O scillatory ac- and photoconductivity of a 2D electron gas: Q uasiclassical transport beyond the Boltzm ann equation

IA.Dmitriev^{1;}, A.D.Mirlin^{1;2;y}, and D.G.Polyakov^{1;}

¹Institut fur Nanotechnologie, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

² Institut fur Theorie der Kondensierten Materie,

Universitat Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

We have analyzed the quasiclassical mechanism of magnetooscillations in the ac- and photoconductivity, related to non-M arkovian dynamics of disorder-induced electron scattering. While the magnetooscillations in the photoconductivity are found to be weak, the elect manifests itself much more strongly in the ac conductivity, where it may easily dominate over the oscillations due to the Landau quantization. We argue that the damping of the oscillatory photoconductivity provides a reliable method of measuring the hom ogeneous broadening of Landau levels (single-particle scattering rate) in high-mobility structures.

PACS num bers: 73.40.-c, 78.67.-n, 73.43.-f, 76.40.+ b

I. IN TRODUCTION

An intriguing development in the study of a highm obility two-dimensional electron gas (2D EG) was the recent observation¹ of magnetooscillations of the photoconductivity of a sample subjected to microwave radiation, as a function of the ratio $!=!_{c}$. Here ! and !_c are the radiation frequency and the cyclotron frequency, respectively. Subsequent experiments,^{2,3,4,5} working with very-high-mobility samples, yielded yet another dram atic discovery: for su ciently high radiation power, the minim a of the oscillations evolve into \zero-resistance states", i.e., the dissipative resistance of a sample becom es vanishingly sm all.

The nature of the oscillations in the photoconductivity $_{\rm ph}$ has raised a lot of interest. An important step was made in Ref. 6, where a direct connection between the emergence of the zero-resistance states and the oscillations was emphasized. Speci cally, it was recognized that whatever the nature of the oscillations, when they become e so large that the linear dc response theory yields a negative $_{\rm ph}$, an instability is developed leading to the form ation of dom ains of counter- ow ing currents and thus to the zero m easured resistance. Follow ing this approach, a key issue which needs to be settled for understanding the experiments is the microscopic mechanism of the oscillatory photoconductivity (OPC).

Sim ilarly to the conventional Shubnikov (de H aas oscillations, the growing body of theoretical work is focused on the oscillations of the density of states (DOS) induced by the Landau quantization as an essential element of the construction. The mechanism of the OPC identi-

ed in Ref. 7 and analyzed in detail in Ref. 8 hinges on the oscillations of the DOS and is related to a radiationinduced change of the electron distribution function in energy space, f ("), such that f (") oscillates with varying both "=! $_{\rm c}$ and !=! $_{\rm c}$. A hallm ark of this contribution to $_{\rm ph}$ is that it yields an amplitude of the OPC which is proportional to the inelastic relaxation time $_{\rm ee}$ due to electron-electron collisions (m ore elective at low temper-

atures than electron-phonon scattering). A nother m echanism of the OPC, based on the e ect of radiation on in purity scattering in the presence of the Landau quantization, was suggested in R ef. 9 (an earlier, closely related variant of this approach was form ulated in Ref. 10). A system atical theory of this contribution to ph was constructed in Ref. 11. Comparing the results of Refs. 7,8 and Ref. 11, one sees that the mechanism 7,8 dom inates, ie., leads to much strongeroscillations, if ee q, where q is the single-particle relaxation time due to impurity scattering. For typical experim ental param eters, a characteristic ratio $_{ee}=_{q}$ 10². O verall the results of R ef. 8 are in good agreem ent with the experim ental data as regards the behavior of $_{\rm ph}$ in the range of parameters where the OPC is not too strongly dam ped, i.e., where the experimental e orts have been focused so far. In particular, Ref. 8 explains the emergence of strong oscillations and, in combination with Ref. 6, the form ation of zero-resistance regions.

W hile the agreem ent between theory and experim ent is very encouraging, the situation is not so clear in the experimental limit of weak (strongly damped) oscillations. Central to the identi cation of the microscopic mechanism of the oscillations is, on top of their period and phase, the behavior of their envelope with decreasing magnetic eld B. For any mechanism based on the DOS oscillations, the relation between the DOS and OPC dam ping factors is critically in portant. The $OPC^{7,8,11}$ is dam ped at low B by a factor exp($=!_{c ph}$), where the ratio ph= q = 1=2 is a distinctive feature not sensitive to m icroscopic details of either disorder or weak inelastic interactions.¹² However, as emphasized in Ref. 7, the experimentally reported values of q and ph do not satisfy this relation, with $_{\rm ph}$ noticeably larger than $_{\rm q}$ =2, roughly by a factor of 10 in Ref. 3 and by a factor of 3 in Ref. 2. Taken at face value, the di erence would mean that the amplitude of the OPC observed at small B is orders of m agnitude higher than given by the m echanism based on the Landau quantization, which m ight be considered as a hint about a di erent origin of the OPC at

smallB. A Itematively, the experiments on the damping of Shubnikov-de H aas oscillations m ight overestim ate the single-particle scattering rate q¹, e.g., because of inhom ogeneous (due to m acroscopic inhom ogeneities) broadening of Landau levels. To resolve this dilemma, it is desirable to exam ine a range of mechanism s of the OPC in the absence of the DOS oscillations.

In this paper, we analyze a mechanism of the OPC govemed by quasiclassicalm em ory e ects. These are related to non-Markovian correlations in electron dynamics.13 We assume that $=!_{cq}$ 1 and completely neglect weak oscillations of the DOS. The OPC induced by the memory e ects is not speci c to any particular type of disorder; however, below we concentrate on the follow ing two-component model, 14 where the memory e ects are particularly prom inent. W e assume that there is a sm ooth random potential of rem ote donors that are separated by a large spacer d $k_{\rm F}^{1}$, where $k_{\rm F}$ is the Ferm i wavevector, from the 2DEG plane and, in addition, there are rare short-range scatterers, e.g., residual in purities located at or near the interface. W e consider the case $_{\rm L}$, where $_{\rm S}$ and $_{\rm L}$ are the zero-B m om entum S relaxation times due to the short-range scatterers and the long-range disorder, respectively. From the experimental point of view, this choice is motivated by reports (see, e.g., Ref. 15) that the zero-B m obility in veryhigh-m obility structures is frequently lim ited by residual impurities and L = S can be as large as 10. Although $_{\rm L}$ in our model, we assume that $_{\rm q}$ is determined S by the sm ooth disorder, i.e., $q' = (2k_F d)^2$ s•

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. II, we outline the approach to the photoconductivity based on the Boltzmann equation. In Sec. III, we discuss the mechanism of the photoconductivity related to electronelectron interactions. In Sec. IV, we turn to the magnetooscillations induced by the memory e ects. Our central results are presented in Secs. V, VI. Section V deals with the oscillations in the ac conductivity. Finally, in Sec. V I, we compare two mechanisms of the oscillatory photoconductivity, quasiclassical and quantum, related to the memory e ects and the Landau quantization, respectively.

