

Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of interacting tunneling transport: variational grand potential and nature of forces

P. Hyldgaard

*Department of Microtechnology and Nanoscience, MC2,
Chalmers University of Technology, SE-41296 Gothenburg, Sweden*

(Dated: November 2, 2022)

The present standard theoretical approach to investigate current-induced structural relaxations in operating tunneling systems involves calculations and implementations of the electrostatic forces. A meaningful implementation of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation (BOA) for tunneling systems requires, however, a formulation of forces within a nonequilibrium (NEQ) thermodynamic theory because we seek transformations which are so slow that they do not lead to an excitation, for example, in the form of an unrelaxed electron entropy content. In this paper I recast a formal NEQ thermodynamic theory for fully interacting tunneling systems, starting from the exact electron quantum kinetics account. I identify the operator for the Gibbs free energy and I define a NEQ thermodynamic grand potential value as well as a corresponding functional which I show is variational with respect to NEQ solution density matrices. From this exact theory, I define thermodynamic forces which are explicitly conservative, given by a generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem, and different from the electrostatic forces. I furthermore show that the uniqueness-of-density proof from a closely related Lippmann-Schwinger collision density functional theory [Phys. Rev. B **78**, 165109 (2008)] makes it possible to express the variational NEQ thermodynamic description in terms of electron-density functionals. I use the variational property to demonstrate that the thermodynamic forces correspond to an entropy maximization which is naturally tempered by a rigorous implementation of boundary conditions. I find that these forces are, in fact, adiabatic as they cannot produce any thermodynamic excitation for sufficiently slow implementations of the nuclei dynamics. I also demonstrate that a slow transformation around a closed loop can never be a source of any entropy, total internal-energy or Gibbs free energy accumulation or depletion, i.e., that there are no inherent tendency for run-away effects in the electron dynamics and therefore no inconsistencies in making an assumption of steady-state tunneling. Finally, I suggest that the here-described thermodynamic approach provides a more consistent implementation of forces, a nonequilibrium BOA for use in computational studies of interacting tunneling.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Gk, 71.10.-w, 72.10.Bg, 71.15.-m

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding self-organizing functional molecular systems presents significant challenges for condensed-matter physics theory. Molecular self-assembly mechanisms provide a low-cost fabrication approach¹ which mimics the molecular-recognition principle² of Nature and which can open technological possibilities, for example, atomically precise production of electronics³ and switching⁴ components. The functionality is specified by the quantum-mechanical behavior of the electrons which typically respond to nonequilibrium (NEQ) conditions. It is natural to assume a Born-Oppenheimer approximation (BOA) of sorts and, in practice, we solve the NEQ electron dynamics problem for model systems or for frozen nuclei coordinates within an electron quantum-kinetic account (QKA).⁵⁻¹³ Accurate theoretical studies have, until recently, delayed the discussion of the NEQ forces which are exerted on the nuclei by transport-induced changes in the electron behavior. Nevertheless, it is a central result from the family of electron density functional theory (DFT) formulations¹⁴⁻²⁸ that the electron behavior is uniquely determined by the specific atomic configuration. Also, molecular systems are characterized by sparseness,²⁹ i.e., have regions of low electron concen-

trations. The components are free to adapt their morphology to the specific environment. To guide development of a molecular system to a pre-specified functionality, it is essential to develop a nonempirical theory of relaxations and excitations,³⁰⁻⁵² in nanoscale tunneling.

A meaningful formulation and implementation of a NEQ BOA in electron QKA methods must be a cornerstone in the desired nonempirical theory of tunneling; the large ratio of nuclei to electron masses strongly suggests the general (but not universal) relevance of a suitable adiabatic behavior.⁵³ This motivates a detailed discussion of simplifications that arise in an electron quantum statistical mechanics (QSM) description from an assumption of adiabatic nuclei evolution. The electron NEQ QSM description must in turn reflect the inherent (open-boundary) thermodynamical nature⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶ of NEQ tunneling. A careful analysis is needed because the equilibrium BOA is cast in terms of concepts (system staying in a ground state or being fully thermalized) which require a reinterpretation before use in a theory of NEQ tunneling.

Recent discussions of both a nonconservative character and of run-away or water-wheel dynamics effects^{47,57-61} accentuates the need for developing a robust framework and a NEQ BOA for theoretical investigations of tunneling in nanoscale systems. Basing the description

