Distinguishing two-component anomalous Hall effect from topological Hall effect in magnetic topological insulator MnBi$_2$Te$_4$
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Abstract

In transport, the topological Hall effect (THE) is widely interpreted as a sign of chiral spin textures, like magnetic skyrmions. However, the co-existence of two anomalous Hall effects (AHE) could give rise to similar non-monotonic features or “humps”, making it
difficult to distinguish between the two. Here we demonstrate that the “artifact” two-component anomalous Hall effect can be clearly distinguished from the genuine topological Hall effect by three methods: 1. Minor loops 2. Temperature dependence 3. Gate dependence. One of the minor loops is a single loop that cannot fit into the full AHE loop under the assumption of AHE+THE. In addition, by increasing the temperature or tuning the gate bias, the emergence of humps is accompanied by a polarity change of the AHE. Using these three methods, one can find the humps are from another AHE loop with a different polarity. Our material is a magnetic topological insulator MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ grown by molecular beam epitaxy, where the presence of the secondary phase MnTe$_2$ on the surface contributes to the extra positive AHE component. Our work may help future researchers to exercise cautions and use these three methods to examine carefully in order to ascertain genuine topological Hall effect.
The anomalous Hall effect (AHE) is a well-known phenomenon in ferromagnets. In a homogeneous ferromagnet, the AHE is linearly proportional to the magnetization normal to the plane, $M_z(H_z)$

$$\rho_{AHE}(H_z) = R_S M_z(H_z)$$

where $\rho_{AHE}(H_z)$ is the AHE resistivity. This makes $\rho_{AHE}$ a monotonically increasing (or decreasing) function of the applied perpendicular field $H_z$ up to magnetic saturation at high field. However, sometimes pronounced nonmonotonic anomalies, or “humps” in the Hall resistivity can be observed and are usually taken as the topological Hall effect (THE).

The origin of the topological Hall effect is distinct from that of the anomalous Hall effect. The anomalous Hall effect, as a combined effect of exchange and spin-orbit interactions, has both extrinsic contributions including skew scattering and side jump and the intrinsic contribution from the Berry curvature in the momentum space. By contrast, the topological Hall effect is from the extra Berry phase obtained by an electron moving in topologically nontrivial (or chiral) spin textures, which effectively work as a fictitious magnetic field and deflect the electrons perpendicularly to the current direction without the need of spin-orbit coupling. Among all chiral spin textures that might contribute to the topological Hall effect, the most notable ones are magnetic skyrmions.

Magnetic skyrmions are swirling topological spin structures with particle-like properties and have the prospect of working as bits in memories and logic devices with the advantages of high-density, non-volatility and low power consumption. Magnetic skyrmions are stabilized by the non-collinear Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions, which
can occur with broken spatial inversion symmetry,\textsuperscript{10,11} dipole-dipole interactions\textsuperscript{12} or frustrated exchange interactions\textsuperscript{13}. Predicted in magnetic metals lacking inversion symmetry,\textsuperscript{14} magnetic skyrmions were first observed in experiments by means of neutron scattering\textsuperscript{15}, and later by Lorentz transmission electron microscopy\textsuperscript{16,17}, magnetic force microscopy\textsuperscript{18}, magneto-optical Kerr effect microscopy\textsuperscript{19,20}, resonant soft X-ray diffraction\textsuperscript{21}, photoemission electron microscopy\textsuperscript{22}, etc.

The topological Hall effect is generally accepted as a hallmark of magnetic skyrmions since the topological Hall effect in the A phase of MnSi\textsuperscript{23,24} was found to be consistent with the direct observation of skyrmions by neutron scattering\textsuperscript{15}. Such consistency was also found in later reports of FeGe\textsuperscript{25,26}, B20-type MnSi,\textsuperscript{27} and several other materials\textsuperscript{28–31}, and single skyrmions can be detected directly by Hall resistivity.\textsuperscript{32} Therefore, a large number of experimental studies to date used the topological Hall effect alone as the sufficient evidence for chiral spin textures, including magnetic skyrmions.\textsuperscript{33–52} However, the two-component anomalous Hall effect, i.e. the co-existence of two anomalous Hall loops, may also give rise to a non-monotonic shape that is similar to the topological Hall effect, making it difficult to distinguish between the two.\textsuperscript{53–56} Distinguishing the genuine topological Hall effect from such artifacts would generally require the direct observation of chiral spin textures (including magnetic skyrmions) in real or momentum space, by resorting to advanced techniques like Lorentz transmission electron microscopy or magnetic force microscopy. To date, the transport studies alone for identifying magnetic skyrmions could be unreliable. It is thus highly desirable to find the unique features that can distinguish two-component anomalous Hall effect from topological Hall effect directly in transport.
Among the various materials that exhibit the AHE or THE, magnetic topological insulators (MTI) are notable as they can realize the quantized version of the AHE, the quantum anomalous Hall effect (QAHE) and can host exotic quasiparticle excitations that behave as axions and Majorana fermions, the latter of which has been shown to have potential for quantum computing. In addition, MTIs have very promising applications in energy-efficient magnetic memory devices because their unique topological surface state enables efficient charge to spin conversion and magnetization manipulation. Recently, MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ has been discovered as an intrinsic MTI and is a layered tetradyomite magnetic compound consisting of Te-Bi-Te-Mn-Te-Bi-Te septuple layers (SL) separated by van der Waals gaps (Fig. 1b). MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ is an A-type antiferromagnet (AFM), and it has a Néel temperature of 25.4 K. Each Mn$^{2+}$ ion has an out-of-plane magnetic moment of about 5μ$_B$ (5 Bohr magnetons), which align parallel to each other within each SL, and anti-parallel between two neighboring SLs. Thin films of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ can be made either through mechanical exfoliation of bulk crystals or molecular beam epitaxy (MBE), and intrinsically show a negative AHE (or QAHE) due to uncompensated magnetic moments.

