of on-site attraction and nearest-neighbor repulsion, using numerically exact quantum Monte Carlo simulations. By varying the electron filling and the spatial extent of the localized flat-band Wannier wavefunctions, we obtain a number of intertwined orders. These include a phase with coexisting charge density wave order and superconductivity, i.e., a supersolid. In spite of the non-perturbative nature of the problem, we identify an analytically tractable limit associated with a ‘small’ spatial extent of the Wannier functions, and derive a low-energy effective Hamiltonian that can well describe our numerical results.

Introduction. Superconductivity in narrow band systems has attracted much attention recently, both from a fundamental point of view [1] and due to the advent of two-dimensional moiré materials [2]. The limit of flat bands is particularly interesting as a possible route to optimize the superconducting \( T_c \) (assuming that an effective attractive interaction is present), because of the diverging density of states. In this situation, it has been predicted that \( T_c \) is proportional to \( |U| \), the strength of the effective attractive interaction [3–5]. However, the lack of electronic dispersion also implies a reduction in the superconducting phase stiffness, limiting the attainable \( T_c \). Moreover, a plethora of competing non-superconducting phases may arise in the flat band limit.

If the flat bands have a topologically non-trivial character, they cannot be spanned by an exponentially localized basis in real space [6]. This has been proposed as a mechanism to generate a non-zero phase stiffness in flat band superconductors [7]. Within Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) mean-field theory, lower bounds on the zero-temperature stiffness can be proven [7–10]. However, mean-field theory is not generally justified if the interaction strength is larger than the bandwidth, unless a special set of conditions is satisfied [7, 11]. Beyond mean-field theory, upper bounds on the stiffness have been proven [12, 13].

Numerically exact determinant quantum Monte Carlo (DQMC) [14] calculations have provided an unambiguous demonstration of isolated, topologically non-trivial flat-bands leading to \( T_c \propto |U| \) [15–17]. However, the normal state above \( T_c \) has strong density and pairing fluctuations, resulting from an emergent particle-hole symmetry [11], making the resulting superconductor highly susceptible to a competing phase separation. Recent work using DQMC has also presented evidence for superconductivity in models with topologically trivial flat-bands [18]. This naturally leads to the following questions, that we address in this letter: (i) What is the nature of the competing phases and associated quantum phase-transitions that may arise in flat bands as a function of various microscopic tuning parameters? (ii) How does varying the spatial extent of the localized Wannier functions tune the system between different orders? (iii) Is there a theoretical limit in which this band competition can be explored in a controlled fashion, without resorting to uncontrolled BCS mean-field theory?

In this Letter, we study a concrete electronic Hamiltonian for topologically trivial flat bands, where the spatial extent of the exponentially localizable Wannier functions can be tuned continuously without affecting the band dispersion. Using unbiased DQMC simulations, we will demonstrate that such a model supports superconductivity with a wide fluctuation regime and obtain the detailed dependence of \( T_c \) on the spatial extent of the Wannier functions. Additionally, by varying the strength of further-neighbor interactions, the electronic density and the spatial extent of the Wannier functions, we can drive phase transitions to commensurate charge density wave and supersolid phases within the same flat-band limit.

Remarkably, we can use the spatial extent associated with the Wannier functions as a ‘small’ parameter to derive an effective pseudospin Hamiltonian that helps explain the origin of intertwined superconductivity, charge density wave and supersolid orders in this non-trivial flat-band model.

Model. We define a two-orbital, spinful electronic model with local interactions, demonstrating that continuously increasing the minimal spatial extent associated with the localized Wannier functions can induce superconductivity in partially filled, topologically trivial flat bands. The model, first introduced in Ref. [19], is time-reversal symmetric, and resides on a square two-dimensional lattice with two orbitals per site. We will
FIG. 1. a) The localized Wannier function, $\Phi_{R_l}(r)$, centered at $r = R_0$. The area of the colored disc is proportional to the amplitude (largest at $R_0$) and the color encodes the phase. b) The superconducting $T_c$ increases with $\zeta^2/|U|$ (see also inset). c) The phase diagram as a function of particle density $n$ and temperature for a fixed $\zeta = 0.75$, $|U| = 1$, and $V = 0.08$; at $n = 1$, the system is an insulating CDW for $T \lesssim 0.075$. When doped with electrons or holes, the excess carriers lead to a supersolid phase. d) The normalized superconducting correlation length $\xi_{sc}/L$ at $T = 0$ across a CDW to supersolid transition with increasing $\zeta$, consistent with a $(2 + 1)$-dimensional XY phase transition ($\zeta_c = 0.815$, $\zeta_{BG} = (\zeta - \zeta_c)/\zeta_c$) for different system sizes, $L$.