(entirely^{47,57–59} or as the key starting point⁶⁰) on classical nuclei reacting to electrostatic forces, Refs. 47,57–60 argue for a nonconserving character of such forces and suggest that the electron tunneling dynamics by itself has an ability, and seemingly a general tendency, to cause structural instability (outside regular Joule heating). These findings are discussed in the absence of possible current-induced excitation of vibrations.⁴⁵ The nonconservative electrostatic forces (defined by electron transport) seem able to drive such potential water-wheel⁵⁸ effects even when a coupling to a phonon bath is included.^{60,61} The possible findings of an electron mechanism for generic current-driven structural instabilities run contrary to a wide-spread expectation.^{13,28,54–56,62–90} that NEQ tunneling can typically be analyzed as a steady-state transport phenomena because of the presence of an entropy flow.^{28,54,55,91,92} The discussions of a nonconservative nature and of inherent stability consequences of electrostatic forces^{47,57–60} are very important. If proven relevant for nanoscale tunneling systems, the ramifications are also serious: it would not be consistent to make a steady-state assumption and it would, for example, be very difficult to strengthen the foundation — as a rigorous steady-state transport DFT^{25–28} — of the widely used (but *ad hoc* defined) ballistic-transport codes.^{39–41,80–82}

However, the existing discussions of NEQ forces are not complete. The present-standard use of electrostatic forces in NEQ QSM does not fully exploit the simplification that an adiabatic nuclei behavior ensures,⁵³ for example, in terms of avoiding thermodynamic excitations. I observe below that there is no formal justification for using an electrostatic force definition under NEQ conditions in an infinite system. More importantly, such forces are not compatible with an open-boundary NEQ thermodynamic description when moving beyond^{55,66,69,70,79,93–95} approximative descriptions in which the leads simply serve as reservoirs of left- and right-moving particles.^{39,40,49,54,64,71,80–82,96} I stress that that many-body (MB) interactions in NEQ tunneling are known to cause changes in the statistical distribution among MB eigenstates^{55,56,88,89,97,98} and thus make complex thermodynamic excitations relevant. While use of electrostatic forces does ensure a disentanglement of nuclei and electron dynamics, it does not avoid creating such MB excitations of the ensemble. It is motivated to question the use of electrostatic forces and deepen the discussion of a NEQ adiabatic nature.

This paper recasts a rigorous NEQ QSM formulation of thermodynamics of general NEQ tunneling, *thereby* permitting a more precise discussion of the adiabatic nature of relaxations in NEQ tunneling. The paper delivers a suitable definition of thermodynamic forces and allows an implementation of a NEQ BOA for electron QKA methods. To accomplish that, the paper expresses a formally exact NEQ thermodynamic theory within the electron QKA which, in turn, is expected to contain all boundary, entropy, and entropy-flow effects in the elec-

tron system. The paper proves a generalization of the variational principle for the NEQ thermodynamic grand canonical ensemble; the proof follows by a straightforward extension of Mermin’s analysis in his development of the equilibrium-thermodynamic DFT.¹⁶ The variational property reflects a maximization of entropy subject to the rigorous boundary conditions set by exact QKA determination of the internal energy and Gibbs-free energy content. The here-defined thermodynamic forces are conservative and cause the electron-nuclei system to reach a further entropy maximization (again tempered by evaluations of relevant thermodynamic properties).

I note that the exact NEQ thermodynamic theory does not provide (nor needs) a uniqueness-of-density argument (as is possible in the equilibrium case¹⁶). However, I also note that the present NEQ thermodynamic account is developed in the same continuum Caroli partition scheme^{62,63} as was previously used in the formulation²⁸ of a MB Lippmann-Schwinger^{99,100} (LS) collision density functional theory (LSC-DFT); the appendix of Ref. 28 provides an argument that one can treat both the NEQ thermodynamic quantities and associated NEQ density matrix solutions as electron-density functionals.

The paper is organized as follows. The next section presents the background, summarizing the recent discussions (of a possible nonconservative nature of forces) to which I here add a perspective on adiabaticity. Section III contains an overview of the formal results for thermodynamic quantities and a description of the nature of the here-defined thermodynamic forces. Section IV presents the partition scheme, including the Hamiltonian and the thermodynamic boundary conditions which are used in the formal collision description of NEQ interaction tunneling and upon which the thermodynamic description rests. Section V provides a presentation of the quantum kinetics account (QKA) and formal NEQ QSM solutions while section VI presents the variational nature of the NEQ thermodynamic theory and the linking with the LSC-DFT.²⁸ Section VII investigates the nature of steady-state forces and Section VIII contains a summary and acknowledgment. Finally, the paper contains two appendices. Appendix A provides details of the proof for a Mermin-type variational principle, i.e., a generalized Hellmann-Feynman (GHF) principle. Appendix B contains a mathematical argument for formal compatibility of LSC-DFT and the here-presented NEQ thermodynamic theory.

II. BACKGROUND: FORCES, RELAXATIONS, AND STABILITY IN TUNNELING

The highly successful standard DFT,^{14,15} i.e., ground-state DFT (GS-DFT) *illustrates* the level of detail and predictive power that we desire from a new nonempirical NEQ computational theory. GS-DFT rests on an equilibrium total-energy variational principle and regularly delivers accurate characterizations of structure for

dense (hard) matter problems using the generalized gradient approximation.¹⁰¹ In GS-DFT, the forces $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^C$ on the nuclei are entirely electrostatic (or Coulombic and hence identified by a superscript ‘C’) in nature and they are given by the traditional, ground-state Hellmann-Feynman (HF) theorem,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} U_{\text{GS}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\text{GS}} \equiv -\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^C. \quad (1)$$

connecting the total-internal energy $U_{\text{GS}} \equiv \langle H \rangle_{\text{GS}}$ directly with the equilibrium forces. A generalized HF-type variational property defined by the thermodynamic grand potential,¹⁶ permits a corresponding simplification of forces on systems described in an equilibrium grand canonical ensemble.

