1. INTRODUCTION

Quasi-two-dimensional dichalcogenides $TX_2$ ($T = Nb, Ta, Mo, Hf; X = S, Se$) and their different polymorphic modifications attracted the attention of scientific community long ago [1]. This was connected with (i) early suggestions to seek high-$T_c$ superconductivity in layered compounds and (ii) the discovery of phase transitions with formation of charge density waves (CDW) [1]. In particular, in 2H-TaSe$_2$ (2H means a hexagonal structure with two Ta layers in the unit cell), a second-order transition into the incommensurate CDW phase is observed at the temperature 122.3 K. At 90 K, there is another transition, to a commensurate CDW phase [1, 2]. In 2H-NbSe$_2$, the transition to incommensurate CDW phase occurs at a much lower temperature of 33.5 K [2] and no commensurate CDW phase is observed.

Above the incommensurate CDW transition temperature in these systems, a range of temperatures might exist where short-range order CDW fluctuations with a finite, but sufficiently large, correlation length $\xi$ exist due to the low-dimensional nature of these systems (and in analogy with antiferromagnetic fluctuations in cuprates). This is indeed observed experimentally in angular resolved X-ray photoemission (ARPES) experiments [3–5].

In this paper, we present band structure calculation results for 2H-TaSe$_2$ and 2H-NbSe$_2$ with the analysis of possible topologies of the Fermi surfaces upon doping, showing the possibility of formation of “bone”-like Fermi sheets. We present the details of the theoretical description of multiband electronic scattering on CDWs in multiple-band systems, applied to pseudogap, incommensurate and commensurate CDW phases for both 2H-TaSe$_2$ and 2H-NbSe$_2$. As an outcome, we obtain spectral functions and Fermi surface maps, which are compared with a number of recent ARPES experimental data, demonstrating rather good qualitative agreement.

2. BAND STRUCTURE

The 2H-TX$_2$ layered compounds have a hexagonal crystal structure with the space symmetry group $P6_3/mmc$ with the lattice parameters $a = 3.436$ Å and $c = 12.7$ Å for the Ta system. The corresponding Wyckoff positions are $2b$ (0, 0, 0.25) for Ta and $4f$ (1/3, 2/3, 0.118) for Se [2]. The formal electronic configuration of Ta is $d^1$. To calculate the electronic structure of the compound, the linearized muffin-tin orbitals method (LMTO) [6] with default settings was used. The obtained band structure and Fermi surfaces are in good agreement with similar LDA calculations by other authors [7]. We do not present any LDA results on 2H-NbSe$_2$ because its crystal structure [2] and the corresponding band structure are very close to those of 2H-TaSe$_2$.

In our LDA calculations, in accordance with the previous works [7], the Fermi level in 2H-TaSe$_2$ is crossed by two Ta-5d bands with the $3z^2 - r^2$ symmetry (see Fig. 1a), which are well separated from other bands.

The Fermi surface (FS) of 2H-TaSe$_2$ has three hole-like cylinders near the $\Gamma$ point and two holes around the $K$ point. The Fermi surface of 2H-NbSe$_2$ has three hole-like cylinders near the $\Gamma$ point.
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Recently, several ARPES studies detected the experimental FS of 2H-TaSe$_2$. In particular, in [8], the electronic structure of the valence band was studied in 1T-TaS$_2$ and 2H-TaSe$_2$. For 2H-TaSe$_2$, it was shown that there are four crossings with the FS along the $\Gamma - K$ direction. A similar picture is also seen in LDA results (Figs. 1a, 1b). In later ARPES studies [3, 4, 9], it was observed that the FS of 2H-TaSe$_2$ has a more complex topology. Namely, “bone”-like FS sheets appear along the $\Gamma - K$ direction. Within the LDA picture, such “bones” can be obtained by shifting the Fermi level down by about 0.1 eV (Figs. 1a, 1c).

In Fig. 2, to improve over simple LDA, we show the “experimental” bands with dispersions:

$$
\epsilon(k) = t_0 + t_1 \left( \frac{k_x}{2} \cos \frac{\sqrt{3}k_y}{2} + \cos k_x \right) \\
+ t_2 \left( 2 \cos \frac{3k_x}{2} \cos \frac{\sqrt{3}k_y}{2} + \cos \sqrt{3}k_y \right) \\
+ t_3 \left[ 2 \cos k_x \cos \frac{3k_y}{2} + \cos 2k_x \right] \\
+ t_4 \left[ 2 \cos 3k_x \cos \frac{\sqrt{3}k_y}{2} + \cos 2\sqrt{3}k_y \right],
$$

$$\text{Fig. 2.}$$

“Experimental” bands for 2H-TaSe$_2$ (solid curves) and 2H-NbSe$_2$ (dashed curves). The Fermi level corresponds to zero.

