Signature of the transition to a bound state in thermoelectric quantum transport
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We study a quantum dot coupled to two semiconducting reservoirs, when the dot level and the electrochemical potential are both close to a band edge in the reservoirs. This is modelled with an exactly solvable Hamiltonian without interactions (the Fano-Anderson model). The model is known to show an abrupt transition as the dot-reservoir coupling is increased into the strong-coupling regime, if the band’s density of states goes to zero at the band edge. This transition involves an infinite-lifetime bound state appearing in the band gap. We find a signature of this transition in a discontinuous behaviour of the dot’s transmission function. This can result in the steady-state DC electric and thermoelectric responses having a very strong dependence on coupling close to critical coupling. We give examples where the conductances and the thermoelectric power factor exhibit huge peaks at critical coupling, while the thermoelectric figure of merit $ZT$ grows as the coupling approaches critical coupling, with a small dip at critical coupling.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is great current interest in the thermal and thermoelectric transport properties of quantum dots or molecules coupled to electronic reservoirs. It is known that they can be used as heat engines (converting a heat flow into electrical power) or refrigerators (using electrical power to extract heat from an already cold reservoir of electrons). Experimental demonstrations include Refs. [1–6], while much of the theory is reviewed in Ref. [7]. However, few such works have considered the effects of the band structure of the electronic reservoirs on the quantum dot’s transport properties, such as when the reservoirs are semiconductors with a band gap.

Here we ask how the physics changes when the dot level is at an energy close to a band edge in the electronic reservoirs. As a first step in answering this question, we consider a non-interacting model, often known as the Fano-Anderson model [8–10] for which one can exactly solve the dynamics and extract all observables. We are particularly interested in the regime of strong coupling between the dot and reservoirs, see e.g. Refs. [10–16], because one expects that stronger coupling allows for larger currents, and hence larger power output of quantum heat-engines, such as this quantum dot thermoelectric.

The bosonic version of the Fano-Anderson model with band edges has been studied in the context of an atomic level coupled to a photonic continuum with a band structure. It has long been known that this model (and other similar models) exhibit an infinite-lifetime bound state, with the earlier works reviewed in Refs. [26] and [27]. As a result, the atomic state get partially trapped in this bound state, and never fully decays. This was recently observed in an NV centre in a waveguide, and is predicted to lead to various effects such as light-trapping and perfect subradiance. In the context of a quantum dot coupled to electronic reservoirs, the model has been greatly studied with the transition to an infinite-lifetime bound state discussed in Refs. [23–30], where it is often called a localized mode. The bound state also leads to Landau-Zener-Stueckelberg physics in a quantum dot coupled to a superconductor.

It is know that if the continuum’s density of states vanishes at the band gap, there is a transition from a situation without a bound state to one with a bound state, as the level’s coupling to the continuum is increased. Qualitatively, the critical coupling at which this transition occurs is of order of the energy difference between the level and reservoir’s band edge. We consider this transition for a quantum dot coupled to two reservoirs, and ask how the appearance of the infinite-lifetime bound state affects the dot’s occupation and transmission function.

In this work we study the DC transport properties determined by the dot’s transmission function. One might guess that the transition does not affect the transport properties, since an infinite-lifetime bound state does not carry any steady-state DC current. However, we show that the dot’s transmission function acquires singular properties at the transition. This leads to rapid

![FIG. 1. A sketch of the type of system considered here, a single-level quantum dot between two semiconductor reservoirs. Inset: To study the system dynamics as a function of the dot-reservoir coupling, one can place the dot in a STM geometry as shown (or a break junction).](image-url)
changes in the electrical conductivity $G$, thermal conductivity $C$, and Seebeck coefficient, $S$, when the electrochemical potential is close to the band edge. We discuss the consequences of this for the system’s thermoelectric power factor $GS^2$ and the dimensionless figure of merit $ZT = GS^2T/C$. We consider examples where the electrochemical potential is close to the band edge, and show that there is a huge peak in the thermoelectric power output accompanied by a sharp (but small amplitude) variation in $ZT$ close to critical coupling. This thermoelectric response is very different from that without band gaps \cite{11, 10, 19} where there is never a bound state. It means that the optimal thermoelectric power generation in such cases is close to critical coupling.

Neither the bound state nor the transition are captured by the standard “weak-coupling” theory reviewed in Chapters 8 and 9 of Ref. \cite{7}; this shows the importance of developing strong-coupling transport theories which capture the bound-state physics. By doing this for a non-interacting system in this work, we hope to open the way to developing a transport theory which captures strong coupling effects like bound states in interacting systems.

A. Contents of this work

Sections II and III give the model and its well-known formal exact solution. Section IV reviews earlier results on the dot occupation for two initial conditions: a sudden turn-on of the dot-reservoir couplings (quench) and an adiabatic turn-on. The central results of this work are then explained in Sections V-VII. Section V gives the transmission from reservoir L to R as a function of energy and coupling, showing its discontinuous behaviour as a function of the dot-reservoir coupling, when the coupling goes through its critical value. Section VI gives a hand-waving interpretation of these results in terms of a Lamb shift induced by level-repulsion between the reservoir states and the dot-level. Section VII gives the electric and thermoelectric response, showing examples where some transport properties have huge peaks (while others have small dips) at the critical value of the coupling.