II. PHOTOCONDUCTIVITY: ESSENTIALS

A necessary input to the calculation of the quasiclassicalOPC is the memory e ects, discarded in the Boltzm ann equation. However, to set up a system atic form alism, it is instructive to begin with a derivation of ph within the conventional kinetic theory. The Boltzm ann equation for the distribution function g(p; ;t) of electrons in m om entum space reads:

$$Lg(p; ;t) = F(g_g(p; ;t);$$
 (1)

where $L = 0_t + !_c 0_t$ $I_{n}, F =$ $e \mathbf{E}_{dc} + \mathbf{E}_{!} \cos ! t$), \mathbf{E}_{dc} is the dc electric eld, $\mathbf{E}_{!}$ is the ac eld, is the angle of the momentum p with respect to the direction of $\mathbf{\tilde{E}}_{dc}$, Iel and Iin are the elastic and inelastic collision integrals, respectively.

W e expand the distribution function at energy " in a $_{n}$ g $_{n}$ (") exp (i + in!t). E lastic series: g(p; ;t) = collisions lead to relaxation of angular harm onics with \in 0; in particular, $I_{el}g_{1n} =$ $^{1}g_{1n}$, where is the momentum relaxation time. Inelastic electron-electron collisions tend to equilibrate electrons among them selves but are not capable of establishing a steady-state dc photo conductivity. For the quasiclassical OPC (in contrast to that based on the DOS oscillations, cf. Ref. 8), the inelastic transitions due to electron-electron interaction do not play any essential role and will be neglected. To dissipate energy absorbed from the ac eld, we introduce coupling to a therm albath, e.g., to an equilibrium phonon system, characterized by a relaxation time in.

Under the assumption that both in and the momentum relaxation time due to the coupling to the bath are much longer than , the main role of the inelastic scattering is to yield a slow relaxation of the isotropic (= 0) part of g to the equilibrium Ferm i distribution f_F at a bath tem perature T .

Expanding the nonequilibrium distribution function in powers of the driving force, we have

A useful way of visualizing this solution of Eq. (1) at given order in E_{dc} and $E_{!}$ is by counting all possible couplings of harm onics g n represented as points on the (;n) plane (Fig. 1). The dc eld E_c couples nearestneighbor harm onics along the $axis, g_n \$ g_{1;n}$. We are interested here in the linear (with respect to E_{dc})



FIG.1: Graphic representation of various contributions to

the photoconductivity \mathbb{E} qs. (2),(3)] in the (;n) space at the

 $O(E_{1c}^{0}E_{1}^{2}).$

lowest order ph



photoconductivity $_{\rm ph}$, so that only one such link is allowed. The ac eld E couples harmonics along diagonals, g $_{\rm n}$ \$ g $_{1;{\rm n}}$ 1 and g $_{1;{\rm n}}$ 1. The propagator L 1 is a diagonal matrix in (;n) space. The static longitudinal current j = $_{\rm ph}E_{\rm dc}$,

$$j = \frac{e}{2 \sim^2} d'' p R e g_{10}$$
; (3)

is expressed through g_{10} , i.e., is given by a sum of all paths starting at (0,0) and ending at (1;0). A lready at order _ph O $(E_{dc}^0 E_1^2)$ as many as 9 di erent graphs arise, shown in Fig. 1, to which one should add their counterparts m irrored in the horizontal axis, which corresponds to the change !!

O urstrategy for nding q_0 is to select graphs involving couplings whose strength diverges at $_{in}$ = ! 1. These are graphs returning to the point (0;0) [graphs (a), (b) in Fig. 1], which are proportional to (L¹)₀₀. This means that to order E_1^2 the path (0;0) ! (1;1) ! (0;0) ! (1;0) (and its counterparts in other quadrants) gives the main contribution to $_{ph}$ for

The perturbative expansion in powers of E_1^2 proceeds by iterating the loop (0;0) ! (1;1) ! (0;0). In this way we arrive at a simple relation ($i!_c + {}^1)g_{1;0} = eE_{dc} @_p f = 2$, where $f = g_{00}$ satis es the closed equation

$$\frac{e^2 E_1^2}{2m} @_{"} [K_! @_{"} f] + I_{in} f = 0 :$$
 (5)

The function $K_{!} = K_{!}^{+} + K_{!}$ describes the absorption rate at energy ":

$$2K_{!} = \frac{"}{1 + (! !_{c})^{2}} :$$
 (6)

The photoconductivity at in is thus completely determined by f, i.e., in this limit the ac eld modi es the dc current through the heating:

$$_{\rm ph} = \frac{e^2}{2 c^2} d'' K_0 @_{*}f :$$
 (7)

The function f (") changes abruptly around the Ferm i energy $_{\rm F}$ on a scale

$$T_e = m \operatorname{axfT}; hg; \qquad (8)$$

where

$$_{h} = (eE_{!} l_{in}=2) [K_{!} (F_{F})=K_{0} (F_{F})]^{1=2}$$
 (9)

and $l_{in} = v_F [K_0(_F)_{in} = _F]^{l=2}$ is the inelastic length (v_F is the Fermi velocity). Note that $_{in}$ in the regime of strong heating ($_h$ T) should be found self-consistently with $_h$ and thus depends on E_1 .

Turning to the evaluation of $_{\rm ph}$ under the assumption that $T_{\rm e}$, we rst notice that a seem ingly reasonable

approximation which neglects the "dependence of in the integrand of Eq. (7) [normally, (") changes on a scale of $_{\rm F}$] yields an identically zero photoresponse. Indeed, in that case $_{\rm ph}$ is equal to the static D rude conductivity $_{\rm Hy}^{\rm D}$ independently of the detailed shape of f ("), since d" "0.ff = 2 $^{2}{\rm n_e}$ =m due to particle number conservation (n_e is the electron concentration). It follows that the dependence of on " should be taken into account. It is worth mentioning that, contrary to a naive expectation, this does not lead to any additional sm allness of _ph since (") enters the result through expressions of the type "0."