$$\text{Fig. 1.}$$

LDA bands and Fermi surfaces for 2H-TaSe$_2$. Panel (a)—LDA electronic dispersions. The Fermi level corresponds to zero. Panel (b)—the LDA Fermi surface. Panel (c)—the Fermi surface for the Fermi level shown in panel (a) with a short line shifted down to obtain bone-like Fermi sheets.
3. ELECTRON SCATTERING ON A CDW

3.1. Commensurate CDW Phase

We consider a schematic picture of the first Brillouin zone for a two-dimensional hexagonal lattice, shown in Fig. 3. In the hexagonal structures under study, the commensurate CDW vector is \( \mathbf{Q} = \frac{2}{3} \Gamma M \), which corresponds to tripling the lattice period. Scattering an electron by this commensurate CDW vector returns the electron to an equivalent point after triple scattering: \( \epsilon(\mathbf{k} + 3\mathbf{Q}) = \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \). Moreover, there are in fact six equivalent scattering vectors for hexagonal structures: \( \mathbf{Q}_1 = \left( \frac{2}{3}, -\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \right) \pi, \mathbf{Q}_2 = \left( \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \right) \pi, \mathbf{Q}_3 = \left( -\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \right) \pi, \) and \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l = -\mathbf{Q}_l (l = 1, 2, 3) \). Maxima of the Lindhardt function, calculated in [3,10], are observed on these vectors \( \mathbf{Q} \). In addition, the Lindhardt function shows pronounced maxima [3,10] for the vectors \( \mathbf{X} = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma K (X_1 = \left( \frac{2}{3}, 0 \right) \pi, X_2 = \left( \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \pi, X_3 = \left( -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \pi, \) and \( \bar{\mathbf{X}}_l = -X_l (l = 1, 2, 3) \), which appear as sums of the scattering vectors \( \mathbf{Q} \) (see table of momentum summation).

Table of scattering vectors summation

| \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_3 \) |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_2 \) | \( 0 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_1 \) |
| \( \mathbf{Q}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_2 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) | \( 0 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) |
| \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_3 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_2 \) | \( 0 \) |
| \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_3 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_2 \) |
| \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) | \( 0 \) | \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) |
| \( \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_1 \) | \( 0 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_3 \) | \( \mathbf{X}_2 \) | \( \mathbf{Q}_3 \) |

An electron with momentum \( \mathbf{k} \) is therefore scattered by any of thirteen different momenta (see table): \( \mathbf{0} \), preserving its initial momentum \( \mathbf{k} \); and \( \mathbf{Q} (\mathbf{Q}_1, \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_1, \mathbf{X} \) and \( \bar{\mathbf{X}}_l \)). In the one-band case, to find the diagonal Green’s function of an electron \( G(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}) \) and twelve off-diagonal \( G(\mathbf{k} \pm \mathbf{Q}_i, \mathbf{k}) \) single-electron Green’s functions, we therefore have to solve the system of thirteen linear equations (17) (see the Appendix). Such an approach can be generalized to a multiple-band case under the simplifying assumption [11] that the intra- and interband CDW scattering amplitudes coincide (see the Appendix). Solving these equations, we can finally find the diagonal Green’s function \( G^0_i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}) \) (where \( i, j = 1, 2 \) are band indices) and the corresponding spectral function

\[
A(E, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \sum_i G''_i(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k})
\]

determining the effective electron dispersion.
function for the scattering vector among the multiple scattering processes is the successful electron then returns to the initial point with the vector that corresponds to six independent scattering processes by vectors close to the Fermi surface. In what follows, we therefore work in the so-called two-wave approximation, when the scattering act consists of two low-cost diagrams. We assume the fluctuations to be Gaussian. Then averaging over such fluctuations corresponds to all possible interconnections of the incoming and outgoing interaction lines of the same type [12–14], producing appropriate effective interactions, assumed to be of the form discussed in these works. For high enough temperatures, we can neglect the dynamics of fluctuations and average over a static random field of Gaussian pseudogap fluctuations [12–14].

We note that the number of different diagrams is defined by the product of the number of ways to interconnect vertices of types 1, 2, and 3. Because only outgoing and incoming lines of each type can be connected, the combinatorics corresponds to the incommensurate case [12]. Following [12–14], we use the basic property of the diagrams of this model: any diagram with crossing interaction lines is equal to some noncrossing diagram of the same order. Hence, only noncrossing diagrams can be considered, while contributions of all diagrams can be accounted for by combinatorial prefactors. For each type of interaction lines (1, 2, 3), we have its own incommensurate combinatorial prefactors, the same as in [12, 13].