II. THE MODEL

The Hamiltonian that we study describes a single-level quantum dot coupled to two reservoirs $\{L, R\}$

$$\hat{H} = \omega_d \hat{d}^\dagger \hat{d} + \sum_{\alpha, k} \omega_{\alpha k} \hat{c}_{\alpha k}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha k} + \sum_{\alpha, k} \left( g_{\alpha k} \hat{d}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\alpha k} + g_{\alpha k}^* \hat{c}_{\alpha k}^\dagger \hat{d} \right),$$

where $\hat{d}$ and $\hat{c}_{\alpha k}$ denote field operators for an electron on the dot and in mode $k$ of reservoir $\alpha \in \{L, R\}$ respectively; the corresponding energies are $\omega_d$ and $\omega_{\alpha k}$. Finally, $g_{\alpha k}$ describes the coupling between the dot and mode $k$ in reservoir $\alpha$. This model neglects electron-electron interactions on the dot. The simplest experimental implementation of such a model is to consider an interacting quantum dot (described by an Anderson impurity Hamiltonian) with a large enough magnetic field that the dot’s spin-state with higher energy is always empty, which makes the on-dot interaction term negligible. The electron reservoirs contain infinitely many modes described by continuous spectral densities:

$$J_\alpha(\omega) = \sum_{\alpha, k} |g_{\alpha k}|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_{\alpha k}).$$

Crucially, we do not take the wide-band limit, and instead consider the case where the dot level is close to a band edge. If not otherwise specified, the results in this work are for an arbitrary band structure in the reservoirs (possibly with multiple bands and band gaps). However, we will particularly consider reservoirs with a single band, when the dot-level is close to the lower band edge. The reservoir’s spectral density goes like a power law at this band edge, $\omega^s$, and is regularised with exponentially decay at high energies. In this case, we restrict our interest to two reservoirs made of the same material in the linear-response regime \cite{22} so

$$J_L(\omega) = J_R(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{K}{2} \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_c} \right)^s e^{-\omega/\omega_c} & \text{for } \omega > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \omega < 0, \end{cases}$$

where (without loss of generality) we take the zero of energy to be the band edge.

III. REVIEW: SOLUTION VIA LAPLACE TRANSFORM OF EQUATIONS OF MOTION

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) is quadratic, so it can be solved using many different methods; such as Heisenberg equations of motion \cite{11, 10, 19, 21, 31, 33, 36, 43}, Feynman-Vernon path integrals \cite{33}, extended quantum Langevin equations \cite{53}, Green’s functions \cite{8} and Keldysh Green’s functions \cite{21, 31, 33, 36, 43}. Here we use the Heisenberg equations of motion, which consist of a set of linear first-order differential equations. \cite{11, 10, 19, 21, 31, 33, 36, 43} These can be solved using a standard Laplace transform method, but we briefly review the method here to fix the ideas and the notation. Let

$$\hat{D}(z) = \int_0^\infty dt e^{zt} \hat{d}(t),$$

where the operator is time-dependent because we work in the Heisenberg picture. In Laplace space, the dot annihilation operator satisfies

$$\hat{D}(z) = \frac{1}{z + i(\omega_d + \Sigma(z))} \left( \hat{d}_0 - i \sum_{\alpha, k} \frac{g_{\alpha k}}{z + i\omega_{\alpha k}} \hat{c}_{\alpha k} \right),$$

(5)
where $\hat{d}_{\alpha k 0}$ and $\hat{c}_{\alpha k 0}$ are the operators at time $t = 0$. The prefactor contains the self-energy

$$\Sigma(z) = \sum_{\alpha, k} \frac{|g_{\alpha k}|^2}{iz - \omega_{\alpha k}} = \int d\omega' \frac{J(\omega')}{iz - \omega'}, \quad (6)$$

where $J(\omega) = J_l(\omega) + J_R(\omega)$. For the spectral densities in Eq. (3) this is

$$\Sigma(z) = -K\Gamma(1 + s) \left( -\frac{iz}{\omega_c} \right)^s \Gamma \left( -s, -\frac{iz}{\omega_c} \right) e^{-iz/\omega_c}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Gamma(a)$ and $\Gamma(a, w)$ respectively denote the complete and incomplete Gamma functions.

### A. Inverse Laplace transform

The time-dependence of the dot’s state is given by the inverse Laplace transform of Eq. (5). This is a product of two terms, so the inverse Laplace transform is a convolution in the time domain of the inverse Laplace transform of each term. The inverse transform of the expression in brackets in Eq. (5) is straightforward, and we therefore focus on the prefactor. We define $\varphi(t)$ as the inverse Laplace transform of this prefactor $\Sigma(1/(z+i(\omega_d+\Sigma(z))))$. It is given by an integration along a vertical line in the complex plane, which we close as in Fig. 2. This process leads to a solution in two parts: the first being the integral along the branch cuts, and the second coming from poles of Eq. (6). We will see that the branch cuts correspond to the continuum of states, while the poles correspond to bound states in the band gaps.

The branch cut is always present, while the poles are only there if $z + i(\omega_d + \Sigma(z)) = 0$ has a solution. It is straightforward to show that any such solution is purely imaginary and so is given by the (real) zeros of the function

$$\Omega(\omega) = \omega - \omega_d - \int d\omega' \frac{J(\omega')}{\omega - \omega'}. \quad (8)$$

The zeros of $\Omega(\omega)$ only occur at values of $\omega$ where $J(\omega) = 0$, otherwise the integral in Eq. (8) is divergent, which means poles only occur at energies in the band gaps of the reservoirs.

The poles given by the zeros of $\Omega(\omega)$, can be shown to correspond to eigenstates of the full Hamiltonian for the dot coupled to the reservoirs, see Eq. (4). To see this, one must perform a Bogoliubov transformation on Eq. (4), so it takes the form of an arrowhead matrix, whose eigenvalues are given in Ref. [46]. Upon taking the continuum limit, the surviving eigenvalues (those that do not fall in the continuum) are seen to satisfy $\Omega(\omega) = 0$. Thus, the poles in the inverse Laplace transform correspond to eigenstates of Eq. (4) in the band gaps. These eigenstates are combinations of dot and reservoir states, and are usually called “bound states” or “localized modes” because they do not decay into the continuum. Since $\Omega(\omega)$ is an increasing function of $\omega$ in any band gap, there is at most one bound state (pole) per band gap.

