# Transport and optical response of molecular junctions driven by surface plasm on-polaritons

Maxim Sukharev<sup>1</sup>, and Michael Galperin<sup>2</sup>, y

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Sciences and Mathematics,

Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus, Mesa, AZ 85212, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

(D ated: February 22, 2024)

W e consider a biased molecular junction subjected to external time-dependent electrom agnetic eld. The eld for two typical junction geometries (bow tie antennas and metal nanospheres) is calculated within nite-di erence time-dom ain technique. Time-dependent transport and optical response of the junctions is calculated within non-equilibrium G reen's function approach expressed in a form convenient for description of multi-level system s. W e present num erical results for a twolevel (HOMO-LUMO) model, and discuss in uence of localized surface plasm on polariton modes on transport.

PACS num bers: 85.65.+ h 73.63 K v 78.67 H c 78.20 B h

Optical properties of structures composed of noble metals have long been attracting a considerable attention due to unique features of such systems in the visible spectrum .<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Recent advances in fabrication techniques<sup>5</sup> along with a trem endous progress in laser technologies opened new venues for application of plasm onic m aterials in biology,<sup>6</sup> integrated optics,<sup>7</sup> nanoscale im agining,<sup>8</sup> and single m olecule m anipulation.<sup>9</sup> Physics of surface plasm on phenom enon is relatively sim ple and has long been studied.<sup>10,11</sup> In brief, coherent oscillations of conductive electrons in a skin-layer of m etal known as plasm ons are capable of producing strong local electromagnetic (EM) elds in the near-eld region. It has been reported that such "hot" spots can be localized within 10 nm or less. This along with a great sensitivity to initial conditions and geom etry makes plasm onic structures so attractable for atom /m olecule m anipulations.

A natural combination of nanoplasm onics and m olecular response to the generated eld started to appear as m olecular nanopolaritonics,<sup>12,13</sup> which studies m olecular in uence on eld propagation, and as a tool for developing m olecular sw itches.<sup>14</sup> The latter utilizes nonadiabatic alignm ent of a m olecule on sem iconductor surface under a tip of scanning tunneling m icroscope.

Recent developments in experimental techniques capable of measuring optical response of current-carrying molecular junctions<sup>15,16</sup> lead to theoretical formulations suitable for simultaneous description of both transport and optical properties of molecular devices.<sup>18,19</sup>

W hile experimental data are measured in real time, theoretical description of both transport and optical response so far has mostly been focused on a steady-state description. Time-dependent transport usually is treated either within kinetic theory<sup>20,21</sup> or within time-dependent density functional approach.<sup>22,23,24</sup> The form ergenerally misses broadening of molecular states due to coupling to macroscopic contacts<sup>25,26,27</sup> and inform a-

tion on coherence,<sup>28</sup> although interesting generalizations started to appear.<sup>29</sup> Lim itations of the latter are due to absence of developed pseudopotentials and fundam ental necessity to treat nite (closed) systems (see e.g. R ef. 30 for discussion). An alternative approach, based on non-equilibrium G reen function (NEGF) technique, was initially formulated in Refs. 31,32,33. This approach is a natural choice for description of open non-equilibrium systems. M oreover it provides possibility to describe response of a molecular junction initially under bias to external time-dependent perturbation (e.g. laser eld).

Here we consider in uence of external eld speci c for particular geom etry on transport properties and optical response of m olecular junction. W hile form ulation of tim e-dependent transport within NEGF is general,<sup>31,32</sup> all the applications so far were restricted to resonant single level m odels only. We propose a variant of the scheme capable of dealing with m any-level system s. The exact calculations are compared to adiabatic pumping regine, frequent in the literature on time-dependent transport,<sup>34,35</sup> were at the low est order the problem is reduced to a set of quasi-steady-state solutions with time e dependent (slow timescale) parameters. A lso we generalize our previous consideration of steady-state optical response of current-carrying junctions<sup>36,37</sup> to a timedependent situation.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II presents a model of molecular junction. Section III describes methodology of EM eld calculation. Section IV describes methodology for simulating transport through molecular junction subjected to external time-dependent eld. A diabatic pumping version is discussed in section V.Numerical results are presented in section VI. Section VII concludes.

#### II. MODEL

W e consider a two-level system  $"_{1,2}$ , representing highest occupied (HOMO) and lowest unoccupied (LUMO) molecular orbitals (or ground and excited states in the m any-body language), coupled to two m acroscopic electrodes L and R. The electrodes are considered to be each in its own equilibrium with electrochem ical potentials  $_{\rm L}$  and  $_{\rm R}$ , respectively. We assume that the driving (laser eld) frequency is smaller than the plasm a frequency, so that usual division of the junction into nonequilibrium molecule coupled to free electron reservoirs (m etallic contacts) is relevant (for a thorough discussion of the assumptions see Ref. 31). Local eld at the position of the molecule is calculated within nite di erence time dom ain technique (see section III for details), and is assumed to be an external time-dependent driving force causing (de)excitation in the molecule. Following Ref. 37 in addition to charge transfer between contacts and m olecule we introduce also energy transfer (coupling of m olecular excitations to electron-hole excitations in the contacts). M olecular excitations are coupled to a bath of free photon m odes (accepting m odes), which serve as a measurem ent device of molecular optical response. Ham iltonian of the system is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H_0} + \hat{\nabla}$$

