

Comparative study of magnetic quantum oscillations in Hall and transverse magnetoresistance

A.A. Sinchenko¹, P.D. Grigoriev^{2,3,4}, A.V. Frolov⁴, A.P. Orlov⁴,

V.N. Zverev⁵, A. Hadj-Azzem⁶, E. Pachoud⁶ and P. Monceau⁶

¹*Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France*

²*L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, 142432, Chernogolovka, Russia*

³*National University of Science and Technology "MISIS", 119049 Moscow, Russia*

⁴*Kotelnikov Institute of Radioengineering and Electronics of RAS, 125009 Moscow, Russia*

⁵*Institute of Solid State Physics, Chernogolovka, Moscow region 142432, Russia and*

⁶*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inst. Neel, F-38042 Grenoble, France, CNRS, Inst. Neel, F-38042 Grenoble, France*

(Dated: March 29, 2024)

Magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO) of Hall coefficient are measured in rare-earth tritelluride TmTe_3 and shown to be much stronger and persist to higher temperature than the Shubnikov oscillations. It is general for MQO in strongly anisotropic metals, and the combined measurements of Hall and diagonal magnetoresistance provide useful informations about the electronic structure. The ratio of their MQO amplitudes depends linearly on magnetic field, and its slope gives a simple and accurate measurement tool of the electron mean free time and its temperature dependence.

PACS numbers: 71.45.Lr, 72.15.G-d, 71.18.+y

The Landau quantization of electron spectrum in magnetic fields leads to the magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO) in metals [1–3]. Usually, the MQO are observed in magnetoresistance, called the Shubnikov-de Haas effect (ShdH), and in magnetization, called the de Haas-van Alphen effect (dHvA). These quantities are measured as a function of the inverse magnetic field and display a periodic behavior. The period is given by the extremal cross section of the Fermi surface (FS) encircled by conducting electrons in a semiclassical picture. The amplitude of the MQO is given by the well known Lifshitz-Kosevich (LK) formula [4]. This formula gives the relation between the MQO frequency and FS, and describes the MQO damping by thermal and disorder broadening. Fitting the experimental temperature dependence of MQO amplitude by the LK formula gives the effective electron mass m^* , while the field dependence of MQO amplitude gives the Landau-level (LL) broadening [1]. The MQO measurements provide a powerful tool to study the electronic properties of various quasi-two-dimensional (Q2D) layered metallic compounds which are the subject of intense studies now: organic metals [5, 6], cuprate and iron-based high-temperature superconductors [7–14], heterostructures [15, 16], graphite intercalation compounds [17], various van-der-Waal crystals [18], topological semimetals [19, 20], etc.

Usually, only the diagonal component of magnetoresistance tensor is used to measure the MQO and to study the electronic structure, although the MQO of non-diagonal Hall component are also clearly observed and may even be stronger. For example, the MQO in the hole-doped high-Tc cuprate superconductors were first discovered measuring the Hall resistance [7]. The high-temperature quantum oscillations of the Hall resistance

were also measured in topological semimetals, such as bulk Bi_2Se_3 [19]. It seems interesting to compare the MQO of diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance components and to analyze if that gives additional useful informations about the electronic structure. For this purpose we choose a Q2D compound TmTe_3 . Compounds of family $R\text{Te}_3$ ($R = \text{Y, La, Ce, Nd, Sm, Gd, Tb, Ho, Dy, Er, Tm}$) have weak orthorhombic structure (space group $Cmcm$) in the normal state (see Fig. 1(a)). These systems exhibit a c -axis incommensurate charge-density wave (CDW) at high temperature through the whole R series that was recently a subject of intense studies [21–26]. For the heaviest rare-earth elements, a second a -axis CDW occurs at low temperature. MQO in $R\text{Te}_3$ compounds have been studied in works [27–30]. It was shown in [30] that in $R\text{Te}_3$ compounds with the double charge density wave state several small pockets with a very small effective mass and with the largest occupying around 0.5% of the Brillouin zone remain. TmTe_3 is a member of $R\text{Te}_3$ family with the heaviest rare-earth element and demonstrates the lowest transition temperature $T_{CDW1} = 250$ K of first high-T CDW and the highest transition temperature $T_{CDW2} = 190$ K of the second low-T CDW [23]. Hence, TmTe_3 is most convenient for the comparative study of MQO in Hall and diagonal magnetoresistance in a wide temperature range.

