

Zero-Field Satellites of a Zero-Bias Anomaly

V. M. Apalkov and M. E. Raikh

Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Spin-orbit (SO) splitting, Δ_{SO} , of the electron Fermi surface in two-dimensional systems manifests itself in the interaction-induced corrections to the tunneling density of states, $\rho(E)$. Namely, in the case of a smooth disorder, it gives rise to the satellites of a zero-bias anomaly at energies $E = \pm \Delta_{SO}$. Zeeman splitting, Δ_z , in a weak parallel magnetic field causes a narrow plateau of a width Δ_z at the top of each sharp satellite peak. As Δ_z exceeds Δ_{SO} , the SO satellites cross over to the conventional narrow maxima at $E = \pm \Delta_z$ with SO-induced plateaus Δ_{SO} at the tops.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Gk, 73.23.Hk, 71.45.Gm, 71.70.Ej

Introduction. A zero-magnetic-field splitting [1] of the electron spectrum in two-dimensional systems has its origin in the spin-orbit (SO) coupling. The effect attracts a steady interest especially since the proposal [2] to utilize it in a spin-transistor device. This proposal was substantiated by the recent experimental demonstration [3,4] that the magnitude of the splitting, $2\Delta_{SO}$, can be controlled by the gate voltage.

A direct consequence of a finite zero-field splitting is the beating pattern in the Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations [5]. These beats remain the prime tool for the experimental determination of Δ_{SO} . However, the reliable results were obtained only for electrons in narrow-gap heterostructures, where the splitting is relatively strong (several meV [6]). In the structures with small Δ_{SO} (e.g., $\Delta_{SO} = 0.5$ meV in GaAs-based heterostructures [7]), inferring the splitting from beating pattern becomes ambiguous, since it requires extrapolation of the beats period to a zero-magnetic-field.

In addition to the beats of the Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations, a number of more delicate effects that are due exclusively to the finite zero-field splitting of the conduction band have been observed experimentally [8-12]. Still, extracting small Δ_{SO} values from the data remains a problem.

In the present paper we identify another prominent manifestation of the zero-field splitting. Namely, we demonstrate that SO coupling causes anomalies in the tunneling conductance, $g(V)$, at a finite bias, V . The positions of anomalies $V = \pm \Delta_{SO}$ reveal directly the splitting magnitude. They emerge as satellites of the conventional zero-bias anomaly at $V = 0$. The latter is the result of electron-electron interactions mediated by the disorder [13]. To the best of our knowledge, these SO-induced satellites represent the first case when a disorder-related effect in transport allows to infer the parameter of the intrinsic electronic spectrum. We note that, in the experiment, very fine features (on the scale of ~ 0.1 meV [14-16]) in the tunneling density of states, $\rho(E)$, can be resolved upon the analysis of $g(V)$ curves at low temperatures $T \ll V$.

In two dimensions, the interaction-induced correction, $\delta\rho(E)$, to the free-electron density of states, ρ_0 , behaves as [17] $\delta\rho(E) \propto \ln(j\tau)$, for τ^{-1} (diffusive regime), where τ is the scattering time. This simple logarithmic form applies in the presence of a tunneling electrode which causes a long-distance cut-off of the Coulomb interactions [18]. Zeeman splitting of the electron spectrum in a parallel magnetic field leads to additional anomalies $\delta\rho(E) \propto \ln(j\tau \pm \Delta_z)$ [19]. Remarkably, these anomalies emerge even in the weak-field limit, when $\Delta_z \ll \Delta_{SO}$. This is because the scattering by the impurity potential does not mix the spin-split subbands. Thus, the wave functions of two particles with opposite spins that differ in energy by $2\Delta_z$ are strictly identical. Naturally, the SO scattering from the impurities suppresses the anomalies at $E = \pm \Delta_z$.

