

Scattering theory of thermocurrent in quantum dots and molecules

Natalya A. Zimbovskaya

*Department of Physics and Electronics,
University of Puerto Rico-Humacao, CUH Station,
Humacao, Puerto Rico 00791, USA,*

*Institute for Functional Nanomaterials, University of Puerto
Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00931, USA*

Email: *natalya.zimbovskaya@upr.edu*

(Dated: February 29, 2024)

In this work we theoretically study properties of electric current driven by a temperature gradient through a quantum dot/molecule coupled to the source and drain charge reservoirs. We analyze the effect of Coulomb interactions between electrons on the dot/molecule and of thermal phonons associated with the electrodes thermal environment on the thermocurrent. The scattering matrix formalism is employed to compute electron transmission through the system. This approach is further developed and combined with nonequilibrium Green's functions formalism, so that scattering probabilities are expressed in terms of relevant energies including the thermal energy, strengths of coupling between the dot/molecule and charge reservoirs and characteristic energies of electron-phonon interactions in the electrodes. It is shown that one may bring the considered system into regime favorable for heat-to-electric energy conversion by varying the applied bias and gate voltages.

Keywords: quantum dots, molecular junctions, thermoelectric properties.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

The field of molecular electronics has been rapidly expanding during the last two decades owing to continuous improvement of techniques intended to electrically contact and control quantum dots and single molecules in transport junctions. Recent advances in heat measurements in nanoscale systems allow to study thermoelectric properties of molecular junctions and similar systems. These studies bring a deeper understanding of transport mechanisms [1–4] and additional information concerning electronic and vibrational excitation spectra of molecules [5, 6]. Also, in the recent years a new field of molecular thermoelectronics have emerged [7]. Thermal analogs of molecular transistors and heat-into-electricity converters were proposed [5, 8–12].

Heat-to-electric power converters operate due to Seebeck effect which appears provided that thermal and electric driving forces simultaneously affect electron transport through the considered system. When a temperature gradient ΔT is applied across the system, a thermovoltage V_{th} emerges under the condition of zero net current thus indicating the energy conversion. At small temperature gradients ($\Delta T \ll T_0$, T_0 being the temperature of the cool region) the system operates within the linear regime and $V_{th} = -S\Delta T$. Within this regime, thermopower S is the decisive quantity determining the extent of energy conversion. Accordingly, the thermopower was intensively studied [5, 10, 13–16] along with the thermoelectric figure of merit [15, 17, 18]. Another interesting quantity characterizing thermoelectric transport through molecular junctions and other systems of similar kind is

thermocurrent I_{th} . The latter may be defined as a difference between the electron tunnel current flowing through a biased thermoelectric junction where the electrodes are kept at different temperatures ($T_L = T_0 + \Delta T$, $T_R = T_0$) and the current flowing in absence of temperature gradient [19]:

$$I_{th} = I(V, T_0, \Delta T) - I(V, T_0, \Delta T = 0). \quad (1)$$

As well as the thermovoltage, the thermocurrent is simultaneously controlled by electric and thermal driving forces. The combined effect of these forces depends of the type of charge carriers involved in transport and of the bias voltage polarity. When the bias voltage is sufficiently strong, its effect predominates. Consequently, the difference between two terms in the Eq. (1) diminishes, and I_{th} approaches zero. At the same time, the thermocurrent flowing through an unbiased or slightly biased molecule (or quantum dot) is mostly controlled by the applied temperature gradient ΔT . Assuming that $V = 0$ and $\Delta T > 0$ (the left electrode is warmer than the right one), I_{th} takes on positive/negative values when the charge carriers involved in transport process are, respectively, holes/electrons. Finally, when V and ΔT influence the transport to a similar extent, the resulting magnitude and direction of I_{th} are determined by both ΔT sign and the bias voltage polarity. These two factors may cooperate or counteract by pushing charge carriers in the same or opposite directions. In the latter case, I_{th} may change its sign at certain values of V and ΔT when electric and thermal driving forces counterbalance each other. It was shown that (disregarding electron-phonon interactions) maximum efficiency of molecular

heat-to-electricity converter could be reached under the condition of vanishing current $I(V, T_0, \Delta T)$. Under this condition, $I_{th} = -I(V, T_0, \Delta T = 0)$. Therefore, relatively large in magnitude thermocurrent flowing through a system may indicate that the system operates in the regime favorable for energy conversion [20].

Properties of the thermovoltage in molecular junctions and quantum dots were theoretically analyzed in numerous works [20–29]. As yet, less attention was paid to studies of thermocurrent in spite of the fact that I_{th} is more straightforward to measure and model than V_{th} , as stated in the recent work [19]. However, theoretical analysis of I_{th} behavior within a weakly nonlinear regime was recently suggested [25]. The purpose of the present work is to analyze the effect of the gate voltage, electron-electron interactions and thermal phonons on the electrodes on the characteristics of thermocurrent flowing through a single-molecule junction or a quantum dot.