In this Article, we demonstrate that the two-component anomalous Hall effect observed experimentally can be clearly distinguished from the topological Hall effect by three methods: 1. Minor loops 2. Temperature dependence, and 3. Gate dependence. By these three methods, we check the Hall loops with humps that are similar to the topological Hall effect in the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ grown by molecular beam epitaxy and confirm its origin as two-component anomalous Hall effect. Because our method can be quickly and easily
checked in transport, we believe that it would be useful for distinguishing the artifacts from genuine topological Hall effect induced by magnetic skyrmions.

**Material Characterizations**

Figure 1. Material characterizations. (a) A cross-sectional HAADF-STEM image showing the epitaxial growth of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ film on the GaAs substrate. The image was taken along the [100] zone-axis of the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ crystal. (b) A local zoom-in view of (a) overlaid with an atomic model of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$. (c) The XRD patterns of the 7 SL sample and the GaAs substrate. Absence of all but 00l (l=6,9,18,21,24) reflections corroborates STEM’s data about the single-crystalline nature of the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ film. The calculated c-lattice parameter is 40.876(3) Å. Note: the peaks from the substrate are marked with *. (d), (e) The RHEED patterns before and after the growth.
In this work, the thin films of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ were grown on GaAs (111)B substrates by molecular beam epitaxy, and various methods are used to characterize the microstructural properties of the thin films.

High-angle annular dark field scanning transmission electron microscopy (HAADF-STEM) was carried out to study the atomic structures of the thin film. Fig. 1a and b show the HAADF-STEM images with atomic resolution from a cross-sectional specimen. The images clearly show the characteristic septuple layer (SL) substructures of rhombic MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ epitaxially grown on cubic GaAs (111)B substrate with crystallographic relationships of (001)$_R$ || (111)$_C$ and [100]$_R$ || [0-11]$_C$. Heavier elements also reveal sharper contrasts (Bi>Te>Mn), which is consistent with the sequence of Te-Bi-Te-Mn-Te-Bi-Te in the SL structures. 77

X-ray diffraction (XRD) was also performed to characterize the film’s crystal structure. The XRD pattern in Fig. 1c shows five 00$l$ ($l$=6,9,18,21,24) reflections from the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ film and two high-intensity 111 and 222 peaks from GaAs, thus confirming the (001)$_R$ || (111)$_C$ epitaxial growth. The out-of-plane lattice constant $c$=40.876 ± 0.003 Å is calculated from the 00$l$ XRD reflections (which comprises of 3 SLs, so that 1 SL= 13.63 Å), which agrees well with previous reports of the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ lattice parameter values. 75,81 All the sharp, narrow peaks in the XRD pattern can be identified from the GaAs substrate and marked with *.

During growth, in-situ reflection high-energy electron diffraction (RHEED), as presented in Fig. 1d and e, showed sharp 1 × 1 diffraction streaks, indicating good epitaxial crystal quality and flat surface morphology. Because the spacing between the two first order diffraction streaks ($d$-spacing) is inversely proportional to the in-plane lattice constant,
the in-plane lattice constant $a=4.32 \pm 0.02 \text{ Å}$ is extracted from the RHEED streaks, which aligns well with previous reports of the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ lattice parameter values.\textsuperscript{75,81}

Notably, cross-sectional HAADF-STEM images of the thin film also reveal additional secondary phases, including Bi$_2$Te$_3$ quintuple layers, BiTe$_2$ monolayers caused by Mn line vacancies in the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ septuple layers, and a MnTe$_2$ monolayer on the surface. (see Fig. S1 in the supplementary information) We will discuss the possible effects of these additional secondary phases in detail later.

