Decoupling of the many-body effects from the electron mass in GaAs by means of reduced dimensionality
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Determining the (bare) electron mass $m_0$ in crystals is often hindered by many-body effects since Fermi-liquid physics renormalises the band mass, making the observed effective mass $m^*$ depend on density. Here, we use a one-dimensional (1D) geometry to amplify the effect of interactions, forcing the electrons to form a nonlinear Luttinger liquid with separate holon and spinon bands, therefore separating the interaction effects from $m_0$. Measuring the spectral function of gated quantum wires formed in GaAs by means of magnetotunneling spectroscopy and interpreting them using the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model, we obtain $m_0 = (0.0525 \pm 0.0015)m_e$ in this material, where $m_e$ is the free-electron mass. By varying the density in the wires, we change the interaction parameter $r_s$ in the range from $\sim 1$ to $4$ and show that $m_0$ remains constant. The determined value of $m_0$ is $\sim 22\%$ lighter than observed in GaAs in geometries of higher dimensionality $D (D > 1)$, consistent with the quasi-particle picture of a Fermi liquid that makes electrons heavier in the presence of interactions.

Since its creation in the 1920s [1], gallium arsenide (GaAs) has become one of the first materials of choice for studying a number of problems in fundamental physics, from the well-known quantum Hall effects [2–4], to spin-orbit coupling [5], and Wigner crystallisation [6]. Simultaneously, it has also been used, together with other compounds of the III-V family, in manufacturing a range of electronic devices, such as laser diodes, integrated circuits, and solar cells, with its versatility as a direct band-gap material being still reflected to date, as the most widely used semiconductor after silicon [7]. One of the basic parameters of any material is the band mass of its electrons $m_0$, the value of which for GaAs is often quoted as the effective bulk (three-dimensional, 3D) mass of $m_0^{3D} = 0.067m_e$ measured at low densities. Indeed, it is well-established that in a crystal the effective mass can often differ from its free-space counterpart by up to several orders of magnitude, something which is understood as a direct result of the electron wave function interfering with the ionic lattice. Additional degrees of freedom such as phonons, spin waves, and plasmons, as well as impurity scattering and spin-orbit interactions, have also been known to affect the effective mass of carriers, including bulk GaAs [8]. At a deeper level, however, one may wonder how strong the effect of the unavoidable electron-electron (e-e) interactions may be on their mass, given that, according to Fermi-liquid theory [9], this cannot be separated from the band-structure effect on the bare mass of one electron.

A way of controlling the effect of e-e interactions on the carrier mass is by altering the coordination number of the electrons, via lowering the dimensionality $D$ of the system. In 1970, after Esaki and Tsu’s [10] breakthrough with the invention of semiconductor quantum wells, two-dimensional electron systems became available, which have since been perfected to extremely high qualities. The study of the electron mass as a function through with the invention of semiconductor quantum wells, two-dimensional electron systems became available, which have since been perfected to extremely high qualities. The study of the electron mass as a function
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**FIG. 1.** Extraction of the bare electron mass $m_0$ in GaAs. We obtain both the spinon ($m_s$) and the holon ($m_c$) masses for a variety of different-length 1D devices at different interaction strengths $\gamma$, which is $\sim r_s$ but also includes screening effects that are quite sizeable in our samples—see details below. In a 1D geometry, $m_0$ is then given as the convergence point of these two masses in the limit as interactions are turned off (i.e., $\gamma \to 0$). Here, the dashed curves represent a one-parameter fit for the evolution of $m_c$ and $m_s$ according to the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model. Note that the obtained value of $m_0$ is significantly below $0.067m_e$ (dotted line). The yellow shaded area marks the region in which $m_s$ cannot be accurately determined, due to the presence of the zero-bias anomaly (ZBA), see text for details.
of carrier density in GaAs/AlGaAs two-dimensional (2D) heterostructures has, however, resulted in conflicting results, with values both above and below the band mass being reported across a range of techniques and for varying carrier densities \([11–14]\). Going further to a 1D geometry changes the effect of interactions drastically, from single-electron mass renormalisation to spin-charge separation \([15, 16]\) predicted by the Luttinger-liquid theory \([17, 18]\). As a result, the Fermi sea of electrons described by only one mass (making the band-structure and the many-body effects fundamentally indistinguishable in \(D > 1\)) separates into two bands for excitations of spin (i.e., spinons) and charge (i.e., holons), which can be described by two incommensurate masses \(m_s\) and \(m_c\), respectively \([19]\). This offers a new method for decoupling the effect of interactions from the measured band mass, whereby \(m_0\) can be determined by increasing the density and observing the point where the two masses converge in the non-interacting limit, see the dashed lines in Fig. 1.