The situation with SO coupling is somewhat opposite. In this case, the disorder potential causes a mixing of the SO subbands. If the disorder is short-ranged, each scattering act results in the momentum transfer of the order of the Fermi wave vector, k_F . Thus, for weak SO coupling, $\Delta_{SO} \ll \Delta_z$, the mixing is strong, and the SO satellites of the zero-bias anomaly are smeared out. If, however, the disorder is smooth, the momentum transfer is much smaller than k_F . In this generic regime of a small-angle scattering, the SO subbands are almost decoupled [20] (see Fig. 1). As a result, the same reasoning that leads to the Zeeman satellites applies, so that the SO satellites are pronounced even if Δ_{SO} is much smaller than Δ_z . Analogously, with a smooth disorder, in the presence of a perpendicular magnetic field, electronic states separated in energy by a cyclotron quantum turn out to be strongly correlated [21]. Consequently, the interaction-induced $\delta\rho(E)$ is an oscillatory function of energy [22] at low (compared to ω_c) cyclotron frequencies. Under the condition of a small-angle scattering, the dominant contribution to $\delta\rho(E)$ comes from the Hartree correction [22].

Below we also study the evolution of the SO satellites with a parallel magnetic field. Due to a non-trivial interplay between SO coupling and Zeeman splitting [23-25], this evolution is rather peculiar. Namely, weak magnetic field causes a flat top of the SO satellite within a narrow interval $E = \Delta_z \pm \Delta_{SO}$. Conversely, in a strong magnetic field, the Zeeman satellite [19] acquires a flat top of a width $\Delta_{SO} \pm \Delta_z$.

Basic Equations. Microscopic origin of the SO coupling for two-dimensional electrons can be either inversion asymmetry of the host crystal [26] or the conduction potential asymmetry [1]. Unless two effects are comparable in strength [27], we can choose the form $(\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{n})\hbar$ for the SO Hamiltonian [1], where \hbar is the coupling constant, \hat{n} is the spin operator, and n is the unit vector normal to the two-dimensional plane. In a parallel magnetic field, that induces the Zeeman splitting $2\mu_B$, the Hamiltonian of a free electron has a form

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} + (\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{n})\hbar + \mu_B \hat{\sigma}_x; \quad (1)$$

where m is the electron mass. The spectrum of the Hamiltonian Eq. (1) represents two branches, so that in the vicinity of the Fermi surface we have

$$E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = E_F + \epsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (2)$$

where

$$\epsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \hbar v_F (\mathbf{k} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}}_F) + \epsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (3)$$

and

$$\epsilon_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\mu_{SO}^2 + \mu_Z^2 + 2\mu_{SO}\mu_Z \sin \theta_k}; \quad (4)$$

Here $v_F = \hbar k_F/m$ is the Fermi velocity, $\pm = 1$ is the branch index, $\mu_{SO} = \hbar k_F$ is the SO splitting, and θ_k is the azimuthal angle of \mathbf{k} . It is convenient to rewrite the diagonalized Hamiltonian Eq. (1) in the form

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\pm} E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}); \quad (5)$$

where the projection operators \hat{P}_{\pm} are defined as [23]

$$\hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 \pm \exp(i\theta'_k)}{\exp(i\theta'_k) \mp 1}; \quad (6)$$

The angle θ'_k is related to the azimuthal angle θ_k as follows

$$\tan \theta'_k = \tan \theta_k + \frac{\mu_Z}{\mu_{SO} \cos \theta_k}; \quad (7)$$

In the presence of the disorder, the electron scattering time is determined by two processes, namely, intra-subband scattering

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\pm}(\mathbf{k})} = \sum_{\pm'} \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} \text{Tr} \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{P}_{\pm'}(\mathbf{p}) S(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) (E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) - E_{\pm'}(\mathbf{p})); \quad (8)$$

and inter-subband scattering

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\pm}(\mathbf{k})} = \sum_{\pm'} \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} \text{Tr} \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{P}_{\pm'}(\mathbf{p}) S(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) (E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) - E_{\pm'}(\mathbf{p})) = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{k})}; \quad (9)$$

where $S(\mathbf{k})$ is the Fourier transform of the correlator of the random potential. Our assumption that the disorder is smooth can be quantitatively expressed as $k_{\mathcal{P}} \ll 1$, where the parameter $k_{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined as

$$k_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{Tr} \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1 + \cos(\theta'_k - \theta'_p)}{2} = \frac{(\theta'_k - \theta'_p)^2}{4}; \quad (10)$$

