Minibands in twisted bilayer graphene probed by magnetic focusing
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Magnetic fields force ballistic electrons injected from a narrow contact to move along skipping orbits and form caustics. This leads to pronounced resistance peaks at nearby voltage probes as electrons are effectively focused inside them, a phenomenon known as magnetic focusing. This can be used not only for the demonstration of ballistic transport but also to study the electronic structure of metals. Here we use magnetic focusing to probe narrow bands in graphene bilayers twisted at \( \sim 2^\circ \). Their minibands are found to support long-range ballistic transport limited at low temperatures by intrinsic electron-electron scattering. A voltage bias between the layers causes strong valley splitting and allows selective focusing for different valleys, which is of interest for using this degree of freedom in frequently-discussed valleytronics.

Introduction

Crystallographic alignment of atomically thin crystals stacked together in a van der Waals heterostructure is a powerful tool that enables fine tuning of their electronic spectra. For crystals with similar honeycomb lattices the spectra are modified by the presence of a long-range interference (moire) pattern with a period \( \lambda_S \) dependent on the twist angle \( \theta \) between the layers \((1-18)\), see Fig 1A. The additional spatial periodicity reduces the size of the Brillouin zone and introduces secondary Dirac points, as illustrated in Fig. 1B. So far, the most pronounced twist-engineered changes in the electronic properties of 2D crystals have been achieved in twisted bilayer graphene (TBG), where the twist at discrete ‘magic’ angles results in narrow bands, periodically modulated interlayer hybridisation and strong enhancement of electron correlations, leading to superconductivity and Mott insulator transitions \((6-8)\). At larger \( \theta \), the TBG spectrum corresponds to a metal with several minibands at each K and K’ valley in the Brillouin zone (Fig. 1B). Electronic properties of such a metal are expected to be quite different from the behaviour of Dirac electrons in monolayer or bilayer (aligned to Bernal stacking) graphene but so far remain largely unexplored. Here we use transverse focusing of electrons in a perpendicular magnetic field (TMF) \((12, 19-23)\) to probe the properties of moiré minibands in TBG and demonstrate an exceptionally high quality of the ‘artificial metal’ in TBG, as well as a possibility to use vertical displacement field, \( D \), to break the valley degeneracy in the two constituent layers and selectively enhance transport in one of the valleys.

Results

Studied devices

We studied two high-quality dual gated TBG devices encapsulated with \( \sim 30-50 \) nm thick hBN crystals: D1, with \( \theta = 1.87 \pm 0.01^\circ \) (shown in Fig. 1C) and D2, with \( \theta = 2.60 \pm 0.01^\circ \) (fig. S1A). The procedure used to determine \( \theta \) is described in section 1 of Supplementary Materials. The devices were fabricated using standard dry-transfer \((24, 25)\) and tear-and-stack \((26, 4)\) techniques, see section 2 in Supplementary materials for details. To ensure a clean interface between the two graphene layers, special care was taken to avoid any contact between graphene and the polymer during the transfer (Supplementary materials section 2). In transport measurements both devices showed similar behaviour, with low-temperature mobilities in excess of \( 400 000 \text{ cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \) for carrier density \( n \sim 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-2} \). All data shown below were obtained at a constant displacement field, \( D \), that was achieved by a simultaneous sweep of the top and bottom gates (Supplementary materials section 2).
Fig. 1. Moiré minibands and TMF measurements. (A), Schematics of the moiré superlattice induced by the twist of graphene layers. Here two graphene sheets are rotated by an angle $\theta$ relative to each other, which creates an additional spatial periodicity $\lambda_s = a/[2\sin(\theta/2)]$ ($a$ is graphene’s lattice constant) with the unit cell area of $A_S = \sqrt{3}/2 \lambda_s^2$. (B) Band structure of TBG graphene in the K valley of the Brillouin zone calculated for the twist angle $\theta = 1.87^\circ$ as discussed in Supplementary materials section 3. (C), Optical image of TBG device D1 with $\theta = 1.87^\circ$. Scale bar corresponds to 4 μm. (D), Two examples of TMF signals measured in device D2 ($D=0$ V/nm) at 5K for the carrier density $3.7 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ (left) and $9.3 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ (right) at a distance 4.9 μm from the injector. The latter are close to the main and secondary neutrality points, respectively, as illustrated in panel (B). The insets are examples of focusing caustics near the main (left) and secondary (right) neutrality points (see more examples in fig. S4). Arrows highlight the focal points for caustics, red star marks the current injection point and red lines show typical trajectories that extend from the injector to the first focal point.