In the present work, we demonstrate the experimental feasibility of this method in GaAs by probing the dispersion of the system via a tunnelling spectroscopy technique. The extracted bare mass was found to be \(m_0 = (0.0525 \pm 0.0015)m_e\), approximately 22\% lower than the commonly quoted value of 0.067\(m_e\), see Fig. 1. Furthermore, \(m_0\) was found to remain systematically below 0.067\(m_e\), as well as below the 2D mass values previously reported in the literature, for a range of densities corresponding to an interaction parameter \(r_s\) of \(\sim 1–4\). These findings show that a sizeable proportion of the effective mass in GaAs (\(\sim 22\%\)) is due to e-e interaction effects, something which was not anticipated by the present understanding of the Fermi-liquid theory on the microscopic level, stressing the need for further development on the fundamentals of the many-body theory. In any case, this result alone already provides reliable experimental data on the decoupling of the single- from the many-particle contributions to electronic parameters such as the carrier mass, which could lead to direct improvements in the modelling of materials. Simultaneously, it also opens a new opportunity for improving the operational efficiency of electronic devices, as additional control of the carrier mass can be achieved via the toolbox of many-body physics. Indeed, lower carrier mass should lead to lower resistivities, resulting in better energy efficiency, as well as faster transistors, e.g. \([20]\).

The system we have investigated is comprised of an array of 1D gated wires, separated from a nearby two-dimensional electron gas (2DEG) by a barrier approximately 14nm thick. The inset in Figure 2 shows a false-colour scanning electron micrograph of a typical device. Each device was fabricated on a 200\(\mu m\)-wide Hall bar, with contacts to each 2DEG being established using Au-GeNi Ohmic contacts. A number of Ti/Au surface gates, fabricated using electron-beam lithography, were used in setting the tunnelling conditions. In particular, an array of ‘wire’ gates (dark blue) was used to laterally confine the electrons in the top 2DEG only, thus creating our experimental 1D system. Each device is capable of generating an array of \(\sim 400\) highly regular 1D channels (\(\sim 50\, nm\) wide) in parallel, with wire-bridge interconnections used to guarantee greater 1D channel uniformity, by avoiding the use of a connecting backbone. For details on how to fabricate these structures, see \([21]\). The lithographic width of the wires, 0.15–0.18\(\mu m\), i.e., the separation between gates, was also chosen to provide an energy spacing between 1D subbands large enough that different degrees of subband filling could be probed separately. Similarly, by changing the voltage applied to the wire-gate, one can change continuously the degree of lateral confinement, and therefore the strength of the e-e interaction \([22]\).

In order to extract the bare electron mass \(m_0\), decoupled from e-e interaction effects, we perform a low-noise, low-temperature spectroscopy measurement of the tunnelling current between each layer, which is proportional to the overlap integral of the respective spectral functions of each system \([22]\). In our devices, while the bottom 2DEG always remains 2D in nature, the top 2DEG has confined (1D) regions, in between the wire-gates (together with a small 2D ‘parasitic’ injection region, coloured yellow), see inset in Fig. 2 and \([22]\). This means that we can use the bottom layer as a well-understood spectrometer in order to probe the 1D dynamics taking place in the layer above. An offset \(eV_{DC}\) between the Fermi energies of the two systems is obtained by applying a DC bias \(V_{DC}\) between the layers. Similarly, a shift in momentum can also be achieved via a magnetic field of strength \(B\) parallel to the 2DEG layers, with the Lorentz force then adding \(\Delta k = e dB\) to the momentum of the tunnelling electrons, where \(d\) is the centre-to-centre well separation. The dispersion of each system is then mapped by measuring the differential tunnelling conductance \(G = dI/dV\) between the systems, as both energy and momentum are varied.

All measurements shown in this work were carried out in a \(^3\)He cryostat at 300 mK. The tunnelling conductance was measured using standard low-frequency ac lock-in techniques with the excitation current chosen so as to avoid sample heating. Each sample was also measured in full during a single cool-down, in order to allow for better data consistency, though different samples were independently thermally cycled, with no significant changes. In total, five different devices were measured, from two different wafers, and belonging to different fabrication batches. Fig. 2 shows a tunnelling differential map \(dG/dV_{DC} vs B\) and \(V_{DC}\) for a device where the wire-gate voltage \(V_{WG}\) is set so that only one 1D subband is occupied in the wires (\(V_{WG} = −0.515\, V\)).

