Distinct charge density wave instabilities in PrTe_{*n***} (** $n = 2, 3$ **) and ErTe₃ investigated via ARPES and XAS**

J.-S. Kan[g](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3012-7673) $\mathbf{D},^{1,*}$ $\mathbf{D},^{1,*}$ $\mathbf{D},^{1,*}$ Seungho Seong $\mathbf{D},^{1}$ Eunsook Lee,¹ Y. S. Kwon,² Kyoo Kim,³ Junwon Kim,^{4,†} Heeju[n](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4793-3732)g Kim,^{4,‡} and B. I. Min $\mathbf{\Theta}^4$

¹*Department of Physics, The [Catholic University of Korea,](https://ror.org/01fpnj063) Bucheon 14662, Republic of Korea* ²*Department of Physics and Chemistry, [DGIST,](https://ror.org/03frjya69) Daegu 42988, Republic of Korea*

³*[Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute](https://ror.org/01xb4fs50) (KAERI), Daejeon 34057, Republic of Korea*

⁴*Department of Physics, [Pohang University of Science and Technology](https://ror.org/04xysgw12) (POSTECH), Pohang 37673, Republic of Korea*

 \bigcirc (Received 25 January 2024; revised 23 June 2024; accepted 28 June 2024; published 7 August 2024)

Understanding the origin of distinct charge density wave (CDW) instabilities in layered RTe_n ($n = 2, 3$) compounds (*R*, rare earth element) has been an important issue. In this research update, we have investigated the electronic structures of PrTe_n $(n = 2, 3)$ and ErTe₃ layered CDW compounds employing angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) and soft x-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS). The trivalent valency of R^{3+} ions is confirmed for PrTe_n ($n = 2, 3$) and ErTe₃, supporting that *R*-Te slabs serve as charge reservoirs and that the CDW instability occurs in the partially filled Te sheets. Both *R* $4d \rightarrow 4f$ resonant photoemission spectroscopy and photon-energy map measurements provide evidence that *R* 4f electrons do not contribute directly to the CDW formation but that the indirect contribution from Pr 4 *f* electrons through the Pr 4 *f* −Te 5*p* hybridization is feasible in PrTe*ⁿ* (*n* = 2, 3). Circular and linear dichroism ARPES measurements indicate that the chirality of the Te 5*p* orbitals certainly plays a role in the CDW formation of RTe_3 ($R = Pr$, Er) while it is relatively weak in PrTe₂, and that the *E*_F-crossing orbitals, responsible for the CDW formation, are ordered in plane (in the *ac* plane) in all of them. Different CDW-induced Fermi surface reconstructions between *R*Te₃ and *R*Te₂ are due to (i) the existence of two Te sheets and one Te sheet per unit cell in *R*Te₃ and *RTe*₂, respectively, so as to produce different numbers of hole carriers, and (ii) the different lattice parameters of Te sheets in *R*Te*n*, leading to the different densities of states at *E*F.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevMaterials.8.080301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevMaterials.8.080301)

I. INTRODUCTION

Charge density wave (CDW) transitions, often observed in low-dimensional systems, are widely considered to arise from the Fermi surface (FS) instability $[1-4]$. Among the extensively studied CDW compounds, layered rare-earth (*R*) tellurides of RTe_n type ($n = 2, 3$) have attracted much attention [\[5–8\]](#page-8-0) because they exhibit not only CDW states but also superconductivity (SC) and other emergent quantum critical phenomena [\[9\]](#page-8-0). *R*Te*ⁿ* has a layered structure, consisting of *R*-Te slabs separated by square Te sheets. Tellurium sheets are bonded weakly by van der Waals (vdW) interactions (see Fig. [1\)](#page-1-0).

 MX_2 -type transition-metal dichalcogenides (TMDs) ($M =$ 3*d*, 4*d*, 5*d* transition-metal ions; $X = S$, Se, Te) are wellknown CDW materials $[11–14]$. In MX_2 -type TMDs, *M d* electrons, which are involved in the CDW instabilities, have rather strong on-site Coulomb interactions (*U*) due to their localized nature. In contrast, Te 5*p* electrons in *R*Te*n*, which are responsible for the CDW instabilities, have smaller *U* due to their delocalized nature, and so the electronic structures of *R*Te*ⁿ* are relatively simpler for the analysis of CDW instabilities than those of *MX*2-type TMDs. An interesting feature in *RTe₃* is double CDW transitions for heavy *R* elements and a single CDW transition for light *R* elements [\[7,15–17\]](#page-8-0). In contrast, only a single CDW transition is observed for all *R*Te₂ [\[4](#page-8-0)[,18,19\]](#page-9-0).

Despite extensive studies on the electronic structures of *R*Te_n ($n = 2, 3$) [\[15–17,](#page-8-0)[20–28\]](#page-9-0), the mechanism of the CDW deformation in *R*Te₃ is still controversial. Angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) is a very powerful tool for studying the electronic structures of CDW compounds [\[14\]](#page-8-0). ARPES studies of several *RTe*₃ compounds [\[15–17,](#page-8-0)[20–](#page-9-0) [23\]](#page-9-0) lead to the FS nesting mechanism for the CDW instability. On the other hand, inelastic x-ray scattering and Raman scattering experiments showed that the momentum-dependent electron-phonon coupling is an important mechanism for the CDW formation in RTe_3 [\[29–31\]](#page-9-0). Curiously, the origin of distinct CDW instabilities in RTe_n between $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ have not been investigated systematically. Further, the role of *R* 4*f* electrons has been explored only in a few works [\[24,25,32,33\]](#page-9-0).

To clarify these issues, we have investigated the electronic structures of PrTe_n $(n = 2, 3)$ and ErTe₃ employing ARPES and soft x-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) in this research

^{*}Contact author: kangjs@catholic.ac.kr

[†]Present address: Department of Chemistry, POSTECH, Pohang 37673, Republic of Korea.

[‡]Present address: MPPHC-CPM, Max Planck POSTECH/Korea Research Initiative, Pohang 37673, Republic of Korea.

FIG. 1. Crystal structures and Fermi surfaces of *R*Te₂ and *R*Te₃. (a) Slightly distorted tetragonal (orthorhombic) crystal structure of *R*Te₂ (left) and its schematic cross section along the *b* axis (right). (b) Similarly for *R*Te3. (c) A sketch of the two-dimensional (2D) Fermi surface (FS) of *R*Te2 in the non-CDW phase (solid red line) on the 2D Brillouin zone (BZ) of the Te sheet (blue). Shadow FS in dotted red line corresponds to the 2D FS folded into the reduced three-dimensional (3D) BZ of *R*Te₂ (black). [(d), (e)] The calculated 3D FSs of PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, respectively, in their non-CDW phases. Γ , *X*, *M*, and *Z* symmetry points in (d) correspond to $\vec{k} = (0, 0, 0)$, $(\frac{\pi}{a}, 0, 0)$, $(\frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{\pi}{a}, 0)$, and $(0, 0, \frac{\pi}{b})$, respectively. In (e), the *Y* symmetry point corresponds to $(0, \frac{\pi}{c}, 0)$ while *X* and *M* that are not symmetry points of the orthorhombic BZ are considered here just for the comparison with those for $PrTe_2$ [\[10\]](#page-8-0).

update. $R = Pr (Z = 59)$ and $R = Er (Z = 68)$ belong to a light and heavy RTe₃, respectively. ErTe₃ has two wellseparated CDW transitions at $T_{CDW1} = 267$ K and $T_{CDW2} =$ 157 K $[7,9,15-17]$ while PrTe₃ is presumed to have only one CDW transition at higher than 450 K ($T_{CDW} > 450$ K) [\[7,9](#page-8-0)[,34\]](#page-9-0). *T*_{CDW} of PrTe₂ is expected to be $T_{\text{CDW}} \sim 1000 \text{ K}$ [\[35\]](#page-9-0) (see Table I).

