The fate of density waves in the presence of a higher order van Hove singularity
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Topological transitions in electronic band structures, resulting in van Hove singularities in the density of states, can considerably affect various types of orderings in quantum materials. Regular topological transitions (of neck formation or collapse) lead to a logarithmic divergence of the electronic density of states (DOS) as a function of energy in two-dimensions. In addition to the regular van-Hove singularities, there are higher order van Hove singularities that have a power-law divergences. By employing renormalization group techniques, we study the fate of density wave phases (spin-density and charge-density waves) formed by the nesting of parts of the Fermi surface when a higher order van Hove singularity (HOVHS) appears in parallel. We find that the phase formation can be boosted by the presence of the singularity depending on the strength of certain interactions, with the critical temperature increasing by orders of magnitude. We discuss applications of our findings to different experimental systems such as Sr$_2$RuO$_7$ and transition metal dichalcogenides.

Introduction. Phase transitions, due to spontaneous symmetry breaking, with the emergence of an order parameter, are closely connected to specific features of the electronic band structure of itinerant systems. For example, various density waves appear in systems with nesting in the electronic band structure, i.e. the spectrum of the electronic excitations close to the Fermi level is characterized by $\varepsilon_p + \mathbf{Q} \approx -\varepsilon_p$ where the vector $\mathbf{Q}$ is the nesting vector. Well known representatives of density waves are the archetypical chromium [1], cuprates [2], iron pnictides [3, 4], organics [5], and transition metal dichalcogenides [6]. Intriguingly, in a range of these materials the band structure hosts energetically close-by singularities in the density of states $\nu$ (DOS), which have been conjectured often to be crucial ingredients stabilizing the emergent phases [7,12].

Singularities and the associated divergence of DOS are a signature of the Fermi surface’s topological transitions [13,14]. The two more well-known cases dealt by Lifshitz [15] in his original work were the appearance or collapsing of a neck and the appearance or collapsing of a pocket in Fermi surface. The former case was the ordinary van Hove singularity (VHS), with the Fermi surface locally consisting of one pair of intersecting straight lines. These two types of Fermi surface topological transitions have been observed along with non-trivial consequences due to interactions in a wide range of quantum materials including cuprates, iron arsenic and ferromagnetic superconductors, cobaltates, Sr$_2$RuO$_4$, heavy fermions [16,25].

However, HOVHS display more exotic phenomena such the non-trivial magnetic and thermodynamic properties in Sr$_2$RuO$_7$ [13], correlated electron phenomena in twisted bilayer graphene near half filling [26], the so-called super-metal with diverging susceptibilities in the absence of long range order [27] and unusual Landau level structure in gated bilayer graphene [14]. Recently, a classification scheme for Fermi surface topological transitions and their associated DOS divergence was developed [28,29] and the effects of disorder were studied [30].

Here, we study the general question about the fate of a density waves, SDW or (current) CDW, that is formed due to nesting of two parts of the Fermi surface when the Fermi energy is tuned so that a Fermi surface topological transition with HOVHS in the DOS at nearly the Fermi level emerges. If the degree of nesting is not significantly changed due to the HOVHS, is the density wave phase going to be suppressed or get boosted?

Model. We take three patches within the first Brillouin zone, two of them (patch 1 and 2) are nested both in the presence and absence of patch 3, which is the one associated with the singular DOS. The dispersion relations are $\varepsilon_1(k) = -\varepsilon_2(k + Q) = \nu_F(k_x - k_p)$ and $\varepsilon_1(k) = \varepsilon_3(-k)$ where $\nu_F$ is the Fermi velocity and $k_F$ is the Fermi momentum of the two nested parts of the FS. The dispersion relation of the third patch with respect to the chemical potential $\mu$ is modelled by $\varepsilon_3(k) = \alpha k^2 + k_x^4 + 6k_x^2 k_y^2 - \mu$ where $\mu$ is the chemical potential and $\alpha \ll 1$ which we take $\alpha = 0$ for simplicity. This is the form that has been recently considered for a higher order VHS in Sr$_3$Ru$_2$O$_7$ [13]. However, the consequences of this work are more general. As $\alpha = 0$, the place of the singularity is at $\mu_c = 0$. The resulting DOS per spin
for patch 3 is:

\[ \nu(\mu) = \alpha_4 |\mu|^{-1/2} \text{ with } \alpha_4 = \frac{1}{8} \frac{\sqrt{T}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)}, \]  

where \( \Gamma \) denotes the gamma function. We consider all possible short-range electron-electron interactions allowed by symmetry and obeying the conservation of momenta. We assume \( Q \) to be incommensurate, as such Unklapp processes are not relevant. Taking into account all possible relevant two-particle-interactions involving fermions in the three patches, the effective Hamiltonian reads:

\[
\mathcal{H} = \int d\mathbf{k} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} \sum_{a=1,2,3} \epsilon_a(\mathbf{k}) c_{a\sigma}^\dag(\mathbf{k}) c_{a\sigma}(\mathbf{k}) + g_1 \int \{d\mathbf{k}_i\} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{1\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_1)c_{2\sigma'}(\mathbf{k}_2)c_{2\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_3)c_{1\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_4) \\
+ g_2 \int \{d\mathbf{k}_i\} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{1\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_1)c_{2\sigma'}(\mathbf{k}_2)c_{1\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_3)c_{2\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_4) + g_3 \int \{d\mathbf{k}_i\} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{1\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_1)c_{2\sigma'}(\mathbf{k}_2)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_3)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_4) \\
+ g_4 \int \{d\mathbf{k}_i\} \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_1)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_2)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_3)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_4) + g_5 \int \{d\mathbf{k}_i\} \sum_{\sigma\sigma',a=1,2} c_{a\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_1)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_2)c_{3\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_3)c_{a\sigma}(\mathbf{k}_4) + h.c.
\]

where \( a \) labels the patches, \( \sigma, \sigma' \) are spin indices, patches 1 and 2 are the nested ones and are taken equivalent. The \( g_i \) term describes density-density interactions between patches 1 and 2. \( g_2 \) takes into account exchange interactions between patches 1 and 2, \( g_4 \) describes pair transfer between patch 3 and patches 1 and 2, while \( g_5 \) describes density-density interaction within patch 3 and \( g_6 \) describes density-density and exchange interactions respectively between patch 3 and each of patches 1 and 2. The interactions which are solely within patch 1 or patch 2 are irrelevant and are not presented in the Hamiltonian. The conservation of momentum is assumed. In principle the effective Hamiltonian and the relative strength of the interactions can be obtained starting with a short-range interaction, when the orbitals that play dominant role at each patch are known. We leave the parameters quite general to account for different possibilities. In the following, we use dimensionless \( g_i \)’s with \( g_i = \nu_0(\sigma)\bar{g}_i \) where \( \nu_0(\sigma) \) is the DOS per spin of the patches 1 and 2.

**Susceptibilities.** As the geometry of the system dictates there are two characteristic momenta. The first one is the nesting vectors \( Q \), which connects patches 1 with 2. The second one \( \bar{Q} \) connects patches 1 with 3 and 2 with 3. In the following, we denote by \( \Pi \) the particle-hole and by \( C \) the particle-particle non-interacting susceptibilities respectively. The particle-hole susceptibilities for the patches 1 and 2 and \( \Pi^{(12)}(\omega = 0, Q) = -T \sum_n \int d\mathbf{k} G_1(\omega_n, \mathbf{k}) G_2(\omega_n, \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{k}) \) is:

\[
\Pi^{(12)}(\omega = 0, Q) = -\nu_0^\dagger(\sigma) \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \tanh \left( \frac{\epsilon}{2T} \right)
\]

where \( G_{1,2}(\omega_n, \mathbf{k}) = [i\omega_n - H_{1,2}(\mathbf{k})]^{-1} \) are the corresponding Green’s functions. Similarly, for the particle-particle susceptibility \( C^{(12)}(\omega = 0, q = 0) = T \sum_n \int d\mathbf{k} G_1(\omega_n, \mathbf{k}) G_2(-\omega_n, -\mathbf{k}) \). In the RG process, the energy integration over the regions \([\epsilon - \delta\epsilon, \epsilon]\) and \([\epsilon, \epsilon + \delta\epsilon]\) results in:

\[
-\delta\Pi^{(12)}(\epsilon, Q) = \delta C^{(12)}(\epsilon, q = 0) = \nu_0 \tan \left( \frac{\epsilon}{2T} \right) \delta\epsilon.
\]