Two kinds of decomposition

Figure 2. Two different decomposition methods. (a) A schematic of the Hall bar device

\[\text{(a)}\]
structure. (b) The Hall resistance of the 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample at T=2 K as a function of an applied out-of-plane magnetic field $H$. The blue and red arrows indicate the direction of the field scan. (c), (d) show the decomposition into anomalous Hall effect (AHE) + topological Hall effect (THE) + ordinary Hall effect (OHE). (e), (f) show the decomposition into two anomalous Hall effects, anomalous Hall effect 1 (AH1) + anomalous Hall effect 2 (AH2) + ordinary Hall effect (OHE).

In this work, the thin films of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ were patterned into Hall bars, as shown in Fig. 2a, to perform transport measurements. A constant current $I$ was applied in the $x$ direction and the Hall voltage $V_{yx}$ was measured along $y$ direction, so the Hall resistance was given by $R_{yx} = V_{yx}/I$. An out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ was applied along $z$ direction. The Hall data of 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample at T=2 K as the function of $H$ is presented in Fig. 2b.

The Hall signal shows an AHE loop around zero field with non-monotonic features, or “humps” that are similar to the topological Hall effect outside the loop. In principle, such kind of Hall signal can always be decomposed into either the sum of AHE and THE (Case 1 as illustrated in Fig. 2c and d) or two AHE loops, AH1 and AH2 (Case 2 as in Fig. 2e and f), plus a linear contribution from the ordinary Hall effect (OHE). If both AHE and THE were present as in Case 1, the loop around zero field could be taken as the AHE, while the hump outside the loop could be taken as the THE, which would be the most straightforward way of decomposition. This method is consistent with previous literature that the THE (as well as the skyrmion phase) could be centered around a non-
zero magnetic field and vanish around zero field. In Case 2, two AHE loops were obtained from the decomposition. The hump outside the loop could be taken as part of the positive AH2, and the rest of AH2 could be obtained by subtracting from the loop around zero field, which would yield the negative AH1. The detailed way of decomposition into two AHE loops can be found in the Section 3 of the supplementary information. To express the two decompositions in equations,

\[
\text{Case 1: } \rho_{yx} = \rho_{AHE} + \rho_{THE} + \alpha_{OHE}H
\]

\[
\text{Case 2: } \rho_{yx} = \rho_{AH1} + \rho_{AH2} + \alpha_{OHE}H
\]

where \(\rho_{AHE}\) and \(\rho_{THE}\) are the Hall resistivities of AHE and THE, \(\rho_{AH1}\) and \(\rho_{AH2}\) are the Hall resistivities of AH1 and AH2, and the constant \(\alpha_{OHE}\) is the slope of the OHE.

At this point, both kinds of decomposition seem reasonable, so that at first glance, the two-component anomalous Hall effect is hardly distinguishable from the genuine topological Hall effect (with anomalous Hall effect). This has been exactly the problem that is troubling the transport studies of magnetic skyrmions with the topological Hall effect alone as the evidence. Therefore, further studies in transport are required to distinguish between the two. Next, we will present three methods using: 1. Minor loops, 2. Temperature dependence, and 3. Gate dependence, to discriminate the genuine THE from artifacts.
**Method 1: Minor Loops**

Figure 3. Minor loops of the Hall resistance in the 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample at T=2 K. (a) Minor loops within the field of $-1.1$ T, which show no hump at positive fields (b) Minor loops beyond the field of $-1.2$ T, which develop humps at positive fields. (c) The minor loop at the field of $-1.1$ T (with OHE removed) and the fitted AHE loop in the case of AHE+THE.

From the same Hall bar as in Fig. 2, minor loops were taken by sweeping the magnetic field from +2 T to zero or a certain value of negative field ($0$ T, $-0.05$ T, $-0.075$ T, $-0.1$ T, $-0.125$ T, $-0.15$ T, $-0.2$ T, $-0.3$ T, $-0.4$ T, ... $-1.9$ T, $-2.0$ T) and then back to +2 T.

Minor loops within the field of $-1.1$ T, as presented in Fig. 3a, show no hump at positive fields, while those beyond the field of $-1.2$ T, as presented in Fig. 3b, gradually develop hump at positive fields. This is consistent with the sum of two AHE loops, because within the field of $-1.1$ T, the AH2, which has a positive polarity and contributes to the humps in the negative AH1, remains unswitched and thus does not contribute to the humps at all. Meanwhile, beyond the field of $-1.2$ T, the AH2 starts being partially and finally fully switched, thus gradually giving rise to the humps.
More importantly, the minor loop that stopped at –1.1 T (with OHE removed), as highlighted in Fig. 3c, clearly cannot fit into the full AHE loop under the assumption that the Hall signal were AHE+THE. This contradiction is the decisive evidence against the assumption of AHE+THE, thus supporting that Hall signal is the sum of two AHE loops.

