Crystalline nodal topological superconductivity and Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces in monolayer NbSe$_2$
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We present a microscopic calculation of the phase diagram of the Ising superconductor NbSe$_2$ in presence of both in-plane magnetic field and Rashba spin-orbit coupling. Repulsive interactions lead to two distinct instabilities, in singlet- and triplet- interaction channels. In the regime of large fields, the topological character of the superconducting state depends strongly on the magnetic field direction. When the field is applied along one of the three $\Gamma$-K lines, a crystalline topological superconducting phase is stabilized, whereas for other field directions the pairing state is topologically trivial. Depending on the Cooper pairs' center-of-mass momentum, this superconducting state displays either Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces or point nodes. Moreover, a chiral topological superconducting phase with Chern number of 6 is realized in the regime of large Rashba and dominant triplet interactions, spontaneously breaking time-reversal symmetry.

Introduction. The observation of superconductivity (SC) in 1H monolayer transition metal dichalcogenides such as NbSe$_2$ and MoS$_2$ opens a new avenue to explore superconductivity in systems with strongly coupled spin-orbital degrees of freedom [1–11]. In contrast to their bulk counterparts, inversion symmetry is broken in these monolayers, giving rise to an Ising spin-orbit coupling (SOC) that forces the spins to point out-of-plane $[7, 8, 12–14]$. This Ising SOC is believed to be responsible for the experimental observation that the superconducting state survives up to remarkably large in-plane magnetic fields, far beyond the usual Pauli limit $[5–7, 10, 15, 16]$.

The combination of large Ising SOC, which lifts the spin degeneracy, with multiple Fermi pockets has inspired considerable interest in the potential for unconventional superconductivity in these materials $[12, 15, 17–27]$. In gated MoS$_2$, which has four spin-split Fermi pockets centered at the $\pm K$ points of the hexagonal Brillouin zone, repulsive inter-band interactions can stabilize a fully gapped triplet SC state $[19, 24, 25]$. Chiral topological superconductivity [28] both with and without large Rashba SOC has also been predicted in MoS$_2$ $[24, 26, 29]$, as has finite-momentum Cooper pairing $[26, 30]$. In NbSe$_2$ and its close relative TaS$_2$, which have Fermi pockets centered at the $\pm K$ and $\Gamma$ points, it was argued that for in-plane magnetic fields larger than the Pauli limiting field, a nodal topological SC state is realized, protected by an anti-unitary time-reversal like symmetry and characterized by Majorana flat bands at the sample’s edges $[17, 22]$.

Despite the flurry of activity on this front, important questions about the microscopic mechanism of unconventional SC and its stability in realistic experimental conditions remain unaddressed. Here, we go beyond phenomenological models and present a microscopic theory of superconductivity in NbSe$_2$ that considers all possible repulsive electronic interactions. Moreover, we include the simultaneous effects of an in-plane magnetic field $B$ and Rashba SOC, with energy scale $\alpha_{RPP}$ ($p_F$ is the Fermi momentum). The latter is commonly present experimentally and can in principle be controlled by gating or by the choice of substrate. Importantly, it changes qualitatively the phase diagram: the nodal SC topological phase present at large fields $[17]$ is generally destroyed by even a small Rashba SOC, as it lifts the nodes and breaks the time-reversal-like symmetry protecting them. The exception is when the $B$ field is parallel to one of the $\Gamma$-K directions: in that case, nodes located along the direction perpendicular to $B$ are protected by mirror symmetry, resulting in a crystalline topological SC phase that can be either nodal or exhibit protected Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces, depending on the momentum of the Cooper pairs.

Our analysis reveals two distinct $(B, \alpha_R)$ phase diagrams, shown in Fig. 1. If the inter-band repulsion coupling the $\Gamma$ and $\pm K$ Fermi pockets dominates, the SC state for $B = \alpha_R = 0$ is predominantly a singlet extended...
s-wave state with nearly isotropic gaps of opposite signs at Γ and ±K (Fig. 1a). If the inter-band processes coupling the K and −K Fermi pockets dominates, the dominant SC instability for \( B = \alpha R = 0 \) is towards a triplet \( f \)-wave state, characterized by isotropic gaps of opposite signs at \( K \) and −\( K \), and a nodal gap at Γ. While the crystalline topological SC phase is present in both phase diagrams for large \( \eta \) and \( B \approx 0 \) in the phase diagram of Fig. 1(b).

**Microscopic model and superconductivity.** The Fermi surface of undoped NbSe\(_2\) is shown in Fig. 2. The non-interacting Hamiltonian is given by:

\[
H_0 = \sum_{\eta \rho \sigma} \psi^\dagger_{\eta, \rho} [\epsilon_\eta(p) + \beta_\eta(p) \sigma^z + \alpha_R (\sigma \times p)_z] \psi_{\eta, \rho} \tag{1}
\]

where \( \psi^\dagger_{\eta, \rho} = (d^\dagger_{\eta, \rho, \uparrow}, d^\dagger_{\eta, \rho, \downarrow}) \) and \( d^\dagger_{\eta, \rho, \sigma} \) creates an electron at band \( \eta \) with spin \( \sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow \) and momentum \( p \) measured relative to the center of the pocket. The Fermi surface has three pairs of spin-split hole pockets centered at the \( \eta = \pm K, \Gamma \) points in the Brillouin zone. Here \( \epsilon_\eta(p) = -\frac{p_x^2}{2m_\eta} - \mu \) is the band dispersion, with \( m_K = m_\eta \). The Ising SOC has the form \( \beta_{\pm K} = \pm \beta_\Gamma \) near the ±K points and \( \beta_\Gamma = 2\lambda p^3 \cos \theta \) near the Γ point, where \( \theta \) is the angle measured relative to the Γ–K direction (see Fig. 2). Although Ising SOC vanishes along the Γ-M lines, \( \alpha_R \) does not, so the spin-degeneracy is fully lifted on all Fermi pockets. An in-plane magnetic field \( B \) adds a term \( H_{\text{Zeeman}} = -\sum_{\eta \rho \sigma} \psi^\dagger_{\eta, \rho} (\mathbf{b} \cdot \sigma) \psi_{\eta, \rho} \), where \( \mathbf{b} \equiv g_{\nu} \mu_B \mathbf{B} \) and \( g_\nu \) is the Landé g-factor.

A microscopic calculation of the electronic instabilities of this problem is possible in the regime of small Fermi surfaces, see also [31–34]. Experimentally, the Fermi level can be conveniently tuned by gating. Symmetry constrains the possible spin-conserving momentum-independent electronic interactions \( g_1 \) between the low-energy fermionic operators to eight. A parquet renormalization group (RG) calculation is employed to determine how these interactions change as higher-energy degrees of freedom are integrated out (details in the supplementary material, SM). We find that the only logarithmic instability is SC. Of the eight interactions, only the four shown in Fig. 2 contribute directly to the pairing channel: intra-pocket density-density interactions involving the Γ \( (g_1) \) and the ±K \( (g_2) \) pockets; and inter-pocket pair-hopping interactions between K and −K \( (g_3) \) and between Γ and ±K \( (g_4) \). The interacting Hamiltonian relevant to superconductivity is thus given by

\[
H_{\text{int}} = \frac{g_1}{2} \sum_{\nu \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, -\sigma} d_{\nu, \sigma} d_{\nu, -\sigma} + \frac{g_2}{2} \sum_{\nu \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, -\sigma} d_{\nu, \sigma} d_{\nu, -\sigma} + \frac{g_3}{2} \sum_{\nu \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, -\sigma} d_{\nu, \sigma} d_{\nu, -\sigma} + \frac{g_4}{2} \sum_{\nu \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, \sigma} d^\dagger_{\nu, -\sigma} d_{\nu, \sigma} d_{\nu, -\sigma} + h.c. \tag{2}
\]

To analyze the SC instabilities in the absence of SOC and magnetic fields, we introduce the gap functions at the Γ pocket, \( \langle \Delta_\Gamma(p) \rangle_{ss'} \propto \langle d_{\Gamma,p,\sigma} d_{\Gamma,-p,-\sigma} \rangle \), and at the ±K pockets, \( \langle \Delta_K(p) \rangle_{ss'} \propto \langle d_{K,p,\sigma} d_{-K,-p,-\sigma} \rangle \), and solve the RG-derived gap equations, which reduce to standard BCS-like equations. Here, \( s, s' \) are spin indices and \( \varepsilon, \varepsilon' = \pm 1 \) are valley indices. Even when all \( g_i \) interactions are purely repulsive, there are two possible SC instabilities, provided that one of the inter-pocket interactions, \( g_3 \) or \( g_4 \), overcomes the intra-pocket repulsion promoted by \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \). When \( g_4 \) is dominant, the resulting SC state is a singlet s-wave, with isotropic gaps \( \langle \Delta_\Gamma(p) \rangle_{ss'} = \Delta_{\Gamma,0} \langle \sigma^\varepsilon \rangle_{ss'} \) and \( \langle \Delta_K(p) \rangle_{ss'} = \Delta_{K,0} \langle \sigma^\varepsilon \rangle_{ss'} \), here, \( \sigma \) and \( \tau \) are Pauli matrices in spin and valley spaces, respectively. Because the two gaps have opposite signs, \( \text{sgn} \langle \Delta_{\Gamma,0} \rangle = -\text{sgn} \langle \Delta_{K,0} \rangle \), this is the so-called extended s-wave or \( s^k \)-wave state, previously proposed to be realized e.g. in iron pnictides [35] and strontium titanate [36].