Single crystals of TmTe_3 were grown by a self-flux technique under purified argon atmosphere as described previously [24]. Thin single-crystal samples with a rectangular shape and with a thickness typically 1-2 μm were prepared by micromechanical exfoliation of relatively thick crystals glued on a sapphire substrate. $R\text{Te}_3$ compounds are quite sensitive to air, so the crystals should be stored in an oxygen and moisture free environment and all ma-




FIG. 1: (color online)(a) Crystal structure of RTe₃ compounds. (b) Temperature dependence of resistivity of TmTe₃ along the a and the c -axis directions and conductivity anisotropy, ρ_a/ρ_c , in the $a-c$ plane. (c) Magnetoresistance, R_{xx} , and (d) Hall resistance, R_{xy} , in TmTe₃ as a function of magnetic field, B applied perpendicular to the $(a-c)$ plane, at various temperatures in the range 5-50 K. Panels (e) and (f) show the corresponding FFT.

nipulation with the crystals in air should be done during minimal time. Because of this feature the electrical contacts were prepared by cold soldering of In. The magnetic field was applied parallel to the b axis, and in-plane magnetoresistance and the Hall resistance were recorded using the van der Pauw method [31], sweeping the field between +10 and -10 T. Measurements were performed at fixed temperature in the temperature range 4.2-100 K. Magnetic field dependencies of resistance and Hall resistance were determined as $\frac{V(+B) \pm V(-B)}{2I}$ taking (+) for magnetoresistance and (-) for Hall resistance correspondingly. Conductivity measurements were performed using the Montgomery technique [32, 33].

Figure 1(b) shows the temperature dependence of resistivity of TmTe₃ measured along the in-plane c and a axes together with the anisotropy ratio ρ_a/ρ_c in the conducting ac plane using the Montgomery method. Above the Peierls transition temperature $T_{CDW1} = 270$ K the studied compound is practically isotropic in the ac plane and $\rho_a/\rho_c \approx 1$. Below T_{CDW1} the ratio ρ_a/ρ_c strongly increases in agreement with Ref. [25]. Below the second CDW transition temperature the resistivity anisotropy decreases, and at $T < 80$ K it becomes less than 5%. In this temperature range the compound can be considered

as nearly isotropic in (ac) plane.

Figs. 1c and 1d show the diagonal R_{xx} and Hall R_{xy} transverse magnetoresistance components in TmTe₃ as a function of magnetic field B at various temperatures T in the range 5-50 K. The MQO of R_{xy} are much more pronounced than of those of R_{xx} . Panels (e) and (f) demonstrate corresponding Fourier transforms (FFT) in the window 3-9 T for MQO of resistivity components ρ_{xx} and ρ_{xy} . The MQO with frequency $F = 15$ T clearly manifest in both the diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance. However, the MQO of Hall resistivity are much stronger and observable till considerably higher temperature. This difference between the MQO of Hall and diagonal magnetoresistance components has not been previously pointed out.

The temperature dependence of MQO amplitude $A(T, B)$ is used to extract the effective electron mass m^* , and its field dependence to extract the Dingle temperature $T_D = \hbar/2\pi k_B \tau$, related to the electron mean free time τ , where $k_B = 1.38 \cdot 10^{-16}$ erg/K is the Boltzmann's constant. In 2D metals the amplitude of MQO is described by modified Lifshitz-Kosevitch formula [34]:

$$A(T, B) \propto R_T(T, B) R_D(B), \quad (1)$$

where the temperature damping factor

$$R_T = R_T(T, B) = \frac{\lambda}{\sinh(\lambda)}, \quad \lambda \equiv \frac{2\pi k_B T}{\hbar \omega_c}, \quad (2)$$

$\omega_c = eB/m^*c$ is the cyclotron frequency, e is the electron charge, c is the light velocity. The damping of MQO by disorder is described by the usual Dingle factor

$$R_D = \exp\left(-\frac{2\pi^2 k_B T_D}{\hbar \omega_c}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{\omega_c \tau}\right). \quad (3)$$