With accurate and transferable functional approximations, the GS-DFT and the equilibrium-thermodynamic DFT¹⁶ are ideally suited to provide a nonempirical description of structural relaxations through an equilibrium BOA; calculations of the density provide a direct determination of the Coulombic force from Eq. (1). The flexibility for relaxations and the presence of important low density regions does imply that even GS-DFT face a significant challenge when trying to describe molecular tunneling system already in equilibrium. Nevertheless, GS-DFT has recently begun to deliver results for the even broader class of sparse-matter systems.^{29,102} The presence of low electron density regions in such systems implies that the dispersive and van der Waals forces play an important role in determining the resulting structure, cohesion, and functionality. There are developments both in semi-empirical¹⁰³ and new nonlocal density functional^{104–106} descriptions with accounts of dispersive or van der Waals interactions. It has become possible to obtain, for example, nonempirical descriptions of interactions and resulting morphology of self-organizing organic-molecular overlayer systems^{107–109} *in equilibrium*.

However, in spite of the GS-DFT versatility, there is no meaningful application to working tunneling systems since the NEQ nature invalidates the foundation for the total-energy variational principle. A breakdown of the ground state HF is broadly expected. The source and extent of the deviation (of the forces from a total-energy variational principle) are explicitly expressed in this paper.

The QKA^{5–13} provides, in principle, a full account of NEQ QSM but actual implementations focus on the electron dynamics and must still rely on empirical input for descriptions of actual systems. Formal electron QKA methods give an exact treatment of NEQ tunneling in a general external (configuration-specific) potential. Actual computational implementations of QKA methods are (of course) approximative but, worse, they are also empirical in the sense that they rely on assumptions of a frozen external potential (i.e., an assumption of frozen nuclei positions) when used to describe actual systems. It is because of this frozen-nuclei computation approach,

that we must now (separately) develop a suitable implementation of a NEQ BOA to reflect the expected adiabatic behavior.

The electron QKA is very powerful and useful. Of central importance for the present paper, I note that the set of QKA methods includes time-evolution methods^{110,111} and reformulations (here termed ReNQSM) of the NEQ QSM for steady-state tunneling^{13,55,56,88,97} and for tunneling systems with a period or pulsed time dependence of the external field.^{112,113} I note that the ReNQSM framework can be adapted for both time-averaged⁸⁹ and variational⁹⁰ determinations of interacting transport in nanoscale systems. The electron QKA also includes Wigner-distribution calculations, for example, as described in an early and clear discussion⁵⁴ of the role of open boundaries and of a need for a thermodynamical treatment of NEQ tunneling.

The electron QKA has found, perhaps, its most common expression in the NEQ Green function (NEGF) technique,^{8–10} based on a diagrammatic approach and with an important emphasis on conserving approximations.⁷ The NEGF approach has brought both analysis and methods.^{38,49,51,52,62,63,65–67,69–79,85,87,114,115} Part of this formal development involves a coupling of an electron QKA with both traditional (finite-system) time-dependent DFT (TD-DFT)^{26,27} and adaptations of TD-DFT results to infinite tunneling systems.^{25,28,95} In the context of nanoscale tunneling transport, there exist, for example, formal generalizations^{66,69,70} of the Landauer-Büttiker formula⁶⁴ to MB interaction cases but also warnings^{55,69,75,79,83,94,95} of a breakdown for an oversimplified single-particle interpretation of this formal result. The NEGF methods have in turn given us a detailed characterization of NEQ interaction effects in nanoscale tunneling transport.^{31,38,44,46,48,54,68,69,73,77–79,84–86,96,116–120}

At the same time, I note that there is a lack of a nonempirical quality in present electron-QKA studies which do not implement effects of NEQ forces and relaxations (except in model studies). It is exciting that recent NEQ QSM calculations, using the self-consistent GW approximation,^{117,119,120} have begun to free the NEGF method of rigid, frozen parameterizations of the interatomic coupling strengths (for actual systems). Still, such (electron) calculations are not yet employed to also predict structural relaxations which results, for example, when we seek to characterize the multiple (meta-)stable configurations in current-induced molecular switching.⁴

The absence of a nonempirical character arises not only from computational limitations but also from a fundamental problem: there is no universally accepted approach to implement the BOA for systems that are out of equilibrium. A complete QKA, treating both electrons and nuclei as quantum-mechanical objects, will obviously provide an exact determination of wind forces and

electromigration³⁰

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} \equiv -i \frac{d}{dt} \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle |_{\text{full QKA}}. \quad (2)$$