Method 2: Temperature dependence

Figure 4. The temperature dependence of the Hall resistance in the 5 SL MnBi2Te4 sample. (a) The Hall resistance $R_{yx}$ as a function of an applied out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ under various temperatures, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The data at T= 7.5 K, 15 K and 20 K are shifted vertically for clarity. (b) The temperature dependence of the zero-field Hall resistance $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ taken after sweeping the magnetic field from +2 T to 0 T (c) The temperature dependence of two fitted AHE components at zero field, $R_{AH1}(H = 0)$ and $R_{AH2}(H = 0)$.
In another Hall bar of the 5 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample, the Hall resistance as a function of an applied out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ was taken under various temperatures, as presented in Fig. 4a. In the Fig. 4b, the zero-field Hall resistance $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ taken after sweeping the magnetic field from +2 T to 0 T is extracted as a function of temperature, and the polarity of the Hall loop is defined as the sign of $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ (positive or negative). The $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ turns from negative to positive with increasing temperature, thus indicating a polarity change of the Hall loop from negative to positive, and eventually vanishes above 25 K, which is consistent with the previous reports of the Néel temperature of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$.\textsuperscript{70–72,76,81}

Strikingly, the Hall signal evolves from a humped negative loop to a single positive loop by increasing the temperature. As mentioned before, if the presence of AHE and THE were assumed, the loop around zero field could be taken as the AHE, while the hump outside the loop could be taken as the THE. As the temperature increases, the two humps that could be taken as the THE start to get closer to the zero field at 7.5 K, merge together and flip the polarity of the Hall signal from negative to positive with some non-monotonic features preserved at 15 K, and eventually form a single positive loop and lose all their non-monotonic characteristics at 20 K (when the linear background is removed). Such a continuous evolution of the humps reveals their origin is the positive AHE loop, or AH2 in the decomposition into two AHEs.

Another possibility is that the AHE around zero field flips its polarity, while the THE outside vanishes with increasing temperature. However, under such an assumption, the coercive field of the AHE decreases first, vanishes, increases again and finally decreases and vanishes with increasing temperature, which is quite unphysical.
Therefore, such emergence of humps with a polarity change in the Hall signal is an important feature of the two-component anomalous Hall effect, and this feature is inconsistent with topological Hall effect. The fitted results of the two AHE components at zero field are presented in Fig. 4c, and the full loops are presented in the Fig. S5 of the supplementary information. With the increase of temperature, $R_{AH1}(H = 0)$ decreases quickly and becomes zero beyond 15 K, while $R_{AH2}(H = 0)$ follows a much slower trend of decrease and eventually vanishes above 25 K. The difference in the temperature dependences of AH1 and AH2, which carry opposite signs, explains the polarity change of the Hall signal with temperature.

**Method 3: Gate dependence**

![Graph](image)

Figure 5. The gate dependence of the Hall resistance in the 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample at T=10 K (the Hall bar device has a top gate). (a) The Hall resistance $R_{yx}$ as a function of an applied out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ under various gate biases, with blue and red
arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The data at $V_G = +4$ V, $-8$ V and $-20$ V are shifted vertically for clarity. (b) The gate dependence of the zero-field Hall resistance $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ (c) The gate dependence of two fitted AHE components at zero field, $R_{AH1}(H = 0)$ and $R_{AH2}(H = 0)$.

In another Hall bar of the 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample with a top gate, the Hall resistance at $T = 10$ K as a function of an applied out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ was taken at various gate voltages, as presented in Fig. 5a. In the Fig. 5b, the zero-field Hall resistance $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ taken after sweeping the magnetic field from +2 T to 0 T is extracted as a function of gate voltage. The $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ turns from positive to negative with increasing gate bias, which also indicates a polarity change of the Hall loop from positive to negative. The Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}(H = 0)$ carries the same sign as $R_{yx}(H = 0)$, and its gate dependence is also presented in the Fig. S7 of the supplementary information to compare with the DFT calculations in the Fig. 6c.

By increasing the gate bias, the Hall signal evolves from a humped positive loop to a single negative loop, which is similar to the temperature dependence. Therefore, a similar line of reasoning also applies to the gate dependence. As the gate bias is increased from $-20$ V to $-8$ V, the humps that could be taken as the THE start to shrink and the Hall signal keeps the same polarity. At $+4$ V, as the humps further shrinks, the Hall signal flips its polarity from positive to negative dramatically. When the gate bias is further increased to $+20$ V, the humps almost vanish and only a single negative AHE loop is left, which is the AH1 in the decomposition into two AHEs. This also corroborates the existence of a negative AH1 component, which gives rise to the non-monotonic characteristics of the Hall signal around zero field. When AH1 is removed from the Hall signals, only a
positive AH2 is left, and the non-monotonic features or humps are gone. (see the Fig. S6 of the supplementary information for detailed decompositions)

Similarly, an alternative explanation is that the AHE around zero field flips its polarity, while the THE outside vanishes with increasing gate bias. However, under such an assumption, the coercive field of the AHE also decreases first, vanishes, and increases again with increasing gate bias, which is very unusual.