**Transverse magnetic focusing**

The high mobility for both devices enabled observation of TMF (12, 19–23), which is a manifestation of ballistic motion of electrons and had been used to characterize the shape of Fermi surfaces both in 3D (19, 20) and 2D (12, 21–23) metals. To measure the effect of TMF in our TBG devices, we employed a nonlocal geometry illustrated in Fig. 1C, where narrow contacts 1 and 2 at one end of the device were used for current injection (driving current $I_{12}$) and contacts 3 and 4 at the other end were used to detect a voltage $V_{34}$. In the presence of a perpendicular magnetic field, electrons injected from contact 1 propagate along the device edges in skipping orbits and form a characteristic caustic pattern determined by the shape of the Fermi surface, as illustrated in the insets of Fig. 1D. Caustics are focused into equidistant focal points along the sample edge and the drift direction of the skipping orbits is determined by the sign of the magnetic field, such that electron-like and hole-like carriers propagate in opposite directions. As the positions of focal points vary with the magnetic field, whenever they coincide with the position of the voltage probe (contact 3 in Fig. 1C), one observes a focusing peak in the nonlocal resistance $R_f = I_{12}/V_{34}$. Fig. 1D gives two examples of the observed focusing peaks measured at different carrier densities.

Fig. 2A shows a typical dependence of $R_f$ on the carrier density and magnetic field at zero displacement field, $D=0$ V/nm. Here the appearance of an $R_f$ signal in a particular quadrant of the $B$-$n$ diagram reflects the sign of the cyclotron mass, while the change of the quadrant upon doping indicates an inversion of the electron dispersion (i.e., a change of sign of the mass from electrons to holes or vice versa). Accordingly, a fan-like pattern in the centre of Fig. 2A, which converges and changes direction at zero carrier density, indicates a neutrality point. Two additional, qualitatively similar, changes of the cyclotron mass appear at higher electron and hole densities, showing inverted fan-like patterns at higher energies. These indicate that the electron dispersion converges towards a new (secondary) neutrality point, such as shown in Fig. 1B. The crossover between these two regimes (at $n \approx 3 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ and $-3 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$) must correspond to a van Hove
singularity (vHS) in the moiré miniband spectrum. For a quantitative comparison, Fig. 2B presents the results of TMF modelling for device D1. Here we used the model from ref (3) to compute the electron spectrum shown in Fig. 1B [see section 3 in Supplementary materials for details] and to perform numerical analysis of caustics (12), where the contributions to $R_f$ from trajectories of electrons leaving the injection contact at different angles were weighted proportionally to $|\nabla_k E|^{-1}$ [section 4 in Supplementary materials]. A good agreement between the experiment (Fig. 2A) and theory (Fig. 2B) suggests that the band structure of TBG is well described by the spectrum shown in Fig. 1B.

**Fig. 2.** Transverse magnetic focusing map. (A), Focusing signal $R_f$ as a function of the magnetic field and carrier density measured at 2K for device D1 in zero displacement field, $D=0$ V/nm. Colour scale: blue to red ±3 Ω. (B), TMF map calculated from the energy spectrum shown in Fig. 1B using a numerical method described in section 4 of Supplementary materials. The angle between the zigzag edge of one of the monolayers and the sample boundary is taken as 45° to avoid any spurious effects of crystallographic alignment. Importantly, as demonstrated in section 4 of Supplementary materials, the calculated TMF map is only very weakly sensitive to the mutual orientation between graphene and the sample edge, confirming the generality of our results. (C), Contour plot of the first conduction miniband shown for the K valley of the Brillouin zone for zero (left) and non-zero (right) displacement fields. Black and
red dashed lines outline the shape of the Fermi surfaces for carrier densities marked by black and red dashed lines in panel (A); the latter correspond to equivalent doping levels relative to the main (black) and secondary (red) neutrality points. The colour scale is from 0 to 154 meV. (D), $R_f$ as a function of magnetic field and carrier density for device D2 measured at $T=2K$ and $D=0.75 V/nm$ at a distance of 8.5 $\mu$m from the injector (more data shown in fig. 5S). Colour scale: blue to red ±0.2 Ω. (E) TMF map calculated numerically for device D2 in a displacement field (see sections 3, 4 and 5 in Supplementary materials for details) which shows the splitting of the focusing peaks originating from the different miniband dispersion at $\kappa$' and $\kappa''$.