$$\hat{H_0} = \frac{1}{r_i \hat{d}_1^y \hat{d}_1} - \frac{1}{r_2 \hat{d}_1^y \hat{d}_2} + \frac{1}{r_2 \hat{d}_2^y \hat{d}_1} \quad E' (t)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{r_k \hat{d}_k^y \hat{d}_k} + \frac{1}{r_k \hat{d}_k^y \hat{d}_k} + \frac{1}{r_k \hat{d}_k^y \hat{d}_k}$$

$$(1)$$

$$(2)$$

$$\hat{V} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ X \\ V_{k1}^{et} \hat{C}_{k}^{Y} \hat{d}_{1}^{i} + V_{ik}^{et} \hat{d}_{1}^{Y} \hat{C}_{k} \\ \stackrel{i=1;2;k2 \text{ fL };R \text{ g}}{X} \\ \hat{V} = \begin{array}{c} V_{kk^{0}} \hat{C}_{k}^{Y} \hat{O}_{k^{0}} \hat{d}_{2}^{Y} \hat{d}_{1}^{i} + V_{k^{0}k}^{eh} \hat{C}_{k^{0}}^{Y} \hat{O}_{k} \hat{d}_{1}^{Y} \hat{d}_{2} \\ \stackrel{k \in k^{0}2 \text{ fL };R \text{ g}}{X} \\ + \end{array} \right. \quad V^{p} \hat{a} \quad \hat{d}_{2}^{Y} \hat{d}_{1}^{i} + V^{p} \hat{a}^{Y} \hat{d}_{2}^{Y} \hat{d}_{2} \qquad (3)$$

Here  $\hat{d}_i^y$  ( $\hat{d}_i$ ) and  $\hat{c}_k^y$  ( $\hat{d}_k$ ) are creation (annihilation) operators for an electron in the state i of the molecule and state k of the contact, respectively.  $\hat{a}^y$  ( $\hat{a}$ ) is creation (annihilation) operator for a photon in the state ,  $\vec{E}$  (t) is external time-dependent eld, and  $\sim_{ij} = \langle ij\hat{j} j \rangle$  is

m atrix element of the molecular (vector) dipole operator between states i and j of the molecule (i; j = 1;2). We assume  $\sim_{11} = \sim_{22} = 0$  (or alternatively one can think about these contributions being included into de nition of the state energies "<sub>1;2</sub>). V<sup>et</sup> and V<sup>en</sup> are matrix elements for electron and energy transfer between molecule and contacts, and V<sup>p</sup> represents optical response of the molecule.

Below we consider two approaches to transport and optical response simulations within the model: exact solution of the time-dependent D yson equation and adiabatic pumping regime. The former is similar to the procedure described in Refs. 31,32,33, however it is presented in a form convenient for treating a multi-level molecular system (see section IV for discussion). The latter assumes that E'(t) can be represented as a product of an oscillation of frequency  $!_0$  with a slow ly varying in time (on the timescale of  $!_0$ ) envelope F'(t). In the spirit of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation F(t) is considered as a parameter when solving electronic part of the problem. In this case the form of molecule- eld interaction becomes (within rotating wave approximation)

$$\sim_{12} \hat{d}_1^{y} \hat{d}_2 e^{i!_0 t} + \sim_{21} \hat{d}_2^{y} \hat{d}_1 e^{i!_0 t} F'(t)$$
 (4)

 ${\tt D}$  etails of the approach are presented in section  ${\tt V}$  .

As usual, we treat the perturbation  $\hat{V}$ , Eq.(3), at the second order and within noncrossing approximation.<sup>43</sup> Self-energy due to energy transfer (on the K eldysh contour) is<sup>37</sup>

<sup>en</sup> 
$$(1; 2) = X$$
  
 $i \neq k^{6} k^{0} 2 f L_{;Rg}$   
 $G_{22} (1; 2) G_{21} (1; 2)$   
 $G_{12} (1; 2) G_{11} (1; 2)$ 
(5)

where G<sub>ij</sub> are molecular G reen functions in the lowest order of expansion associated with the H am iltonian  $\hat{H_0}$ , Eq.(2), and  $g_k$  are G reen functions of free electrons in the contacts. Self-energy due to coupling to photon bath is<sup>37</sup>

$${}^{p}(_{1;2}) = {}^{x} {}^{y}{}^{p}{}^{2}{}^{j} {}^{t} {}^{t}{}^{t}{}^{t}{}^{t}{}^{(2;1)}G_{22}(_{1;2}) {}^{t}{}^{(1;2)}{}^{t}{}^$$

where F is G reen function for free photon and  $_{ij}(t)$ iG  $_{ij}^{<}(t;t)$  is non-equilibrium reduced density matrix.

Below we discuss methods for calculating external eld for dierent geometries, and present approaches to calculate time-dependent current and optical response of driven molecular junction.

## III. ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELD SIMULATIONS

Am ong various num erical techniques that allow one to predict optical properties of plasm onic systems the nite-di erence tim e-dom ain approach (FDTD) is considered to be the most e cient and yet relatively sim ple. FDTD yields data in perfect agreement with experimental measurements and results obtained within other techniques.<sup>38</sup> W e simulate optical response of metal structures utilizing FDTD approach, in which Maxwell equations are discretized in space and time following Yee's algorithm<sup>39</sup>. D ispersion of dielectric constant of metal, "(!), is taken in the form of the D rude model

$$"(!) = "_{r} \quad \frac{!_{p}^{2}}{!^{2} \quad i \; !} \tag{7}$$

with num erical parameters describing silver for the wavelengths of interest " $_{\rm r}$  = 826, ! $_{\rm p}$  = 1:76 10<sup>16</sup> rad/sec, = 3:08 10<sup>14</sup> rad/sec.