Therefore, we also know from the gate dependence that such emergence of humps with a polarity change in the Hall signal distinguishes two-component anomalous Hall effect from topological Hall effect. The fitted results of the two AHE components at zero field are plotted against gate bias in Fig. 5c, and the full loops are presented in the Fig. S6 of the supplementary information. With the increase of gate bias, $R_{AH1}(H = 0)$ follows an ambipolar response to the gate voltage and changes by a factor of 4.1 in amplitude only, while $R_{AH2}(H = 0)$ almost saturates at negative gate voltage and decreases rapidly at positive gate voltage by a factor of 16.7. The obvious difference in the gate dependence of AH1 and AH2, which carry opposite signs, also accounts for the polarity change of the Hall signal with gate.
The origins of two AHE components by DFT calculations

Figure 6. (a) The charge density redistribution of 3MBT-MT, (red and blue colors indicate charge depletion and accumulation, and the isosurface is $3.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ e/Å}^3$). (b) The top view of 3MBT-MT. (c) The Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}$ of 3MBT-MT as a function of Fermi level (d) The band structure of 3MBT-MT. (The blue circles represent the weight of MnTe$_2$ in the total band).

Now we are going to explore the origins of two AHE components, namely AH1 and AH2, by density functional theory (DFT) calculations. The negative AHE component AH1 is intrinsic to the magnetic topological insulator MnBi$_2$Te$_4$, which shows a negative AHE due to uncompensated magnetic moments,$^{60,61,77}$ while the positive AHE component AH2 is from a ferromagnetic MnTe$_2$ monolayer on the surface.$^{82,83}$

Under cross-sectional HAADF-STEM (see Fig. S1 in the supplementary information), we observed several additional secondary phases, including Bi$_2$Te$_3$ quintuple layers, BiTe$_2$
monolayers caused by Mn line vacancies in the MnBi₂Te₄ septuple layers, and a MnTe₂ monolayer on the surface. Among them, we believe that the interfacial MnTe₂ monolayer gives rise to the positive AH2. It is not likely for Bi₂Te₃ quintuple layers to give rise to the positive AH2, since they either do not contain magnetic elements and are non-magnetic, or contain Mn dopants and show a negative AHE. Bi₂Te₃ can also work as non-magnetic buffer layers between MnBi₂Te₄ and give rise to weaker antiferromagnetic order or ferromagnetism in MnBi₂Te₄/(Bi₂Te₃)ₙ superlattices, but the resulting AHE is still negative. To the best of our knowledge, there is also no previous report of BiTe₂ monolayers giving rise to a positive AHE. It is most likely that the interfacial MnTe₂ monolayer gives rise to the positive AH2 since it is ferromagnetic and has perpendicular magnetic anisotropy (PMA) according to previous calculations.

We performed density functional theory (DFT) calculations to further corroborate our hypothesis. Here in the calculations, we use a supercell with three septuple layers (SL) of MnBi₂Te₄, one monolayer of MnTe₂ (3MBT-MT) and a vacuum of 15 Å thick along the surface normal, and the following is the justification for this simplified model.

Considering the balance between calculation costs and simulation accuracy, only 3 SL MnBi₂Te₄ are included in this model. Our DFT calculations demonstrated that 3 SL MnBi₂Te₄ are enough to mimic the contributions of odd layers of MnBi₂Te₄ to the total Hall conductivity, because the 3 SL MnBi₂Te₄ film alone is a magnetic topological insulator with a gap of ~67 meV and a negative anomalous Hall conductivity (−e²/ℏ) (see Fig. S2 in the supplementary information). This is in line with previous reports of the Hall conductivity of 5 or 7 SL MnBi₂Te₄. On the other hand, an isolated MnTe₂
monolayer is metallic and has a large positive anomalous Hall conductivity, as shown in Fig. S3 in the supplementary information.

In this model, the optimized in-plane lattice constant and the interlayer distance between MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ and MnTe$_2$ are 4.34 Å and 2.42 Å, respectively, which agree well with the experimental results above. DFT calculations further show that the coupling between MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ and MnTe$_2$ at the interface is ferromagnetic with an exchange energy of ~15 meV per cell, and each Mn ion in MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ and MnTe$_2$ has a magnetic moment of 5\(\mu_B\) or 3\(\mu_B\), respectively. As shown in the charge density redistribution (see in Fig. 6a), a small amount electron transfer from MnTe$_2$ to MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ occurs at the interface, and the Bader charge is ~0.03e per cell. This is also reflected in the band structure, where the Dirac cone of MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ shifts to below the Fermi level. Many interfacial states from a MnTe$_2$ monolayer cross the Fermi level, which offers a possibility for tuning the Hall conductivity of this system.