The magnetic oscillations of diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance at different temperatures are shown in Fig. 2 (a) and (b) correspondingly. Fig. 2c demonstrates the temperature evolution of MQO amplitudes. The MQO amplitude A_{xx} of the diagonal magnetoresistance (blue symbols) is well fitted by the Eq. (1) (blue solid lines) with the best-fit value $m_\alpha^* = 0.033m_e$. The low ShdH frequency and very small effective mass indicate the existence of small FS pockets with very light carriers in these compounds at low T in agreement with Ref. [30]. At the same time, the temperature dependence of the oscillation amplitude A_{xy} of Hall resistance, indicated by red squares in Fig. 2c, cannot be described by the same formula because A_{xy} decreases much slower than A_{xx} as temperature grows and the MQO of ρ_{xy} are observable up to much higher temperatures.

The Dingle temperature and the scattering time are, usually, extracted from the so-called Dingle plot that is the logarithm of MQO amplitude divided by a thermal damping factor, $\lambda/\sinh(\lambda)$, plotted as a function of inverse magnetic field, $1/B$. The corresponding Dingle




FIG. 2: (color online) Temperature evolution of the MQO of magnetoresistance (a) and of Hall resistance (b) in TmTe_3 for $F = 15$ T. (c) The temperature dependence of the amplitude of Shubnikov oscillations for $F = 15$ T (blue symbols) and the corresponding Lifshitz-Kosevitch fits (blue solid lines). Red squares indicate the temperature dependence of MQO amplitude of the Hall resistance. (d) The Dingle plots, $\ln(A \sinh(\lambda)/\lambda)(B^{-1})$, for the MQO of diagonal magnetoresistance ρ_{xx} at the same temperatures. (e) The magnetic-field dependence of the ratio of MQO amplitudes, A_{xx}/A_{xy} , at various temperatures. Inset shows the corresponding temperature dependence of the scattering rate, $1/\tau(T)$.

plots for the MQO of ρ_{xx} are shown in Fig. 2 (d) at various temperatures. We see that these plots and their slope change strongly as temperature increases. The Dingle temperature extracted from the slope of these curves at $T = 5$ K is equal to $T_D \approx 13.4$ K, while at $T = 25$ K it decreases to $T_D \approx 5.9$ K. Of course, this strong decrease of $T_D(T)$ is not physical and appears from the incorrect use of Eq. (1) beyond its applicability region. As we argue below, one may use the value T_D extracted

only at low temperature. The corresponding scattering times extracted from the Dingle plot at low $T = 5$ K is $\tau_\alpha = (0.90 \pm 0.07)10^{-13}$ seconds.

The MQO of magnetoresistance in two-dimensional (2D) electron systems for low/intermediate magnetic fields were theoretically studied in Ref. [35]. According to this work, the MQO should be observable both in diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance components, and for one-band 2D metals they are given by simple formulas:

$$\rho_{xx} = \frac{1}{\sigma_0} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\Delta g(T)}{g_0} \right), \quad (4)$$

$$\rho_{xy} = \frac{\omega_c \tau}{\sigma_0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(\omega_c \tau)^2} \frac{\Delta g(T)}{g_0} \right), \quad (5)$$

where in a weak magnetic field, when high harmonics of MQO are small,

$$\frac{\Delta g(T)}{g_0} = -2 \cos \left(\frac{2\pi \varepsilon_F}{\hbar \omega_c} \right) R_D R_T \quad (6)$$

is the oscillatory part of the density of states (DoS), multiplied by the temperature damping factor R_T , ε_F is the Fermi energy, and the damping factors R_D and R_T are given by Eqs. (3) and (2). Eqs. (4)-(6) were recently generalized [36, 45] to layered quasi-2D metals (see Eqs. (57)-(60) of Ref. [36]) and shown to be valid in the main (first) order in the Dingle factor R_D even at finite interlayer electron transfer integral t_z if the oscillating DoS in Eq. (6) is multiplied by the additional factor $J_0(4\pi t_z/(\hbar \omega_c))$ typical to quasi-2D metals, where $J_0(x)$ is the Bessel function of zeroth order.