The curves drawn on Fig. 2 were obtained assuming single-electron tunnelling processes between the wells,
and mark the positions of resonant peaks arising from the maximal overlap of the offset spectral functions. Black dashed lines mark the location of 2D-2D resonant-tunnelling processes happening in the ‘parasitic’ injection region, which have been separately mapped and subtracted from the data. The extracted renormalised 2D mass $m_{2D}$ obtained here using our technique is in very good agreement with independent work carried out in similar systems using a variety of different techniques, see [22] for more information.

Having shown our technique to work successfully in 2D, we now use it in order to extract $m_0$ by probing the dispersion of the 1D wires. We use the dispersions of charge and spin modes predicted by the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model in order to interpret the additional signal coming from the quantum wires

$$H = -t \sum_{j=1, \alpha=\uparrow, \downarrow}^{L/a} (c_{j+1, \alpha}^\dagger c_{j, \alpha} + c_{j, \alpha}^\dagger c_{j+1, \alpha} + U \sum_{j=1}^{L/a} n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow},$$

(1)

where $c_{j\alpha}$ are the Fermi ladder operators, $\alpha$ is the spin index $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$, $n_{j\alpha} = c_{j\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha}$ the density operator, $t$ the hopping amplitude, $U$ the interaction strength, $L$ the length of the wire, and $a$ the lattice parameter of the host crystal. The many-body spectra of this model are found from the Lieb-Wu equations [23],

$$k_j L - \sum_{l=1}^{M} \varphi(\lambda_m - k_j a) = 2\pi I_j,$$

(2)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \varphi(\lambda_m - k_j a) - \sum_{l=1}^{M} \varphi(\lambda_m/2 - \lambda_l/2) = 2\pi J_m,$$

(3)

where $\varphi(x) = -2\arctan(4tx/U)$ is the two-body scattering phase. A particular set of $N$ non-equal integers $I_j$ and $M$ non-equal integers $J_m$ dictate a unique solution of this system of $N + M$ connected equations for two types of momentum states, $k_j$ for charge and $\lambda_m$ for spin degrees of freedom, giving immediately the eigenenergy of the many-body state as $E = 4a^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} k_j^2$ and its momentum as $k = \sum_{j=1}^{N} k_j$. In the long-wavelength limit of our semiconductor experiment, the hopping amplitude is

![FIG. 2. Tunnelling spectroscopy measurements. Tunnelling conductance differential $dG/dV_{DC}$ vs magnetic field $B$ and inter-layer bias $V_{DC}$ for 1D-2D tunnelling processes (dark blue region in inset). $V_{WG} = -0.515$ V so that only one 1D sub-band is occupied. $V_{DC} > 0$ corresponds to the particle sector, and $V_{DC} < 0$ to the hole sector, for electrons tunnelling into and out of the wires, respectively. Black dashed lines mark the locations of the resonances resulting from the 2D-2D tunnelling processes between both wells in the ‘parasitic’ injection region (yellow region in inset). This has been separately mapped and subtracted from the data shown [22]. The blue dashed line corresponds to the dispersion of the bottom 2DEG as mapped by the 1D wires, while the green and magenta dashed lines are associated with the dispersions of the 1D system, marking the locations of the spinon and holon modes, respectively. Inset: Scanning electron micrograph of a tunnelling device.](image)
given by the single-particle mass $m_0$ as $t = \hbar^2 / (2m_0a^2)$, scaling the spin and the charge spectra simultaneously by $1/m_0$.

Selecting the two sets of integers as Fermi seas $[I_i = -(N-1)/2 \ldots (N-1)/2, J_m = -(M-1)/2 \ldots (M-1)/2]$ and creating linear excitations on top of them corresponds to calculating two phenomenological parameters of the low-energy field theory around the Fermi points $\pm k_F$ (the Tomonaga-Luttinger model) [24]. Extension of these excitations away from the Fermi points provides a natural continuation of the charge/spin branches into the nonlinear region. Numerical calculation of their dispersions, shown by triangles and squares in Fig. 3, gives shapes that are close to two different parabolae (see magenta and green dashed lines), which can be described by a pair of incommensurate masses $m_s$ and $m_c$. We use these two dispersions in fitting the 1D signal and its evolution with the microscopic Hubbard parameters to extract the dependence of the two masses on the interaction strength in our experiment. Instead of $U$ we use a more natural dimensionless interaction parameter of the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model [25],

$$\gamma = 0.032 \frac{\lambda_F U}{a} t,$$

which serves as a more detailed counterpart of the generally used $r_s$ in this particular dimension, by including the screening effects, which can be quite sizeable in our samples [19].