In contrast, when \( g_3 \) is the dominant interaction, the SC instability is towards a triplet \( f \)-wave state, characterized by \( \langle \Delta_\Gamma(p) \rangle_{ss'} = \langle d_{\Gamma,p,\sigma} \sigma \sigma^\varepsilon \rangle_{ss'} \) and \( \langle \Delta_K(p) \rangle_{ss'} = \langle d_{K,p,\sigma} \sigma \sigma^\varepsilon \rangle_{ss'} \), where, \( \Delta_{\Gamma}(p) = \Delta_{\Gamma,0} \cos 3\theta d_{\Gamma} \) is the d-vector of the Γ pocket gap, whereas \( d_{K}(p) = \Delta_{K,0} d_{K} \) is the d-vector of the K pocket gap. Unlike typical triplet gaps, here \( d_K(p) \) is momentum independent, as \( \Delta_K(p) \) is anti-symmetric in the valley degrees of freedom. In order for \( \Delta_{\Gamma}(p) \) to be non-zero, sub-leading momentum-dependent interactions, which do not contribute significantly to the pairing instability, must be included (see SM). While here our focus is on SC due to purely electronic interactions, the SC states obtained above are not necessarily inconsistent with electron-phonon interactions, which are expected to promote intra-pocket attraction, thus reducing the amplitude – or even changing the sign – of the \( g_1, g_2 \) terms. **Superconducting phase diagrams in the presence of Rashba SOC.** We first perform a unitary transformation \( U_{\eta}(p) \) that diagonalizes the non-interacting Hamiltonian \( H_0 + H_{\text{Zeeman}} \), resulting in new electronic operators.
\[ c_{n\tau r} = U_{n\tau r}^* (p) d_{n, ps}. \] Here, \( \tau = \pm 1 \) replaces the spin index \( s = \uparrow, \downarrow \) and labels respectively the inner and outer spin-polarized pockets centered at \( \eta = \Gamma, \pm K \) (see Fig. 2). For uniform SC (i.e. with zero center-of-mass momentum), the paired electrons are either both from inner pockets or both from outer pockets. The gap functions are now \( \Delta_{\eta r} (p) \propto \langle c_{n\tau r} e^{-i q_{pr}} \rangle \) with non-trivial momentum dependence arising from the unitary transformation \( U_{n\tau r}^* (p) \) (details in the SM).

We obtain two qualitatively different \((b, \alpha_R)\) SC phase diagrams depending on which inter-band interactions are dominant, which we refer to as the “singlet instability” and “triplet instability” phase diagrams, respectively. This refers to the form of the superconducting gap in the absence of SOC and B. Note, however, that the SC states themselves are always a mixture of singlet and triplet for finite SOC and B. We first analyze the phase diagram of Fig. 1(a), where the dominant \( g_1 \) interaction gives the singlet extended \( s \)-wave state in the limit of vanishing SOC and magnetic field. In this case, the gap at the \( \pm K \) pockets is nearly isotropic. Along the \( b = 0 \) axis, the main effect of increasing the Rashba SOC \( \alpha_R \) is to make \( \Delta_{\Gamma r} (p) \) mildly anisotropic, due to the small admixture of the nodal triplet \( f \)-wave state. Importantly, no phase transition happens along this axis. In contrast, along the \( \alpha_R = 0 \) axis, a phase transition takes place to a nodal topological SC state for \( b = b_p \), where \( b_p \approx \Delta_{\Gamma 1} \) corresponds roughly to the Pauli-limiting field [37, 38]. This phase transition, and the topological character of the resulting nodal SC state, were previously predicted in Ref. [17] and can be understood as a consequence of the vanishing of the Ising SOC along the six \( \Gamma - M \) directions, where the SC gap vanishes and 12 nodes (6 for each \( \Gamma \) pocket) appear due to spins aligning with the magnetic field. The energy spectrum at the inner \( \Gamma \) Fermi surface, as well as its spin texture, are shown in Fig. 3(a).

Moving away from the \( \alpha_R = 0 \) axis, the Rashba SOC introduces a second spin-orbit energy scale that does not vanish along the \( \Gamma - M \) directions. As a result, generally even an infinitesimal Rashba SOC lifts the nodes and destroys the topological character of this state, as shown by the energy spectrum of Fig. 3(b). The only exception is when \( B \) is aligned along one of the \( \Gamma - K \) directions: in this case, as we discuss in detail below, the system has a mirror symmetry such that spins along the \( \Gamma - M \) line perpendicular to \( B \) align with the magnetic field (as long as \( \alpha_{RFF} < b \)). As a consequence, two pairs of nodes originally present along the line perpendicular to \( B \) are protected, whereas the remaining eight nodes are gapped (see Fig. 3(c) showing the pair on the inner Fermi surface), resulting in a crystalline topological SC state.

Due to the simultaneous presence of \( \alpha_R \) and \( b \), the Fermi surface is no longer inversion-symmetric. This leads to two important consequences for the crystalline topological SC state: first, the two nodes on the same Fermi surface move away from the Fermi level in opposite directions, resulting in residual Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces, as shown in Fig. 3(c) (cf. [39–42]). In contrast to the trivial SC state, these Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces are guaranteed to exist due to the stability of the nodes. Second, the Cooper logarithm is suppressed for a non-inversion-symmetric Fermi surface. We find, however, that the uniform SC state remains stable for sufficiently small \( \alpha_R \) and \( b \), as indicated by the dashed line in Fig. 1(a) (details in the SM). Outside this range (opaque regions of the phase diagram), SC is still possible, but with a finite Cooper pair momentum, similarly to the so-called FFLO state [30, 43–45]. In particular, if the pair-momentum matches the displacement of the centers of the Fermi pockets, the nodes move back to the Fermi level, resulting in the crystalline nodal topological SC phase shown in Fig. 3(d). Because this pair-momentum maximizes the gapping of the Fermi surface, it is likely the one chosen by the SC state to maximize the condensation energy.

Moving on to the phase diagram shown in Fig. 1(b), which is promoted by a dominant \( g_1 \) interaction, we note many similarities with the phase diagram of Fig. 1(a). One difference is that the nodal topological SC state along the \( \alpha_R = 0 \) line can occur for arbitrarily small values of \( b \), due to the absence of the Pauli limit in this regime [37, 38]. Along the \( b = 0 \) line, the nodes on the \( \Gamma \) pocket are lifted due to an admixture with the sub-leading singlet state generated by small differences between the density of states of the inner and outer Fermi surfaces. The main difference, however, is the emergence of a chiral \( p \pm ip \) superconducting state at large values of \( \alpha_R \) (of the order of the Ising SOC) at \( b = 0 \). The chiral phase occurs because the gap formally transforms as a two-dimensional irreducible representation of the relevant \( C_{3v} \) point group. Analyzing the gap equations beyond the linearized approximation (see SM), we find that time reversal is spontaneously broken [46, 47]. While our calculations give a nodal gap \( \Delta_{\Gamma r} (p) \), these nodes are not symmetry-enforced, and can be lifted by sub-leading terms not included in our model. This results in a gapped chiral topological SC with a Chern number of \( \pm 6 \) (\( \pm 2 \) from the \( \Gamma \) pocket, and \( \pm 4 \) from the \( \pm K \) pockets), and gapless chiral edge modes resulting in a thermal Hall conductivity \( \kappa_{xy} = \pm 6 (\pi^2 k_B^2 / 3h) T \) [28]. This topological SC phase survives for some range of \( b \), but our approach is insufficient to quantitatively obtain the phase boundary (see blue dashed line in Fig. 1(b)).

**Crystalline gapless topological superconductivity.** Having established the existence of a SC phase for large magnetic fields in the phase diagrams of Fig. 1, we now discuss its topological properties. As discussed in Refs. [48–53], two-dimensional gapless topological phases are stable only in the presence of certain symmetries, which guarantee stability of both the bulk nodes and of the corresponding edge modes. When \( \alpha_R = 0 \), the SC state has both particle-hole symmetry and an anti-unitary time-reversal-like symmetry \( \tilde{T} = i\sigma^x K \) (\( K \) is complex conjugation, and \( \sigma^x \) acts on the spin index), which is a composition of time-reversal symmetry and a reflection with respect to the \( xy \) plane. \( \tilde{T} \) reverses the in-plane momen-
FIG. 3. Superconducting excitation spectrum for the inner Fermi surface at $\Gamma$ in the presence of an in-plane magnetic field and without (panel a) or with (panels b, c, d) Rashba SOC. In panel b (panels c and d), $\mathbf{B}$ is aligned away from (parallel to) the $\Gamma$-$K$ lines. In panel c (panel d), the Cooper pair has zero (non-zero) center-of-mass momentum. Insets show the resulting spin textures along the normal-state Fermi surfaces for the corresponding field directions, with colors as in Fig. 2 and arrows indicating in-plane spin components.

The notable exception is when $\mathbf{B}$ is parallel to one of the $\Gamma$-$K$ directions: in this case, the system has a mirror symmetry associated with reflection about the plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{B}$. Combined with particle-hole symmetry, this mirror reflection can protect the four nodes in the reflection plane (see Fig. 3(c))[51, 52, 56]. For example, when $\mathbf{B}$ is parallel to the $x$ axis, the mirror symmetry corresponds to a reflection with respect to the $yz$ plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{B}$, which also flips the $y$ and $z$ components of spin: $\mathcal{M}_x = i\sigma^x R_{yz}$, where the reflection $R_{yz}$ corresponds to $(x, y, z) \rightarrow (-x, y, z)$ and, as above, $\sigma^x$ acts on the physical spin indices. As discussed in the SM, for $\alpha_{\text{RPF}} < b$, this symmetry forbids any fermion bilinears that can lift the nodes, although it allows terms that move the nodes in a staggered way above and below the Fermi level, giving rise to Bolyubov Fermi surfaces. This analysis is sufficient [51] to guarantee topological stability of the nodes; thus, the crystalline SC state is stable in a wide region of the phase diagrams of Fig. 1. We emphasize that the topological nature of the $\alpha_R \neq 0$ SC state is qualitatively different than of the $\alpha_R = 0$ SC state, as in the former case the symmetry that protects the SC state is not time-reversal-like, but a mirror symmetry – hence the denomination crystalline gapless topological SC [51, 52].