To properly analyze thermoelectric transport through molecules/quantum dots one needs to use an approach including unified treatment of electron and phonon dynamics in the considered system. For this purpose, one may use diagrammatic technique or nonequilibrium Green's function formalism (NEGF), as described in the review [30]. However, application of these advanced formalisms to realistic models simulating molecular junctions is extremely difficult. Several simplified approaches based on scattering theory [6] and on quantum rate equations [5, 14, 20, 31, 32] were developed and used to study thermoelectric properties of molecular junctions taking into account contributions of vibrational phonons and electron-vibron interactions. Very recently, a scattering theory based approach was suggested to analyze weakly nonlinear thermoelectric transport in mesoscopic systems [25–27]. Nevertheless, these studies are not completed so far.

In the present work we use a scattering theory first suggested by Buttiker [33] combined with certain NEGF based results. The adopted approach allows to derive the expression for the electron transmission which remains applicable for an arbitrary value of the difference between the temperatures of the electrodes. Therefore, this expression may be employed to analyze nonlinear effects in thermoelectric properties of considered systems.

II. MODEL AND RESULTS

The schematics of the suggested model is presented in the Fig. 1. To simplify the computations we mimic the bridge linking the electrodes by a single state with the energy E_0 . This energy is independent of the electrodes chemical potentials. However, if the third (gate) electrode is attaches to the system, one may shift the position of the bridge level by applying the gate voltage.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematics of the considered system. Semicircles represent the left and right electrodes, square stands for the molecule/quantum dot sandwiched in between. Dephasing/dissipative reservoirs are associated with the electrodes and characterized by temperatures T_L and T_R , respectively.

We assume that electrons tunnel from the electrodes to the bridge and vice versa via the channels 1 and 2 thus maintaining an elastic component of the charge flow. Incoming wave amplitudes a_1, a_2 and outgoing wave amplitudes a'_1, a'_2 characterize this process. Also, electrons in the electrodes may interact with thermal phonons. An electron may enter the bridge by emitting or absorbing a phonon. Such electrons contribute to inelastic component of the charge flow. We assume that the total current is the sum of the elastic and inelastic components. To describe the inelastic contribution to the current we introduce a pair of dephasing/dissipative electron reservoirs. The channels 3,4 and/or 5,6 connect these reservoirs with the bridge. While in a reservoir, the electron undergoes scattering by thermal phonons and then it tunnels to the bridge, so there is no direct coupling of the bridge to the thermal phonons. In the present analysis we assume that the thermal phonons are associated with the left and right electrodes which are kept at the temperatures T_L and T_R . The labels indicated the reservoirs are accordingly chosen.

So, within the accepted model we have six transport channels. The relations between incoming particle fluxes J_k and outgoing fluxes J'_k take on the form ($1 \leq i \leq k \leq 6$):

$$J'_k = \sum T_{ik} J_k. \quad (2)$$

Here, the coefficients T_{ik} are related to matrix elements of the scattering matrix M : $T_{ik} = |M_{ik}|^2$. To maintain the charge conservation in the system, zero net current should flow in the channels linking the bridge with the reservoirs:

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 + J_4 - J'_3 - J'_4 &= 0, \\ J_5 + J_6 - J'_5 - J'_6 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The scattering matrix express outgoing wave amplitudes $b'_L, b'_R, a'_3, a'_4, a'_5$ and a'_6 in terms of incident ones $b_L, b_R, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6$. To derive expressions for the matrix elements M_{ik} we first consider a part of the whole system shown in the Fig. 1. This part consists of the reservoir of the Temperature T_L associated with the left electrode and the bridge site. Following the Buttiker's approach [33], we find the expression for the matrix $s^{(1)}$ relating wave amplitudes a'_1, a'_2, a'_3, a'_4 to wave amplitudes a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 namely

$$s^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{1-\epsilon_L} & \sqrt{\epsilon_L} & 0 \\ \sqrt{1-\epsilon_L} & 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{\epsilon_L} \\ \sqrt{\epsilon_L} & 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{1-\epsilon_L} \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon_L} & -\sqrt{1-\epsilon_L} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Here, ϵ_L is the scattering probability associated with the effect of thermal phonons concentrated on the left electrode (and represented by the corresponding dephasing/dissipative reservoir). When $\epsilon_L = 0$, the reservoir is detached from the bridge, so thermal phonons do not affect electron's tunneling from the left electrode to the bridge. Within the opposite limit ($\epsilon_L = 1$), electrons traveling from the left electrode to the bridge are necessarily scattered into the reservoir which results in the overall phase randomization and inelastic transport. Electron tunneling through a barrier separating the left electrode from the bridge is characterized by the transmission and reflection amplitudes (t_L and r_L , respectively). These are matrix elements of a 2×2 matrix:

$$s_L = \begin{pmatrix} t_L & -r_L \\ r_L & t_L \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