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

High-quality single crystals of RTe_n ($R = Pr$, Er; $n = 2$, 3) were grown by using the self-flux Bridgeman method [\[24\]](#page-9-0). The quality and the orientation of single crystals were checked by Laue and ARPES measurements. The long axis, perpendicular to the layers, is conventionally taken as the *c* axis in $RTe₂$ while it is the *b* axis in $RTe₃$ [\[39\]](#page-9-0). In order to compare $RTe₂$ and $RTe₃$, we have chosen the long axis as *b* for both $RTe₂$ and $RTe₃$ in this work (see Fig. 1). The lattice parameters of *a* and *c* in the *ac* planes are very similar to each other while *b* is much larger than *a* and *c* [\[36–38,40\]](#page-9-0). The lattice parameters and the T'_{CDW} values are listed in Table I.

ARPES measurements were carried out at the 4A2 undulator beamline of the Pohang Light Source-II (PLS-II) and

TABLE I. Lattice parameters *a*, *b*, and *c*, and the CDW transition temperatures T_{CDW1} and T_{CDW2} of RTe_n ($R = Pr$, Er; $n = 2, 3$). For the in-plane lattice parameters, the same values are adopted for *a* and *c* because of the very subtle difference between them (*c* is slightly larger than a in RTe_3).

Materials	$a \approx c$		T_{CDW1}	T_{CDW2}
PrTe ₂ [36]	4.44 Å	9.06 Å	\sim 1000 K [35]	
$PrTe_3$ [37]	4.36 Å	25.89 Å	>450 K [34]	
ErTe ₃ [38]	4.29 Å	25.30 Å	267 K [7]	157 K [7]

the 4.0.3 undulator beamline of the Advanced Light Source (ALS). Single crystalline samples were cleaved *in situ* by using the top-post method and measured under pressure better than 5×10^{-11} Torr. The Fermi level (E_F) and the instrumental resolution of the system were determined from the Fermi edge spectrum of the Au metal in electrical contact with samples. The energy resolution of the ARPES data is set to be ∼30 meV. The details of ARPES experiments are described in Refs. [\[24,25\]](#page-9-0).

III. CRYSTAL STRUCTURE, TWO- AND THREE-DIMENSIONAL BRILLOUIN ZONES, AND FERMI SURFACES

Figures $1(a)$ and $1(b)$ show the quasi-2D layered orthorhombic (slightly distorted from tetragonal) structures of *RTe_n* ($n = 2, 3$) with their schematic cross sections along the *b* axis. *R*-Te(1) slabs are common for $n = 2$ and 3, where Te(1) and *R* atoms form the corrugated double layers. $RTe₂$ has single Te(2) planar sheets and R Te₃ has Te(2)/Te(3) bilayer planar sheets, sandwiched between *R*-Te(1) slabs along the *b* axis [\[18,19\]](#page-9-0).

Figure 1(c) shows the 2D Brillouin zone (BZ) (blue lines), the 3D BZ (black lines), and the schematic FS of $RTe₂$ in the non-CDW phase. Due to the *R*-Te(1) slabs, the unit cell (u.c.) of the 3D orthorhombic structure is doubled by $\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2}$ and rotated by 45◦ from the 2D u.c. of the planar Te sheets. Such an enlarged 3D u.c. yields a reduced 3D BZ; i.e., the size of the 3D BZ is decreased by half and rotated by 45◦ from the 2D BZ of the planar Te sheets. When the FS in the 2D BZ is folded into the reduced 3D BZ, the folded shadow FS (dotted red lines) appears in the 3D BZ. Consequently, the intensity of the inner (smaller) FS around the Γ point (solid red line) is stronger than that of the outer (larger) shadow FS (dotted red line). The stronger the interlayer interaction between the Te sheets and the *R*-Te(1) slabs is, the higher the

FIG. 2. Core-level and *R* 4*f* photoemission spectroscopy (PES) spectra of RTe_n ($R = Pr$, Er; $n = 2, 3$). (a) Comparison of the angle-integrated Pr $4f$ PES spectra of PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, obtained at the on-resonance energy ($hv = 124$ eV) in Pr $4d \rightarrow 4f$ resonant photoemission spectroscopy (RPES). (b) Comparison of the angle-integrated valence-band PES spectra of ErTe₃, obtained at the on-resonance energy $(hv = 174 \text{ eV})$ and far away from the resonance $(hv = 104 \text{ eV})$ in Er $4d \rightarrow 4f$ RPES, respectively. (c) Comparison of the Te 4*d* core-level PES spectra of RTe_n ($R = Pr$, Er; $n = 2, 3$), obtained at $hv \approx 100$ eV. The data of PrTe₂ and PrTe₃ were obtained at $T \approx 35$ K and those of ErTe₃ were obtained at $T \approx 80$ K.

intensity of shadow FSs becomes, accompanied by a larger FS dispersion along k_b due to the 3D-like nature.

Figures $1(d)$ and $1(e)$ show the calculated 3D FSs of the non-CDW phases of $PrTe_2$ and $PrTe_3$, respectively. The shapes of the 3D FSs of $PrTe_2$ and $PrTe_3$ are similar to each other, supporting the fact that the FSs of both $PrTe_2$ and PrTe3 are determined mainly by the Te 5*p* electrons of Te sheets. On the other hand, the size of the inner FS centered at Γ or Z points in PrTe₃ is larger than that in PrTe₂. Such differences suggest that the inner FS centered at Γ or Z arises from the hole pocket, supported by the trivalent $(3+)$ nature of *R* ions (as explained below).

If *R* ions are trivalent $(3+)$ and donate two electrons to *R*-Te(1) slabs and one electron to Te sheets, then the ionic configuration of *R*Te₂ will be R^{3+} Te(1)⁶Te(2)⁵ [\[27\]](#page-9-0) with a partially filled Te sheet while that of *RTe₃* will be R^{3+} Te(1)⁶Te(2)^{4.5}Te(3)^{4.5} with two partially filled Te sheets. These configurations will be confirmed in Sec. IV. Thus, more hole carriers are produced in *RTe₃* (1.5 holes per Te sheet) than in *RTe₂* (1 hole per Te sheet), yielding a larger hole FS in $RTe₃$ than in $RTe₂$.

IV. *R* **4** *f* **STATES**

Figure 2(a) compares the angle-integrated Pr 4 *f* PES spectra of PrTe_n $(n = 2, 3)$, obtained at the on-resonance energy $(hv = 124 \text{ eV}; hv, photon energy)$ in Pr $4d \rightarrow 4f$ resonant photoemission spectroscopy (RPES). Similarly, Fig. 2(b) compares the angle-integrated valence-band PES spectra of ErTe₃, obtained at the on-resonance energy $(hv = 174 \text{ eV})$ and far away from the resonance ($hv = 104$ eV) in Er $4d \rightarrow$ 4 *f* RPES, respectively. All the data were obtained in their CDW phases (at $T \approx 35$ K for PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, and at $T \approx$ 80 K for ErTe₃).