The case in Eq. (3) has a single band gap (which extends over all negative energies), it thus features at most one bound state. It has $\Omega(-\infty) = -\infty$, with $\Omega(\omega)$ monotonically increasing for $\omega < 0$, so the bound state exists in the band gap if and only if $\Omega(\omega \to 0^-) > 0$. Given Eq. (6), this criterion becomes $K > K_*$, where the critical coupling

$$K_* = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } s \leq 0, \\
\omega_d/\Gamma(s) & \text{for } s > 0.
\end{cases} \quad (9)$$

This is sketched in Fig. 3. For $s < 0$ (for example a square-root divergence in the density of states at the band edge) the bound state is present at all couplings. In contrast, for all $s > 0$, there is no bound state at weak coupling, but one appears at a transition when one increases the coupling to $K = K_*$. The critical coupling, $K_*$, is proportional to the energy gap $\omega_d$ between the dot level and the band edge, hence the transition will be easily observed in systems with the dot level close to the band edge. In contrast, the wide-band limit corresponds to the dot level infinitely far from any band edge, so one will not see a bound state for any finite dot-reservoir coupling.

In general one finds that

$$\varphi(t) = \int_0^\infty d\omega S(\omega)e^{-i\omega t} + \sum_n Z_n e^{-i\omega_n t}, \quad (10)$$

where $\int_0^\infty$ in the first term is an integral over all bands (all $\omega$ where $J(\omega) \neq 0$) and is due to the continuum of states (branch cuts), while the second term is a sum over all bound states (poles). Eq. (10) introduces two quantities, $Z_n$ and $S(\omega)$. Firstly, the continuum contribution
contains \( S(\omega) = \frac{J(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_d + \Lambda(\omega))^2 + \pi^2 J(\omega)^2} \), \( \Lambda(\omega) \) corresponds to the Lamb shift which accounts for the renormalization of the dot level due to the coupling to the reservoirs. It is given by the real part of \( \Sigma(-i\omega) \) in Eq. (6), and hence equals the Cauchy principal value integral,

\[
\Lambda(\omega) = \int \frac{d\omega'}{\omega - \omega'} J(\omega') \tag{12}
\]

It can be shown that \( S(\omega) \) is the local density of states of the dot. \( \text{[23]} \)

Secondly, \( Z_{sn} \) is the overlap between the dot-level and the \( n \)th bound state, with energy \( \omega_{sn} \). It reads

\[
Z_{sn} = \begin{cases} 
(1 + \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{J(\omega)}{\omega - \omega_{sn}})^{-1} & \text{for } K > K_{sn}, \\
0 & \text{for } K < K_{sn},
\end{cases} \tag{13}
\]

where \( K_{sn} \) is the critical coupling above which the \( n \)th bound state appears. For the spectral density in Eq. (3), where there is only one bound state with critical coupling \( K_{sn} \) given in Eq. (9), the precise nature of the discontinuity at \( K = K_{sn} \) is seen by taking \( K - K_{sn} \) to be small, then, for \( 0 < s < 1 \),

\[
Z_s = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\omega_c}{s} \left[ B(s) \right]^{1/s} [\Gamma(s) (K - K_{sn})]^{(1-s)/s} & \text{for } K > K_{sn}, \\
0 & \text{for } K < K_{sn},
\end{cases} \tag{14}
\]

where \( B(s) = \sin(\pi s)/\pi K \). For \( s > 1 \), the transition involves \( Z_s \) jumping from 0 to \((s - 1)/(s - 1 + \omega_d/\omega_c)\).

### IV. REVIEW: DOT DYNAMICS

In the context of an atom coupled to a photonic band-gap material, the dynamics of the atom’s decay were studied in detail in a number of works, starting with Refs. \( 17, 20 \) reviewed in Refs. \( 20 \) and \( 27 \). A series of works independently discovered the same physics in the context of a quantum dot coupled to electronic reservoirs. \( 21, 22, 23, 24 \) Photon statistics were also addressed \( 21, 22, 23 \). These works thoroughly investigated the transient dynamics of the dot state, associated with its (partial) relaxation. Here we recall the physics of this, concentrating on the long-time dot occupation.

Because the bound state induces an infinite memory time in the dot, \( 17, 20, 22 \) the long-time state of the dot is sensitive to how the dot is prepared. This preparation will vary from experiment to experiment, and so we consider two preparation protocols here; “initial quench” and “adiabatic preparation”. The former was extensively studied \( 17, 21, 22, 23 \), while the latter is similar to Ref. \( 32 \) in that it uses an additional reservoir interaction to ensure the adiabatic preparation. A third protocol, known as “partition free”, is discussed in the literature \( 20, 27 \) but we do not address it here.

#### A. Initial quench

Here, we consider the dynamics of the dot occupation \( n(t) \) for an initial product state between the dot and the reservoirs, with the dot in a chosen state and the reservoirs in a thermal state. This is natural when the system and reservoirs are initially decoupled, and we instantaneously turn on the coupling (a quench) at time \( t = 0 \). The state at the moment of the quench \( (t = 0) \) is thus

\[ \hat{\rho}(t = 0) = \hat{\rho}_0 \otimes \hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}, \text{L}} \otimes \hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}, \text{R}}. \] \( \text{(15)} \)

where \( \hat{\rho}_0 \) is the initial density matrix of the quantum dot and \( \hat{\rho}_{\alpha, \text{eq}} \) is the equilibrium density matrix for reservoir \( \alpha \),