It is noticeable that the fan-like patterns in Figs 2A and 2B - corresponding to the main and secondary neutrality points of the TBG superlattice (around zero carrier density and above the vHS, respectively) - have different periodicities. This difference is caused by different sizes of the Fermi surfaces at equivalent doping levels (black and red dashed lines in Fig. 2A), due to the degeneracy of the miniband dispersion at $\kappa$ and $\kappa''$. The Fermi surface contours are shown in Fig. 2C by black dashed lines around $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$ points of the mini Brillouin zone (main neutrality point) and a red dashed line around the $\gamma$ point (secondary neutrality point). Furthermore, our theoretical analysis suggests that the Fermi surfaces close to the $\gamma$ point have a triangular shape (Fig. 2C) which can be traced to the strong interlayer hybridisation of those states. At the same time the Fermi surfaces around $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$ points (that coincide with the valley centres K of the top and bottom graphene layers) are almost isotropic, as in monolayer graphene, pointing towards weak interlayer hybridisation of these states.

Effect of the displacement field

The absence of appreciable interlayer coupling at $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$ can be used to disentangle the TMF contributions from different valleys. To this end, we employed a finite displacement field, up to $D=0.75 V/nm$ (achievable without a risk of damaging our devices) which shifts the on-layer potential for electrons and, therefore, shifts the energies of the Dirac cones at $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$, as illustrated in Fig. 2C. Such layer-symmetry breaking lifts the degeneracy between $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$ and separates the motion of electrons from different valleys in a magnetic field, as they now have different sizes of cyclotron orbits. This generates two different magneto-oscillation frequencies of $R_f$ at low carrier densities, $|n|<10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$, as clearly seen in Fig. 2D where separate focusing peaks appear for the electrons from each valley.

Fig. 3. Temperature dependence of magnetic focusing. (A), Temperature dependence of the TMF signal measured at two characteristic carrier densities for device D1 (see legends). $T$ was varied from 2K to 30K (blue to red). (B), $T$ dependence of the relative scattering length (see text) extracted from experimental data for consecutive focusing peaks. Absolute scattering lengths for several relative orientations of the crystallographic axes and the sample edge are shown in a fig. S6. Dashed line shows $T^{-2}$ dependence. The inset shows the ratio of the areas under the 1$^{st}$ and 2$^{nd}$ focusing peaks in (A) as a function of $T$. Arrows correspond to $A_2/A_1=0.8$ and 0.65 (see text). Error bars indicate the accuracy of determining $A_2/A_1$; large errors at $T>20K$ are due to the relatively large background signal as the focusing peaks become strongly suppressed.
Temperature dependence of TMF

Further information about carrier dynamics in TBG can be obtained by studying the temperature dependence of TMF and its evolution for consecutive focusing peaks. In Fig. 3A we show how the amplitude of TMF oscillations depends on temperature $T$ in the range $2K < T < 30K$, in the vicinity of both main and secondary neutrality points. For quantitative analysis, we extract the relative scattering length as \( L_s \):

