

# Composite fermions in the Fractional Quantum Hall Effect: Transport at finite wavevector.

A.D. Mirlin<sup>1,2</sup> and P. Woelke<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institut für Theorie der Kondensierten Materie, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188350 Gatchina, St. Petersburg, Russia.

(February 2, 2022)

We consider the conductivity tensor for composite fermions in a close to half-filled Landau band in the temperature regime where the scattering on the potential and the trapped gauge field of random impurities dominates. The Boltzmann equation approach is employed to calculate the quasiclassical transport properties at finite effective magnetic field, wavevector and frequency. We present an exact solution of the kinetic equation for all parameter regimes. Our results allow a consistent description of recently observed surface acoustic wave resonances and other findings.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Pm, 73.50.Bk, 73.20.Dx

The properties of two-dimensional (2D) electron systems in high magnetic fields appear to be well described by the model of composite fermions (CF's) [1,2]. It postulates the existence of fermionic quasiparticles consisting of electrons to which an even number of flux quanta has been attached. The corresponding mapping can be expressed by introduction of a Chern-Simons (CS) gauge field [2,3]. The average magnetic field  $B_e$  experienced by the CF's is the difference of the external magnetic field  $B$  and the mean field of the flux tubes,  $B = B_0 - n\phi_0$ , where  $\phi_0 = hc/e$  is the flux quantum,  $n$  is the (even) number of flux quanta per electron and  $n$  is the electron density. The CF model appears to capture the effect of the Coulomb interaction in maintaining optimum electron separation particularly near even denominator fillings of the Landau level,  $\nu = 1/(2q)$ , when choosing  $n = 2q$  ( $q = 1; 2; \dots$ ). Then the effective magnetic field  $B_e$  is largely reduced near and exactly zero at these filling factors. In this regime the CF model implies the existence of a Fermi surface with wave number  $k_F = \sqrt{4n}$  in a weak magnetic field [2]. At low temperatures the CF's are subject to elastic impurity scattering on the random potential created by a remote layer of donors and, more importantly, on the frozen random gauge field configuration induced by the impurities. In addition, the CF's interact via the scalar (Coulomb) potential and the CS gauge field.

The existence of new particles with a definite effective mass moving under the influence of an effective magnetic field  $B_e$  has been demonstrated in a number of experiments. For example, the interpretation of magnetooscillations in the longitudinal resistivity in terms of the Shubnikov-de Haas (SdH) effect for CF's has been very successful [4,5]. The observation of resonance effects

for the motion of charge carriers in the field of surface acoustic waves (SAW) is another example [6]. However, a closer examination suggested [7] that the experimental observation of these resonances is inconsistent with the conventional interpretation in the range of wave frequencies used. A quantity of central interest for the theoretical description of this phenomenon is the conductivity tensor at finite wave vector  $(\omega; q)$ , the calculation of which we will reexamine in the present paper. The momentum-dependent conductivity  $(\omega; q)$ , which determines the gauge field polarization operator, is also of importance for the damping of SdH oscillations by static and dynamic fluctuations of the gauge field [5,8].

In this letter we present a quasiclassical calculation of  $(\omega; q)$  in a magnetic field, taking into account the impurity scattering of fermions on a static random magnetic field and random potential. Surprisingly, despite the general character and the importance of the problem, we did not find a correct calculation of  $(\omega; q)$  in the literature even for the usual case of a short-range correlated random potential, except in the collisionless limit [9]. The standard reference [10] appears to have missed the fact that, since at finite wave vector  $q$  the current and density fluctuations are coupled, the relaxation time approximation in its simplest form cannot be used because it violates the particle number conservation. In particular, the results of Ref. [10] (used later for interpretation of the SAW experiments in Refs. [2,6,7]) violate the exact property  $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} q(\omega; q) = 0$ , which is a consequence of the current conservation. The particle number conservation has to be taken into account properly in modelling the collision integral of the Boltzmann equation, as shown below. Another new aspect of the transport problem we are considering is the extreme angular dependence of the scattering on a random magnetic field, which is so strongly peaked in the forward direction, that the relaxation time approximation is not adequate.