However, the key issue is to ensure a suitable adiabatic behavior,⁵³ i.e. a meaningful NEQ BOA, when using electron-QKA calculations to approximately predict the actual relaxation. The challenge of trying to thus address the electromigration has stimulated a sequence of method-development, analysis, and model studies.^{47,50–52,57–59} Effectively, the existing descriptions are built on the *definition*

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{C,NEQ}} \equiv - \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\text{NEQ}}, \quad (3)$$

and an *assumption* (for example, expressed by a choice of Lagrangian) that the relevant adiabatic NEQ forces are given by this electrostatic character, i.e., the assumption $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} \approx \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{C,NEQ}}$. I note that while the assumption of electrostatic forces has recently been supplemented by terms describing the coupling to a phonon bath, it is the electron behavior expressed by the Coulombic forces (3) which are seen as the source for a possible structural instability in tunneling systems.^{60,61}

Trusting a NEQ usage of electrostatic forces has important ramifications. There are important modeling consequences of the recent electrostatic-force analysis.^{47,57–60} The emphasis on electrostatics would, of course, be convenient for both electron QKA methods and for the set of rigorous, DFT-based formulations^{25–28,47} since access to the exact electron density will directly yield the electrostatic forces. *At the same time, if* nanoscale tunneling must be treated through nonconservative electrostatic forces, it would imply that we cannot use any state function to fully characterize properties (including morphology) of steady-state NEQ tunneling. Contrary to the traditional and general expectation, it would imply that treating tunneling as a steady state phenomena would rarely be consistent (because of a would-be inherent tendency for a run-away dynamics induced already by the electron system). Nonconservative forces would in particular imply that we can never construct a broad rigorous electron-density functional description^{25–28} for steady-state tunneling. It would then be exceedingly difficult to strengthen the foundation of the present-standard transport codes^{80–82} (which now rest on an ad-hoc combination of GS-DFT and a Landauer-Büttiker⁶⁴ type scattering description).

However, a question mark must be clearly expressed in the electrostatic-force assumption,

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} = - \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\text{NEQ}}? \quad (4)$$

The question mark is stressed primarily because the ansatz (4) does not implement the full character of the expected behavior in NEQ thermodynamic systems with genuine MB interactions^{55,56} as explained further below.

First, though, it is relevant to discuss another limitation: the ansatz (4) lacks a formal derivation for open, infinite systems out of equilibrium. This is true even if we seek to characterize the full dynamics in a given open-boundary tunneling system with classical nuclei (at a specific time). Like Refs. 51,52,57, I observe that the ansatz can only be derived subject to an additional assumption of an absence of a velocity-dependent force term. This is a relevant reservation for one must expect that friction effects can arise not only through coupling to vibrations but also within an electron QKA, as a result of a combination between electron-electron scattering and the finite particle and entropy flow. Refs. 50,57,59 correctly points out that there is a need for corrections to the use of Ehrenfest theorem¹²¹

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle |_{\text{EQ or finite}} = \langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\text{EQ or finite}}. \quad (5)$$

Here the subscripts on both sides emphasize that the proof is only available for equilibrium¹²² or for finite systems.¹²¹ Reservations (and a possible work around for single-particle wavefunctions) are formulated^{50,57,59} when we have only a limited accuracy in the pure-state expansion or when working with (single-particle) scattering states^{80,123} because these are not square renormalizable. However, the reservations apply equally well for MB collision problems (when there is no work around) treated in the formal LS approach.^{28,100,124}

Ehrenfest theorem is, of course, relevant for calculations in traditional time-dependent DFT,¹²⁵ which implicitly assumes a finite extension of the MB problem.^{126,127} However, Ehrenfest proof (for single-particle dynamics) rests on using Green's theorem

$$\int_V (u \Delta v - v \Delta u) d\mathbf{r} = \int_S (u \nabla v - v \nabla u) \cdot d\boldsymbol{\tau} \quad (6)$$

and on using an assumed cancellation of the surface terms (in 'S') at infinity.¹²¹ However, there is no argument directly available for a cancellation for scattering states (except by the single-particle work around discussed in Refs. 50). In fact, a careful handling of surface terms is essential for both the formal single-particle collision formulation,¹²³ for a consistent NEGF evaluation of non-interacting tunneling transport,^{75,128} and for a LS collision description of an open MB interaction problem.^{99,124} No argument exists for Ehrenfest theorem for the electron QKA which treats NEQ tunneling as a MB collision problem.^{28,62,63}

This paper takes a fundamentally different route than the Ehrenfest or electrostatic-force approach (4) to ensure an improved description of an adiabatic character in relaxations and a better framework for implementing a NEQ BOA. The primary problem with the ansatz (4) is that it attempts to describe the full, unrestricted dynamics of a given pure state (at a given time). However, we need an ensemble description and an unrestricted implementation of an ansatz for pure-state forces (4) is not what we want. The pure-state force description may — in

fact, will certainly — propel the tunneling system to an ensemble configuration with an excess thermodynamic-potential value (that is, with an under-relaxed electron-entropy content).