The peaks that exhibit strong resonance enhancement in the on-resonance spectra represent $R \, 4f$ states, arising from the well-known *R* $4d \rightarrow 4f$ resonance [\[41\]](#page-9-0). In PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, the Pr 4 *f* peaks well below E_F (\sim − 4 eV) represent the trivalent Pr $4f^2 \rightarrow 4f^1$ transition. Similarly, the Er 4f peaks between -5 and -12 eV in ErTe₃ correspond to the $4f^{10}$ final-state multiplets from the $Er^{3+} 4f^{11} \rightarrow 4f^{10}$ transition. Such Er $4f$ multiplets in ErTe₃ are similar to those in other Er materials [\[42,43\]](#page-9-0). In both $R = Pr$ and Er, the bare $R 4f^{n-1}$ final-state multiplets are located well below E_F , indicating that *R* 4*f* electrons are very localized for both $R = Pr$ and Er. Considering that the metallic electronic states near E_F are important to cause the CDW instabilities, the very localized character of $R \, 4f$ electrons manifests the weak contribution of *R* 4 *f* electrons to the CDW formation.

Note that the low-energy Pr 4 *f* peaks (at \sim − 1 eV) correspond to the $4f^2\bar{L}$ final states ($4f^2 \rightarrow 4f^2\bar{L}$) (where \bar{L} is a ligand hole in Te $5p$ bands) arising from the Pr $4f$ –Te $5p$ hybridization [\[41,44,45\]](#page-9-0). In contrast to the significantly large Pr 4*f* spectral weight at \sim − 1 eV in PrTe_n (*n* = 2, 3), the Er 4*f* spectral weight of the $4f^{11} \rightarrow 4f^{11}\bar{L}$ peak near E_F is negligibly weak in ErTe₃. Such differences in R 4 f spectral weight near E_F between $R = Pr$ and $R = Er$ indicate that the Pr $4f$ –Te $5p$ hybridization is much larger than the Er $4f$ –Te 5*p* hybridization. Compared to the *R* elements with small *Z* (where Z is the atomic number), the R 4 f electrons in the R elements with large *Z* are located at deep binding energies because of the strong attractive Coulomb interaction between heavy R ions and $4f$ electrons. Consequently, the localized R 4 f states are located well below the Te $5p$ states in heavy *R*Te_n while the less-bound *R* 4*f* states in light *RTe_n* overlap with the Te $5p$ states, resulting in the weaker R 4 f –Te $5p$ hybridization in heavy *R*Te*ⁿ* than in light *R*Te*n*. Therefore, the Pr $4f$ electrons in PrTe_n would possibly contribute to the CDW formation indirectly through the Pr $4f$ –Te $5p$ hybridization while the Er $4f$ electrons would hardly contribute to the CDW formation.

Finally, differences are observed in the Pr 4f spectra of $PrTe₂$ and $PrTe₃$:

(i) The bare Pr³⁺ peak ($4f^2 \rightarrow 4f^1$) in PrTe₃ (~ -4.5 eV) is located closer to E_F than that in PrTe₂ (\sim – 5 eV), suggesting the stronger Pr $4f$ –Te $5p$ hybridization in PrTe₃ than in $PrTe₂$.

(ii) In the $4f^2\bar{L}$ final-state peaks, the Pr $4f$ spectral intensity near E_F is finite in PrTe₃ while it is very weak in PrTe₂, in agreement with the more metallic resistivity in PrTe₃ than in $PrTe₂$.

These differences indicate that the contribution from Pr $4f$ electrons to the CDW formation through the Pr $4f$ –Te $5p$ hybridization is larger in $PrTe_3$ than in $PrTe_2$. This conclusion is supported by the findings of Fig. [5](#page-4-0) below.

Figure 2(c) shows the Te 4*d* core-level PES spectra of RTe_2 ($R = Ce$, Pr) and RTe_3 ($R = Pr$, Er). Te 4*d* core levels exhibit $4d_{5/2}$ and $4d_{3/2}$ components, separated by the spinorbit (SO) splitting, where each SO component consists of

FIG. 3. *R* 3*d* XAS spectra of *R*Te_n ($R = Ce$, Pr, Er; $n = 2, 3$). (a) The Ce 3*d* XAS spectrum of CeTe₂, in comparison to those of Ce metal, trivalent $Ce₂O₃$, and tetravalent $Ce₂$. (b) The Pr 3*d* XAS spectra of PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, in comparison to those of trivalent Pr₂O₃ and Pr metal. (c) The Er 3*d* XAS spectrum of ErTe₃, compared to that of trivalent Er₂O₃. All the *R* 3*d* XAS spectra were obtained at $T \approx 80$ K.

multiple peaks. The similarity between Pr and Er in *R*Te₃ and that between Ce and Pr in RTe_2 reveal that these Te 4*d* core-level PES spectra represent the intrinsic features of *R*Te*n*. Multiple peaks are expected to arise from two different Te sites [\[25\]](#page-9-0), one at *R*-Te(1) slabs [low-binding-energy (BE) peaks] and the other at Te(2)/Te(3) sheets (high-BE peaks), respectively, which is confirmed by the calculated BE values [\[46\]](#page-9-0). The Te 4*d* core-level line shapes of $RTe₂$ are more complicated than those of *R*Te₃. The relative weights among the multiple peaks in the core-level PES depend on which cleavage planes are exposed to photons [\[47\]](#page-9-0). In reality, however, it is likely that the cleaved surfaces consist of different planes.

Figure $3(a)$ shows the Ce 3*d* XAS spectrum of CeTe₂, in comparison to those of the reference materials, such as Ce metal, trivalent $Ce₂O₃$, and tetravalent $CeO₂$. Figure $3(b)$ shows the Pr $3d$ (*M* edge) XAS spectra of PrTe₂ and PrTe₃, in comparison to those of trivalent Pr_2O_3 and metallic Pr metal. Similarly, Fig. 3(c) shows the Er 3*d* XAS spectrum of ErTe₃, in comparison to that of trivalent $Er₂O₃$ [\[48\]](#page-9-0).

The Ce $3d$ XAS spectrum of CeTe₂ shows clearly that Ce ions are trivalent, having the ground state $(|g\rangle)$ configuration of $|g\rangle \approx |4f^1\rangle$. The Pr 3*d* XAS spectra of both PrTe₂ and PrTe₃ are very similar to each other and also to that of trivalent $(3+)$ Pr₂O₃ and Pr metal, indicating that Pr ions are nearly trivalent, with $|g\rangle \approx |4f^2\rangle$. Similarly, Er ions in ErTe₃ are found to be trivalent, with $|g\rangle \approx |4f^{11}\rangle$. The findings in Fig. 3 provide evidence that the valence states of *R* ions in RTe_n are nearly trivalent (R^{3+}) so that each *R* ion donates three electrons per unit cell. This finding supports the previous consensus (see the discussion in Fig. [1\)](#page-1-0) that the *R*-Te(1) slabs serve as charge reservoirs and that the CDW instability occurs in the $Te(2)/Te(3)$ sheets. The fully occupied Pr-Te(1) slabs become semiconducting while the partially filled Te(2)/Te(3) sheets become metallic, and easily distorted to form the CDW phase. It was proposed that, due to partial filling, the square nets of Te sheets are easily distorted by the Peierls-like mechanism [\[49,50\]](#page-9-0), which was supported by the band-structure calculations [$18,19,51-53$]. Our finding of trivalent R^{3+} ions satisfies the prerequisite condition of partial filling for the FS nesting mechanism, even though the electron-phonon mechanism is not ruled out either.