$$L_s = \left( \ln \left( \frac{A(T_{\text{base}})}{A(T)} \right) \right)^{-1}$$

where $L_{\text{path}}$ is the length of trajectories extending from the injector to the first focal point as shown in Fig. 1D, and $A_{1(2)}(T)$ and $A_{1(2)}(T_{\text{base}})$ the areas under the first (second) focusing peak in Fig. 3A at $T$ and $T_{\text{base}} = 2K$, respectively. The results are shown in Fig. 3B. The measured scattering lengths $L_s$ for both carrier densities and all focusing peaks clearly follow a $T^{-2}$ scaling, which is different from the $T^{-1}$ dependence characteristic of phonon-dominated scattering (23, 27). Such scaling points towards the dominance of low-angle electron-electron scattering that was also found to be responsible for the TMF suppression in graphene/hBN superlattices (12). Furthermore, the ratio between the areas under the 2nd and 1st focusing peaks in Fig. 3A, $A_2/A_1$, characterizes the reflection of electrons at the sample boundary: The closer it is to one, the higher the probability for the incoming electrons to undergo specular reflection. In our experiment, electrons with energies near the main neutrality points ($n \approx 1.8 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, right panel in Fig. 3A) undergo almost specular reflection ($A_2/A_1 \approx 0.8$), while reflection of the electrons with energies near the secondary neutrality point ($n \approx 6.6 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, left panel in Fig. 3A) is notably less specular ($A_2/A_1 \approx 0.65$). This indicates a higher probability of diffusive scattering in the latter case, which is consistent with the greater sensitivity of the corresponding part of the miniband spectrum to inevitable perturbations of the moiré pattern near the sample edge. Indeed, due to little hybridization between the layers near $\kappa$ and $\kappa'$, the scattering of Dirac electrons should be little affected by the termination of superlattice periodicity near the edge, while its part near the secondary neutrality points should be affected significantly, promoting diffusive scattering.

Fig. 4. Bulk transport properties of TBG. (A), Resistivity as a function of carrier density measured at 5K for device D1. The inset shows the same data on a logarithmic scale. (B), Hall resistivity as a function of the carrier density for D1. Black arrows in (A) and (B) mark neutrality points and red arrows mark vHS. (C), Resistivity vs magnetic field measured at different temperatures for device D1 at $n = 3.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. Red dots on a 40K curve highlight the positions of Brown-Zak oscillations.

Comparison with bulk transport

Finally, we note that the above observations of superlattice effects in TMF correlate well with the bulk transport properties of the same TBG samples studied using local geometry. The longitudinal and Hall resistivity shown in Figs 4A and 4B displays secondary neutrality points (indicated by black arrows) and van Hove singularities (red arrows) at the same carrier densities as those inferred from the TMF experiments.
Furthermore, the presence of a moiré superlattice in the studied TBG samples is seen from the presence of Brown-Zak oscillations (13, 14) that dominate the magnetotransport above \( T \sim 30K \) (Fig. 4C): While at low temperatures the magnetoresistance is dominated by Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations (see \( T = 2K \) curve in Fig. 4C), these are rapidly suppressed as \( T \) increases and give way to another \( 1/B \)-periodic oscillations, with period determined by the relation between the magnetic flux through the moiré supercell area, \( A_S \), and the magnetic flux quantum \( \phi_0 = h/e \), i.e., \( B A_S = \phi_0/q \) (where \( q \) is an integer).

To conclude, we have demonstrated that TBG supports ballistic propagation of electrons in multi-micrometer devices, with electron transport determined by the reconstruction of the energy spectrum in the presence of a long-period superlattice. This offers new opportunities to study fundamental phenomena, such as Bloch oscillations in moiré superlattices (28–30) and their use for, e.g., THz generation. Moreover, we have shown that the sensitivity of the TBG band structure to the displacement field allows selective manipulation of electrons from different valleys which may be implemented in electronic devices exploiting the valley degree of freedom.

Materials and methods

**Device fabrication:** to make twisted bilayer graphene we used the standard tear-and-stack method as described in Supplementary section 2. TBG stacks were encapsulated between hBN crystals and assembled onto SiO\(_2\) substrate with doped silicon underneath which served as a bottom gate electrode. Then devices were shaped into hall bars using standard electron-beam lithography and reactive-ion etching techniques (Supplementary section 2).

**Measurement details:** We used standard low-frequency lock-in measurement technique with excitation frequency 10–30 Hz. To independently control the carrier density and interlayer displacement field we used dual-gated geometry as discussed in Supplementary section 2.
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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Section 1. Determining twist angle.