Now the fact that the observed MQO in Hall resistance ρ_{xy} are stronger and observable up to much higher temperatures than the MQO of ρ_{xx} is not surprising because it directly follows from Eqs. (4) and (5). Indeed, in contrast to MQO of ρ_{xx} the amplitude A_{xy} of MQO in ρ_{xy} is inversely proportional to τ_0 , which should decrease as the temperature grows because the electron levels become broadened not only by static crystal disorder but also by thermal excitations due to the electron-phonon (e-ph) and electron-electron (e-e) interaction.

We now emphasize another interesting point: Eqs. (4) and (5) predict a very simple formula for the ratio of MQO amplitudes,

$$\Delta \rho_{xx} / \Delta \rho_{xy} = 2\omega_c \tau = 2eB\tau / (m^*c). \quad (7)$$

Hence, plotting the ratio $\Delta \rho_{xx} / \Delta \rho_{xy}$ as a function of magnetic field B one obtains a linear dependence with a slope equal to $2e\tau / (m^*c)$. Figs. 2a and 2b show the magnetic-field dependence of the relative MQO amplitudes $\Delta \rho_{xx} / \bar{\rho}_{xx}$ and $\Delta \rho_{xy} / \bar{\rho}_{xy}$ obtained from the inverse Fourier transformation, where $\bar{\rho}_{xx}$ and $\bar{\rho}_{xy}$ are non-oscillating parts of diagonal and Hall magnetoresistivity correspondingly.

The Hall-resistivity oscillations are in antiphase to magnetoresistance oscillations (see Fig. 2 (a) and (b)), which corresponds to the theoretical prediction [35, 36] in Eqs. (4) and (5). In Fig. 2(e) the ratio of the absolute values of MQO amplitudes, $\Delta\rho_{xx}/\Delta\rho_{xy}$, as a function of B are shown at various temperatures. We see that these dependencies are linear at all temperatures in agreement with Eq. (7). The scattering time obtained using Eq. (7) from the slope of this curve at $T = 5$ K is $\tau = (0.99 \pm 0.09)10^{-13}$ s, which coincides with the scattering time $\tau_\alpha = (0.90 \pm 0.07)10^{-13}$ s extracted from the Dingle plot at the same temperature.

The above results suggest a new and elegant method to determine the electron scattering time τ using the ratio between the MQO amplitudes of diagonal and Hall magnetoresistivity. To check the applicability region of the proposed method we apply it at higher temperatures and compare with other common methods. As we noted before, the Dingle plots at $T > 10$ K demonstrate an unrealistic behavior. For $T = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25$ K these plots are shown in Fig. 2(d), where all these graphs are almost linear but with a slope that continuously decreases with increasing temperature. This corresponds to the decrease of scattering time $\tau(T)$ with increasing temperature, which is unphysical and indicates that the L-K formula (1) for the temperature dependence of MQO amplitude does not hold. At $T = 5$ K the temperature damping factor R_T is only a small correction that does not affect the Dingle plot. Hence, the extracted Dingle temperature $T_D = 13.4$ K and the corresponding mean-free time $\tau_\alpha \approx 0.9 \cdot 10^{-13}$ s are reasonable. However, at higher temperature even small violations of the L-K formula (1) change dramatically the final Dingle plot and spoil the common method of determining τ from the Dingle plot.

On contrary, we can extract the scattering time τ at high temperature from the ratio $\Delta\rho_{xx}/\Delta\rho_{xy}$. The dependence of this ratio on magnetic field B at $T = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30$ K is shown in Fig. 2(e). In contrast to the Dingle-plot procedure, from the ratios $\Delta\rho_{xx}/\Delta\rho_{xy}$ we obtain a reasonable temperature dependence of the scattering rate $1/\tau(T)$ shown in the inset in Fig. 2(e) and given by the sum of contributions from the electron-phonon (e-ph) and electron-electron (e-e) interaction [2],

$$\tau^{-1}(T) = \tau^{-1}(0) + \tau_{e-ph}^{-1}(T) + \tau_{e-e}^{-1}(T), \quad (8)$$

where at low $T < 30$ K $\tau_{e-ph}^{-1}(T) \propto T^3$ and $\tau_{e-e}^{-1}(T) \propto T^2$.