For simulations of open systems, one needs to impose arti cialabsorbing boundaries in order to avoid re ection of outgoing EM waves back to the simulation domain. Am ong various approaches that address this num erical issue, the perfectly matched layers (PML) technique  $^{40}$ is considered to be the most adequate. It reduces the re ection coe cient of outgoing waves at the simulation region boundary to 10  $^{\rm 8}$  . Essentially, the PM L approach surrounds the simulation domain by thin layers of nonphysicalm aterial that e ciently absorbs outgoing waves incident at any angle. W e im plem ent the most e cient and least memory intensive method, convolution perfectly matched layers (CPML)<sup>41</sup> absorbing boundaries, at all six sides of the 3D m odeling space. Through extensive num erical experim entation, we have em pirically determined optimal parameters for the CPML boundaries that lead to alm ost no re ection of the outgoing EM waves at all incident angles. Spatial steps, x = y = z, along all axes are xed at 1 nm to assure num erical convergence and the tem poral step is t = x = (2c), where c is the speed of light in vacuum .

Num erical integration of M axwell equations on a grid within the FD TD fram ework was performed at the local A SU hom e-built supercomputer utilizing 120 processors. An average execution time for our codes is around 20 m inutes.

A particular advantage of the FD TD m ethod is its ability to obtain the optical response of the structure (assum ing linear response) in the desired spectral range in a single run.<sup>42</sup> The system is excited with an ultra-short optical pulse constructed from Fourier components spanning the frequency range of interest. Next, Maxwell's equations are propagated in time for several hundred fem to seconds and the components of the EM eld are detected at the point of interest (for our purposes we consider the detection point where a molecule is located). Fourier transforming the detected EM eld on the y yields intensities that can be easily processed into the spectral response. Since we also have access to the eld components, we can evaluate the intensity enhancement relative to the incident eld. This provides the capability for straightforward evaluation of coupling e ciency' of our plasm onic structures in the spectral range of interest.

# IV. TIME-DEPENDENT TRANSPORT

W e are interested in calculating time-dependent current and optical response of the junction. Expression for the current at the interface K (K = L;R) between m olecule and contact is<sup>44</sup>

$$I_{K}(t) = \frac{e^{Z}}{2} t dt_{1}$$

$$Tr \stackrel{<}{_{K}}(t;t_{1})G^{>}(t_{1};t) + G^{>}(t;t_{1}) \stackrel{<}{_{K}}(t_{1};t) (8)$$

$$\stackrel{>}{_{K}}(t;t_{1})G^{<}(t_{1};t) G^{<}(t_{1};t) K(t_{1};t)$$

where  $_{\rm K}$  is self-energy due to coupling to contact K

$${}^{\text{et}}_{K} ( {}_{1}; {}_{2}) {}_{\text{ij}} = {}^{X}_{k \times K} V_{ik} g_{k} ( {}_{1}; {}_{2}) V_{k \text{j}}$$
(9)

and r, a, < , > are retarded, advanced, lesser, and greater projections respectively. In the wide band limit, when escape rate matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} K \\ K \end{bmatrix}_{ij} = 2 \begin{bmatrix} X \\ V_{ik} V_{kj} \\ K^{2K} \end{bmatrix} (E \\ (10)$$

is assumed to be energy independent and real part of the self-energy (9) is disregarded, and when time modulation is restricted to molecular subspace only, expression (8) can be reduced to<sup>31</sup>

$$I_{K} (t) = I_{K}^{in} (t) \qquad I_{K}^{out} (t)$$

$$(11)$$

$$I_{K}^{in}(t) = \frac{e}{\sim} dE f_{K}(E) Im Tr[_{K} A^{r}(t; E)] (12)$$

$$I_{K}^{out}(t) = + \frac{e}{c} R e Tr[K(t)]$$
 (13)

where  $f_K$  (E) is Ferm i-Dirac distribution in contact K and A<sup>r</sup>(t;E) is time-dependent (one-sided) Fourier transform of the retarded G reen function G<sup>r</sup>(t;t<sup>0</sup>).

$$A^{r}(t; E) = \int_{1}^{Z} dt^{0} e^{iE(t t^{0})} G^{r}(t; t^{0})$$
(14)

In the absence of time-dependent driving A<sup>r</sup>(t;E) reduces to usualFourier transform for retarded G reen function G $_0^r(E) = [E H_0 r(E)]^1$ . In general r has contributions (additive within noncrossing approximation) from all the processes involved. (t) in (13) is reduced density matrix

$$(t) = iG^{<}(t;t) \tag{15}$$

Lesser and greater G reen functions are calculated from the tim e dependent D yson equation

$$G^{>,<}(t;t^{0}) = dt_{1} dt_{2}e^{iE(t_{1}t_{2})}$$

$$A^{r}(t_{1};E)^{>,<}(E)A^{a}(t_{2};E) (16)$$

where

$$A_{ij}^{a}(t;E) = A_{ji}^{r}(t;E)$$
 (17)

and  $A^{r}$  (t; E) is de ned in Eq.(14).

