Dark and leaky exciton condensates in transition metal dichalcogenide moiré bilayers
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We show that the “dark condensates” that arise when excitons form a Bose–Einstein condensate in a material with an indirect bandgap are not completely dark to optical emission. Rather, such states are “leaky condensates” in which optical emission is facilitated by many-body interactions. We analyze the properties of these leaky condensates in the context of twisted bilayers of transition metal dichalcogenides, which host strongly interacting excitons and an indirect bandgap. We show that, even though excitonic condensates in these materials can break translational symmetry, direct emission remains forbidden by a robust rotational symmetry. The optical signatures at low temperatures are dominated by the interaction-driven “leaky” emission, with distinctive qualitative features.

Excitons, bound electron–hole (e–h) pairs, give rise to a plethora of quantum-coherent phenomena in solid state materials, including light–matter hybridization [1, 2], long-range order [3], phase coherence [4], and the formation of Bose–Einstein condensates (BECs) [5]. Novel atomically-thin transition metal dichalcogenide (TMD) structures [6], featuring tightly bound excitons with long lifetime [7–9] and valley pseudospin with contrasting optical selection rules [10], have spearheaded a new generation of excitonic devices. In parallel, the maturing field of twistronics [11] predicts excitonic phenomena such as flat [12] and topological bands with chiral edge modes [13]. This versatility is promising for realizing quantum emitters [14, 15], simulators [16], and exciton BECs [17, 18], and many-body exciton physics is being explored in settings such as electrostatically gated, optically-inert excitonic insulators [19–25] and cavity exciton–polaritons [26–30].

In twisted TMD heterobilayers, interlayer excitons [31] formed by electrons and holes in opposite layers lie at low energies [32], and provide a compelling platform for pumped exciton condensates. The effects of stacking and twisting compound twice: First, the spatial separation of electrons and holes leads to long exciton lifetimes. The interlayer twist then rotates electron bands in momentum space [33], resulting in an indirect bandgap and lifetimes longer still [7, 34]. Second, the misaligned layers form a large-scale moiré superlattice, with a spatially-modulated bandgap [14, 35–39] that traps excitons in localized orbitals [40–44]. This, and the excitons’ interlayer electric dipole, place them in the strongly-interacting regime [14]. These BECs thus merge strong correlations, quasi-equilibrium dynamics, opto-, twist- and valleytronics. Clearly, new approaches are called for.

In this manuscript we show that the intersection of strong interactions and indirect gap leads to striking features in the optical properties of these moiré BECs. The indirect bandgap suggests that the ground state of the excitons would form a so-called “dark condensate” that cannot emit light directly [45]. However, as we will show, no condensate is completely dark if interactions are considered, and in this strongly-interacting system the interaction effects can dominate the optical emission. With a symmetry analysis we establish that direct coherent emission remains forbidden despite the loss of momentum conservation in this symmetry-breaking condensate. We then show that exciton–exciton interactions endow the BEC with an optical footprint which we describe as a “leaky condensate”. These “leaks” give rise to distinctive qualitative features in the optical emission of TMD moiré excitons at low temperatures.

Model.—We consider a tight-binding lattice model that the interlayer excitons realize on the TMD moiré superlattice, as proposed in previous works [14, 36, 40, 41, 45]. The superlattice inherits the triangular symmetry of the underlying monolayers, and has three high-symmetry locations labeled A, B, and C, as seen in Fig. 1a [46]. Sites A and B are local energy minima that host bound states [14, 36]. For simplicity we consider only the lowest-energy locale, and whether it is A or B may depend on
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the choice and stacking of the monolayers; we will ana-
lyze both cases. Excitons can form in either of the TMD
optoelectronic K valleys, so are labeled by their valley
pseudospin $\tau = \pm 1$. We consider the Bose–Hubbard [47]
Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \tau} (E_0 + \epsilon_\mathbf{k}) \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{k\tau}^\dagger \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{k\tau} + \sum_{\mathbf{R}, \tau, \sigma} \frac{U_{\tau\sigma}}{2} \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\tau}^\dagger \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\sigma} \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\sigma} \hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\tau} + \hat{V}_{\text{LMI}} (1)$$

where $\hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\tau}^\dagger$ is the bosonic creation operator of the lowest
Wannier state in supercell $\mathbf{R}$ (at either locale A or B).
$\epsilon_\mathbf{k} = -t [4 \cos(k_x a/2) \cos(\sqrt{3} k_y a/2) + 2 \cos(k_z a) - 6]$ is the dispersion due to six-fold nearest-neighbor hopping
with amplitude $t > 0$ [46], plotted in Fig. 1b, with $a$
the moiré period. $E_0$ is the exciton formation energy
(bandgap minus binding energy), and $U_{\tau\sigma} > 0$ are valley-
dependent [48] on-site repulsion strengths. $\hat{V}_{\text{LMI}}$ is the light–matter interaction, addressed below.

Exciton momentum eigenstates superpose e–h pairs with fixed momentum transfer $p_x - p_y = p$. Due to the indirect gap, the lowest-energy transition occurs at nonzero momentum $p = -\tau Q$, where $Q = \mathbf{K}_\Lambda - \mathbf{K}_\Sigma$ is the momentum mismatch between the $\tau = +1$ valley ex-
trema of the two layers [14, 33], coinciding with the moiré
Brillouin zone (MBZ) corner. It is then convenient to de-
fine the shifted wave vector $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p} + \tau Q$ to absorb this
mismatch, so real- and $k$-space states are related by

$$\hat{\chi}_\mathbf{R\tau} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(k - \tau Q) \cdot \mathbf{R}} \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}\tau} (2)$$

with $N$ the number of supercells. Indeed, the hopping
amplitudes $\langle \mathbf{R}\tau | \hat{H} | \mathbf{R}'\tau' \rangle$ are complex. Their phases are fixed by the momentum mismatch [14], which guarantees [46] that it is in this gauge that $\epsilon_\mathbf{k}$ is valley-independent and minimal at $\mathbf{k} = 0$.