From the zero-bias field intersections of the charge (magenta) and spin (green) parabolae at $B^-$ and $B^+$ in Fig. 2 (corresponding to $k = \pm k_F$), we extract $k_F = ed(B^+ - B^-)/2\hbar$. This can be converted to the free-electron density $n_{1D}$ and the interaction parameter $r_s$, which are given by $n_{1D} = 4/\lambda_F$, and $r_s = 1/(2a_B'n_{1D})$, respectively; for an equivalent analysis in 2D and 3D geometries see [22]. Here, $a_B'$ is the Bohr radius of the conduction electrons in GaAs (i.e., with $m_0 = 0.067m_e$ and $e \approx 12$). Fitting of the whole 1D dispersion in the data reveals its modification by strong e-e interactions, including the emergence of separate collective spin and charge modes. As can be seen from the data, however, the spin parabola below the $B$-axis does not extend smoothly towards higher energies. Instead, the dispersion at positive $t$ extends down towards the charge line, which we interpret as indicative of the presence of two, not one, Fermi seas, for charge and for spin degrees of freedom, respectively (see our previous work [19] for details). Nevertheless, both dispersion modes are essentially parabolic, meaning that they can be associated with an effective mass, $m_s$ and $m_c$, respectively, as is predicted by the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model described above.

Our goal is to extract the electron mass $m_0$ in 1D GaAs wires as a function of density. In our previous works [16, 19, 36–39], we generally worked at a range of $r_s = 0.8–1.5$. Larger $r_s$ can nevertheless be obtained by mapping near the bottom of a subband, by depleting it to as low density as possible. The present device design allows us to vary the number of occupied 1D subbands up to four, see [22] for details. Ideally then, the mapping would be done at the bottom of the first 1D subband; however, at these voltages the tunnelling signal is strongly dominated by the ‘parasitic’ 2D injection region as the entire 1D channel is near pinch-off. Similarly, fitting to the third or fourth subband proved inadequate, partially due to the proximity to the bottom of the 2D band (where the upper 2DEG under the wire-gates is not fully depleted), and also due to the increase in overall map complexity as more subbands become occupied. The most reliable data were therefore obtained by mapping at the bottom of the second subband, up to $r_s \sim 4$. We did not observe any dependence of the mass on channel length (which was varied from 1–18 µm). Nevertheless, in order to increase the robustness of the analysis, we focused on two longer-wire samples (3 and 5 µm), as they provide a larger ratio of wire to ‘parasitic’ signal.
For each measurement with a different density, we obtained the interaction strength $\gamma$ from the directly observed ratio $m_s/m_e$ using the dependence between these two quantities predicted by the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model [22]. Fig. 1 shows the holon mass $m_e$ and the spinon mass $m_s$ as a function of the interaction strength $\gamma$. We are able to follow the evolution of the charge mode across a large range of $\gamma$ values with good agreement with theory. We can also follow the evolution of the spin mass, as extracted from the same set of measurements, up to about $\gamma \sim 3$. Above this, the spin mode is obscured by the zero-bias anomaly (ZBA), which greatly suppresses all signal falling within $\pm 0.5$ meV of zero bias. This is further complicated as, unlike its charge counterpart, the spin mode is only observed and tracked in the hole sector, making the extraction of $m_s$ more challenging. Nevertheless, the extracted values are shown to evolve systematically with $\gamma$, and they are in good agreement with our model. As the mass of each mode converges to the bare electron mass $m_0$ once interactions are turned off (i.e., $\gamma = 0$), taking the best fit to the data as given by the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model, we obtain $m_0 = (0.0525 \pm 0.0015)m_e$.