C ontrary to our previous consideration<sup>36,37</sup> optical response of m olecular junction is calculated as a true photon ux into m odes f g, rather than corresponding electronic current between m olecular orbitals. We start from general expression for time-dependent photon ux into m ode (the derivation follows the corresponding procedure for electronic current, the latter can be found in e.g. Ref. 44)

$$J (t) \frac{d}{dt} < \hat{a}^{y}(t)\hat{a}(t) > = j V^{p} \hat{j}^{z} dt_{1}$$

$$F^{<}(t;t_{1})G^{>}(t_{1};t) + G^{>}(t;t_{1})F^{<}(t_{1};t) (18)$$

$$F^{>}(t;t_{1})G^{<}(t_{1};t) G^{<}(t;t_{1})F^{>}(t_{1};t)$$

Here G is two-particle G reen function

G(; <sup>0</sup>) 
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 < T<sub>c</sub>D<sup>()</sup> ()D<sup>(y)</sup> (<sup>0</sup>) > (19)

where  $\hat{D} = \hat{d}_1^y \hat{d}_2$  is molecular de-excitation operator. For empty accepting mode expression (18) reduces to

$$J (t) = 2 \frac{\mathbf{j} p^{p} \mathbf{j}^{2}}{\sim} \operatorname{Im}_{1} dt_{1} e^{\mathbf{i}! (t_{1} t)} G^{<} (t_{1}; t)$$
(20)

As in Ref. 37 we approximate the two-particle G reen function by zero-order (in interaction) expression

$$G^{<}(t_{1};t) \qquad i^{-} G^{>}_{11}(t;t_{1})G^{<}_{22}(t_{1};t) \qquad _{12}(t) \qquad _{21}(t_{1})$$
(21)

Note that if envelope change in time is slow (on the timescale of!) second term on the right of (21) can be safely disregarded. In this case expression (20) becomes equivalent to approximate expression used in Ref. 37.

Below we calculate frequency resolved

$$J(!;t) \qquad J(t)(!!) \qquad (22)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sim} \quad (!) R e \qquad dt_1 e^{i! (t_1 t)} G_{11}^{>} (t; t_1) G_{22}^{<} (t_1; t_2) G_{22}^{<} (t_1; t_2) G_{22}^{<} (t_2; t_2) G_{22}^{<} (t_1; t_2) G_{22}^{<} (t_2; t_2) G_{<$$

and total

...

$$Z_{1}$$
  
 $J_{tot}$  (t) d! J (!;t) (23)

photon uxes. Here (!)  $2^{1}$  (! !), and in simulations we use<sup>45</sup>

$$(!) = !e^{!!}$$
 (24)

To calculate tim e-dependent charge, Eq.(11), and photon, Eq.(20), uxes one needs tim e-dependent Fourier transform of retarded G reen function, Eq.(14). The D yson equation for retarded G reen function is

$$i\frac{@}{@t} H (t) G^{r}(t;t^{0})$$
(25)  

$$Z_{+1} dt_{1} r(t t_{1})G^{r}(t_{1};t^{0}) = (t t^{0})$$

$$I$$

Its one-sided Fourier transform leads to equation for A  $^{\rm r}$  (t;E ) in the form

$$i\frac{@}{@t} [H_{0}(t) E] A^{r}(t;E)$$

$$Z_{+1}$$

$$dt_{1} (t t_{1}) A^{r}(t_{1};E) = I$$

$$(26)$$

W e consider situation when tim e-dependent external eld is applied at tim e t<sub>0</sub> to a biased molecular junction initially at steady-state. In this case di erential equation (26) can be solved num erically starting from known initial condition A<sup>r</sup>(t<sub>0</sub>; E) = G<sup>r</sup><sub>0</sub>(E) = [E H<sup>c</sup><sub>0</sub><sup>c</sup><sup>r</sup>(E)]<sup>1</sup>.

A lternatively, splitting H  $_0$  (t) into tim e-independent H  $_0^c$  and tim e-dependent H  $_0^t$  (t) parts (average over tim e of the tim e-dependent part can be included into the tim e-independent H am iltonian), one can rew rite D yson equation (25) in the integral form

$$G^{r}(t;t^{0}) = G^{r}_{0}(t t^{0}) + dt_{1} G^{r}_{0}(t t_{1})H^{t}_{0}(t_{1})G^{r}(t_{1};t^{0})$$

$$(27)$$

One-sided Fourier transform of (27) leads to integral equation for A  $^{\rm r}$  (t;E )

$$A^{r}(t; E) = G_{0}^{r}(E)$$
(28)  
$$Z_{t}$$
+ dt\_{1} G\_{0}^{r}(t t\_{1})e^{iE(t t\_{1})}H\_{0}^{c}(t\_{1})A^{r}(t\_{1}; E)  
$$t_{0}$$

where lower lim it of the integral in the right is set to  $t_0$  since H  $_0^t$  (t <  $t_0$ ) = 0. Its solution is

$$A^{r}(t; E) = U_{eff}(t; t_{0}; E) G_{0}^{r}(E)$$
 (29)  
 $Z_{+}$ 

$$U_{eff}(t;t_0;E) T \exp dt_1 G_0^r(t t_1) e^{iE(t_1)} H_0^t(t_1)$$

$$t_0$$
(30)

E ective evolution operator U  $_{eff}$  can be obtained by variety of methods available in the literature (see e.g. Ref. 46 and references therein). One of the simplest schemes is cumulant (or M agnus) expansion.<sup>47,48,49</sup>

Note that although our consideration is restricted to the case when time-dependent driving takes place in the molecular subspace only, generalization to driving in the contacts or at the molecule-contact interface is straightforward.

### V. ADIABATIC PUMPING REGIME

W hen time evolution of an envelope F'(t), Eq.(4), is slow on the timescale of the eld frequency  $!_0$ , consideration of the time dependent transport is simplied by invoking adiabatic assumption (treating F (t) as a parameter).