With increasing temperature, the MQO in magnetoresistance quickly disappear according to Eq. (2) due to temperature smearing of the Fermi level. An increase in temperature also leads to the raise of electron scattering rate τ^{-1} because of the e-ph and e-e interaction [2]. However, in the lowest order of e-ph interaction and for exponentially weak MQO, the e-ph interaction leaves the Dingle factor R_D and the effective mass m^* unchanged

in the MQO damping given by Eq. (1) [37, 38]. This comes from the special cancellation of two terms in the electron self energy at $T \gg \hbar\omega_c$, which enter both R_D and R_T . Later this cancellation was confirmed for the 2D electron systems and for the e-e interaction [39–41] and named the first Matsubara-frequency rule [41].

The above cancellation of the T -dependence of MQO amplitude [37–41] concerns only the exponential factor given by Eq. (1), which contains the product of R_T and R_D . The prefactors $\omega_c\tau$ in Eqs. (5) and (7), as well as the Dingle factor R_D alone, do not have this cancellation, and τ in these prefactors depends on temperature.

The resistivity $\rho_{xx}(T)$ contains the T -dependence of the transport scattering rate $\tau_{tr}^{-1}(T)$, which differs from $\tau^{-1}(T)$ at low temperature [2]. Hence, $\rho_{xx}(T)$ only gives a qualitative dependence $\tau(T)$. Thermal conductivity contains $\tau^{-1}(T)$ in combination with the electronic part of the specific heat $C(T) \propto T$ [2] and also can be used to extract the dependence $\tau^{-1}(T)$. The temperature dependence of τ and of the Dingle factor (3) can also be studied experimentally using the so-called differential or slow magnetoresistance oscillations (SIO) [28, 42–45]

$$\rho_d \approx A_d \cos(2\pi\Delta F/B) R_D^2 \quad (9)$$

with a frequency ΔF proportional not to the Fermi energy ε_F or to the Fermi-pocket area but to the splitting of electron band structure due to the interlayer transfer integral. This energy splitting is not affected by the temperature smearing of the Fermi level, hence the SIO do not have the temperature damping factor R_T given by Eq. (2), and the temperature damping of SIO is determined only by the electron scattering processes entering $\tau^{-1}(T)$. The SIO amplitude is also not affected by the macroscopic sample inhomogeneities, which smear the Fermi level and MQO similar to temperature [42–46]. Therefore, the SIO are often stronger than the usual MQO [42]. The magnetic intersubband oscillations [47–49] or difference-frequency oscillations in multiband metals [50] have a similar origin but are less convenient to extract $\tau^{-1}(T)$, since their amplitudes contain the temperature damping factor $R_T(T)$ because the effective masses differ on two different bands or FS pockets.

We pay attention on the fact which was not seen before: if τ in Eq. (5) decreases with temperature, e.g. due to e-e or e-ph interaction, the MQO should fade with temperature much slower for Hall than for diagonal resistivity, because the oscillatory term in Hall resistivity is inversely proportional τ . This interesting fact didn't get enough attention till now probably because of fact that the work [35] was oriented mainly on the quantum Hall effect (QHE) systems. As a rule, QHE is studied in semiconducting heterostructures having relatively low carrier concentration. Hence, in these structures the relative MQO in Hall resistance appear much weaker than the MQO in magnetoresistance. Another situation takes

place in metallic Q2D compounds where the carrier concentration is high and the Hall effect is not too large. In such systems one can expect that the relative MQO in Hall coefficient are much stronger than in diagonal magnetoresistance. As an indication of such a behavior we notice the first observation of MQO in high-temperature cuprate superconductors just in the Hall resistance [7]. From Eq. (5) we see that the MQO of Hall coefficient are stronger than the MQO of diagonal magnetoresistance at low and intermediate magnetic field range when $\omega_c\tau \lesssim 1$. Thus, for the experimental observation of this enhancement of MQO in Hall coefficient in other compounds, the most convenient is to study Q2D metals in the intermediate magnetic-field range.