By the bulk-boundary correspondence [51, 52], there are edge bands terminating at the nodes (see SM). Fig. 4 shows the Bogolyubov-de Gennes (BdG) spectrum on a $150 \times \infty$ unit cell strip with open zig-zag edges parallel to the $y$ direction, and $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{x}$, in the uniform superconducting state. Each state $\psi_k$ is colored according to the inverse participation ratio $\sum_y |\psi_k(y)|^4$, such that the boundary (bulk) modes are red (blue). A cut containing the nodes along $p_x = 0$ of the bulk BdG spectrum is shown in yellow. Unlike in other nodal topological superconductors [17, 48, 49, 57], the edge modes are not pinned to zero energy, and are not in general flat (cf. drumhead modes in crystalline nodal semimetals [58–60]). In actual materials, the existence of both bulk nodes and corresponding boundary states is guaranteed only if the relevant mirror reflection is an exact symmetry. As such, these may be sensitive to orientational defects in the crystal.

Concluding remarks: Our microscopic interacting model for NbSe$_2$ predicts multiple possible exotic superconducting phases in this material, tuned by the Rashba SOC $\alpha_R$ and the in-plane magnetic field $B$. Two different primary SC instabilities can be driven by purely
electronic interactions: a singlet extended s-wave and a triplet \( f \)-wave instabilities. The triplet instability supports a chiral topological SC state for small \( b \) and large \( \alpha_R \), and both instabilities support a crystalline topological SC state for large \( b \) and small \( \alpha_R \). Interestingly, the topological properties of the latter phase depend crucially on the \( B \) field being aligned along one of the \( \Gamma-K \) directions.

Although direct experimental detection of these topological SC states may be technically challenging, their indirect experimental manifestations should be accessible. For instance, because the chiral SC state transforms as a two-dimensional irreducible representation of the trigonal space group, it should be strongly affected by strain, with \( T_c \) splitting into 2 separate transitions under externally applied uniaxial strain [61]. As for the crystalline topological SC state, its extreme sensitivity to the field direction is expected to promote strongly anisotropic properties. Specifically, since the nature of the SC state changes as a function of the \( B \) direction, one expects pronounced six-fold anisotropies in the upper critical field and in the critical current. Such anisotropies should vary significantly as the Rashba SOC is changed. Moreover, the presence of Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces should also be manifested in several experimental observables that are sensitive to the existence of a finite DOS at zero energy [62].
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I. GAP EQUATIONS

The interactions presented in Eq. (2) of the main text can be expressed in the form:

$$H_{\text{Int}} = V^\alpha_\Gamma \delta^{\beta_1} \delta^{\beta_2} \delta^{\beta_3} \delta^{\beta_4} \frac{d^4 \mathbf{p}}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \frac{d^4 \mathbf{k}}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \text{Tr} \left[ \gamma_5 d^\alpha \gamma_5 d^\beta \gamma_5 d^\gamma \right] + \text{h.c.}$$

where $V^\alpha_\Gamma$ includes all Hermitian conjugates, the uniform part of anti-symmetric nature of the fermion operators (and in-
flow equations for \( \mu = 0 \) and \( \mu = t \) decouple:
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\tilde{g}}(\mu) &= -\left(\tilde{g}(\mu)\right)^2 - 2 \left(\tilde{g'}(\mu)\right)^2 \\
\dot{\tilde{g'}}(\mu) &= -2 \left(\tilde{g'}(\mu)\right)^2 - \left(\tilde{g}(\mu)\right)^2 \\
\dot{\tilde{g}}(\mu) &= -\left(\tilde{g}(\mu) + 2\tilde{g'}(\mu)\right)^2
\end{align*}
\]  
(S6)

where the dot indicates a derivative with respect to the RG scale \( x \) determined by the pairing susceptibility via

\[-N_\eta x = \Pi_\eta = T \sum_\omega \int d\Lambda \left[g(\omega, Q)G(\omega, -\omega, -Q)\right] d^2Q (2\pi)^3 \]  
(S9)

where \( \omega_n \) is a Matsubara frequency and the momentum integral is restricted to a thin shell at energy \( \Lambda \) and of thickness \( d\Lambda \equiv \Lambda_x \). Here,

\[ G(\omega, Q) = \frac{1}{\omega_n - \epsilon_\eta(Q)} \]  
(S10)

is the bare normal state Green’s function. Eq. (S6) has an analytic solution, which can be obtained by switching to a cylindrical coordinate system in the \( \tilde{g}(\mu), \tilde{g'}(\mu) \), and \( \tilde{g}(\mu) \) parameter space:

\[ z(\mu) = 2\tilde{g}(\mu) + \tilde{g'}(\mu) \]

\[ r(\mu) \cos \theta(\mu) = \tilde{g}(\mu) \]

\[ r(\mu) \sin \theta(\mu) = 2\tilde{g'}(\mu) - \tilde{g}(\mu) \]

The RG equations become:

\[ \dot{z}(\mu) = -\frac{(z(\mu))^2}{2} - \frac{r(\mu)^2}{2} (1 + 7 \cos^2 \theta(\mu)) \]  
(S11)

\[ \dot{r}(\mu) = -r(\mu)z(\mu) \]  
(S12)

\[ \dot{\theta}(\mu) = 0 \]  
(S13)

The last equations indicates that one channel, parametrized by \( \theta(\mu) \), is not renormalized within the one-loop. The other two channels decouple according to:

\[ \gamma(\mu) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dx} \left(z(\mu) + r(\mu)\sqrt{1 + 7 \cos^2 \theta(\mu)}\right) = (\gamma(\mu))^2 \]  
(S14)

In terms of the coupling constants \( g \), we have:

\[ 2\gamma(\mu) = -\tilde{g}(\mu) - 2\tilde{g'}(\mu) \pm \sqrt{(\tilde{g}(\mu) - 2\tilde{g'}(\mu))^2 + 8(\tilde{g'}(\mu))^2} \]  
(S15)

Clearly, only when \( \gamma(\mu) > 0 \) the coupling constant flows to \( \infty \). Note that since \( \gamma(\mu) > \gamma(\mu) \), the former would diverge faster than the latter. Having determined the RG flow of the coupling constants, we now discuss which instabilities they cause. To do so, we need to introduce vertices associated with different types of electronic order. We first start with the pairing vertices \( \Delta(\mu)(p) \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta_-^{(\mu)}(p) &= i\sigma y D_-^{(\mu)} \\
\Delta_+^{(\mu)}(p) &= \sqrt{2} \cos 3\phi p \sigma' i\sigma y D_+^{(\mu)} \\
\Delta_\pm^{(\mu)}(p) &= \pm \sigma' i\sigma y D_\pm^{(\mu)}
\end{align*}
\]  
(S16)

where \( i = x, y, z \) denotes the three different components of the triplet SC channel and \( \partial_{\Gamma, \mu} \) is the angle about the \( \Gamma \) Fermi surface. Here, \( D_-^{(\mu)} \) are momentum-independent coefficients. Note that \( \Delta(\mu)(p) = -\left[\Delta(\mu)(-p)\right]^T \) due to the anti-commutation relations of fermionic creation and annihilation operators. The one-loop vertex flow correction is then

\[ [\delta \Delta^{(\mu)}(p)]_{\alpha\beta} = \Pi_\eta' \int [V(k; p)]^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta'} [\Delta^{(\mu)}(k)]_{\gamma\delta'} \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} \]  
(S17)

with a sum over repeated indices implied. This reduces to a system of \( 2 \times 2 \) equations for the \( D^{(\mu)}_\ell \) coefficients:

\[ \frac{d}{dx} \left( D^{(\mu)}_\ell \right) = -\left( \frac{\tilde{g}(\mu) + 2\tilde{g'}(\mu)}{\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_x}}} \right) \left( D^{(\mu)}_\ell \right) \]  
(S18)

which is solved by diagonalizing the matrix. It is clear that the eigenvalues correspond precisely to the decoupled RG effective couplings \( \gamma(\mu) \). Thus, \( \gamma(\mu) > 0 \) implies a SC transition in the corresponding \( \mu \) channel.

We now move on to investigate whether density-wave particle-hole instabilities in the spin and charge channels are competitors of the particle-particle instability. The corresponding vertices are

\[ \Delta^{(\mu)}(p) = d^{\mu}_\pi \sigma_{\alpha\beta} d^{\mu}_\eta \]  
(S19)

with \( \mu = 0 \) corresponding to CDW and the rest to SDW order parameters (here we are ignoring the small momentum dependence). Because the pockets at \( K \) and \( \Gamma \) are both hole pockets, the spin and charge density-wave channels completely decouple from the SC channels. Explicitly, while the particle-particle bubble

\[ \Pi_\eta = \int \frac{\mathrm{tanh} \frac{\eta}{2\epsilon_\eta}}{2\epsilon_\eta} d^2Q (2\pi)^3 \]  
(S20)

has a logarithmic divergence when integrated over all momenta, the particle-hole bubble does not:

\[ \chi_\eta = T \sum_\omega \int g^{(0)}(i\omega, Q)G^{(0)}(\omega, -Q) d^2Q (2\pi)^3 = -\int \frac{\mathrm{tanh} \frac{\eta}{2\epsilon_\eta}}{4\pi} \frac{d^2Q}{(2\pi)^3} \]  
(S21)

Consequently, any particle-hole channel is subleading to the SC channel within weak-coupling. For example,

\[ \delta \Delta^{(\text{CDW})}_{\Gamma, \Gamma} = 2\chi_\Gamma g_1 \Delta^{(\text{CDW})}_{\Gamma, \Gamma} + \chi_\Gamma \frac{g_\eta + g_\pi}{2} \Delta^{(\text{CDW})}_{K, K} \]  
(S22)

There are additional CDW and SDW vertices, but all the equations have \( \chi_\eta \) in them and thus the flows are all exponentially suppressed by a factor of \( \text{sech} \frac{\eta}{2\epsilon_\eta} \) as a result. This agrees with the analysis of Ref. [4], which only found leading particle-hole instabilities because the \( \Gamma \) pocket was electron-like and nested with the \( K \) pocket.
B. Self-Consistent Mean-Field Gap Equations

We established above that the leading weak-coupling instability is in the SC channel. We now proceed to incorporate the effects of SOC and magnetic fields. The key point is that the flow equations for the SC gaps, Eq. (S17), yields precisely the linearized BCS-like gap equations one would obtain by projecting the $g$ interactions onto the singlet and triplet SC channels. Thus, to make the analysis simpler, hereafter we focus on the linearized gap equations only.