For patch 3 the leading divergences of free-particle susceptibilities are associated with the particle-particle \( C^{(33)} \) and particle-hole \( \Pi^{(33)} \) bubbles at zero momentum transfer. More specifically \[31\]:

\[
\delta\Pi^{(33)}(\epsilon, q = 0) = -\nu(\epsilon) \frac{T}{4} \cosh^2 \frac{\epsilon}{2T} \delta\epsilon, \\
\delta C^{(33)}(\epsilon, q = 0) = \nu(\epsilon) \frac{\tanh \left( \frac{\epsilon}{2T} \right)}{\epsilon} \delta\epsilon.
\]

where \( \nu(\epsilon) \) is given by Eq. [1]. Comparing Eqs. [2] [4] we see three different energy dependencies of the susceptibilities. At large energies \( \epsilon \gg T \) the slope of the susceptibilities in particle-particle and particle-hole channels for patches 1,2 are slowly decaying functions of \( \epsilon \) as \( -\delta\Pi^{(12)}/\delta\epsilon = \delta C^{(12)}/\delta\epsilon \sim 1/\epsilon \), which leads to the standard ultraviolet log(\( \Lambda \)) and infrared log(\( \epsilon \)) divergences. In contrast, the susceptibilities for the patch 3 decay much faster with \( \epsilon \) as \( \delta C^{(33)}/\delta\epsilon \sim \epsilon^{-3/2} \) and \( \delta\Pi^{(33)}/\delta\epsilon \sim \exp(-\epsilon/T)/\sqrt{\epsilon} \). The divergence at lower limit is removed by the temperature factor in the case of the particle-particle channels and it is completely absent in the case of the particle-hole channel. We have also checked the contribution of susceptibilities \( C^{(13)}(Q - \bar{Q}), \Pi^{(13)}(Q - \bar{Q}) \)
\(\tilde{Q}\) (similarly \(C^{(23)}\) and \(\Pi^{(23)}\) and found them to be negligible in comparison to \(\Pi^{(12)}, C^{(12)}, \Pi^{(33)}, C^{(33)}\). Therefore, in the next we do not include them. This simplification allows us to work in energy space without any consequence to the results.

**RG equations.** We employ one loop parquet RG, which can be connected to functional RG (e.g. Ref. [10]) and has been used successfully e.g. Refs [11, 32–35]. However, a cutoff scheme is needed for the implementation of the procedure. In this work we use energy shell RG and the cutoff scheme is:

\[
\frac{1}{i\omega_n - \varepsilon(k)} \rightarrow \frac{\Theta(|\varepsilon(k)| - \Lambda)}{i\omega_n - \varepsilon(k)}
\]

which interpolates between the zero propagator and the bare propagator as the cutoff \(\Lambda\) changes between 0 and \(\infty\), whereby one obtains the energy shell pRG.

For the RG equations we only include the terms with the most diverging susceptibilities and redefine the RG flow parameter \(L = \log\left(\frac{\Omega}{\Lambda}\right)\), where \(\Omega\) is the bandwidth of the pockets 1 and 2. The resulting set of the differential equations has the following form:

\[
g_1 = \eta_1 g_1^2 - \eta_2 g_2^2 + 2\eta_3 g_3 (g_6 - g_5)
\]

\[
g_2 = 2\eta_1 (g_1 g_2 - g_2^2) - \eta_2 g_3^2 + \eta_3 g_6
\]

\[
g_3 = -\eta_2 g_3 g_4
\]

\[
g_4 = (\eta_3 - \eta_2) g_4^2
\]

\[
g_5 = \eta_3 g_4 (g_6 - g_5)
\]

\[
g_6 = \eta_3 g_6 g_4
\]

The introduced functions \(\eta_2\) and \(\eta_3\) reflect the second scale imposed by \(\Pi^{(33)}\) and \(C^{(33)}\) while \(\eta_1\) effectively carries the temperature cut-off.