primarily focus on densities in the vicinity of one electron per unit cell, corresponding to quarter filling. The model can be tuned to have to pairs of perfectly flat-bands at energies, $\varepsilon_k = \pm t$, where $t$ sets the overall scale associated with the microscopic hopping parameters and the energy gap between the two flat-bands is $\Delta_{\text{gap}} = 2t$. In order to demonstrate a non-zero Berry curvature is not necessary to obtain superconducting. The model is designed to have zero Berry curvature everywhere in the Brillouin zone (BZ).

The non-interacting part of the Hamiltonian reads

$$H_0 = -t \sum_{k,\sigma} \hat{c}_{k,\sigma}^\dagger \left[ (\sin \alpha_k \tau_x + (-1)^\sigma \cos \alpha_k \tau_y + \mu \tau_0) \right] \hat{c}_{k,\sigma},$$

(1)

Here, $\hat{c}_{k,l}^\dagger$ creates an electron with momentum $k$ in orbital $l = 1, 2$ with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and $\tau_0 = 0, x, y, z$ act on the orbital indices. It is straightforward to check that regardless of $t$, the parameter $\zeta$ controls the spatial extent of the localized Wannier functions, $\Phi_{R_l}(r) \sim (i\zeta)^L \delta_i^L + O(\delta_i^L + |\delta_i^L| + 2)$, where $\mathbf{r} = r - R_0$; see Fig. 1(a). The associated quantum geometric tensor, $G_{ij}$, is simple—the imaginary part (i.e. Berry curvature) is identically zero everywhere in the BZ while the real part (i.e. the Fubini-Study metric) is finite and integrates to $\zeta^2/2$ [20]. Fourier transforming to real space, the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) includes hopping terms that decay exponentially as a function of distance.

At a fractional filling of the lower band ($\varepsilon_k = -t$), we will study the effect of an on-site attraction, $U > 0$, and a nearest-neighbor interaction, $V$, of either sign,

$$H_{\text{int}} = -\frac{U}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{r},l} \delta_n^{l,l} + V \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}' \rangle;l} \delta_{n_r,l} \delta_{n_{r'},l},$$

(2)

where $\delta_{n_r,l} = \sum_\sigma \hat{c}_{l,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{l,\sigma} - 1$ refers to the (shifted) density operator in orbital $l$ at site $\mathbf{r}$. The above model, $H = H_0 + H_{\text{int}}$, is free of the infamous sign problem as long as $U \geq 4|V|$. Before analyzing the above model numerically, we make an analytical detour to derive the effective Hamiltonian that illustrates the competition between various ordering tendencies. This analytical approach relies on a controlled expansion for small $\zeta$, but agrees qualitatively with the non-perturbative results obtained using DQMC.

**Analytical results for small $\zeta$.** We focus on the limit of $\zeta \ll 1$ and $T, V \ll U \ll \Delta_{\text{gap}} (= 2t)$, that allows us to project the interaction to the lower “active” band. The localized Wannier wave function constructed out of the lower band and centered around $\mathbf{r} = R_0$ [20], $\Phi_{R_0,\sigma}(r) = 1/\sqrt{2L} \sum_\mathbf{k} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$, is depicted in Fig. 1(a). Upon introducing new operators, $\hat{c}_{l,\sigma}^\dagger \mapsto \sum_\mathbf{r} \Phi_{l,\sigma}(\mathbf{r},l) \hat{d}_{l}^\dagger$, the projected interaction Hamiltonian for $n = 1$ in the $\zeta \ll 1$ limit takes the form of an effective XXZ model supplemented by other terms,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = -\frac{U_{\text{eff}}}{2} \sum_{r} (2\hat{n}_{r}^2) + \frac{U \zeta^2}{32} \sum \hat{n}_{r}^2 (2\hat{B}_{r}^Z - \hat{B}_{r}^{\Sigma})$$

$$- \sum_{(r,r')} \left[ J_\perp (\hat{n}_{r}^{\perp} \hat{n}_{r}'^{\perp} + \hat{n}_{r}^{\perp} \hat{n}_{r}'^{\perp}) + J_\parallel \hat{n}_{r}^{\parallel} \hat{n}_{r}'^{\parallel} \right],$$