In quasiclassical transport theory the components of the electrical current  $j$  may be expressed in terms of the distribution function  $f(k; r; t)$  of fermions of momentum  $k$  at position  $r$  and time  $t$  as  $j(r; t) = e \int (dk) (k - m) f(k; r; t)$ , where  $e$  and  $m$  are the charge and the effective mass of the carriers. We are interested in the linear response  $f_1(k; r; t)$  to an applied electric field  $E(r; t) = E \exp(i\omega t + iqr)$  in the presence of a weak magnetic field  $B_0$  perpendicular to the plane, such that  $\omega_c \gg 1$  (here  $\omega_c = eB_0/mc$  is cyclotron frequency and

$\gamma_s^{-1}$  is the width of the Landau levels). The function  $f_1$  is obtained from the kinetic equation

$$i(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q}) f_1 + \frac{e}{c} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{B}_0) \mathbf{k} f_1 + e E r_k f_0 = C f f_1 g; \quad (1)$$

where  $f_0$  is the equilibrium distribution function,  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{k}/m$  (we assume isotropic Fermi surface) and  $C f f_1 g$  is the collision integral. The external force  $\mathbf{E} \cdot \nabla f_0$  acts only on states at the Fermi circle ( $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}_F$ ), and therefore  $f_1$  is only a function of the angle of  $\mathbf{k}$  with the  $\mathbf{x}$  axis, say. In terms of the angular momentum eigenfunctions  $f_m(\theta) = e^{im\theta}$ , the collision integral is given as

$$C f f_1 g = \sum_{m=-1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{2} \exp(i m \theta) g f_1(\theta): \quad (1)$$

Particle number conservation requires  $d_0 = 0$ , also  $m = m$ , since  $C$  is a hermitean and non-negative operator. The usual relaxation time approximation used in Ref. [10],  $C' f_1 = -\nu f_1$ , is equivalent to setting  $d_m = 1$  for all  $m$ , obviously violating the requirement  $d_0 = 0$ . This can be corrected by approximating

$$C' f_1 = -\nu f_1 \quad (1) \quad f_1 d = 2 \quad (2)$$

implying  $d_0 = 0$  and  $d_m = 1$  for all  $m \neq 0$  (in the following called model I). Model I describes isotropic impurity scattering and is applicable for short-range correlated random potential. For scattering on a random magnetic field, when the transition rate  $W(\theta)$  for scattering of a particle from angle  $\theta$  to angle  $\theta'$  on the Fermi circle is given (in Born approximation) by [11]  $W(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \cot^2[(\theta - \theta')/2]$ , model I is not adequate. In this case,  $W$  is seen to diverge in the forward scattering limit  $\theta = \theta'$ . The eigenvalues of the collision operator

$$C f f_1 g = (d_n/2) W(\theta) [f_1(\theta) - f_1(\theta')] \quad (3)$$

are then given from  $\epsilon_0$  by  $d_m = \frac{1}{2} (2m+1)$ , i.e. they increase linearly with  $m$  (to be called model II). The larger  $m$ , the deeper the forward scattering divergence is probed. Finally, if both random potential and random magnetic field scattering mechanisms are present, we have  $d_m = \frac{1}{2} (1 - 2p + 2p|m|)$ , with  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ , where  $p = 0$  and  $p = 1$  correspond to pure models I and II respectively. In the sequel, we solve the Boltzmann equation exactly for arbitrary values of the frequency  $\omega$ , momentum  $q$  and magnetic field  $B_0$ , and for arbitrary value of  $p$ .

**Solution of the kinetic equation.** We define a dimensionless distribution function  $g(\theta)$  by  $f_1(\mathbf{k}; q; \omega) = (e f_0 / c) e i \mathbf{E} g(\theta)$ , where  $l = v_F$  is the transport mean free path. The function  $g(\theta)$  obeys the integro-differential equation

$$i(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q} \cos \theta) g + \frac{d}{d\theta} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta} \cos(\theta - \theta') = C f g g; \quad (4)$$

