Charge nonconservation of molecular devices in the presence of a nonlocal potential
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In the presence of a nonlocal potential in molecular device systems, generally the charge conservation cannot be satisfied, and in literatures the modifications of the conventional definition of current were given to solve this problem. We demonstrate that, however, the nonconservation is not due to the invalidation of the conventional definition of current, but originates respectively from the improper approximations to electron-electron interactions and the inappropriate definition of current using pseudo wave functions in pseudopotential implementations. In this work, we propose a nonlocal-potential formulation of the interactions to fulfill the charge conservation and also give a discussion about the calculation of current when the pseudopotential is involved. As an example of application of our formulation, we further present the calculated results of a double-barrier model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, investigations on transport properties of mesoscopic systems and nanostructures have been extensively reported both on experimental advances and theoretical explorations. It is widely acknowledged that these functional devices can be constituted by ultrasmall conjugated molecules, single-layer or multi-layer nanotubes, bulk organic molecules, etc., and plenty of interesting phenomena such as molecular field effects, Coulomb blockade, negative differential resistance, and conductance switching effects have been revealed, which exhibit fundamental significance and potential microelectronic applications. In most of the works, considerable research efforts are focused on current-voltage ($I$-$V$) characteristics as the $I$-$V$ profiles provide opportunities for a deeper understanding of, e.g., the basic mechanism and structure properties, as well as promising guidance for future molecular nanoelectronics designs and manipulations.

On the theoretical side, calculations for the $I$-$V$ characteristics of molecular device systems are mostly performed by employing the self-consistent field (SCF) theory or nonequilibrium Green’s functions combined with density functional theory (NEGF-DFT) and the universally used DFT calculations at present can be vested in the SCF method. In comparison with conventional SCF in addition to self-consistent Hartree potential DFT introduces the exchange-correlation potential, which is nonlocal if one wants to go beyond the local density approximation. It has been shown that in the presence of a nonlocal potential $V(r, r')$, the current obtained from the conventionally defined current density does not fulfill the conservation. Thus the calculations may give very incorrect results, even nonphysical results in the DFT calculations.

Li et al. proposed a scheme to reconsider the contribution of the nonlocal potential to the current density and therefore gave a new definition. The approach therein appeared to yield the charge conservation in a computationally efficacious way. However, either local or nonlocal exchange-correlation potential stems from the approximation to electron-electron interactions, and according to the conventional definition of current density the conservation can be exactly satisfied in the presence of the interactions. Hence we have reasons to believe that the problems of charge nonconservation coming from the nonlocal exchange-correlation potential should not be settled by redefining the current density. Instead, it has to be resolved by finding a reasonable nonlocal potential that does not result in additional currents. On the other hand, in first-principles calculations the norm-conserving pseudopotentials are generally utilized to reduce the size of plane-wave basis sets, which is another origin of the nonlocal potential. But we know that the pseudopotentials give the pseudo wave functions, while the wave functions used in the continuity equation $\partial \rho + \nabla \cdot J = 0$ should be real functions instead of the pseudo ones. The continuity equation is the only criteria regardless of any approximations brought in as long as the particles are conserved, which can be easily proved with the original Hamiltonian. It is the purpose of this work to investigate the above problems.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, the origins of nonlocal potentials and the consequent issues of charge nonconservation are discussed. We lay special emphasis on the nonlocal exchange-correlation potential from the starting point of second quantization, and subsequently demonstrate that in DFT calculations the nonconservation is caused by inappropriate definition of current density using pseudo wave functions rather than the introduction of the pseudopotentials. As an example, the current of a quasi-one-dimensional double-barrier model is numerically calculated in Sec.III to confirm our theoretical formulation. Section IV gives the conclusions and discussions.

II. THEORETICAL FORMULATION

In the context of first-principles calculations, if we use real wave functions $\psi (r)$ of the system from the very beginning throughout the processes, the continuity equation $\partial \rho_e + \nabla \cdot J_e = 0$ can be easily realized according to the Schrödinger equation, where $\rho_e = |\psi (r)|^2$ is the conventional electron density and $J_e$ is the conventional
current density in the absence of magnetic field with the
definition as
\[ \mathbf{J}_c = \frac{-i\hbar}{2m} \left[ \psi^*(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \psi(\mathbf{r}) - \psi(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \psi^*(\mathbf{r}) \right]. \]  
(1)