To summarize, we performed a comprehensive analysis of the quantum oscillations of magnetoresistance tensor in layered rare-earth tritellurides, including the intralayer diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance. The magnetic quantum oscillations (MQO) of Hall coefficient are much stronger and persist to much higher temperature. We show that this is a general effect for MQO in highly anisotropic metals, and the combined Hall and diagonal magnetoresistance measurements provide additional useful information about the electronic structure. In particular, the ratio of MQO amplitudes of diagonal and Hall magnetoresistance components depends linearly on the magnetic field, and its slope gives a simpler and much more accurate estimate of the electron mean free time than the Dingle plot, especially at finite temperature $T \sim \hbar\omega_c$. This provides an elegant new method of measuring the electron scattering rate and its temperature dependence in various quasi-2D conductors, including high-temperature superconductors, organic metals, layered van-der-Waal crystals, topological materials, graphite intercalation compounds, artificial heterostructures, etc.

The work is supported by RSF-ANR grant RSF-22-42-09018 and ANR-21-CE30-0055.

[1] D. Shoenberg, *Magnetic oscillations in metals*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984).
 [2] A.A. Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the theory of metals*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988).
 [3] J. M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972).
 [4] I. M. Lifshitz and A. M. Kosevich, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **2**, 636 (1955).
 [5] *The Physics of Organic Superconductors and Conductors*, ed. by A. G. Lebed (Springer Series in Materials Science, V. 110; Springer Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2008).
 [6] M.V. Kartsovnik, *Chem. Rev.* **104**, 5737 (2004).
 [7] Nicolas Doiron-Leyraud, Cyril Proust, David LeBoeuf, Julien Levallois, Jean-Baptiste Bonnemaïson, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, Louis Taillefer, *Nature* **447**, 565 (2007).

[8] B. Vignolle, A. Carrington, R. A. Cooper, M. M. J. French, A. P. Mackenzie, C. Jaudet, D. Vignolles, Cyril Proust & N. E. Hussey, *Nature* **455**, 952 (2008).
 [9] T. Helm, M.V. Kartsovnik, M. Bartkowiak, N. Bittner, M. Lambacher, A. Erb, J. Wosnitza, and R. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 157002 (2009).
 [10] T. Helm, M.V. Kartsovnik, I. Sheikin, M. Bartkowiak, F. Wolff-Fabris, N. Bittner, W. Biberacher, M. Lambacher, A. Erb, J. Wosnitza, and R. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 247002 (2010).
 [11] Suchitra E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, Ruixing Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, C. H. Mielke, and G. G. Lonzarich *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 196403 (2012)
 [12] Taichi Terashima, Nobuyuki Kurita, Megumi Tomita, Kunihiko Kihou, Chul-Ho Lee, Yasuhide Tomioka, Toshimitsu Ito, Akira Iyo, Hiroshi Eisaki, Tian Liang, Masamichi Nakajima, Shigeyuki Ishida, Shin-ichi Uchida, Hisatomo Harima, and Shinya Uji, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 176402 (2011).
 [13] D. Graf, R. Stillwell, T. P. Murphy, J.-H. Park, E. C. Palm, P. Schlottmann, R. D. McDonald, J. G. Analytis, I. R. Fisher, and S. W. Tozer, *Phys. Rev. B.* **85**, 134503 (2012).
 [14] Amalia I. Coldea; Daniel Braithwaite; Antony Carrington, *Comptes Rendus. Physique* **14**, 176402 (2013); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crhy.2012.07.003> .
 [15] M. Kuraguchi, E. Ohmichi, T. Osada, Y. Shiraki, *Synth. Met.* **133-134**, 113 (2003).
 [16] Y.-W. Tan, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 036804 (2007).
 [17] G. Csanyi, P.B. Littlewood, A.H. Nevidomskyy, C.J. Pickard, B.D. Simon, *Nat. Phys.* **1**, 42 (2005).
 [18] B. Fallahazad, H.C.P. Movva, K. Kim, S. Larentis, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, S.K. Banerjee, and E. Tutuc, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 086601 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.086601>
 [19] M. Busch, O. Chiatti, S. Pezzini et al., High-temperature quantum oscillations of the Hall resistance in bulk Bi₂Se₃, *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 485 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-18960-0>
 [20] Qianni Jiang, Chong Wang, Paul Malinowski, Zhaoyu Liu, Yue Shi, Zhong Lin, Zaiyao Fei, Tiancheng Song, David Graf, Shalinee Chikara, Xiaodong Xu, Jiaqiang Yan, Di Xiao, and Jiun-Haw Chu, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 205111 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.97.115137>
 [21] E. DiMasi, M. C. Aronson, J. F. Mansfield, B. Foran, and S. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 14516 (1995).
 [22] V. Brouet, W. L. Yang, X. J. Zhou, Z. Hussain, R. G. Moore, R. He, D. H. Lu, Z. X. Shen, J. Laverock, S. B. Dugdale, N. Ru, and I. R. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 235104 (2008).
 [23] N. Ru, C. L. Condron, G. Y. Margulis, K. Y. Shin, J. Laverock, S. B. Dugdale, M. F. Toney, and I. R. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 035114 (2008).
 [24] A.A. Sinchenko, P. Lejay, and P. Monceau, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 241110(R) (2012).
 [25] A.A. Sinchenko, P.D. Grigoriev, P. Lejay, and P. Monceau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 036601 (2014).
 [26] A.A. Sinchenko, P. Lejay, O. Leynaud and P. Monceau, *Solid State Communications* **188**, 67 (2014).
 [27] N. Ru, R. A. Borzi, A. Rost, A. P. Mackenzie, J. Laverock, S. B. Dugdale, and I. R. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 045123 (2008).