which relates b'_L, a'_1 to b_L, a_1 . Combining Eqs. (4) and (5) one obtained the following expression for the matrix $M^{(1)}$ which relates b'_L, a'_2, a'_3, a'_4 to b_L, a_2, a_3, a_4 :

$$M^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} r_L & \alpha_L t_L & \beta_L t_L & 0 \\ \alpha_L t_L & \alpha_L^2 r_L & \alpha_L \beta_L r_L & \beta_L \\ \beta_L t_L & \alpha_L \beta_L r_L & \beta_L^2 r_L & -\alpha_L \\ 0 & \beta_L & -\alpha_L & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Here, $\alpha_L = \sqrt{1-\epsilon_L}$, $\beta_L = \sqrt{\epsilon_L}$. now, we take into consideration the remaining part of the considered system. As shown in an earlier work [34], the matrix $M^{(2)}$ relating a'_2, b'_R, a'_5, a'_6 to a_2, b_R, a_5, a_6 has the form:

$$M^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_R^2 r_R & \alpha_R t_R & \beta_R & \alpha_R \beta_R r_R \\ \alpha_R t_R & r_R & 0 & \beta_R t_R \\ \beta_R & 0 & 0 & -\alpha_R \\ \alpha_R \beta_R r_R & \beta_R & -\alpha_R & \beta_R^2 r_R \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha_R = \sqrt{1-\epsilon_R}$, $\beta_R = \sqrt{\epsilon_R}$, the scattering probability ϵ_R is associated with the effect of thermal phonons concentrated on the right electrode, and the transmission (t_R) and reflection (r_R) amplitudes characterize electron tunneling between the bridge site and tunneling between the bridge site the right electrode. Using Eqs. (6), (7), one arrives at the following expression for the scattering matrix [35]:

$$M = \frac{1}{Z} \left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} r_L + \alpha_L^2 \alpha_R^2 r_R & \alpha_L \alpha_R t_L t_R & \beta_L t_L & \alpha_L \alpha_R^2 \beta_L t_L r_R \\ \alpha_L \alpha_R t_L t_R & r_R + \alpha_L^2 \alpha_R^2 r_L & \alpha_L \alpha_R \beta_L t_R r_L & \alpha_L \beta_L t_R \\ \beta_L t_L & \alpha_L \alpha_R \beta_L t_R r_L & \beta_L^2 r_R & \alpha_L (\alpha_R^2 r_L r_R - 1) \\ \alpha_L \alpha_R^2 \beta_L t_L r_R & \alpha_R \beta_L t_R & \alpha_L (\alpha_R^2 r_L r_R - 1) & \alpha_R^2 \beta_L^2 r_R \\ \alpha_L \beta_R t_L & \alpha_L^2 \alpha_R \beta_R t_R r_L & \alpha_L \beta_L \beta_R r_L & \beta_L \beta_R \\ \alpha_L \alpha_R \beta_R r_R t_L & \beta_R t_R & \alpha_L \alpha_R \beta_L \beta_R r_L r_R & \alpha_R (\alpha_L^2 r_L r_R - 1) \\ & & & \beta_R^2 r_R \end{array} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Here, $Z = 1 - \alpha_L^2 \alpha_R^2 r_L r_R$.

Solving the equations (2), (3) one arrives at the following expression for the electron transmission [36]:

$$\tau(E) = \frac{J'_2}{J_1} = T_{21} + \sum_{m,n} K_m^{(2)} (W^{-1})_{mn} K_n^{(1)}. \quad (9)$$

Within the considered model, $1 \leq m, n \leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_m^{(1)} &= T_{2m+1,1} + T_{2m+2,1}, \\ K_m^{(2)} &= T_{2,2m+1} + T_{2,2m+2}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and matrix elements of 2×2 matrix W are given by

$$W_{mn} = (2 - R_{mm})\delta_{mn} - \tilde{R}_{mn}(1 - \delta_{mn}) \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{mm} &= T_{2m+1,2m+1} + T_{2m+2,2m+2} \\ &\quad + T_{2m+2,2m+1} + T_{2m+1,2m+2}, \\ \tilde{R}_{mn} &= T_{2m+1,2n+1} + T_{2m+1,2n+2} \\ &\quad + T_{2m+2,2n+1} + T_{2m+2,2n+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

It is known that thermoelectric efficiency of a thermoelectric materials becomes reduced if the phonons thermal

conductance takes on significant values. In the expression of thermoelectric figure of merit which characterizes the efficiency of energy conversion at small temperature gradients, the denominator is the sum of electron and phonon thermal conductances [37, 38]. We remark that within the adopted model the phonon thermal conductance through the junction is zero. This seems a reasonable assumption for experiments give low values of phonon thermal conductance in several molecular junctions [39, 40]. This may be attributed to the fact that in many molecules the majority of vibrational transitions lie above the range determined by thermal energy provided that relevant temperatures take on values below room temperature [15, 41].