Correspondingly, $\text{Tr} \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{P}_{\pm}(\mathbf{p}) = 1 - k_{\mathcal{P}}$ is close to unity. Using Eq. (7), the parameter $k_{\mathcal{P}}$ can be expressed through the angles θ_k and θ_p as

$$k_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{\mu_{SO}^2 (\mu_{SO} + \mu_Z \sin \theta_k)^2}{4 \mu_{SO}^4 (\mathbf{k})} (\theta_k - \theta_p)^2; \quad (11)$$

From Eqs. (8), (9) we get the final expression for the scattering time

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} + \frac{1}{\tau_1} = \frac{m}{2} \int d^3p S(k_F, p); \quad (12)$$

where we assumed that $\epsilon_{s0}, \epsilon_z \ll E_F$.

As it was discussed above, the satellite anomaly in () originates from the Hartree correction. In the case of two subbands, the expression for the energy-dependent part of the Hartree correction has the form

$$\frac{\epsilon_z}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \text{Re} \int d^3p \int d^3q \frac{dp}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{dp^0}{(2\pi)^2} V(p-p^0) \chi^+(p; p^0; q; !)(1 - \epsilon_{p+q} \epsilon_{p^0+q})(1 - \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p^0}) G_1^R(+!; p+q) G_1^R(+!; p^0+q) G_1^A(-!; p) G_1^A(-!; p^0); \quad (13)$$

where $V(p)$ is the Fourier transform of the screened electron-electron interaction. The retarded and advanced Green functions are the following matrices

$$\hat{G}^{R,A}(-!; p) = X \frac{\hat{G}(p)}{(p) - \frac{i}{2}} = X \hat{G}^{R,A}(-!; p); \quad (14)$$

The two-particle vertex function, χ^+ , that is responsible for satellites, is determined from the standard Dyson-type equation with a kernel

$$K(p; p_1; q; !) = e^{i(p-p_1) \cdot r} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{p+q} \epsilon_{p_1+q} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p_1} \right] e^{i(p+q) \cdot r} e^{i(p_1+q) \cdot r} G_1^R(+!; p_1+q) G_1^A(-!; p_1) S(k_F, p-p_1, q); \quad (15)$$

where the first three factors originate from the overlap integrals. With a bare spectrum Eqs. (3), (4) the product $G_1^R(+!; p_1+q) G_1^A(-!; p_1)$ averaged over the disorder is given by

$$G_1^R(+!; p_1+q) G_1^A(-!; p_1) = \frac{m}{2} \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \left[i \left(\frac{1}{2} (p) - \frac{1}{2} (p+q) \right) + i \hbar q v_F \cos(p-p_1) \right]; \quad (16)$$

Small-angle scattering implies that a typical $q \ll k_F$. This allows to set in Eq. (15) $(p+q) \approx (p)$, $\epsilon_{p+q} \epsilon_{p_1+q} \approx \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p_1}$, and $p+q \approx p$. Then the kernel Eq. (15) simplifies to

$$K(p; p_1; q; !) = \frac{m}{2} \frac{(1 - \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p_1}) S(k_F, p-p_1, q)}{1 - i \left(\frac{1}{2} (p) - \frac{1}{2} (p) \right) + i \hbar q v_F \cos(p-p_1)}; \quad (17)$$

At this point we note that, upon integration over p_1 , the product $(1 - \epsilon_p \epsilon_{p_1}) S(k_F, p-p_1, q)$ is proportional to $\frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_{int}} (p)$, where ϵ_{int} is the inter-subband scattering time (9). Then, in the diffusive regime, $(\frac{1}{2} (p)) \approx 1$, the solution of the Dyson equation for the vertex function $\chi^+(p; p^0; q; !)$ reads

$$\chi^+(p; p^0; q; !) = \frac{S(k_F, p-p^0, q)}{i \left(\frac{1}{2} (p) - \frac{1}{2} (p^0) \right) + D q^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon_{int}} (p)}; \quad (18)$$

where we have neglected a weak anisotropy of the diffusion coefficient $D = v_F^2 \tau_F = 2$.