**Recurrent Procedure for the Green’s Function: Single-Band Case**

Using straightforward generalization of the approach in [12, 13], the one-electron Green’s function can be obtained in the single-band case via a recurrent procedure, which is shown diagrammati-
and the vectors κcally in Fig. 6. There, n1 is the number of interaction lines of type l surrounding the “bare” electron line. Analytically, this procedure can be written as

\[ G^{-1}_{n_1,n_2,n_3}(k) = g^{-1}_{n_1,n_2,n_3}(k) - \Sigma_{n_1+1,n_2,n_3} \]

Here, \( g^{-1}_{n_1,n_2,n_3}(k) = \frac{1}{E - \epsilon(k) + \text{inv}(k)\kappa} \)

\( \kappa = 1/\xi \) is the inverse correlation length of pseudogap fluctuations, \( n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \), \( \nu(k) = |\nu_x(k)| + |\nu_y(k)| \), and \( \nu_{x,y}(k) = \frac{\partial\epsilon(k)}{\partial k_{x,y}} \) are projections of quasiparticle velocities.

For incommensurate fluctuations, the combinatorial prefactors are

\[ s(n) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{n+1}{2} & \text{for odd } k, \\
\frac{n}{2} & \text{for even } k.
\end{cases} \]  

This recurrent procedure is applied in analogy with [12, 13]. At the first step, we take large enough \( n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \), for example even, and assume that all Green’s functions \( G_{n_1,n_2,n_3} \) with even \( n_1, n_2, n_3 \) such that \( n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \) are equal to zero. From Eq. (9), we then find that all \( \Sigma_{n_1,n_2,n_3} \) for the same indices are also equal to zero. Then using the recurrent procedure, we can obtain all new values for \( G_{n_1,n_2,n_3} \) with even \( n_1, n_2, n_3 \), such that \( n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n - 2 \), and repeat the procedure until we obtain the physical Green’s function

\[ G(k) = G_{0,0,0}(k). \]  

**Multiple-Band Pseudogap Model for Quasi-Two-Dimensional Hexagonal Structures**

In hexagonal diselenides TaSe2 and NbSe2, as we have seen, the Fermi level is crossed by two bands. Hence, our recurrent procedure should be generalized for the case of multiple bands. We follow [11], devoted to the description of possible pseudogap behavior in iron-based superconductors, and assume that the
intra- and interband pseudogap scattering amplitudes are identical. This simplifies the analysis and the recurrent procedure for diagonal elements (with respect to band indices) of the general matrix Green’s function $G_{ij}$ can be drawn diagrammatically as in Fig. 7. For our two-band model, each of the band indices ranges over two possible values, and summation is performed over all possible values of indices $p, m, l$ in the vertices (Fig. 7). Therefore, the self-energy in these diagrams has no dependence on band indices at all, and we can obtain the recurrent procedure for

$$G_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{ij} = \sum_{i,j} G_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{ij},$$

which is identical to Eqs. (6)–(9) in the single-band case, with the only replacement

$$\Sigma_{n_1, n_2, n_3} = \Sigma_{1, 0, 0} + \Sigma_{0, 1, 0} + \Sigma_{0, 0, 1},$$

At the end of the procedure, we define the physical matrix Green’s function as

$$G_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{ij}(k) = \sum_j g_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{ij}(k),$$

$$= \sum_j \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_j(k) + i\nu_j(k)\kappa}, n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3. \quad (13)$$

At the end of the procedure, we define the physical matrix Green’s function as

$$G_{n_1, n_2, n_3}^{ij}(k) = g_{0,0,0}^{ij}(k)\delta_0 + \frac{g_{0,0,0}^{ij}(k)\Sigma_{0,0,0}(k)}{1 - \Sigma_{0,0,0}(k)}, \quad (14)$$

where $\Sigma = \Sigma_{1,0,0} + \Sigma_{0,1,0} + \Sigma_{0,0,1}$. This Green’s function allows finding spectral function (2) in the presence of CDW pseudogap fluctuations.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In our calculations, we used a rather typical estimate of CDW potential $\Delta = 0.05$ eV, and we assumed the value $\xi = 10a$ (where $a$ is the lattice spacing) for the correlations length of pseudogap fluctuations. To mimic the experimental ARPES resolution, we broadened our spectral functions with a Lorentzian of the width $\gamma = 0.03$ eV, which practically means that we made the substitution $E \rightarrow E + iy$ throughout the calculation.