In the following analysis we focus on a significantly coupled system. Provided that the dephasing reservoirs are detached from the bridge ($\epsilon_L = \epsilon_R = 0$) and the barriers separating the electrodes from the bridge are identical ($t_L = t_R = t$, $r_L = r_R = r$), the electron transmission determined by Eqs. (8)-(12) accepts a simple form:

$$\tau(E) = \frac{t^4}{(1+r^2)^2}. \quad (13)$$

As known, in the case of coherent transport, the current flowing through the system could be presented in the form:

$$I = \frac{ie}{h} \sum_{\sigma} \int dE \{ (\Gamma_L^{\sigma} f_L - \Gamma_R^{\sigma} f_R) (G_{\sigma}^r - G_{\sigma}^a) + (\Gamma_L^{\sigma} - \Gamma_R^{\sigma}) G_{\sigma}^{<} \} \quad (14)$$

Here, $\Gamma_{L,R}^{\sigma}(E)$ are self-energy terms describing coupling of an electron on the bridge (with a certain spin orientation σ) to the electrodes, $f_{L,R}$ are Fermi distribution functions for the electrons on the electrodes, and $G_{\sigma}^{r,a,<}(E)$ are the retarded, advanced and lesser Green's functions associated with the QD/molecule.

Further, we accept a wide-band approximation for the self-energy terms, and we concentrate on a symmetrically coupled system assuming $\Gamma_L^{\sigma} = \Gamma_R^{\sigma} = \Gamma$. Then the term proportional to the lesser Green's function disappears from Eq. (14), and we obtain:

$$I = \frac{e}{\pi h} \int \tau(E) (f_L - f_R) dE \quad (15)$$

where the electron transmission function is given by

$$\tau(E) = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma \sum_{\sigma} [G_{\sigma}^r(E) - G_{\sigma}^a(E)] \equiv g^2(E). \quad (16)$$

So, we have derived two expressions for the electron transmission function appropriate to describe coherent electron transport through the considered system. One of them (Eq. (13)) is obtained using the scattering theory whereas another one (Eq. (16)) is ensued employing

NEGF formalism. Within the considered coherent limit these expressions should be identical. Comparing them, we get:

$$t^2 = \frac{2g}{1+g}. \quad (17)$$

Provided that the electron transport through the junction is undisturbed by electron-phonon interactions and disregarding spin-flip processes, $G_{\sigma}^r(E)$ may be approximated as [42]:

$$G_{\sigma}^r(E) = \frac{E - E_0 - \Sigma_{02}^{\sigma} - U(1 - \langle n_{-\sigma} \rangle)}{(E - E_0 - \Sigma_{0\sigma})(E - E_0 - U - \Sigma_{02}^{\sigma}) + U \Sigma_{1\sigma}}. \quad (18)$$

In this expression, U is the charging energy describing Coulomb repulsion between electrons on the bridge, and $\langle n_{\sigma} \rangle$ are one-particle occupation numbers which could be computed by integration of the lesser Green's function $G_{\sigma}^{<}(E)$ over the whole range of tunnel energy E values:

$$\langle n_{\sigma} \rangle = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int G_{\sigma}^{<}(E) dE. \quad (19)$$

Self-energy terms $\Sigma_{0\sigma}$, $\Sigma_{1\sigma}$ and $\Sigma_{2\sigma}$ appear in the Eq. (10) due to the coupling of the bridge to the leads:

$$\Sigma_{0\sigma} = \sum_{r\beta} \frac{|t_{r\beta;\sigma}|^2}{E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma} + i\eta}, \quad (20)$$

$$\Sigma_{1\sigma} = \sum_{r\beta} |t_{r\beta;\sigma}|^2 f_{r,-\sigma}^{\beta} \left\{ \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_{r\beta;-\sigma} + i\eta} + \frac{1}{E - 2E_0 - U + \epsilon_{r\beta;-\sigma} + i\eta} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

$$\Sigma_{2\sigma} = \sum_{r\beta} |t_{r\beta;\sigma}|^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_{r\beta;-\sigma} + i\eta} + \frac{1}{E - 2E_0 - U + \epsilon_{r\beta;-\sigma} + i\eta} \right\}, \quad (22)$$

$$\Sigma_{02} = \Sigma_{0\sigma} + \Sigma_{2\sigma}. \quad (23)$$

Here, $t_{r\beta;\sigma}$ are parameters describing the coupling of r, β electron states on the electrode β ($\beta = L, R$) to the bridge state, $\epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma}$ are single-electron energies in the electrode β , $f_{r\sigma}^{\beta}$ is the Fermi distribution function for the energy $\epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma}$, chemical potential μ_{β} and temperature T_{β} and η is a positive infinitesimal parameter. Previously introduced coupling parameters $\Gamma_{L,R}^{\sigma}$ are closely related to $\Sigma_{0\sigma}$, namely: $\Sigma_{0\sigma} = \Sigma_{0\sigma}^L + \Sigma_{0\sigma}^R$, $\Gamma_{L,R}^{\sigma} = -2\text{Im}\Sigma_{0\sigma}^{L,R}$. We remark that $\Sigma_{1\sigma}$ and $\Sigma_{2\sigma}$ depend on the temperatures of electrodes which is taken into account in further computations.