Quantitatively, the Hall conductivity \(\sigma_{xy}\) as function of Fermi level was calculated from the Berry curvature over the Brillouin zone, which contains contributions from both MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ and the interfacial states from a MnTe$_2$ monolayer. As shown in Fig. 6c, the Hall conductivity can be tuned from positive (+16.37 \(e^2/\hbar\)) to negative (~2.07 \(e^2/\hbar\)) when the Fermi level is shifted up by 10 meV. Notably the interfacial states from a MnTe$_2$ monolayer play a dominant role in the large positive Hall conductivity. These results confirm that the negative AHE component AH1 is intrinsic to MnBi$_2$Te$_4$, and the positive AHE component AH2 originates from the interfacial MnTe$_2$ monolayer. These results also agree with the sign change of Hall resistance (as well as Hall conductivity) from positive to negative by increasing the gate bias, as shown in Fig. 5b and Fig. S7.
Conclusions

In conclusion, we have proposed three methods: 1. Minor loops 2. Temperature dependence 3. Gate dependence for distinguishing the “artifact” two-component anomalous Hall effect from the genuine topological Hall effect. As a demonstration, we examined AHE loops bearing non-monotonic features, or “humps” that are similar to the topological Hall effect in the magnetic topological insulator MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ grown by molecular beam epitaxy. These can either be decomposed into the sum of AHE and THE or two AHE loops. By carefully examining the minor loops, we found that one of the minor loops is a single loop that cannot fit into the full AHE loop under the assumption of AHE+THE, thus supporting the sum of two AHE loops. In addition, by increasing the temperature, the Hall signal evolved from a humped negative loop to a single positive loop; by tuning the gate bias, the Hall signal evolved from a humped positive loop to a single negative loop. Such emergence of humps accompanied by a polarity change of the AHE also reveals that the humps are from another AHE loop with a different polarity. By cross-sectional scanning transmission electron microscopy and DFT calculations, we also found that the negative AHE component AH1 is intrinsic to the magnetic topological insulator MnBi$_2$Te$_4$, which shows a negative AHE due to uncompensated magnetic moments, while the positive AHE component AH2 comes from a secondary phase, which is a ferromagnetic MnTe$_2$ monolayer on the surface.

Our work shows that caution must be exercised in determining THE from AHE. We suggest that three methods, namely: 1. Minor loops, 2. Temperature dependence and 3. Gate dependence should be used to ascertain topological Hall effect.
Methods

Growth of materials. All the materials in this paper were grown in an ultra-high vacuum, Perkin-Elmer molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) system. We used epi-ready semi-insulating GaAs (111)B substrates for the growth. The entire process was monitored by the reflection high-energy electron diffraction (RHEED) *in situ*, where the digital RHEED images were captured using a KSA400 system built by K-space Associates, Inc. Before growth, the substrates were loaded into the MBE chamber and pre-annealed at the temperature of 630 °C in a Te-rich environment to desorb the oxide on the surface. During growth, we kept the substrate at 200 °C. High-purity Mn, Bi and Te were evaporated simultaneously from standard Knudsen cells. After the deposition, the film was post-annealed in a Te-rich environment at 290 °C for 2 minutes to improve crystallinity. The sharp and streaky lines in the RHEED pattern indicate good epitaxial crystal quality.

Material characterizations. The X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurements were performed on the 7 SL sample using an X-ray powder diffractometer with Cu Kα radiation (Panalytical X’Pert Pro). The HAADF-STEM characterization was performed on the 24 SL sample with FEI Nova NanoLab 600 DualBeam (SEM/FIB). Initially, 0.5 μm thick Pt was deposited by electron beam-induced deposition on top of the thin film sample to protect its surface. After that, 1 μm Pt was deposited by ion beam-induced deposition. In the final step of preparation, the sample was cleaned with 2 kV Ga-ions using a low beam current of 29 pA and a small incident angle of 3 degrees to reduce Ga-ions damage. An FEI Titan 80-300 probe-corrected STEM/TEM microscope operating at 300 keV was employed to acquire atomic-resolution HAADF-STEM images.
**Transport measurements.** Two types of Hall bar devices were fabricated to characterize the transport properties. The first type without a gate was millimeter-sized and made for all the samples (as in Fig. 2a). The thin films were fabricated into Hall bar patterns with the dimensions of 2 mm (length) \(\times\) 1 mm (width) using standard etching with a hard mask. Indium contacts were later soldered onto the devices. The second type with a top gate was micron-sized and made for the 7 SL sample only. The thin film was fabricated into a 40 μm (length) \(\times\) 40 μm (width) Hall bar geometry using a standard photolithography process. Cr/Au contact electrodes with thicknesses of 10/100 nm were deposited using an electron beam evaporator. Mica and graphite thin flakes, which serve as the gate dielectric and the electrode, respectively, were exfoliated and subsequently transferred onto the as-fabricated Hall bar device for top gating.