The inherent thermodynamic character of tunneling⁵⁴ and formal insight based on the exact steady-state ReNQSM,^{55,56,88,89} give strong arguments for refining the NEQ description beyond electrostatic forces to ensure an adiabatic behavior in the implementation of nuclei dynamics. Most tunneling systems can be expected to approach a steady-state behavior^{25,91,92} due to the open-boundary conditions and due to the presence of an entropy flow.^{28,54,55,97} The QKA naturally treats such a system as an effective ensemble of tunneling systems and the QKA correctly reflects the existence of statistical fluctuations in the electron distribution at relevant times, $t \approx 0$. The fluctuations manifest themselves, for example, as current noise.^{65,129,130} The presence of fluctuations also motivates a time-averaged operator approach, Ref. 89,98. A natural assumption of ergodicity also implies that the full temporal evolution of the electron behavior for the tunneling system will itself produce such an ensemble (even in the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$): the classical nuclei will never swim the exact same electron stream.

Electrostatic forces will only be interesting if the definition (3) provides an evaluation which is representative for the ensemble. However, the source of an additional force contribution with a statistical origin is evident in the exact ReNQSM result for an effective (unnormalized) steady state NEQ density matrix⁵⁵

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}} \equiv \exp[-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})]. \quad (7)$$

The NEQ density matrix is given not only in terms of the Hamiltonian but also in terms of an operator¹³¹ \hat{Y}_{LS} for interaction-induced redistributions of electrons. Accordingly, it is important that the forces that effectively acts on this ensemble (of steady-state NEQ tunneling systems) reflect the sensitivity of this electron redistribution on the nuclei position.¹³² Going towards a thermodynamic account is particularly relevant for combining an electron QKA with a NEQ BOA, for we seek a description of relaxation which mimics suitably defined adiabatic transformations.

III. FORMAL THERMODYNAMICS RESULTS

I use a continuum formulation to describe the NEQ electron dynamics in tunneling as a collision problem to ensure that the formal solution is *nonempirical*. That is, I emphasize a continuum description so that the formal NEQ thermodynamic solution permits calculations of parametric derivatives. The here-presented thermodynamic theory can (in connection with a NEQ BOA) therefore *predict* atomic-structure relaxations under operating (current carrying) conditions. Thus the present thermodynamic theory is, in principle, capable of deliver-

ing an *ab initio level of detail* (as we can do in equilibrium with GS-DFT).

This paper motivates and provides a definition of an exact NEQ thermodynamic grand potential value and a corresponding functional,

$$\Omega_{\text{col}}(t) \equiv -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta[H(t) - \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)]}\}, \quad (8)$$

$$\Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] \equiv \text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)[H(t) - \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho}(t)]\}, \quad (9)$$

respectively. I denote the inverse temperature as β . A subscript ‘col’ is used to emphasize that the NEQ interaction tunneling problem is solved as a formal MB collision problem for a general time dependence. This approach was also taken in the development of LSC-DFT.²⁸ The functional formulation is a generalization of Mermin’s equilibrium thermodynamic theory¹⁶ and it is closely related to ReNQSM descriptions.^{55,97,112,113} The NEQ thermodynamic grand potential (9) is a functional of the class of possible NEQ (time-dependent) density matrices $\hat{\rho}(t)$. The definition and formal results are made possible by the identification of an operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ for the NEQ Gibbs free energy for MB collision problems.

This paper also demonstrates that the grand potential functional (9) is extremal at the exact NEQ collision density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$:

$$\Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] > \Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)] = \Omega_{\text{col}}(t). \quad (10)$$

That is, the grand potential functional acquires the expected minimum (8) as the extremal value and serves both to identify the exact NEQ grand potential value (8) and the exact NEQ density matrix for interacting tunneling problems. The Mermin-like variational principle (10) of this NEQ thermodynamic theory supplements the ReNQSM-based variational principle defined by a variance expression in Ref. 90 and supplements the ground-state, action, and MB-LS T-matrix variational principles used in DFT formulations.

The variational property (10) is proved in appendix A for members, $\hat{\rho}$, of the class of normalized NEQ density matrices with a statistical weighting given by a Hermitian operator $\hat{X}(t)$ and normalization $N_{\hat{X}(t)}$,

$$\hat{\rho} \in \{N_{\hat{X}(t)}\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}(t)}\}; \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}(t)} \equiv \exp[-\beta\hat{X}(t)], \quad (12)$$

$$N_{\hat{X}(t)} = \text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}(t)}\}. \quad (13)$$

The set of all possible NEQ solution density matrices, $\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$ (resulting in MB collision problems) are contained in $\{N_{\hat{X}(t)}\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}(t)}\}$; the conservative nature of the QKA is, of course, sufficient to ensure that the normalization is independent of time.