We do not discuss speci c m icroscopic m odels of the inelastic coupling of electrons to a therm albath, our purpose here is to use the simplest possible representation of $I_{\rm in}$. In a conserving relaxation-time approximation

$$I_{in}f = \prod_{in}^{1} (f f_{F}); \qquad (10)$$

where the "independent $_{in}^{1}$ is in generala functional of f ("), we get from Eqs. (5), (7) for $T_e = _F$:

ph
$$D_{0}^{D} = \frac{D}{!} \frac{e^{2}E_{!}^{2} in}{2m} K_{0}^{00}$$

= $\frac{e^{2}}{2c^{2}} \frac{2}{h}K_{0}^{00}$; (11)

Here $K_0^{00} = Q_*^2 K_0 j_{=F}$ and $\stackrel{D}{!}$ is the zero-T dynamic D rude conductivity, $\stackrel{D}{!} = e^2 K_! (_F) = 2 \sim^2$. Note that the only source of nonlinearity of $_{ph}$ with respect to the ac eld power in Eq. (11) is a dependence of $_{in}$ on E_!.

A lternatively, assuming the dominant role of soft inelastic scattering with energy transfersm uch smaller than T, we can write $I_{\rm in}\,$ in the Fokker-P lanck form :

$$I_{in}f = Q_{*}fB [Q_{*}f + T^{-1}f(1 - f)]g;$$
 (12)

where B (") = (")²W ("; ") =2 is the di usion coefcient in energy space, W is the corresponding rate of inelastic processes, and h:::i denotes averaging over the energy transfer ". Equation (5) become sthen rst-order in @., which gives f (") described by the Ferm i distribution with the e ective electron temperature

$$\Gamma_{\rm e} = T + {}_{\rm FP}; \qquad (13)$$

where

$$_{FP} = e^{2}E_{!}^{2}TK_{!}(_{F})=2mB(_{F});$$
 (14)

and

ph
$$D_{0} = \frac{e^{2}}{2 \sim^{2}} \frac{2}{6} (T_{e}^{2} - T^{2}) K_{0}^{00}$$

= $\frac{e^{2}}{2 \sim^{2}} \frac{2}{6} (2T + F_{F}) F_{F} K_{0}^{00}$: (15)

The case of typical energy transfers T m ay be qualitatively described by either m odel with B ($_{\rm F}$) $_{\rm in}$ TeT.

The m icrow ave power and tem perature dependences of $_{\rm ph}$ can be found from Eqs.(11),(15) for a variety of scattering m echanism s. If one assumes that $_{\rm in}$ is determined by scattering on acoustic phonons via the piezoelectric interaction screened by the 2D EG, the characteristic energy transfer is T_e and $_{\rm in}^{-1}$ / T_e^{-3} . It follows then from Eq.(9) that the heating at $_{\rm h}$ T is characterized by T_e / $E_!^{2=5}$. By using Eq.(11) we get $_{\rm ph}$ $_0^{\rm D}$ / $E_!^{2\rm T}^{-3}$ for $_{\rm h}$ T and T independent $_{\rm ph}$ $_0^{\rm D}$ / $E_!^{4=5}$ otherwise.

Having identi ed the main contribution to $_{\rm ph}$ in the lim it $_{\rm in}$ = 1 [diagrams (a), (b) in Fig. 1] it is instructive to compare this contribution with that corresponding to other diagram s [diagram s (c) { (i)]. While the former is related to the heating of electrons by the ac edd, the latter can be regarded as an elect of radiation on the inpurity scattering and thus represents a classical analog of the quantum elect considered in Refs. 9{11. Following the procedure given by Eqs. (2), (3) and making use of the explicit matrix form of the eld operator, $[F@pg]_n = F_{nn}^{0}g_{0n}^{0}$,

$$F_{nn^{0}}^{0} = \frac{1}{2} ; \circ_{1} s \circ \mathcal{R}_{nn^{0}}^{0} \quad (e_{p} + (^{0})) \xrightarrow{0}{p} ;$$

$$E_{nn^{0}}^{0} = E_{dc nn^{0}} + \frac{1}{2} E_{! n;n^{0} 1}^{0};$$

$$s \circ = e_{x} + i(^{0}) e_{y};$$
(16)

one can readily calculate the photoconductivity at any desirable order in the $eldsE_{dc}$ and $E_{!}$ ($e_{x,y}$ are the unit vectors along the x; y axes). At the low est order the photoconductivity $_{ph}$ O ($E_{dc}^{0}E_{!}^{2}$) is given by the diagram s (a) { (i) in Fig. 1 (together with their counterparts in a low er half-plane, !!!). The result takes a simple form in the limit $_{in}^{1}$ 1 !c !:

$$\begin{array}{c} {}_{ph} {}_{0} {}_{0} {}_{=} {} {}_{\overline{8}} {}_{0} {}_{0} {}_{-} {} {} {}_{\overline{F}} {}_{\overline{F}}$$

where $c_1 = " (g_1^2 " ^1 j_{!="_F} , c_2 = " (g_1 ^1 j_{!="_F} are num$ bers (typically of order unity) determ ined by the type of disorder, $E_{\rm E}$ is the angle between $\tilde{E}_{\rm dc}$ and $\tilde{E}_{\rm l}$. The rst term in the square brackets corresponds to the diagram s (a), (b) in Fig. 1 and reproduces Eq. (11) in the lim it of T. The term $(5c_1 + 4c_2)$ corresponds weak heating, h to the diagram s (c), (e), and (f). The polarization { dependent part, given by the last term , originates from the diagrams (d) and (i) (in which both diagonal links have the same direction along the axis). Finally, the diagram s (g) and (h) give a contribution which is sm aller, compared to the diagram s (c) { (f) and (i), in the param -1 and is om itted in Eq. (18). One can eter 1=!_{c in} clearly see from Eq. (18) that in the lim it $_{in}$ = 1 the photoconductivity is dom inated by the heating of electrons.

III. IN TERACTION -IN DUCED PHOTOCONDUCTIVITY

In the above, we have neglected inelastic electronelectron collisions, whose role is not essential for the quasiclassical OPC, but have also ignored the renorm alization of the elastic scattering rate by electron-electron interactions. The latter approximation, which ts in with the conventional approach to the photoconductivity, in fact m isses an important contribution to ph. Recall that the change of the conductivity due to radiation at in comes mainly from the heating. It is most illum inating to focus on the model of Eqs. (12),(15), within which $_0^{\rm D}$ is simply proportional to $T_{\rm e}^{\,2}$ T². C learly, ph this contribution to ph is associated with the term in the D rude conductivity that is quadratic in the sm all param eter T = F. Substituting T_e for T in the D rude term yields $_{\rm ph}$ given by Eq. (15). On the other hand, there are T dependent quantum corrections to the conductivity, neglected above, in which one should sim ilarly change T ! $T_{\rm e}$. At low T , the term s in $_{\rm ph}$ coming from these quantum corrections may easily become larger than the classical contribution (15), as we now dem onstrate.

