

Multiple Scattering in a Vacuum Barrier from Real-Space Wavefunctions

Werner A. Hofer*

*Donostia International Physics Center, San Sebastian, Spain, and
Surface Science Research Centre, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, Britain*

We have developed a method to simulate multiple electron scattering in a vacuum barrier using real-space single-electron wavefunctions of the separate surfaces. The tunnelling current is calculated to first order in the Dyson series. In zero order, we find a result which differs from the usual Bardeen approach by the decay constants of the wavefunctions, entering the description as individual weights of tunnelling transitions. To first order we find multiple electron scattering, which can be formulated in terms of Bardeen matrices. Here, we also derive a first-principles formulation for the interaction energy between the two surfaces. With this method the tunnelling current can in principle be computed to any order in the Dyson expansion.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Bg, 72.15.Eb, 73.23.Hk

From a theoretical point of view a tunnelling electron, e.g. in a scanning tunnelling microscopy measurement, is part of a system comprising two infinite metal leads and an interface, consisting of a vacuum barrier and, optionally, a molecule or a cluster of atoms with different properties than the infinite leads. The system can be said to be open - the number of charge carriers is not constant - and out of equilibrium - the applied potential and charge transport itself introduce polarizations and excitations within the system. The theoretical description of such a system has advanced significantly over the last years, to date the most comprehensive description is based either on a self-consistent solution of the Lippman-Schwinger equation [1] or on the non-equilibrium Green's function approach [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Inelastic effects within e.g. a molecule-surface interface can be included by considering multiple electron paths from the vacuum into the surface substrate [7]. Within the vacuum barrier itself, inelastic effects play an insignificant role. Here, as in most experiments in scanning tunneling microscopy, the problem can be reduced to the description of the tunnelling current between two leads - the surface S and the tip T - thought to be in thermal equilibrium. The bias potential of the circuit is in this case described by a modification of the chemical potentials of surface and tip system, symbolized by μ_S and μ_T . This reduces the tunnelling problem to the Landauer-Büttiker formulation [3, 8], or :

$$I \propto \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dE [f(\mu_S, E) - f(\mu_T, E)] \times \\ \times \text{Tr} [\Gamma_T(E) G^R(E) \Gamma_S(E) G^A(E)] \quad (1)$$

f denotes the Fermi distribution functions, $G^{R(A)}(E)$ and $G^A(E)$ are the retarded (advanced) Greens functions of the barrier, the $\Gamma_{S(T)}$ are the surface and tip contacts. They correspond to the difference of retarded and advanced self energy terms of surface and tip; we define

them by their relation to the spectral function $A_{S(T)}$ of the surface (tip) [3]:

$$A_{S(T)} = i \left[G_{S(T)}^R - G_{S(T)}^A \right] = G_{S(T)}^R \Gamma_{S(T)} G_{S(T)}^A \quad (2)$$

Here, the explicit energy dependency has been omitted for brevity. At present, these equations are evaluated within localized basis sets, and in a matrix representation. From a theoretical point of view this requires to either represent the electronic properties of the two surfaces also in a localized representation [5, 6], or to transform the plane wave basis set of most density functional methods to a local basis. The use of local basis sets compromises the numerical accuracy in the tunnelling barrier, since the vacuum tails of the surface wavefunctions decay too rapidly: the constant current contours in this case are too close to the surface.

In this Letter we present a formulation of the problem which is based on the Green's functions of the two surfaces, given in a real space representation based on the electronic eigenstates of the two systems. We show how the multiple scattering formalism described in Eq. 1 can be evaluated in real space, and how it relates to the perturbation expansion of the tunnelling problem. We start with an eigenvector expansion of the two surface Green's functions, given by:

$$G_S^{R(A)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) = \sum_i \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{E - E_i + (-)i\eta} \quad (3)$$

$$G_T^{R(A)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) = \sum_j \frac{\chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_j^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{E - E_j + (-)i\epsilon} \quad (4)$$