Under a broad set of conditions, the Hamiltonian (1)
has a many-body ground state that is Bose-condensed.
This state has two interwoven components: a condens-
ate wavefunction of $\mathbf{k} = 0$ excitons and an incoherent
component, driven by interactions, of particles depleted
from the condensate. Each has its own optical properties,
which we address in the next and subsequent sections,
respectively.

Darkness of moiré exciton BECs.—The condens-
ate wavefunction is responsible for any coherent emis-
sion. To determine if it is dark, we analyze the symme-
tries of $\hat{H}$ and those that might be spontaneously broken
in the ground state. Three symmetries are pertinent:

The first is translation symmetry. The nearly-vertical
photon dispersion gives rise to the well-known optical
light cone (LC) of states with $|p| \lesssim E_0/\hbar c$ that can re-
combine, with $c$ the speed of light in the surrounding
medium. The light cone of each valley is thereby cen-
tered at $\mathbf{k} = \tau Q$, i.e. the MBZ corners, see Fig. 1b. Cru-
ially, the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ states lie outside both cones. Conse-
quently, a simple BEC in either valley minimum cannot
emit light: direct emission can occur only if translation
symmetry is broken.

A charge-density wave is a hallmark of indirect-gap
exciton coherence [19, 49, 50]. A condensate that is in
superposition of two different momenta naturally breaks
translational invariance. Indeed, for a BEC that is in su-
perposition of both the $\tau = +1$ and $\tau = -1$ minima,
translation symmetry is reduced in a way that folds the
light cones precisely onto the condensate [46, 51]. Such a
brightening of momentum-dark excitons by translation-
symmetry-breaking charge-ordered states has recently
been observed in TMD mono- and bilayers [52, 53].

However, other symmetries of $\hat{H}$ will prevent emission
even in this translation-symmetry-breaking BEC.

A U(1) symmetry arises from the separate conservation
of excitons in each valley. Interlayer exciton intervalley
conversion is often neglected in quantitative modeling of
TMD optoelectronics, e.g. Ref. [42], as it is quenched by
the large e–h separation [31], and long valley depolariza-
tion times are indeed observed [41, 54]. This intervalley
symmetry prohibits genuine momentum folding, as it im-
plies that $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{P} + Q(\hat{N}_+ - \hat{N}_-)$, with $\mathbf{P}$ the total momentum
and $\hat{N}_\tau$ the population in each valley, is a constant of
motion. $\mathbf{K}$ remains conserved since both valley minima
are its $\mathbf{k} = 0$ eigenstates, and modes of differing $\mathbf{k}$ are
forbidden from mixing. This symmetry can be broken mani-
stefly by including a perturbative conversion process

$$\Delta \hat{H}_{\text{IV}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \tau} J_{\mathbf{k}\tau}^\dagger \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}\tau}^\dagger \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}+\tau\tau} + \hat{V}_{\text{LMI}} (3)$$

with intervalley tunneling coefficients $J_{\mathbf{k}\tau}^\dagger$. Using $J_{\mathbf{k}\tau}^\dagger$
given by nearest-neighbor hopping commensurate with
the crystal symmetries, we confirm by an explicit mean-
field theory calculation that the two-valley BEC indeed
leads to a translation-symmetry-broken effective Hamiltoni-
However, despite being folded over each other, the
condensate and light cones remain decoupled.

This robust darkness despite broken translation sym-
metry, and intervalley conversion, arises from a rotational
symmetry and the associated conservation of angular mo-
momentum. The moiré lattice has three-fold symmetries
$\hat{C}_{3\alpha}$ around all three locales $s = \Lambda$, B, and C [cf. Fig. 1a], with respect to which we compute [46] angular momenta
$\ell_k^{(s)}$ of high-symmetry states. By time-reversal symmetry, symmetric.

Leaky condensates.—While its coherent component
cannot emit directly, the many-body condensed ground
state is not completely dark. Rather, exciton–exciton
interactions enable emission from its incoherent component, in a mechanism we call “leaky condensate”. Emission is driven by excitonic collective modes [55], which have attracted recent attention as insightful probes of excitonic many-body states [50, 56–61]. Here, the collective modes supply the necessary linear and angular momenta for the excitons to recombine, even for vanishing interlayer tunneling ($v_F^y = 0$).

The essential physics of our mechanism is captured by a single-valley model. In light of the quenched inter valley conversion, this may be realized experimentally by pumping a valley-contrasting circularly-dichroic intralayer exciton resonance, followed by rapid interlayer charge transfer [54]. We thus project $\hat{H}$ onto valley $\tau = +1$ only, and suppressing $\tau$ henceforth.

$$\hat{H} = \sum_k (\epsilon_k + \hat{\epsilon}_k^\dagger \hat{\chi}_k \hat{\chi}_k^\dagger) + \frac{U}{2} \sum_R \hat{\chi}_R \hat{\chi}_R^\dagger \hat{\chi}_R^\dagger + \hat{V}_{\text{LMI}}. \tag{4}$$

Eq. (2) notwithstanding, all excitons now carry the same momentum mismatch so it is gauge-eliminable, and Eq. (4) realizes the usual Bose–Hubbard Hamiltonian.

Let us assume that exciton recombination is sufficient to maintain quasi-equilibrium, with an associated chemical potential $\mu$ and grand-canonical potential $\tilde{Z} = \hat{H} - \mu \hat{N}$. We will study the ground state of the excitonic sector of $\hat{Z}$ and treat $\hat{V}_{\text{LMI}}$ as a weak perturbation that generates photons which probe this state. This picture is made consistent by shifting the photon energies to $(\hbar \omega_p - \mu)$ [46].

Intermediate excitons in twisted TMD bilayers are predicted to realize a model with $t \ll U$ [14, 45]. However, for clarity we first illustrate our emission mechanism in the familiar weakly-interacting Bogoliubov theory, before addressing the strongly-interacting limit.