Scattering probabilities $\epsilon_{L,R}$ may be given an explicit physical meaning by expressing them in terms of relevant energies. In the considered system, dephasing and energy dissipation originate from interactions of charge

carriers in the electrodes with thermal phonons. So, one can approximate these parameters as follows:

$$\epsilon_\beta = \frac{\Gamma_{ph}^\beta}{\Gamma_\beta + \Gamma_{ph}^\beta}. \quad (24)$$

Here, Γ_{ph}^β represents the self-energy term occurring due to electron-phonon interactions in the electrode β . Using NEGF to compute the relevant electron and phonon Green's functions within the self-consistent Born approximation, one may derive a relatively simple approximation for Γ_{ph}^β [43]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ph}^\beta &= \frac{2\pi}{\Gamma_\beta^2} \int_0^\infty d(\hbar\omega) \sum_\alpha |\lambda_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \delta(\hbar\omega - \hbar\omega_{\alpha\beta}) \sum_{r\sigma} |t_{r\beta;\sigma}|^2 \\ &\times \left\{ [1 - f_\sigma^\beta(E - \hbar\omega)] [1 + N_\beta(\omega)] \delta(E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma} - \hbar\omega) \right. \\ &+ f_\sigma^\beta(E - \hbar\omega) N_\beta(\omega) \delta(E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma} - \hbar\omega) \\ &+ f_\sigma^\beta(E + \hbar\omega) [1 + N_\beta(\omega)] \delta(E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma} + \hbar\omega) \\ &\left. + [1 - f_\sigma^\beta(E + \hbar\omega)] N_\beta(\omega) \delta(E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma} + \hbar\omega) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In writing down this expression, we had assumed that the coupling strength $\lambda_{\alpha\beta}$ characterizing interaction between an electron in the electrode β and a thermal phonon with the energy $\hbar\omega_\alpha$ does not depend of the electron state r, σ . The electrodes are kept at different temperatures T_β , so we introduce two phonon distribution functions $N_\beta(\omega) = \{ \exp[\hbar\omega/kT_\beta] - 1 \}^{-1}$, (k being the Boltzmann's constant).

The phonon spectral function may be determined using molecular dynamic simulations. However, to qualitatively analyze the effect of thermal phonons on the transport characteristics, one may use the approximation [44]:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ph}^\beta(\omega) &= \sum_\alpha |\lambda_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \delta(\hbar\omega - \hbar\omega_{\alpha\beta}) \\ &= \lambda_\beta \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_{c\beta}} \right) e^{-\omega/\omega_{c\beta}} \theta(\omega) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\theta(\omega)$ is the Heaviside step function, and $\omega_{c\beta}$ characterize relaxation times for the thermal phonons.

Substituting the approximation (26) into Eq. (25) one may see that the major contribution to the integral comes from the region where $\omega \sim \omega_c$. On these grounds, one may replace ω by $\omega_{c\beta}$ in the arguments of slowly varying functions in the integrand of Eq (25). Also, one may assume that $\hbar\omega_{c\beta}$ is much smaller than μ_β . So, corrections including $\hbar\omega_{c\beta}$ in the arguments of the Fermi distribution functions and delta functions may be omitted. Then one may use the expression for Γ_β^σ which follows from its definition:

$$\Gamma_\beta^\sigma = 2\pi \sum_r |t_{r\beta;\sigma}|^2 \delta(E - \epsilon_{r\beta;\sigma}) \quad (27)$$

to reduce Eq. (25) to the form:

$$\Gamma_{ph}^\beta = \frac{2\lambda_\beta}{\Gamma_\beta} \hbar\omega_{c\beta} \left(\frac{kT_\beta}{\hbar\omega_{c\beta}} \right)^2 \zeta \left(2; \frac{kT_\beta}{\hbar\omega_{c\beta}} + 1 \right) \quad (28)$$

where $\zeta(x; q)$ is the Riemann's ζ function. If the thermal energy kT_β significantly exceeds $\hbar\omega_c$, Γ_{ph}^β accepts an especially simple form, namely: $\Gamma_{ph}^\beta \approx 2\lambda_\beta kT_\beta / \Gamma_\beta$. In further calculations we assume for simplicity that $\lambda_L = \lambda_R = \lambda$.

For a considered symmetrically coupled junction, the thermocurrent is described by the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{th} &= \frac{e}{\pi\hbar} \int dE \left\{ \tau(E, T_0, \Delta T) f^L(E, T_0 + \Delta T) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \tau(E, T_0, \Delta T = 0) f^L(E, T_0) - \Delta\tau f^R(E, T_0) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $\Delta\tau$ is given by:

$$\Delta\tau = \tau(E, T_0, \Delta T) - \tau(E, T_0, \Delta T = 0). \quad (30)$$

The suggested approach allows one to analyze the effect of thermal phonons on characteristics of thermoelectric transport beyond the linear regime. Using Eqs. (8)-(28), one may compute the electron transmission function for an arbitrary value of the ratio $\Delta T/T_0$. This result may be used to calculate thermocurrent and analyze how it is affected by various characteristics of the considered junction (such as the quality of contact between the electrodes and the linker, electron-electron and electron-phonon interactions) and by external factors including the bias and gate voltage and temperature gradient.