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\alpha, \text{eq}} = \frac{e^{-\beta_\alpha \sum_k (\omega_{ak} - \mu_\alpha) \hat{c}_k\hat{c}_k^\dagger}}{\text{Tr} \left( e^{-\beta_\alpha \sum_k (\omega_{ak} - \mu_\alpha) \hat{c}_k\hat{c}_k^\dagger} \right)}, \tag{16}
\]

with \( \beta_\alpha \) and \( \mu_\alpha \) denoting the inverse temperature and the chemical potential of reservoir \( \alpha \). The average number of electrons on the dot is

\[ n(t) = \langle \hat{d}^\dagger(t) \hat{d}(t) \rangle, \] \( \text{(17)} \)

where \( \langle \cdots \rangle = \text{Tr} \left[ \cdots \hat{\rho}(t = 0) \right] \). The exact dynamics of the field operators derived above, provide a full solution of the model. So the occupation for any time is

\[
n(t) = n_0 | \varphi(t) |^2 + \int B \, d\omega \frac{J(\omega)}{J(\omega)} | \tilde{\varphi}(t, \omega) |^2, \tag{18}
\]

where \( n_0 \) is the initial occupation of the dot. Here, \( F(\omega) = \sum_\alpha J_\alpha(\omega) f_\alpha(\omega)/J(\omega) \), so it is the “average” of...
FIG. 4. Long-time dot occupation versus the system-reservoir coupling, $K$, when the two reservoirs have the same temperature and bias. The $J(\omega)$ for this plot is Eq. (3) with $\omega_c = 10\omega_d$, $s = 1/2$, $\mu = -0.01\omega_d$. The solid lines representing the occupation a long-time after a quench, Eq. (21), and exhibit a clear change of behaviour for $K = K^* \simeq 0.564\omega_d$. When $K > K^*$, the occupation at arbitrarily long times depends on the dot’s initial occupations, $n_0$. The dashed lines are the occupation a long time after an adiabatic preparation, Eq. (28), and do not show the transition.

the Fermi functions $f_L(\omega)$ and $f_R(\omega)$. The two other functions are $\varphi(t)$ given in Eq. (10) and

$$\psi(t, \omega) = i \int_0^t dt' \varphi(t') e^{-i\omega(t-t')}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

The long-time limits are obtained using the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, which states that the Fourier transform of an integrable function vanishes at infinity, so

$$\varphi(t \to \infty) = \sum_n Z_{n} e^{-i\omega_n t}. \hspace{1cm} (20)$$

The long-time limit of $n(t)$ is easily obtained using arguments of this type, but the result is ugly. Appendix A gives this result, and uses particle conservation to find a more compact expression for any situation with at most one bound state. This reads

$$n_{\text{long-time}} = \int_0^\infty d\omega S(\omega) F(\omega) + Z^2 \left( n_0 + \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{J(\omega)F(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_s)^2} \right). \hspace{1cm} (21)$$

One sees that when there is no bound state ($Z_s = 0$), the long-time limit of the dot occupation is independent of the initial dot occupation, $n_0$. In contrast, when a bound state exists ($Z_s \neq 0$), the long-time occupation depends on the initial dot occupation, $n_0$, because the dot gets partially trapped in its initial state forever. This is seen in Fig. 4, where the dot occupation a long time after a quench depends on the choice of $n_0$ for all $K > K^*$.

B. Adiabatic preparation

In quantum dots or molecular nanostructures, a rapid quench of the dot-reservoir coupling can be diffcult. At the same time the bound state will not have entirely infinite lifetime, because weak inelastic scattering effects (phonons, etc) which are beyond Eq. (1), will give it a long but finite lifetime. Hence, it is natural to consider an initial state which has had non-zero dot-reservoir coupling for so long that even the bound state has relaxed to its steady state at the start of the experiment. Similiarly to Ref. [32], we model this very slow equilibration of the bound state by adding an infinitesimally weak coupling between the bound state and the reservoirs. Here we show that with this initial condition, the dot occupation shows no discontinuity at the transition, see the dashed line in Fig. 4. However, the transition is visible as a discontinuity in the following correlation function of the dot occupation

$$G(t, \tau) = \langle \hat{n}(t + \tau) \hat{n}(t) \rangle - \langle \hat{n}(t + \tau) \rangle \langle \hat{n}(t) \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where we assume the system was in a product state with the reservoirs at time 0, but that time $t$ is so much larger that the system (including any bound states) has arrived at its steady-state. To ensure that the bound state (if it exists) arrives at its steady state by time $t$, we add a small constant $\eta$ to the coupling $J(\omega)$, so we replace $J(\omega)$ by

$$\tilde{J}_\alpha(\omega) = J_\alpha(\omega) + \eta\kappa_\alpha \hspace{1cm} (23)$$

in all quantities (indicating them with a tilde). For small but finite $\eta$, the bound state is replaced by a resonance, which gives a narrow Lorentzian in the density of states.

This is a crude way of mimicking the weak inelastic effects that will give the bound state a finite lifetime, but will be sufficient for our purposes. The Lorentzian tends to a delta-function as $\eta \to 0$, and the resonance tends to an infinite lifetime bound state. As $\tilde{J}(\omega)$ represents a continuum extending over the whole range of energies, the formulae derived before can be used here upon extending the integrations to all energies, and dropping the $Z_s$-terms. At the end of the calculation, we take $t \to \infty$ and then $\eta \to 0$, to recover the physics of the bound state (including the $Z_s$ term) between time $t$ and $t + \tau$ while ensuring that even the bound state was completely relaxed to its steady state at time $t$.

In this situation the self-energy is

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(x - \omega) = \Sigma(x - \omega) - i\pi\eta(\kappa_L + \kappa_R) \text{sgn}(x). \hspace{1cm} (24)$$

The Lamb shift is unchanged as the additional term in the self-energy is purely imaginary. The steady-state occupation ($t \to \infty$) for finite $\eta$ reads

$$\tilde{n}_{\text{long-time}} = \int_B d\omega \tilde{S}(\omega) \tilde{F}(\omega). \hspace{1cm} (25)$$
We now take the limit $\eta \to 0$. Crucially in the regimes where $J(\omega) = 0$ the limits are\cite{52}

\[
\lim_{\eta \to 0} \tilde{F}(\omega) = \kappa_L f_L(\omega) + \kappa_R f_R(\omega) \quad \frac{\kappa_L + \kappa_R}{\kappa_L + \kappa_R},
\]

\[
\lim_{\eta \to 0} \tilde{S}(\omega) = \sum_n Z_{sn} \delta(\omega - \omega_{sn}).
\]

This yields for $\eta \to 0$

\[
\tilde{n}_{\text{long-time}} = \int_B d\omega S(\omega) \tilde{F}(\omega) + \sum_n Z_{sn} F(\omega_{sn}),
\]

which is a continuous function of dot-reservoir coupling (see e.g. the dashed line in Fig. 4).