where  $\tan \theta = E_y/E_x$  and we have chosen the direction of the momentum  $\mathbf{q} \parallel \mathbf{x}$ . Expanding  $g$  in terms of eigenfunctions  $f_m(\theta)$ ,  $g(\theta) = \sum_{m=-1}^{\infty} g_m f_m(\theta)$ , yields the recursion relations

$$a_m g_m - b(g_{m+1} + g_{m-1}) = S_m \quad (5)$$

with  $a_m = i! + im!c + m$ ,  $b = ivq = 2$ , and  $S_m = (l/2) \exp(-im\theta) \sin \theta$ . We note that the angular momentum components  $g_m$  only mix through the term proportional to  $q$ . For positive  $m \geq 2$ , the system (5) can be solved to yield

$$g_2 = R + g_1; \quad R = (b - a_2) P_3 = P_2; \quad (6)$$

where  $P_k$  are power series in  $b^2$  (thus, in  $q^2$ ):

$$P_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} (b^2 + 1)^n = \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} a_l \quad (7)$$

Here  $a_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (a_m/m)$ , and we assume  $a_m$  to increase at most linearly with  $m$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ; the condition which is fulfilled for the models considered. For negative  $m$  we find analogously  $g_{-2} = R - g_1$ , where  $R(-1/c) = R + (1/c)$  and  $(-1/c) = + (1/c)$ . In terms of the components  $g_1, g_{-1}$  of the distribution function the components of the conductivity tensor are given by  $\sigma_x = \sigma_0 (g_1 + g_{-1})$  and  $\sigma_y = i \sigma_0 (g_1 - g_{-1})$ , where  $\sigma_0 = e^2 n / m$  and the index corresponds to the direction of the electric field determined by the angle  $\theta$ . Using eq.(6) and its counterpart for negative  $m$ , we solve the system of the remaining three equations from (5) (with  $m = 0, \pm 1$ ) and find

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xx} &= \sigma_0 i! (1 + 1/c) = D; \\ \sigma_{xy} &= \sigma_0 i! (1 + 1/c) = D = \sigma_{yx}; \\ \sigma_{yy} &= \sigma_0 [4b^2 + i! (1 + 1/c)] = D; \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $D = 2 = b^2 (1 + 1/c) + i! (1 + 1/c)$  and  $i! = 1 - bR$ . For the chosen direction of  $\mathbf{q} \parallel \mathbf{x}$  we find as expected  $\sigma_x(q; \omega) / \sigma_0$  for  $\omega \neq 0, q \neq 0$ . The exact solution (8) of the Boltzmann equation for any impurity collision integral can be easily evaluated for any finite value of  $q$ , since the power series representation of the functions  $P_k$ , eq.(7), is rapidly converging. For the special cases of both models I and II the eigenvalues of the collision integral  $d_m$  and consequently the coefficients  $a_m$  are linear function of  $m$ , so that the power series representation of  $P_k$  is reduced to that of the Bessel function  $J(z)$ , with complex valued index and argument  $z$ :

$$R = J_{2+}(Q) = J_{1+}(Q); \quad Q = ivq = \dots; \quad (9)$$

with  $Q = 2p - i!c$ ,  $Q = (1 - 2p - i!c) = \dots$ .

Substituting eq.(9) in (8) and using the recursion relation for the Bessel functions,  $z[J_{n+1}(z) + J_{n-1}(z)] = 2J_n(z)$ , we finally get the conductivity tensor for arbitrary values of the three dimensionless parameters  $Q = qR_c$ ,  $Q = qv = i!c$ ,  $S = i!c$ , and  $T = i!c$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{xx} &= \frac{(i_0=Q S) (J_{1+} J_{1-} - J_{1+} J_{1-})}{J_{1+} J_{1-} (Q=2T) (J_{1+} J_{1-} - J_{1+} J_{1-})}; \\
\chi_{yx} &= \chi_{xy} = \frac{(i_0=Q S) (J_{1+} + J_{1-} J_{1-})}{J_{1+} J_{1-} (Q=2T) (J_{1+} J_{1-} - J_{1+} J_{1-})}; \\
\chi_{yy} &= \chi_{xx} + \frac{(2i_0=ST) J_{1+} J_{1-}}{J_{1+} J_{1-} (Q=2T) (J_{1+} J_{1-} - J_{1+} J_{1-})}; \\
J_{1+} &= J_{1+} (T + (1-2p)i=S) = (1-2pi=S) (Q=(1-2pi=S)); \\
J_{1-} &= J_{1-} (T + (1-2p)i=S) = (1-2pi=S) (Q=(1-2pi=S)) \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

