# **Oscillatory TMR effect in carbon nanowires**

Kamil Walczak<sup>1</sup>

Institute of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University Umultowska 85, 61-614 Poznań, Poland

Coherent electronic transport through a molecular device is studied using non-equilibrium Green's function (NEGF) formalism. Such device is made of a carbon nanowire which is connected to ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co, respectively). Molecule itself is described with the help of Hubbard model (Coulomb interactions are treated by means of the Hartree-Fock approximation), while the coupling to the electrodes is modeled through the use of a broad-band theory. It was shown that magnetoresistance varies periodically with increasing the length of atomic wire (in the linear response regime) and oscillates with increasing of bias voltage (in the nonlinear response regime). Since the TMR effect for analyzed structures is predicted to be large (tens of percentage), considered junctions seem to be suitable for application as a magnetoresistive elements in the future electronic circuits.

Key words: Hubbard model, tunnel magnetoresistance (TMR), molecular spintronics, molecular device

PACS numbers: 85.65.+h, 73.63.Nm, 72.80.Le

## I. Introduction

Advances in experimental techniques have made it possible to fabricate molecular-scale devices and to measure their current-voltage (I-V) characteristics. Generally speaking, molecular junctions are usually made of two (or more) electrodes connected by a molecule (or molecular layer). Experiments performed on such structures have shown a variety of novel transport phenomena, namely: rectification [1], negative differential resistance [2], switching behavior, memory cell operation [3] and transistor action [4]. Molecular junctions are important both from a pure science point of view and because of their potential applications. They are promising candidates for future electronic devices because of their: small sizes, theoretically inexhaustible possibilities of structural modifications of the molecules, relatively low costs and easiness in obtaining layer-based molecular junctions (due to self-assembly features of organic molecules). Transport properties of such devices are dominated by some effects of quantum origin, such as: quantum tunneling, quantization of molecular energy levels and discreteness of electron charge. However, it should be also stressed that electron's spin as well as its charge can be employed to store, process and transmit information [5,6]. Since spin orientation of conduction electrons survives for a long period of time ( $\sim$  ns) in comparison with the residence time of the tunneling electron on the molecules (~ fs), molecular junctions may be useful in applications involving electron spin manipulation. It means that spin-conserving transport in molecular-scale devices is possible, where spin-flip scattering and all the spin-orbit processes can be neglected.

Recent experiments on Ni nanocontacts disclosed magnetoresistance values up to 280 % at room temperature for a few-atom contact in the ballistic transport regime [7]. This effect is justified as a relative change of a number of conducting channels when magnetization changes its orientation from parallel to antiparallel [8]. Similar effects are also expected for a molecular junctions, where single molecular wires are attached to ferromagnetic electrodes [9-13]. In this case, tunnel magnetoresistance (TMR) is associated with: the asymmetry of

the density of states (DOS) for two spin channels in the ferromagnetic materials and the quantum tunneling phenomenon. Generally, the tunneling probability of the electron flowing through the molecule depends on few factors: the relative orientations of the electrode magnetizations which can be changed from the parallel (P) to antiparallel (AP) by applying an external magnetic field, the electronic structure of the molecular wire, the nature of the molecule-to-electrodes coupling and the location of the Fermi level in relation to molecular energy levels. In particular, spin-polarized transport of electrons tunneling through the junction consisting of a self-assembled monolayer (SAM) of octanethiol attached to a pair of Ni electrodes was studied experimentally [14]. These molecular junctions exhibit TMR values up to 16 % at low bias voltages. However, strong voltage and temperature dependence of the junction magnetoresistance and time-dependent telegraph noise signals suggest that transport properties of the mentioned device can be affected by localized states in the molecular monolayer.