One of the origins of the charge nonconservation comes from approximations to electron-electron interactions, \textit{i.e.,} some improper exchange-correlation potentials are introduced. We will show that according to the standard definition of current density, the conservation is still satisfied in the presence of interactions, but generally can be violated by introducing the nonlocal exchange-correlation potentials. To see this, the simplest case of Hamiltonian of a finite many-electron system is considered, in which the electron-electron interactions are not taken into account firstly so that the second quantized nonrelativistic Hamiltonian (a quantity with a caret symbol denotes an operator) is
\[ \hat{H}_0 = \hat{T}_s + U_{ex}, \]  
(2)
where in terms of the field operators \( \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \) and \( \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \), the single-particle kinetic energy operator and the external potential operator can be written respectively as
\[ \hat{T}_s = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \nabla^2 \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t), \]  
(3)
\[ \hat{U}_{ex} = \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) v(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t). \]  
(4)

The density operator can be defined as \( \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \) and the current density operator is
\[ \hat{\mathbf{J}}_c(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{-i\hbar}{2m} \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \nabla \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \nabla \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right], \]  
(5)
by means of the Heisenberg’s equation and the anticommutation relation that we obtain
\[ \frac{\partial \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} \left[ \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t), \hat{H}_0 \right] = \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t), \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \right] \hat{H}'(\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t)] = \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{H}'(\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t), -\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{H}' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right] = \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \nabla^2 \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \nabla^2 \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \right] = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_c(\mathbf{r}, t), \]  
(6)
where the charge conservation is accomplished while only kinetic energy and external potential are included, as expected. Next, we introduce the interactions, thus the corresponding Hamiltonian can be written as
\[ \hat{H}_w = \hat{T}_s + U_{ex} + \hat{W}, \]  
(7)
where
\[ \hat{W} = \int d\mathbf{r}'' d\mathbf{r}' \omega(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'). \]  
(8)
Since the foregoing equations present the continuity condition with respect to \( \hat{T}_s \) and \( U_{ex} \), only interaction operator is taken into account hereafter, \textit{i.e.,}
\[ \left[ \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t), \hat{W} \right] = \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t), \int d\mathbf{r}'' d\mathbf{r}' \omega(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}''), \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \right] \times \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \right] = \int d\mathbf{r}'' d\mathbf{r}' \omega(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}'') \]  
\[ \cdot \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \]  
\[ - \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'', t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]  
\[ + \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]  
\[ - \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'', t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]  
\[ = 0, \]  
(9)
indicating the satisfaction when the interaction is involved.

According to common methods, we now proceed to expand the wave function \( \Psi \) in terms of a complete basis set \( \varphi_m \) as
\[ \Psi = \sum_m c_m \varphi_m, \]  
(10)
where \( c_m \) is a coefficient independent of \( \mathbf{r} \). The Hamiltonian of the system and the Schrödinger-like equation can then be rewritten as
\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{mn} (H_{0mn} + V_{mn}) a^\dagger_m(t) a_n(t), \]  
(11)
\[ H_0 \Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) + \int d\mathbf{r}' V_{nl}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \Psi(\mathbf{r}', t) \]  
\[ = \sum_m c_m H_0 \varphi_m(\mathbf{r}, t) + \sum_m c_m \int d\mathbf{r}' V_{nl}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')(\varphi_m(\mathbf{r}', t), \]  
(12)
where \( a^\dagger_m \) and \( a_n \) are creation and annihilation operators, respectively, and
\[ V_{mn}(t) = \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \varphi_m^\ast(\mathbf{r}, t)V_{nl}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varphi_n(\mathbf{r}', t). \]  
(13)
Similarly, the field operator is
\[ \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sum_n \varphi_n(\mathbf{r}) a_n(t), \]  
(14)
\[ a_n(t) = \int d\mathbf{r} \varphi_n^*(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t), \] (15)

in view of which we have the current operator

\[ \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sum_{mn} \varphi_m^*(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_n(\mathbf{r}, t) a_m^\dagger(t)a_n(t). \] (16)

Since

\[ \sum_{mn} V_{mn}(t) \varphi_n^*(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_m(\mathbf{r}', t) \]

\[ = \int d\xi d\xi' V(\xi, \xi') \sum_{mn} \varphi_m^*(\xi, t) \varphi_n(\xi', t) \varphi_n^*(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_m(\mathbf{r}', t), \] (17)

the potential operator can be written as

\[ \hat{V}(t) = \sum_{mn} V_{mn}(t) a_m^\dagger(t)a_n(t) \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \sum_{mn} V_{mn}(t) \varphi_n^*(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_m(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' V_{nn}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t), \] (18)

and after some computations we reach

\[ [\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t), \hat{V}(t)] \]

\[ = \left[ \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}), \int d\mathbf{r}^\prime d\mathbf{r}^\prime' V(\mathbf{r}^\prime, \mathbf{r}^\prime') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}^\prime, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}^\prime', t) \right] \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r}'' d\mathbf{r}''' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) V(\mathbf{r}''', \mathbf{r}'') \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}''') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \]

\[ - \int d\mathbf{r}'' d\mathbf{r}''' V(\mathbf{r}''', \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r}' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \]

\[ - \int d\mathbf{r}'' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}'', t) V(\mathbf{r}''', \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \]

\[ \neq 0, \] (19)

where the continuity condition is no longer satisfied.