In Fig. 8, we show spectral function maps along high-symmetry directions with $k_z = 0$ for 2H-TaSe$_2$. The upper panel shows a spectral function map for the incommensurate pseudogap phase obtained within our pseudogap model. In general, it resembles the bare “experimental” dispersions plotted in Fig. 2. But we here see some additional broadening of the initial spectra. These broadened regions of spectral functions with a lower intensity represent regions of pseudogap formation. Why do we speak about regions? In contrast to cuprates [15], where we have a finite and rather small number of “hot spots,” we here have virtually infinitely many “hot spots,” and it is the interplay between all of them that leads to the formation of such regions. But still the dispersion here does not have any obvious discontinuities.

The middle panel in Fig. 8 displays the case of the incommensurate CDW phase. We see that the regions previously covered with a pseudogap have clear discontinuities—gaps and also many shadow bands. When we pass further to the commensurate CDW phase (the lower panel in Fig. 8), those gaps become even stronger and we can see much more pronounced shadow bands.

Figures 9–11 show spectral function maps in the vicinity of the Fermi level along the cuts shown in Fig. 1c. In all figures, the upper row represents exper-
Electrical data in [4], while the lower one shows our theoretical results. Generally speaking, in all phases—the incommensurate pseudogap Fig. 9, the incommensurate CDW Fig. 10, and the commensurate CDW Fig. 11—we obtain a rather good qualitative agreement of the theory and the experiment for the number of bands crossing the Fermi level, their position, and relative intensity.

In Fig. 12, we compare the experimental and theoretical Fermi surfaces for 2H-TaSe₂. In the middle part of Fig. 12, we show the experimental ARPES data from [4]. The data at 180 K correspond to the pseudogap phase, and those at 30 K are for the commensurate CDW phase.

The upper panel in Fig. 12, shows our theoretical Fermi surface in the incommensurate pseudogap regime for 2H-TaSe₂. In general, it more or less resembles the LDA Fermi surface in Fig. 1c. But there are obvious signatures of partial destruction of the Fermi surface sheets. Namely, a cylinder around the \( K \) point and "bones" along the \( K-M \) direction are partially smeared. It is seen that this picture agrees well with the experimental ARPES data in [3, 4].

For the commensurate CDW phase (the lower panel in Fig. 12), the Fermi surface stays close to that obtained in the LDA and shown in Fig. 1c. In contrast to the incommensurate pseudogap phase, the Fermi surface sheets are here sharper in both experiment and theory. The cylinder around the \( K \) point is now continuous. In the middle of the "bones," we observe the start of formation of small triangles, shown in the center of the middle panel. In the commensurate CDW...
In Fig. 13, we compare experimental (middle panel) and theoretical (lower and upper panels) Fermi surfaces for 2H-NbSe$_2$. Experimental data on the Fermi surface are available only for the commensurate CDW phase [5]. We can therefore compare these with the theoretical picture shown in lower panel in Fig. 13. In general, both Fermi surfaces resemble those in Fig. 1b. Taking the electron scattering on a commensurate CDW into account leads to small regions of Fermi surface destruction, namely, along the $\Gamma-K$ and $K-M$ directions. If there exists an incommensurate pseudo-gap phase for 2H-NbSe$_2$ at sufficiently high temperatures, its Fermi surface is not changed much by pseudogap fluctuations, as can be seen in the upper panel in Fig. 13.

5. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, we have presented theoretical results on the electronic structure of two-dimensional diselenides 2H-TaSe$_2$ and 2H-NbSe$_2$ within different CDW phases.

First of all, we formulated a theoretical approach to account for multiple scattering of electrons on different CDW types, also in the multiple-band case. We next investigated spectral functions and Fermi surfaces for the pseudogap, incommensurate CDW, and commensurate CDW phases. The calculated theoretical spectral functions for the pseudogap phase demonstrate “hot regions” where the spectral function is additionally broadened. In incommensurate CDW and commensurate CDW phases, in place of these “hot regions,” we obtained the opening of the number of gaps at the intersections with rather pronounced “shadow bands.” Comparing experimental and theoretical Fermi surfaces in the pseudogap phase, we observe rather clear signs of partial Fermi surface destruction with formation of a number of typical “Fermi arcs,” separated by pseudogap regions. In the commensurate CDW phase, Fermi surfaces are rather similar to those in the initial LDA picture, with quite small features due to CDW. The overall agreement between theory and ARPES experiments is rather satisfactory.
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APPENDIX