V. CONSTANT ENERGY MAPS AND FERMI SURFACES

Figure [4](#page-4-0) shows the measured constant energy (CE) maps of $PrTe_2$, $PrTe_3$, and $ErTe_3$ in the momentum space. The labels in Fig. [4](#page-4-0) denote the initial-state energies (E_i) , which vary from $E_i = 0$ eV (= E_F) to $E_i = -0.8$ eV with decrement by −0.2 eV. Here, the horizontal and vertical directions are along $k_{a(100)}$ and $k_{c(010)}$, respectively. All these CE data were obtained with the linear horizontal (LH) polarization. The CE maps in this figure were made by integrating the spectral intensity of $E_i \pm 16$ meV for each E_i . The overall intensity of each map has been scaled by an arbitrary scale factor.

With decreasing E_i , the shapes and the behavior of the CE maps of *RTe*₂ and *RTe*₃ are similar to one another for $E_i \leq \sim$ −0.4 eV. Such similarities indicate that the measured CE maps represent those of the Te square nets in the $Te(2)/Te(3)$ sheets. This also implies the weak interlayer interaction and so the weak contribution of *R* 4*f* electrons to the CDW distortion in *R*Te*n*. This finding is consistent with the Peierls-like mechanism of the CDW deformation in RTe*n*, as described above. However, the shapes of the FSs among $PrTe_2$, $PrTe_3$, and ErTe₃ are quite different. The origin of these differences will be discussed in Fig. [5.](#page-4-0)

Figure $4(d)$ shows the calculated CE maps for the non-CDW phase of ErTe₃ from $E_i = +0.2$ eV to $E_i = -0.6$ eV, which are obtained from the DFT calculations. When the calculated CE maps are sliced at higher E_i' by ~ + 0.2 eV, the measured and calculated CE maps agree very well [\[54\]](#page-9-0) [see Figs. $4(c)$ and $4(d)$]. Such a good agreement in ErTe₃

FIG. 4. Comparison of the measured constant energy (CE) maps of PrTe₂, PrTe₃, and ErTe₃. (a) CE maps of PrTe₂ on the [001] ($k_b = 0$) plane of PrTe₂ in the momentum space. The labels denote the initial-state energies (E_i') , which vary from $E_i = 0$ eV (= E_F) to $E_i = -0.8$ eV with decrement by −0.2 eV. Here, the horizontal and vertical directions are along $k_{\alpha(100)}$ and $k_{c(010)}$, respectively. [(b), (c)] Similarly for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃. These CE data were obtained at $h\nu = 104$ eV with the linear horizontal (LH) polarization, except for PrTe₂ that was obtained at $h\nu = 110$ eV. The CE data for PrTe₂ and PrTe₃ were obtained at $T \approx 35$ K while those for ErTe₃ were obtained at $T \approx 80$ K. (d) The calculated CE maps for the non-CDW phase of ErTe₃, obtained from the density functional theory (DFT) calculations. In the comparison between experiment and calculations, the calculated maps were shifted by $+0.2$ ev; i.e., the calculated maps were cut at higher E_i by $+0.2$ eV.

FIG. 5. FSs of PrTe₃, ErTe₃, and PrTe₂ in the CDW phase. $[(a)-(c)]$ The measured FSs of PrTe₃, ErTe₃, and PrTe₂, respectively, which were obtained at $h\nu \approx 104$ eV ($h\nu = 110$ eV for PrTe₂) and below their CDW transition temperatures (at $T = 35$ K for PrTe₂ and PrTe₃; and at $T = 80$ K for ErTe₃). (d) The calculated FS of PrTe₃ for the 7×1 supercell structure [shown in (e)], which is then unfolded into the 2D BZ. This calculated FS was obtained using the tight-binding (TB) model, and reproduced from Fig. 3 in Ref. [\[23\]](#page-9-0). (e) The putative CDW-supercell structure of the 7×1 u.c. in the bilayer Te sheets. The dumbbells, connected via red bars, represent the dimerized Te atoms. Trimers and tetramers serve as the basic building blocks. (f) The schematically drawn FS of PrTe₃ (red) in comparison with that of PrTe₂ (blue). (g) The schematically drawn FS of PrTe₃ (red) in comparison with that of ErTe₃ (blue).

supports that the normal-state electronic structures of *R*Te*ⁿ* are described well by the DFT calculations and that the contribution of *R* 4 *f* electrons to the CDW distortion is weak in RTe_n due to the weak interlayer interaction.

Figures $5(a)$ – $5(c)$ show the FSs of PrTe₃, ErTe₃, and PrTe₂, respectively, obtained well below their CDW transition temperatures. FS reconstructions under the CDW instabilities are clearly manifested, and the FSs are seen to be only partially gapped. Common and different features are as follows:

(i) The FS of $PrTe_3$ exhibits the most pronounced CDWdistorted features, as compared to $E\text{T}E_3$ and $Pr\text{T}e_2$. In $Pr\text{T}e_3$ [Fig. $5(a)$], the FS intensity nearly vanishes (gapped) around the vertical *X* points $(0, \pm \frac{\pi}{c})$ while it is appreciably finite (ungapped) at the horizontal corners of the inner and outer FSs, resulting in the twofold-symmetric FS.

(ii) ErTe₃ also exhibits the twofold-symmetric FS, but, distinctly from that in $PrTe_3$, the FS around the vertical X points appears to be not fully gapped. Furthermore, gapping appears at the horizontal corners of the inner FS (i.e., gapping appears along the horizontal $X \Gamma X$ line).

(iii) The reconstructed FS in $PrTe_2$ is fourfold symmetric with weak gapping along the side lines of the diamond-shaped FS but no gapping on the corners of the FS. Also, the overall FS reconstruction appears to be weak as compared to those in PrTe₃ and ErTe₃.

To understand the origin of the distinct CDW distortions in RTe_n , we have done the TB model calculations for $PrTe_3$. Figure $5(d)$ shows the TB-calculated FS for the 7×1 supercell structure, which is then unfolded into the 2D BZ. The putative CDW supercell structure of the 7×1 u.c. in the bilayer Te sheets is drawn schematically in Fig. $5(e)$, where trimers and tetramers serve as the basic building blocks. The dumbbells, connected by red bars, represent the dimerized Te atoms. The good agreement between the measured and calculated FSs of PrTe₃ indicates that the 7×1 supercell structure is a good candidate CDW structure for PrTe₃. This 7×1 supercell structure is large enough to take into account the local oligomer-type distortion $\left[37\right]$ of the Te(2)/Te(3) atoms in the CDW state. In other words, the CDW state of $PrTe₃$ is locally commensurate within the domains (i.e., "discommensurate") [\[47\]](#page-9-0), having the CDW wave vector (Q_{CDW}) of $Q_{CDW} \approx \frac{2}{7}c^*$. The comparison between Figs. $5(a)$ and $5(b)$ shows that the twofold-symmetric feature of the CDW-induced FS of ErTe₃ is similar to (even though weaker than) that of $PrTe_3$, suggesting that Q_{CDW} in ErTe₃ is also likely to be $Q_{CDW} \approx \frac{2}{7}c^*$ (or $Q_{\text{CDW}} \approx \frac{2}{7}a^*$).