The correlation function for $t \to \infty$ with finite $\eta$, reads\cite{53}

\[
\tilde{G}(\tau) = \int d\omega d\omega' \tilde{F}(\omega) (1 - \tilde{F}(\omega')) \tilde{S}(\omega) \tilde{S}(\omega') e^{i(\omega - \omega') \tau}.
\]

Taking the limit $\eta \to 0$ and then the limit of large $\tau$, we find for any situation with only one bound state that

\[
G_{\text{long-time}} = Z^2 F(\omega_s)(1 - F(\omega_s)).
\]

We recall that $Z_n$ in Eq. (13) is zero for dot-system coupling $K < K_a$ and non-zero for $K > K_a$. Thus, the correlations decay if there is no bound state ($K < K_a$), so $G_{\text{long-time}}$ is zero. However when the bound state is present, then the correlations remain for all $\tau$ (up to the inelastic timescale).

For multiple bound states, $\tilde{G}(\tau)$ decays at large $\tau$ to coherent oscillations, due to beating between with different bound states\cite{53}

\[
G_{\text{long-time}} = \sum_{n,m} Z_{sn} Z_{sm} F_{sn} (1 - F_{sm}) e^{i(\omega_{sn} - \omega_{sm}) \tau},
\]

where we write $F(\omega_{sn})$ as $F_{sn}$ for compactness. This is reminiscent of the decay of a driven-dissipative classical system to a limit cycle, although here the oscillations in the long-time limit are of quantum origin.

Note that above we explicitly introduced extremely weak coupling of the reservoirs to all states (including the bound state), to ensure that the bound state is thermalized at the large time $t$. Of course, this coupling will cut-off the correlations induced by the bound state at the timescale of order $1/\eta$. In physical systems, this coupling mimics weak inelastic effects (which are always present in such quantum dot systems) so the correlations induced by the bound state will be cut-off on the timescale of inelastic scattering. However, at low temperatures this can be orders of magnitude longer than the decay in the absence of the bound state.

One of us (M.H.) initially derived\cite{53} Eqs. (28,30) with the Keldysh method in Ref. [52], before we recovered them using the above Heisenberg equations of motion.

V. CURRENTS AND THE TRANSMISSION FUNCTION

Now we turn to the central subject of this work; the steady-state DC transport properties of quantum dots which exhibit a transition to a bound state, due to a band gap in the reservoirs. This DC transport was not considered in detail in the works we cited above, yet it determines the electric and thermoelectric properties of the dot.

To be more precise, the steady-state DC currents (particle current, electrical current, heat current, etc) are defined as the zero-frequency component of the long-time limit of the currents. We specify this because in some cases the long-time limit of the currents have finite-frequency oscillations super-imposed on the zero-frequency current.\cite{53} However, for the explicit spectrum considered here in Eq. (3), there are no such oscillations, so the steady-state current is time-independent (purely DC). The steady-state DC currents do not depend on the initial state of the dot, and so are the same for both preparation protocols discussed in Section IV. This is very different from the long-time limits of the dot occupation and the current’s oscillatory component (when it persists at long-time\cite{53}), which both depend on the initial dot state.

As the bound state does not contribute directly to the steady-state DC currents, one might guess that the sudden appearance of the bound state at critical coupling ($K = K_*$) will not cause an abrupt change in properties of the steady-state current — unlike the abrupt change in the nature of the dot occupation seen in Fig. 4. However, this is not the case. We find that the continuum states (which carry the steady state DC currents) exhibit an abrupt change at the transition. We will show that there is a discontinuity in the $K$ dependence of the dot’s transmission function at $K = K_*$, which can have a strong effect on the dot’s electric and thermoelectric transport properties.

The particle current into reservoir $\alpha$ is defined as

\[
\dot{j}^{(N)}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \sum_k \langle \hat{c}^\dagger_{\alpha k}(t) \hat{c}_{\alpha k}(t) \rangle.
\]

Then at time $t$ after a quench,

\[
\dot{j}^{(N)}(t) = 2 \text{Im} \left( n_0 \phi^*(t) \int d\omega J_{\alpha}(\omega) \psi(t,\omega) \right.
\]

\[
+ \int d\omega J_{\alpha}(\omega) f_{\alpha}(\omega) \psi^*(t,\omega) e^{-i\omega t}
\]

\[
+ \int d\omega d\omega' J_{\alpha}(\omega) J_{\alpha}(\omega') F(\omega') \times \psi^*(t,\omega') \chi(t,\omega,\omega') \right)
\]

where we have defined

\[
\chi(t,\omega,\omega') = i \int_0^t dt' \psi(t',\omega') e^{-i\omega(t-t')}.
\]
These currents do not cancel \((j_1^{(N)}(t) + j_R^{(N)}(t) \neq 0)\), while the dot occupation is changing with time. However, when there is at most one bound state, the dot occupation reaches a steady-state at long times,\(^{53}\) so one can use particle conservation to define, \(j_{\text{steady}}^{(N)} = j_R^{(N)}(t \to \infty) = -j_1^{(N)}(t \to \infty)\). The steady state current is derived through the same process that led to the long-term occupation probability. After some algebraic manipulations (see Appendix A) we find that this steady-state DC current takes a Landauer form:

\[
j_{\text{steady}}^{(N)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} T(\omega)(f_L(\omega) - f_R(\omega)), \tag{35}
\]

with the transmission function

\[
T(\omega) = \frac{4\pi^2 J_L(\omega) J_R(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_d - \Lambda(\omega))^2 + \pi^2 J(\omega)^2}, \tag{36}
\]

for all \(\omega\) where \(J_L,R(\omega) \neq 0\). The transmission function is zero for any \(\omega\) where \(J_L(R)(\omega) = 0\). Here \(\Lambda(\omega)\) is the Lamb shift in Eq. (12). This result does not depend on the bound state (which does not carry DC currents), but do not depend on the continuum of states that carry these currents, but do not depend on the bound state (which does not carry DC currents). As only the bound state carries the infinite-time memory of the initial state, these steady-state DC currents are independent of the initial dot state.