Thus far an inference can be drawn that an unreasonable approximation for the interaction has been brought in, and it exists in most of the modern implementations with nonlocal exchange-correlation potentials. Currents, of course, are required to include both the contributions of local and nonlocal potentials, so we rewrite the potential energy

\[ \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \]

\[ \rightarrow \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left[ \int d\mathbf{r}' \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \right] \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) \]

\[ - \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) U(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) + \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}'), \] (20)

where

\[ U(\mathbf{r}) = \int d\mathbf{r}' \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}, \quad V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \] (21)

Introduce an auxiliary variable \( \hat{F} \) as

\[ \hat{F}(\mathbf{r}) = \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') - V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}) \right], \] (22)

and we obtain the expectation of this variable

\[ \langle \hat{F}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle \right. \]

\[ - V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) \langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle \]

\[ = \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}') \rangle}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle \right] \]

\[ = 0, \] (23)

which indicates that with this method the conservation can be again fulfilled in the meaning of statistic average.

Another origin of the nonconservation is the inappropriate definition of the current density. In DFT calculations, one often needs to bring in pseudopotential approximations for simplification of the intractable computations, where nonlocal potential emerges. We first discuss that in introducing the nonlocal pseudopotential, the current calculated with pseudo wave function does not satisfy the conservation. Pseudopotentials were originally introduced to simplify electronic structure calculations by adding some core functions to the wave function \( \psi(\mathbf{r}) \) to obtain a smooth pseudo wave function\(^{38-40} \)

\[ \psi(\mathbf{r}) = \phi(\mathbf{r}) - \sum_n \langle \psi_n | \phi \rangle \psi_n(\mathbf{r}), \] (24)

where \( \phi(\mathbf{r}) \) is the pseudo wave function and \( \psi_n(\mathbf{r}) \) is the core function, and the general form of the pseudopotential (only its nonlocal part) is

\[ V_{nl} = \sum_n (E - E_n) |\psi_n| \langle \psi_n |, \] (25)

from which we obtain

\[ \sum_n |\psi_n| \langle \psi_n | = (E - H_0)^{-1} V_{nl} = G V_{nl}, \] (26)

where \( G = (E - H_0)^{-1} \) is the Green’s function, and \( H_0 \) is the original Hamiltonian. The real wave function can then be denoted by

\[ \psi(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \mathbf{r} | \psi \rangle \]

\[ = \langle \mathbf{r} | \phi \rangle - \langle \mathbf{r} | GV_{nl} | \phi \rangle \]

\[ = \phi(\mathbf{r}) - \int d\mathbf{r}' \int d\mathbf{r}'' \langle \mathbf{r} | G(\mathbf{r}') (\mathbf{r}' | V_{nl} (\mathbf{r}'') | \mathbf{r}'') \phi \rangle \]

\[ = \phi(\mathbf{r}) - \int d\mathbf{r}' d\mathbf{r}'' G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') V_{nl}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'') \phi(\mathbf{r}''). \] (27)
Therefore, the corresponding Schrödinger equation for the pseudo wave function is
\[ H_0 \phi(r) + \int dr' V_{nl}(r, r') \phi(r') = E \phi(r), \] (28)
where
\[ V_{nl}(r, r') = \sum_n (E - E_n) \psi_n(r) \psi_n^*(r') \]
\[ = (E - H_0) \sum_n \psi_n(r) \psi_n^*(r'). \] (29)