- [28] P.D. Grigoriev, A.A. Sinchenko, P. Lejay, A. Hadj-Azzem, J. Balay, O. Leynaud, V.N. Zverev, P. Monceau, Bilayer splitting versus Fermi-surface warping as an origin of slow oscillations of in-plane magnetoresistance in rare-earth tritellurides, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **89**(6), 151 (2016).
- [29] S. Lei, J. Lin, Y. Jia, M. Gray, A. Topp, G. Farahi, S. Klemenz, T. Gao, F. Rodolakis, J. L. McChesney, C. R. Ast, A. Yazdani, K. S. Burch, S. Wu, N. P. Ong, and L. M. Schoop, *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay6407 (2020).
- [30] P. Walmsley, S. Aeschlimann, J. A. W. Straquadine, P. Giraldo-Gallo, S. C. Riggs, M. K. Chan, R. D. McDonald, and I. R. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 045150 (2020).
- [31] L.J. van der Pauw, *Philips Res. Repts.* **16**, 187 (1961).
- [32] H.C. Montgomery, *J.Appl.Phys.* **42**, 2971 (1971).
- [33] B. F. Logan, S. O. Rice, and R. F. Wick, *J.Appl.Phys.* **42**, 2975 (1971).
- [34] D. Shoenberg, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **56**, 417 (1984).
- [35] Akira Isihara and Ludvig Smrčka, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **19** 6777 (1986).
- [36] Pavel D. Grigoriev, Taras I. Mogilyuk, arXiv:2312.07496.
- [37] M. Fowler and R. E. Prange, *Physics Long Island City, N.Y.* **1**, 315 (1965).
- [38] S. Engelsberg and G. Simpson, *Phys. Rev. B* **2**, 1657 (1970).
- [39] G. W. Martin, D. L. Maslov, and M. Yu. Reizer, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 241309(R) (2003).
- [40] Y. Adamov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 045426 (2006).
- [41] A. V. Chubukov and D. L. Maslov *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 155136 (2012).
- [42] M. V. Kartsovnik, P. D. Grigoriev, W. Biberacher, N. D. Kushch, and P. Wyder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 126802 (2002).
- [43] P. D. Grigoriev, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 144401 (2003).
- [44] P. D. Grigoriev and T. Ziman, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 165110 (2017); *JETP Lett.* **106**, 371 (2017).
- [45] T.I. Mogilyuk and P.D. Grigoriev, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 045118 (2018).
- [46] P. D. Grigoriev, M. V. Kartsovnik, and W. Biberacher, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 165125 (2012).
- [47] M. E. Raikh and T. V. Shahbazyan, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 5531 (1994).
- [48] N. S. Averkiev, L. E. Golub, S. A. Tarasenko, and M. Willander, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **13**, 2517 (2001).
- [49] A. V. Goran, A. A. Bykov, A. I. Toropov, and S. A. Vitkalov, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 193305 (2009); S. Abedi, S. Vitkalov, A. A. Bykov, and A. K. Bakarov *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 075416 (2021).
- [50] V. Leeb and J. Knolle, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 054202 (2023).