We used two independent methods to find the actual twist angle $\theta$ between the two graphene layers. First, the twist angles were found from $\rho_{xx}(n)$ and $\rho_{xy}(n)$ measurements using the position of the secondary neutrality points (NP):

$$\theta = 2 \arcsin \left( \sqrt{\frac{3a^2}{8A}} \right),$$

(S1)

where $a$ is graphene’s lattice constant, $n$ the carrier density, $A = 4/\Delta n$ the superlattice unit cell area, and $\Delta n$ the position of the secondary NP. For device D1, NP are shown in Figs 4A and 4B in the main text yielding $\Delta n = 8.1 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ and $\theta = 1.87^\circ$. For device D2 it was impossible to reach secondary NPs using electrostatic gating; to find the twist angle in this case we used the fact that NPs can be found by extrapolation of the reciprocal Hall resistivity, $(\rho_{xy})^{-1}$ as shown in Fig. S1A. The main neutrality point is clearly seen at zero carrier density and two van Hove singularities (vHS) are shown by red arrows. To find the secondary NPs, the linear dependences below and above the vHS were extrapolated as shown in Fig. S1A, with NPs corresponding to the intersections with $(\rho_{xy})^{-1} = 0$. The positions of the secondary NPs for this device, marked by black arrows, give $\Delta n = 15.7 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ corresponding to $\theta = 2.60^\circ$.

Another way to determine the twist angle is from the periodicity of Brown-Zak oscillations (13, 14), which are shown in Fig. 4C for D1 and in Fig. S1B for D2. The superlattice area can be found as $A = \Delta \left( \frac{1}{B} \right) \phi_0$, where $\Delta \left( \frac{1}{B} \right)$ is the period of Brown-Zak oscillations in the reciprocal magnetic field, and $\phi_0$ the flux quantum. This gives $\Delta \left( \frac{1}{B} \right) = 0.0119 \pm 0.0005$ T$^{-1}$ for D1 and $0.00616 \pm 0.00005$ T$^{-1}$ for D2 corresponding to $\theta = 1.87 \pm 0.01^\circ$ for device D1 and $\theta = 2.60 \pm 0.01^\circ$ for D2, in good agreement with the values found from Hall resistivity.

Fig. S1. Hall resistivity and Brown-Zak oscillations in device D2. (A), Reciprocal Hall resistivity as a function of carrier density in a magnetic field of 1T measured at 3.5K. Black arrows indicate positions of neutrality points and red arrows show positions of vHS. Black dashed lines are extrapolations that allowed us to find positions of the secondary NPs. (B), Longitudinal resistivity vs magnetic field measured at different temperatures for device D2 at the carrier density $n = 5.8 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$. 
Section 2. Device fabrication and measurement details

The heterostructures studied in this work were assembled using the standard dry-transfer technique (24, 25), and for the fabrication of the twisted bilayer graphene (TBG) we adapted the tear-and-stack (26, 4) method. Details of these methods are outlined below.

First, the top hexagonal boron nitride (hBN) crystal was picked up using a polypropylene carbonate (PPC) polymer spun onto a polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) film. Then we used a micromanipulator to place the hBN crystal so as to cover only a part of the monolayer graphene located on a SiO$_2$/Si substrate. Next, hBN was slowly peeled off the substrate, tearing the graphene flake into two pieces while picking up the part covered with hBN. The remaining part of the graphene flake was rotated by 2° and picked up with the first half attached to hBN to produce TBG. The temperature of the substrate was kept at 70° C throughout this process in order to reduce thermally induced strain or relaxation of the layers. By carefully controlling the micromanipulator, we ensured that graphene layers had no contact with the PPC polymer, guaranteeing a clean interface between the two graphene monolayers. Finally, the bottom hBN crystal was picked up to encapsulate the TBG, and the whole stack released onto a SiO$_2$/Si substrate. To define 1D contacts, we used reactive ion etching to selectively remove the heterostructures areas, followed by deposition of Cr (3 nm) and Au (60 nm). An additional lithography step was used to make a gold top gate, which also served as an etching mask to define the mesa. An example of the final device is shown in Fig. S2A, where we show one of our dual gated TBG samples. For this sample we used p-doped Si as the bottom gate and Au as the top gate.