III. DISCUSSION

The most interesting thermoelectric properties are better pronounced in weakly coupled junctions where electron transmission exhibits sharp maxima [20]. Correspondingly, in further analysis we assume that $\Gamma < kT_0$. Then, as shown in the Fig. 2, $\Delta\tau$ displays sharp dips at $E = E_0$ and $E = E_0 + U$, and the magnitudes of these features increase as the difference in the temperatures of electrodes enhances. Electron-phonon interactions significantly affect the transmission. As the coupling between electrons and thermal phonons strengthens, $\Delta\tau$ generally takes on greater values. However, too strong electron-phonon interactions bring partial spreading of the resonance features which is not favorable for nonlinear behavior of thermocurrent to be revealed.

Thermocurrent dependence of the applied bias voltage is illustrated in the left panel of the Fig. 3 assuming for certainty that the left (hot) electrode is kept at higher voltage and the bridge energy level E_0 is situated below the Fermi level for the electrodes. When the bias




FIG. 2: (Color online) Energy dependencies of the electron transmission through the junction. The function $\Delta\tau = \tau(E, \Delta T) - \tau(E, \Delta T = 0)$ is shown assuming $E_0 = -2\text{meV}$, $U = 6\text{meV}$, $\Gamma = 0.3\text{meV}$, $kT_0 = 0.65\text{meV}$ at $\lambda = 0.5\text{meV}$ (left panel) and $\Delta T = 0.5T_0$ (right panel).

is small so that E_0 remains outside the conduction window whose width is determined by the difference between chemical potentials of electrodes μ_L and μ_R , the charge flow is driven by the temperature gradient. Higher temperature of the left electrode enhances probability for an electron to tunnel there from the bridge provided that E_0 is rather close to the Fermi level, so that their difference is of the same order as the thermal energy kT_0 . Under these conditions, I_{th} takes on positive values. When the bias becomes greater, E_0 enters the conduction window, and the electric driving forces come into play. As a result, the thermocurrent changes its sign. It remains negative at moderate bias. In strongly biased junctions, electric driving forces predominate, and I_{th} approaches zero. The depth of the dip appearing on the $I_{th} - V$ curves, as well as its position, are controlled by several factors. Assuming that the charging energy U and electron-phonon coupling strength λ are fixed, it is determined by the value of ΔT . The greater becomes the difference between the electrodes temperatures, the greater is the maximum magnitude of I_{th} indicating more favorable conditions for energy conversion in the considered system.

It was reported [19] that thermocurrent flowing through a quantum dot may exhibit a nonlinear dependence of ΔT even at small values of the latter. As recently suggested [25], the nonlinearity appears due to renormalization of the energy E_0 in the presence of temperature gradient. Taking into account the suggested energy renormalization, we showed that weak nonlinearity of I_{th} versus ΔT curves may be actually traced (see right panel of the Fig. 3). Presented curves demonstrate a qualitative agreement with the experimental results of Ref. [19]. However, we remark that the suggested renormalization $E_0 \rightarrow E_0 + zk\Delta T$ where $|z| < 1$ may significantly affect the thermocurrent behavior only at certain values of the bias voltage, when E_0 is very close to the boundary of the conduction window.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Left panel: Thermocurrent as the function of bias voltage. The curves are plotted at $U = 6\text{meV}$, $\lambda = 0.5\text{meV}$, $kT_0 = 0.65\text{meV}$. Right panel: Temperature dependencies of the thermocurrent. The curves are plotted assuming $kT_0 = 0.65\text{meV}$, $\lambda = 0.5\text{meV}$. Remaining parameters are the same as in the Fig. 2.

Coulomb repulsion between electrons on the bridge and the electron interactions with thermal phonons may significantly influence thermoelectric transport through the junction, as demonstrated in the Fig. 4. The enhancement of charging energy narrows down the interval where I_{th} accepts negative values and makes the dips in the $I_{th} - V$ curves more shallow. This may be explained by considering the role taken by Coulomb interactions. Electron-electron interactions are hindering electron flow through the system in both directions, which leads to the Coulomb blockade. These interactions could be treated as a source of an effective force opposing any predominating driving force (originating either from the bias voltage or from the temperature gradient applied across the junction). As a result, the characteristic features manifested in the shapes of $I_{th} - V$ curves become less distinctly pronounced.