Low temperature magnetoelectric transport measurements were conducted in a Quantum Design physical property measurement system (PPMS) equipped with a 9 T superconducting magnet with a base temperature of 1.9 K. A Keithley 6221 current source was used to generate a source AC current of 0.1 μA at 8.3 Hz (for the micron-sized Hall bar device with a top gate) or 1 μA at 15.38 Hz (for the millimeter-sized Hall bar devices without a gate), and multiple lock-in amplifiers (Stanford Research SR830) were used to obtain longitudinal and Hall resistance from the Hall bar devices. Gate voltage was applied to the gate electrode of the micron-sized Hall bar device and swept by a Keithley 2636 source meter.

**DFT calculations.** All *ab initio* calculations in this work were carried out with the Vienna *ab-initio* simulation package (VASP) at the level of the spin-polarized generalized-gradient approximation (GGA). The interaction between valence electrons and ionic
cores was considered within the framework of the projector augmented wave (PAW) method.\textsuperscript{89,90} The energy cutoff for the plane wave basis expansion was set to 500 eV. A Hubbard $U = 4.0$ eV was applied to the Manganese 3d orbitals. The vdW correction (DFT-D3) was included in all calculations.\textsuperscript{91} All atoms were fully relaxed using the conjugated gradient method for the energy minimization until the force on each atom became smaller than 0.01 eV/Å, and $10^{-6}$ was chosen as the convergence criterion for the total energy for all DFT calculations.
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Supplementary Information

1. Additional cross-sectional HAADF-STEM images

Figure S1. Additional cross-sectional HAADF-STEM images of the thin film, showing (a) a Bi$_2$Te$_3$ quintuple layer, (b) two BiTe$_2$ monolayers caused by Mn line vacancies in the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ septuple layers and (c) a MnTe$_2$ monolayer on the surface of the thin film.

Cross-sectional HAADF-STEM images of the thin film also reveal additional secondary phases, including Bi$_2$Te$_3$ quintuple layers, BiTe$_2$ monolayers caused by Mn line vacancies in the MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ septuple layers, and a MnTe$_2$ monolayer on the surface of the thin film.
2. DFT calculations

Figure S2. (a) (b) The side and top view of 3SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$. (c) the Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}$ of 3SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ as a function of Fermi level (d) The band structure of 3SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$. 
Figure S3. (a) The top view of monolayer MnTe$_2$. (b) The Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}$ of monolayer MnTe$_2$ as a function of Fermi level (c) The band structure of monolayer MnTe$_2$. 
3. The method of AHE decompositions

Figure S4. A schematic for the decomposition of the AHE. (a) The full loop and the minor loop at the field of -1.1 T, which shows no hump at positive fields (b) The decomposed data AH1 (with linear OHE), AH1 (with the OHE removed) and AH2.

The method of decomposition is as follows. Since within the field of –1.1 T, the AH2 remains unswitched, the minor loops contain only the AH1 component. The minor loop at the field of –1.1 T is taken as the single AH1 to verify the decomposition. As shown in Fig. S4a, by shifting the forward sweeping curve from –2 T to +2 T upwards so that it becomes tangential to the backward sweeping curve from +2 T to –2 T, we can obtain a single AH1 loop that matches well with the minor loop. By subtracting the AH1 loop from the Hall signal, we can obtain the single AH2 loop, as shown in Fig. S4b. The full decompositions at various temperatures or gate biases are presented in Fig. S5 and Fig. S6.
Figure S5. The temperature dependence of the AHE in the 5 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample. (a) The original data under various temperatures, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. (b), (c) The two AHEs that are obtained by decomposing the original data (AH1 and AH2).
Figure S6. The gate dependence of the AHE in the 7 SL MnBi$_2$Te$_4$ sample (the Hall bar device has a top gate) at T=10 K. (a) The original data under various gate biases, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. (b), (c) The two AHEs that are obtained by decomposing the original data (AH1 and AH2).
4. Gate dependence of Hall conductivity

Figure S7. (a) The gate dependence of the zero-field Hall resistance $R_{yx}(H = 0)$ and longitudinal resistance $R_{xx}(H = 0)$ (b) The gate dependence of the zero-field Hall conductivity, $\sigma_{xy}(H = 0)$.

The relation between resistance and resistivity is given by

$$R_i = \rho_i \frac{l}{S} = \rho_i \frac{l}{d t}$$

, where $i = xx$ or $yx$, $l$ is the length, $d$ is the width and $t = 9.54$ nm is the thickness of the Hall bar. Since the aspect ratio $l/d = 1$, we can obtain $\rho_i = R_i t$. The Hall conductivity is thus given by

$$\sigma_{xy} = \frac{\rho_{yx}}{\rho_{xx}^2 + \rho_{yx}^2} = \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{R_{yx}}{R_{xx}^2 + R_{yx}^2} \right)$$
5. Thickness dependence

Figure S8. The thickness dependence of the AHE (Hall bar devices with no gate). (a)-(i) The Hall resistance of samples with various thicknesses as a function of out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ at $T=2$ K, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The linear ordinary Hall backgrounds are removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness (SL)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have humps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_c ) (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S1. The existence of humps in the AHE loops and the coercivity (\( H_c \)) of the AHE for samples with various thicknesses.