Alternatively, we can extract values of both $m_0$ and $\gamma$ from each individual measurement at a different density (i.e., interaction parameter $r_s$). In addition to extracting $\gamma$ from the observed $m_s/m_e$ ratio, we use the Hubbard spectra in Fig. 3 to fit data similar to that shown in Fig. 2 by scaling the overall energy axis by $1/m_0$. As a result, we obtain an average mass of $m_0 = (0.0515 \pm 0.0015)m_e$ for $r_s < 1.6$, which shows no dependence on density (see Fig. 4b, closed symbols) and is in good agreement with the previous value within experimental error. At higher $r_s$ (open symbols), individual extraction of $m_0$ is hindered, given that $m_s$ cannot be accurately extracted due to the ZBA. We estimate $m_0$ by fitting the spinon mode up to the point where the ZBA takes over, $\gamma_{\text{min}}$, as well as assuming a scenario of minimal screening, $\gamma_{\text{max}}$, from which lower and upper bounds, respectively, on $m_0$ can be obtained given knowledge of $m_e$ [22]. The open symbols in Fig. 4b correspond to the average values between these two limits. Therefore, although the current level of resolution of the spin mode in our experiment does not allow us to discern between different mass models, our results are compatible with a picture where $m_0$ remains constant as a function of density, as it is no longer being determined by many-body effects. Most importantly, however, is that even within the error, all extracted mass values are observed to fall systematically below $m_0^{2D}$ and $m_0^{3D}$, see Fig. 4a. Furthermore, note that even if a dependence of $m_0$ on $r_s$ exists, this can already be seen to be, within error, much weaker than that observed in 2D and 3D over a comparable range. It is also worth highlighting that the upper bound of the error bars shown for $r_s \gtrsim 2$ was obtained assuming minimal screening, an unlikely scenario since in this region every device has two 1D subbands occupied. Therefore, the real error is most likely smaller than that shown in Fig. 4b.

We now turn to the influence that other effects could have on the $m_0$ value. At high densities (i.e., $r_s \lesssim 1$), the nonparabolicity of the GaAs conduction band further enhances the effective mass with respect to the band mass [40]. However, at our highest density probed this corresponds to, at most, a 5% relative increase and therefore can largely be ignored. On the other hand, lattice strain is known to lead to slight crystal distortions and, therefore, uncertainty in the position and shape of electrostatically defined structures, such as the quantum wires in the present work. In our system, this is mostly caused by the surface electrodes, as GaAs and Al$_x$Ga$_{1-x}$As are essentially lattice-matched for $x = 0.3$ (mismatch $\sim 4 \times 10^{-4}$). Independent work carried out using wafers and electrodes similar to our own measured a stress-induced tilt of the crystallographic planes of about 0.015°, matching a stress of 57 MPa, and therefore corresponding to a maximum in-place strain of $\epsilon_{xx}$ of $\sim 4 \times 10^{-5}$ [41, 42]. It is important to highlight, however, that these measurements were carried out at room temperature, and that it is expected that the strain is reduced by up to factor of 2 when cooled down to cryogenic temperatures [43]. Nevertheless, even when taking the maximal allowed values, they are three orders of magnitude too small to account for any significant change in the curvature of the 1D dispersion and therefore, justify the observed mass change.

The value of $m_0 = 0.0525m_e$ observed in this work falls about 22% below the most commonly quoted value of the band mass $m_0 = 0.067m_e$. A comparison with other experimental values measured at different dimensions and for various densities is presented in Fig. 4a, where the data for $D > 1$ are taken from [8, 14, 26–35]. A systematic interpretation of this emergent picture can be given in terms of Fermi-liquid theory [9], which is valid for $D > 1$. Within this theory, the band mass $m_0$ is renormalised due to the many-body effect of the Coulomb interaction between electrons, producing an effective mass $m^*$. For weak interactions (i.e., $r_s \ll 1$), the well-understood random-phase approximation [44] gives a reduction in the effective mass $m^*/m_0 = 1 + b_1 r_s \ln r_s + b_2 r_s + O(r_s^2) < 1$, where the positive coefficients $b_i$ depend on dimensionality and details of the interaction potential, due to the screening effect, which decrease the effect of interactions. For intermediate-to-strong interactions, $r_s \gtrsim 1$, a larger degree of dressing in the formation of the quasi-particles competes with the screening, making the effective mass heavier ($m_s/m_0 > 1$), and for extremely strong interaction $r_s \gtrsim 20$–30 the Fermi-liquid state is expected to break down, with interacting electrons undergoing instead a type of exotic Wigner crystallisation. However, the microscopic calculation of the phenomenological parameters of the Fermi liquid for intermediate-to-strong interactions (i.e., $r_s \gtrsim 1$) is still an open problem, with effort being expended on both analytical [45–47] and nu-
merical [48–50] fronts. While these works converge at the qualitative level, there is as yet no firm prediction for the exact dependence of \( m^* \) on \( r_s \) beyond small \( r_s \), and at which value of \( r_s \) the crossover between the principal regimes occurs.