**Weak interactions: Bogoliubov theory.**—A BEC with all excitons at $k = 0$ will be depleted by interactions which eject pairs of counter-propagating excitons from the condensate. If one lands within the light cone, it may recombine. Bogoliubov theory lets us neatly resum these virtual processes and find the depleted ground state.

Consider a state of filling $\nu$, with condensate fraction $\nu_c$. Eq. (4) leads to the standard [64] mean-field (MF) Bogoliubov-de-Gennes (BdG) Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\tilde{Z}} \text{MF} = \sum_k \epsilon_k \hat{b}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_k + \frac{\Omega_k^2}{4} \hat{b}_k^\dagger \hat{b}_k \text{with the familiar dispersion } \Omega_k^2 = \epsilon_k (\epsilon_k + 2\nu_c U), \mu = E_0 + \nu_c U, \text{ and the Bogoliubov modes}\n
$$

$\hat{b}_k = \cosh(\theta_k) \hat{\chi}_k + \sinh(\theta_k) \hat{\chi}_k^\dagger, \quad \sinh \theta_k = \frac{\Omega_k - \epsilon_k}{2\sqrt{\Omega_k \epsilon_k}}. \tag{6}$

The ground state of the theory is the BdG vacuum. Yet the mixing of particle creation and annihilation in Eq. (6) implies that it nevertheless contains some excitons, most notably inside the optical light cone.

It is instructive to study the recombination in terms of the collective modes. Transcribed into BdG modes, Eq. (5) contains terms such as $-g_{\rho\sigma} \sinh(\theta_{Q+p\rho}) \hat{a}_{\rho\sigma}^\dagger \hat{b}_\rho^\dagger$, which represent a spontaneous emission of a photon and a BdG mode, the latter assuring momentum conservation in analogy to phonon-assisted exciton recombination [5], with amplitude $\sinh \theta \sim U$. Therefore, interactions enable an otherwise-dark exciton condensate to “leak” photons satisfying

$$\hbar \omega_p = E_0 + \nu_c U - \Omega_{-Q-p\rho} < E_0. \tag{7}$$

As expected, some energy is lost to the Bogoliubov mode.

We compute the total emission rate $\Gamma$ with Fermi’s Golden Rule via transitions between the BdG vacuum and single quasiparticle states. The redshift in Eq. (7) is negligible compared to $E_0$, so this is equivalent to counting the number of excitons present within the light cone,

$$\Gamma \approx \sum_{k \in \text{LC}} \Gamma_k n_k \approx N \tau_{\text{loc}}^{-1} n_Q \approx N \tau_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{18} \frac{\nu_c}{U} \right)^2. \tag{8}$$

Here we approximated $n_k = \langle \hat{\chi}_k^\dagger \hat{\chi}_k \rangle \approx n_Q = \sinh^2 \theta_k Q$ inside the light cone, assuming it is much smaller than the MBZ, and expanded around small densities. Unlike spontaneous decay which is linear in density, $\Gamma$ is quadratic, exemplifying its origins in exciton–exciton collisions.

The simplicity of this construction suggests the leaky condensate mechanism generalizes to any indirect-gap excitonic system. Moreover, it is accomplished without additional degrees of freedom. This contrasts with external optical probing [65] and other mechanisms that require phonons to sink the excess momentum [66], or carrier exchange in larger exciton complexes [67].

Interactions can broaden the exciton distribution to excited bands as well, and so leaky condensates can also occur in systems that are dark due to a spin-forbidden transition, etc. Previous studies have shown that, for sufficiently strong interactions (or, equivalently, above a threshold density), the dark condensate can undergo a transition into a so-called “gray condensate” [68–71]. Our finding of leaky emissions is distinct from these previous
where \( \hat{\tau} \)
The recombination rate is \( \Gamma \)
The grand-canonical potential is then

\[
\hat{\Sigma}_R = e^{-iQ R} \hat{\chi}_R, \quad \hat{\Sigma}^\dagger_R = e^{iQ R} \hat{\chi}^\dagger_R, \quad \hat{\Sigma}_R = \hat{\chi}^\dagger_R \hat{\chi}_R - S. \tag{9}
\]

The grand-canonical potential is then

\[
\hat{Z} = -\ell \sum_{(R, R')}(\hat{\Sigma}^+_{Q, R} \hat{\Sigma}^{-\dagger}_{Q, R'} + \hat{\Sigma}^{-\dagger}_{Q, R} \hat{\Sigma}^+_{Q, R'}) + (E_0 - \mu) \sum_R (\hat{\Sigma}^\dagger_R + S). \tag{10}
\]

The recombination rate is \( \Gamma_{\text{loc}}/N \approx n_Q = \langle \hat{S}_Q^\dagger \hat{S}_Q \rangle \)

where \( \hat{S}_Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_R e^{-iQ R} \hat{\Sigma}_R \).

Interactions will be evidenced by a nonlinear dependence of \( n_Q(\nu) \) on the filling fraction \( 0 \leq \nu \leq 2S \), analogous to the mean magnetization. The MF limit and emergent particle–hole symmetry of Hamiltonian (10) put strong bounds on \( n_Q(\nu) \) that guarantee nonlinearity [46].

Emission is again driven by spontaneously excited collective modes, which now take the form of spin waves. We perform a Holstein–Primakoff (HP) 1/S expansion [80] similar to Bernardet et al. [81]. This expansion yields free spin waves that mix particles and holes, and as before, we compute \( n_Q \) in the spin-wave vacuum. Details are provided in the Appendices [46].