(3)

with pseudospin operators, $\hat{n}_{r}^\alpha \equiv (\Psi_{r}^\dagger \eta^\sigma \Psi_{r})/2$, where $\Psi_{r} = (\hat{d}_{r}^\uparrow, \hat{d}_{r}^\downarrow)$.

The parameters, $U_{\text{eff}} = U(2 - \zeta^2)/4$, $J_\parallel = \zeta^2 U/4$, and $J_\perp = \zeta^2 U/4 - 2V$. For $\zeta = 0$, the sites decouple completely and $\Phi_{r,\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \propto \delta_{\mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}}$; only the first term in Eq. (3) survives and the ground state manifold is highly degenerate, consisting of local Cooper pairs without long-ranged phase coherence. The projected Hamiltonian also contains interaction-mediated hoppings, with $\hat{B}_{r}^Z = \sum_{\sigma \in \pm} \hat{d}_{r}^\sigma \hat{d}_{r+1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{r+2,\sigma}^\dagger$ representing hopping terms between the second and third nearest-neighbor sites of $\mathbf{r}$, and $\hat{B}_{r}^{\Sigma} = \sum_{\sigma \in \pm} \hat{d}_{r+1,\sigma} \hat{d}_{r+2,\sigma}^\dagger$ the wiggly lines, respectively. The interaction-mediated hoppings between second and third neighbors are depicted as solid and dashed lines, respectively. The interaction-mediated hopping between second-nearest-neighbor sites at order $\zeta$ vanishes due to the chiral symmetry of the model [20].
At finite $\zeta$ and $V = 0$, $\tilde{H}_{\text{int}}$ exhibits an emergent SU(2) symmetry [11], and exhibits strong fluctuations in the degenerate density and pairing response, without any long-range order at finite temperature. This symmetry is broken by higher-order terms in $U/\Delta_{\text{gap}}$, leading to an anisotropy $\Delta_{\|} = J_{\|} - J_{\perp}$ and a finite superconducting transition with $T_c \propto \pi J_{\perp}/\log(\pi J_{\perp}/\Delta_{\|})$, as shown in Fig. 1(b). The anisotropy can also be tuned by turning on $V$; the ground state is susceptible towards formation of an ordered charge density wave (CDW) at a commensurate filling when $-1 < J_{\perp}/J_c < 1$ (Fig. 1c). As we discuss in more detail below, doping away from the commensurate CDW at $n = 1$ induces a density-mediated hopping and leads to a superfluid phase with long-range superconducting phase coherence (Fig. 1c). Furthermore, at $n = 1$, increasing $\zeta$ also induces a continuous transition to a superfluid ground state. The transition seems to be in the $(2 + 1)$-dimensional XY universality class (Fig. 1d-inset).

**Numerical results.** We begin by noting that $H_0$ contains hopping matrix elements which decay in real-space as $f_k \sim \zeta^{-|\delta_k|+|\delta_y|}$. We truncate the range of hopping in our numerical implementation of the DQMC computations, neglecting terms with $|\delta_k| > 3$, leading to non-zero bandwidth $W \sim O(\zeta^4)$. We use ALF [21, 22] for DQMC simulations.

We first focus on the case of on-site interaction only ($V = 0$) at quarter filling ($n = 1$). We are interested in two-particle susceptibilities of local operators, $\hat{O}$, i.e., $\chi_{\alpha} = L^{-2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \langle \hat{O}(\tau)\hat{O}(\tau = 0) \rangle$.