**RG Analysis** To understand the effect of the singularity, we compare the flow of \(g_1\) and \(g_2\) which are responsible for the formation of DWs, without and in the presence of patch 3. Without patch 3, \(g_1(L) = g_1^0/(1-g_1^0 L)\) where \(g_1^0\) is the bare value (initial condition) of \(g_1\) while the analytical result for \(g_2\) is more complicated [36]. From the leading order correction to SDW and CDW vertices \(\Gamma_{SDW}\) and \(\Gamma_{CDW}\) respectively [31], we obtain for the renormalized order parameters:

\[
\Delta_{SDW} = \Gamma_{SDW}(L) \Delta_{SDW}(L)
\]

\[
\Delta_{CDW} = \Gamma_{CDW}(L) \Delta_{CDW}(L)
\]

where \(\Gamma_{SDW}(L) = g_1(L)\) and \(\Gamma_{CDW}(L) = g_1(L) - 2g_2(L)\) [31]. To analyze the phases note that in general the RG equations are of the form \(\dot{g}_i = \sum A^i_{jk} g_j g_k\). Given that, by construction, only \(g_1\) and \(g_2\) can diverge, we can write:

\[
g_1 = \eta_1 g_1^2
\]

\[
g_2 = 2\eta_1 (g_1 g_2 - g_2^2)
\]

where we assume that all the effect of patch 3 is to renormalize strongly the value \(L_0\) of \(L\) where the divergence occurs. Then the solutions can take the form of the ansatz:

\[
g_1 = \frac{\bar{g}_1}{L_0 - L} + ..., g_2 = \frac{\bar{g}_2}{L_0 - L} + ...
\]

where the dots stand for regular terms. By Eq (9) and substituting the ansatz in Eq. (10) taking \(L \approx L_0\) in the argument of tanh: \(\frac{\bar{g}_1}{\frac{L_0 - L}{2}} \tan h(\frac{\Omega e^{-L}}{2T})\) and \(\frac{\bar{g}_2}{\frac{L_0 - L}{2}} \tan h(\frac{\Omega e^{-L}}{2T})\). Because \(\bar{g}_1\) is uncoupled from \(\bar{g}_2\) their divergences have to be handled separately. By inspection there are two cases: If \(\bar{g}_1 = 0\) then \(\bar{g}_2 = -1/(2\tan h 0)\) and the vertices are simplified to: \(\Delta_{SDW} \equiv 0\) and \(\Delta_{CDW} \equiv \Delta_{CDW}/(L_0 - L)\). Therefore \(\Delta_{CDW} = \text{const}/(L_0 - L) + ...\) and \(\Delta_{SDW} = \text{const} + ...\) where the dots stand for regular terms so that the CDW always wins. If, on the other hand, \(\bar{g}_1 \neq 0\) then: \(\bar{g}_1 = 1/\tan h 0\) and \(\bar{g}_2 = 1/(2\tan h 0)\). In this case: \(\Delta_{CDW} \equiv 0\) and \(\Delta_{SDW} \equiv \Delta_{SDW}/(L_0 - L)\). Therefore \(\Delta_{CDW} = \text{const} + ...\) while \(\Delta_{SDW} = A/(L_0 - L) + ...\) and the SDW is always the dominant one.

In Fig. 1 we see the flow of \(g_1\) and \(g_2\) in the absence of patch 3, along with the behavior of the SDW and CDW vertices for specific initial values \(g_1^0\) and \(g_2^0\). The divergence and as a result the SDW formation happens at a critical temperature \(T_c \simeq 10^{-6}\).
10^{-6}, already the level of accuracy of our numerical calculations. If patch 3 is present at the FS, then the rest of $g_i$’s come into play. For the same initial values as before $g_1$ and $g_2$ and for the same set of initial values of $g_5$, $g_6$ and $g_6$, we present the behavior of the vertices for two limiting cases of $g_6$ in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. In Fig. 2 where $g_6 = 0.05$, then the $T_c$ of SDW is boosted by 5 orders of magnitude to $T_c = 10^{-2}$ while in Fig. 3, for $g_6 = 0.4$ the formation of CDW is boosted, with $T_c$ four orders of magnitude greater than the $T_c$ of SDW without patch 3. As it is evident, the presence of the singularity, when $g_i$’s for $i = 3, 4, 5, 6$ are nonzero, leads to a boost of $g_1$ and $g_2$. Depending on the initial conditions the effect of the singular patch 3 on the DWs is summarised by the following statements: (i) the density wave is destroyed when $g_6 > g^0_6$ (ii) if $g_6 < g^0_6$ it is very much enhanced (with $T_c$ enhanced by potentially orders of magnitude), promoting SDW for smaller values of $g^0_3$ or CDW for larger values of $g^0_6$.