We start with Hamiltonian (1) in which interaction with driving eld is written in the form presented in Eq.(4). Transforming the Hamiltonian into rotating frame of the  $eld^{50,51}$ 

$$\hat{H} = e^{\hat{S}} \hat{H} e^{-\hat{S}} + i \frac{\hat{\theta}}{\hat{\theta}t} e^{\hat{S}} e^{-\hat{S}}$$
 (31)

$$\hat{S} = \frac{i!_0 t}{2} (\hat{n}_1 \quad \hat{n}_2)$$
(32)

where  $\hat{n}_i = \hat{d}_i^y \hat{d}_i$  (i = 1;2), leads to

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{0} + \hat{V}$$

$$\hat{H}_{0} = \overset{X}{}^{u}_{i} \hat{d}_{i}^{v} \hat{d}_{i} \qquad \sim_{12} \hat{d}_{1}^{v} \hat{d}_{2} + \sim_{21} \hat{d}_{2}^{v} \hat{d}_{1} \quad F^{*} (t)$$

$$\stackrel{i=1,2}{}^{x} X \qquad X \qquad (34)$$

$$\hat{V} = V_{kk}^{et} \hat{C}_{k}^{V} \hat{d}_{i} e^{i(1)} + H \epsilon; \qquad (35)$$

$$\hat{V} = V_{kk}^{eh} \hat{C}_{k}^{V} \hat{d}_{i} e^{i!} + H \epsilon; \qquad (35)$$

$$\hat{V} = V_{kk}^{eh} \hat{C}_{k}^{V} \hat{d}_{k} \hat{d}_{i} e^{i!} + H \epsilon; \qquad (35)$$

$$\hat{V} = V_{kk}^{eh} \hat{d}_{i}^{V} \hat{d}_{i} e^{i!} + H \epsilon; \qquad (35)$$

where

$$"_{i} = "_{i} (1)^{i}!_{0} = 2$$
 (36)

W ithin rotating wave approximation only diagonal elements of the self-energy due to coupling to the contacts (electron transfer)  $e^{t}$ , Eq.(9), and self-energy due to coupling to electron-hole excitations (energy transfer)  $e^{n}$ , Eq.(5), survive

$$\stackrel{\text{en}}{_{ii}} (_{1};_{2}) = \stackrel{\text{en}}{_{ii}} (_{1};_{2}) e^{i(_{1})^{_{1}}!_{_{0}}(t_{1}, t_{2})}$$
(38)

For self-energy due to coupling to photon bath p, Eq.(6), we neglect non-diagonal terms, since they contribute to retarded (advanced) projection only and coupling to the bath is assumed to be small relative to coupling to the contacts. The self-energy becomes diagonal

$$_{ii}^{p}(_{1};_{2}) = _{ii}^{p}(_{1};_{2})e^{i(_{1})^{i}!_{0}(t_{1} t_{2})}$$
(39)

Resulting G reen functions G ( $t_1$ ; $t_2$ ) depend parametrically on slow time variable t = ( $t_1 + t_2$ )=2 through time dependence of the envelope F (t), Eq.(34). Transform ing to W igner coordinates, taking Fourier transform in the relative coordinate  $t_1$  t<sub>2</sub>, and using gradient

 $expansion_{\prime}^{44}$  leads to the follow ing expressions for charge

$$I_{K} (t) = \frac{X^{i}}{n=0} \frac{t^{n}}{2^{n} n!} \frac{z^{i+1}}{1} \frac{dE}{2}$$
(40)  
$$Tr \frac{e^{n}}{e^{K}} \frac{e^{n}}{k} \frac{e^{k$$

and photon

$$J_{a}(t) = \int y^{p} \int_{n \neq m = 0}^{X^{d}} \frac{i^{n+m}}{2^{n+m} n \ln !} \int_{1}^{Z_{n+1}} \frac{dE}{2}$$
(41)  
$$\frac{e^{n}}{e^{n}} \frac{e^{n}}{e^{n}} G_{11}^{>}(t; E) \frac{e^{m}}{e^{t^{m}}} \frac{e^{m}}{e^{E^{m}}} G_{22}^{<}(t; E + !)$$

uxes. Eqs. (40) and (41) are m ain results of this section. They are to be compared with general expressions (8) and (20), respectively.

#### VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

W e calculate tim e-dependent transport and optical response by envoking Runge-Kutta scheme with adaptive stepsize control<sup>52</sup> to solve num erically system of di erential equations (26).



FIG.1: (Color online) Current on the left,  $I_{\rm L}$ , and right,  $I_{\rm R}$ , interfaces vs. time for single level model. Numerical results (dashed line, red) are compared to analytical expression (solid line, blue). Also shown is sum of the currents,  $I_{\rm L}$  +  $I_{\rm R}$  at the two interfaces (dotted line, black). See text for parameters.

To check accuracy of our num erical approach we start from a test calculation for a single level model. A nalytical solution is available for the latter.<sup>31</sup> In a biased junction ( $_{\rm L} = 1 \, {\rm eV}$  and  $_{\rm R} = 1 \, {\rm eV}$ ) the level is set below both chem ical potentials ( $^{\rm H}_0 = 2 \, {\rm eV}$ ), so that initially the level is occupied and current through the junction is negligible (escape rates are  $_{\rm L} = _{\rm R} = 0.2$ ). At tim e t<sub>0</sub> position of the level is shifted to 0 eV (steplike