![FIG. 2. (a) Spin susceptibility, $\chi_S(T)$, for different $U$ at fixed $\zeta = 0.75$ (solid) and $\zeta = 0.5$ (dashed). The purple line, $\zeta = 0$, represents the atomic limit with a spin gap of $\Delta_{\text{spin}} = U/4$. (b) Inverse pair susceptibility, $\chi^{-1}(T)$, and (c) compressibility, $\chi_n(T)$, as a function of temperature obtained for same values of $U$ as in (a). (d) Exemplary data for superfluid stiffness, $D_s(T)$, used to extract the critical temperature, $T_c$. $V = 0$ for all of these results.

In addition, we examine the pairing-susceptibility, $\chi_\Delta$ for $\hat{O} \equiv S_z$, where $\Delta_s = \sum_{\ell \neq 0} (\epsilon_{\ell,\uparrow}\epsilon_{\ell,\downarrow} + \text{h.c.})$, and the charge-compressibility, $\chi_n$ for $\hat{O} = N$, where $N = \sum_{\ell \neq 0} (n_{\ell,\uparrow} + n_{\ell,\downarrow})$. The pairing and charge fluctuations are strongly enhanced with decreasing temperature, signaling a near degeneracy between the competing tendencies towards superconductivity and phase-separation [11]; see Fig. 2(b)-(c). However, upon approaching the superconducting $T_c$ from above, the pair-susceptibility diverges (i.e., $\chi_\Delta \rightarrow 0$; Fig. 2b), while the compressibility saturates to a finite value (Fig. 2c).

In two-dimensions, the superconducting $T_c$ can be obtained using the criterion $D_s(T \rightarrow T_c^-) = 2T_c/\pi$ [23], where $D_s(T) = [-\Delta_{\text{pair}}(q \rightarrow 0)/4]$ is the superfluid stiffness. Here, $\Lambda_{\text{pair}}(q)$ is the paramagnetic current-current correlation function at zero Matsubara frequency and $K_x$ is the diamagnetic current correlator [24]. In Fig. 2(d), we show the data for $D_s(T)$ for $(U, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.75)$ (solid) and $(U, \zeta) = (1.5, 0.5)$ (dashed). To a reasonable approximation, $T_c \propto \zeta^{-2}$, as shown in Fig. 1(b). This is expected based on our discussion of the effective XXZ model in the small $\zeta$ limit. A superconducting instability with $T_c \propto U$ has been reported in earlier DQMC computations involving topological flat-bands [15, 16], and more recently in topologically trivial flat-bands [18]. Our numerically exact analysis of this non-perturbative regime and the complementary analytical results obtained using the XXZ pseudospin Hamiltonian offer new insights into the role of a tunable metric on flat-band superconductivity.

We now include a repulsive nearest-neighbor density
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interaction, $V = 0.08$, and analyze the phase diagram for a range of fillings near $n = 1$ (Fig. 1c). The main effect of the repulsive interaction is to spontaneously break the discrete translational symmetry and induce a charge density wave order at an ordering wavevector of $(\pi, \pi)$. In Fig. 3(a), we plot the CDW correlation length $\xi_{\text{CDW}}$, for different system sizes with $n = 1$; the crossing-point marks the transition temperature, $T_{\text{CDW}}(n = 1) = 0.08 \pm 0.01$. We have extracted $\xi_{\text{CDW}}$ and the associated $T_{\text{CDW}}$ as a function of $n$ for a range of fillings near $n = 1$; note that a fully insulating CDW is present only at the commensurate filling $n = 1$ (green vertical line in Fig. 1c). Next, we address the fate of this insulating CDW when doped with electrons or holes away from $n = 1$.

At a low temperature, $T = 0.008$, we calculate $D_s$ for a range of fillings near $n = 1$ (Fig. 3b); for reference, we also draw the line $(2\pi/T)$, which determines the superconducting $T_c$. By analyzing carefully the finite size effects, we find the critical carrier densities beyond which the ground state exhibits superconducting order to be $n_c = 0.923 \pm 0.006$ and $n_c = 1.062 \pm 0.008$ for hole and electron doping, respectively. We remark that the non-vanishing stiffness $D_s$ in the normal state is due to finite size effects [15]. Fig. 1(c) summarizes $n_c$ for different temperatures. $T_c$ vanishes for $n = 1$ and increases monotonically with $\delta n = |n - 1|$, suggesting that superconductivity arises due to excess (“doped”) electrons or holes relative to the ordered CDW insulator. Importantly, along with superconductivity, the CDW remains long-range ordered. Thus the resulting phase is a super-solid, with a finite superconducting phase stiffness and a spontaneously broken lattice translational symmetry. The lightly doped system can effectively be described in terms of a dilute liquid of interacting bosons with a superconducting $T_c \propto \delta n$, up to additional logarithmic corrections [26-28].