Throughout this paper the wavefunctions ψ and χ denote the Kohn-Sham states of surface and tip, respectively, resulting from a density functional calculation. The spectral function A_S describes the charge density matrix, from Eq. 2 we find:

$$A_S(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) = 2\eta \sum_i \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{(E - E_i)^2 + \eta^2} \quad (5)$$

*Electronic address: w.hofer@liverpool.ac.uk

The spectral function is related to Γ_S by Eq. 2. With the ansatz for Γ_S :

$$\Gamma_S(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4, E) = C \sum_j \psi_j(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_j^*(\mathbf{r}_4) \quad (6)$$

where C is a constant, we perform the double volume integration of Eq. 2. In this case the orthogonality of surface states reduces the expression to a compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} & C \int d\mathbf{r}_3 d\mathbf{r}_4 G_S^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3, E) \Gamma_S(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4, E) G_S^A(\mathbf{r}_4, \mathbf{r}_2, E) \\ &= C \sum_{ijk} \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk}}{(E - E_i + i\eta)(E - E_k - i\eta)} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Comparing the result with Eq. 5 we find for the contacts of surface and tip:

$$\Gamma_S = 2\eta \sum_k \psi_k(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_4) \quad \Gamma_T = 2\epsilon \sum_i \chi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \quad (8)$$

For the construction of the Greens function in the barrier we use the fact that the charge density is known from the separate calculation of surface and tip. In the limit of weak coupling, the total charge density of the interface is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} n(\mathbf{r}_1, E) &= \sum_i \psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \delta(E - E_i) + \\ &+ \sum_j \chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_j^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \delta(E - E_j) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The surface Green's function fulfills the boundary conditions at the interface between surface and vacuum. The tip Green's function at this position can be considered as a weak perturbation, which does not alter the electronic properties of the surface. Conversely, the same statement holds for the interface between the vacuum and the tip with respect to the tip Green's function. This allows to construct the zero order approximation for the Green's function of the vacuum barrier as the sum of surface and tip Green's functions, or:

$$G_{(0)}^{R(A)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) = G_S^{R(A)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) + G_T^{R(A)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, E) \quad (10)$$

Now all the necessary components for calculating the trace in the non equilibrium formalism are given in terms of the real space surface and tip wavefunctions. The trace involves the following integral:

$$\begin{aligned} Tr [\Gamma_T G^R \Gamma_S G^A] &= \\ &= \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \Gamma_T(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) G_{(0)}^R(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \Gamma_S(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4) G_{(0)}^A(\mathbf{r}_4, \mathbf{r}_1) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The integrations have to be performed successively. We start with the first integral, which involves:

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\eta \int d\mathbf{r}_4 \sum_m \psi_m(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_m^*(\mathbf{r}_4) \times \\ & \times \left[\sum_n \frac{\psi_n(\mathbf{r}_4) \psi_n^*(\mathbf{r}_1)}{E - E_n - i\eta} + \sum_n \frac{\chi_n(\mathbf{r}_4) \chi_n^*(\mathbf{r}_1)}{E - E_n - i\eta} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here, we use the physical condition of weak coupling to simplify the evaluation. In this limit the overlap integrals between states ψ_m and χ_n will be substantially smaller than overlaps between ψ_m and ψ_n . Then the integral is reduced due to the orthogonality of the wavefunctions to the simple form:

$$\int d\mathbf{r}_4 = 2\eta \sum_m \frac{\psi_m(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_m^*(\mathbf{r}_1)}{E - E_m - i\eta} \quad (13)$$

The same condition leads to the compact result for the second integral:

$$\int d\mathbf{r}_3 = 2\eta \sum_k \frac{\psi_k(\mathbf{r}_2) \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_1)}{(E - E_k)^2 + \eta^2} \quad (14)$$

The last two integrals involve the overlap between surface and tip states. The final relation for the trace reads then:

$$Tr = \sum_{ik} \frac{4\eta\epsilon}{(E - E_k)^2 + \eta^2} \underbrace{\left| \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}_1) \right|^2}_{=: |A_{ik}|^2} \quad (15)$$

The calculation of the matrix elements involves an integration over infinite space, which cannot directly be performed. To convert the volume integrals into surface integrals we use the fact that the vacuum states of surface and tip are free electron solutions with characteristic decay constants, complying with the vacuum Schrödinger equation.