Given this state of the theory, we can conclude from our data that for \( r_s \approx 1 \) the Fermi liquid is already in the regime where the quasi-particles consist of a large enough number of electrons to make the effective mass heavier than the single-particle mass. Analyzing the dimensional dependence in Fig. 4, we see that \( m^* \) is heaviest for \( D = 3 \), in which the largest coordination number makes the quasi-particles build out of the largest number of electrons geometrically. Then, \( m^* \) decreases for \( D = 2 \), as expected for a smaller coordination number, and is lightest when \( D = 1 \), in which the phenomenon of spin-charge separation and the emergence of two separate Fermi seas fully decouples the interaction effects from the mass renormalisation, allowing the observation of the bare band mass \( m_0 \) directly. A further argument to support this interpretation is the strong dependence of the observed electron mass on density in \( D = 2,3 \) but no variation of the mass, within the error, for the density range observed in \( D = 1 \).

In conclusion, using the effect of spin-charge separation in 1D we have decoupled the interaction effects from the electron mass in GaAs, allowing us to measure the bare mass directly. The observed value of \( m_0 = 0.0525 m_e \) falls significantly below the most commonly quoted value of the band mass \( m_0 = 0.067 m_e \) in what is the second-most industrially important semiconductor. Our experimental findings also show that a sizeable proportion of the effective mass in 3D (\( \sim 22\% \)) can be accounted for by interaction effects, which stresses further the need for non-perturbative methods in the microscopic development of the Fermi-liquid theory.
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SAMPLE PREPARATION AND MEASUREMENT

All devices measured in this work were fabricated using two semiconductor double-quantum-well heterostructures grown via molecular-beam epitaxy (MBE). These comprised two identical 18 nm GaAs quantum wells separated by a 14 nm Al$_{0.165}$Ga$_{0.835}$As superlattice tunnelling barrier [10 pairs of Al$_{0.33}$Ga$_{0.67}$As and GaAs monolayers]. Both wafers had 20 and 40 nm Al$_{0.33}$Ga$_{0.67}$As spacer layers above and below the wells, respectively. These were followed in both cases by 40 nm Si-doped layers of Al$_{0.33}$Ga$_{0.67}$As (donor concentration $1 \times 10^{24}$ m$^{-3}$). Wafer 1, however, differed from Wafer 2 by having a 100 $\times$ 2.5 nm/2.5 nm GaAs/AlGaAs superlattice below the 350 nm AlGaAs under the lower quantum well. The electron concentrations were 3 (2.2) $\times$ 10$^{11}$ m$^{-2}$ with mobilities of 120 (165) m$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ for the top (bottom) wells for Wafer 1, and 2.85 (1.54) $\times$ 10$^{15}$ m$^{-2}$ and 191 (55) m$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ for Wafer 2, as measured at 1.4 K. The distance from the top of the upper well to the surface was $\sim$ 70 nm, including a GaAs cap layer to prevent oxidation.

The surface structure of the devices was fabricated on a 200 $\mu$m-wide etched Hall bar, with current flowing along the high-mobility axis ((110) direction). Electrical contact to both wells was established using AuGeNi ohmic contacts. All gates were patterned using electron-beam lithography, and consisted of split (SG), mid-line (MG), bar (BG), and cut-off (CG) gates (used to set up tunnelling conditions), together with an array of air-bridge-connected [1] wire-gates (WGs) (used to define the quantum wires in the top well only), see Fig. S1. All WGs fabricated were 1–18 $\mu$m-long and 0.3 $\mu$m wide, with their separation being 0.15–0.17 $\mu$m. A ‘parasitic’ gate (PG) running along the length of the array was used to modulate the density of the 2D ‘parasitic’ injection region. All device dimensions were carefully chosen so as to minimise any modulation of the bottom well, which acted as a 2D spectrometer.