It is interesting to examine the single-particle spectrum of the different phases. To this end, we compute $A(k, \omega) = -\text{Im} G(k, \omega)/\pi$ from the imaginary time Green’s function, $G(k, \tau) = \sum_{l, \sigma} \langle \hat{c}_{k,l,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k,l,\sigma}^{\dagger}(0) \rangle$ via the maximum entropy method [29]. Similarly, we also compute the two-particle spectrum in the pairing and density channel, respectively [20].

We focus on $V = 0$ first. The results for the single and two-particle spectra are summarized in Figs. 4(a)-c) at $n = 0.93$, $T = 0.016$, and $\zeta = 0.75$. The single electron spectrum [Fig. 4(a)] exhibits two nearly flat bands at $\omega \approx \pm 0.25$, that are well separated from a slightly broader band at $\omega \approx 2(= \Delta_{\text{pp}})$. The latter is clearly the higher energy flat band associated with $H_0$. The bands at $\omega \approx \pm 0.25$ originate from the low-energy flat band of $H_0$, that splits due to the Hubbard interaction; specifically, the splitting energy is approximately $\Delta_{s_c} = U/4$, the gap associated with the $\zeta = 0$ limit of the projected Hamiltonian. The spectrum of pairing and density excitations [Figs. 4(b,c)] show linearly dispersing, Goldstone-like modes near the $\Gamma$-point. These modes can be understood as arising from the approximate SU(2) symmetry of the attractive Hubbard interaction projected to the flat band [30].

We now set $V = 0.08$. The single and two-particle spectra are summarized in Figs. 4(d)-(f) at $n = 1$ and $T = 0.016$. The high-energy band at $\omega \approx 2(= \Delta_{\text{pp}})$ in Fig. 4(d) is nearly identical to the previous case. However, the low-energy bands are significantly more dispersive than in Fig. 4(a). This dispersion is due to the density assisted hopping terms (Fig. 1) of the projected Hamiltonian. Incorporating the CDW, which is generated due to a finite $V$, on a mean-field level, $\Delta_{\text{CDW}} \equiv (|\langle \xi \rangle|^2\eta_c^2)$, induces a dispersion, $\omega = \pm \varepsilon_k$,

$$\varepsilon_k = \bar{\Delta} - \frac{U\zeta^2\Delta_{\text{CDW}}}{4} \left( 2 \sum_{a=\pm} \cos k_a + \sum_{a=x,y} \cos 2k_a \right), \quad (4)$$

where $k_\pm = k_x \pm k_y$. Here, $\Delta_{\text{CDW}}$ controls the bandwidth while the center of the bands, $\bar{\Delta}$, accounts for the energy scales for breaking a pair and creating a point defect in the CDW. In the small $\zeta$ limit, this energy is $\bar{\Delta} = \frac{U^2}{4} - 4\Delta_{\text{CDW}}\bar{\epsilon}_s$ [20]. We fit the dispersing bands in Fig. 4(c) to the above expression in Eqn. 4 (dashed orange lines) using $\bar{\Delta}$, $\Delta_{\text{CDW}}$ as free parameters.