The main purpose of the present work is to study the coherent spin-dependent electronic transport through carbon nanowires symmetrically coupled to a pair of identical ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co, respectively). This choice is dictated by experimental situation, in which linear carbon-atom chains containing up to 20 atoms connected at the ends to metal atoms have been synthesized [15] and recognized as ideal one-dimensional wires [16,17]. For the case of paramagnetic electrodes, it is known from the previous *ab initio* studies that linear conductance of carbon nanowires varies in an oscillatory manner as the number of carbon atoms is increased [16,17]. Odd-number carbon atom wires showing a higher conductance than even-number ones, where the conductance values fall in the approximate range of  $G_0$  to  $2G_0$ . Here  $G_0 \equiv 2e^2 / h \approx 77.5 \ \mu S$  is the quantum of conductance corresponding to a resistance of 12.9 k $\Omega$ . Furthermore, it should be also noted that an oscillatory behavior has been observed in other properties of carbon nanowires, such as their stability towards fragmentation [18,19]. In this paper we will discuss the oscillatory dependence of tunnel magnetoresistance with the increase of carbon atoms in the wire (in the linear response regime) and with the increase of bias voltage (in the nonlinear response regime). Since only delocalized  $\pi$  orbitals of organic molecules are involved into conduction process and Coulomb interactions can be important in determining transport properties of small systems, molecule itself is described with the help of Hückel model ( $\pi$ -electron approximation) with the electron interactions treated within Hubbard approach [20,21], while the coupling to the electrodes is modeled through the use of a broad-band theory [11]. Coulomb interations within molecular wire are treated by means of the Hartree-Fock (HF) approximation.

#### **II.** Computational scheme

The Hamiltonian of the entire system composed of two electrodes spanned by a molecular wire can be expressed as a three-part sum:  $H_{tot} = H_{el} + H_{mol} + H_{el-mol}$ . The first term describes electrons in the electrodes:

$$H_{el} = \sum_{k,\sigma \in \alpha} \varepsilon_{k,\sigma} c_{k,\sigma}^{+} c_{k,\sigma}, \qquad (1)$$

where:  $\alpha = L/R$  for the case of left/right (source/drain) electrode, respectively. In the presence of bias voltage, one-electron energies  $\varepsilon_{k,\sigma}$  are shifted in the following way:  $\varepsilon_{k,\sigma} \rightarrow \varepsilon_{k,\sigma} + eV/2$  in the left electrode and  $\varepsilon_{k,\sigma} \rightarrow \varepsilon_{k,\sigma} - eV/2$  in the right electrode,

while chemical potentials of the electrodes are defined through the relations:  $\mu_L = \epsilon_F + eV/2$  and  $\mu_R = \epsilon_F - eV/2$  ( $\epsilon_F$  denotes the equilibrium Fermi level). The second term represents a linear N-atom chain, which is described within the Hubbard model approach:

$$H_{mol} = \sum_{i,j,\sigma} (\epsilon_{i,\sigma} \delta_{i,j} - \beta) c_{i,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j,\sigma} + U \sum_{i} n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}, \qquad (2)$$

where:  $\varepsilon_{i,\sigma}$  is local site energy,  $\beta$  is the hopping integral, U is the on-site Coulomb interaction between two electrons with opposite spins, while  $n_{i,\sigma}$ ,  $c_{i,\sigma}^+$  and  $c_{i,\sigma}$  denote the number, creation and annihilation operators for electron on site i with spin  $\sigma$ . For the sake of simplicity we restrict the summation in Eq.2 to the simplest situation of nearest-neighbor atoms. By setting U = 0 in Eq.2, one reproduces tight-binding (Hückel) Hamiltonian. Here we assume a uniform electric field between the electrodes and the linear potential drop at the molecule (ramp model) [20-22]. Therefore, the local site energies  $\varepsilon_{i,\sigma}$  are shifted due to this voltage ramp:  $\varepsilon_{i,\sigma} \rightarrow \varepsilon_{i,\sigma} + eV[1-2i/(N+1)]/2$ . The third term corresponds to the tunneling process from the electrodes onto the molecule:

$$H_{el-mol} = \sum_{k,\sigma \in \alpha} t_{\alpha} (c_{k,\sigma}^{+} c_{i,\sigma} + h.c.), \qquad (3)$$

where:  $t_{\alpha}$  is hopping integral responsible for the strength of the coupling with the electrode  $\alpha$ . All the values of energy integrals ( $\epsilon$ ,  $\beta$ , U, t) are treated as parameters which can be reasonably modified.