This paper uses the formal electron QKA of thermodynamic to identify new thermodynamic forces which I find explicitly satisfy the adiabatic criteria of a meaningful NEQ BOA. Here I focus on tunneling systems in

cases where a steady-state transport does emerge, as is expected to happen in general because of the entropy flow.^{28,91,92} For these systems it is possible to define the solution grand potential as a state-function, $\bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}$. The thermodynamic forces are defined as minus the parametric derivatives (with respect to nuclei positions \mathbf{R}_i) of this state function,

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{LS},\mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}. \quad (14)$$

These thermodynamic forces express a tendency of the (overall, electron-nuclei) system to maximize the (electron) entropy by exploiting atomic-coordinate changes (thus extending entropy optimization beyond the maximization which already occurs at frozen coordinates).

I show that the thermodynamic forces are different from the electrostatic forces analyzed or used in a number of previous studies.^{39,47,49–52,57–60} The here-defined thermodynamic forces are given by a GHF variational theorem

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}} = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} [H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}] \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}}. \quad (15)$$

The thermodynamic forces are explicitly conservative and I show that they are adiabatic. In summary, I find that use of thermodynamic forces are guided by a fundamental principle and that they are the best approximation for implementing a meaningful NEQ BOA.

Finally, I note that the set of formal results leads towards a rigorous single-particle formulation of steady-state NEQ thermodynamics, a formulation that uses the LSC-DFT proof for uniqueness of density.²⁸ However, I emphasize that the expectation value of the here-defined Gibbs free energy operator \hat{Y}_{LS} cannot easily be described as a universal functional as it has an explicit dependence on the external potential.^{55,97,98}

IV. PARTITION SCHEME AND HAMILTONIAN

The partition scheme of Caroli *et al.*, Ref. 62, allows a description of tunneling which is first principle and predictive (i.e., parameter-free, atomistic). This is true when the Caroli partition scheme is extended from the original tight-binding framework to the continuum formulation.^{28,63} The emphasis on an atomistic approach, i.e., with the description of the electron dynamics having a parametric dependence of the nuclei positions, is important because we desire a thermodynamic theory specific to the materials nature. Avoiding tight-binding parameters implies that electron behavior is completely specified by the position of the nuclei and by whatever external field that one chooses to apply. Subject to a suitable NEQ implementation of the BOA, one can therefore seek to relax atomic structure and morphology to provide a parameter-free and fully predictive thermodynamic description of interacting NEQ tunneling (starting from an electron Hamiltonian).

A. Initial disconnected equilibria system

I assume, for simplicity, that the tunneling structure only comprises a left (right) lead $\mathbf{r} < z_L (> z_R)$ plus a central tunneling region ‘C’ in $z_L < \mathbf{r} < z_R$. Using atomic units throughout, the total kinetic energy can thus be expressed by the operator

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \sum_s \int d\mathbf{r}' \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \{ \nabla \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \}^2 \right) \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}) \\ &\equiv K_L + K_R + K_C + \delta K \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $K_{L,R,C}$ has supports which are confined to the respective, separate components. For this atomistic Caroli partition scheme, the tunneling term is

$$\delta K = \sum_{i=L/R} \sum_s \int d\mathbf{r} \hat{\psi}_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \{ \nabla \delta(\mathbf{r} - z_i) \}^2 \right) \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r}). \quad (17)$$

One is free to make arbitrary choices for the positions $z_{L,R}$, since we formally carry the perturbation in δK (and all other interaction terms) to all orders.

In the far past, at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, the partition scheme assumes that each of the disconnected subsections $H_d = \sum_{i=L,C,R} H_i$ is in equilibrium at different chemical potentials $\mu_{L/C/R}$. Initially, at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, the system is described by a static potential $v_d(\mathbf{r})$ and corresponding operator

$$V_d = \int d\mathbf{r} v_d(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (18)$$

Here $\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \sum_s \psi_s^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}_s(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the electron-density operator. It is convenient to assume that the form of $v_d(\mathbf{r})$ for \mathbf{r} reduces to a uniform background potential $\phi_{L/R}$ for $z \rightarrow +/\infty$; in this case the values of ϕ_L and ϕ_R must be chosen to ensure charge neutrality of the initial, disconnected Hamiltonian

$$H_d = \sum_{i=L/R/C} K_i + V_0 \quad (19)$$

at $t \rightarrow -\infty$ (and at $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$ in general). I use $\{c_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}^\dagger\}$ to denote the set of operators which creates an electron in a H_d single-particle eigenstate with basis in the left, right, or center regions, respectively.