Resistance measurements were carried out using the standard low-frequency lock-in technique with a small excitation current $\sim$100 nA; this ensured negligible heating effects down to the lowest measurement temperature, $T = 2K$. The dual-gated geometry allowed us to control the total carrier density and the displacement field independently. The total carrier density is the sum of carrier densities induced by the top and bottom gates: $n_{\text{total}} = \frac{1}{e} (C_{\text{tg}}V_{\text{tg}} + C_{\text{bg}}V_{\text{bg}})$, where $V_{\text{tg}}$ and $V_{\text{bg}}$ are the top and bottom gate voltages, $e$ is the electron charge, $C_{\text{tg}}$ and $C_{\text{bg}}$ are the respective capacitances per unit area of the top and bottom gate (here $C_{\text{tg}}$ and $C_{\text{bg}}$ were obtained from the Hall measurements). The displacement field is calculated using $D = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon_0} (C_{\text{tg}}V_{\text{tg}} - C_{\text{bg}}V_{\text{bg}})$, where $\varepsilon_0$ is the vacuum permittivity. To achieve a fixed displacement field, $V_{\text{tg}}$ and $V_{\text{bg}}$ were varied simultaneously according to the above formula, so that only the total carrier density changed. An example of such measurements is shown in Fig. S2B.

Fig. S2. Dual-gate measurement setup. (A), Optical image of device D2. Scale bar, 7 µm. (B), $\rho_{xx}$ as a function of top and bottom gate voltages for device D2 at $T = 3.5K$. Red dashed line corresponds to the conditions of zero carrier density and black dashed lines show the direction of double gate sweeps at D=0 and 0.5 V/nm.
Section 3. Calculations of TBG band structure

To calculate the band structure of TBG, we used the model reported in ref. (31), where the Hamiltonian is given by:

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{TBG}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\Delta}{2} & \nu \pi^+ & \sum_{j=0,1,2} w e^{-i \Delta K_j \cdot r} \left( \frac{1}{e^{-i \frac{2\pi}{3} j}} e^{i \frac{2\pi}{3} j} \right) \\
\nu \pi & \frac{\Delta}{2} & -\frac{\Delta}{2} \nu \pi^+ \\
\sum_{j=0,1,2} w e^{i \Delta K_j \cdot r} \left( e^{i \frac{2\pi}{3} j} 1 \right) & \nu \pi & -\frac{\Delta}{2}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(S2)

This is equivalent to the continuum-model Hamiltonian derived in ref. (3) up to a gauge transformation. The on-diagonal blocks describe the top and bottom layers of graphene where \( \nu \) is the Dirac velocity for the monolayer and \( \Delta \) the energy shift induced by the perpendicular displacement field. The off-diagonal blocks describe the interactions between the two layers, with the interlayer coupling strength given by \( w=110 \text{ meV} \).

The original band touching point of the top layer is placed at the corner of the mini Brillouin zone (mBZ) \( \kappa \), and the band touching point of the bottom layer is placed at \( \kappa' \). The vectors \( \Delta K_j \) accounting for the shift between Brillouin zone corners for the two layers (as illustrated in Fig. S3) are given by:

\[
\Delta K_j = \frac{4\pi \theta}{3a} \left( -\sin \left( \frac{2\pi j}{3} \right), \cos \left( \frac{2\pi j}{3} \right) \right),
\]

where \( \theta \) is the twist angle between the two layers in radians and \( a=2.46 \text{ Å} \) is graphene’s lattice constant.

[Fig. S3. Brillouin zone of two twisted graphene layers. Red and black hexagons are the original Brillouin zones of the two monolayers overlaid with a relative twist. The vectors \( \Delta K_j \) (defined in Eq. (S3)) account for the shift between the original Brillouin zone corners of the two graphene layers making up a twisted bilayer graphene.]

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (S2) is shown for the K valley of the original Brillouin zone. To obtain the band structure in the K’ valley, we use a \( \pi \)-rotation of this Hamiltonian.