The schematically drawn FSs of PrTe₂, PrTe₃, and ErTe₃ are compared in Figs. $5(f)$ and $5(g)$, manifesting that the size and shape of the FS of PrTe₃ are very similar to those of $E r T e_3$, but somewhat different from those of PrTe₂. The origin of such differences is likely due to (i) the existence of two Te sheets per unit cell in *R*Te₃ in contrast to one Te sheet per unit cell in *R*Te₂, and (ii) the different crystal structures between *RTe₃* and *RTe₂*, namely, twofold-symmetric orthorhombic for the former and fourfold-symmetric tetragonal for the latter. In the case of orthorhombic $RTe₃$, due to the slightly different lattice parameters of *a* and c ($c > a$), the CDW instability occurs first with Q_{CDW} along the *c* direction [\[55\]](#page-9-0), causing the twofold-symmetric FS reconstruction. On the other hand, for tetragonal *R*Te2, the CDW instability either along the *a* or *c* direction is feasible, realizing the fourfold-symmetric FS reconstruction.

Somewhat different FS features between $PrTe₃$ and $ErTe₃$ and the absence of the second CDW transition in PrTe₃ $(i.e., a single CDW transition in PrTe₃ versus double CDW$ transitions in $E\text{FTe}_3$) are expected to arise from the much larger lattice parameters of Te sheets in $PrTe₃$ than in $ErTe₃$ (see Table [I\)](#page-1-0). This leads to the weaker overlap, the narrower bandwidth, and the higher density of states at $E_F [N(E_F)]$ in PrTe₃ than in ErTe₃. Consequently, the larger energy gain is achieved in PrTe₃ by the first CDW transition $[52]$. On the contrary, due to the smaller energy gain by the CDW instability in ErTe₃, $N(E_F)$ even after the first CDW transition remains still high enough to drive the second CDW transition in ErTe₃ [\[7\]](#page-8-0). The higher T_{CDW1} of PrTe₂ than that of PrTe₃ can be understood based on the higher occupation of *p* electrons in the one-dimensional Te $5p_x$ and $5p_z$ bands as well as the larger lattice parameters of Te sheets in $PrTe_2$ than in $PrTe_3$. Both effects bring about the higher $N(E_F)$ [\[52\]](#page-9-0) and a higher T_{CDW1} in PrTe₂ than in PrTe₃.

VI. CIRCULAR AND LINEAR DICHROISM

The investigation of circular dichroism (CD) in ARPES is very useful because the observed CD reflects the chiral polarizations of the orbital and spin states of the system [\[56\]](#page-9-0). In the CDW state, the local symmetry of a system, such as inversion and/or possibly time-reversal symmetry, could be broken so that the band structures would have *k* -dependent chiral spin and orbital polarizations. Then the system in the CDW state is expected to exhibit CD effects in CD-ARPES, even though the system is nonmagnetic (i.e., the total spin and/or orbital polarizations are vanishing). Hence the CD-ARPES study of *R*Te*ⁿ* might give a clue to the origin of their distinct CDW instabilities. However, there is a technical problem of distinguishing between the intrinsic and the extrinsic geometrical CD effects in ARPES [\[57,58\]](#page-9-0). This makes it difficult to interpret the observed CD in CD-ARPES.

FIG. 6. Circular dichroism (CD) FS of RTe_3 ($R = Pr$, Er). (a) The schematic drawing of the measurement geometry for the right-circular (RC) and left-circular (LC) polarizations. [(b), (c)] The measured FSs of PrTe₃ and ErTe₃, respectively, obtained with the RC polarization (left) and LC polarization (middle), and the difference between them (right), corresponding to the CD FS. In the CD FS, red and blue denote stronger RC and stronger LC intensities, respectively. All these data were obtained at $hv = 104$ eV and at $T \approx 35$ K.

FIG. 7. CD-ARPES of RTe_n ($n = 2$, 3; $R = Pr$, Er). (a) The measured ARPES image plots of PrTe₂ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$, obtained with the RC polarization (left) and LC polarization (middle), and the corresponding CD (right) ($CD \equiv RC$ -LC), respectively. $[(b), (c)]$ Similarly for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃. These ARPES data were obtained at $hv = 104$ eV and at $T \approx 35$ K.

Figure [6](#page-5-0) shows the measured CD FS of RTe_3 ($R = Pr$, Er). In Fig. $6(a)$ is shown the schematic drawing of the measurement geometry for the right-circular (RC) and left-circular (LC) polarizations. In Figs. $6(b)$ and $6(c)$ are shown the measured FSs of PrTe₃ and ErTe₃, respectively, obtained with the RC polarization (left), LC polarization (middle), and the difference between them (right), which corresponds to CD in the FS [\[59\]](#page-9-0). In CD FS, red and blue denote stronger RC intensity and stronger LC intensity, respectively. The observed CD effect in the measured CD FSs of *R*Te₃ appears to be weak, but the intrinsic CD is observed clearly in the CD-ARPES data of *R*Te3, as shown in Fig. 7.

The effects of CD in ARPES of RTe_n ($n = 2, 3; R = Pr$, Er) are shown in Fig. 7. Figure $7(a)$ shows the measured ARPES image plots of $PrTe_2$ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$, obtained with the RC (left) and LC (middle) polarizations, and the corresponding $CD \equiv RC$ -LC (right). Similarly, the measured CD-ARPES for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$ are shown in Figs. 7(b) and 7(c), respectively. In all the measured CD-ARPES of RTe_n ($n = 2$, 3; $\hat{R} = \text{Pr}$, Er), from E_F near $\bar{\Gamma}$ to ~ -6 eV around \bar{M} exhibit mostly stronger RC for the left side and stronger LC for the right side. These common features indicate that the overall CD effects in the dispersive bands arise from the Te 5*p* states in *R*Te_n. The flat *R* 4*f* states at \sim − 4.5 to \sim − 5 eV in PrTe_n and at \sim − 6 eV in ErTe₃ reveal stronger RC for the left side and stronger LC for the right side, the sign of which is same as that of the above-described dispersive Te 5*p* bands. Such similar signs of CD for both R 4 f and Te 5 p states imply that the major contribution to the observed CD in *R*Te*ⁿ* is the extrinsic geometric effect.

In a close examination of the CD-ARPES of PrTe₃, however, the additional CD effects are observed, as follows. The bands crossing E_F at $\sim \pm \frac{1}{3}\bar{\Gamma}\bar{M}$ exhibit stronger LC for the

FIG. 8. Linear dichroism (LD) in ARPES. [(a), (b)] The schematic drawings of the measurement geometry for the linear-horizontal (LH) polarization and linear-vertical (LV) polarization, respectively. (c) From left to right, the measured ARPES image plots of PrTe₂ along \bar{M} $\bar{\Gamma}$ \bar{M} , obtained with the LH and LV polarizations, and LD-ARPES ($LD \equiv LH-LV$), respectively. In LD-ARPES, red and blue represent the stronger LH and LV intensities, respectively. [(d), (e)] Similarly for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃, respectively. All these data were obtained at $h\nu = 104$ eV and $T \approx 35$ K. (f) The near-*E*_F region of the LD-ARPES image plot of PrTe₂ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$. (g) The calculated band structures of ErTe₃ along several high-symmetry lines, obtained from DFT calculations for the non-CDW phase (undistorted phase). (h) Comparison between ARPES and the calculated band structures of ErTe₃ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$.

left side and stronger RC for the right side, the sign of which is opposite to that of the overall geometrical CD in the steeply dispersive Te 5*p* bands and the flat *R* 4 *f* states. Similar effects are observed in the additional CD of $E \cap E_3$ even though the features are broad and not resolved well. These additional CD features manifest the intrinsic CD effects in RTe_3 ($R = Pr$, Er) and consequently the chiral polarizations of the Te 5*p* bands despite their weak effects. Hence, these chiral polarizations of the Te 5*p* bands are expected to be related to the CDW formation in *RTe₃*. Meanwhile, only the overall geometrical CD effect is observed in $PrTe_2$, implying that the contribution from the chiral polarizations of Te 5*p* bands to the CDW formation in $PrTe_2$ is relatively weak.