FIG. 2: (Color online) Results of FDTD simulations. Left panel shows intensity enhancement as a function of the incident wavelength (in nm) in logarithm ic scale for two spheres of 20 nm in diameter with a gap of 10 nm (solid line, black) and bow tie antenna with a gap of 10 nm (dashed line, red), and 5 nm (dash-dotted line, blue). Top right inset represents steady-state intensity enhancement distribution in logarithmic scale for two spheres system at the resonant wavelength of 368 202 nm. Low er right inset shows intensity distribution for the bow tie antennas with a gap of 5 nm at 602:647 nm.

m odulation). Here and below we assume Ferm i distributions in the leads corresponding to room temperature T = 300 K. Figure 1 presents transient current at the two interfaces (direction from contact into the system is taken to be positive for both currents) calculated num erically (dashed line) and with analytical solution (solid line). A loo shown is sum of the currents at the two interfaces (dotted line). Out ux of electrons from initially fully populated level into the right contact leads to ringing e ect. Eventually the current achieves steady-state. O ur num erical procedure is seen to give good correspondence with the analytical result. Below we use sim ilar param eters for calculation of time-dependent response of the two-level system .

W e consider two geom etries of a junction: a bow tie antenna like electrodes and electrodes in the form of m etallic spheres. Large single-m olecule uorescence m easurem ents were reported recently for the form er.<sup>53</sup> T he latter (m olecule between two m etallic nanoparticles) is custom – ary in experim ental setups.

B oth structures are excited by a plane wave polarized along the axis of symmetry (i.e. along the axis connecting centers of two spheres, for instance). The electric eld am plitude is then detected as a function of time. Recorded am plitudes are Fourier transformed and normalized with respect to the incident eld am plitude leading to enhancement as a function in the frequency domain.



FIG.3: (Color online) Comparison of exact numerical solution (solid line, red) to adiabatic approximation (dashed line, blue) for the two-level (HOMO-LUMO) model. Shown are (a) levels populations and (b) current at the left interface vs. time. See text for parameters.

R esults of our simulations for both geom etnies are presented in Fig. 2 showing intensity enhancements in the main panel. As expected bow tie structures result in noticeably higher enhancements reaching 630 centered at

= 600 nm for a bow tie antenna with a gap of 5 nm. Two spheres also show signi cant enhancement of 55 around = 370 nm. We note that the bow tie antenna in comparison to two spheres system exhibits two resonances. The "blue" resonance located at low wavelength corresponds to rod lightning e ect with high enhancement localized primarily at the edges of each triangle. This feature disappears from the spectrum once sharp corners are replaced with sm ooth edges.<sup>42</sup> Top and bottom insets show intensity enhancement distributions at resonant conditions for the two spheres and bow tie antennas, respectively. We place m olecular junction in the hot spot regions.

Figure 3a shows time-dependent populations of molecular junction driven by external electrom agnetic eld for the ground,  $n_1$ , and excited,  $n_2$ , states. T im e-dependent current at the left interface,  $I_L$ , is shown in Fig. 3b. Param eters of the calculation are T = 300 K,  $"_1 = 1 \text{ eV}$ ,  $"_2 = 1 \text{ eV}$ ,  $[_K ]_{mm} = 0:1 \text{ eV}$  and  $[_K ]_{h2} = [_K ]_{b1} = 0$ 



FIG.4: (Coloronline) The two-level (HOMO-LUMO) model. Shown are (a) current and (b) total optical response, (23), vs. time for bow tie nanoantennas (the strongest signal, blue) and two spheres junction geometries. In the latter case the response is calculated for two positions of the molecule in the junction: in the middle between the spheres (the weakest signal, red) and closer to one of the spheres (interm ediate signal, (a) white silhouette and (b) solid line, black). Figure (c) shows contour map of optical ux, (22), for bow tie geom etry vs. outgoing frequency and time. See text for parameters.

(m = 1;2 and K = L;R). For interaction with electrom agnetic eld we take ~  $E_0 = 0.005 \text{ eV}$ , where  $E_0$  is am plitude of the external laser eld before enhancement. Bias V is applied symmetrically  $_{L,R} = E_F = V=2$ , and the Fermi energy is  $E_F = 0$ . Results presented in Fig. 3 are obtained for bow tie geom etry with 10 nm gap at bias V = 2 V. Exact num erical calculation (solid line) is compared with adiabatic approximation data (dashed line). One sees, that the adiabatic approximation for realistic parameters provides qualitatively correct results. It misses how ever delay (m em ory) elects and overestimates response signal. Electrom agnetic pulse depletes ground state and populates excited state, which for the chosen bias leads to increase of current through the junction due to increase in transmission of the excited state channel (see also Fig. 5 below).

W e com pare response of the two molecular junction geom etries in Fig. 4. Bow tie geom etry provides stronger local enhancem ent, and consequently stronger m olecular response. In the case of spherical nanoparticles we consider two possible positions of molecule between the electrodes: sym m etric and asym m etric (3 nm shift from the center, where the eld enhancem ent for the geom etry is strongest). These yield weakest and interm ediate signal, respectively. Note, that it is natural to expect that local eld enhancem ent is stronger for a structure with uneven surface. Fig. 4a presents tim e-dependent current for the three cases. Total optical response, Eq. (23), is shown in Fig. 4b. We choose = 5  $10^5$  and  $!_c = 2 \text{ eV}$ , other parameters are as in Fig. 3. Note much more sensitive character of optical response to resonant conditions. It results from our choice of (!), Eq.(24), so that most of the electronic excitation contributes to current. W hile the choice is arbitrary, it indicates in portance of the environm ent (bath spectral density). Fig. 4c shows tim edependent optical spectrum, Eq.(22), for the bow tie geom etry. The signal follows (with a delay) the pulse of the external eld. A symmetric character of the spectrum relative to resonance, ! = 2 eV, stem s from overlap of Lorentzians (levels boradening due to coupling to the contacts) centered on ground and excited states.