We first need to express the interactions in terms of the eigenstates of the single body Hamiltonian with Ising SOC, Rashba SOC, and magnetic field. The non-interacting Hamiltonian given in the main text is diagonalized by performing a unitary transformation

$$c_{\eta, \tau} = U_{\eta, \tau}^{\alpha}(p)d_{\alpha, p}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S23)

where $\tau = \pm 1$ (−1) on the outer (inner) spin-split Fermi surface, $\alpha = 1$ (−1) for spin up (spin down), and we have defined

$$U_{\tau}^{\alpha}(p) = \frac{\delta_{\Gamma} + \tau \alpha (2\lambda p^3 \cos 3\theta_p)}{2\delta_{\Gamma}}(\tau e^{-i\phi})^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S24a)

$$U_{\alpha, \tau}^{\alpha}(p) = \frac{\delta_{K} + \tau \alpha \beta_{\tau}}{2\delta_{K}}(\tau e^{-i\phi})^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S24b)

Here

$$\delta_{\Gamma} = \sqrt{(2\lambda p^3 \cos(3\theta_p))^2 + (\alpha_R p_y + b_z)^2 + (\alpha_R p_x - b_y)^2}$$

$$\delta_{K} = \sqrt{\beta_{\tau}^2 + (\alpha_R p_y + b_z)^2 + (\alpha_R p_x - b_y)^2}$$

$$e^{i\phi} = \frac{\alpha_R p_y + b_z + i(-\alpha_R p_x + b_y)}{\sqrt{(\alpha_R p_y + b_z)^2 + (\alpha_R p_x - b_y)^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S25)

where $p$ is the momentum at the Fermi surface centered at $\Gamma$ or $\pm K$, $b \equiv g_\nu \mu B$, $\alpha_R$ is the Rashba SOC parameter, $\beta_{\tau}$ is the Ising SOC parameter at $K$, and $\lambda$ is the Ising SOC parameter at $\Gamma$. Projecting the interactions onto the spin-split Fermi surfaces gives

$$H_{\text{Int}} = \sum_{\Gamma, \Gamma', \tau, \tau'} \tilde{V}_{\Gamma, \Gamma'}^{\tau, \tau'} c_{\tau}^\dagger G_{\tau}^\dagger c_{\tau'}^\dagger G_{\tau'} + \tilde{V}_{\pm K, \pm K}^{\tau, \tau'} c_{\tau}^\dagger G_{\tau}^\dagger c_{\tau'}^\dagger G_{\tau'} + \tilde{V}_{\pm K, \pm K}^{\tau, \tau'} c_{\tau}^\dagger G_{\tau}^\dagger c_{\tau'}^\dagger G_{\tau'} + \tilde{V}_{\pm K, \pm K}^{\tau, \tau'} c_{\tau}^\dagger G_{\tau}^\dagger c_{\tau'}^\dagger G_{\tau'}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S26)

with (repeated indices are summed implicitly in the expression below):

$$\tilde{V}_{\eta, \eta'}^{\tau, \tau'}(p, k) = U_{\eta, \tau}^{\alpha}(p)U_{\eta', \tau'}^{\beta}(k)U_{\eta, \tau'}^{\beta}(k)U_{\eta, \tau}^{\alpha}(p) \hspace{1cm} (S27)$$

where we define the pocket index $\eta = K, -K, \Gamma$, and use the convention that $-\Gamma \equiv \Gamma$. Note that after this projection, all interactions are momentum-dependent.

For later purposes it is useful to derive the gap equation from the Ginzburg-Landau free energy. To do this, we perform a Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation which introduces the bosonic fields/gap functions

$$\Delta_{\Gamma, \tau}(p) \propto \langle c_{\Gamma, \tau}^\dagger G \cdot \tau - \tau^\dagger G \rangle$$

$$\Delta_{\Gamma, \tau}(p) \propto \langle c_{\pm K, \tau}^\dagger G - \tau^\dagger G \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (S28)

where the momentum $p$ is measured with respect to the center of the Fermi pocket in question in all cases, and $\epsilon = \pm 1$. For convenience of notation, we define $\Delta_{\pm K, \tau}(p) = \Delta_{\pm K, \tau}(p)$. Because particle-hole symmetry imposes $\Delta_{-K, \tau}(p) = -\Delta_{K, \tau}(-p)$, it is sufficient to determine $\Delta_{K, \tau}$ only.

After the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation we obtain the Bogolyubov-Gor’kov effective Hamiltonian:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p, \eta, \tau} \xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) \psi_{p, \eta, \tau} \psi_{p, \eta, \tau}^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p, \eta, \tau} \xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) + \mathcal{H}_0(\Delta^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S29)

where

$$\mathcal{H}_0(\Delta^2) = -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{p, \eta, \tau, \kappa} \Delta_{\eta, \tau}(p) \left( \tilde{V}^{-1}(p : k) \right)_{\eta', \tau'} \Delta_{\eta', \tau'}(k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S30)

and where we use the Nambu-Gor’kov representation

$$\Psi_{\eta, \tau}(p) = (\xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) \Delta_{\eta, \tau}(p) \Delta_{\eta, \tau}^\dagger(p) - \xi_{\eta, \tau}(p))$$  \hspace{1cm} (S31)

Here $\xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) = \xi_{\eta}(p) + \tau \delta_{\eta}(p)$ are the eigenvalues of the non-interacting part of the Hamiltonian (\delta_{\eta} defined in (S25)). Note that when TRS is broken, $\xi_{\eta, \tau}(-p) \neq \xi_{\eta, \tau}(p)$ in general. The BdG spectrum is given by the eigenvalues of the BdG Hamiltonian, one of which is

$$E_{\eta, \tau}(p) = \xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) + \sqrt{\xi_{\eta, \tau}(p)^2 + \left| \Delta_{\eta, \tau}(p) \right|^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S22)

with

$$\xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) = \frac{\xi_{\eta}(p) + \xi_{\eta}(-p)}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S33)

where

$$\xi_{\eta, \tau}(p) = \frac{\xi_{\eta}(p) - \xi_{\eta}(-p)}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S34)

The second eigenvalue is fixed by particle-hole symmetry to be $-E_{-\eta, \tau}(-p)$. Using the fact that

$$\det[-i\omega + \mathcal{H}_{\eta, \tau}(p)] = (-i\omega + E_{\eta, \tau}(p))(-i\omega - E_{-\eta, \tau}(-p))$$  \hspace{1cm} (S35)

we obtain the Ginzburg-Landau free energy:
\[ F = -\frac{T}{2} \sum_{\nu \pi \tau} \ln \left[ 2 \cosh \left( \frac{\beta E_{\nu \pi \tau}^\eta (\mathbf{p})}{2} \right) \right] - \frac{T}{2} \sum_{\nu \pi \tau} \ln \left[ 2 \cosh \left( \frac{\beta E_{-\nu \pi \tau}^\eta (-\mathbf{p})}{2} \right) \right] + \mathcal{H}_0 \left( \Delta^2 \right) \]  

(S36)

To obtain the linearized gap equation we expand \( F \) to first order in \( |\Delta_{\nu \pi \tau}^\eta|^2 \), which yields

\[ F^{(2)} = -\frac{T}{2} \sum_{\nu \pi \tau} \ln \left[ 2 \cosh \left( \frac{\beta E_{\nu \pi \tau}^\eta (\mathbf{p})}{2} \right) \right] + \mathcal{H}_0 \left( \Delta^2 \right) \]  

(S37)

Splitting the sum into radial and angular components we identify the particle-particle bubble or pairing susceptibility:

\[ \Pi_{\nu \pi \tau}(\theta_{\eta \mathbf{p}}) = -\frac{\sum \tanh \left( \frac{\beta E_{\nu \pi \tau}^\eta (\mathbf{p})}{2} \right) + \tanh \left( \frac{\beta E_{-\nu \pi \tau}^\eta (-\mathbf{p})}{2} \right)}{2 \xi_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p})} \]  

(S38)

where \( \theta_{\eta \mathbf{p}} \) is the angle along the \( \tau \) Fermi surface relative to the center of the pocket \( \eta \) (below we simply use \( \theta \) when this is clear from context). Ignoring the coupling between the inner and outer Fermi surfaces centered at the high-symmetry points and minimizing the free energy in Eq. (S37) with respect to \( \Delta_{\nu \pi \tau}^\eta(\mathbf{p}) \) yields the linearized gap equation:

\[ \Delta_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} \int \Pi_{\nu \pi \tau}(\theta_{\eta \mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{k}) \tilde{V}_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{k}) \Delta_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{k}) \frac{d\theta_{\eta \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}}}{2\pi} \]  

Changing variables from \( p \) to \( \xi_{\nu \pi \tau} \) and assuming that the Fermi surface is inversion symmetric (i.e. \( \xi_{\nu \pi \tau} = 0 \)), we find

\[ \Pi_{\nu \pi \tau}(\theta_{\eta \mathbf{p}}) = -N_{\nu \pi} \ln \frac{1.13\lambda}{T} \]  

with \( N_{\nu \pi} \) the density of states at the inner or outer Fermi surface at the \( \eta \) pocket and \( \Lambda \) is the cut-off energy as before. In section III below, we revisit the issue of how breaking the inversion symmetry of the Fermi surfaces suppresses the logarithm and eventually destroys the uniform SC state.