The effect of linear dichroism (LD) in ARPES provides straightforward and very useful information on the symmetry of the orbital character. As shown in Figs. $8(a)$ and $8(b)$, the electric-field vector (\vec{E}) of the incident photons is always parallel to the sample surface in the linear-vertical (LV) polarization while, in the linear-horizontal (LH) polarization, *E* has both perpendicular and parallel components to the sample surface and has a significant amount of the perpendicular component when photons are incident at a glancing angle. Hence the stronger LH intensity reflects the out-of-plane orbital character (i.e., being perpendicular to the sample surface) while the stronger LV intensity reflects the in-plane orbital character (i.e., being parallel to the sample surface).

Figure [8](#page-6-0) shows the effect of LD in ARPES of *R*Te*n*. From left to right, Fig. $8(c)$ shows the ARPES image plots of PrTe₂ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$, obtained with the LH and LV polarizations, and LD-ARPES ($LD \equiv LH-LV$). In LD-ARPES, red and blue represent the stronger LH and LV intensities, respectively. Similarly, Figs. $8(d)$ and $8(e)$ show the effect of LD in ARPES along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$ for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃, respectively.

Before discussing the LD effect in ARPES of *R*Te*n*, we discuss the observed features in LH- and LV-ARPES bands of *R*Te*ⁿ* in Fig. [8.](#page-6-0) Many dispersive bands are observed clearly in ARPES. The large-energy-scale band structures are similar to one another in these three compounds, indicating that the measured ARPES bands represent the intrinsic features of *R*Te*ⁿ* and that these dispersive bands have the Te 5*p* character. In Fig. [8\(f\),](#page-6-0) the bands crossing through E_F at $\sim \pm \frac{1}{5} \Gamma M$ are observed, which are responsible for the FSs at the corresponding k_F values. The E_F -crossing bands are also observed in both PrTe₃ and ErTe₃. Indeed, the *E*_F-crossing positions in ErTe₃ agree very well with those in the calculated bands for the non-CDW phase of *R*Te*ⁿ* [see Fig. [8\(h\)\]](#page-6-0), indicating that they have mainly Te 5*p* character and that the CDW deformation in *R*Te*ⁿ* is not so strong. This conclusion is supported by the good agreement between the measured and calculated band structures in ErTe₃, shown in Fig. $8(h)$. For reference, Fig. $8(g)$ shows the calculated band structures of ErTe₃ along several high-symmetry lines, obtained from the DFT calculations for the non-CDW phase (undistorted phase). Then good agreement is found in the comparison between the measured ARPES and the calculated band structures of $E \n\Gamma E_3$ along $\bar{M} \bar{\Gamma} \bar{M}$ [see Fig. [8\(h\)\]](#page-6-0).

Back to the discussion of the LD effect in *R*Te*n*, first, the features in LD-ARPES are similar to one another. The dispersive bands between ∼−1 and ∼−3 eV exhibit the overall stronger LH polarization, indicating that these orbitals are ordered mainly out of plane; i.e., they are ordered along the *b* axis perpendicular to the sample surface of the *ac* plane. In contrast, both the flat *R* 4 *f* bands and the steeply dispersive bands, starting from these flat *R* 4 *f* bands toward deep binding energies, exhibit the stronger LV polarization, indicating that these orbitals lie in the *ac* plane.

The region near E_F of the LD ARPES of PrTe₂ along $\overline{M} \overline{\Gamma} \overline{M}$ is shown in Fig. [8\(f\),](#page-6-0) where the *E*_F-crossing bands at $\sim \pm \frac{1}{5} \Gamma M$ exhibit the stronger LV polarization (blue). Therefore, these E_F -crossing bands are in-plane orbitals, as described above. In $PrTe_3$ and $ErTe_3$, the observed LD effects in the near- E_F states are not so clear as in PrTe₂. Nevertheless, the same conclusion can be made for $PrTe_3$ and $ErTe_3$ based on the overall similarity in three compounds. In conclusion, the E_F -crossing states in RTe_n , responsible for their CDW formations, originate mainly from the in-plane (*ac* plane)

FIG. 9. Photon energy (hv) maps of RTe_n $(R = Pr, Er; n = 2,$ 3). (a) The *h*ν-map measurement was done on the plane (marked in blue) in the 3D BZ of *R*Te*n*. (b) The Fermi-edge-state *h*ν map for PrTe₂, obtained for *hv* in the range 80–120 eV. The horizontal and the vertical axes are along $k_{a(100)}$ and $k_{b(001)}$, respectively, where the variation in hv is parallel to $k_{b(001)}$ ($|| hv$). [(c), (d)] Similarly for PrTe₃ and ErTe₃. These hv maps cut through $X - \Gamma - X$ ($R - Z - R$). All these *hv* maps were obtained at $T = 35$ K.

orbitals of the Te sheets. This observation is consistent with the calculated band character of the E_F -crossing in-plane Te orbitals of Te sheets in *R*Te*ⁿ* [\[32\]](#page-9-0).

VII. PHOTON ENERGY MAP

Figure [9](#page-7-0) shows the measured *h*ν maps for the Fermi-edge states of RTe_n ($R = Pr$, Er; $n = 2, 3$) in the range $80 \leq h\nu \leq$ \sim 120 eV. The horizontal axis is parallel to $k_{a(100)}$ and the vertical axis is parallel to $k_{b(001)}$; i.e., the variation in *hv* is \parallel $k_{b(001)}$. These *hv* maps cut through *X*- Γ -*X* (also *R*-*Z*-*R*). In Fig. [9\(a\)](#page-7-0) is shown the plane of the *h*ν map measurement (blue) in the 3D BZ. In Figs. $9(b)$ – $9(d)$ are shown the E_F -state hv maps of $PrTe_2$, $PrTe_3$, and $ErTe_3$, respectively.

The major feature in the E_F -state $h\nu$ maps is the straight vertical dispersion along $hv \parallel k_b$ in all three compounds. Remember that the alternating *R*-Te(1) and Te(2)/Te(3) layers are stacked along the *b* axis (see Fig. [1\)](#page-1-0). Hence, the straight vertical dispersions along k_b indicate that the near- E_F states have mainly 2D character, implying the weak interlayer interaction between *R*-Te(1) slabs and Te(2)/Te(3) sheets. Consequently, the effect of the interlayer interaction on the CDW formation would be very weak in *R*Te*n*; i.e., the effect of the interlayer interaction on the near- E_F electronic states responsible for the CDW formation is weak.