In principle, the Dyson equation for χ^+ couples (weakly) this function to the other vertex functions, i.e. χ^+ . This coupling would be important in the domain $\epsilon_{s0} \approx \epsilon_{int}$. In our case, $\epsilon_{s0} \ll \epsilon_{int} \ll 1$, this coupling can be neglected. Substituting Eq. (18) into Eq. (13) and performing integration over p and p^0 , we obtain

$$\frac{\epsilon_z}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \text{Re} \int_0^{Z_{1=v_F}} dq q \int_0^{Z_2} \frac{dp}{2} \int_0^{Z_2} \frac{dp^0}{2} \frac{V(k_F, p-p^0, q) S(k_F, p-p^0, q)}{i \left(\frac{1}{2} (p) - \frac{1}{2} (p^0) \right) + D q^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon_{int}} (p)}; \quad (19)$$

The fact that characteristic $p-p^0$ is small allows to set $V(k_F, p-p^0, q) = V(0)$, where $V(0) = 1/\epsilon_0$ (static screening). Then integration over p^0 yields $1/(m)$. Finally we obtain

$$\frac{(\epsilon)}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{1}{16 E_F \tau_{tr}} L(\epsilon); \quad (20)$$

where the energy-dependent factor, $L(\epsilon)$, is defined as

$$L(\epsilon) = \frac{Z}{2} \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \ln \left(2(\epsilon)^2 + \frac{\tau_{int}^2}{2} \right) : \quad (21)$$

We see that the energy cut-off in Eq. (21) is determined by τ_{int}^{-1} . Note, that inter-subband scattering time τ_{int} can be conveniently expressed through the conventional transport relaxation time τ_{tr} . Using Eqs. (9), (11) we obtain

$$\tau_{int}(\epsilon) = 2 \tau_{tr} \frac{(\epsilon_z^2 + \epsilon_{so}^2 + 2\epsilon_z \epsilon_{so} \sin^2 \theta)}{(\epsilon_{so}^2 + \epsilon_z^2 \sin^2 \theta)} : \quad (22)$$

Equations (20)-(22) constitute our main result. In principle, the exchange correction to $\epsilon(\epsilon)$ also yields the anomaly at $\epsilon = 0$. However, the exchange term is suppressed since it contains an extra factor τ_{tr} which comes from overlap integrals between different branches. Note also, that Eqs. (20)-(22) can be easily modified to the case when the crystalline anisotropy term [26], $(\hat{x}k_x - \hat{y}k_y)$, is present in the Hamiltonian (1) alongside with SO-term [1]. Modification reduces to the replacement ϵ_z by k_F , and ϵ_{so} by $2\epsilon_F$ [24].

Analysis of the anomaly.

(i) Zero-field limit: $\epsilon_z = 0 = \epsilon_{so}$.

The shape of the satellite peak in $\epsilon(\epsilon)$ is given by

$$\frac{(\epsilon)}{\epsilon_0} = \frac{1}{16 E_F \tau_{tr}} \ln \left(2\epsilon_{so}^2 + \frac{\tau_{tr}^2}{4} \right) : \quad (23)$$

The peak is well pronounced when $\epsilon_{so} \tau_{tr} \gg 1$.

(ii) Intermediate fields: $\epsilon_z = \epsilon_{so}$.

The broadening of the SO-satellite peak is determined by the angular dependence of $\epsilon(\epsilon)$. The integral $L(\epsilon)$ can be evaluated in this limit, yielding

$$L(\epsilon) = 2 \ln \int_{-2\epsilon_{so}}^{2\epsilon_{so}} \frac{d\epsilon_z}{2} + \frac{r}{2} \frac{\epsilon_{so}^2 + \epsilon_z^2}{\epsilon_{so}^2 + \epsilon_z^2} \int_{-2\epsilon_{so}}^{2\epsilon_{so}} d\epsilon_z \quad (24)$$

Remarkably, within a domain $\epsilon_z \in [-2\epsilon_{so}, 2\epsilon_{so}]$, there is a plateau in $\epsilon(\epsilon)$, i.e. within this domain $L(\epsilon) = \ln 2$.