FIG.5: (Color online) Current vs. time for the two-level (HOMO-LUMO) m odel calculated at two di erent biases. See text for param eters.

Figure 5 shows time-dependent current response to external driving at two di erent constant biases. The calculation is done for bow tie geom etry with a gap of 10 nm, parameters are the same as in Fig. 3. For pre-resonant bias, V = 1.8 V, optical excitation is e ective in depleting the ground and populating the excited states of the mogeoege (Grich results in increased current through both channels. At post-resonant bias, V = 2.2 V, the charge transfer channels are open. Here optical excitation contributes mostly to decrease in conductance of the ground state and appearance of leakage current to the left contact in the excited state. This leads to overall decrease in current through the junction (see also discussion below). 2.8e-06



FIG.6: (Coloronline) Role of energy transfer process. Shown are (a) total optical response vs. time with (dotted line, red) and without (solid line, blue) electron-hole excitations and (b) di erence between current calculated with and without electron-hole excitations vs. time and bias. Calculations are performed within adiabatic approximation scheme. See text for parameters.

Calculations so far disregarded in uence of both energy transfer, Eq.(5), and external photon bath, Eq.(6), (except its contribution to optical rate) on electronic distribution in the molecule. W hile the latter can indeed be disregarded due to sm allness of the reasonable coupling parameter (see Ref. 37 for discussion), the former can make a di erence. Here we illustrate in uence of energy transfer process on time-dependent response of the junction within adiabatic approximation (full numeric calculation is straightforward but time-consuming). Figure 6a show stotal optical response calculated with (dashed line) and without (solid line) energy transfer included. Calculation is done for bow tie geometry with 10 nm gap at pre-resonant constant bias V = 1.8 V. O ther parameters are as in Fig. 3. As expected, energy transfer diminishes optical response of the junction, since both energy trans-

fer from m olecule to contacts and uorescence compete for the same excess electronic population in the excited state. Current change upon including electron-hole excitations into consideration is more interesting. Interplay between channelblocking and resonant pathways for electron transferm ay lead to increase in current through the junction as is illustrated in Fig. 6b). This e ect is sim ilar to the situation presented in Fig. 5.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

We consider a two-level (HOMO-LUMO) model of molecular junction driven by external time-dependent laser eld. Finite di erence time domain technique is used to calculate eld distribution for two junction geom etries. Resulting local eld at the molecule is considered to be the driving force. We assume that the junction is initially in a nonequilibrium steady-state resulting from applied constant bias. At time  $t_0$  driving force (laser pulse) starts to in uence the system . T in edependent transport (charge ux through the junction) and optical response (photon ux from the molecule into accepting modes) are calculated for a set of geometries and applied biases. We rewrite a nonequilibrium Green function technique for time-dependent calculation in a form convenient for treating many-level molecular systems. Results of the simulations within the approach are compared to approximate scheme for an adiabatic pum ping regime. Note that while our present consideration is restricted to driving force applied to the molecule only, generalization of the approach to situations of tim edependent bias and/or coupling between molecule and contacts is straightforward. Extension of the consideration to realistic molecular devices, taking into account tim e-dependent non-equilibrium distribution in the contacts and spatial pro le of the eld, and considering interplay of time-dependencies of bias and laser eld are goals of future research.

### A cknow ledgm ents

M S.isgratefulto A SU nancial and technical support (startup funds). M G.gratefully acknow ledges support by the UCSD (startup funds), the UC A cadem ic Senate (research grant), and the US.-Israel B inational Science E lectronic address: m axim .sukharev@ asu edu

- <sup>y</sup> E lectronic address: m igalperin@ ucsd.edu
- <sup>1</sup> SAM aier and HAAtwater. J. App. Phys. 98, 011101 (2005).
- $^2\,$  E O zbay. Science 311, 189 (2006).
- $^3$  W A M urray and W L B ames.A dv.M at.19,3771 (2007).
- <sup>4</sup> A M Schwartzberg and JZ Zhang. J. Phys. Chem. C 112, 10323 (2008).
- $^5$  E Hutter and J.H Fendler.Adv.M at.16,1685 (2004).
- <sup>6</sup> A JHaes and R P. Van Duyne. Expert Rev. M ol. D iagn. 4, 527 (2004).
- <sup>7</sup> R.Charbonneau, N.Lahoud, G.M. attiussi, and P.Berini. Opt.Expr.13, 977 (2005).
- <sup>8</sup> A K Sarychev and V M Shalaev. Electrodynamics of metamaterials. W orld Scientic (2007).
- <sup>9</sup> H.Yokota, K.Saito, and T.Yanagida. Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4606 (1998).
- <sup>10</sup> H Raether. Surface P lasm ons on Sm ooth and Rough Surfaces and on G ratings. Springer, Berlin (1988).
- <sup>11</sup> U K reibig and M Nollmer. Optical Properties of M etal Clusters. Springer, New York (1995).
- <sup>12</sup> K Lopata and D N euhauser. J. Chem. Phys. 130, 104707 (2009).
- <sup>13</sup> K Lopata and D N euhauser. J. Chem. Phys. 131, 014701 (2009).
- <sup>14</sup> M G Reuter, M Sukharev, and T Seidem an. Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 208303 (2008).
- <sup>15</sup> S.W. Wu, G.V. Nazin, and W. Ho, Phys. Rev. B 77, 205430 (2008).
- <sup>16</sup> D R W ard, N JHalas, JW Ciszek, JM Tour, Y W u, P N ordlander and D N atelson. N ano Lett. 8, 919 (2008).
- <sup>17</sup> Z.Jo e, T.Shamai, A.Ophir, G.Noy, I.Yutsis, K.K.r, O.Cheshnovsky and Y.Selzer. Nature Nanotechnology 3, 727 (2008).
- <sup>18</sup> M Galperin and A Nitzan. J. Chem. Phys. 124, 234709 (2006).
- <sup>19</sup> M Galperin, M A Ratner, and A Nitzan. J. Chem. Phys. 130, 144109 (2009).
- <sup>20</sup> E G Petrov, V M ay, and P H anggi C hem . Phys. 319, 380 (2005).
- <sup>21</sup> E.G. Petrov, V.M. ay, and P.H. anggi. Phys. Rev. B 73, 045408 (2006).
- <sup>22</sup> M Koentopp, C Chang, K Burke, and R Car. J. Phys.: Condens.M atter 20, 083203 (2008).
- <sup>23</sup> G Stefanucci and C.-O A lm bladh. Europhys. Lett. 67, 14 (2004).
- <sup>24</sup> S.Kurth, G.Stefanucci, C.-O.A.Imbladh, A.Rubio, and E.K.J.G.ross.Phys.Rev.B 72,035308 (2005).
- <sup>25</sup> JN Pedersen and A W acker. Phys. Rev. B 72, 195330 (2005).
- <sup>26</sup> I.V O vchinnikov and D Neuhauser. J. Chem. Phys. 122, 024707 (2005).
- <sup>27</sup> M Esposito and M Galperin. Phys. Rev. B 79, 205303 (2009).
- <sup>28</sup> M G Schultz and F.von Oppen.Phys.Rev.b 80, 033302 (2009).