We plot the resulting emission rate \( \Gamma \) in Fig. 2 [82]. Comparing it against small-scale exact diagonalization, we find very good agreement across a wide range of fillings. In the dilute limit we expand [46]

\[
\Gamma(\nu \ll 1) \approx \frac{4}{9} N \Gamma_{\text{loc}}^{1/2} \nu^{2} \tag{11}
\]

Here \( \nu_{\text{MF}} \) is the classical mean-field order parameter [cf. \( \nu_c \) in Eq. (8)]. The apparent quadratic dependence in Eq. (11) does not imply an absence of correlations, which can cause \( \nu_{\text{MF}}(\nu) \) and \( \nu \) to differ. Exciton correlations can be inferred from two-body states [71], from which we deduce [46] the asymptotic form \( \Gamma \sim (\nu/\log \nu)^2 \), revealing the expected suppression. Numerical evaluation confirms [46] that \( \nu_{\text{MF}} \sim (\nu/\log \nu) \) for \( \nu \ll 1 \), indicating correlations are successfully captured by our HP theory.

**Experimental consequences.**—We have shown that, as a result of strong interactions, excitons BECs in TMD twisted bilayers will emit light even in the limit of zero temperature. To understand the qualitative signatures of this effect, it is helpful to compare with the emissions at higher temperatures.

Thermal excitations enhance emission and unlock a second channel whereby a collective mode is absorbed instead of emitted, leading to two emission lines. In the inset of Fig. 2 we plot the crossover temperature \( T^* \) at which depletion (due to interactions) and thermal excitations contribute equally [46] to the total emission rate, and below which interactions dominate. This crossover occurs above the Berezinskii–Kosterlitz–Thouless (BKT) transition [83, 84], indicating that interactions are dominant in the superfluid phase and much of the quantum-degenerate regime. Remarkably, at small filling interactions dominate the emission even in a hot exciton gas. In contrast to the Stokes and anti-Stokes lines in phonon-assisted emission [5], the two BdG processes have unequal matrix elements with different density dependences. For \( \nu < \frac{1}{2} \), the anti-Stokes-like line dominates above \( T^* \), and the net annihilation of BdG modes may evaporatively cool the BEC, similarly to a mechanism recently sug-
gested [85]. Finally, the ratio of emission line intensities can be used to estimate the strength of interactions [46].

The leaky condensate picture thus predicts a distinctive property of moiré exciton emission: A dominant red-shifted emission line with quadratic density dependence below \( T^* \), compared to a dominant blueshifted line with linear density dependence above \( T^* \). We do not expect a qualitative change at the BKT transition.

Exciton density is controlled with pumping fluence, and tracked with transient absorption [86, 87], emission blueshift [cf. Eq. (7)] [65, 69, 88], or time-resolved photoluminescence (PL) [88]. These reveal non-exponential decay profiles and suggest a quadratic density dependence in the loss rate, to which the leaky condensate mechanism could be contributing. A quadratic dependence can arise from Auger recombination. However, unlike Auger and other non-radiative loss channels driving population evolution, the leaky condensate also leads to nonlinearity in the instantaneous emission intensity, and might be important in interpreting PL kinetics at low temperatures.

We may assess the relevant parameters under which the leaky condensate may be observed. Comparing Eq. (8) with (11) suggests that this mechanism saturates once \( U \gtrsim 12 \), which should indeed be realized in TMD heterobilayers across a wide range of twist angles [14]. For \( a \approx 10 \) nm (twist \( \approx 2^{\circ} \)) and corresponding \( t \approx 0.2 \) meV [14], and at a demonstrated [88] photoexcited exciton densities of \( n \approx 10^{11} \) cm\(^{-2} \) (\( \nu \approx 0.1 \)), \( T^* \approx 5 \) K, roughly coinciding with the degeneracy onset temperature. This temperature could be enhanced in bilayers with larger twist angles or intercalated hBN spacers, both increasing exciton bandwidth [14, 45]. Additionally, an external electric field might also modify the moiré symmetry [14] or its elastic reconstruction [89, 90], allowing further in-situ tunability. Above \( T^* \) the two emission lines are split by \( \sim 20 \) \( \sim 4 \) meV and should be resolvable.

Our study motivates several other consequences of optical emissions in twisted TMD bilayers. (i) We have shown that moiré exciton BECs lie on the verge of optical activation, prevented only by the \( C_3 \) rotational symmetry. Explicitly breaking that rotational symmetry should turn the leaky condensate bright, with a pronounced and coherent emission peak. We have tested this by using a constant \( \gamma \), corresponding to a \( C_3 \)-forbidden on-site interconversion, and find that the mean-field condensate becomes bright with emission rate \( \propto (J^IV)^2 \). Thus, breaking rotational symmetry should show the appearance of a condensate emission, with concomitant long-range phase coherence [5]. Furthermore, this suggests that these systems could be sensitive to external fields, strain, layer separation and out-of-plane pressure, with possible sensitivities applications. (ii) Finally, while here we mostly considered a single-valley model, the physics of the two interacting valleys are very rich. Besides the density wave explored above, the interplay between the opposite momentum and polarization of the two valleys could lead to other novel phenomena, which we leave to future work.
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Appendix A: Moiré Lattice Model and Symmetries

In this Appendix we briefly outline the geometry of the moiré lattice used throughout the main text.

**Geometry.** — We define the lattice primitive vectors

\[
\mathbf{a}_1 = a\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{a}_2 = \frac{1}{2}a\mathbf{x} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}a\mathbf{y},
\]

(A1)

where \(a\) is the moiré period. The moiré lattice has symmetry group \(p\overline{3}m1\), with 3 high-symmetry points \(A\), \(B\), and \(C\). These locales are found at relative displacements \(\mathbf{d}_A = 0\), \(\mathbf{d}_B = \mathbf{d}\), \(\mathbf{d}_C = 2\mathbf{d}\), \(\mathbf{d} = (a_1 + a_2)/3\). (A2) within each unit cell. The reciprocal basis vectors are

\[
\mathbf{b}_1 = \frac{2\pi}{a}(x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}y), \quad \mathbf{b}_2 = \frac{2\pi}{a} \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}y.
\]

(A3)