The projected interactions can be expressed conveniently as:

\[ \tilde{V}_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mu, \alpha \beta i} g_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) h_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{q}) f_{\mu}(\mathbf{q}) \]  

(S41)

where \( h_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{q}) \) are constants independent of \( \mathbf{p} \) and \( \mathbf{k} \). Explicitly, \( g_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{q}) \) are constants independent of \( \mathbf{p} \) and \( \mathbf{k} \). The gap function is

\[ \Delta_{\nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\mu} D_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) \]  

(S42)

where \( D_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) \) are gap coefficients independent of momentum to be determined. Explicitly,

\[ Q_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} (i\sigma^\alpha \gamma^\alpha \beta) U_{\nu \pi \tau}^\alpha(\mathbf{p}) U_{\nu \pi \tau}^\beta(-\mathbf{p}) \]  

(S43)

\[ Q_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) = \pm \sum_{\alpha \beta} (i\sigma^\alpha \gamma^\alpha \beta) U_{\nu \pi \tau}^\alpha(\mathbf{p}) U_{\nu \pi \tau}^\beta(-\mathbf{p}) \]  

(S44)

The additional factors of \( i \) in the last two expressions are taken for convenience, making the \( D_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) \) coefficients real when the density of states are equal on inner and outer Fermi surfaces. The structure of the reduced equation implies that we can take \( D_{\eta \nu \pi}(\mathbf{p}) = D_{\eta \nu \pi}^\alpha(\mathbf{p}) = D_{\eta \nu \pi}^\beta(\mathbf{p}) \), and we thus drop the \( \tau \) index on \( D \) hereafter. Moreover, particle-hole symmetry enforces \( D_{\eta \nu \pi}^\alpha(\mathbf{p}) = D_{\eta \nu \pi}^\beta(\mathbf{p}) \), consistent with the fact that \( \Delta_{\eta \nu \pi}^\alpha(\mathbf{p}) = -\Delta_{\eta \nu \pi}^\beta(-\mathbf{p}) \).

Plugging the form (S43) back into the gap equation (S39) yields the reduced gap equation

\[ D_{\eta \nu \pi}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\eta \nu \pi \rho} g_{\eta \nu \pi \rho}(\mathbf{p}) f_{\eta \nu \pi \rho}(\mathbf{p}) \]  

(S44)

or more explicitly

\[ D_{\gamma}^{(0)} = \sum_{\mu} \left( g_{1} f_{\mu}^{(0)} K D_{\gamma}^{(0) \mu} + 2 g_{4} f_{\mu}^{(0) K} D_{\gamma}^{(0) \mu} \right) \]  

(S45)

\[ D_{\gamma}^{(0)} = \sum_{\mu} \left( 2 g_{4} f_{\mu}^{(0) K} D_{\gamma}^{(0) \mu} + (g_{2} + g_{3}) f_{\mu}^{(0) K} D_{\gamma}^{(0) \mu} \right) \]  

\[ D_{\gamma}^{(i)} = \sum_{\mu} \left( g_{1} f_{\mu}^{(i)} K D_{\gamma}^{(i) \mu} + 2 g_{4} f_{\mu}^{(i) K} D_{\gamma}^{(i) \mu} \right) \]  

\[ D_{\gamma}^{(0)} = \sum_{\mu} \left( 2 g_{4} f_{\mu}^{(i) K} D_{\gamma}^{(i) \mu} + (g_{2} - g_{3}) f_{\mu}^{(i) K} D_{\gamma}^{(i) \mu} \right) \]  

where \( \mu = 0, x, y, z \), and form factors \( f_{\mu}^{(i)} \) given by:

\[ f_{\mu}^{(i) \eta}(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\tau} \Pi_{\tau} Q_{\eta \nu \pi \tau}(\mathbf{p}) f_{\mu}^{(i) \eta}(\mathbf{p}) \frac{d\theta_{\eta \mu \mathbf{k}}}{2\pi} \]  

(S46)

Note that due to the SOC the singlet and triplet channels do not decouple in general, and the superconducting gaps are neither spin singlet nor spin triplet. Eq. (S45) can be expressed as an \( 8 \times 8 \) matrix equation, leading to 8 possible superconducting solutions, of which we choose the one with the highest \( T_{c} \). The solutions can be found analytically when either the magnetic field or Rashba SOC is absent, but otherwise the equations have to be solved numerically.
To define the singlet and triplet instability regimes discussed in the main text, we consider the limit of no SOC and magnetic field. In this case, the (0) term reduces to the usual singlet gap, while (i) reduce to components of the triplet gap with d-vector aligned along \( i = x, y, z \). We define a dominant singlet (dominant triplet) instability to occur when the largest eigenvalue of the matrix equation (S45) is for the spin singlet (spin triplet) gap. The transition temperature for each channel is given by the condition that the corresponding eigenvalue of the gap equation equals 1. This yields \( T_c^{(0)} = 1.13 \Lambda \exp \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi \eta \tau}} \right) \), where \( \Lambda \) is the DOS of all bands (assumed to be equal), \( \Lambda \) is the upper energy cutoff, and:

\[
2\gamma^{(s)} = -g_1 - g_2 - g_3 + \sqrt{(g_1 - g_2 - g_3)^2 + 8g_4^2} \tag{S47}
\]
in the singlet channel and

\[
2\gamma^{(t)} = g_3 - g_2 + |g_2 - g_3| \tag{S48}
\]
in the triplet channel. These expressions coincide with those obtained from the RG analysis above; note that, since \( |g_4| < |g_3| \), we neglected \( g_4 \) in the expressions above. Thus, for repulsive interactions, a SC state is realized when the the inter-band repulsions \( g_3 \) and \( g_4 \) dominate over the intraband repulsions \( g_2 \) and \( g_4 \). In this case, the singlet instability dominates for large \( g_4 \), while the triplet instability dominates for large \( g_3 \). Fig. (S1) shows solutions of the gap equations in different regimes of the phase diagrams of Fig. 1 of the main text. See the Section V for parameter values.

II. SPONTANEOUS TIME-REVERSAL SYMMETRY BREAKING

As discussed in the main text, for large enough \( \alpha_R \) and \( b = 0 \), the triplet-instability phase diagram displays spontaneous time-reversal symmetry breaking, resulting in a chiral \( p \pm ip \) superconducting phase. To show that indeed time-reversal symmetry is broken in this phase, we need to go beyond the linearized gap equations of the previous section. Note that in the basis (S23) we are working with, at \( b = 0 \) TRS acts as \( T e^{\pm \eta} T^{-1} = i \tau \bar{e}^{\mp \eta} \bar{e}^{\eta} \), which means that it takes the term \( \Delta_{\eta\eta}(p) e^{\pm \eta(p)} P \) to \( -e^{2\theta} \Delta_{\eta\eta}^*(p) e^{\pm \eta(p)} P \). Taking \( \Delta_{\eta\eta}(p) = e^{\phi_{\eta\eta}(p)} \Delta_{\eta\eta}(p) \), TRS is satisfied when \( e^{\phi_{\eta\eta}(p)} = \pm i e^{-i\theta} \).

Assuming equal densities of states on inner and outer Fermi surfaces, for \( b = 0 \) the different \( \mu \) in the reduced gap equation (S45) are not coupled, so \( \Delta_{\eta\eta}(p) = D_{\eta\eta}^{(s)}(p) \xi_{\eta\eta}(p) \) are themselves solutions of the gap equation

\[
\frac{\Delta_{\eta\eta}(p)}{\Delta_{\eta\eta}^{(s)}} = \frac{\tau^R e^{i\theta} D_{\eta\eta}^{(s)}}{\tau^R e^{i\theta} D_{\eta\eta}^{(s)}} \tag{S49}
\]

for each \( \mu = 0, x, y, z \). Explicitly, for \( b = 0 \) they are

\[
\Delta_{\Gamma}(0)(p) = \tau^R e^{-i\theta} D_{\Gamma}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

\[
\Delta_{\pm K}(0)(p) = \tau^R e^{-i\theta} D_{K}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

\[
\Delta_{\pm K}(\pm)(p) = \sqrt{2i} \tau^{R} \cos^2(2\theta) \frac{\lambda p^2}{\delta_y(p)} D_{\Gamma}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

\[
\Delta_{\pm K}(\tau)(p) = 3 \tau^R e^{-i\theta} \sin \theta \cos 3\theta \frac{\lambda p^2}{\delta_y(p)} D_{\Gamma}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

\[
\Delta_{\mp K}(\pm)(p) = \tau^R e^{-i\theta} \frac{\lambda p^2}{\delta_y(p)} D_{K}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

\[
\Delta_{\mp K}(\tau)(p) = 3 \tau^R e^{-i\theta} \sin \theta \cos 3\theta \frac{\lambda p^2}{\delta_y(p)} D_{K}^{(s)}(p) \tag{S49}
\]

The key point is that the \( (x) \) and \( (y) \) solutions are degenerate, i.e. have the same \( T_c \). Formally, they belong to the 2D E irreps of \( C_{3v} \), the relevant point group in this regime. We therefore associate these two solutions with \( x \)-wave and \( \eta \)-wave states. We now need to establish whether all of the \( D_{\eta}^{(x)}(p) \) and \( D_{\eta}^{(y)}(p) \) are non-zero, and if so, what their relative phase is. Instead of solving the full non-linear gap equations, it is sufficient to focus on the quartic term of the Ginzburg-Landau free energy. Since \( b = 0 \), it follows that \( \xi_{\eta\eta}(p) = \xi_{\eta\eta}(p) \), and the free
energy in Eq. (S36) simplifies to
\[ F = -T \sum_{p \gamma \tau} \ln \left[ 2 \cosh \left( \frac{\beta E_{\eta \tau}(p)}{2} \right) \right] + \mathcal{H}_0 (\Delta^2) \] (S50)

Expanding in powers of the gap function, to quartic order we obtain:
\[ F^{(4)} = \frac{7 \zeta(3)}{64 \pi^2 T^2} \sum_{\eta \gamma} N_{\eta \gamma} |\Delta_{\eta \gamma}(p)|^4 \frac{d \phi_p}{2\pi} \] (S51)

where \( \zeta(x) \) is the Riemann zeta function. Substituting the general form of the gap function:
\[ \Delta_{\eta \gamma}(p) = \sqrt{2} e^{-i\phi} \cos \frac{\alpha_{RPF}}{\delta_0(p)} \left( D_{\Delta}^{(x)} \cos \theta + D_{\Delta}^{(y)} \sin \theta \right) \] (S52)

\[ \Delta_{\pm K \gamma}(p) = \pm i e^{-i\phi} \frac{\alpha_{RPF}}{\delta_0(p)} \left( D_{\Delta}^{(x)} \cos \theta + D_{\Delta}^{(y)} \sin \theta \right) \] (S53)

and approximating \( \frac{\alpha_{RPF}}{\delta_0(p)} \approx 1 \) (which is valid as long as \( \alpha_{RPF} \gg \lambda_p^F \)), we obtain:
\[ F^{(4)} = \frac{7 \zeta(3)}{2048 \pi^2 T^2} \sum_{\eta \gamma} N_{\eta \gamma} \left[ 3 \left( |D_{\Delta}^{(y)}|^2 + |D_{\Delta}^{(y)}|^2 \right)^2 \right. \]
\[ -4 |D_{\Delta}^{(x)}|^2 |D_{\Delta}^{(y)}|^2 \sin^2 \phi_{xy} \] (S54)

where \( \phi_{xy} \) is the relative phase between \( D_{\Delta}^{(x)} \) and \( D_{\Delta}^{(y)} \). A straightforward minimization gives \( \phi_{xy} = \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \), which implies that the ground state is a \( p \pm ip \) superconducting phase. Note that while the resulting \( \Delta_{\eta \gamma}(p) \) is actually nodal, there is an additional symmetry allowed term \( \Delta^{(a)} = e^{3i\phi} \) that belongs to the same \( E \) irreducible representation which lifts the nodes.