VIII. SUMMARY AND PERSPECTIVE

The electronic structures of layered CDW compounds of PrTe_n $(n = 2, 3)$ and ErTe₃ have been investigated via ARPES and XAS studies of high-quality stoichiometric single crystals. *R* 3*d* XAS measurements confirm the trivalent valency of R^{3+} ions, so that *R*-Te(1) slabs serve as charge reservoirs and the CDW instability occurs in the Te(2)/Te(3) sheets. $R \cdot 4d \rightarrow$ 4*f* RPES study of PrTe_n ($n = 2, 3$) and ErTe₃ shows that the *R* 4*f* states do not contribute directly to the CDW formation in RTe_n . Pr 4f electrons in PrTe_n, however, can contribute indirectly to the CDW distortion through the non-negligible Pr 4 *f* –Te 5*p* hybridization.

The twofold-symmetric features are observed in the CDW-induced FS of PrTe₃, arising from the putative 7×1 modulated structural formation. The origin of the distinct CDW deformations and single versus double CDW transitions in PrTe₃ and ErTe₃ is due to the larger lattice parameters of Te sheets and the resultant higher $N(E_F)$ in PrTe₃ than in ErTe₃. The higher T_{CDW} in PrTe₂ than in PrTe₃ originates from the higher Te 5*p*-electron occupation and also the larger lattice parameters of Te sheets in $PrTe_2$ than in $PrTe_3$, both of which bring about the higher $N(E_F)$ and the concomitant higher T_{CDW} .

The intrinsic CD is observed in CDW-distorted RTe_3 ($R =$ Pr, Er), indicating the *k* -dependent chiral polarizations of the Te 5*p* bands, while only the geometrical CD is observed in PrTe₂, implying the relatively weak Te $5p$ chiral polarizations in PrTe₂. LD-ARPES confirms that the E_F crossing orbitals are ordered in plane (i.e., in the *ac* plane) in PrTe_n $(n = 2, 3)$ and ErTe₃. The near- E_F *hv* maps exhibit the straight vertical dispersions along k_b , demonstrating the nearly 2D character for the near- E_F states and the weak interlayer coupling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation (NRF) of Korea (Grant No. RS-2023-00275779). K.K. acknowledges the support by the NRF (Grant No. 2016R1D1A1B02008461). The experiment at PLS-II was supported in part by MSICT (the Ministry of Science and ICT) and POSTECH. The ALS is supported by U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