The miniband spectrum is calculated by zone folding (32), i.e., by bringing the states in the K valley with momenta connected by the reciprocal lattice vectors of the moiré pattern to the first mBZ. The basis of \( k \)-states of the top and bottom layer are formed from the reciprocal lattice vectors \( \Delta K_0 + mG_1 + nG_2 \) and \( 2\Delta K_0 + mG_1 + nG_2 \), respectively, where \( G_1 = \Delta K_0 - \Delta K_1 \) and \( G_2 = \Delta K_0 - \Delta K_2 \). The number of basis states is chosen to ensure convergence of the first three conduction and valence bands. The resulting Hamiltonian that contains the matrix elements between the basis states is diagonalised using a similar method to ref. (33).
Section 4. Numerical simulations of transverse magnetic focusing

To simulate TMF maps shown in Fig. 2 in the main text, we first calculate the band structures to extract the Fermi surfaces and then determine the cyclotron orbits in real space by rotating the Fermi surfaces by 90° and scaling by $\hbar/eB$ (the scaling factor is obtained from the quasi-classical equations of motion (32)). Charge carriers propagate either clockwise or anticlockwise, depending on the sign of the effective charge. We assume specular boundary conditions, so that in a magnetic field the carriers travel along the edge of the sample following cyclotron (skipping) orbits and caustics of skipping orbits focus onto equidistant points. The drift direction of the skipping orbits depends on the effective charge of the carriers and the direction of the magnetic field.

To achieve consistency with the experiment we select the states that are moving away from the injection point with energies between $\epsilon_f$ and $\epsilon_f + eV$ (where $\epsilon_f$ is the Fermi energy and $V$ the applied voltage). The group velocity is calculated from the band structure using $v \propto \nabla_E k$, i.e., it is related to the energy dispersion (for example, the velocity is smaller in flatter parts of the dispersion). Accordingly, as the applied voltage elevates the Fermi level, it results in extra states being occupied such that the available states are populated with a probability proportional to $|\nabla_E k|^{-1}$ and different injection angles should be weighted with a probability proportional to the density of states.

The TMF spectra shown in Fig. 2B, E in the main text are calculated numerically by using a similar method to ref. (12). This is achieved by counting how many electrons enter contact 3 (Fig. 1C in the main text) having a finite width $w$. The non-local resistance $(V_3 - V_4)/I_1$ is then found by calculating $(N_3 - N_4)/N_1$, where $N_1$ is the total number of injected electrons, $N_3$ is the number of electrons entering contact 3 and $N_4$ is a smooth background given by $N_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} w/d_i$. Here the subscripts correspond to the device contacts in Fig. 1C and $d_i$ is the distance between consecutive skips along the edge of the $i^{th}$ trajectory.

To investigate whether the TMF spectra are sensitive to the crystallographic orientation of graphene layers with respect to the skipping direction (the edge of the sample), Fig. S4 compares TMF maps simulated for different edge orientations characterised by an angle $\Phi$. To this end, we fix the orientation of one of the monolayers so that $\Phi = 0^\circ$ corresponds to the zig zag edge and $\Phi = 90^\circ$ to the armchair edge. The results for parameters of device D1 at $|n| = 6.6 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ give triangular skipping orbits with the distance between the focusing peaks along the sample boundary weakly dependent on $\Phi$ – see Fig. S4. Similar results are obtained for all carrier densities where the Fermi surfaces are anisotropic, i.e., for $|n| > 3 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ where the Fermi surface around the $\gamma$ point has a pronounced triangular shape (see Fig. 2C in the main text). Corresponding TMF maps show focusing peaks at slightly shifted positions relative to each other. The 3-fold symmetry of the triangular Fermi surface means that the TMF maps should repeat after 60° as is indeed seen for $\Phi = 30^\circ$ and 90° in Fig. S4, where the results are identical. At low carrier densities, near the main neutrality point, the Fermi surfaces are almost isotropic and the TMF maps are independent of $\Phi$. The positions of vHSSs are independent of $\Phi$ as well, in agreement with ref. (12).
Fig. S4. TMF maps and simulated skipping orbits for different edge alignment. The TMF maps are simulated for $\Phi = 0^\circ, 20^\circ, 30^\circ, 45^\circ$ and $90^\circ$ for device D1. The orientation of one of the monolayers is fixed such that $0^\circ$ corresponds to the zig zag edge and $90^\circ$ to the armchair edge. The skipping orbits are shown at $|n| = 6.6 \times 10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$. 
Section 5. Electrostatic screening in a finite displacement field