(iii) Strong fields: $\epsilon_z = \epsilon_{so} = \epsilon_F$.

In this case, conversely, SO coupling determines the shape of the Zeeman satellite

$$L(\epsilon) = 2 \ln \int_{-2\epsilon_F}^{2\epsilon_F} \frac{d\epsilon_z}{2} + \frac{r}{2} \frac{\epsilon_z^2 + \epsilon_{so}^2}{\epsilon_z^2 + \epsilon_{so}^2} \int_{-2\epsilon_F}^{2\epsilon_F} d\epsilon_z \quad (25)$$

Again a plateau at $\epsilon_z \in [-2\epsilon_F, 2\epsilon_F]$ emerges at the top of the Zeeman satellite.

Typical examples of the energy dependence of $\epsilon(\epsilon)$, obtained by numerical integration of Eq. (21), are shown in Fig. 2. They illustrate the successive broadening and then narrowing of the satellite peak with increasing magnetic field.

Conclusion. The above consideration was restricted to the diffusive regime $\epsilon_{so} \tau_{tr} \ll 1$. It is known however [28-30], that the conventional diffusive zero-bias anomaly persists at high electron energies $\epsilon_F \gg \epsilon_{so}$ (ballistic regime). The question arises whether the SO anomaly survives in the ballistic regime. We will discuss this case qualitatively. Without SO coupling, the physical mechanism responsible for the formation of the zero-bias anomaly is combined scattering of a probe electron from an isolated impurity and a perturbation of the electron density caused by this impurity. The latter perturbation falls off with distance as $\sin(2k_F r)/r^2$ (Friedel oscillation). Then the anomaly emerges as a result of the Bragg backscattering from this almost periodic potential profile. In the presence of SO coupling, a single impurity induces Friedel oscillation with three wave vectors [31], namely $2k_F$, $2k_F \pm 2\epsilon_{so}/v_F$. Then the wave vector for an electron with chirality $+1$ and energy $2\epsilon_{so}$ above the Fermi level will satisfy the Bragg condition for the Friedel oscillation created by electrons with chirality -1 . This is illustrated in Fig. 1. The efficiency of the Bragg scattering, and, hence, the anomaly at $\epsilon = 2\epsilon_{so}$, is suppressed in the absence of magnetic field due to the fact that, for a given chirality, the spinors corresponding to the wave vectors k and $k + k_{SO}$ are orthogonal to each other. A transparent underlying physics of the ballistic zero-bias anomaly suggests that electrons with both chiralities

can experience Bragg scattering from the SO specific $2k_F$ oscillation [31]. These resonances give rise to yet additional weak anomalies at energies $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$, that are absent in the diffusive regime.

Note in conclusion, that experimental studies [32] indicate that even in moderate quality GaAs-based samples with mobility $\mu \approx 10^4 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}$ (as in [16]) the typical value of the ratio ϵ_0 is 0.1. Then for $\epsilon_0 = 0.5 \text{ meV}$ the parameter $\epsilon_0 \approx 6.6$.

As a final remark, SO coupling for two-dimensional holes is much stronger than for electrons. Therefore, the satellites of the zero-bias anomaly can be expected in the hole samples too. However, due to the warp of the valence band spectrum caused by the crystalline anisotropy, the subband splitting depends on the direction of the hole wave vector. This would lead to the smearing of the satellites.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to R. Ashoori for a valuable discussion.