In the limiting case  $p=0$  (model I) the formulas (10) simplify, since the arguments of all the Bessel functions are equal to  $Q$ :  $J_{1+} = J_{1-} = J_{1+} (T+i=S) (Q)$ ,  $J_{1-} = J_{1-} (T+i=S) (Q)$ . In this case eqs.(10) can be rewritten in a slightly modified form (similar to that obtained in Ref. [9] in the limit  $\omega=1$ ) by using the Bessel functions identity

$$J_{1+} J_{1-} - J_{1+} J_{1-} = \frac{2(T+i=S)}{Q} J_{1+} J_{1-} \frac{\sin(T+i=S)}{(T+i=S)}$$

For the particular case of model I, the kinetic equation (4), (2) can be also solved in a different way. With the notation  $(d=2) g(\omega) = g_0$ , eq.(4) reduces to a first order differential equation, which has the solution

$$g(\omega) = \int_0^{\omega} d\omega' \exp[K(\omega; \omega')] g_0 \frac{\cos(\omega - \omega')}{\omega_c}; \quad (11)$$

$$K(\omega; \omega') = \frac{1}{\omega_c} (\omega - \omega') + \frac{i v q}{\omega_c} (\sin \omega - \sin \omega') \quad (12)$$

Calculating now  $d g(\omega)$ , we get a selfconsistency equation for  $g_0$ . Substituting the found value of  $g_0$  back into eq.(11), and calculating the conductivity components, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{xx} &= 2i_0 \frac{1}{(q v)^2} \frac{1}{\omega_c} \frac{A_{00}}{A_{00} \omega_c}; \\
\chi_{yx} &= \chi_{xy} = 2i_0 \frac{A_{s0}}{v q A_{00} \omega_c}; \\
\chi_{yy} &= \frac{2}{\omega_c} \frac{A_{0s} A_{s0}}{A_{00} \omega_c} A_{ss}; \\
A_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\omega} d\omega' (\omega - \omega') \int_0^{\omega'} d\omega'' (\omega' - \omega'') \exp[K(\omega; \omega')] g; \\
\omega(0) &= 1; \quad \omega_s(\omega) = \sin \omega
\end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In this form the results for model I are more suitable for consideration of the zero magnetic field limit (see below).

Limiting cases. Despite their apparent simplicity, the results (10) possess a rich variety of regimes with various types of behavior depending on the relations between  $S$ ,  $Q$ , and  $T$ ; we consider only some of them below. In the limit  $q=0$  we have  $R=0$ , so that the general results (8) reduce to the usual Drude formulas. In the collisionless limit  $\omega=1$ , formulas (10) can be proven to reduce to the results of Simon and Halperin [9].

In zero magnetic field,  $\omega_c=0$ , we have  $\chi_{xy}=0$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{xx}^I &= 2i_0 \frac{1}{\omega_c} \frac{1}{(1-i)} \frac{1}{1+2=(1-i)^2} \frac{1}{(1-i)^2} \\
\chi_{yy}^I &= 2i_0 \frac{1}{\omega_c} \frac{1}{1+2=(1-i)^2} \frac{1}{(1-i)^2} \\
\chi_{xx}^{II} &= \frac{2}{\omega_c} \frac{I_{(1-i)=2}(\omega)}{I_{(1-i)=2}(\omega)} \frac{1}{i} \\
\chi_{yy}^{II} &= \frac{2}{\omega_c} \frac{I_{(1-i)=2}(\omega)}{I_{(1-i)=2}(\omega)} \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

where the superscripts I and II refer to the models I and II respectively,  $\omega = qv$ ,  $\omega = 1$ , and  $I(z)$  is the modified Bessel function [12]. In particular, in the large wavevector limit,  $\omega \gg 1$ ; we get for both the models

$$\chi_{xx} \approx i \omega_c^2 = q^2; \quad \chi_{yy} \approx e^2 v = q; \quad (15)$$

where  $\omega_c = m^{-1}$  is the density of states at Fermi surface. These results are identical to those in the collisionless limit. We conclude that although the eigenvalues  $\omega_m$  of the collision operator  $C$  of model II grow with  $m$  without bound, for  $q v \gg \omega_c$  the collision integral  $C$  is negligible in comparison with  $v q$ .