III. STABILITY OF THE UNIFORM SC STATE

An important question is whether the SC solution assumed in our analysis is stable against the combination of Rashba SOC and magnetic field, since the presence of both suppresses the logarithm in the gap equation (S39). To investigate this issue, we evaluate the particle-particle bubble in Eq. (S38) in the limit of \( \Lambda \gg \xi_{\eta \gamma} \), taking \( \xi_{\eta \gamma} \) from Eq. (S34) to be a function only of the direction \( \theta \) around the Fermi surface. This yields
\[ \Pi_{\eta \gamma}(\theta) = -\ln \left[ \frac{1.13 \Lambda}{T_c} \right] + \Re \left[ \psi \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{i \xi_{\eta \gamma}(\theta)}{2 \pi T_c} \right) - \psi \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \] (S55)

where \( \psi \) is the digamma function. As a result, at zero temperature
\[ \Pi_{\eta \gamma}(\theta) = -N_{\eta \gamma} \ln \left[ \frac{\Lambda}{\xi_{\eta \gamma}(\theta)} \right] \] (S56)

i.e. the infrared logarithmic divergence originally present is cutoff by the term \( |\xi_{\eta \gamma}(\theta)|^2 \), which is only non-zero when both Rashba SOC and the magnetic field are non-zero (indicating a Fermi surface that is no longer inversion symmetric). This means that there is a critical value of the parameter \( \xi_{\eta \gamma} \), beyond which uniform SC is no longer stable. The resulting critical lines are shown in Fig. S2 and in Fig. 1 of the main text for both singlet and triplet instabilities, using parameter values summarized in the Section V. Note that because this is a multi-band superconductor, the critical line has a (weak) dependence of the cutoff \( \Lambda \).

The general shape of the critical lines can be understood from a simple approximation, noting that
\[ \xi_{\eta \gamma}(p) = \frac{T}{2} \left( \delta_\eta(p) - \delta_-\eta(-p) \right), \] (S57)

where \( \delta_\eta \) are functions of \( \alpha_{RPF} \), \( b \) as given in (S25). For \( \alpha_{RPF}, b \ll \beta_I \),
\[ \xi_{\eta \gamma}(p) \approx \tau \frac{\alpha_{RPF} b}{\beta_I} \sin(\theta - \theta'), \] (S58)

where \( \beta_I \) is the Ising SOC on the relevant pocket. From (S56), we can estimate that the characteristic scale of \( \xi_{\eta \gamma} \), properly averaged, is of the order \( T_{\eta \gamma}/1.13 \), where \( T_{\eta \gamma} \) is the solution of the gap equation when \( \xi_{\eta \gamma} = 0 \), see Eq. (S40). The critical curve is thus roughly given by
\[ \alpha_{RPF} b \sim \frac{\beta_I T_{\eta \gamma}}{1.13} \] (S59)

As shown in Fig. S2, this approximation reasonably captures the exact result for the critical line.

The curve in the \( (\alpha_{RPF}, b) \) plane plotted in Fig. 1 of the main text denotes the limit of stability of the uniform SC phase. Beyond these values, it is still possible to obtain a SC state, although with finite center-of-mass momentum \( p_{shift} \neq 0 \), i.e. a so-called FFLO phase [5–7] (cf. [8], who analyzed a mathematically similar problem for SDW). Depending on whether \( p_{shift, \eta \gamma} = p_{shift, \eta \gamma - \tau} \) or \( p_{shift, \eta \gamma} = - p_{shift, \eta \gamma - \tau} \), the FFLO phase is classified as...
helical and stripe, respectively, and may even compete with the uniform SC phase below the threshold curve in the \((\alpha_{BPF}, b)\) plane [5]. Ultimately, the four parameters \(p_{\text{shift}, \eta\tau}\) must be obtained by minimization of the free energy, which is a computationally involved task beyond the scope of our work. It is interesting to note, however, that by matching \(p_{\text{shift}}\) with the geometric shift of the center of the corresponding Fermi surface once \(\xi_{\eta\tau} \neq 0\), the nodes of the superconducting ground state move back to the Fermi level. Because this configuration maximizes the gap around the Fermi surface, it is expected to maximize the condensation energy. In any case, as we show in the next section, the finite momentum pairing does not affect the topological properties of the SC phase.

IV. TOPOLOGICAL SUPERCONDUCTIVITY

In the main text, we predicted two types of topological superconducting phases in NbSe\(_2\) beyond the nodal topological superconductor at large in-plane magnetic fields previously discussed in the literature [9]. These were (1) a fully gapped, chiral superconductor with total Chern number 6 at large Rashba SOC similar to that recently predicted in MoS\(_2\) [10], and (2) a crystalline topological SC for large in-plane magnetic fields oriented along the \(\Gamma-K\) lines. Here we support these claims by calculating the Chern number of the time-reversal breaking superconductor, and discussing in more depth how symmetry protects the nodes of the crystalline topological SC.

A. Chern number

The Chern number of a 2D material is given by

\[
C_h = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{BZ} F_{\eta\tau}(p) \cdot d^2 p \tag{S60}
\]

where the Berry curvature vector is given by

\[
F_{\eta\tau}(p) = \sum_{\eta\tau} \nabla \times A_{\eta\tau}(p) \tag{S61}
\]

with \(A_{\eta\tau}(p)\) the usual Berry connection associated with the occupied band only. For a superconductor, the Berry connection is defined in terms of the normalized eigenvectors of the BdG Hamiltonian (S31): \(Y_{\eta\tau}(p) = u_{\eta\tau}(p)c_{\eta, p \tau} + v_{\eta\tau}(p)c_{-\eta, -p \tau}\), via

\[
A_{\eta\tau}(p) = i \langle Y_{\eta\tau}(p) | \nabla_p | Y_{\eta\tau}(p) \rangle. \tag{S62}
\]

In our case, the \(c_{\alpha, \beta}p\tau\) operators may carry a nontrivial Berry phase due to the changing orientation of the associated spin. One should therefore consider \(|Y_{\eta\tau}(p)\rangle\) as a four component eigenvector in a basis of Nambu-Gor’kov 4-spinors \(\psi_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p) = (d_{\eta, p \tau}, d_{\eta, -p \tau}, d_{-\eta, -p \tau}, d_{-\eta, -p \tau})^T\).

\[
c_{\eta, p \tau} = U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p) d_{\eta, p \alpha} \tag{S63}
\]

we thus have

\[
|\mathbf{r}_{\eta\tau}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix}
U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p)u_{\eta\tau}(p) \\
U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p)v_{\eta\tau}(p) \\
U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(-p)u_{\eta\tau}(p) \\
U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(-p)v_{\eta\tau}(p)
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{S64}
\]

where using the same notation as (S32) we have

\[
u_{\eta\tau}(p) = \frac{\xi_{S\eta\tau} - E_{\eta\tau}(p)}{\sqrt{(\xi_{S\eta\tau} - E_{\eta\tau}(p))^2 + |\Delta_{\eta\tau}(p)|^2}} \tag{S65}
\]

\[
u_{\eta\tau}(p) = \frac{\Delta_{\eta\tau}(p)}{\sqrt{(\xi_{S\eta\tau} - E_{\eta\tau}(p))^2 + |\Delta_{\eta\tau}(p)|^2}} \tag{S66}
\]

Below we calculate the Chern number for \(b = 0\) and non-zero \(\alpha_B\) only, in which case \(U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p) = -i [U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p)] e^{-i\theta_{\eta\tau}}\) where \(\theta_{\eta\tau}\) is the angle of the momentum \(p\) measured relative to the center of the Fermi pocket \(\eta\). Defining \(\Delta_{\eta\tau}(p) = |\Delta_{\eta\tau}(p)| e^{iS_{\eta\tau}(p)}\), we find that in this regime the Berry connection associated with the pocket \(\eta\) is

\[
A_{\eta\tau}(p) = [U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p)]^2 \nabla \theta_{\eta\tau} - |v_{\eta\tau}(p)|^2 (\nabla \Phi_{\eta\tau}(p) + \nabla \theta_{\eta\tau}) \tag{S67}
\]

For the two TRS-breaking linear combinations \(p + ip\) (\(p - ip\)) that we found above, \(\Phi_{\eta\tau} = 0\) (\(\Phi_{\eta\tau} = -2\eta\)) respectively, on both \(\Gamma\) and \(\pm K\) pockets. To obtain the Chern number we insert these expressions into (S67), and integrate over an annulus around each component of the Fermi surface. Although in principle the integral in Eq. (S60) should be carried out over the entire Brillouin zone, in practice only this region proximate to the Fermi surface contributes. This is because any topological phase transition requires band touching that only happens when both \(\xi_{S\eta\tau}\) and \(\Delta_{\eta\tau}\) are zero in Eq. (S32), so any topological invariant is independent of the extension of \(\Delta_{\eta\tau}\) outside of that region (as can be verified by constructing a simple homotopy between Hamiltonians with any two such extensions). To evaluate these integrals, we assume that the gap function is constant in some region around the FS, and completely vanishing in regions sufficiently far from the FS, with a phase independent of the radial direction \(p\), and take \([U_{\eta\tau}^{(4)}(p)]^2\) to be independent of \(p\). Finally, observe that \(v_{\eta\tau}\) changes rapidly from 0 to 1 in the vicinity of the Fermi surface.