\section{A. Transmission for \(0 < s < 1\)}

For the spectrum in Eq. (3) with \(0 < s < 1\) the transmission as a function of energy is qualitatively similar to that shown for \(s = 1/2\) in Fig. 4. The transition can be clearly seen as a discontinuity of the transmission at the band edge, \(T(\omega \to 0^+)\), as a function of \(K\). The nature of the discontinuity at small \(\omega\) depends on the exponent \(s\). For \(0 < s < 1\), the transmission at small \(\omega\) is

\[
T(\omega \to 0^+) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\pi^2 K^2 (\omega/\omega_d)^{2s}}{\Gamma^2(s)(K-K_*)^2} & \text{for } K \neq K_*, \\
\frac{\sin^2(\pi s)}{\Gamma(2s)} & \text{for } K = K_*.
\end{cases} \tag{39}
\]

Hence, the transmission at the band edge has a discontinuity at \(K = K_*\); it vanishes at the band edge for all \(K \neq K_*\), but is finite for \(K = K_*\). Indeed when \(s = 1/2\) and \(K = K_*\), the transmission at the band edge is perfect; \(T(\omega \to 0^+) = 1\). While the transmission is only a discontinuous function of \(K\) at \(\omega \to 0^+\), it changes rapidly close to the transition for any \(\omega \ll \omega_d\) (as seen in Fig. 5). Furthermore, for \(1/2 \leq s < 1\) the transmission function has a peak with perfect transmission (i.e. transmission equal to one at a certain value of \(\omega\)) for all \(K < K_*\), while no such perfect transmission peak exists for \(K > K_*\). For \(0 < s < 1/2\), the situation is a bit more complicated because there is a small regime at \(K > K_*\) with a double peak in the the transmission, we will discuss this in detail elsewhere.\(^{55}\)

\section{B. Transmission for \(s > 1\)}

For the spectrum in Eq. (3) with \(s > 1\), the transmission, \(T(\omega)\), has a different functional forms at small \(\omega\) for \(K < K_*\), \(K = K_*\) and \(K > K_*\). However, unlike for \(0 < s < 1\), all three functions vanish at \(\omega \to 0^+\). In this case, the most obvious discontinuity can be described as follows. As \(K\) approaches \(K_*\) from below, the transmission peak moves towards the band edge (as for \(s = 1/2\) in Fig. 5). However, unlike for \(s = 1/2\), the peak gets
The transmission given in Eq. (36) has a peak at $\omega = \omega_d - \Lambda(\omega)$ for $s > 0$, as in Fig. 5, this peak moves to lower energies as the coupling is increased (for $K < K_*$). This corresponds to an increasingly negative Lamb shift of the dot level, which the coupling also gives a finite lifetime, broadening it into a resonance. When the coupling reaches the critical value $K_*$, the peak sits exactly at the band edge. So at this and only this coupling, the transmission at the band edge can be finite. When the coupling $K$ becomes larger than $K_*$, the Lamb shift is so large that it has moved the peak out of the band.

One can naively interpret this as the Lamb shift having pushed the dot level out of the band, at which point the level becomes a bound state with energy given by the $\omega$ which satisfies $\Omega(\omega) = 0$ in Eq. (8). However, more precisely, the dot state is then a superposition of the bound state and continuum states, so there is still transmission through the dot at $K > K_*$, but it no longer exhibits a peak with transmission equal to one.

This hand-waving argument does not work very well for $s < 1/2$. For $0 < s < 1/2$, it does not capture the small region for $K > K_*$, where there are two peaks in the transmission, an effect that we discuss in detail elsewhere. However it fails completely for $s < 0$, because the usual weak-coupling (Fermi golden rule) argument does not reproduce the bound state that is always narrow as it approaches the band edge, so its width vanishes when it reaches the band edge at $K = K_*$. In other words, just below the transition (when $K - K_*$ is small and negative), the transmission goes from zero at $\omega = 0$ up to a peak of perfect transmission (transmission of one) and then drops back down to a transmission close to zero in an energy window of order $|K - K_*|$. In contrast, this peak is completely absent for all $K > K_*$ (where the peak has become the bound state). Thus, here the discontinuity at $K = K_*$ is the disappearance of this sharp peak in the transmission at small $\omega$.

C. Transmission for negative $s$

Above we treated cases with positive $s$, for which the reservoir’s spectral density vanished at the band edge, $J(\omega \to 0^+) \to 0$. The behaviour is very different when $J(\omega)$ diverges at the band edge, as it does for $s < 0$ in Eq. (5). The integrals become ill-defined if $s < -1$, suggesting that $s < -1$ is unphysical. However, the regime of $-1 < s < 0$ is well-defined, with $s = -1/2$ being of particular relevance in the context of both one-dimensional reservoirs and the quasi-particle spectrum in superconducting reservoirs.

For $-1 < s < 0$, there is a bound state at all values of the coupling and we find that transmission always exhibits a peak at the band edge, because $J(\omega)$ diverges at this point. There we have $T(\omega \to 0^+) \to \sin^2(\pi s)$. This result holds for any coupling, see for example Fig. 6. Thus, even for very small coupling, where one would guess that the transmission would be a narrow Lorentzian centred at the dot-level, there is a second narrow peak at the band edge.

VI. INTERPRETATION AS A LAMB SHIFT

To get an more intuitive feel for the physics, this section describes the physics qualitatively by interpreting the Lamb shift in terms of level-repulsion between the dot level and the reservoir’s continuum.