Turning to the two-particle spectra (Fig. 4e,f), we find that the linearly dispersing Goldstone mode near the $\Gamma$-point is gapped for $n = 1$ and $V = 0.08$, while the density spectrum (Fig. 4f) shows a clear softening near the CDW ordering wavevector, $M = (\pi, \pi)$. Increasing $\zeta$ while keeping all other parameters fixed, we have extracted the single-particle and two-particle gaps, $\Delta_p$ and $\Delta_{pp}$, at $T = 0$ near the $\Gamma$-point (Figs. 4g-h, respectively). As long as $\zeta < 0.7$, $\Delta_p$ decreases with increasing $\zeta$, in agreement with the expectation $\Delta_p = \frac{U^2}{4} + 2V - \frac{U}{2}\zeta^2$ [Eq. (4)]. $\Delta_p$ assumes its minimal value at $\zeta \approx 0.75$. Similarly, $\Delta_{pp}$ is largest for $\zeta = 0$ and decreases with increasing $\zeta$ (Fig. 4 h), vanishing for $\zeta > 0.815$. It is important to note that the onset of superconductivity at $\zeta_c = 0.815$, as inferred from the behavior of $\varepsilon_{\text{SC}}/L$ (Fig. 1d), is accompanied by a finite $\Delta_{\text{CDW}}$; the transition from CDW to supersolid order belongs in the $(2 + 1)$-dimensional XY universality class. In the pseudospin notation introduced in Eqn. 3, the supersolid is represented by a canted antiferromagnet, where the in-plane (XY) ferromagnetic components represent the SC while the out-of-plane antiferromagnetic component represent the CDW.

Discussion. - Our work highlights phase competition in flat bands with non-trivial band geometry. By construction, these systems are very strongly correlated; in addition, due to the band geometry, quantum fluctuations are important even in the perfectly flat band limit. As a result, the phase diagram can be difficult to predict a priori, without controlled calculations.

We have demonstrated this rich physics by a sign problem-free, explicitly solvable model with a tunable quantum metric. The model exhibits a cascade of quantum phases. The interactions within the flat band lead to the formation of a charge density wave phase, whose...
electronic excitations acquire a non-trivial dispersion due to the band geometry. Increasing this dispersion by tuning the quantum metric ultimately leads to a further instability towards a supersolid phase. We expect such cascades of different ordering tendencies to arise also in realistic flat-band systems, such as those that occur in two-dimensional van der Waals materials.
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Appendix A: Wannier wave function

The non-interacting Hamiltonian, Eq. (1) of the main text, can be rewritten in a rotating frame as

\[
H_0(k) = -t (\sin \alpha_k \tau_x + (-1)^\sigma \cos \alpha_k \tau_y)
\]

\[
= -t \left( (-1)^\sigma \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k \tau_x \tau_y e^{-i \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k \tau_z} \right).
\]

(A1)

Then the eigenstates at momentum \(k\), satisfying

\[
H_0(k) \varphi_{\pm,k,\sigma} = \pm \varphi_{\pm,k,\sigma}
\]

(A2)

are readily given by the rotating eigenvectors of \(\tau_y\),

\[
\varphi_{\pm,k,\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i \frac{1}{2} (-1)^\sigma \alpha_k \tau_z} (1 \mp i \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k \tau_y)\).
\]

(A3)

To derive the exponentially localized Wannier orbitals that span the lower energy band, we introduce,

\[
b_{r_i}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{-i r_i \cdot k} c_{k,\sigma}^\dagger, \quad a_{r_i}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_r e^{i r_i \cdot k} c_{r_i,\sigma}^\dagger.
\]

(A4)

Hence, we have,

\[
b_{r_i,l,\sigma}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{-i r_i \cdot k} b_{k,l,\sigma}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{-i r_i \cdot k} \varphi_{l,k,\sigma}(l) \tilde{d}_{k,\lambda,\sigma}^\dagger
\]

\[
\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{-i r_i \cdot k} \varphi_{l,k,\sigma}(l) \tilde{d}_{k,\lambda,\sigma}^\dagger = \frac{1}{A} \sum_{k,r_j} e^{-i r_i \cdot k} \varphi_{l,k,\sigma}(l) e^{i r_i \cdot k} \tilde{d}_{r_j,\sigma}^\dagger = \sum_{r_j} \Phi_{r_i,\sigma}(r_j, l) \tilde{d}_{r_j,\sigma}^\dagger
\]

(A5)

\[
\Phi_{r_i,\sigma}(r_j, l) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{i (r_i \cdot r_j - l) k} \varphi_{-k,\sigma}(l),
\]

(A6)

where we dropped the band index in the last step of Eq. (A5). The Wannier orbitals are given by \(\Phi_{r_i,\sigma}(r_j, l)\) and \(\tilde{d}_{r_j,\sigma}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{A}} \sum_k e^{-i r_i \cdot k} \tilde{d}_{k,\sigma}^\dagger\) creates an electron centered around the \(r_j\)th unit cell with spin \(\sigma\).