The moiré Brillouin zone has two inequivalent corners which should be labeled consistently. We follow Refs. [14, 36] which find the \(A\) and \(B\) sites host s-wave bound states with angular momenta \(\ell_A = \tau\) and \(\ell_B = -\tau\), respectively, due to the local interlayer atomic registry. The \(C\) locale is a potential maxima and so does not host any states. \(C\Delta\) rotation symmetry dictates that the hopping amplitudes from an \(A\) site to its three nearest-neighbor \(B\) sites must be complex and transform like a \(d_{\ell\pm 2}\) wave (mod 3),

\[
t(C_3^\Delta\mathbf{d}) = e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}\tau}t(C_3\mathbf{d}) = e^{-\frac{4\pi i}{3}\tau}t(\mathbf{d}),
\]

(A4)

where \(t(\mathbf{v}) = \langle \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{v}, \tau | \hat{H} | \mathbf{R}, \tau \rangle\). On the other hand, the (intravalley) hopping amplitude phases are fixed by momentum mismatch [14]

\[
t(\mathbf{v}) = -|t(\mathbf{v})| e^{-i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{v}},
\]

(A5)

where \(-\tau\mathbf{Q}\) is the exciton momentum mismatch, \(|t(\mathbf{v})|\) has three-fold symmetry, and we separated the usual minus sign. \(\mathbf{Q}\) coincides with one of the moiré Brillouin zone
corners, and Eqs. (A4) and (A5) are reconciled by picking
\[ Q = \frac{2}{3} b_1 + \frac{1}{3} b_2 = \frac{4\tau}{3\hbar} \hat{x}. \]  

Kinetic energy.—The valley-dependent complex phases (A5) generally lead to valley-dependent dispersions. However, the gauge choice (2) uniquely gives a valley-independent dispersion,
\[ e_k = \langle k, \tau | \hat{H} | k, \tau \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{R,v} e^{-i(k \cdot R + v \cdot \tau)} \langle R + v, \tau | \hat{H} | R, \tau \rangle = -\sum_v |t(v)| e^{-i k \cdot v}. \]  

We see this gauge also conveniently fixes \( e_k \)'s minima to \( k = 0 \). In this work we consider only one locale with its nearest-neighbor hopping, so \( |t(C_0 a_1)| = t \) and otherwise zero. In the main text and here throughout we absorb \( e_Q \) into \( E_0 \) so that the band minimum is at 0 and \( e_Q = 0 \).

Angular momenta.—The rotation operations around the three moiré locales are related by [cf. Fig. 1]
\[ \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{T}_a, \hat{C}_{3A} \hat{T}_a, \hat{C}_{3C} = \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{T}_a \hat{C}_{3B}, \]  

with \( \hat{T}_a \) an elementary lattice translation. It follows that if \( k \) is an angular momentum eigenstate with angular-momentum numbers \( \ell_{kr}^{(A,B)} \) with respect to symmetries \( \hat{C}_{3A,3B} \), they must be related by
\[ e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3} (k \cdot \ell_{kr}^{(B)} \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1)} = \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1 \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1 \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1 = e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3} (k \cdot \ell_{kr}^{(A)} \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1)} \hat{a}_1 \hat{C}_{3B} \hat{a}_1 \] \[ (A9) \]

Conversely, \( k \) can be a rotational eigenstate only if \( C_0 k = k \) up to reciprocal lattice vectors. This holds only at the high-symmetry \( k \) points, that is the zone center and corners. Writing \( \mathbf{k} = \kappa \mathbf{Q}, \kappa = 0, \pm 1 \), we thereby find
\[ \ell_{kr}^{(B)} = \ell_{kr}^{(A)} = \frac{a_1 \cdot \mathbf{k} - \tau \mathbf{Q}}{2\pi/3} \mod 3 = -(\kappa - \tau) \mod 3. \]  

(A10)

The same identity relates \( \ell_{kr}^{(B)} \) and \( \ell_{kr}^{(C)} \). Using these relations, we list \( \ell_{kr}^{(s)} \) of all high-symmetry momenta states formed by the lowest-energy orbitals in the A and B moiré sites in Table 1.

In particular, these identities show that \( \ell_{kr}^{(s)} \) increments by \( \tau \) as an \( s \) scans \{A, B, C\}, and thus one will be 0 \mod 3. Table 1 shows that due to their circular polarization, this is \( \ell_{kr}^{(C)} \) for both A- or B-localized excitons. As explained in the main text, this implies symmetry \( \hat{C}_{3C} \) is preserved, and \( \ell_{kr}^{(C)} \) is \( 0 \) prevents emission from the condensate.

Density wave.—To see how the two-valley condensate exciton density wave is realized in our model, consider the mean-field-decoupled cross-valley scattering channel in Eq. (1), which contains terms like
\[ \sum_{R} \langle \hat{R}^\dagger \hat{R}^\dagger \rangle \hat{X}_R \hat{X}_R^\dagger = \langle \hat{X}_R^\dagger \hat{X}_R \rangle \sum_{R} e^{-i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \hat{X}_R \hat{X}_R^\dagger. \]  

Here we used \( \langle \hat{X}_R \rangle \propto e^{-i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \) due to the condensation

| Table I: Angular momentum quantum numbers \( \ell_{kr}^{(s)} \) of momentum states relative to the three rotation centers. The condensate remains dark since all \( \mathbf{k} = 0 \) states have identical \( \hat{C}_{3C} \) eigenvalues of 0. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| locale | op. | \(-Q\) | \(0\) | \(+Q\) | \(-Q\) | \(0\) | \(+Q\) |
| \(C_{3A}\) | +1 | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| A | \(C_{3B}\) | 0 | -1 | +1 | -1 | +1 | 0 |
| B | \(C_{3C}\) | 0 | -1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | 0 |
| \(C_{3B}\) | 0 | +1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| \(C_{3C}\) | +1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | +1 | 0 | -1 |