The thickness dependence of the AHE loops is presented in Fig. S8. In order to extract the coercivity from the intersection of the AHE loops and the \( x \)-axis, the linear ordinary Hall backgrounds have been subtracted around the saturation field of \(~+0.7 \, \text{T}\) (when sweeping from \( +2 \, \text{T} \) to \( -2 \, \text{T} \)). All the samples show a negative AHE under the temperature at \( T=2 \, \text{K} \) due to uncompensated magnetic moments of \( \text{MnBi}_2\text{Te}_4 \) (the even layers still have uncompensated magnetic moments due to variations of thickness over different areas, so the thickness is only taken as an average thickness) However, the humps in the AHE only appear between 4 to 7 SL and vanish for the thickness of 9 SL and beyond. Vanishing humps with increasing thickness are consistent with our conclusion that the interfacial \( \text{MnTe}_2 \) monolayer gives rise to the positive \( \text{AH}_2 \). As the transport becomes dominated by the bulk channels in thicker layers, the \( \text{AH}_2 \) from the surface is no longer distinguishable. As the thickness further increases, the coercivities also tend to increase to a large extent, although not monotonously, as are listed in Table S1.
6. Reproducibility and Controllability

Figure S9. The Hall resistance of the three 6 SL samples with different growth methods and the same medium Mn concentration as a function of out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ at $T=2$ K, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The linear ordinary Hall background is removed.

Figure S10. The Hall resistance of three 6 SL samples grown by the same co-evaporation + post-annealing method with various Mn concentrations as a function of out-of-plane magnetic field $H$ at $T=2$ K, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The linear ordinary Hall background is removed.
Figure S11. The Hall resistance of three different 6 SL samples grown with the same co-evaporation + post-annealing method and the same medium Mn concentration as a function of out-of-plane magnetic field H at T=2 K, with blue and red arrows indicating the direction of the field scan. The linear ordinary Hall background is removed.

To show that the humps in the Hall signal caused by the additional positive AHE component AH2 are both controllable and repeatable, we present a systematic study of growth methods.

The humps in the Hall signal can be induced by co-evaporation and post-annealing, as shown by three 6 SL samples with different growth methods and the same medium Mn concentration in Fig. S9. Here co-evaporation means that Mn, Bi and Te were evaporated simultaneously during the growth, and alternating layer means depositing 1 quintuple layer (QL) Bi2Te3 and 1 bilayer (BL) MnTe alternatively (thus evaporating Bi and Mn alternatively) to automatically form 1 SL MnBi2Te4, as demonstrated by Gong et al.77. Post-annealing means after the deposition, the film was post-annealed in a Te-rich environment at 290 °C for 2 minutes to improve crystallinity. We found that the growth method of alternating layer gave rise to a single negative AHE without humps, which is
consistent with Gong et al. However, as the growth method was changed to co-evaporation, humps in the Hall signal emerged. Moreover, as post-annealing was further introduced, the relative amplitude of the humps increased dramatically. This can be explained by the fact that the secondary phase of MnTe₂ on the surface can be induced effectively by means of co-evaporation and post-annealing, thus contributing to an extra positive AHE component AH₂.

The relative amplitude of the humps also increases with Mn concentration in the sample, as indicated by three 6 SL samples grown by the same co-evaporation + post-annealing method with various Mn concentrations in Fig. S10. Here low, medium and high Mn concentrations mean that the standard Knudsen cell for Mn was kept at 730, 750, and 770°C during growth, respectively, and a higher temperature means higher Mn vapor pressure and thus higher Mn concentration in the sample. A low Mn concentration gave rise to relatively smaller humps because less secondary phase of MnTe₂ (and more secondary phase of Mn-doped Bi₂Te₃) was present. As Mn concentration increased to medium and more secondary phase of MnTe₂ was formed, the relative amplitude of the humps increased significantly. When Mn concentration further increased to high, the AHE shrank dramatically, thus making the relative contribution of humps even larger, as even more metallic MnTe₂ was present and AH₂ caused by MnTe₂ dominated the conduction channel over the negative AH₁ from MnBi₂Te₄ itself.

The humps in the Hall signal are also highly repeatable, as confirmed by three different 6 SL samples grown with the same co-evaporation + post-annealing method and the same medium Mn concentration in Fig. S11. The Hall signals reveal a similar pattern of humps, despite some difference in the amplitude caused by some geometric difference in
the soldering process or variations in the growth. This means that the relative contribution of AH2 from MnTe2 is similar with the same growth method.