Appendix B: Quantum geometric tensor

The quantum geometric tensor of the lower band, \(\varphi_{-k,\sigma}\), is given by

\[
G_{ij}(k, \sigma) = \langle \partial_i \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | (1 - | \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle \langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \rangle \partial_j \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle.
\]

(B1)

The derivatives are readily determined from Eq. (A3),

\[
| \partial_j \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle = i (\partial_j \alpha_k \left( \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k \tau_z \right) | \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle,
\]

\[
\langle \partial_i \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | = -i (\partial_i \alpha_k \left( \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k \tau_z \right) \langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \tau_z \rangle.
\]

(B2)

Note that due to the chiral symmetry the wave function has equal support on both orbitals such that \(\langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \tau_z \rangle \langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \rangle = 0\) and hence \(\langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \partial_j \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle = 0\). Therefore, we have

\[
G_{ij}(k, \sigma) = \langle \partial_i \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \partial_j \varphi_{-k,\sigma} \rangle
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{4} (\partial_i \alpha_k) (\partial_j \alpha_k) \langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \tau_z \rangle \langle \varphi_{-k,\sigma} | \tau_z \rangle
\]

(B3)

\[
= \frac{1}{4} \xi^2 \sin k_i \sin k_j
\]

(B4)

and the quantum geometric tensor integrates to

\[
\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} dk_x dk_y G_{ij}(k, \sigma) = \frac{\xi^2}{8} \delta_{ij},
\]

\[
\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} dk_x dk_y \sum_{\sigma} \text{Tr} [G_{ij}(k, \sigma)] = \frac{\xi^2}{2}.
\]

(B6)
Supplemental Figure S1. Imaginary-time displaced correlation functions for representative ζ and respective fits used to extract single- and two-particle excitation energies Δ_p and Δ_pp: (a) ⟨T c□(0)c† □(τ)⟩ for hole, (b) ⟨T c□(τ)c† □(0)⟩ for electron, and (c) ⟨T Δ□(0)Δ† □(τ)⟩ for two-particle excitations.

Appendix C: Absence of O(ζ) terms in projected Hamiltonian

Here we address the origin of absence of terms in the projected Hamiltonian that are linear in ζ. Those contributions vanish due to the chiral symmetry and the orbital independent interaction. For example, a density assisted hopping of the form d†□x,σdr,σ′d□r,σ′ is not generated as the contributions from both orbitals differ exactly by a sign and cancel each other. Note that these perturbations remain a higher order correction in case of a weakly broken chiral symmetry or orbital-dependent interaction strength. The above operator generates odd parity sites and is therefore suppressed in 1/U. In case of orbital dependent U_i, the relevant perturbation is of order ζ^2(U_1 - U_2)^2/(U_1 + U_2).

Appendix D: Correlation length of the charge density wave

In the main text, we analyse the correlation length of the charge density wave [Figure 3(a) of the main text]. It is defined as

$$\xi_{CDW} = (2\sin(\pi/L))^{-1} \left[ \frac{S_N((\pi,\pi))}{S_N((\pi,\pi) + \delta q)} - 1 \right],$$

where δq is a smallest non-vanishing momentum of the lattice and S_N(q) is the equal-time density correlation function [25]. The ratio ξ_{CDW}/L increases (decreases) with system size in long-range ordered (disordered) phases. The ratio is an RG-invariant quantity such that the crossing point between different lattice sizes locates the phase transition.