In the absence of patch 3, the flow equations Eq. (6) are such that the repulsive interactions cannot be reverted to attractive. It is easy to see that in this case $g_1$ can only grow, while $g_2$ can not change the sign. The presence of patch 3 makes possible for $g_1$ and $g_2$ to change sign and become negative (attractive) [34], due to overscreening effect caused by the HOVHS [32, 34]. This is a very interesting feature of the model. For lower temperatures we searched for the possibility $g_1$ and/or $g_2$ to diverge (signature of superconducting instability) but we concluded that under low temperature conditions this is not possible for this model.

**Discussion.** In this study we have considered the effect of a higher order van Hove singularity on the formation of a density wave (SDW or CDW) due
to nesting of other parts of the FS. The scattering through the patch with the singular DOS can have very important consequences, depending on the bare values of the interactions. It can definitely destroy the phase but surprisingly it can also boost the formation of the density wave and increase the corresponding $T_c$ by orders of magnitude. It is important to note that if the initial value of the pair-transfer between patch 3 and the other two patches is strong enough, a SDW can be turned to a CDW. The boosting of the DW formation happens as long as the exchange interactions between patch 3 and each of the nested patches is greater than the density-density interactions between patch 3 and each of the other two. In the opposite case, the DW gets destroyed.

The different bare values of the interaction mimics material-specific effects such as the specific geometry in the BZ of the patches and the orbitals involved which can be different in nature.

Recently, many surprising experimental results of Sr$_3$Ru$_2$O$_7$ [39] were explained assuming the presence of a HOVHS in a magnetic field [13]. The reason that SDW phases (A and B) [40] only appear adjacent to a HOVHS by tuning the external magnetic field, although the same nesting vector that was identified as the one connecting the edges of the $\gamma$-bands could also equally well connect existed other parts of the FS which respond less drastically to the magnetic field, was not explained. Although the difference of the present general theory to the experiments on Sr$_3$Ru$_2$O$_7$ is that the latter is a case of SU(2) symmetry breaking as HOVS appears when the minority spins in the $\gamma$-bands sink below Fermi energy, the present work can explain in principle why the SDW was detected only when the HOVHS appeared. There are parts of the FS that can provide the nest-
ing which are almost insensitive to the applied magnetic field while the $\gamma$-bands are strongly affected. These bands are responsible for the formation of the HOVHS which, in turn, boost the formation of SDW to a critical temperature that is measurable. Therefore, the mechanism presented here is the key one to explain the SDW formation through the effect of the singularity at the centre of the $\gamma$-bands to the other nested pieces of the BZ.

Our theory can also explain, in principle, the CDW formation in 1T-VSe$_2$ where a van Hove singularity is present [43]. A HOVHS at the $\Gamma$ point of the BZ can be also expected as seen in DFT calculations [44]. This geometry would correspond to a dispersion relation with a term $\propto k^6\cos(6\phi)$ that can boost the formation of the CDW. We expect this theory to apply to many different materials.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

\( \Pi^{(33)} \)\text{ **CALCULATION**}

The derivation for the polarization bubble \( \Pi^{(33)}(q=0, T) \) is provided here:

\[
\Pi^{(33)}(q \approx 0, T) = \int \int d^2p \frac{n(\varepsilon_3(p)) - n(\varepsilon_3(p+q))}{\varepsilon_3(p) - \varepsilon_3(p+q)} = \int \int d^2p \frac{\partial n(\varepsilon_3(p))}{\partial \varepsilon_3(p)} \tag{S1}
\]

where \( n(\varepsilon_3(p)) \) and \( \varepsilon_3(p) \) are the Fermi-Dirac distribution and the dispersion relation of patch 3 respectively. Using the hyperbolic coordinates: \( \eta = p^4 \sin 4\phi \) and \( \xi = p^4 \cos 4\phi \) and taking into account the Jacobian of the transformation, the integral is transformed to:

\[
\Pi^{(33)}(q = 0, T) = \int \int d\xi d\eta \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{(\xi^2 + \eta^2)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \frac{\partial n(\xi)}{\partial \xi} \]