Further analysis are performed within Hartree-Fock (HF) approximation, where the charge occupation number on particular sites are calculated using self-consistent procedure. The HF problem is associated with a simplification of molecular Hamiltonian (2), which can be rewritten in the form:

$$H_{mol}^{HF} = \sum_{i,j,\sigma} (\tilde{\epsilon}_{i,\sigma} \delta_{i,j} - \beta) c_{i,\sigma}^{+} c_{j,\sigma}^{-}, \qquad (4)$$

with the local site energy given by:

$$\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i,\sigma} = \epsilon_{i,\sigma} + U \langle n_{i,\overline{\sigma}} \rangle.$$
(5)

Occupation number of the electrons on each site for particular voltages (nonequilibrium case) is determined self-consistently using the Keldysh formalism [23]:

$$\langle \mathbf{n}_{i,\sigma} \rangle = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega G_{i\sigma,i\sigma}^{<}(\omega),$$
 (6)

The lesser Green function  $G^{<}$  can be obtained from the Dyson equation and expressed in the general form as:

$$G_{i\sigma,j\sigma}^{<} = \sum_{i',j'} G_{i\sigma,i'\sigma}^{r} \Sigma_{i'\sigma,j'\sigma}^{<} G_{j'\sigma,j\sigma}^{a}.$$
(7)

The superscripts r and a denote the retarded and advanced Green functions, respectively:

$$G^{r}(\omega) = \left[J\omega - H_{mol}^{HF} - \Sigma^{r}\right]^{-1}$$
(8)

and  $G^a = [G^r]^*$  (here J denotes the unit matrix of the dimension equal to molecular Hamiltonian N × N). Since the molecule is contacted with the electrodes only through the atoms at the ends of the wire, the lesser self-energy can be written as follows:

$$\Sigma_{i\sigma,j\sigma}^{<}(\omega) = 2i\delta_{i,j} \left[ \delta_{i,l} \Delta_{L\sigma}(\omega) f_{L}(\omega) + \delta_{i,N} \Delta_{R\sigma}(\omega) f_{R}(\omega) \right], \tag{9}$$

where  $f_{\alpha}$  is Fermi distribution function in the  $\alpha$  electrode. Furthermore, the retarded and advanced self-energy functions are given by:

$$\Sigma_{i\sigma,j\sigma}^{r}(\omega) = \delta_{i,j} \left[ \delta_{i,1} \left[ \Lambda_{L\sigma}(\omega) - i \Delta_{L\sigma}(\omega) \right] + \delta_{i,N} \left[ \Lambda_{R\sigma}(\omega) - i \Delta_{R\sigma}(\omega) \right] \right]$$
(10)

and  $\Sigma^a = [\Sigma^r]^*$ . The real and imaginary terms of the self-energy components are not independent from each other, being related through the Hilbert transform [20]:  $\Lambda_{\alpha\sigma}(\omega) = P \int dz \Delta_{\alpha\sigma}(z) / [\pi(\omega - z)]$ , where P is the Cauchy principal value. In order to speed up the computations we approximate the contact self-energies with the help of their imaginary elements only (neglecting their real parts as responsible for energy shifts). In our case:

$$\Delta_{\alpha\sigma}(\omega) = \pi t_{\alpha}^2 \rho_{\alpha\sigma}, \qquad (11)$$

where  $\rho_{\alpha\sigma}$  is local density of states (at the Fermi energy level) for the electrons with spin  $\sigma$  in the  $\alpha$  electrode. This assumption is equivalent to the physical situation, in which the local density of states in both electrodes is constant over an energy bandwidth and zero otherwise. The dispersionless coupling parameters are commonly used in the literature and are usually sufficient in describing broad-band metals [22,24,25]. It is clear that here we focus our attention only on qualitative results, since the detailed description of the molecule-to-electrodes coupling is far beyond the scope of the present paper [26].

The current flowing through the device can be computed from the time evolution of the occupation number for electrons in the left (or equivalently right) electrode  $N_{\alpha} = \sum_{k,\sigma \in \alpha} c_{k,\sigma}^{+} c_{k,\sigma}$  and can be expressed by the lesser Green function [23,27]:

$$I(V) = -e\frac{d}{dt} \langle N_{\alpha} \rangle = \frac{e}{h} \sum_{i,k,\sigma} t_{\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega \left[ G_{i\sigma,k\sigma}^{<}(\omega) + c.c. \right].$$
(12)

After applying the Dyson equation, current formula can be written with the help of the retarded Green function:

$$I(V) = \frac{4e}{h} \sum_{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega [f_{L}(\omega) - f_{R}(\omega)] \Delta_{L\sigma}(\omega) \Delta_{R\sigma}(\omega) |G_{1\sigma,N\sigma}^{r}(\omega)|^{2}.$$
(13)

The conductance is then given as a derivative of the current with respect to voltage: G(V) = dI(V)/dV. Tunnel magnetoresitance is defined as a relative difference of the conductance in the parallel (P) and antiparallel (AP) configuration of the spin polarization alignment in the electrodes:  $TMR(V) = [G_P(V) - G_{AP}(V)]/G_P(V)$ .