A simple Gibbs-weighting operator \hat{X}_d and associated unnormalized density matrix,

$$\hat{\rho}_d \equiv \exp[-\beta \hat{X}_d], \quad (20)$$

characterize the disconnected ($t \rightarrow -\infty$) system at inverse temperature β . The initial density matrix is a direct product of L/R/R equilibrium density matrices and the initial Gibbs weighting can therefore directly be expressed as a difference

$$\hat{X}_d \equiv H_d - \hat{Y}_d \quad (21)$$

between H_d and an operator for the $t \rightarrow -\infty$ Gibbs free energy,

$$\hat{Y}_d \equiv \sum_{i=L/R/C} \mu_i \hat{c}_{\lambda,i}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\lambda,i}. \quad (22)$$

The disconnected-equilibria ($t \rightarrow -\infty$) density matrix

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}_d}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}} = \frac{\exp[-\beta(H_d - \hat{Y}_d)]}{\text{Tr}\{\exp[-\beta(H_d - \hat{Y}_d)]\}} \quad (23)$$

is independent of the value of the applied bias $\phi_{\text{bias}} \equiv \phi_L - \phi_R = \mu_L - \mu_R$. This specification is not in conflict with the analysis and conclusions presented in Ref. 93; the interacting tunneling system will evolve to gain the correct density distribution (the relation $\phi_L - \phi_R = \mu_L - \mu_R$ is neither valid nor used at relevant times $t \approx 0$). The initial density matrix depends exclusively on the initial electron concentration in the leads and the pair of values for lead chemical potentials, (and, formally, on the initial occupation of the central island ‘C’).²⁸

B. The interacting tunneling system

The continuum Caroli partition scheme assumes an adiabatic turning on of the fixed tunneling δK , of a given MB interaction W (for example, the full electron-electron interaction) and of a static electron-scattering potential $v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$ which includes the effects of the applied bias and of the set of atomic potentials. The scheme can also allow for an additional time-dependent potential $\phi_g(\mathbf{r}, t > t_g)$, for example, describing a gate operation starting at some finite time t_g . The total (time-dependent) collision potential is then

$$v_{\text{col}}(\mathbf{r}, t) = v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) + \phi_g(\mathbf{r}, t). \quad (24)$$

In several cases in the presentation of a thermodynamic theory for tunneling, the focus will be on the steady-state regime. Here the collision term simply describes the effect of the time-independent scattering potential

$$V_{\text{col}}(t) \longrightarrow V_{\text{sc}} = \int d\mathbf{r} v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (25)$$

In such steady state cases I will use a subscript ‘sc’ or ‘LS’ on formal evaluations to emphasize that the results are obtained when operators characterize the steady-state situation or the operators and expectation values are given by a formal LS solution, respectively.

For a continuum description (which allows atomistic calculations) of electron dynamics in NEQ interacting tunneling, I investigate the full quantum-kinetics of the electrons in the connected (time-dependent and interacting) Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = H_d + a_\eta(t) [H_1 + V_{\text{col}}(t)], \quad (26)$$

$$H_1 = \delta K + W \quad (27)$$

$$V_{\text{col}}(t) = \int d\mathbf{r} v_{\text{col}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (28)$$

The adiabatic turn on is described by a factor $a_\eta(t)$ which for all practical purposes¹³³ can be taken as $\exp(\eta t)$, $\eta \rightarrow 0$; the original LS analysis⁹⁹ of the MB collision problems used $\exp(\eta|t|)$, $\eta = 0^+$.

C. Relation to the quantum kinetics account

I note that both the original Caroli scheme and the presently used continuum Caroli partition scheme^{28,63} define a MB collision problem⁹⁹ for NEQ tunneling. Traditional MB collision problems involve an approach of originally free particles to a central interacting collision region; this approach can conveniently be expressed by an adiabatic turn on, for example, as used in the formal LS formulation,⁹⁹ and in subsequent analysis by Pirenne,¹³⁵ Dyson¹³⁶, Gellmann and Goldberger,¹³⁷ DeWitt,¹³⁸ and by others.

Ref. 114 provides an excellent introduction and discussion of application of formal collision theory to condensed matter theory problems. The trick of a soft turn on of the perturbations was soon applied also for (infinite) condensed matter problems to drive the system from a well-defined initial configuration and to the physically relevant case of an interacting MB system. The adiabatic turn on (and hence the inherent collision nature) is essential for the quantum-kinetics account of NEQ dynamics¹⁰ as well as specific NEGF calculations of interacting tunneling for it provides such calculations with a well-defined starting point.

The identification of operators, $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ or \hat{Y}_{LS} , for the emerging Gibbs free energy provides a link between the exact ReNQSM approach, formal MB collision theory (including LSCDFT), and the present exact thermodynamics. The steady-state Gibbs free energy operator coincides with the operator (originally termed ‘ \hat{Y} ’) that the steady-state ReNQSM uses to describe electron redistribution in the NEQ density matrix (7). This redistribution operator can be interpreted^{55,56}