Electrons interactions with thermal phonons do not change the width of the region where I_{th} remains negative. However, these interactions may affect the magnitude of thermocurrent. In the right panel of the Fig. 4, we present the I_{th} value at the bottom of the dip as a function of the electron-phonon coupling strength. As shown in the figure, the dip depth reduces as λ increases. This effect is better pronounced at weak or moderate electron-phonon coupling ($\lambda \lesssim \Gamma, kT_0$), and it fades away when λ significantly exceeds Γ .

As known, transport properties of molecular junctions and other similar systems may be controlled by varying the positions of the bridge energy levels. Practically, the levels may be shifted by a gate voltage applied to the system. Within the accepted model, the bridge in the considered junction is represented by a single energy level E_0 . In the Fig. 5 we trace the thermocurrent dependencies of E_0 . The presented results confirm those shown in the previous figures. Again, the thermocurrent acquires




FIG. 4: (Color online) The effect of electron-electron (left panel) and electron-phonon (right panel) interactions on the thermocurrent. Curves are plotted at $\Delta T = 0.25T_0$, $\lambda = 0$ (left panel) and at $V = 6meV$ (right panel). Other relevant parameters are the same as in the previous figures.




FIG. 5: (Color online) Thermocurrent as a function of the bridge level position E_0 . Curves are plotted assuming $V = 4mV$, $\Delta T = 0.25T_0$, $\lambda = 2.5meV$ (left panel) and $U = 5meV$ (right panel). Other relevant parameters are the same as in the previous figures.

a negative sign when the bridge level moving upwards appears in the conduction window. For a symmetrically coupled system this happens at $E_0 = -\frac{1}{2}V$ assuming that the Fermi level for unbiased junction $\mu = 0$. As the bridge level moves higher, I_{th} remains negative while the level is still inside the conduction window. When it leaves the window but remains near its upper boundary, the thermocurrent may change sign once more, being influenced by electron-electron interactions and electron-phonon interactions in the electrodes. However, when the bridge level moves farther away from the conduction window, both terms in the Eq. (1) approach zero, so the thermocurrent disappears.

IV. CONCLUSION

Finally, we repeat again that various aspects of energy conversion in nanoscale systems attract significant interest of the research community. The present work

was inspired by this common interest. Also, the present research was motivated by recent experimental observations of nonlinear thermocurrent flowing through quantum dots. The thermocurrent defined by Eq. (1) is an important characteristic of thermoelectric transport. The behavior of the thermocurrent brings some information concerning the efficiency of energy conversion in the considered systems. For instance, I_{th} reaches minimum at a certain value of the applied bias voltage, as shown in the Figs. 3,4. One may conjecture that this minimum occurs when the current $I(V, T_0, \Delta T)$ becomes zero, so the corresponding magnitude of bias voltage is close to the magnitude of thermovoltage V_{th} and may be employed to estimate the latter. However, we remark that one cannot extract sufficient information to properly estimate the thermoelectric efficiency of the system basing on the thermocurrent behavior alone. Even within the linear in temperature regime one needs additional information concerning electron electrical and thermal conductances and thermopower to make such estimates.

In a nanoscale junction consisting of a quantum dot or molecule sandwiched in between two electrodes, the thermocurrent value is controlled by several factors. These include temperatures of electrodes, bias and gate voltage, charging energy characterizing electron-electron interactions on the bridge and specific energies characterizing the coupling of the bridge to the electrodes and electron-phonon interactions. To theoretically analyze possible effect of the above factors on thermocurrent we employ a single-particle scattering approach pioneered by Landauer in the context of charge transport in mesoscopic systems.

For simplicity, we simulate the bridge in the considered junction by a single orbital, and we assume that it is symmetrically coupled to the electrodes. Then the thermocurrent is expressed in terms of electron transmission functions (which depend on all above mentioned factors) and Fermi distribution functions for the electrodes. We derive the expression for the electron transmission which remains valid for an arbitrary value of the difference between the temperatures of electrodes. This makes it suitable for analysis of thermoelectric transport both within and beyond linear in temperature regime. Using this expression, we show that varying the bias and gate voltage one may create favorable conditions for heat-to-electricity conversion in a junction assuming that the most important characteristic energies kT_0 , U and λ are fixed. Also, we analyze how electron-electron interactions on the bridge and electrons interactions with thermal phonons associated with electrodes may affect the thermoelectric properties of the considered systems. Coulomb repulsion between electrons opposes electron transport through the junction at small bias voltage. We show that this brings a partial suppression of the thermocurrent. Electron-phonon interactions in the electrodes assist in the increase of scattering probabilities

thus destroying the coherence of electron transport and bringing additional suppression of thermocurrent, as illustrated in Figs. 4,5.

The computational method employed in the present work may be further generalized to include the effect of molecular vibrations. Also, one may simulate the bridging molecule/quantum dot by several orbitals thus opening the way to studies of quantum interference effects. So, we believe that presented computational scheme and obtained results may be helpful for further understanding of thermoelectric properties of nanoscale systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by NSF-DMR-PREM 0934195. The author thanks G. M. Zimbovsky for help with the manuscript.