In this weak coupling limit, Fermi’s golden rule tells us that the coupling to a continuum has two effects on the discrete levels of a quantum system. Firstly, the coupling shifts the energies of the discrete levels; this is known as a Lamb shift. Secondly the levels are broadened to become resonances because the state acquires a finite lifetime. The usual weak-coupling (Fermi golden rule) formula for the Lamb shift of the quantum dot level is $\Lambda(\omega_d)$, with $\Lambda(\omega)$ given in Eq. (12). This fits with the exact result in Eq. (12) when the coupling is weak enough that the physics is dominated by $\omega \approx \omega_d$.

The Lamb shift has the following hand-waving interpretation in terms of the level repulsion between the dot level and individual continuum levels. The coupling to a continuum level with higher energy than the dot level will shift the dot level down in energy (with the continuum level being shifted up slightly). At the same time, the coupling to a continuum level with lower energy than the dot level will shift the dot level up in energy. The Lamb shift is the sum of all of these small shifts. If the continuum has a constant density of states (wide band limit), then the shifts up and down cancel, and there is no Lamb shift. However, if the continuum has a higher density of states above the dot level than below it (as for Eq. (3) with $s > 0$), the Lamb shift is negative and moves the dot level to lower energies.

The transmission given in Eq. (36) has a peak at $\omega = \omega_d - \Lambda(\omega)$. For $s > 0$, as in Fig. 5, this peak moves to lower energies as the coupling is increased (for $K < K_*$). This corresponds to an increasingly negative Lamb shift of the dot level, which the coupling also gives a finite lifetime, broadening it into a resonance. When the coupling reaches the critical value $K_*$, the peak sits exactly at the band edge. So at this and only this coupling, the transmission at the band edge can be finite. When the coupling becomes larger than $K_*$, the Lamb shift is so large that it has moved the peak out of the band.
FIG. 7. Transport coefficients and thermoelectric parameters versus coupling for different values of the chemical potential, when $J(\omega)$ is given by Eq. (3) with $s = 1/2$. Other parameters are $\omega_c = 10\omega_d$ and $T = 0.03\omega_d/k_B$. The transport coefficients are plotted in dimensionless units, so the electrical conductance is shown as $\bar{h}G/e^2$, the heat conductance as $C/(k_B\omega_d)$, and the Seebeck coefficient as $eS/k_B$. The thermoelectric power factor in dimensionless units is $hGS^2/k_B^2$. The dashed red vertical line indicates the critical coupling $K_*$, with $K_*/\omega_d \simeq 0.56$ for these parameters.

The power factor $GS^2$ determines the maximum power output of any given thermoelectric in the linear response regime, this maximum power is

$$P_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{4} GS^2 \Delta T^2$$

where $\Delta T$ is the temperature difference across the thermoelectric. This is determined by defining the power output as $P = J_{\text{steady}}(N)\Delta \mu$, when the potential difference across the thermoelectric is $\Delta \mu = \mu_R - \mu_L$, and tuning $\Delta \mu$ to maximize $P$.

The dimensionless figure of merit $ZT$ is a measure of a thermoelectric’s maximum efficiency. For any given thermoelectric, the efficiency (defined as power output over heat input) as a function of power output is

$$\eta(P) = \eta_{\text{Carnot}} \frac{P/P_{\text{max}}}{2 + 2/ZT - \sqrt{1 - P/P_{\text{max}}}}$$

where $\eta_{\text{Carnot}}$ is the Carnot efficiency for this $\Delta T$. Hence, for any given $P/P_{\text{max}}$ the efficiency is increased by increasing $ZT$. There are two well-known results of this formula. Firstly, the efficiency at maximum power is $\eta(P_{\text{max}}) = \eta_{\text{Carnot}} ZT/(2ZT + 4)$. Secondly, the maximum efficiency — achieved by tuning $P$ to maximize $\eta$ (physically this is done by tuning $\Delta \mu$) — is

$$\eta_{\text{max}} = \frac{\eta_{\text{Carnot}} \sqrt{ZT + 1} - 1}{\sqrt{ZT + 1} + 1}.$$
so only a thermoelectric with $ZT \to \infty$ can achieve Carnot efficiency. The power output at $\eta_{\text{max}}$ is

$$P = \frac{1}{2} GS^2 \times \frac{\sqrt{ZT+1}}{1 + \frac{1}{2} ZT + \sqrt{ZT+1}} \times \Delta T^2 \quad (43)$$

Hence, one can improve a thermoelectric’s power output without affecting its efficiency, if one can increase $GS^2$ without significantly reducing $ZT$.

Taking the linear-response regime of Eqs. (35) and (38), the thermoelectric coefficients are given by

- electric conductance, $G = e^2 I_0$, \hspace{1cm} (44a)
- thermal conductance, $C = \frac{1}{T} \left( I_2 - \frac{I_2^2}{I_0} \right)$, \hspace{1cm} (44b)
- Seebeck coefficient, $S = \frac{I_1}{e T I_0}$, \hspace{1cm} (44c)
- power factor, $GS^2 = \frac{I_1^2}{T^2 I_0^2}$, \hspace{1cm} (44d)
- dimensionless figure of merit, $ZT = \frac{I_1^2}{I_0 I_2 - I_1^2}$. \hspace{1cm} (44e)

Here $e$ is the electron charge, $T$ is the average temperature of the two reservoirs, and

$$I_n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} (\omega - \mu)^n T(\omega)(-f'(\omega)),$$ \hspace{1cm} (45)

with $f'(\omega)$ being the derivative of the Fermi distribution; $-f'(\omega) = \beta/(2 \cosh(\beta(\omega - \mu)/2)).$

From these equations, we see that the change of behaviour of the transmission at low energies leads to rapid changes for the transport coefficients when one considers the electrochemical potential below the band edge ($\mu < 0$). Indeed, $-f'(\omega)$ is basically a box centered on $\mu$ of width $\sim T$ that is superimposed on the transmission function. If one then takes $\mu$ to be negative and $T$ of the order of $|\mu|$, the transport coefficients will be dominated by the small $\omega$ behaviour of $T(\omega)$. These coefficients carry a signature of the discontinuities of $T(\omega)$ in their rapid change with $K$ when it is close to $K_*$, see Fig. 7. In some cases the change is so rapid, that the curves looks discontinuous, however they only becomes strictly discontinuous in the $\mu \to 0$ and $T \to 0$ limit, which is also the limit where $C$ and $S$ become vanishingly small.