For high-m obility sam ples, we are mostly interested in $_{ph}$ at not too low tem peratures T =~ 1. In this \ballistic" regime, the most important T dependent term in the conductivity at zero B, for the lim iting case of shortrange disorder ($!_{\rm S}$), is related to screening of the disorder by Friedel oscillations, which translates into a T and "dependent renorm alization of the elastic scattering rate. This quantum interaction-induced term is given $_{int} = (e^2 = \sim^2) T_s \cdot^{16} Here$ is the interaction by coupling constant, equal to unity for the C oulom b interaction (under the assumption that $k_{\rm F}^{-1}$ is much smaller than the static screening length). Rem arkably, int is linear in $T = F_F$, in contrast to the classical T dependent term which is quadratic in T = F. Substitution $T ! T_e$ int yields an interaction-induced term in the phoin to conductivity, $_{\rm ph}$ = ($e^2 = \sim^2$) (T_e T) $_{\rm S}$, where T = FP is given by Eq. (14). For nite B, assum -Te ing that T ~! c;~= , this term in ph reads

$$_{\rm ph} = -\frac{e^2}{2} (T_e - T)_S \frac{1 + \frac{l_c^2 r_s^2}{(1 + \frac{l_c^2 r_s^2}{2})^2}}{(1 + \frac{l_c^2 r_s^2}{2})^2} :$$
 (18)

This result is obtained by inverting the resistivity tensor for which the leading (for T $~:_c; :=$) interactioninduced correction to $_{XX}$ is B independent, while that to $_{Xy}$ m ay be neglected. It follows from the comparison of Eqs. (15),(18) that this quantum contribution to the photoconductivity is much larger than the classical one provided the e ective temperature is low, $T_e = _F$, which is satistic ed for 1 in the whole range of temperatures in a degenerate Fermi system. Thus su ciently strong interactions have the e ect of greatly enhancing the photoconductivity.

For stronger magnetic elds, $\sim !_c$ T, another mechanism of the interaction-induced photoconductivity becomes relevant, related to the interplay¹⁷ of quasiclassical memory e ects and electron-electron interactions. For the two-component model of disorder, assuming, as above, that $_{\rm S}$ $_{\rm L}$, the T dependent correction to the conductivity is $_{\rm int}$

 $(e^2 = ~)(_L = _S)^{1=2} (T_S = ~)^{1=2} \cdot \overset{1=2}{\cdot} \cdot \overset{17}{\cdot} W$ ith num erical factors included, this yields a contribution to the photo-conductivity

$$_{\rm ph} = -\frac{e^2}{\sim} \frac{3}{16} \frac{(3=2)}{^{3=2}} - \frac{L}{_{\rm S}} - \frac{^{1=2}}{^{1=2}} \frac{{\rm T}_{e}^{-1=2}}{(_{\rm S}=\sim)^{1=2}} : (19)$$

C om paring Eqs. (18) and (19), one sees that the latter mechanism gives a larger contribution to $_{\rm ph}$ in the whole tem perature range T . ~!_c. At T ~!_c, the term (19) is still larger than that given by Eq. (18) by a factor $(!_{\rm c~L})^{1=2}$ 1. W ith increasing T, however, the mem ory-e ects induced correction falls o rapidly, as exp[4 2 T=!_c], so that at T ~!_c ln (!_{c L}) a crossover to Eq. (18) occurs.

IV. MAGNETOOSCILLATIONSDUE TO MEMORY EFFECTS

The photoconductivity obtained in Secs. II,III exhibits the cyclotron resonance but shows no oscillations with varying $!=!_c$. Let us now incorporate the mem ory effects. To this end, we have to step back to write the Liouville equation not yet averaged over positions of im – purities. M ore precisely, for the two-com ponent m odel of disorder (speci ed in Sec. I), we average only over sm ooth disorder and represent the Liouville operator as

$$L = L_0 + L \quad \underline{I}_n ; \tag{20}$$

where L_0 includes the e ect of scattering on sm ooth disorder:

$$L_0 = Q_t + vr_r + !_c Q_{L^2} Q^2$$
; (21)

and $L = \prod_{i=1}^{P} I_{R_{i}}(r)$ is a sum of collision operators for short-range in purities located at points R_{i} . We have to keep in L_{0} the spatial-gradient term (v is the velocity).

A veraging the solution of Eq. (1) over R_i with L given by Eq. (20) can be done system atically along the lines of R ef. 14: a classical diagram technique is form ulated by m eans of the free propagator L_0^{-1} and the disorder correlation function h L (r) L (f)i. We proceed by representing the averaged propagator L $^{-1} = (L_0 + M - I_m)^{-1}$ in terms of the self-energy operator M. Equations (5) { (7) are then reproduced with in Eq. (6) given by

$$^{1} = ^{1}_{1} + (!);$$
 (22)

where $= \begin{pmatrix} R \\ (d = 2 \end{pmatrix}$ nM n and n = v=jvj. To rst order in L,

$$^{(1)} = n_{\rm B} \, dr \, (d = 2) \, n \, {\rm I}_{\rm R_{i}}(r) \, n :$$
 (23)

By de nition $r_{B} \operatorname{dr} I_{R_{i}}(r)n = n_{S}^{1}$, so that we have ⁽¹⁾ = $_{S}^{1}$, which yields the D rude result for the total scattering rate $^{1} = _{L}^{1} + _{S}^{1}$. Expanding now M to second order in L, we obtain the leading correction to that is due to the memory elects:

$$(!) = n_{\rm B} \frac{Z Z Z}{dr dr^0} \frac{d}{2}$$

n $\mathbb{I}_{\rm R_{i}}(r) D_{!}(r r^0) \mathbb{I}_{\rm R_{i}}(r^0) n;$ (24)

ormore explicitly

(2)

where the propagator

$$D = (L_0 + {}_S^{-1})^{-1}$$
(26)

is taken in the ! representation. M ost importantly, the ! dispersion of D leads to oscillations of $^{(2)}$ (!) with a period !_c.