Finally, let us consider the case of relatively strong magnetic fields,  $S \gg \omega_c$ , corresponding to the region where most of the resonance and magnetooscillation effects for the composite fermions are observed [13]. For these phenomena the behavior of conductivity at low frequencies  $\omega \ll \omega_c; qv$  and finite wavevectors  $q R_c > 1$  is important. In this regime,  $\chi_{xx}$  and  $\chi_{xy}$  are small (since they vanish at  $\omega=0$ ), and  $\chi_{yy}$  plays the most important role. We find

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{yy}^I &= 2i_0 \frac{J_1^2(Q)}{\omega_c} = (1 - J_0^2(Q) - i!) \omega_c; \\
\chi_{yy}^{II} &= \frac{J_1^2(Q) + J_0^2(Q)}{2i_0 Q S} \frac{J_0(Q) J_1(Q)}{Q} = Q \quad \begin{matrix} Q=S & 1 \\ Q=S & 1 \end{matrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for the model II at a large wavevector,  $Q \gg S$ , the zero magnetic field result, eq.(15), is restored, whereas it is not the case for the model I.

SAW resonances. As an important example of application of our results, we will now reconsider the interpretation of experimental data on the SAW resonances [6,7]. As discussed in Ref. [7], using the formulas from Ref. [10] for the CF conductivity does not allow to explain the observation of resonances at the experimental frequency  $\omega = 2 \times 10^7$  GHz if the value of the effective mass extracted from the SdH measurements,  $m^* = 0.8 m_e$ , is assumed ( $m_e$  being the free electron mass). We have, however, recalculated the SAW velocity shift [6,7],

$$\begin{aligned}
v = v(\omega^2=2) &= \text{Re}[1 + i \chi_{xx}^{(e)}]^{-1/2}; \quad \omega^2=2 = 3.2 \times 10^4; \\
\chi_{xx}^{(e)} &= \chi_{yy}^{(e)} = \chi_{xy}^{(e)} = 2h = e^2; \\
\chi_{yy} &= \chi_{xx} = (\chi_{xx} \chi_{yy} + \frac{2}{\omega_c})
\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

making use of the correct formulas for  $\chi_{xx}^{(e)}$  derived above and setting  $m = 0.8 m_e$ . The constant  $\omega_c$  in

eq.(16) and the transport time were used as parameters to optimize the fit to the experimental data from Fig.1 of Ref. [7]. We get very good fits to the experimentally observed resonances by using any of the models I or II, or a mixed model with combined mechanism of scattering (Fig.1), at  $\mu_m = 1 \text{ f0 cm/s} \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , which is close to expected values of this parameter [6,7]. Note that the value of the transport time found from optimizing the fit depends appreciably upon the model assumed, varying from  $\tau = 20 \text{ ps}$  to  $\tau = 120 \text{ ps}$  in the limiting cases of the models I and II respectively.




FIG. 1. Velocity shift of the surface acoustic waves, eq.(16), as a function of the effective magnetic field experienced by composite fermions, with the following values of the parameters:  $\omega = 2 \cdot 10^7 \text{ GHz}$ ,  $q = 2 \cdot 10^7 \text{ f0 cm}$ ,  $m = 0.8m_e$ ,  $n = 1.6 \cdot 10^2$ , and  $\mu_m = 1 \text{ f0 cm/s}$ . The three curves shown correspond to: a) model I ( $p = 0$ ),  $\tau = 20 \text{ ps}$ ; b) mixed model ( $p = 0.3$ ),  $\tau = 50 \text{ ps}$ ; c) model II ( $p = 1$ ),  $\tau = 120 \text{ ps}$ . For clarity, the curves a) and b) are offset by 0.0001 and 0.00005 respectively. The principal and secondary resonances (minima) are seen at  $B_e \approx 6 \text{ kG}$  and  $B_e \approx 2.5 \text{ kG}$ , as observed in the experiment [7].