For the pocket \(\eta\), we therefore obtain:

\[
C_h = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int (F_{\eta\tau}(p))_{\nu\theta} dp d\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \partial_\theta (A_{\eta\tau}(p))_{\nu\theta} dp d\theta \tag{S68}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\theta_p} \right)_{\nu\theta} \right]_{p=0}^{p=\infty} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int \left( \Phi_{\eta\tau}(p) + \theta_{\eta\tau} \right) dp \tag{S69}
\]

where the integrals over \(\theta\) and \(p\) are understood to be over the tangential and normal directions in a disk including the Fermi surface of the \(\eta\) pocket, respectively. This gives a net Chern number of \(\pm 6\), with a total contribution of \(\pm 4\) from the \(\pm K\) pockets, and of \(\pm 2\) from the \(\Gamma\) pocket.
B. Symmetry Protected Crystalline Superconducting Phase

Here we show using a general symmetry analysis that in the presence of a mirror reflection symmetry the nodes lying on the reflection plane perpendicular to the sample plane indeed cannot be lifted provided that \( b > \alpha_{RPF} \). (When \( b = \alpha_{RPF}, \) pairs of nodes touch and there is a topological phase transition into a nodeless phase at \( b < \alpha_{RPF} \).) Specifically, we will follow the approach of Ref. [11], which established that an analysis of the symmetry-allowed mass terms in an effective low energy theory can reveal whether a non-gapped superconductor is topologically non-trivial. As our system is in symmetry class D (see Ref. [12]), and the reflection symmetry anti-commutes with PHS, there is a Z-valued topological invariant that diagnoses the topological superconducting phase [11]. This invariant is characterized by non-vanishing quantized winding number along a contour encircling each node [13][14]. When the nodes are not at zero energy, the criterion is the same, except that the contours encircle the Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces.

To examine the topological crystalline superconducting phase, we take the magnetic field to be along the \( \hat{X} \) direction, in which case the mirror symmetry \( \mathcal{M}_z \) acts on the \( y-z \) plane perpendicular to the superconducting layer. This acts on the non-BdG Hamiltonian as

\[
\mathcal{M}_z^{-1} H(p) \mathcal{M}_z = H(p)
\]

where \( \mathbf{p} = (-p_x, p_y) \). Since this reflection also reverses the \( y \) and \( z \) components of the spin, in the spin basis \( \mathcal{M}_z \) acts as \( i\sigma_z \), while in the SOC basis (S23) it is momentum dependent, \( \mathcal{M}_z = -i\tau \gamma^z \).

The action of mirror symmetry can be extended to the BdG spinnors to give

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_z(p) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_z(p) & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{M}_z^\dagger(-p) \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi(p)} & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-i\phi(-p)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{S71}
\]

This acts on the BdG Hamiltonian according to:

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_z^{-1} H^{(BdG)}_{\eta^z}(\mathbf{p}) \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_z = H^{(BdG)}_{\eta^z}(\mathbf{p}) \tag{S72}
\]

Here the relative sign between the two non-vanishing components of \( \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \) is fixed by the way the gap functions transform under the mirror symmetry. In the regime of interest, where the SC gap is odd under \( p_x \rightarrow -p_x \), the appropriate choice is minus.

Following the methods of Ref. [11], we will show that in the low-energy theory obtained by linearizing the model near the nodes, there are no symmetry-allowed mass terms; this is equivalent to showing that the topological winding number is non-trivial (which can also be verified in our model by direct computation, though we will not present the calculation here). To see this, we first linearize the Hamiltonian in the region \( b > \alpha_{RPF} \) around the pair of nodes at \( p_x = 0 \). This gives a \( 4 \times 4 \) low-energy effective Hamiltonian, with a new index \( L, R \) to keep track of the two nodes. We define \( \tau^\mu \) to be the Pauli matrices acting on the \( L, R \) indices, while \( \gamma^\mu \) are Pauli matrices acting on the 2 indices of the BdG spinors (i.e. on the particle-hole indices). In this basis the particle-hole symmetry, which interchanges the two nodes, acts via \( \mathcal{C} = \gamma^z \otimes \tau^R \). Note that Eq. (S71) implies that the action of \( \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_z \) on the mirror plane changes discontinuously at \( b = \alpha_{RPF} \); for \( b < \alpha_{RPF} \), \( \mathcal{M}_z \) is proportional to the identity matrix times \( \text{sgn}(p_y) \), while for \( b > \alpha_{RPF} \) it has the form \( \mathcal{M}_z(p) = \gamma^z \). Since the mirror symmetry acts in the same way near both nodes, in our linearized theory it acts via

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_z = \gamma^z \otimes \tau^0 \ . \tag{S73}
\]

We now consider all leading terms of the generic form \( h(\delta p_y, p_x)\gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \) allowed by symmetry, with \( \delta p_y = p_y - p_y^{(\text{node})} \). Note that we do not wish to allow terms that couple the two nodes, as these break translational symmetry; thus we require \( \nu = 0 \) or \( z \). Recall that the symmetries are

\[
\mathcal{C}^{-1} H(\delta p_y, p_x) \mathcal{C} = -H(-\delta p_y, -p_x)
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_z^{-1} H(\delta p_y, p_x) \mathcal{M}_z = H(\delta p_y, -p_x) . \tag{S74}
\]

Thus \( h(-\delta p_y, -p_x) = \pm h(\delta p_y, p_x) \), where \( \mathcal{C}^{-1} \gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \mathcal{C} = \mp \gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \). Similarly \( h(\delta p_y, -p_x) = \pm h(\delta p_y, p_x) \), where \( \mathcal{M}_z^{-1} \gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \mathcal{M}_z = \pm \gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \). To gap out the nodes we must have \( h(0,0) \neq 0 \); thus we need plus signs in both cases. Hence \( \gamma^\mu \otimes \tau^\nu \) anti-commutes with \( \gamma^z \otimes \tau^z \) and commutes with \( \mathcal{M}_z \).

This restricts the linearized Hamiltonian for \( b > \alpha_{RPF} \) to the form

\[
\mathcal{H} = \delta p_y \xi^0 \otimes \tau^2 + p_x \xi^0 \otimes \tau^0 + m \xi^0 \otimes \tau^0 + \xi_A \xi^0 \otimes \tau^z \tag{S75}
\]

where \( m \) and \( \xi_A \) are constants. The \( m \) term, which plays the role of a chemical potential shift at each node, does not lift the nodes; rather it shifts them in opposite directions along the \( p_y \) axis, from \( p_y = \pm p_F \) to \( p_y = \pm (p_F + m) \). The \( \xi_A \xi^0 \otimes \tau^z \) term, on the other hand, shifts the nodes in opposite directions in energy by an amount \( \xi_A \), inflating the nodes into small Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces (see also [15–18]). Comparing with Eq. (S31) and Eq. (S32), a short computation shows that \( \xi_A \) is precisely the value of \( \xi_A \) at \( \xi_{STF} = 0 \). Since a constant shift in energy cannot change the Berry connection, the winding numbers are unaffected and remain non-trivial [19, 20], as can be verified by direct computation. Note that the Bogolyubov Fermi surfaces are topologically protected only in a fragile sense [21], as they can be removed by mixing with additional bands, similar to what has been observed theoretically in 1D crystalline topological insulators [22, 23].

The term \( \xi_A \xi^0 \otimes \tau^z \) arises in our case from the breaking of momentum-inversion symmetry. In particular, it describes a normal state FS, defined as the contour of
zero normal state energy, that is shifted by a momentum of $\xi_A$ relative to the Brillouin zone center. To see this, note that at $p_x = 0$, the FS at both nodes is determined by $\delta p_y + \xi_A = 0$, which means that Cooper pairs cannot both lie on the FS. As discussed in the main text, a stripe FFLO phase is likely realized for sufficiently large inversion symmetry breaking, in which case pairing is between electrons on the FS, so the Cooper pair in this case acquires a finite momentum $p_{\text{shift}}$ [5]. In this case the Nambu spinors have to be redefined as $(e^{i\varphi} p_x, e^{i\varphi} c_{\text{p- \text{shift}}})$. This transforms the BdG Hamiltonian in Eq. (S31) into

$$H_{\eta \tau}(p) = \left( \frac{\xi_{\eta \tau}(p + p_{\text{shift}})}{\Delta_{\eta \tau}(p)} - \frac{\xi_{-\eta \tau}(-p + p_{\text{shift}})}{\Delta_{-\eta \tau}(p)} \right),$$

with the spectrum now given by

$$E_{\eta \tau}(p) = \xi_{A\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}}) + \sqrt{\xi_{S\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}})^2 + |\Delta_{\eta \tau}(p)|^2} \quad (S76)$$

with

$$\xi_{S\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}}) = \frac{\xi_{\eta \tau}(p + p_{\text{shift}}) + \xi_{-\eta \tau}(-p + p_{\text{shift}})}{2},$$

$$\xi_{A\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}}) = \frac{\xi_{\eta \tau}(p + p_{\text{shift}}) - \xi_{-\eta \tau}(-p + p_{\text{shift}})}{2} \quad (S78)$$

Applied to (S75), this amounts precisely to adding $-p_{\text{shift}}\hat{\tau} \otimes \tau_z$, thus canceling the term that shifts the nodes and bringing them back to zero energy if we pick $p_{\text{shift}} = \xi_A$. This amounts to setting $\xi_{A\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}})$ to be zero simultaneously with $\xi_{S\eta \tau}(p, p_{\text{shift}})$.