Our spectroscopy technique consists of a low-noise, low-temperature measurement of the tunnelling current between the wells, which is given by

$$I \propto \int d^kdE \left[ f_T(E - E_{F1D} - eV_{DC}) - f_T(E - E_{F2D}) \right] \times A_1(k,E)A_2(k + ed(n \times B)/\hbar, E - eV_{DC}),$$

(1)

Here, $e$ is the electronic charge, $f_T(E)$ the Fermi-Dirac distribution, $d$ the centre-to-centre well separation, $n$ the unit normal to the 2D plane, $B=-B\hat{y}$ the magnetic-field

FIG. S1. A vertical tunnelling spectrometer. (a) Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) micrograph of a 1 $\mu$m long device. A number of electron-beam-defined gates are used in setting up the tunnelling conditions, see text for details. Inset: air-bridge interconnections, suspended $\sim$ 100 nm over the surface. (b) Schematic of a device operating in tunnelling mode. Here, tunnelling occurs between a 1D wire array defined in the upper well (UW) and a 2D spectrometer in the lower well (LW).
FIG. S2. Characterisation of the 1D wires and 2D spectrometer. (a) $dG/dV_{WG}$ (where $G$ is the tunnelling conductance) as a function of both wire-gate voltage $V_{WG}$ and magnetic field $B$. As $V_{WG}$ becomes more negative, multiple 1D subbands start forming below the 2D band, from $V_{WG} \approx -0.3$ V until $\approx -0.6$ V, before the wires pinch off. The yellow shaded area marks the bottom of the second 1D subband. (b) Equilibrium 1D electron density $n_{1D}$ for each of the conducting subbands, determined from (a) (filled symbols). Open symbols correspond to the equivalent density values as extracted from the full energy-momentum maps, see text. (c) 2D electron density $n_{2D}$ of the ‘parasitic’ injection region in both upper (blue) and lower (green) wells. The relatively independence of $n_{2D}$ from $V_{WG}$, together with the proximity of the lower-well density values in the ‘parasitic’ and wire (red) regions, allows us to use the lower well as a well-understood 2D probe (our spectrometer). (d) Interaction parameter $r_s$ vs $n_{1D}$. Green and red crosses correspond to the respective open circles seen in (b).

The Wigner-Seitz radius $r_s$ is often defined as the ratio of the interaction energy to the kinetic energy, and is used as a way to estimate the interaction strength in Fermi systems. One can measure the interaction parameter $r_s$ by mapping the dispersion of one system with respect to the other by measuring the differential tunnelling conductance $G = dI/dV$ in both energy and momentum space, see Fig. 2 in the main paper.
systems independently of their dimension. It is given by

\[
r_s = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{2a_B n_{1D}} & \text{in 1D} \\
\left(\frac{n_{2D}}{4\pi a_B^2}\right)^{1/2} & \text{in 2D} \\
\left(\frac{3}{4\pi a_B^3 n_{3D}}\right)^{1/3} & \text{in 3D},
\end{cases}
\]

where \(n_{1D}, n_{2D},\) and \(n_{3D}\), are the respective electron densities in 1D, 2D, and 3D, and \(a_B = 4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar^2/m_e^2\) is the Bohr radius. In GaAs, \(\varepsilon \approx 12\) and \(m = 0.067 m_e\).

In our experiment we can vary the number of occupied 1D subbands from one to four by applying a bias \(V_{WG}\) to WG, see Fig. S2a. From here, we extract the value of the Fermi wavelength \(\lambda_F\) in the 1D and 2D regions from their respective densities, see Fig. S2b and S2c. These values can also be obtained from maps such as that shown in Fig. S3, using the zero-bias intersection points. This gives us two independent estimates from which the value of \(r_s\) can be extracted. Note that \(n_{1D} = 4/\lambda_F^2\) and \(n_{2D} = 2\pi/\lambda_F^2\), respectively.

The electron mass \(m_0\) in 1D GaAs wires can then be extracted as a function of density. In our previous works [2–6], we generally worked at a range of \(r_s = 0.8 – 1.5\). Larger \(r_s\) can nevertheless be obtained by mapping near the bottom of the each subband, by depleting them to as low a density as possible, see Fig. S2d.

**EXTRACTION OF \(m_{2D}\)**

We can set the wire-gate voltage \(V_{WG}\) such that the wires pinch off and are unable to conduct. Under these conditions, electrons can only tunnel from the ‘parasitic’ injection area running alongside the WG array. This is wide enough (0.45–0.6\(\mu\)m) for the electron gas to remain unconfined and, therefore, 2D in nature, see Fig. S3. Note that the electron densities in this region for both the upper (UW) and lower wells (LW) (see Fig. S2c) are high enough for these systems to be treated as Fermi liquids, with the effective mass \(m_{2D}^*\) renormalised by interactions.