- [1] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1976).
- [2] W. Kohn, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.2.393) **2**, 393 (1959).
- [3] J. Voit, L. Perfetti, F. Zwick, H. Berger, G. Margaritondo, [G. Grüner, H. Höchst, and M. Grioni,](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.290.5491.501) Science **290**, 501 (2000).
- [4] [T. Kasuya, M. H. Jung, and T. Takabatake,](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-8853(00)00451-0) J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **220**, 235 (2000).
- [5] [H. Yao, J. A. Robertson, E. A. Kim, and S. A. Kivelson,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.74.245126) *Phys.* Rev. B **74**, 245126 (2006).
- [6] H. J. Kim, C. D. Malliakas, A. T. Tomic, S. H. Tessmer, M. G. ´ [Kanatzidis, and S. J. L. Billinge,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.226401) Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 226401 (2006).
- [7] N. Ru, C. L. Condron, G. Y. Margulis, K. Y. Shin, J. Laverock, [S. B. Dugdale, M. F. Toney, and I. R. Fisher,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.035114) Phys. Rev. B **77**, 035114 (2008).
- [8] [A. Fang, N. Ru, I. R. Fisher, and A. Kapitulnik,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.046401) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 046401 (2007).
- [9] K. Yumigeta, Y. Qin, H. Li, M. Blei, Y. Attarde, C. Kopas, and S. Tongay, Adv. Sci. **8**[, 2004762 \(2021\).](https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202004762)
- [10] Note that the symmetry points of the orthorhombic BZ are assigned differently from the ones in Fig. $1(e)$. We consider, for PrTe₃, *X* and *M* of nearly square-type Γ -centered BZ (due to $a \approx c$), just for the comparison with those for $PrTe_2$.
- [11] M. Grioni, I. Vobomik, F. Zwick, and G. Margaritondo, [J. Electron Spectrosc. Relat. Phenom.](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0368-2048(99)00053-5) **100**, 313 (1999).
- [12] [P. Aebi, T. Pillo, H. Berger, and F. Levy,](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0368-2048(01)00262-6) J. Electron Spectrosc. Relat. Phenom. **117-118**, 433 (2001).
- [13] S. V. Borisenko, A. A. Kordyuk, A. N. Yaresko, V. B. Zabolotnyy, D. S. Inosov, R. Schuster, B. Büchner, R. Weber, [R. Follath, and L. Patthey, and H. Berger,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.196402) Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 196402 (2008).
- [14] K. Rossnagel, [J. Phys.: Condens. Matter](https://doi.org/10.1088/0953-8984/23/21/213001) **23**, 213001 (2011).
- [15] R. G. Moore, V. Brouet, R. He, D. H. Lu, N. Ru, J.-H. Chu, I. R. Fisher, and Z.-X. Shen, Phys. Rev. B **81**[, 073102 \(2010\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.073102)
- [16] N. Lazarevic, Z. V. Popovic, Rongwei Hu, and C. Petrovic, Phys. Rev. B **83**[, 024302 \(2011\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.83.024302)
- [17] H.-M. Eiter, M. Lavagnini, R. Hackl, E. A. Nowadnick, A. F. Kemper, T. P. Devereauz, J.-H. Chu, J. A. Analytis, I. R. Fisher, and L. Degiorgi, [Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1214745110) **110**, 64 (2013).
- [18] A. Kikuchi, [J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.](https://doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.67.1308) **67**, 1308 (1998).
- [19] K. Stöwe, [J.](https://doi.org/10.1006/jssc.1999.8514)[Alloys](https://doi.org/10.1006/jssc.1999.8514)[Compd.](https://doi.org/10.1006/jssc.1999.8514) **307**, 101 (2000); J. Solid State Chem. **149**, 155 (2000).
- [20] G.-H. Gweon, J. D. Denlinger, J. A. Clack, J. W. Allen, C. G. Olson, E. D. DiMasi, M. C. Aronson, B. Foran, and S. Lee, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.886) **81**, 886 (1998).
- [21] H. Komoda, T. Sato, S. Souma, T. Takahashi, Y. Ito, and K. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. B **70**[, 195101 \(2004\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.70.195101)
- [22] J. Laverock, S. B. Dugdale, Z. Major, M. A. Alam, N. Ru, I. R. Fisher, G. Santi, and E. Bruno, Phys. Rev. B **71**[, 085114 \(2005\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.71.085114)
- [23] V. Brouet, W. L. Yang, X. J. Zhou, Z. Hussain, R. G. Moore, R. He, D. H. Lu, Z. X. Shen, J. Laverock, S. B. Dugdale, N. Ru, and I. R. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **77**[, 235104 \(2008\),](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.235104) and references therein.
- [24] E. Lee, D. H. Kim, H. W. Kim, J. D. Denlinger, H. Kim, J. Kim, K. Kim, B. I. Min, B. H. Min, Y. S. Kwon, and J.-S. Kang, Sci. Rep. **6**[, 30318 \(2016\).](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep30318)
- [25] S. Seong, H. Kim, K. Kim, B. I. Min, Y. S. Kwon, S. W. Han, [B.-G. Park, R. Stania, Y. Seo, and J.-S. Kang,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.104.195153) Phys. Rev. B **104**, 195153 (2021).
- [26] [K. Y. Shin, V. Brouet, N. Ru, Z. X. Shen, and I. R. Fisher,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.72.085132) *Phys.* Rev. B **72**, 085132 (2005).
- [27] J.-S. Kang, C. G. Olson, Y. S. Kwon, J. H. Shim, and B. I. Min, Phys. Rev. B **74**[, 085115 \(2006\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.74.085115)
- [28] D. R. Garcia, G.-H. Gweon, S. Y. Zhou, J. Graf, C. M. Jozwiak, [M. H. Jung, Y. S. Kwon, and A. Lanzara,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.166403) Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 166403 (2007).
- [29] M. Lavagnini, M. Baldini, A. Sacchetti, D. Di Castro, B. Delley, R. Monnier, J.-H. Chu, N. Ru, I. R. Fisher, P. Postorino, and L. Degiorgi, Phys. Rev. B **78**[, 201101\(R\) \(2008\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.78.201101)
- [30] M. Maschek, S. Rosenkranz, R. Heid, A. H. Said, P. Giraldo-[Gallo, I. R. Fisher, and F. Weber,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.235146) Phys. Rev. B **91**, 235146 (2015).
- [31] M. Maschek, D. A. Zocco, S. Rosenkranz, R. Heid, A. H. Said, [A. Alatas, P. Walmsley, I. R. Fisher, and F. Weber,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.98.094304) Phys. Rev. B **98**, 094304 (2018).
- [32] E. Lee, D. H. Kim, J. D. Denlinger, J. Kim, K. Kim, B. I. Min, [B. H. Min, Y. S. Kwon, and J.-S. Kang,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.125137) Phys. Rev. B **91**, 125137 (2015).
- [33] P. Li, B. Lv, Y. Fang, W. Guo, Z. Wu, Y. Wu, D. Shen, Y. Nie, [L. Petaccia, C. Cao, and Z. A. Xu, and Y. Liu,](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11433-020-1642-2) Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. **64**, 237412 (2021).
- [34] N. Ru, Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 2008.
- [35] M. H. Jung, A. Alsmadi, H. C. Kim, Y. Bang, K. H. Ahn, K. Umeo, A. H. Lacerda, H. Nakotte, H. C. Ri, and T. Takabatake, Phys. Rev. B **67**[, 212504 \(2003\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.67.212504)
- [36] [Y. S. Kwon and B. H. Min,](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-4526(99)01084-4) Phys. B: Condens. Matter **281-282**, 120 (2000).
- [37] C. Malliakas, S. J. L. Billinge, H. J. Kim, and M. G. Kanatzidis, [J. Am. Chem. Soc.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja0505292) **127**, 6510 (2005).
- [38] J. A. W. Straquadine, F. Weber, S. Rosenkranz, A. H. Said, and I. R. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **99**[, 235138 \(2019\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.99.235138)
- [39] J. Gjerde and R. Jishi, Crystals **12**[, 1839 \(2022\).](https://doi.org/10.3390/cryst12121839)
- [40] M. Lavagnini, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, 2009.
- [41] J. W. Allen, S.-J. Oh, O. Gunnarsson, K. Schönhammer, M. B. [Maple, M. S. Torikachvili, and I. Lindau,](https://doi.org/10.1080/00018738600101901) Adv. Phys. **35**, 275 (1986).
- [42] [P. A. Cox, Y. Baer, and C. K. Jørgesen,](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2614(73)87001-0) Chem. Phys. Lett. **22**, 433 (1973); P. A. Cox, *Structure and Bonding*, Photoelectron Spectrometry, Vol. 24 (Springer, New York, 1975), p. 59.
- [43] F. Gerken, A. S. Flodstrom, J. Barth, L. I. Johnsson, and C. Kunz, Phys. Scr. **32**[, 43 \(1985\).](https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-8949/32/1/006)
- [44] [O. Gunnarsson and K. Schönhammer,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.28.4315) Phys. Rev. B **28**, 4315 (1983); **31**[, 4815 \(1985\);](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.31.4815) *Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths*, edited by K. A. Gschneidner, L. Eyring, and S. Hüfner (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1987), Vol. 10, p. 103.
- [45] [B. I. Min, H. J. F. Jansen, T. Oguchi, and A. J. Freeman,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.33.8005) *Phys.* Rev. B **33**, 8005 (1986).
- [46] H. Kim, J. Kim, and B. I. Min, DFT calculations (unpublished).
- [47] A. Tomic, Z. Rak, J. P. Veazey, C. D. Malliakas, S. D. Mahanti, [M. G. Kanatzidis, and S. H. Tessmer,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.085422) Phys. Rev. B **79**, 085422 (2009).
- [48] A. Kot, K. Placheta, M. Radecka, and K. Zakrzewska, International School and Symposium on Synchrotron Radiation in Natural Science, Krakow, Poland, 22-25 August 2022 (unpublished).
- [49] J. K. Burdett and S. Lee, [J. Am. Chem. Soc.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00343a001) **105**, 1079 (1983).
- [50] [G. A. Papoian and R. Hoffmann,](https://doi.org/10.1002/1521-3773(20000717)39:14<2408::AID-ANIE2408>3.0.CO;2-U) Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. **39**, 2408 (2000).
- [51] [E. DiMasi, B. Foran, M. C. Aronson, and S. Lee,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.54.13587) *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 13587 (1996).
- [52] [J. H. Shim, J.-S. Kang, and B. I. Min,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.156406) Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 156406 (2004).
- [53] J.-S. Kang, D. H. Kim, H. J. Lee, J. Hwang, H.-K. Lee, H.-D. Kim, B. H. Min, K. E. Lee, Y. S. Kwon, J. W. Kim, Kyoo Kim, B. H. Kim, and B. I. Min, Phys. Rev. B **85**[, 085104 \(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.85.085104)
- [54] In fact, the bilayer splitting, predicted in the calculated CE maps, is not resolved well in the measured CE maps. However, the separation of the predicted small bilayer splitting is within the width of the measured CE data. So we think that this discrepancy does not conflict with the good agreement between experiment and calculations.
- [55] R. G. Moore, W. S. Lee, P. S. Kirchman, Y. D. Chuang, A. F. Kemper, M. Trigo, L. Patthey, D. H. Lu, O. Krupin, M. Yi, D. A. Reis, D. Doering, P. Denes, W. F. Schlotter, J. J. Turner, G. Hays, P. Hering, T. Benson, J.-H. Chu, T. P. Devereaux, I. R. [Fisher, Z. Hussain, and Z.-X. Shen,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.024304) Phys. Rev. B **93**, 024304 (2016).
- [56] Y. A. Bychkov and E. I. Rashba, JETP Lett. **39**, 78 (1984).
- [57] A. Kaminski, S. Rosenkranz, H. M. Fretwell, J. C. Campuzano, Z. Li, H. Raffy, W. G. Cullen, H. You, C. G. Olson, C. M. Varma, and H. Höchst, [Nature \(London\)](https://doi.org/10.1038/416610a) **416**, 610 (2002).
- [58] S. Cho, J.-H. Park, J. Hong, J. Jung, B. S. Kim, G. Han, W. Kyung, Y. Kim, S.-K. Mo, J. D. Denlinger, J. H. Shim, J. H. [Han, C. Kim, and S. R. Park,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.186401) Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 186401 (2018).
- [59] No CD FS map data for PrTe₂ are presented in this paper because we have not measured CD FS maps for PrTe₂.