It should be also noted that in our calculations we have assumed that transport process is purely coherent and elastic. It means that the current conservation rule is fulfilled on each site and for any energy  $\omega$ . Furthermore, the method presented in this work (based on HF approximation) neglects all the many-body effects and electronic correlations.

#### **III.** Numerical results and comments

As an example we take into consideration a linear carbon-atom chain connected to two ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co). Molecular description itself includes only  $\pi$ -electrons of hydrocarbons (and is based on the assumption of one  $2p_z$ -basis function for each carbon atom), while the coupling to the electrodes is treated within a broad-band theory. This is a test case simple enough to analyze all the essential physics in detail. In order to simulate conjugated molecules, we choose the following energy parameters (given in eV) [20]:  $\varepsilon = 0$ (the reference energy),  $\beta = 2.4$ , U = 2. In this work we assume realistically that Fermi level is fixed exactly in the middle of DOS spectra of the molecule ( $\varepsilon_F = 0$ ). Since ferromagnets have unequal spin up and spin down populations, their densities of states for both spin orientations are different. Here we adopt such densities for Ni and Co electrodes from the work [11] as obtained from band structure calculations performed using the tight-binding version of the linear muffin-tin orbital method in the atomic sphere approximation:  $\rho_{Ni\uparrow}=0.1897\,,~\rho_{Ni\downarrow}=1.7261\,,~\rho_{Co\uparrow}=0.1740\,,~\rho_{Co\downarrow}=0.7349\,.$  Assuming a symmetric coupling at both ends of the molecule and setting typical hopping parameters as  $t_L = t_R = 0.5$ , we obtain the following self-energy terms:  $\Delta_{Ni\uparrow} = 0.1490$ ,  $\Delta_{Ni\downarrow} = 1.3557$ ,  $\Delta_{Co\uparrow} = 0.1367$ ,  $\Delta_{Co\downarrow} = 0.5772$ . The temperature energy of the system is assumed to be equal to that of the room temperature  $k_BT = 0.025$  (however, obtained results are not particularly sensitive to temperature).

### A. Linear response regime

Now we discuss the length behavior of transport characteristics found in the linear response regime. It is clear that at low bias voltages ( $V \le 0.1$  Volt), the current becomes a linear function of an applied bias: I = GV. Presented method allows us to compute the zerobias conductance using the Landauer-type expression [28]:

$$G = \frac{4e^2}{h} \sum_{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega F_{T}(\omega) \Delta_{L\sigma}(\omega) \Delta_{R\sigma}(\omega) |G_{1\sigma,N\sigma}^{r}(\omega)|^2, \qquad (14)$$

where thermal broadening function is given through the relation [22,29,30]:

$$F_{\rm T}(\omega) \equiv -\frac{\partial f(\omega)}{\partial \omega} = \frac{1}{4k_{\rm B}T} \sec h^2 \left[\frac{\omega - \varepsilon_{\rm F}}{2k_{\rm B}T}\right].$$
 (15)

Figure 1 shows the linear conductance as a function of the number of carbon atoms attached to ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co). Here conductance for parallel alignment of magnetizations in the electrodes reaches higher values than for the case of antiparallel alignment. However, conductance oscillations with increasing the length of the wire are also observed for both cases, where odd-numbered nanowires showing a higher conductance than even-numbered ones. But in our studies conductance values fall in range of 0 to  $2G_0$ . The amplitude of the mentioned oscillations strongly depends on: the strength of the molecule-to-electrodes coupling and the position of Fermi level in relation to the electronic structure of the molecular wire. It should be still remembered that molecular energy levels constitute conducting quantum channels between two reservoirs of charge carriers. The origin of the oscillatory conductance is very simple.



Fig.1 Linear conductance as a function of the number of carbon atoms attached to a) Co electrodes and b) Ni electrodes. Solid curves (black circles) and broken curves (gray circles) correspond to parallel and antiparallel of the electrodes' magnetization, respectively. The other parameters of the model (given in eV):  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $\beta = 2.4$ , U = 2,  $t_L = t_R = 0.5$ ,  $k_BT = 0.025$ .