Appendix B: The Rotating Frame

To study emission from condensed states, we must consider populated, i.e. excited states of Hamiltonian (4). Nevertheless, it is convenient to move to a frame in which the condensate is the ground state, so that various observables are given by ground state expectation values. Such a transition is implemented by the unitary operator \( e^{i\mu N t} \) with \( \hat{N} \) the particle counting operator. However, this would lead to a time-dependent light–matter interaction \( \hat{V}_{LM}(t) \) in the new frame. This is avoided by having \( \hat{N} \) count photons as well. The Hamiltonian is then transformed into
\[ \hat{\Xi} = \hat{H} - \mu \hat{N}, \]  

\[ \hat{\Xi} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \langle \hat{k}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \hat{k}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger + \sum_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{\sigma}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{\sigma}}, \]  

(B1)

and \( \hat{\Xi} \) is time-independent since \( [\hat{H}, \hat{N}] = 0 \) thanks to the rotating-wave approximation in Eq. (5). \( \hat{\Xi} \) then appears as a standard excitonic grand-canonical potential with chemical potential \( \mu \), perturbatively coupled to photons with energies \( \hbar \omega_p - \mu \). As this frame allows us to focus on the low-energy physics of the condensate, this shift sets the emission spectrum around the bilayer optical bandgap \( \mu \approx E_0 \).

Appendix C: Hard-Core Bosons and Spin Waves

In this Appendix we briefly outline the analysis of the hard-core boson and corresponding spin model studied in the main text. Particle–hole symmetry.—The hard-core constraint gives rise to the notion of boson vacancies. A particle–hole-like symmetry \( \hat{P} S_R^\dagger \hat{P} = S_R^\dagger \) connects the
ground state of Eq. (10) with filling \( \nu \) to that with filling \( 2S - \nu \). Therefore, one can show
\[
n_k(\nu) - n_{k}(2S - \nu) = 2 \langle \tilde{S}^z \rangle = 2\nu - 2S. \tag{C1}
\]
This relation places a strong restriction on the resulting emission rate. For a finite system size \( N \), \( n_k(0) = n_{k\neq 0}(1/N) = 0 \), leading to the leading-order dependences at low and high filling
\[
n_{k\neq 0}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 
0 + \mathcal{O}(\nu^2), & \nu \to 0 \\
2\nu - 2S + \mathcal{O}((2S - \nu)^2), & \nu \to 2S.
\end{cases} \tag{C2}
\]
These two asymptotes can be satisfied simultaneously only by a nonlinear dependence, thus establishing the role of interactions.

**Mean-field theory.** —The first refinement to Eq. (C2) is found in classical mean-field theory. We write the mean-field wavefunction
\[
|\Psi_{\text{MF}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{\mathbf{R}} \left( \cos \frac{\vartheta}{2} |\uparrow\rangle + \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2} |\downarrow\rangle \right)_{\mathbf{R}} \tag{C3}
\]
which corresponds to a uniform polarization in the XZ plane at polar angle \( \vartheta \), and is the mean-field ground state for \( \mu = E_0 + z \cos \vartheta \), where \( z = 6 \) is the lattice coordination number. At mean-field level the filling is \( \nu_{\text{MF}} = \langle \tilde{S}^z \rangle + S = S \cos \vartheta + 1 \). A straightforward computation yields
\[
n_{k\neq 0}(\nu_{\text{MF}}) = \langle \tilde{S}^z_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \cos^4 \frac{\vartheta}{2} = \nu_{\text{MF}}^2, \tag{C4}
\]
which is consistent with Eq. (C2). The factorized wavefunction (C3) is totally uncorrelated. However, due to their strong repulsion, particles should be anticorrelated, leading to fewer scatterings and thus weaker emission. Therefore, this result is an upper bound on the emission rate. In addition, its independence of \( \mathbf{k} \) motivates us to seek the next order correction.

**Spin-wave theory.** —Our treatment closely follows that of Bernardet et al [81] and references therein with suitable adaptations to the present lattice geometry. We first rotate the spins in the XZ plane such that the mean-field state points in the negative z direction, and then perform a Holstein-Primakoff (HP) 1/\( S \) expansion [80]. We substitute for the spin fields
\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{S}^x_{\mathbf{R}} &= \frac{\cos \vartheta}{2} \sqrt{2S - \hat{\mathbf{h}}^\dagger \mathbf{R} \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R}} + \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2} (S - \hat{\mathbf{h}}^\dagger \mathbf{R} \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R}) + \text{H.c.}, \\
\hat{S}^y_{\mathbf{R}} &= -\frac{\sin \vartheta}{2} \sqrt{2S - \hat{\mathbf{h}}^\dagger \mathbf{R} \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R}} + \cos \frac{\vartheta}{2} (S - \hat{\mathbf{h}}^\dagger \mathbf{R} \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R}) + \text{H.c.}, \\
\hat{S}^z_{\mathbf{R}} &= \frac{1}{2\mathbf{r}} \sqrt{2S - \hat{\mathbf{h}}^\dagger \mathbf{R} \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R}} + \text{H.c.},
\end{align*} \tag{C5}
\]
where \( \hat{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{R} \) are the HP bosonic annihilation operators.

Linearizing results in a quadratic Hamiltonian that is diagonalized by the mode expansion \( \hat{\Xi} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \Omega_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \), with dispersion \( \Omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \epsilon_k (\epsilon_k \cos^2 \vartheta + z \sin^2 \vartheta) \) where \( \epsilon_k \) is the dispersion in the main text. In terms of these collective modes, the real exciton annihilation operator is
\[
\hat{\chi}_{k\neq 0} = \left( \cos^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cos \theta_k + \sin^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \sin \theta_k \right) \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger - \left( \sin^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cos \theta_k + \cos^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \sin \theta_k \right) \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}} + \ldots \tag{C6}
\]
In this instance, the BdG mixing angles are given by
\[
\sin^2 \theta_k = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \cos^2 \vartheta \right) \epsilon_k + zt \sin^2 \vartheta - 1 \right). \tag{C7}
\]
The ellipses in Eq. (C6) represent sub-leading terms that are higher powers of \( \hat{b}, \hat{b}^\dagger \). The HP picture naturally shows that higher order processes that leave behind more than one collective mode will appear in the theory. Yet these contributions to \( \eta_Q \) cannot be evaluated consistently without computing higher-order corrections to the ground state as well, so are dropped.