It is easy to verify that the conventionally defined current density \( J = -i \hbar \left[ \phi^*(r) \nabla \phi(r) - \phi(r) \nabla \phi^*(r) \right] \) along with the obtained pseudo electron density \( \rho_{ps} = |\phi(r)|^2 \) do not meet the charge conservation. Nevertheless, this nonconservation is not caused by introducing the pseudopotential, but is that the above definition of current density cannot be used to the pseudo wave function \( \phi(r) \). The correct current density must be defined by using the real wave function \( \psi(r) \). According to the definition \( J_r = -i \hbar \left[ \phi^*(r) \nabla \psi(r) - \psi(r) \nabla \phi^*(r) \right] \) we get
\[ J_r = J_{ps} + J_{nl}, \] (30)
where
\[ J_{ps} = -i \hbar \left[ \phi^*(r) \nabla \phi(r) - \phi(r) \nabla \phi^*(r) \right], \] (31)
and
\[ J_{nl} = i \hbar \left[ \phi^*(r) \nabla \Pi(r) + \Pi(r) \nabla \phi^*(r) - \Pi^*(r) \nabla \Pi(r) - c.c. \right]. \] (32)
Here, \( \Pi(r) = \int dr'' G(r, r') V_{nl}(r', r'') \phi(r'') \). On the basis of Eq. (25), in steady states we can easily give \( \nabla \cdot J_{ps} = -\nabla \cdot J_{nl} \), which verifies the conservation of charge with the definition of current density in Eq. (30).

Note that in practical calculations, the current density achieved with real wave function \( \psi(r) \) should reduce to the general form and is no doubt reasonable. When different pseudopotentials are introduced, one often obtains the first term of \( J_r \), which is called the pseudo current density as it stems only from the pseudo wave function and results in the charge nonconservation. Furthermore, the contribution of the pseudopotential should be confined to a small sphere surrounding the core with a cut-off radius and the nonlocal part vanishes outside the core region, thus the nonconservation occurs only in the atomic sphere and the confined pseudopotential has little influence on the total current density in the whole space. Also, the newly obtained current density as defined in Eq. (30) can be applicable to steady states, while it would be somewhat difficult to be used in time-dependent cases, since the pseudopotential above depends explicitly on the eigenvalue \( E \), which is unpractical.

III. NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION

To illustrate the theoretical formulation proposed above, we consider a quasi-one-dimensional double-barrier model confined transversely to simulate the device system, as shown in Fig. 1. The nonlocal potential is placed only in the region between \(-a \) and \( a \), and the barriers can be regarded as part of two ideal leads without nonlocal potentials.

FIG. 1: Schematic view of the transversely confined double-barrier model. The dashed-line box \( C \) is a hypothetical region including the core device and part of two ideal leads, and \( L/R \) symbolize the rest of the leads.
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FIG. 2: Particle current densities for: (a) the optional nonlocal potential \( V_{nl} \) with single-particle energy of \( E = 0.8 \), (b) the proposed formalism with single-particle energy of \( E = 0.8 \), and (c) the collective properties of all the particles with energy \( E = [0, 1] \). Here, \( \lambda = 0.009 \), \( \eta = 0.01 \), and the width of the barriers is 1.0.

We imagine a central region \( C \) (the dashed-line box) that encloses both the core device and the barriers, and the total Hamiltonian for this model can be written as
\[ \hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = H_0 + V_H + \hat{V}_{xc}, \] (33)
where \( H_0 = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U_0 \) with \( U_0 \) the local potential within the barriers, \( V_H \) is the Hartree potential and \( \hat{V}_{xc} \) is the exchange-correlation potential operator: \( \langle \hat{V}_{xc} \psi \rangle = \int V_{xc}(r, r') \psi(r') \psi(r) dr' \). We use a reduced interaction in one
dimension as
\[ V_H(x) = \int \sum_k v(x, x') |\psi_k(x')|^2 dx', \quad (34) \]
\[ V_{xc}(x, x') = -\sum_k v(x, x') \psi_k^\ast(x) \psi_k(x'), \quad (35) \]
where
\[ v(x, x') = \int \rho_1 d\rho_1 \int \rho_2 d\rho_2 \int \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} \frac{\varphi^2(\rho_1) \varphi^2(\rho_2)}{\sqrt{\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2 - 2\rho_1 \rho_2 \cos \varphi + (x - x')^2}} \quad (36) \]
which is averaged over the transverse wave functions.\(^{42}\) A single wave function \( \varphi(\rho) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi} \exp(-\rho^2/4l^2) \) is chosen universally, and a transverse radius \( 2l \) characterizes the size of the confinement. To proceed, we first solve the energy eigenequations of the double-barrier model with only local potential \( U_0 \) and numerically calculate the wave functions \( \psi(x) \), thus the corresponding Hartree potential \( V_H \) and exchange-correlation potential \( V_{xc} \) of the central region can be constructed from the wave functions and the reduced interaction. In general, once all the wave functions with eigenenergies below the Fermi energy \( E_F \) are known, we can obtain the current density at all points. Energy unit \( \hbar^2/2ma^2 \) is used throughout the calculations as a reduced coefficient, where \( m \) is the mass of the electron, and the current density is measured in \( (e\hbar/m)V \). The Fermi energy here is set as \( E_F = 1.0 \), and the magnitude of the barriers is fixed to be \( U_0 = 0.0 \). In addition, all the calculations are performed in low-temperature limit, i.e., the temperature \( T = 0 \).

