Reply to "Comment on 'Fano resonance for Anderson Impurity System s' "

In their C om m ent, K olf et al. [1] criticizing our work on the Fano resonance for A nderson in purity system s [2], based their argum ent on the assumption that the G reen's function of d-electron has approximately a Lorentzian form around the K ondo energy (Eq. (1) in [1]). However, that assumption is inconsistent with the numerical renormalization group (NRG) results[3], revealing an asymmetric lineshape of the in purity quasiparticle peak for system swithout particle-hole symmetry, especially in the mixed valence regime. The asymmetric lineshape, resulting mainly from the interference between the K ondo resonance and the broadening in purity level[2], can strongly a ect the low energy behavior of conduction electrons, in particular the di erential conductance measured in STM experiments, and should not be ignored.

In their C om m ent, K olf et al. correctly pointed out that Eq. (8) in [2] overestim ates the asymmetry of the impurity lineshape in the mixed valence regime. How - ever, the error in Eq. (8) was not caused by Eq. (4) in [2] which is rigorous. It can be derived using the equation of motion m ethod w ithout invoking W ick's theorem. The error is instead due to an oversim plication in our approximate expression for  $T_d$  (!), Eq. (7) in [2], containing a K ondo resonance pole and a slow ly varying background. The correct low energy form of  $T_d$  (!) should be [4]:

$$T_{d}(!) = \frac{ae^{i}}{! ! ! + i_{K}} + t_{in \, coh};$$
 (1)

where  $e^1$  is the phase factor that wasm issed in [2]. In the K ondo lim it, 0 and a  $_{\rm K} = _{\rm d;0}$ , the above equation reduces to Eq. (7), while in the m ixed valence regime m issing of the phase factor leads to an overestimation of the lineshape asymmetry. Replacing Eq. (7) in [2] with the above equation, the rest of derivations in [2] are still valid. Therefore our main physical picture and conclusions made in [2] remain unchanged.

Using Eqs. (4-6) in [2] and Eq. (1) here, we have reanalyzed the experimental data of Ti/Au and Ti/Ag systems, assuming U! 1 for simplicity. The tting parameters are  $(n, "_d, , "_K, _K, a, , q_c) = (0.38, 2.3,$ 65:0, 1:9, 4:0, 28:2, 2:7, 2:0) for T i/Au and (0:53, 13:4, 38:8, 1:4,5:2,144:9,3:0,1:8) for Ti/Ag ("F = 0 and the unit of energy is m eV). Figure 1 shows that the experin ental data can be well described by these equations. However, after the inclusion of the phase factor, d(!)cannot be any more expressed in the simplied form of a Fano resonance as given by Eq. (8) in [2]. The insets show d(!) are asymmetric, but now without unphysicaldip structure, in qualitative agreem ent with the NRG results $\beta$ ]. The values of the tting parameters indicate that both Ti/Au and Ti/Ag systems are in the mixed valence regime, being consistent with the experimental analysis and our previous conclusion. Thus their criticism that our analysis "is conceptually incorrect and the quantitative agreem ent of ... is meaningless" is unjustied.



FIG.1: Comparison between theoretical tting curves and the STM experimental data for T i/A u and T i/A g. The inset shows the corresponding in purity density of states.

The second comment of [1] is conceptually incorrect. and K result from two di erent physical e ects and represent two di erent energy scales. They can certainly be distinguished, at least in the lim it  $_{\rm K}$ when the broadened in purity level can be taken e ectively as a continuum channel and our theory can be applied. In the mixed valence regime, the fact that one cannot see a sharp peak with width  $_{\rm K}$  does not mean at all the absence of that energy scale. In the third comment, the authors of Ref. [1] claim ed that the values of we obtained for T i/A u and T i/A g are too sm all. How ever, they did not give any m evidence to support that claim. In fact, as revealed by experim ents, the spectra for di erent transition metal atoms on Au surface behave very di erently [5]. Thus, there is no reason to expect that the hybridization between a transition metal atom and conduction electrons should have the sam e order ofm agnitude.

H.G.Luo, T.Xiang, X.Q.W ang, Z.B.Su, and L.Yu Institute of Theoretical Physics and Interdisciplinary Center of Theoretical Studies, Chinese A cadem y of Sciences, P.O.Box 2735, Beijing 100080, China

- [1] Ch.Kolfet al, the Comment.
- [2] H.G.Luo et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 256602 (2004).
- [3] T.A.Costi, A.C. Hewson, and V.Zlatic, J.Phys.: Condens. M atter 6, 2519 (1994).
- [4] See, e.g., J. R. Taylor, Scattering Theory (John W iley, 1972), p407.
- [5] T. Jam neala, V. M adhavan, W. Chen, and M. F. Crommie, Phys. Rev. B 61, 9990 (2000).