To nd ⁽²⁾ (!), we rst note that, since $\underline{I}_{i}(\mathbf{r})$ as a function of r falls o fast beyond a small vicinity of R_i, one can put $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}^{0}$ in the argument of D₁ in Eqs. (24),(25). Then, ⁽²⁾ (!) is given by

where D $_{!}$ (0; ; $^{0})$ is the Fourier transform in t of the probability density to return with a direction of v speci-

ed by ⁰ if one starts at an angle . Let us now focus on the case $!_{c \ S}$ 1. In this lim it, D $_{!}$ (0; ; ⁰) is sharply peaked at $= \frac{1}{R}^{0}$ and, introducing the total probability of return P $_{!} = d^{0}D_{!}$ (0; ; ⁰), we nally get

$$^{(2)}(!) = P_1 = n_S \frac{2}{S}$$
: (28)

A return-induced correction to the e ective scattering rate, which comes according to Eq. (28) from $\text{ReP}_{!}$, yields, away from the cyclotron resonance, oscillations of the absorption rate through a correction to the function $K_{!}(F_{)}$ [cf. Eq. (6)]:

$$K_{!}(F_{F}) = (F_{F} = 2n_{S} S_{S}^{2}) ReP_{!} = (! !_{c})^{2}$$
: (29)

The oscillatory part of K $_{!}$ ($_{\rm F}$) leads to classical oscillations of the linear ac conductivity, 19

$$_{!}^{(c)} = _{!}^{D} \operatorname{ReP}_{!} = n_{S S};$$
 (30)

and being substituted in Eqs. (5){(7), to those of $_{\rm ph}$. To rst order in $E_{\rm r}^2$, the classical oscillatory correction to $_{\rm ph}$ reads

$$\frac{\frac{(c)}{ph}}{\frac{p}{ph}} = \frac{\frac{(c)}{!}}{\frac{p}{!}} = \frac{ReP_{!}}{n_{S S}} :$$
(31)



FIG.2: Diagram s describing the memory e ects in the photoconductivity $_{\rm ph}$: oscillatory self-energy (b) and vertex (c) corrections to the sm ooth part (a) of $_{\rm ph}$.

It is worth noting once more that both the smooth correction $_{\rm ph}$ $_0^{\rm D}$ and the oscillatory contribution $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$ are proportional to the inelastic time $_{\rm in}$.

In the above, we have analyzed the oscillatory correction to the self-energy in terms of the return probability P_1 . In fact, there are other contributions to the OPC which are not reduced to the self-energy corrections and cannot be represented through P₁. To illustrate this point, it is convenient to switch to a more conventional (dual) representation of the diagram s in Fig. 1, now with lines corresponding to the propagators and vertices representing the eld operators (16), as shown in Fig. 2. The diagram (a) in Fig. 2 reproduces the graph (a) in Fig. 1. The diagram Fig. 2(b) represents the oscillatory correction to $_{\rm ph}$ of the self-energy type, Eq. (31). Both diagram s (a) and (b) in Fig. 2 contain the inelastic propagator (L¹)₀₀ = in at zero m om entum q, w hich is m uch larger than all other propagators, (L 1) $_{n}$ with at least one of the indices ;n for 0. By contrast, the diagram (c), which exempli es an oscillatory vertex correction to ph, is not proportional to in, because of large q running along the internal propagators D (q;!) [de ned in Eq. (26)]. The vertex type corrections, which are of the same order in all of the diagrams (a) { (i), are thus by a factor $_{in} = _{S}$ sm aller than the self-energy contribution (31).

The function P₁ for $!_{c L}$ 1 is most directly evaluated by using Eq. (21) which represents the time evolution of as a di usion process with a white noise spectrum of \mathcal{C}_t . This approach is justimed for not too strong B, namely for d, where (see Appendix)

$$= 2^{1=2} v_{F L} = (!_{C L})^{3=2}$$
(32)

is a mean-square uctuation of the guiding center of a cyclotron orbit after one cyclotron revolution (otherwise adiabatic drift dynamics is developed). The probability

density $p_n(x_2; x_k)$ for particles on the Ferm i surface to be scattered from the starting point on a cyclotron orbit by a distance x_2 across the orbit and a distance x_k along it in time 2 n=!_c is then given by the apisotropic G aussian distribution with averages $x_2^2 = x_k^2 = 3 = n^2 = 2$ (see Appendix). Sum m ing over multiple cyclotron revolutions, we thus express P_1 as

$$P_{!} = \int_{n=1}^{X} dt e^{i(! - i - s)t} p_{n} [0; v_{F} (t - 2 n = !_{c})]: (33)$$

Note that once the particle hits a short-range in purity, its guiding center is shifted by a distance of the order of the cyclotron radius. As a result, the contribution of such trajectories to the return probability can be neglected and only non-colliding orbits should be taken into account, which is expressed by the exponential factor $\exp(t=_{s})$. Equation (33) gives oscillations of P_{1} as $!=!_{c}$ is varied:

$$P_{!} = \frac{1}{P_{T}} \frac{X}{V_{F}} \frac{1}{n=1} \exp \left(\frac{2 n}{!_{c}} (i! + 1)\right); \quad (34)$$

whose dam ping with decreasing B is characterized by

$$=\frac{3}{2_{\rm L}} \frac{!}{!_{\rm c}}^2 + \frac{1}{!_{\rm s}} :$$
(35)

In the limit of weak damping, $!_c$, we perform the sum mation in Eq. (34) by means of Poisson's form ula to represent ReP₁ as a series of sharp peaks centered at $! = N !_c$. A peak at ! ' N !_c is of the form ²⁰

$$ReP_{!} = \frac{\frac{!_{c}^{3} L}{2 3 v_{F}^{2} !} F \frac{! N !_{c}}{...} ; \qquad (36)$$

F (x) =
$$\frac{1 + (1 + x^2)^{1=2}}{2(1 + x^2)}$$
; F (0) = 1 : (37)

Note that the amplitude of the peaks in Eq. (36) falls o with decreasing ! $_{\rm c}$ or increasing ! as a power law, namely as ! $_{\rm c}^3$ =!. The power-law suppression of the oscillations crosses over into the exponential damping only for very large (!=! $_{\rm c}$)² ! $_{\rm c~L}$, when one can neglect all terms in Eq. (34) but the rst one, which gives

$$ReP_{!} = \frac{(!_{c L})^{3=2}}{2 v_{F L}^{2}} \cos \frac{2!_{c}}{!_{c}} \exp \frac{2!_{c}}{!_{c}} : (38)$$

It is worth noting that, because of the condition $!_{cS}$ 1, the term $_{S}$ ¹ in Eq. (35) m ay be neglected in the dam ping factor of Eq. (38), so that the exponential dam ping is determined by the momentum relaxation time for scattering o the long-range disorder.