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} (\nabla^2 - \kappa_i^2) \chi_i(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \Rightarrow \chi_i(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\nabla^2}{\kappa_i^2} \chi_i(\mathbf{r}) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} (\nabla^2 - \kappa_k^2) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \Rightarrow \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\nabla^2}{\kappa_k^2} \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) \quad (17)$$

In addition we make use of the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_i^* \nabla^2 \psi_k &= \nabla(\chi_i^* \nabla \psi_k) - \nabla \chi_i^* \nabla \psi_k \\ \psi_k \nabla^2 \chi_i^* &= \nabla(\psi_k \nabla \chi_i^*) - \nabla \psi_k \nabla \chi_i^* \end{aligned}$$

After some trivial manipulations, and making use of Gauss' theorem, this leads to the result:

$$A_{ik} = \frac{1}{\kappa_k^2 - \kappa_i^2} \int dS [\chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) - \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r})] \quad (18)$$

The surface integral is well known; apart from the universal constant $\hbar^2/2m$ it describes the tunneling matrix element in the perturbation approach [10, 11]. Denoting the surface integral by M_{ik} , we obtain for the zero order expansion of the Green's functions the trace:

$$Tr = 4 \sum_{ik} \frac{\eta\epsilon}{(E - E_k)^2 + \eta^2} \left| \frac{M_{ik}}{\kappa_k^2 - \kappa_i^2} \right|^2 \quad (19)$$

Considering that the states will have discrete energy levels $E = E_k$ and setting $\eta \approx \epsilon$ the limit $\eta, \epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$

is easy to evaluate. To check for consistency, we also calculated the trace if both contacts are part of the surface, described by Γ_S and the Green's function G_S . The calculation yields:

$$Tr = 4 \sum_k \frac{\eta \epsilon}{(E - E_k)^2 + \eta^2} \quad (20)$$

Considering, that the transition probability in this case must be unity, we conclude that the trace has to be scaled by a factor of 1/4 to yield the transition probability. The final formulation for the tunnelling current thus reads:

$$I_{(0)} = \frac{2e}{\hbar} \sum_{ik} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dE [f(\mu_S, E) - f(\mu_T, E)] \left| \frac{M_{ik}}{\kappa_k^2 - \kappa_i^2} \right|^2 \quad (21)$$

Note that $|M_{ik}/(\kappa_k^2 - \kappa_i^2)|^2$ is a dimensionless value. It describes, like in the Landauer-Büttiker equation [8], the transition probability $T_{ik} = t_{ik}^+ t_{ik}$. Even though the formulation looks quite similar to the standard results in perturbation theory, it contains some decisive differences. While in the perturbation approach the condition of resonant tunnelling is explicitly included by a delta functional, this is not the case in the scattering formulation. Instead, the matrix elements are divided by the difference between the decay constants of the two wavefunctions. The decay constants describe the longitudinal component of the electron momentum, they enter the description, since they account for energy conservation via the vacuum Schrödinger equations (see Eq. 16). Their difference is also related to the speed of charge transfer from one side of the junction to the other. Given that the denominator differs for every transition, this formulation describes, for the first time, how individual contributions to the current have to be treated in a proper manner.

We may compare this new formulation for the zero order tunnelling current in the non equilibrium approach to the traditional formulation based on Fermi's golden rule and the Bardeen method. There we find for the current [10, 11]:

$$I_b = \frac{4\pi e}{\hbar} \sum_{ik} [f(\mu_S, E_k) - f(\mu_T, E_i)] \times \quad (22)$$

$$\times \left| -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} M_{ik} \right|^2 \delta(E_i - E_k)$$

Neglecting initially the decay constants and using atomic units ($e = m = \hbar = 1$) the scattering approach yields currents for $E_i = E_k$ which are only about one tenth the currents obtained in the approach based on Fermi's golden rule. However, this is not the full picture. The decay constants for metals are in the order of 0.5 to 0.6 atomic units. Depending on the difference in work functions of surface and tip, the current in the scattering formulation will be increased by the denominator. The increase will be moderate for e.g. tungsten tips and noble metal surfaces, where the workfunctions differ by about

1 to 2 eV. But even in this case it should more than compensate for the initial difference. The reason seems to be that the time of transition is not infinite, as assumed in the derivation of Fermi's golden rule, but finite.