-
- [1] Yu. A. Bychkov and E. I. Rashba, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 39, 64 (1984) [JETP Lett. 39, 78 (1984)].
 - [2] S. Datta and B. Das, Appl. Phys. Lett. 56, 665 (1990).
 - [3] J. Nitta, T. Akazaki, H. Takayanagi, and T. Enoki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 1335 (1997).
 - [4] G. Engels, J. Lange, Th. Schapers, and H. Luth, Phys. Rev. B 55, R1958 (1997).
 - [5] J. Luo, H. Munekata, F. F. Fang, and P. J. Stiles, Phys. Rev. B 38, 10 142 (1988); Phys. Rev. B 41, 7685 (1990).
 - [6] Y. Sato, T. Kita, S. Goto, and S. Yamada, J. Appl. Phys. 89, 8017 (2001).
 - [7] P. Ramvall, B. Kowalski, and P. Omling, Phys. Rev. B 55, 7160 (1997).
 - [8] P. D. Dresselhaus, C. M. A. Papavassiliou, R. G. Wheeler, and R. N. Sacks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 106 (1992).
 - [9] B. Jusserand, D. Richards, H. Peric, and B. Etienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 848 (1992).
 - [10] W. Knap, C. Skierbiszewski, A. Zduniak, E. Litwin-Staszewska, D. Bertho, F. Kobbi, J. L. Robert, G. E. Pikus, F. G. Pikus, S. V. Iordanskii, V. Mosser, K. Zekentes, and Yu. B. Lyanda-Geller, Phys. Rev. B 53, 3912 (1996).
 - [11] A. F. Morpurgo, J. P. Heida, T. M. Klapwijk, B. J. van Wees, and G. Borghs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1050 (1998).
 - [12] J. A. Folk, S. R. Patel, K. M. Bibbaum, C. M. Marcus, C. I. Duruoz, and J. S. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2102 (2001).
 - [13] B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, Solid State Commun. 30, 115 (1979).
 - [14] W. Wu and P. W. Adams, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1139 (1996).
 - [15] V. Yu. Butko, P. W. Adams, and I. L. Aleiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 4284 (1999).
 - [16] H. B. Chan, P. I. Glcofridis, R. C. Ashoori, and M. R. Melloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2867 (1997).
 - [17] B. L. Altshuler, A. G. Aronov, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 1288 (1980);
 - [18] A. Yu. Zyuzin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 33, 377 (1984) [JETP Lett. 33, 360 (1984)].
 - [19] B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, in Electron-Electron Interactions in Disordered Systems, edited by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985), p. 1.
 - [20] A. P. Dmitriev and V. Yu. Kocharovskii, Phys. Rev. B 63, 113301 (2001).
 - [21] A. M. Rudin, I. L. Aleiner, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. B 58, 15698 (1998).
 - [22] A. M. Rudin, I. L. Aleiner, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 709 (1997).
 - [23] G. H. Chen and M. E. Raikh, Phys. Rev. B 60, 4826 (1999).
 - [24] G. H. Chen, M. E. Raikh, and Y. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B 61, R10539 (2000).
 - [25] I. L. Aleiner and V. I. Fal'ko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 256801 (2001).
 - [26] G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. 100, 580 (1955).
 - [27] F. G. Pikus and G. E. Pikus, Phys. Rev. B 51, 16928 (1995).
 - [28] A. M. Rudin, I. L. Aleiner, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. B 55, 9322 (1997).
 - [29] D. V. Khveshchenko and M. Reizer, Phys. Rev. B 57, R4245 (1998).
 - [30] E. G. Mishchenko and A. V. Andreev, ArXiv: cond-mat/0110065.
 - [31] G. H. Chen and M. E. Raikh, Phys. Rev. B 59, 5090 (1999).
 - [32] P. T. Coleridge, Phys. Rev. B 44, 3793 (1991).




FIG. 1. Schematic illustration of the processes responsible for satellite anomaly at $\omega = 2\omega_{so}$ in the diffusive (a) and ballistic (b) regimes.




FIG. 2. Normalized correction, $|L|$, calculated from Eqs. (21), (22) for $\omega_{so} \tau = 10$ is plotted versus dimensionless energy $\epsilon = 2(\omega_{so}^2 + \omega_z^2)^{1/2}$ for various ratios ω_z/ω_{so} . For convenience different curves are shifted along the vertical axis.