In conclusion, we have presented a solution of a very general problem: calculation of the semiclassical conductivity tensor of fermions in a random potential and/or random magnetic field in 2D at finite values of frequency  $\omega$  and momentum  $q$  and in uniform magnetic field  $B_0$ . We have pointed out that explicit account of the particle number conservation in modelling the collision integral is crucially important at finite  $q$ ; missing this fact led to incorrect results in earlier publications. Expanding the distribution function in angular harmonics in momentum space, we mapped the Boltzmann equation onto a system of recursion relations and found its solution. In the particular case of a short-range correlated random potential and/or random magnetic field the conductivity tensor takes a rather simple form, eq.(10). Application of our results resolves an apparent inconsistency with the interpretation of the experimental data on resonances of composite fermions with surface acoustic waves. Using

our formulas with experimental values of frequency and the CF effective mass  $m = 0.8m_e$ , as extracted from the SdH measurements, we obtained the curves (Fig.1) which describe well the experimentally observed resonances (Fig.1 of Ref. [7]). Our results are also to be used in all the cases when the propagator of the gauge field (coupled to CF's) at finite  $\omega$  and  $q$  is considered. This is important, in particular, when one discusses the damping of SdH oscillations at finite temperatures due to dynamic fluctuations of the gauge field [5,8].

We are grateful to P. A. Lee for an interesting discussion which motivated this work. This project was supported by SFB 195 der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft and by the German-Israeli Foundation.

- 
- [1] D. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 199 (1989), Phys. Rev. B 40, 8079 (1989), Phys. Rev. B 41, 7653 (1990).
  - [2] B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B 47, 7312 (1993).
  - [3] A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B 44, 5246 (1991); Phys. Rev. B 47, 7080 (1993).
  - [4] R. R. Du, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. West, Solid State Comm. 90, 71 (1994); Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2944 (1993); D. R. Leadley, R. J. Nicholas, C. T. Foxon, and J. J. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1906 (1994); D. R. Leadley, M. van der Burgt, R. J. Nicholas, C. T. Foxon, and J. J. Harris, Phys. Rev. B 53, 2057 (1996); P. T. Coleridge, Z. W. Wasilewski, P. Zawadzki, A. S. Sachrajda, and H. A. Cammona, Phys. Rev. B 52, R11603 (1995).
  - [5] A. G. Aronov, E. A. Itskhuler, A. D. Mirlin, and P. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 52, 4708 (1995); A. D. Mirlin, E. A. Itskhuler, and P. W. Lee, Ann. Physik (Leipzig) 5, 281 (1996).
  - [6] R. L. Willett, M. A. Paalanen, R. R. Ruel, K. W. West, L. N. Pfeiffer, and D. J. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 112 (1990); R. L. Willett, R. R. Ruel, M. A. Paalanen, K. W. West, and L. N. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. B 47, 7344 (1993); R. L. Willett, R. R. Ruel, K. W. West, and L. N. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3846 (1993).
  - [7] R. L. Willett, K. W. West, and L. N. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2988 (1995).
  - [8] P. A. Lee, E. R. Mucciolo, and H. Smith, Phys. Rev. B 54, 8782 (1996).
  - [9] S. H. Simon, B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B 48, 17368 (1993).
  - [10] M. H. Cohen, M. J. Harrison, and W. J. Harrison, Phys. Rev. 117, 937 (1960).
  - [11] A. G. Aronov, A. D. Mirlin and P. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. B 49, 16609 (1994).
  - [12] Note that taking the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  in Eqs.(10) for the model I is not trivial, since the arguments and the indices of the Bessel functions diverge in this limit. It is more convenient to use the integral representation (13) in this case, which in contrast simplifies in the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .
  - [13] Note that the condition  $\omega_c \ll 1$  is not in conflict with the requirement  $\omega_c \gg 1$ , which guarantees that the magnetooscillations are weak and thus excludes the quantum Hall regime, since  $\omega_c$  is in the presence of random magnetic field scattering [11,5].