We first study the influences of an optional nonlocal potential and the formalism in Eq.\(^{20}\) on the particle current, respectively. The nonlocal potential is nonzero when \( x \) is from \(-1 \) to \( 1 \), and the barriers are located in \([-2, -1] \) and \([1, 2] \). The optional nonlocal potential here is chosen as \( V_{nl}(x, x') = \lambda \exp[\eta (x - x')^2] \), where \( \lambda \) and \( \eta \) are two independent coefficients. From Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 2(b), we can see that when single particle with a certain energy \( E \) is considered, the lead currents \( I_L \) and \( I_R \) hold to be constant in both cases, while the current \( I_C \) obtained from the central region turns out to be varying with \( x \), revealing a dissatisfaction of the conservation. If we consider the collective properties of all the particles within \( E_F \), as shown in Fig. 2(c), the case for optional nonlocal potential still violates the continuity condition, while the currents calculated with the formalism of Eq.\(^{20}\) are seen to be conservative in the whole simulation region. Moreover, particle currents in all the three regions serve as a minor correction to the ones with Hartree potential only (see Fig. 3).

![FIG. 3: Comparison of the particle current densities for each region.](image)

The case that involves the reasonable nonlocal exchange-correlation potential \( V_{xc} \) (dash-dot line) is somewhat a correction to the one that only considers the Hartree potential \( V_H \) (solid line).

![FIG. 4: Dependence of the electric currents on the selection of the central region.](image)

Nonlocal potential is not included, and the width and magnitude of the barriers are both fixed.

![FIG. 5: Current properties of different sites of the system with the optional nonlocal potential \( V_{nl} \).](image)

The central region is fixed to be \( x = [-1, 1] \), and the barriers are located in \( x = [-2, -1] \) and \( x = [1, 2] \). Discrepancies of the currents for all three positions enlarge with the increasing voltage.
different sites along the nonlocal potential area selection must be taken into actual systems to ensure ones, indicating that careful considerations on relevant shift downwards gradually and finally become nonlinear I the current changeable, and the nonlocal potential is absent therein. As we shall see, when the core region is chosen as small as $x = [-0.2, 0.2]$, it exhibits a sublinear relation between the current $I$ and the voltage $V$, which is similar to that of a general single-barrier model, and the scattering effect in the central box vanishes. With the increases of the width as $x = [-0.5, 0.5]$ and $x = [-1.0, 1.0]$, the curves shift downwards gradually and finally become nonlinear ones, indicating that careful considerations on relevant area selection must be taken into actual systems to ensure the computational accuracy.

In Fig. 5, we present the $I$-$V$ characteristics of different sites along the $x$ axis when the above optional nonlocal potential $V_{nl}(x, x')$ is included. Current densities of $x = 0$, $x = 0.5$ and $x = 2.0$ differ mutually, as expected, which means that currents in the central region and the leads calculated with the optional nonlocal potential cannot meet the charge conservation. We further explore the contrastive characteristics with our approximation. From Fig. 6, one can see that when only Hartree potential $V_{H}$ is taken into account, currents of all sites are equal to each other with the increase of the voltage. When the exchange-correlation potential $V_{xc}$ is also considered, the whole of the curve bears an upward shift, whose corresponding current is a bit larger than that calculated with Hartree potential $V_{H}$ only, and the currents obtained can be still conservative.

**IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS**

In summary, it is of great importance to give correct dynamic charge and potential distributions of transport systems, which is the key point for the valid current and prospective applications of molecular devices. Once we are able to calculate strictly according to the original Hamiltonian, the problems of charge nonconservation induced by nonlocal potential would not exist, and the results are undoubtedly reasonable. However, it is impossible to obtain rigorous solutions under such intricate interactions. We demonstrate these issues and attest that the nonconservation stems respectively from improper approximations to electron-electron interactions and inappropriate definition of current using pseudo wave functions in pseudopotential implementations, and propose a nonlocal-potential formulation of the interactions as well as give a verification about the calculation of current in the presence of pseudopotentials. With this method, we have also studied a double-barrier model to simulate the molecular device system, which further confirms our formulation.

---

* Electronic address: apybyu@hnu.edu.cn.

50. 5528 (1994).
32 C. S. Li, L. H. Wan, Y. D. Wei, and J. Wang, Nanotechnology 19, 155401 (2008).