Under the same approximation of a nearly-uniform occupancy inside the light cone, we find
\[
\Gamma(\nu) = N_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \times \left( \cos^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cos \theta_k - \sin^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \sinh \left( \frac{\theta_k Q}{2} \right) \right)^2 \\
= N_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \times \left( \cos \vartheta + \frac{2 + \cos 2\vartheta}{\sqrt{30 + 6 \cos 2\vartheta}} \right). \tag{C8}
\]
Note that \( \theta_k < 0 \) if \( \epsilon_k > zt \), and here we have explicitly used that it is negative at \( Q \). This shows suppression of emission compared to the mean-field result. \( \Gamma \) may be expressed explicitly by radicals, and in the dilute limit
\[
\Gamma(\nu \ll 1) \approx N_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \left( \frac{zt}{Q} \right)^2 \cos^4 \frac{\vartheta}{2} = \frac{4}{9} N_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \nu_{\text{MF}}^2. \tag{C9}
\]
Truncation of the HP expansion generically breaks Hamiltonian symmetries [91], and here the particle–hole relation (C1) is violated. However, trigonometric identities show that \( \Gamma(\nu) \) upholds (C1) at the level of the mean-field density \( \nu_{\text{MF}} \). Except for very small fillings (see below), the numerical correction between \( \nu \) and \( \nu_{\text{MF}} \) is merely quantitative, and we neglect it when evaluating \( \Gamma(\nu) \) in the main text. This recovers the particle–hole symmetry of \( \Gamma(\nu) \), e.g. in Fig. 2.

**Nonzero temperature.** —Thermal excitations will also lead to a population of zone-corner excitons, and are the primary channel considered for exciton loss, e.g. Ref. [34]. In terms of spin waves, this corresponds to processes wherein thermal collective modes are absorbed, rather than emitted, to sink excess momentum.

Thus, at \( T > 0 \) two emission lines emerge around \( E_0 \),
\[
h\omega = \mu \mp \Omega_Q = E_0 + zt(\cos \vartheta \mp \sqrt{r^2 \cos^2 \vartheta + r \sin^2 \vartheta}), \tag{C10}
\]
where \( r = c_Q / zt \) (=3/2) and the signs correspond to processes that emit and absorb a spin wave, respectively. Interactions lead to a blueshift with increasing density,
\[
h\omega_{\text{emit}} \approx E_0 - \frac{5}{2} zt + 3zt\nu, \quad h\omega_{\text{absorb}} \approx E_0 + \frac{1}{2} zt + 3zt\nu. \tag{C11}
\]
The two emission peaks are split by \( 3zt \sim 20t \). For a representative \( t \sim 0.2 \text{ meV} \) [14], this separation is \( \sim 4 \text{ meV} \), and might be resolved spectrscopically.

The matrix element for the two processes are given by the parentheses in Eq. (C6). Unlike the usual Stokes and
anti-Stokes lines in phonon-assisted emission [5], they are not equal. Rather, at high temperature the ratio of intensities reproduces the leaky condensate scaling

\[
\frac{\Gamma_\mathrm{a}}{\Gamma_\mathrm{p}} \approx \left[ \cos^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cosh \theta_k + \sin^2 \frac{\vartheta}{2} \sinh \theta_k \right]^2 \approx \frac{4}{9} \nu_\mathrm{MF}^2 \quad \text{(C12)}
\]

and the anti-Stokes-like line dominates at high \( T \). In contrast, Bogoliubov theory (6) gives \( \Gamma_\mathrm{a}/\Gamma_\mathrm{p} \approx \tan^2 \theta_\Omega \approx (\nu U/2Q)^2 \). Therefore, the ratio of intensities could be also used to estimate the strength of exciton interactions.

The combined contribution of both processes to the zone-corner exciton population is

\[
n_\Omega(T) = n_\Omega(0) + \frac{3 - 2 \sin^2 \vartheta}{\sqrt{9 - 3 \sin^2 \vartheta}} \times \frac{1}{\epsilon_n \kappa \alpha T}.
\]

The first and second terms correspond to the contributions of interactions at \( T = 0 \) and thermal excitations, respectively. It is then natural to ask which of the mechanisms is dominant. The inset of Fig. 2 depicts the crossover temperature \( T^* \) at which the two make equal contributions.

The natural temperature scale to compare against is the Berezinskii–Kosterlitz–Thouless (BKT) superfluid phase transition temperature, given by [84]

\[
k T_{\mathrm{BKT}} = \frac{\hbar^2 \pi}{m} n_s \leq 3 \pi \nu T.
\]

Here \( n_s = \nu/\mathcal{A}_M \leq \nu/\mathcal{A}_M \), with \( \mathcal{A}_M \) the moiré supercell area, is the number density of the superfluid component at \( T = 0 \), and in the effective mass approximation for \( \epsilon_k \), \( \hbar^2 / m = 2 \sqrt{3} \mathcal{A}_M \). Similarly, we estimate the degeneracy temperature by \( k T_\Omega = 2 \pi \hbar^2 n/m \approx 4 \sqrt{3} \pi \nu T \). Fig. 2 shows that at all densities \( T^* > T_{\mathrm{BKT}} \), demonstrating that interactions dominate the emission in the superfluid phase and much of the Bose-degenerate regime.