C. Edge Modes and Tight Binding Model

The presence of topologically non-trivial nodes leads to edge modes that connect to the bulk spectrum at the nodes, as can be shown by directly solving the Schrödinger equation for a continuum $k \cdot p$ model following [24, 25]. That analysis shows that for $p_y$ close to the node, the edge mode has energy $\xi_A$, i.e. the value of $\xi_{A\eta \tau}$ at $\xi_{S\eta \tau} = 0$ corresponding to that value of $p_y$. This means in particular that unlike other nodal topological superconductors with Majorana flat band edge modes [9, 26–28], the edge modes in the crystalline topological phase under consideration are not in general flat and not necessarily at zero energy. The edge bands necessarily cross zero energy when $\xi_A$ vanishes at the node (i.e. if a stripe FFLO phase is realized in the bulk), but the modes are still not flat in general as $\xi_A$ doesn’t have to vanish for all $p_y$. Similar edge states have been studied in 3D crystalline topological insulators, where they are referred to as drumhead states [29, 30].

As an alternative way to understand the edge modes, it is helpful to view the edge modes as topological boundary modes of a family of 1D Hamiltonians $H_{p_y}(p_x) = \mathcal{H}(p_x, p_y)$ at fixed $p_y$, which are in topological class A and respect mirror symmetry. Since mirror symmetry is equivalent to inversion in 1D, these are the same systems as studied in [22, 23]. As $p_y$ crosses the node, $H_{p_y}(p_x)$ undergoes a topological phase transition from trivial to non-trivial. The 1D topological invariant is the mirror index $\mathcal{M}_Z$ defined as follows [22, 31]. Since $H_{p_y}(p_x)$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}_x$ at $p_x = 0$ and $p_x = \pi$ (the boundary of the 1D Brillouin zone), at those points it can be decomposed into two blocks on which $\mathcal{M}_x = \pm 1$ respectively: $H_{p_y}^\pm(0)$ and $H_{p_y}^\pm(\pi)$. If $n_+^{(0)}$ is the number of occupied states of $H_{p_y}^+(0)$ and $n_+^{(\pi)}$ is that of $H_{p_y}^+(\pi)$, the mirror index is simply $\mathcal{M}_Z = |n_+^{(0)} - n_+^{(\pi)}|$. There are then $2\mathcal{M}_Z$ edge states, with each state even under reflection being degenerate with an edge state that is odd under reflection. Taken together these edge states form the band of edge modes of the 2D system. At a node (which is at $p_x = 0$), $H_{p_y}^+(0)$ crosses with a state in $H_{p_y}^-(0)$, which changes $n_+^{(0)}$ by one and the number of edge states by two. The edge mode thus splits into two bulk modes which cross at the node.

To study the edge modes in more detail and produce the plot in Fig. 4 we used a tight binding model defined on the triangular lattice. The Hamiltonian has the general form

$$H = H_0 + H_Z + H_{SC} \quad (S79)$$

The first term describes the normal state band structure in the presence of SOC; the second-term is the Zeeman coupling due to in-plane magnetic field; and the last term represents the superconducting pairing gap. For simplicity we use a tight-binding model that only includes the $\eta = \Gamma$ pocket Fermi surface, since the $\pm K$ pockets are unimportant for the crystalline nodal topological superconductor.

We describe our model in terms of the creation operators $d_{i \alpha}^\dagger$, where $\alpha = \uparrow, \downarrow$ is a spin index, and $i$ is a site index. We have

$$H_0 = \sum_{i \alpha} \mu d_{i \alpha}^\dagger d_{i \alpha} + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \alpha \beta} t d_{i \alpha}^\dagger d_{j \beta} + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \alpha \beta} \left[ 4i \lambda \nu_{ij} \sigma_{\alpha \beta} + \frac{i \alpha \beta}{3} \hat{z} \cdot (\sigma \times a_{ij})_{\alpha \beta} \right] d_{i \alpha}^\dagger d_{j \beta}$$

$$H_Z = \sum_{i \alpha \beta} (\mathbf{b} \cdot \sigma)_{\alpha \beta} d_{i \alpha}^\dagger d_{i \beta} \quad (S80)$$

$$H_{SC} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij \alpha \beta} [\Delta_{ij \alpha \beta} d_{i \alpha}^\dagger d_{j \beta}] + \text{h.c.}$$

where $a_{ij} \in \{ \pm a_1, \pm a_2, \pm a_3 \}$ is the vector from site $i$ to site $j$, and $\nu_{ij} = 1$ ($-1$) if the vector is $a_1, -a_2, a_3$ ($-a_1, a_2, -a_3$). For our triangular lattice, $a_1 = (a, 0)$ and $a_2 = \frac{a}{2}(1, \sqrt{3})$, $a_3 = a_3 = a_3 = a_3 = a_3 = a_3$. We consider the singlet-instability regime, in the crystalline nodal topological phase where $b \gg \alpha R$. In this region the
self-consistent solutions of the gap equation obtained in a $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ model are well-approximated by

$$\Delta^{ij} = \Delta_i \nu_{ij} (\sigma^x \cos \theta + \sigma^y \sin \theta) i\sigma^y + \Delta_i i\sigma^y$$  \hspace{1cm} (S81)

where $\theta$ is the direction of the magnetic field, assuming $\Delta_s \ll \Delta_t$ (higher lattice harmonics are in general needed to match the $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ model exactly). The numerical coefficients are chosen to match the $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ Hamiltonian (including the value of $p_F$). The specific values used in the Figure are listed in Section V.

Our cylinder is created by taking periodic boundary conditions in the vertical $y$ direction, and open zig-zag boundary conditions along the $x$ direction. To produce the plot, we Fourier transform in the $y$ direction:

$$d_{R_\alpha} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{p_y} d_{i,p_y} e^{-i p_y R_\alpha} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{p_y} d_{i,p_y} e^{-i p_y R_\alpha}$$ \hspace{1cm} (S82)

where $R_i = (R_{ix}, R_{iy})$. Note that $i$ labels the $x$ coordinates of the sites which go in increments of $a/2$, while the period along the $y$ axis is actually doubled since identical sites are now separated by $2a_2$, resulting in the folding of the 1D Brillouin zone (which has a period of $\frac{2\pi}{a_0}$).

The resulting BdG Hamiltonian on the cylinder can be expressed

$$H_{BdG} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij,p_y} \Psi_i^{\dagger} \mathcal{H}^{ij}(p_y) \Psi_{j,-p_y}$$ \hspace{1cm} (S83)

where $\Psi_{i,p_y} = (d_{i,p_y}, d_{i,-p_y}, d_{i,p_y}^\dagger, d_{i,-p_y}^\dagger)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^{ij}(p_y) = \begin{pmatrix} H_{kin}(p_y) & \Delta^{ij}(p_y) \\ -\Delta^{ij}(-p_y)^* & -H_{kin}(-p_y) \end{pmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (S84)

where we have defined

$$H_0 + H_Z = \sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} (H_{kin}(p_y))^{ij}_{\alpha,\beta} d_{i,p_y,\alpha}^\dagger d_{j,-p_y,\beta}$$ \hspace{1cm} (S85)

### V. PARAMETER VALUES

Fig. 1, Fig. S2, and Fig. S1 used the following parameter values: $\lambda/\beta_I = 0.6, g_2 = 1.2, g_4 = 2, g'_1 = 0.2$ and $g'_4 = 0.1$ (all $g$’s are given in units of the arbitrary positive interaction $g_1$). We used $g_3 = 1.05$ in plots for the singlet-instability (all panels (a) and panel (b) in Fig. S1). Note that with this choice $\gamma^{(s)} > 0$, in which case the critical magnetic field in the absence of Rashba is finite; in the alternate case the critical field is finite, but large if $\gamma^{(s)} \gg \gamma^{(t)}$. We used $g_3 = 4.2$ in the rest of the panels for the triplet-instability. The magnetic field was taken to be along a $\Gamma$–$K$ direction ($\theta = 0$) in all plots except for Fig. S1(a) where we took $\theta = 2\pi/25$. In addition we took the inner and outer densities of states to differ by ten percent in Fig. S1 to ensure that the symmetry allowed mixings between the singlet and triplet channels are present in our solutions.

To obtain the critical lines separating the opaque regions in Fig. 1 in the main text and in Fig. S2 we in addition took $T_c = 0.01\beta_I$ and $\Lambda = 25$. These correspond roughly to the experimental values: $\beta_I \approx 40$ meV, $T_{c0} \approx 0.4$ meV, and $\Lambda$ given by the bandwidth which is on the order of 1 eV [9, 32, 33]. We have not found a value of Ising SOC at $\Gamma, \lambda$, in the literature, but it is reported to be smaller than $\beta_I$ at $K$ points (roughly we expect $\lambda K^3 = \beta_I$). The highest magnetic fields used in experiment are on the order of 4 meV, i.e. 0.1/$\beta_I$. Values of Rashba SOC in real materials are hard to measure directly; Ref. [32] estimated $\alpha_R p_F \approx 6$meV by fitting the upper critical magnetic field to a phenomenological model first used for MoS$_2$ in [34] and [35].

The Fermi surfaces in Fig. 2 in the main text correspond to the following parameter values in Eq. 1 of the main text: $m = 1.5, \mu = -0.5, \beta_I = 0.1, \lambda = 0.05$. We took $b = 0.05$ and $\alpha_R = 0$ for Fig. 2 (b = 0, and $\alpha_R = 0.05$ give the same Fermi surface). We used the same parameter for Fig. 3 but took $b = 0.5$ and $\alpha_R = 0$ in (a) and $\alpha_R = 0.2$ in (b-d). Fig. 3(a-c) shows the BdG spectra in Eq. (S32) for $\eta = \Gamma$ and $\tau = -1$ with with $D_{\Gamma,-1}^{(0)} = 2$ and $D_{\Gamma,-1}^{(j)} = 2$. In Fig. 3(d) we plotted the BdG spectrum in the FFLO phase given by Eq. (S77) where we took $p_{shift} = 0$. In Fig. 4 we plot the spectrum of (S84) with the number of sites along the non-periodic $x$ direction $N = 300$ (which corresponds to 150 unit cells due to period doubling) and took $t = 1, \mu = 0, \beta_I = 1, \lambda = 0.2, b = 1, \alpha_R = 0.1, \Delta_t = 1, \Delta_s = 0.1$. The magnetic field was again aligned along one of the $\Gamma$–$K$ directions, $\theta = 0$. 
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