- <sup>29</sup> M Leijnæ and M R W egewijs. Phys. Rev. B 78, 235424 (2008).
- <sup>30</sup> M Galperin and S.Tretiak. J. Chem. Phys. 128, 124705 (2008).
- <sup>31</sup> A Jauho, N S.W ingreen and Y M eir. Phys. Rev. B 50, 5528 (1994).
- $^{32}$  M <code>PAnantram</code> and <code>SD</code> atta.Phys.Rev.B 51,7632 (1995).
- <sup>33</sup> B W ang, JW ang, and H G uo. Phys. Rev. Lett. textbf82, 398 (1999).
- <sup>34</sup> A Prociuk and B D D unietz. Phys. Rev. B 78, 165112 (2008).
- <sup>35</sup> A R Hemandez, F A Pinheiro, C H Lewenkopf, and E R M ucciolo.Phys.Rev.b 80, 115311 (2009).
- <sup>36</sup> M Galperin and A Nitzan. Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 206802 (2005).
- <sup>37</sup> M Galperin and A Nitzan. J. Chem. Phys. 124, 234709 (2006).
- <sup>38</sup> M Besbes, JPHugonin, PLalanne, S. van Haver, O.T.A.Jansse, A.M.Nugrowati, M.Xu, SFPereira, H.P.J.rbach, A.S. van de Nes, P.Bienstman, G.G.ranet, S.Helfert, M.Sukharev, T.Seideman, F.I.Baida, B.G.uizal, and D.Van Labeke.J.Eur.Opt.Soc.: Rapid Publications 2,07022 (2007).
- <sup>39</sup> A Ta ove and S C H agness. C om putational E lectrodynam ics: The F inite-D i erence T im e-D om ain M ethod, 3rd ed., A rtech H ouse, B oston (2005).
- <sup>40</sup> J.P.B.erenger. Perfectly M atched Layer (PML) for Computational E lectrom agnetics in Synthesis lectures on computational electrom agnetics ed. C A Balanis, M organ and C laypool Publ. (2007).
- <sup>41</sup> JA R oden and SD G edney.M icrow.Opt.Techn.Let.27, 334 (2000).
- <sup>42</sup> M Sukharev, J.Sung, K & Spears, and T Seidem an. Phys. Rev. B 76, 184302 (2007).
- <sup>43</sup> G D M ahan. M any-Particle Physics. K luwer A cadem ic/P lenum Publishers (2000).
- <sup>14</sup> H Haug and A .- P Jauho. Quantum K inetics in Transport and Optics of Sem iconductors. Springer (2008).
- <sup>45</sup> A N itzan. Chem ical D ynam ics in C ondensed P hases. O xford U niversity P ress (2006).
- <sup>46</sup> D Lauvergnat, S B lasco, X Chapuisat, and A N auts. J. Chem. Phys. 126, 204103 (2007).
- <sup>47</sup> W Magnus.Commun.Pure Appl.Math.7,649 (1954).
- <sup>48</sup> S M ukam el. P rinciples of N onlinear O ptical Spectroscopy. O xford U niversity P ress (1995).
- <sup>49</sup> D Prato and PW Lamberti. J. Chem. Phys. 106, 4640 (1997).
- <sup>50</sup> P Zhang, Q .K Xue, and X C X ie. Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 196602 (2003).
- <sup>51</sup> J.Fransson and J.-X Zhu.Phys.Rev.B 78, 113307 (2008).
- <sup>52</sup> W H Press, S A Teukolsky, W T Vetterling, and B P F lannery. Numerical Recipes in C, Cambridge University Press (1994).
- <sup>53</sup> A Kinkhabwala, Z Yu, S Fan, Yu A vlasevich, K M ullen, and W E M oemer. Nature Photonics 3, 654 (2009).