For even number of carbon atoms there are occupied bonding states and unoccupied antibonding states separated by the HOMO-LUMO gap. Since we chose the Fermi level to be fixed exactly in the middle of molecular DOS spectrum, electronic transport is in the off-resonance regime (i.e. quantum tunneling is strongly damped) [31,32]. However, for odd number of carbon atoms half-filled nonbonding state exists in the middle of molecular DOS and consequently we have an open channel for conductance (resonance regime). So periodical changes of the conductance with increasing the length of the nanowire are associated with switching between resonance and off-resonance tunneling for odd- and even-numbered chains.

In Fig.2 we plot tunnel magnetoresistance as a function of the number of carbon atoms attached to ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co) in the linear response regime. The TMR coefficient reaches higher values for Ni electrodes in comparison with Co electrodes. Moreover, magnetoresistance varies periodically with increasing the length of atomic wire, which is a straightforward consequence of conductance oscillations. However, surprisingly odd-numbered nanowires showing a lower values of TMR coefficient than even-numbered ones (in opposition to conductance behavior).



Fig.2 Tunnel magnetoresistance as a function of the number of carbon atoms attached to Ni electrodes (solid curve, black circles) and Co electrodes (broken curve, gray circles), respectively. The other parameters of the model (given in eV):  $\epsilon = 0$ ,  $\beta = 2.4$ , U = 2,  $t_L = t_R = 0.5$ ,  $k_BT = 0.025$ .



Fig.3 Current-voltage characteristics for the device made of four carbon atoms (a: N = 4) and five carbon atoms (b: N = 5) attached to Ni electrodes (black circles) and Co electrodes (gray circles), respectively. Solid and broken curves correspond to parallel and antiparallel alignment of the electrodes' magnetization. The other parameters of the model (given in eV):  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $\beta = 2.4$ , U = 2,  $t_L = t_R = 0.5$ ,  $k_BT = 0.025$ .

Oscillations for Ni electrodes are not so evident as for Co electrodes. This effect again strongly depends on: the strength of the molecule-to-electrodes coupling and the position of Fermi level in relation to the electronic structure of the molecular wire. Anyway, the choice of Coulomb integral have negligible influence on our zero-bias results, since the value of U-parameter is essential only for finite voltages (as will be discussed later in this paper).

## **B.** Nonlinear response regime

Now we discuss the voltage dependence of transport characteristics found in the nonlinear response regime. For higher voltages (V > 0.1 Volt), the current becomes a nonlinear function of an applied bias (see Eq.13). Such nonlinearity arises because of: the exponential dependence of Fermi functions on bias voltage and the variation of the molecular Green function due to the voltage shift of the site energy levels in the wire. Figure 3 shows I-V curves for the case of four-atom and five-atom nanowires connected to ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co). Such I-V curves are fairly smooth, since the energy level broadening due to its contact with the electrodes is significant. The current for the P alignment reaches higher values than for the AP configuration in the case of analyzed materials. Similarly, the current for Ni-based junctions reaches higher values in comparison with Co-based junctions.

Although the predicted order of the magnitude of the current values (hundreds of  $\mu$ A) is comparable with some *ab initio* computations [33-35], the discrepancy with the experimental results indicates that the coupling of the molecule to the electrodes can be smaller than estimated. There are few factors that can be crucial in determining the parameter of the coupling strength, such as: the atomic-scale contact geometry, the nature of the molecule-toelectrodes coupling (chemisorption or physisorption) or even the variations of surface properties due to adsorption of molecular monolayer. Additional effects that can alter the value of the current flowing through the junction are associated with some temperature effects (hot electrons and vibrational coupling) or local disorder in the electrodes near the contacts (electron localization) [36].



Fig.4 Tunnel magnetoresistance for the device made of four carbon atoms (a: N = 4) and five carbon atoms (b: N = 5) attached to Ni electrodes (solid curves) and Co electrodes (broken curves), respectively. Gray and black circles correspond to different Hubbard parameters U = 0 and U = 2. The other parameters of the model (given in eV):  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,  $\beta = 2.4$ ,  $t_L = t_R = 0.5$ ,  $k_BT = 0.025$ .

In Fig.4 we plot tunnel magnetoresistance for the devices made of four-atom and fiveatom nanowires connected to ferromagnetic electrodes (Ni and Co). Here we can observe oscillations of TMR coefficient with increasing of bias voltage. Such effect is independent from the strength of the U-parameter (and even the presence or absence of potential drop along the molecular wire). It turned out that Coulomb repulsion are important in determining magnetoresistance (or alternatively conductance) only in the case of higher voltages (compare gray and black circles in Fig.4). The effect of electro-electron interactions (taken into account within the molecular system) is mostly to reduce the TMR parameter.

## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to T. Kostyrko and B. Bułka for many valuable discussions.

# References

<sup>1</sup> E-mail: <u>walczak@amu.edu.pl</u>

- [1] R. M. Metzger, Acc. Chem. Res. 32, 950 (1999).
- [2] J. Chen, M. A. Reed, A. M. Rawlett and J. M. Tour, Science 286, 1550 (1999).
- [3] M. A. Reed, J. Chen, A. M. Rawlett, D. W. Price and J. M. Tour, Appl. Phys. Lett. 78, 3735 (2001).
- [4] J. Park, A. N. Pasupathy, J. I. Goldsmith, C. Chang, Y. Yaish, J. R. Petta, M. Rinkoski, J. P. Sethna, H. D. Abruńa, P. L. McEuen and D. C. Ralph, Nature 417, 722 (2002).
- [5] G. A. Prinz, Science 282, 1660 (1998).
- [6] I. Žutić, J. Fabian, S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 323 (2004).
- [7] N. Garcia, M. Mũnoz and Y.-W. Zhao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 2923 (1999).
- [8] H. Imamura, N. Kobayashi, S. Takahashi and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5128 (2000).
- [9] E. G. Emberly and G. Kirczenow, Chem. Phys. 281, 311 (2002).
- [10] M. Zwolak and M. Di Ventra, Appl. Phys. Lett. 81, 925 (2002).
- [11] W. I. Babiaczyk and B. R. Bułka, Phys. Stat. Sol. (a) 196, 169 (2003).
- [12] W. I. Babiaczyk and B. R. Bułka, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 16, 4001 (2004).
- [13] K. Walczak, arXiv:cond-mat/0410625 (2004).

- [14] J. R. Petta, S. K. Slater and D. C. Ralph, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 136601 (2004).
- [15] G. Roth and H. Fischer, Organometallics 15, 5766 (1996).
- [16] N. D. Lang and Ph. Avouris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3515 (1998).
- [17] N. D. Lang and Ph. Avouris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 358 (2000).
- [18] K. Raghavachari and J. S. Binkley, J. Chem. Phys. 87, 2191 (1987).
- [19] L. Lou and P. Nordlander, Phys. Rev. B 54, 16659 (1996).
- [20] V. Mujica, M. Kemp, A. Roitberg and M. Ratner, J. Chem. Phys. 104, 7296 (1996).
- [21] T. Kostyrko and B. R. Bułka, Phys. Rev. B 67, 205331 (2003).
- [22] W. Tian, S. Datta, S. Hong, R. Reifenberger, J. I. Henderson and C. P. Kubiak, J. Chem. Phys. 109, 2874 (1998).
- [23] H. Haug and A.-P. Jauho, *Quantum Kinetics in Transport and Optics of Semiconductors*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1998.
- [24] S. T. Pantelides, M. Di Ventra and N. D. Lang, Physica B 296, 72 (2001).
- [25] A. Di Carlo, M. Gheorghe, P. Lugli, M. Sternberg, G. Seifert and T. Frauenheim, Physica B 314, 86 (2002).
- [26] L. E. Hall, J. R. Reimers, N. S. Hush and K. Silverbrook, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 1510 (2000).
- [27] Y. Meir and N. S. Wingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2512 (1992).
- [28] A. Oguri, Physica E 18, 81 (2003).
- [29] P. F. Bagwell and T. P. Orlando, Phys. Rev. B 40, 1456 (1989).
- [30] W. Tian and S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B 49, 5097 (1994).
- [31] M. Magoga and C. Joachim, Phys. Rev. B 56, 4722 (1997).
- [32] M. Magoga and C. Joachim, Phys. Rev. B 57, 1820 (1998).
- [33] M. Di Ventra, S. T. Pantelides and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 979 (2000).
- [34] S. T. Pantelides, M. Di Ventra and N. D. Lang, Physica B 296, 72 (2001).
- [35] M. Di Ventra, N. D. Lang and S. T. Pantelides, Chem. Phys. 281, 189 (2002).
- [36] P. W. Anderson, D. J. Thouless, E. Abrahams and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 22, 3519 (1980).