The approach can be extended to higher orders. In the first order expansion of the Dyson series the Green's function is given by:

$$G_{(1)}^R = G_{(0)}^R + G_{(0)}^R V G_{(0)}^R \quad (23)$$

To calculate the first order Green's function for systems out of equilibrium, the equation has to be solved self-consistently [1, 5]. Under tunnelling conditions, however, the leads are in thermal equilibrium and the systems only weakly coupled. V in this case is the tip potential V_T within the vacuum barrier [9]. Self consistency can in principle also be achieved by basing the calculation on the Kohn-Sham states ψ and χ of charged surfaces [12].

$$G_{(1)}^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = G_{(0)}^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + \int d\mathbf{r}_3 G_{(0)}^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3) V_T(\mathbf{r}_3) G_{(0)}^R(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (24)$$

Setting $\epsilon \approx \eta$ and with the shortcut $f_{ik}^\pm = (E - E_i \pm i\eta)(E - E_k \pm i\eta)$ the first order Green's function depends on three additional terms:

$$+ \sum_{ik} \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{f_{ik}^+} \int d\mathbf{r}_3 \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_3) V_T(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}_3)$$

$$+ \sum_{ik} \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{f_{ik}^+} \int d\mathbf{r}_3 \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_3) V_T(\mathbf{r}_3) \chi_k(\mathbf{r}_3) \quad (25)$$

$$+ \sum_{ik} \frac{\chi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{f_{ik}^+} \int d\mathbf{r}_3 \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_3) V_T(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}_3)$$

On the one hand the three additional contributions describe excitations of surface electrons. These contributions can be included in the formulation by a suitable adaptation of many-body theory. On the other hand they describe the scattering across the barrier due to the vicinity of surface and tip. These matrix elements, however, are well known. Apart from an insignificant contribution within the surface system, they are just the Bardeen matrix elements in the zero order expansion, or [9, 11]:

$$\int d\mathbf{r}_3 \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_3) V_T(\mathbf{r}_3) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}_3) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} M_{ik} \quad (26)$$

Limiting the evaluation in the following to scattering events across the barrier, we may write for the first order Green's function the expansion:

$$G_{(1)}^R = G_{(0)}^R - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{ik} \left[\frac{\chi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) M_{ik} \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{f_{ik}^+} + \frac{\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_1) M_{ki}^* \chi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2)}{f_{ik}^+} \right] \quad (27)$$

The trace now has to be evaluated for the additional contributions. The same strategy as used for the zero

order expansion leads in the limit of $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ to only one surviving multiple scattering term, given by:

$$\left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\right)^2 \sum_{iklm} \frac{M_{ik} M_{lk}^* M_{ml} M_{im}^*}{(\kappa_l^2 - \kappa_k^2)(\kappa_i^2 - \kappa_m^2)(E_i - E_k)(E_m - E_l)}$$

The current through the tunnelling barrier in the first order expansion of the scattering series is therefore:

$$I_{(1)} = I_{(0)} + \frac{2e}{h} \sum_{iklm} \int dE [f(\mu_S, E) - f(\mu_T, E)] \times (28)$$

$$\times \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\right)^2 \frac{M_{ik}}{(E_i - E_k)} \frac{M_{lk}^*}{(\kappa_l^2 - \kappa_k^2)} \frac{M_{ml}}{(E_m - E_l)} \frac{M_{im}^*}{(\kappa_i^2 - \kappa_m^2)}$$

Note that the product in the bottom line is again dimensionless and describes the transition probability in the multiple scattering case. The expression contains some interesting features. Firstly, the dynamics of electron scattering are fully included by the decay constants in the denominator; they describe the difference in propagation velocity for the two different directions. It is also quite interesting, that the expression reaches a maximum, if the decay constants are roughly equal. This indicates a potential resonance in tunnelling circuits, which should be detectable by accurate comparisons between experiment and theory. Secondly, the denominator contains the energy differences to the intermediate states in the multiple scattering process. This is quite understandable from perturbation theory, where e.g. the interaction energies scale with the inverse of the energy difference. In this case the intermediate states have to be evaluated over the whole energy range.