V. OSCILLATORY AC CONDUCTIVITY: QUASICLASSICAL VS QUANTUM

Now we compare the classical oscillatory ac conductivity $\stackrel{(c)}{!}$, given by Eqs. (30), (36), (38), with the quantum



FIG. 3: Quasiclassical $[!^{(c)}, Eq. (40)]$ and quantum $[!^{(q)},$ Eq. (41)] oscillatory ac conductivity (norm alized to the D rude conductivity $^{D}_{!}$) vs !_c=! for !=2 = 100 G H z, = 0:6 ns, = q = 50, s = L = 0:1, a = 0:25 at $!_{c} = ! = 1=2$.

contribution ! calculated in Ref. 7. Let us represent ^(c) for weak dam ping at ! = N !_c as

is given by Eq. (32) and we have introduced where a characteristic size of the short-range in purities a = $(n_{\rm S} v_{\rm F~S})^{-1}$. It follows that, apart from the harm onics num ber N , the am plitude of the oscillations is given by the product of a sm all factor a= and a large factor $(!_{c L})^{1=2}$. In the exponential damping regime, $!^{(c)}_{!}$ is re-w ritten as

$$\frac{\binom{(c)}{!}}{\binom{D}{!}} = 1 \quad \frac{a}{p-1} \cos \frac{2!}{!_{c}} \exp \frac{!}{!_{c}} \frac{2}{!_{c}} \frac{3}{!_{c}} ; (40)$$

so that the pre-exponential factor is $\sin p \ln q$ given by a =. An important point to notice is that the damping in Eq. (40) is characterized solely by the long transport time for scattering o the sm ooth disorder. On the other hand, the envelope of the quantum oscillations of the ac conductivity is determ ined by the single-particle time $_{a}$:

$$\frac{\stackrel{(q)}{!}}{\stackrel{D}{!}} = 1 + 2\cos\frac{2!}{!_{c}}\exp\frac{2!}{!_{c q}}$$
(41)

(this equation is valid for 2 T $\sim = \alpha$, for sm aller T see Ref.7).

Note the di erence in the sign of the oscillatory term s: there is a shift of the quantum and classical oscillations with respect to each other. A nother di erence is that the damping of the classical oscillations is ! dependent, in contrast to the quantum case. One sees that, despite the sm all factor a= , the classical oscillations m ay be stronger than the quantum ones since in high-mobility structures I, and the quantum oscillations are dam ped much α m ore strongly. The behavior of the two contributions to the oscillatory ac conductivity is illustrated in Fig. 3.

VI. MECHANISMS OF THE OSCILLATORY PHOTOCONDUCTIVITY: QUASICLASSICAL VS OUANTUM

 $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$ to the Having found the classical contribution OPC [Eqs. (31), (36), (38)], let us compare it with the $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (q)}$, 7,8 related to the quantum oscillatory contribution oscillations of the DOS.Using Eqs. (31),(35),(38) and om itting num erical factors, we write down the essential (C) factors in for & !c for the case of non interacting ph electrons:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (c) & & & \\ ph & & 0 & \underline{in} & \underline{eE_{!} v_{F}} & ^{2} \underline{a} \\ & & & & F_{!} & \\ & & & & \\ & &$$

 $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$ in Eq. (42) depends on that of K $_0^{\rm (0)}$ [see The sign of Eq. (11)].

ph

(C)

ph

As shown in Sec. III, unless the electron-electron interaction is extremely weak, the largest contribution to the smooth part of $_{\rm ph}$ comes from the interaction correction to the conductivity. For T $\& ~ !_{\rm c} \ln (!_{\rm c \ L})$, the main interaction-induced term in the smooth part of ph is given by Eq. (18) and, according to Eq. (31), this yields in ^(c) Putting turn them ain term in the oscillating part

1 (long-range C oulom b interaction), we have:

$$\sum_{0}^{D} \frac{in}{r} \frac{(eE_{!} v_{F} = !)^{2}}{F_{m}T} \frac{a}{r}$$

$$\cos \frac{2}{!_{c}} \exp \frac{1}{!_{c}} \frac{2}{r} \frac{3}{!_{c L}} ; \quad (43)$$

which is larger than the noninteracting part [Eq. (42)] by a factor F = T.

For T ~! $_{\rm c}$, the main contribution to $_{\rm ph}$ is related to the interaction correction given by Eq. (19), $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$ sim ilar (in term s which yields the oscillatory part of the phase of the oscillations and their dam ping factor) to that in Eq. (43) but multiplied by a large factor $(!_{\rm C-L})^2 = (T_{\rm L} = \sim)^{3=2}$. In the interm ediate range of tem -Т ~! $_{\rm c} \ln$ (! $_{\rm c}$ $_{\rm L}$), there is an expoperature, ~!_c nentially fast crossover between the two regimes. The regime most relevant to the experiments^{1,2,3,4,5} is that of high tem perature, T & ~!c. It is worth noting that Eqs. (42), (43) rem ain valid in the regime of strong heating as well, provided the e ective electron tem perature T_e [Eq. (9)] is substituted for T.

(q) For convenience, we also reproduce here in the case of overlapping Landau levels; speci cally, for $!_c j \& !_c$ in the regime linear with respect to the ή! microwave power (see Eq. (8) of Ref. 8; here we om it num erical factors):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (q) & & \\ ph & & 0 \end{array} \xrightarrow{ee} & \frac{eE_{!} v_{F}}{\sim !^{2}} \xrightarrow{2} \frac{!}{!_{c}} \end{array}$$

$$\sin\frac{2 !}{!_{c}} \exp \frac{2}{!_{c q}} : \qquad (44)$$

The electron-electron scattering tim $e^8 e_e / T_e^2$ (up to a logarithm ic factor) depends on the electron tem perature T_e [Eq. (9)]. A lineagh both contributions, Eqs. (43),(44) have the same period in $!=!_c$, crucial distinctions are clear.

Firstly, their phases are shifted by =2. Secondly, despite both contributions being proportional to a certain inelastic relaxation time, they are dierent in that $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (q)}$ is limited by $_{\rm ee}$ (which at low the amplitude of T is much shorter than the electron-phonon scattering time), whereas the classical term is not sensitive to the inelastic electron-electron scattering in any essential way¹⁸ and is proportional to the energy relaxation time [$_{in}$ in Eqs. (10), (43)], lim ited by coupling to the external bath (phonons). It follows that in the lim it of small T the ratio of the amplitudes of the OPC, classical-to-quantum, contains a large T dependent factor $_{in} = _{ee}$, which may be easily as large as 10^2 . The sensitivity of $^{(q)}_{ph}$ to electronelectron collisions stems from the fact that the quantum contribution is due to a radiation-induced change of the distribution function f (") that oscillates with both " and °, is asso-! . By contrast, the classical contribution ph ciated with an oscillatory term in the characteristic electron tem perature, i.e., with a sm ooth part of f (") which oscillates with ! only.²¹

Thirdly, the dependences of the envelope of the OPC on !, !c, and the degree of disorder are quite di erent. The most important point is that although there is a small factor / $_{\rm F}^{-1}$ in Eq. (43), in addition to another small factor a= , the damping of the classical term is much weaker than that of $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (q)}$ / exp (2 =!_{c q}). Indeed, the exponential damping of $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$ is governed by $_{\rm L}$ Eq. (43)], which is far larger than $_{\rm q}$ in high-m obility samples. It is only that in the limit of very low B that the ! $_{\rm c}^{-3}$ factor in the exponent of Eq. (43) suppresses the classical OPC more electively than the linear in ! $_{\rm c}^{-1}$