\[
= -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} 32T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta \frac{1}{(\xi^2 + \eta^2)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \cosh^{-2} \left( \frac{\xi}{2T} \right) \]

\[
= -\frac{1}{4T} \int_{0}^{\infty} d\xi \frac{\nu(\xi)}{(\xi^2 + \xi^2)^{\frac{3}{4}}} \cosh^{-2} \left( \frac{\xi}{2T} \right) \tag{S2}
\]

where \( \nu(\xi) \) is the density of states for patch 3 (Eq. (1) of the main text for both spin species as we consider SU(2) symmetric case). We have also used the following relation: \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta \frac{1}{(\xi^2 + \eta^2)^{\frac{3}{4}}} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi T}(\xi^2 + \xi^2)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\xi^2 \Gamma(1 - \frac{1}{4})}, \quad \xi > 0 \). From Eq. (S2), we obtain Eq. (3) of the main text.

Performing the same change of variables to hyperbolic coordinates and following the same steps for the particle-particle channel, we get to Eq. (4) of the main text for \( \delta C^{(33)} \).
MORE CHARACTERISTIC CASES FROM RG CALCULATIONS

We present some more numerical results, for different cases which also support the conclusions of the main text.

FIG. S1: Case where the density wave order is not boosted by the presence of patch 3. The initial conditions are $g_1^0 = 0.05, g_2^0 = 0.1, g_3^0 = 0.5, g_6^0 = 0.1$ for both figures. Then for left one: $g_4^0 = 0.05, g_5^0 = 0.1$ and $T = 10^{-3}$. While for the right one: $g_4^0 = 0.25, g_5^0 = 0.3$ and $T = 10^{-5}$. We have also confirmed that for any value of $g_4^0$ there is no divergence as long as $g_3^0 < 0.3$.

FIG. S2: Case where the CDW is boosted by the presence of patch 3. The initial conditions are $g_1^0 = 0.05, g_2^0 = 0.1, g_3^0 = 0.4, g_6^0 = 0.5, g_0^0 = 0.1$ for all three figures. Then for left one: $g_4^0 = 0.05$ and $T_c = 10^{-4}$. For the middle one: $g_4^0 = 0.1$ and $T_c = 0.091$. While for the right one: $g_4^0 = 0.5$ and $T_c = 2.93 \times 10^{-4}$. We notice the trend that higher values of $g_4^0$ lead to lower values of $T_c$.

FIG. S3: Case with $g_1^0 > g_2^0$. For both figures the initial conditions $g_1^0 = 0.1, g_2^0 = 0.05, g_0^0 = 0.5, g_6^0 = 0.1$ are the same. Then for the left figure: $g_3^0 = 0.05, g_4^0 = 0.1$ and $T_c = 8.9 \times 10^{-4}$. For the right one: $g_3^0 = 0.3, g_4^0 = 0.1$ and $T_c = 5.5 \times 10^{-2}$. We further investigated that as long as $g_3^0 < 0.12$ we are in the SDW phase, on the contrary if $g_3^0 > 0.12$, the system changes density order to CDW.
FIG. S4: This is another interesting case with $g_1^0 > g_2^0$ but investigating the role of $g_3^0, g_4^0$. For both figures the initial conditions $g_1^0 = 0.1, g_2^0 = 0.05, g_3^0 = 0.5, g_4^0 = 0.1$ are the same. Then for the left figure: $g_1^0 = 0.05, g_2^0 = 0.3$ and $T_c = 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$. For the right one: $g_1^0 = 0.3, g_2^0 = 0.3$ and $T_c = 8 \times 10^{-3}$. For this set of parameters and for every value of $g_2^0$, if we start in the SDW (CDW) phase, we stay in the same.

**SDW AND CDW VERTICES**

Here we provide the equation for the vertices. Diagrammatically it is:

![Diagram](image1)

FIG. S5: The diagrammatic equations for the order parameter of SDW and CDW and the associated vertices. (a) for the SDW and (b) for the CDW.

For the CDW case and for the vertex corrections related to process $g_2$ there is a factor (-2), due to the associated internal bubble and the summation over the internal spin degree of freedom. As the result, as written in the main text for the vertices: $\Gamma_{SDW} (L) = g_1 (L)$ and $\Gamma_{CDW} (L) = g_1 (L) - 2g_2 (L)$.