Appendix E: Single- and two-particle gap

We use the imaginary-time displaced correlation functions ⟨T c□(0)c† □(τ)⟩ and ⟨T c□(τ)c† □(0)⟩ to extract the single particle gap Δ_p, and the symmetrized pair correlation function ⟨T Δ□(0)Δ† □(τ)⟩ + ⟨T Δ† □(0)Δ □(τ)⟩ to extract the two-particle gap. In both cases, we focus on the center of the BZ, Γ, where the band minimum is located. We employ the ground state version of the DQMC algorithm where a trial wave function |Ψ_T⟩ is projected onto the ground state |Ψ_{GS}⟩ = e^{-\Theta H_T} |Ψ_T⟩ with Θ = 30. Hence, the correlation function decays exponentially with imaginary time τ where the decay rate is set by the excitation energies, e.g., ⟨T c□(τ)c† □(0)⟩ = \sum_{\Psi_n} e^{-\tau(E_n - E_0)} |\langle \Psi_n | c□(0) | Ψ_{GS} ⟩|^2, where |Ψ_n⟩ is the n\textsuperscript{th} eigenstate of the interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H} with energy E_n and E_0 refers to the ground state energy. Note that this projective QMC algorithm is based on the canonical ensemble with fixed particle numbers. Here, we choose a trial wave function at quarter filling n = 1 with N = L\textsuperscript{2}/4 particles. Since c□† creates an additional particle, Ψ_n has to contain N + 1 particles and the decay rate in the long imaginary time limit determines E_{N+1} - E_N. Similarly, ⟨T c□(0)c† □(τ)⟩ provides access to E_{N-1} - E_N. We extract the decay rate by fitting exponentially decaying tail of
the correlation function as shown in Fig. S1(a),(b) and combine them to be independent of the chemical potential as
\[ \Delta_p = 0.5(E_{N+1} + E_{N-1} - 2E_N). \]

We use the symmetrized pair correlation function to extract the two-particle gap \( \Delta_{pp} \) by fitting the exponentially decaying tail as shown in Fig. S1(c). Strictly speaking, we should again determine the two correlation function \( \langle T \Delta \Gamma_\tau(0) \Delta \Gamma(\tau) \rangle \) and \( \langle T \Delta \Gamma^\dagger(0) \Delta \Gamma(\tau) \rangle \) separately, determine their decay rates and combine both results to \( \Delta_{pp} = 0.5(E_{N+2} + E_{N-2} - 2E_N) \). Instead, we average both correlation function before extracting the decay rates. This is justified due to the similarity of both excitations energies and the corresponding exponential decay rate, directly visible in Fig. S1(c), in particular for \( \zeta = 0.82 \) and \( \zeta = 0.92 \) where the two-particle excitation gap vanishes in the supersolid phase.

Finally, let us derive the analytical expression for the single-particle gap, \( \Delta_p = U_4 + 2V - \frac{7}{8}U\zeta^2 \), in the small-\( \zeta \) limit. When \( \zeta = 0 \), all the terms in the projected Hamiltonian commute and the fully-polarized CDW states are the ground states. The additional electron can be added at the empty sites and the energy cost is given by the Hubbard interaction, contributing \( \frac{U_\text{eff}}{2} \), and the energy of a defect with respect to the CDW, \( -4\Delta_{\text{CDW}}^2J_z \). For a finite \( \zeta \), the quantum fluctuations reduce the order parameter \( \Delta_{\text{CDW}} = 1/2 - O(\zeta^2) \). Additionally, the density-assisted hopping terms allow the defects to delocalize and the dispersion is given by \( -\frac{U\zeta^2}{4}2\sum_{a=\pm} \cos k_a + \sum_{a=x,y} \cos 2k_a \), where the density operator, \( \eta_z \), is replaced by its expectation value. Note that the band bottom is located at \( k_{\text{min}} = (\pi, \pi) \). Altogether, we have

\[ \Delta_p = \frac{U_\text{eff}}{2} - 4\Delta_{\text{CDW}}^2J_z - \frac{U\zeta^2}{4}2\sum_{a=\pm} \cos k_a^{\text{min}} + \sum_{a=x,y} \cos 2k_a^{\text{min}} \]  

\[ = \frac{U}{4} - \frac{U\zeta^2}{8} - J_z - \frac{U\zeta^2}{8}6 \]  

\[ = \frac{U}{4} + 2V - \frac{7}{8}U\zeta^2. \]  

\[ (E1) \]  

\[ (E2) \]  

\[ (E3) \]