Numerical results.—We compare our HP expansion against exact diagonalization by implementing the Hamiltonian (10) numerically. We set \( \mu = E_0 \) for convenience, and compute numerically the ground state of \( \hat{\Xi} \) in each of the fixed density sectors \( \nu = 2N, 3N \ldots \) separately. We then evaluate \( \langle \hat{\Delta}_+^\dagger \hat{\Delta}_-^\dagger \rangle \) in this state to obtain \( n_\Omega(\nu) \) of each sector. Commensurability of \( \Omega \) with periodic boundary conditions limits the triangular crystal dimensions to be \( N = 3n \times 3m \) with \( n, m \) integers. Fig. 2 shows the results for a \( 6 \times 3 \) lattice.

Asymptotic correlations.—We would like to estimate the emission rate for very low filling. In this regime, correlation lengths become large, yet \( n \)-particle correlations are suppressed by factors of \( \nu^n \). Therefore, 2-particle correlations are dominant [71]. We thus consider a fixed number of \( N_s = 2 \) hard-core bosons, while taking the system size \( N \to \infty \) to scan \( n_\Omega(\nu) \) for \( \nu = \frac{3}{2} \to 0 \). The order of thermodynamic limits is important, and we expect different results for \( n_\Omega(\nu) \) if \( N_s \) or \( \nu \) are held fixed while taking \( N \to \infty \), and we therefore use this to extract scaling laws without precise numerical factors.

The two-body ground state with energy \( E_{\mathrm{GS}} \) is generally written

\[
|\mathrm{GS}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \sum_{R, \Delta} \psi_\Delta \hat{\Delta}_+^\dagger \hat{\Delta}_-^\dagger \vert \mathrm{vac}\rangle \quad \text{(C15)}
\]

where \( \psi_\Delta \) is a real and symmetric normalized two-body pairing wavefunction, with \( \psi_0 = 0 \) due to the hard-core constraint. The zone-corner occupation is then

\[
n_\Omega = 2 \times |\psi_\Omega|^2 \quad \text{(C16)}
\]

Substituting this state into the Hamiltonian (10) gives a discretized Schrödinger equation for \( \psi \), solved by

\[
|\psi_k|^2 = \frac{1}{(\epsilon_k - \epsilon)^2} \left| \sum_{k'} \frac{1}{(\epsilon_{k'} - \epsilon)} \right|^2 \quad \text{(C17)}
\]

Here \( \epsilon = E_{\mathrm{GS}} / 2 - c_0 \) is the mean energy of each particle relative to the non-interacting single-particle band minimum, determined implicitly by the hard-core condition

\[
\psi_0 \propto \sum_k e^{\epsilon_k} = 0. \quad \text{(C18)}
\]

So far this solution is exact. We proceed to evaluate \( n_\Omega \) asymptotically by

\[
n_\Omega(\nu) \sim \frac{\epsilon^2}{\epsilon_\Omega} \sim \left( \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{\epsilon_\Omega}{\epsilon_k} \right)^{-2} \sim \left[ N \int \frac{k dk}{\epsilon^2} \right]^{-2} \sim \frac{A \nu^2}{(\log(\nu/\nu_0))^2} \quad \text{(C19)}
\]

where \( A \) is a proportionality constant, and \( N_0 \) and \( \nu_0 \) are some positive constants associated with an infrared cutoff of the integral’s logarithmic divergence at the origin, corresponding to omitting \( k = 0 \) from the initial sum.

While this relation was derived for a two-particle problem, it provides a remarkably good description of \( n_\Omega(\nu) \) for more particles, as seen in Fig. 2. Demanding a smooth transition at the \( \nu = \frac{3}{2} \) particle-hole symmetry point with \( d n_\Omega / d \nu = 1 \) eliminates \( A \), and we obtain the form

\[
n_\Omega(\nu < \frac{3}{2}) = \frac{[\ln(2\nu_0)]^3}{1 + \ln(2\nu_0)} \nu^2 \quad \text{(C20)}
\]

with appropriate symmetrization for \( \nu > \frac{3}{2} \), and a single fitting parameter \( \nu_0 \) (to which we ascribe no physical meaning). Fitting numerical results with Eq. (C20), we obtain \( \nu_0 \sim 5.5 \).

Our spin-wave result Eq. (11) is consistent with Eq. (C20) only if \( \nu_{\mathrm{MF}} \sim \nu / \log(\nu/\nu_0) \) with a similar \( \nu_0 \). Following Bernardet et al [81], we numerically evaluate the density from the defining thermodynamic relation

\[
\nu - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (\Xi), \quad \nu \text{ then differs from } \nu_{\mathrm{MF}} \text{ by the}
\]
FIG. 3: Left: Mapping between $\nu$ and $\nu_{\text{MF}}$. The dots are calculated numerically, and the solid line is a fit to $\nu_{\text{MF}} \propto -\nu / \log(\nu / \nu_0)$, giving excellent agreement with $\nu_0 = 5.0$. The dashed line marks $\nu_{\text{MF}} = \nu$ for comparison.

Right: Asymptotics of emission rate at low filling. The emission rate $\Gamma(\nu)$ is plotted without (solid line, same as in Fig. 2) and with (dashed black line) spin-wave density corrections between $\nu_{\text{MF}}$ and $\nu$. Focusing on smaller filling allows us to exactly diagonalize a larger $6 \times 6$ system, which we fit with the functional form (C20) (dashed blue line). Note the spin-wave corrections give the correct asymptotic form for $\nu \to 0$. The remaining discrepancy could be due to finite-size effects.

The contribution of the spin-wave zero-point motion to the ground state expectation value $\langle \hat{\Xi} \rangle$. We plot $\nu_{\text{MF}}$ versus $\nu$ in Fig. 3a, and fit the expected logarithmic correction to excellent agreement, with $\nu_0 \sim 5.0$. The close agreement between the two fitted values shows that the spin-wave theory correctly captures the correlations at small filling. We then plot the emission rate in terms of the full density in Fig. 3b, showing good agreement between the spin-wave calculation and exact diagonalization data.