Finally, we consider the interaction energy between the surface and the tip in the low coupling limit. It has been shown recently by an analysis of first order perturbation expressions for the tunnelling current and the interaction energy, that the two variables should be linear with each other. From the first order Greens function we may construct the density matrix \hat{n} . The interaction energy is then [13]:

$$E_{int} = Tr[\hat{n}V] = \frac{i}{2\pi} Tr \left[\left(G_{(1)}^R - G_{(1)}^A \right) V \right] \quad (29)$$

With $G_{(1)}^R$ and $G_{(1)}^A$ from Eq. 27 this leads to the following result:

$$E_{int} = \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\right)^2 \sum_{ik} \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} \left(\frac{i}{f_{ik}^+} - \frac{i}{f_{ik}^-} \right) (|M_{ik}|^2 + |M_{ki}|^2) \quad (30)$$

The energy integration in this case is not trivial, since a term containing $1/f_{ik}^\pm$ will be singular for $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ and $E = E_i$ or $E = E_k$. This is due to the missing resistance of electrons upon reflection at the surfaces. If a resistance term η is introduced in the same manner as e.g. for the contacts Γ (see Eq. 8), then the result converges, and we obtain:

$$E_{int} = -\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\right)^2 \sum_{ik} \frac{|M_{ik}|^2 + |M_{ki}|^2}{|E_i - E_k|} \quad (31)$$

Physically, we may relate this addition to the fact that transiting electrons will lead to charge oscillations in the surface layers, depending on the conductance properties of the leads. The calculation of the interaction energy only involves the computation of the tunnelling matrix elements. And, as shown previously, the interaction energy will therefore be proportional to the tunnelling current [13].

To summarize, tunnelling currents and interaction energies can be calculated in real space within the non equilibrium Greens function formalism based on the separate wavefunctions of surface and tip. The zero order expansion is similar to the traditional Bardeen approach, even though we find that each transition carries an individual weight. This also implies that resonances between surface and tip will play an essential role under specific material conditions. The first order expansion describes multiple scattering across the tunnelling barrier. In this case we can derive a first principles formulation for the interaction energy between the two surfaces.

The author acknowledges helpful discussions with A. Arnau, P. Echenique, M. Johnson, N. Lorente, J. Soler, and L. Wirtz. He also thanks the Royal Society for the award of a University Research Fellowship.

-
- [1] M. Di Ventra and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. B 65, 045402 (2002)
 - [2] Y. Meir and N. S. Wingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2512 (1992)
 - [3] S. Datta, Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995)
 - [4] J. Taylor, H. Guo, and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 63, 245407 (2001)
 - [5] M. Brandbyge, J.-L. Mozos, P. Ordejon, J. Taylor, and K. Stokbro, Phys. Rev. B 65, 165401 (2002)
 - [6] F. J. Garcia-Vidal, F. Flores, and S. G. Davidson, Progr. Surf. Sci. 74, 177 (2003)
 - [7] N. Lorente and M. Persson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2997 (2000)
 - [8] M. Büttiker, Y. Imry, R. Landauer and S. Pinhas, Phys. Rev. B 31, 6207 (1985)
 - [9] C. Julian Chen, Introduction to Scanning Tunneling Microscopy, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1993)
 - [10] J. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 6, 57 (1961)
 - [11] W. A. Hofer, A. S. Foster, and A. L. Shluger, Rev. Mod. Phys. 75, 1287 (2003)
 - [12] A. Y. Lozovoi, A. Alavi, J. Kohanoff, and R. M. Lynden-Bell, J. Chem. Phys. 115, 1661 (2001)
 - [13] W. A. Hofer and A. J. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 036803

(2003)