The conductances ($G, C$) and thermoelectric power factor ($GS^2$) exhibit huge peaks at $K \approx K_*$, whereas the Seebeck coefficient ($S$) and the figure of merit ($ZT$) have small dips at this point. The dips in $S$ and $ZT$ are a competition between peaks in the numerators and denominators in Eqs. (44c,44e), with the peak in the denominator winning over that in the numerator in the cases we have studied. In the limit $\mu \to 0$ and $T \to 0$, the peaks and dips become discontinuities in the derivative of the function in question, and sit exactly at $K_*$.

What is interesting from the point of view of engineering the thermoelectric response is that the thermoelectric power factor $GS^2$ has a huge peak near at $K \approx K_*$.

Hence, if one has a thermoelectric system of this type with the electro-chemical potential close to or below the band edge, one can get much bigger power for approximately the same efficiency by taking $K \approx K_*$. What is more, the huge peak in $GS^2$ almost aligns with the modest increase in $ZT$, so one can get much more power, with a modest increase in efficiency.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We consider a quantum dot coupled to reservoirs with band gaps. For reservoir’s spectra that vanish at the band edge, an infinite-lifetime bound state is known to appear in the band gap when the dot-reservoir coupling exceeds a critical value. We show that this transition induces a discontinuities in the dot’s transmission. This has a strong signature in the electric and thermoelectric transport properties, whenever the reservoirs’ electrochemical potentials are close to or below the band edge. Under such conditions the system’s optimal thermoelectric response is close to the critical dot-reservoir coupling, $K \approx K_*; a$ with a huge increase in power output accompanied by a small change in efficiency.

For reservoir spectra that diverge at the band edge, it is known that there is a bound state for all coupling. We show that dot’s transmission has a peak at the band edge, even at arbitrarily weak coupling. This peak will dominate transport whenever the electrochemical potential is near the band edge. The usual argument, that the dot’s transmission is a Lorentzian centred at the dot level, will give erroneous transport properties in such situations.

The richness of this physics could not be guessed from the usual weak-coupling arguments, which suggests that other surprises may await us in the strong-coupling limit when we add electron-electron interactions.
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Appendix A: Some details on the calculation of long-time occupation and current

Here we combine the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma and continuity equation to obtain the long-time limits of the dot occupation (Eq. (21)) and particle (Eq. (45)). We focus on situations with a single energy band for positive energies, that is, with only one bound state.
Using the same kind of arguments that gave \( \varphi(t \to \infty) \) in Eq. (20), we obtain

\[
n_{\text{long-time}} = \int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega) A(\omega) F(\omega) + Z_s^2 \left( n_0 + \int_0^\infty d\omega \frac{J(\omega) F(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_s)^2} \right). \quad \text{(A1)}
\]

where we regroup numerous terms in \( A(\omega) \), defined as

\[
A(\omega) = \sigma(\omega)^2 + \pi^2 S(\omega)^2 + \frac{2Z_s \sigma(\omega)}{\omega - \omega_s} + \frac{Z_s^2}{(\omega - \omega_s)^2},
\]

with \( \sigma(\omega) \) being the following principal value integral,

\[
\sigma(\omega) = \oint d\omega' \frac{S(\omega')}{\omega - \omega'}. \quad \text{(A2)}
\]

Similarly, the steady-state currents read

\[
j_{\alpha}^{(N)}(t \to \infty) = 2\pi \int_0^\infty d\omega J_\alpha(\omega) (J(\omega) A(\omega) F(\omega) - S(\omega)f_\alpha(\omega)). \quad \text{(A3)}
\]

It is straightforward to show that the quantum dot obeys the continuity equation \( (dn/dt) + j_L^{(N)} + j_R^{(N)} = 0 \). For the cases considered here (with at most one bound state), we see from Eq. (A1) that \( n \) is constant for \( t \to \infty \), which means that \( j_L^{(N)} + j_R^{(N)} = 0 \), so

\[
\int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega) F(\omega) (J(\omega) A(\omega) - S(\omega)) = 0. \quad \text{(A5)}
\]

The fact that this integral must vanish for any choice of reservoir temperatures and chemical potentials in \( F(\omega) \), means that one must have

\[
J(\omega) A(\omega) = S(\omega). \quad \text{(A6)}
\]

Then, replacing \( A(\omega) \) in Eqs. (A1) and (A4), we obtain the simpler expressions in Eqs. (21) and (35).
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40 G. Schaller, Open quantum systems far from equilibrium (Springer, 2014).
41 We measure energies in units of inverse time, so \( \hbar = 1 \).
42 Electroneutrality means that each reservoir’s band structure is shifted in energy by \( e \) times the reservoir’s bias. Hence reservoirs made of the same material will only have the same spectral function in the limit where the bias is negligibly small (linear response regime).
45 Physically, \( \varphi(t) \) gives the time dependence of the average value of the annihilation operator \( d(t) \).
50 If the two reservoirs have the same \( T \) and \( \mu \), this steady state is the thermal state of the full Hamiltonian in Eq. (1).
51 Ref. [25] considers this \( t \to \infty \) limit for a model without the extremely slow relaxation of the bound-state, so the continuum states are relaxed at \( t \to \infty \) but the bound-state still has its initial occupation.
53 If there is any kind of sudden preparation (such as our initial quench), and there are also two or more bound-states (which is not the case for the spectrum in Eq. (1)), then the dot occupation oscillates forever at frequencies given by the energy difference between the bound states. Since electrons are conserved, this requires a tiny electron flow (with a magnitude of a fraction of an electron) from reservoir to dot and back again during each oscillation. Hence the currents also exhibit oscillations at these frequencies for all times, which are super-imposed on the zero-frequency (D.C.) currents in Eqs. (35,38).