It is important to stress that the amplitude of the classical OPC in units of the dark conductivity is not large under the conditions of the experiments on the zero-resistance states. Indeed, the pre-exponential factorofEq. (43) may be written as $_{0}^{D}$ ($_{h}^{2}$ = $_{F}$ T)(a=) for the regime linear with respect to the microwave power. Now, the crossover to the regime of strong heating occurs when the classical OPC is still sm all, namely the $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}=~_0^{\rm D}$ is of order (T = $_{\rm F}$)(a=) . 10 $^2.$ This ratio should be contrasted with the quantum OPC which may become large (and thus lead to the zero-resistance states) when the heating m ay be still negligible. For the regime of strong heating, when the e ective electron temperature $T_{\rm e}$ & T , the amplitude of the classical OPC shows a sub-linear growth with increasing microwave power and may be estimated as ${}^{
m D}_{
m 0}$ (T $_{
m e}$ = $_{
m F}$)(a=). In particular, for the piezoelectric mechanism of the energy relaxation due to electron-phonon coupling, the classicalOPC grows as $E_1^{2=5}$ [see the discussion below Eq. (15)]. We conclude that, because of the slow growth with increasing m icrow ave power, the characteristic ratio ${(c) \atop ph} = {D \atop 0}$ can hardly exceed the level of a few percent in the current experiments. That is to say the zero-resistance states are related to the quantum OPC. The most favorable conditions for the observation of the classical OPC should be realized if the quantum contribution to the OPC is strongly damped, which means su ciently large 2 =! q & 7. For a high-mobility sample with q 3ps, this would require !=2 . 50 G H z.

The above analysis shows that the classicalOPC cannot possibly explain the experimentally reported strong deviations of the ratio $_{\rm ph}=_{\rm q}$ from 1/2, the value predicted by the theory of the quantum OPC, as discussed in Introduction. We thus argue that the experiments on the damping of Shubnikov-de H aas oscillations m ight strongly overestimate the single-particle scattering rate $_{\rm q}^{-1}$. One of the reasons could be the presence of m acroscopic inhom ogeneities leading to an inhom ogeneous broadening of Landau levels, which m ight be by

far larger than the hom ogeneous broadening given by $_{q}^{1}$ and m easured in the photoconductivity experiments (such a possibility was mentioned in Ref. 1). We suggest that measuring the damping of the OPC provides a reliable means of extracting $_{q}^{1}$ from the magnetooscillations, free from the e ect of the additional inhom ogeneous damping characteristic to the Shubnikov-de H aas measurements. The method based on the OPC is particularly useful in high-mobility samples, where $_{q}^{1}$ is small and in the conventional Shubnikov (de H aas measurements one has to go to fairly low temperatures to separate the in purity-induced damping from that related to the therm also earing of the Ferm i surface.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In sum m ary, we have analyzed the quasiclassical mechanism of magnetooscillations in the ac-and photoconductivity, related to non-Markovian dynamics of disorderinduced scattering of electrons in high-mobility structures. We have calculated the leading contribution associated with a radiation-induced change of the electron distribution function, which is proportional to the inelastic (electron-phonon) relaxation time. We have found that the quasiclassical oscillations in the photoconductivity are weak under the conditions of current experiments. Therefore, the zero-resistance states and the strong oscillations that have been observed in the experim ents are likely due to the quantum mechanism of Refs. 7,8. We argue that the damping of the oscillatory photoconductivity provides a reliable m ethod of m easuring the hom ogeneous broadening of Landau levels (single-particle scattering rate q^{1}) in high-mobility structures (which also resolves the dilem m a posed in Introduction: the analysis of the dam ping of Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations

apparently gives overestim ated values of $_{\rm q}^{-1}$ due to an inhom ogeneous broadening).

On the other hand, we have identi ed a range of param eters within which the quasiclassical mechanism yields oscillations of the photoconductivity that may dominate at small B over those based on the Landau quantization. In addition to the di erent low B damping factor, the quasiclassical oscillations are shifted in phase by =2 with respect to the quantum oscillations, see Eqs. (43),(44). We have also shown that the quasiclassical magnetooscillations in the ac conductivity are much stronger than in the photoconductivity and may easily compete with the quantum oscillations.

We thank R.R.Du, K. von Klitzing, R.G.Mani, J.H. Smet, and M.A. Zudov for information about the experiments. We are grateful to I.L.A leiner and I.V.G omyi for valuable discussions. In particlular, we thank I.L.A leiner for attracting our attention to the im – portance of quantum interaction corrections. This work was supported by the SPP \Q uanten-Hall-System e" of DFG and by RFBR.

*

APPENDIX A:RETURN PROBABILITY IN A MAGNETIC FIELD

The return probability P_{\perp} Eq. (28)] can be directly evaluated by using the quasiclassical propagator $D = (L_0 + {}_S^{-1})^{-1}$ Eq. (26)]. In this Appendix, we present a di erent, more illustrative way to derive P_{\perp} . We recall that the Liouville operator L_0 Eq. (21)] represents the time evolution of the direction of the electron velocity n = v = jv j = (sin ; cos) as a combination of the cyclotron motion and the angle di usion due to scattering o sm ooth disorder. The random part of the angle is characterized by a white noise spectrum of Q_t :

In what follows we calculate the mean-square uctuation of the guiding center of cyclotron motion , Eq. (32), and mean-square shifts of an electron along and across the cyclotron orbit affer n cyclotron periods at $t = n T_c = 2$ n=!_c. For de niteness, let the guiding center be initially placed at the origin, R (t = 0) = (0;0), and the electron coordinate and velocity be r (t = 0) = (R_c ; 0), v (t = 0) = (0; v_F) ($R_c = v_F$ =!_c is the cyclotron radius).

U sing Eq. (A 1) we get the m ean-square shifts of the position of guiding center R and the uctuating angle in time $t = nT_c$:

$$hR_{x}^{2}i = \begin{cases} * Z_{nT_{c}} & !_{2}+ \\ dtR_{c}\cos(t) \theta_{t} & (t) \\ = \frac{2R_{c}^{2}}{L} \int_{0}^{Z_{nT_{c}}} dt\cos^{2}(t) = R_{c}^{2}\frac{nT_{c}}{L} \\ hR_{y}^{2}i = hR_{x}^{2}i; \\ * Z_{nT_{c}} & !_{2}+ \\ h^{2}i = dt\theta_{t} & (t) = \frac{2nT_{c}}{L}: \quad (A2) \end{cases}$$

The di usion approximation is valid as long as the rootmean-square shift of the guiding center after one cyclotron revolution (n = 1) exceeds the characteristic length scale of the random potential,

=
$$hR_x^2 i + hR_y^2 i^{1=2} = R_c \frac{4}{!_{cL}}^{1=2}$$
 d: (A3)