The curves drawn in Fig. S3 were obtained assuming single-electron tunnelling processes between the wells, and they mark the positions of resonant peaks arising from the maximal overlap of the offset spectral functions \(\varepsilon(k)\) for both wells. These were obtained assuming a parabolic functional form

\[
\varepsilon_{2D}(k) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{2D}^*}[k^2 - (k_{F2D}^*)^2]
\]

as well as conservation of energy and momentum during the tunnelling process

\[
\varepsilon_{UW}(k - \Delta k) = \varepsilon_{LW}(k) - eV_{DC},
\]

where \(\Delta k = edB\).

From the MBE growth recipe we know that \(d \approx 32\) nm, and while single-layer fluctuations are expected, these
DEPENDENCE OF $m_s$ AND $m_c$ ON THE INTERACTION STRENGTH

In order to model the dependence of the holon, $m_c$, and the spinon, $m_s$, masses on the interaction strength, we repeat the calculation of the dispersions of these two bands based on the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model (presented in Fig. 3 of the main paper for $\gamma = 2$) for a range of $\gamma$ from 0 to a large value. Fitting two parabolae to the numerically obtained dispersions for each calculation, we find the two masses’ dependence on $\gamma$, shown in Fig. S4a. At very large interaction strengths (i.e., large $\gamma$), the masses are very different from one another, with the ratio of $m_s/m_c$ becoming infinite for $\gamma \to \infty$, since the spinon dispersion flattens out, yielding $m_s \to \infty$, while the holon mass remains finite in this limit. For small $\gamma$, on the other hand, the two masses are close to one another, becoming degenerate and equal to the single-particle mass (i.e., $m_s = m_c = m_0$) in the free-particle limit of $\gamma = 0$.

We use this pair of curves obtained theoretically to fit the experimental data shown in Fig. 1 of the main paper, extracting the value of the single-particle mass $m_0$. We plot the theoretical dependence of the mass ratio $m_s/m_c$ on $\gamma$ in Fig. S4b. This is a monotonic function of $\gamma$ for all interaction strengths, allowing us to use this dependence to extract $\gamma$ from the sets of experimentally measured values of $m_c$ and $m_s$, shown in Fig. 1 of the main text.
SCRENNING EFFECTS AND EXTRACTION OF $m_0$ FOR HIGH $r_s$

At high $r_s$ (i.e., $r_s \geq 2$), direct extraction of $m_0$ (see Fig. 1 in the main text) is hindered by the fact that $m_s$ cannot be accurately determined. This is because the bottom of the spinon band falls within $\pm 0.5\text{meV}$ from zero-bias, therefore being strongly suppressed by the zero-bias anomaly (ZBA). In order to establish lower and upper bounds on the value of the bare mass, we instead determine the minimum and maximum values for $\gamma$, from which an estimate of $m_0$ can be obtained, given accurate knowledge of $m_c$.

We define $\gamma_{\text{min}}$ as the minimal interaction strength allowed before the ZBA. On the other hand, $\gamma_{\text{max}}$ corresponds to the maximum interaction strength given a minimal screening regime, see Fig. S5. Looking exclusively at the single-subband data, we find that $\gamma$ and $r_s$ are approximately proportional to each other, with ratio $\approx 1.6$ (dashed line), therefore marking the minimal screening boundary. All other points, corresponding to multiple-subband occupancy, systematically fall below this line.

We interpret this as a manifestation of inter-subband screening, which is not captured by $r_s$ but is taken into account explicitly by $\gamma$ via the two-body interaction energy $U$, result which has already been reported in [6]. Therefore, $\gamma_{\text{max}} \approx 1.6 r_s$. From here, and given accurate knowledge of $m_c$, we determine $m_0^{\text{min}}$ and $m_0^{\text{max}}$, see Fig. 4b in the main text. The open symbols correspond to the average values between these two limits. We highlight, however, that $m_0^{\text{max}}$ is most likely an overestimate given that all data obtained at $r_s \geq 2$ correspond to the regime with multiple subbands occupied, not just one. Nevertheless, even within error $m_0$ still falls significantly below the lowest $m_0^{2D}$ recorded in the literature.