SCATTERING ON A COMMENSURATE CDW

One-Band Scattering

We first consider the single-band case with a “bare” electron spectrum $\epsilon(k)$. These “bare” electrons are scattered on the CDW potential written as

$$V(r) = 2\Delta \sum_{l=1}^{3} \cos Q_l r.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The “bare” retarded Green’s function is:

$$g(k) = \frac{1}{E - \epsilon(k) + i\delta}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

We introduce the short notation $g(k) = g$, $g(k + Q_1) = f_l$, $g(k - Q_2) = f_l$, $g(k + X_1) = \phi_l$, and $g(k - X_1) = \phi_l$. For the diagonal Green’s function $G = G(k, k)$ and twelve off-diagonal ones ($F_l = G(k + Q_l, k)$, $F_l = G(k - Q_l, k)$, $\Phi_l = G(k + X_l, k)$, $\Phi_l = G(k - X_l, k)$), we then
obtain the system of thirteen linear equations (see table of scattering vector summation):

\[
G = g + g\Delta F,
\]

\[
F_1 = f_1\Delta(F_1 + \Phi_1 + F_2 + G + F_3 + \Phi_4),
\]

\[
F_2 = f_2\Delta(\Phi_2 + F_2 + \Phi_3 + F_3 + G + F_4),
\]

\[
F_3 = f_3\Delta(F_2 + \Phi_3 + F_3 + \Phi_1 + F_1 + G),
\]

\[
F_4 = f_4\Delta(G + F_4 + \Phi_1 + F_1 + \Phi_2 + F_2),
\]

\[
F_5 = f_5\Delta(F_5 + G + F_1 + \Phi_2 + F_2),
\]

\[
F_6 = f_6\Delta(F_6 + \Phi_1 + F_1 + F_2 + \Phi_2 + F_2),
\]

\[
F_7 = f_7\Delta(\Phi_2 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_8 = f_8\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_9 = f_9\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_{10} = f_{10}\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_{11} = f_{11}\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_{12} = f_{12}\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

\[
F_{13} = f_{13}\Delta(\Phi_1 + F_1 + G + F_2 + \Phi_3),
\]

where \( F = \sum_{i=1}^{13} (F_i + F_i) \).

Solving Eqs. (17) yields the diagonal Green’s function \( G = G(k, k) \):
where $\alpha = \Delta(f_2 + f_1 + f_3)$, $\beta = \Delta(f_1 + f_3 + f_2)$, $a = \Delta^2[f_1(\phi_1 + \phi_2) + f_2(\phi_2 + \phi_3) + f_3(\phi_3 + \phi_1)]$, and $b = \Delta^2[f_1(\phi_1 + \phi_2) + f_3(\phi_3 + \phi_1) + f_2(\phi_2 + \phi_3)]$.

**Multiband Scattering**

Following the approach in [11], we assume that the CDW scattering amplitude $\Delta$ is identical for intra- and interband transitions. We introduce the short notations $g' = g(k) = \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_i(k) + i\delta}$, $f'(l) = g(k \pm Q_l)$, and $\phi'^i(l) = g(k \pm X_i)$, where $i$ is the band index. The diagonal and off-diagonal Green’s functions have additional band indices. The rest of the notation is the same as in the single-band case. For the diagonal Green’s function, in analogy with first equation of system (17), we can obtain

$$G^i = g^i \delta_{ij} + g^i \Delta \sum_{m \neq i} \sum_{l=1}^{3} (F'^{mi}_{ij} + F'^{mj}_{ij}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

Introducing $G^i = \sum_k G'^i_{k(l)}$, $F'^{i}_{k(l)} = \sum_j F'^{ij}_{k(l)}$, $\Phi'^i_{k(l)} = \sum_j \phi'^i_{k(l)}$, $g = \sum_i g^i$, $f_{k(l)} = \sum_j f'^{i}_{k(l)}$, and $\phi_{k(l)} = \sum_j \phi'^i_{k(l)}$, and summing Eq. (19) over $i$, we obtain

$$G^i = g^i + g \Delta \sum_{l=1}^{3} (F'^i_{i(l)} + F'^i_{j(i)}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

The other twelve equations for $F'^{i}_{k(l)}$ and $\Phi'^i_{k(l)}$ are completely equivalent to the corresponding one-band Eq. (17). Hence, we immediately obtain

$$G^i = g^i K,$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

where $K$ is defined in Eq. (18). But the quantities $g$, $f_{k(l)}$, and $\phi_{k(l)}$ are now summed over all band indices. From Eqs. (19) and (20), using Eq. (21), we finally obtain

$$G^i = g^i \delta_{ij} + (g^i g'^i - g^i g) \frac{g^i g'^i}{g} (K - 1),$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

which allows calculating spectral function (2) with the account of scattering on a commensurate CDW.
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