-
- [1] M. Paulsson and S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 241403 (2003).
- [2] X. Zheng, W. Zheng, Y. Wei, Z. Zeng, and J. Wang, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 8537 (2004).
- [3] D. Segal, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 165426 (2005).
- [4] E. Pop, Nano Research **3**, 146 (2010).
- [5] J. Koch, F. von Oppen, Y. Oreg, and E. Sela, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 195107 (2004).
- [6] M. Galperin, A. Nitzan, and M. A. Ratner, Mol. Phys. **106**, 397 (2008).
- [7] F. Giazotto, T. T. Heikkil, A. Luukanen, A. M. Savin, and J. P. Pekola, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 217 (2006).
- [8] P. Reddy, S.-Y. Jang, R. A. Segalman, A. Majumdar, Science **315**, 1568 (2007).
- [9] K. Baheti, J. A. Malen, P. Doak, P. Reddy, S.-Y. Jang, T. D. Tilley, A. Majumdar, and R. A. Segalman, Nano Lett. **8** 715 (2008).
- [10] C. M. Finch, V. M. Garcia-Suarez, and C. J. Lambert, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 033405 (2009).
- [11] L. Wang and B. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 177208 (2007).
- [12] L. E. Bell, Science **321**, 1457 (2008).
- [13] F. Pauli, J. K. Viljas, and J. C. Cuevas, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 035315 (2008).
- [14] S. Y. Quek, H. J. Choi, S. G. Louie, and J. B. Neaton, ACS Nano **5**, 551 (2010).
- [15] D. Nozaki, H. Sevincli, W. Li, R. Gutierrez, and G. Cuniberti, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 235406 (2010).
- [16] M. Burkle, L. A. Zotti, J. K. Viljas, D. Vonlanthen, A. Mishchenko, T. Wandlowski, M. Mayor, G. Schon, and F. Pauly, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115304 (2012).
- [17] Y. S. Liu, Y. R. Chen, Y. C. Chen, ACS Nano, **3**, 3497 (2009).
- [18] J. P. Bergfield, M. A. Solis, and C. A. Stafford, ACS Nano **4**, 5314 (2010).
- [19] S. Fahlvik Svensson, E. A. Hoffmann, N. Nakpathomkun, P. M. Wu, H. Q. Xu, H. A. Nilsson, D. Sanchez, V. Kashcheyevs, and H. Linke, New J. Phys. **15**, 105011 (2013). 146803 (2005).
- [20] M. Leijnse, M. R. Wegewijs, and K. Flensberg, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 045412 (2010). 195403 (2009).
- [21] J. Wang, L. Wang, Y. Wey, Y. Xing, and J. Wang, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **20**, 215 (2006).
- [22] D. Boese and R. Fazio, Europhys. Lett. **56**, 576 (2001). **85**, 155443 (2012).
- [23] J. Azema, A. M. Dare, S. Schafer, and P. Lombardo, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 075203 (2012). 066801 (2008).
- [24] M. Wierzbicki, and R. Swirkowicz, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 165334 (2010).
- [25] D. Sanchez and R. Lopez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 026804 (2013).
- [26] J. Meair and P. Jacquod, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **25**, 082201 (2013).
- [27] R. S. Whitney, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 115404 (2013).
- [28] Y.-C. Chang and D.-M. T. Kuo, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 245412 (2008).
- [29] Y. Dubi and M. Di Ventra, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 131 (2011).
van Houten, O. J. A. Buyk, M. A. A. Mabesoone, C. W. J. Beenakker, and C. T. Foxon, Europhys. Lett. **22**, 57 (1993). **19**, 103201 (2007).
- [30] M. Galperin, M. A. Ratner, and A. Nitzan, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **19**, 103201 (2007).
- [31] N. A. Zimbovskaya and M. R. Pederson, Phys. Rep. **87**, 1 (2011).
- [32] Y. Dubi and M. Di Ventra, Nano Lett. **9**, 97 (2009).
- [33] M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 3020 (1986). **83**, 195415 (2011).
- [34] N. A. Zimbovskaya and M. M. Kukulja, J. Chem. Phys. **131**, 114703 (2009).
- [35] N. A. Zimbovskaya, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, **26** xxx (2014).
- [36] J. L. D'Amato and H. M. Pastawski, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 7411 (1990).
- [37] P. Murphy, S. Mukerjee, and J. Moore, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 161406(R) (2008).
- [38] T. Markussen, A.-P. Jauho, and M. Brandbyge, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 035415 (2009).
- [39] Z. Wang, J. A. Carter, A. Lagutchev, Y. K. Koh, and N. H. Seong, Science **317**, 787 (2007).
- [40] N. Mingo, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 125402 (2006).
- [41] O. Karlstrom, H. Linke, G. Karlstrom, and A. Wacker, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 113415 (2011).
- [42] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3048 (1991).
- [43] S. Datta, *Quantum Transport: Atom to Transistor*, (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2005).
- [44] C. D. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics* (Plenum, New York, 2000).