In the same manner, we calculate the mean square of electron shifts along and across the cyclotron orbit, x_k $w(t = nT_k) = \frac{R_n T_c}{r_k} dt w$ and $w = w(t = nT_k)$

$$y(t = n I_c) = 0 \quad \text{atv}_F \quad \cos(t) \text{ and } x_? \quad x(t = n I_c)$$

$$R_c = 0 \quad \text{atv}_F \quad \sin(t), \text{ respectively,}$$

$$hx_{k}^{2}i = h(R_{y} + R_{c})^{2}i = hR_{y}^{2}i + R_{c}^{2}h^{2}i$$
: (A4)

It follows that uctuations along the cyclotron orbit are enhanced with respect to those across the orbit, $hx_k^2 i = 3hx_2^2 i = 3n^{-2}=2$, and we arrive at the anisotropic electron distribution after n cyclotron revolutions,

$$p_{n}(x_{2};x_{k}) = \frac{1}{p-n} \exp \left(\frac{x_{2}^{2}}{n^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{p-1} \exp \left(\frac{x_{k}^{2}}{3n^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{p-1} \exp \left(\frac{x_{k}^{2}}{3n^{2}}\right$$

which enters Eq. (33) for the return probability.

- * A lso at A F. Io e Physico-Technical Institute, 194021 St.Petersburg, Russia.
- ^y Also at Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188350 St.Petersburg, Russia.
- ¹ M A. Zudov, R R. Du, JA. Simmons, and JL. Reno,

Phys. Rev. B 64, 201311 (R) (2001); PD.Ye, LW. Engel, DC. Tsui, JA. Simmons, JR. W endt, GA. Vawter, and JL. Reno, Appl. Phys. Lett. 79, 2193 (2001).

² R G .M ani, J.H .Sm et, K .von K litzing, V .N arayanam urti, W B .Johnson, and V .Um ansky, Nature 420, 646 (2002); Phys.Rev.B 69, 193304 (2004); cond-m at/0306388.

- ³ M A.Zudov, R R.Du, L N.Pfei er, and K W .W est, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 046807 (2003); C L. Yang, M A. Zudov, T A.Knuuttila, R R.Du, L N.Pfei er, and K W .W est, ibid. 91, 096803 (2003).
- ⁴ S.I.Dorozhkin, JETP Lett. 77, 577 (2003).
- ⁵ R L. W illett, L N. P fei er, and K W. W est, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 026804 (2004).
- ⁶ A.V. Andreev, IL. A leiner, and A.J. M illis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 056803 (2003).
- ⁷ IA.Dm itriev, A D.M irlin, and D.G. Polyakov, Phys.Rev. Lett. 91, 226802 (2003).
- ⁸ IA.Dm itriev, M G.Vavilov, IL.A leiner, A D.M irlin, and D G.Polyakov, cond-m at/0310668.
- ⁹ A C. Durst, S. Sachdev, N. Read, and S.M. Girvin, Phys. Rev.Lett. 91, 086803 (2003).
- ¹⁰ V J. Ryzhii, Sov. Phys. Solid State 11, 2078 (1970); V J. Ryzhii, R A Suris, and B S. Shcham khalova, Sov. Phys. Sem icond. 20, 1299 (1986).
- ¹¹ M G. Vavilov and IL. A leiner, Phys. Rev. B 69, 035303 (2004).
- ¹² To avoid confusion, it is worthwhile to note that the Shubnikov-de H as oscillations of the dark resistivity were dam ped in Refs. 1,2,3,4,5 m ostly by tem perature rather than by disorder.
- ¹³ For smooth disorder, manifestations of the memory elects in the magnetoresistance and ac transport were studied in A D. Mirlin, J. W ilke, F. Evers, D G. Polyakov, and P. W ol e, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2801 (1999); J. W ilke, A D. Mirlin, D G. Polyakov, F. Evers, and P. W ol e, Phys. Rev. B 61, 13774 (2000). Recently, the role of the memory elects in the photoconductivity, in the case of smooth disorder, was discussed in terms of the in uence of microwave radiation on the collision integral in Ref. 11 and in I.L. A leiner, B L. A ltshuler, and A V. Andreev, unpublished. How ever, the memory elects manifest them selves in the photoconductivity much more strongly through a radiation-induced change of the electron distribution function.
- ¹⁴ A D .M irlin, D G .Polyakov, F.Evers, and P.W ol e, Phys. Rev.Lett. 87, 126805 (2001).
- ¹⁵ V.Um ansky, R.de Picciotto, and M.Heiblum, Appl.Phys. Lett. 71, 683 (1997).

- ¹⁶ G. Zala, B.N. Narozhny, and I.L. A leiner, Phys. Rev. B 64, 214204 (2001).
- ¹⁷ I.V. Gornyi and A.D. M irlin, Phys. Rev. B 69, 045313 (2004).
- ¹⁸ M ore precisely, the e ect of inelastic electron-electron scattering on the OPC is twofold: rstly, it suppresses oscillations of f (") induced by those of the DOS; secondly, it affects the exact shape of the sm ooth part of f (") by therm alizing electrons am ong them selves. The form er e ect leads $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (q)}$, as discussed to the dam ping of the quantum term in Ref. 8. The latter can only yield a num erical coe cient $_{\rm ph}^{\rm (c)}$, depending on of order unity in the classical term what other mechanisms of inelastic scattering are. Moreover, this num erical factor is one, so that electron-electron _{ph} at all, inelastic scattering does not manifest itself in if the inelastic coupling to the therm al bath in the presence of a driving force yields f (") whose shape is given by the Ferm i distribution (but with an e ective tem perature di erent from that of the bath). This is the case, e.g., for the Fokker-Planck mechanism of Eqs. (12), (15).
- ¹⁹ Sim ilar oscillations of the ac conductivity were studied for the case of a random antidot array, where the mem ory effects are still stronger, in D.G. Polyakov, F. Evers, and I.V.G omyi, Phys. Rev. B 65, 125326 (2002). The antidotarray model also describes correctly rare strong shortranged scatterers in the absence of background smooth disorder.
- ²⁰ Equation (36) has the same structure as an interactioninduced correction to the tunneling DOS, studied in A M. Rudin, IL. A keiner, and L.I. G kazman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 709 (1997), which is also proportional to the retum probability P₁.
- ²¹ It is worth noting that there exists also a subleading quantum contribution to the OPC that is due to the oscillatory heating, i.e., due to a sm ooth part of f (") which oscillates with ! (because of the oscillatory absorption rate coming in turn from the Landau quantization). It has the same damping factor as in Eq. (44), but the phase of the oscillations as in Eq. (43). This quantum term is, however, much sm aller than given by Eq. (44); speci cally, by a factor $(\sim^2 ! !_c = \frac{1}{F})_{in} = \frac{1}{2}$.