The TMF map in Fig. 2E in the main text shows the effect of a finite displacement field between the two graphene monolayers. To find the effective electric field for each $n$ in this figure, we need to take into account electrostatic screening. At twist angles $\sim 2^\circ$ and low carrier densities, the two monolayers are almost decoupled. To take into account electrostatic screening in this case, we include a screening term as proposed in ref. (34):

$$
e \left( D - \frac{e(n_1 - n_2)}{2\varepsilon_0} \right) \frac{d}{\varepsilon} = \frac{hv}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \left( s_1\sqrt{|n_1|} - s_2\sqrt{|n_2|} \right), \quad (S4)$$

$$n = n_1 + n_2. \quad (S5)$$

where $n_1$ and $n_2$ are carrier densities in the two parallel graphene layers separated by a distance $d$, $D$ the applied displacement field, $v$ the Dirac velocity, the band indices $s_1$ and $s_2$ are given by $s_i = n_i / |n_i|$, and the electron charge $e < 0$. In case of the TBG, we use $d \approx 0.34$ nm and following Refs. (35, 36), the dielectric constant for twisted bilayer $\varepsilon = 2.7$. The total carrier density $n$ is given by Eq. (S5). To find the effective electric field for each value of $n$ and $D$ used in the experiment, the two equations are solved simultaneously using the Dirac velocity for monolayer graphene, $v = 10^6$ m/s. In our calculations, we take $n_1$ to be the bottom layer and $n_2$ to be the top layer. The positive direction of $D$ is from the top to the bottom (pointing downwards).

Fig. S5. Further examples of TMF in a displacement field. (A), $R_f$ as a function of a magnetic field and carrier density measured for the device D2 at 2K at a distance 4.9 $\mu$m from the injector in a displacement field 0.5 V/nm. Colour scale: blue to red $\pm 2.5 \, \Omega$. (B), $R_f$ as a function of a magnetic field and carrier density measured for the device D2 at 5K at a distance 4.9 $\mu$m from the injector in a displacement field 0.75 V/nm. Colour scale: blue to red $\pm 1.5 \, \Omega$. (C), TMF map calculated numerically for panel (A). (D), TMF map calculated numerically for panel (B).
Section 6. Temperature dependence of electron scattering length

Fig. 3B of the main text shows the temperature dependence of the relative scattering length $L_S/L_{\text{path}}$ for the electrons near the main and secondary neutrality points, where $L_S$ is the electron scattering length and $L_{\text{path}}$ is the length of the trajectories extending from the injector to the first focal point. To extract the absolute scattering lengths we have calculated $L_{\text{path}}$ such that the position of the first focal point coincides with the position of the voltage probe. For the electrons near the main neutrality point, $L_{\text{path}} \approx \frac{L}{2}$, (see inset in Fig. 1a in the main text), where $L$ is the distance from the current injector to the voltage probe, which is independent of the angle between the crystallographic axes orientation of graphene layers and the sample edge. Near the secondary neutrality point $L_{\text{path}}$ is sensitive to the relative orientation of the graphene layers and the sample edge, as can be seen in Fig. S4. We have calculated $L_{\text{path}}$ and extracted the corresponding scattering lengths for several characteristic angles between the device edge and zig zag axis of the top graphene layer: $L_{\text{path} \, 0^\circ} = 1.11 \, L$; $L_{\text{path} \, 10^\circ} = 1.25 \, L$; $L_{\text{path} \, 20^\circ} = 1.58 \, L$; $L_{\text{path} \, 30^\circ} = 1.77 \, L$; $L_{\text{path} \, 45^\circ} = 1.93 \, L$. Using these values we extracted the scattering lengths, presuming different crystallographic orientations and compare them in Fig. S6. This showed that in all cases scattering lengths vary between ~100 µm at low $T$ and a few µm at $T=30K$, indicating the importance of electron-electron scattering at elevated $T$ as discussed in the main text.

![Fig. S6. Temperature dependence of electron scattering length. Electron scattering lengths corresponding to different relative orientations of the graphene’s crystallographic axes and the sample edge were extracted from the temperature dependence of the first focusing peak in Fig. 3B of the main text using $L_{\text{path}}$ calculated as described in Supplementary section 6.](image)
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