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} = \sum_{\lambda,i=L/R/C} \hat{\psi}_{LS,\lambda,i}^\dagger \hat{\psi}_{LS,\lambda,i}. \quad (29)$$

in terms of a family of operators, $\{\hat{\Psi}_{LS,\lambda,i}^\dagger\}$ for MB-LS single-quasiparticle excitations (of energy $\epsilon_{\lambda,i=L/R/C}$). These operators express the adiabatic evolution (described by a MB Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_H \hat{A} \equiv [H, \hat{A}]$) of the initial (independent) states subject to full MB interaction,^{55,56,98}

$$\hat{\psi}_{LS,\lambda,i}^\dagger = \frac{i\eta}{\epsilon_{\lambda,i} + \mathcal{L}_H + i\eta} \hat{c}_{\lambda,i}^\dagger. \quad (30)$$

This operator-based ReNQSM analysis can be generalized and it is possible to express not only the general Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ but also the variational LS expression for the MB T-matrix²⁸ in terms of single-quasi-particle excitations. A more complete account will

be given in a forthcoming paper,⁹⁸ below I simply summarize the findings relevant for the NEQ thermodynamic theory.

V. NONEQUILIBRIUM QUANTUM STATISTICAL MECHANICS

The formal structure of the exact NEQ thermodynamic theory is obtained in the spirit of Mermin's 1965 formulation of equilibrium thermodynamics.¹⁶ In fact, in the absence of any applied bias one regains the grand canonical system for which Mermin succeeded in formulating an equilibrium-thermodynamic DFT.

A. Collision nature of transport

The general strategy for studying MB collision problems is to formally solve for projections of the full time-evolution operator

$$i\frac{\partial\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)}{\partial t} = H(t)\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty). \quad (31)$$

This operator describes, for example, a MB collision state

$$|\Psi_\xi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)|\Phi_\xi\rangle \quad (32)$$

originating and evolving from an initial state $|\Phi_\xi\rangle$. I shall assume that such initial states are simultaneous eigenstates of the disconnected-system operators H_d and \hat{Y}_d (of eigenvalues E_ξ and Y_ξ , respectively) and I expand the unnormalized, initial density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_d \equiv \sum_\xi |\Phi_\xi\rangle \exp[-\beta(E_\xi - Y_\xi)] \langle \Psi_\xi|. \quad (33)$$

For a steady state collision problem one can explicitly construct a NEQ density matrix which incorporates the full complexity of the MB LS solution.⁹⁹ This LS solution

$$|\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \frac{i\eta}{H - E_\xi + i\eta} |\Phi_\xi\rangle \quad (34)$$

constitutes an explicit construction of an interacting eigenstate of energy E_ξ for steady-state problems. Steady state solutions arise in the collision problems when the collision potential reduces to the time-independent form (25) and when the system dynamics is completely specified by $H(t=0)$. The MB LS solution (34) constitutes a projection of the time-evolution operator $\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)$, since it satisfies

$$\exp(-iE_\xi t)|\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)|\Phi_\xi\rangle. \quad (35)$$

in the limit of an infinitely slow adiabatic turn on, $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$. Combining Eqs. (33) and (35) yields an (unnormalized) steady-state NEQ collision density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_{LS} \equiv \sum_\xi |\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle \exp[-\beta(E_\xi - Y_\xi)] \langle \Psi_\xi^{(+)}|. \quad (36)$$

The explicit construction (36) of the steady-state NEQ density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{LS}$ provides a direct link of the NEQ thermodynamic theory (and of ReNQSM) to formal MB LS solutions.⁹⁹ A closely related link was expressed already in the steady-state ReNQSM papers, Ref. 55,56 as discussed in subsection III.C.

B. Collision picture of interacting tunneling

Standard QKA methods, including NEGF techniques, permit calculations of operator expectations values under NEQ conditions and must therefore provide a consistent treatment of the collision nature (32). The tested versatility of the MB LS equation for steady state problems motivates an effort to keep a corresponding collision picture for solving general (time-dependent or steady-state) interacting tunneling through a NEQ collision density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{col}(t)$.

Traditionally, the formal starting point for calculating the expectation value of an operator $\hat{O}(t)$ in a NEQ system is¹⁰

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{col}(t) \equiv \frac{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d \hat{O}_H(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}} \quad (37)$$

The subscript 'col' emphasizes that a Caroli collision picture underpins the definition. The evaluation (37) rests on the Heisenberg picture which represents a canonical transformation of operators,

$$\hat{O}(t) \longrightarrow \hat{O}_H(t) \equiv \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty)\hat{O}(t)\mathcal{U}(t,-\infty). \quad (38)$$

The Heisenberg picture has advantages for time-independent problems (for it leaves the MB eigenstates fixed), but it is not a natural description in the presence of the adiabatic turn found in the collision problems. Nevertheless, the original $t \rightarrow -\infty$ system (H_d) has a well-defined separated-equilibrium thermodynamics $\hat{\rho}_d$ and the formulation (37) still serves to uniquely define the expectation value because the QKAs emphasize accurate (conserving) descriptions of the time-evaluation $\mathcal{U}(t,\infty)$.

For development of a NEQ thermodynamic theory it is more advantageous to make the collision nature (32) explicit in the operators for thermodynamic quantities. I work below with a collision picture defined by operator transformations

$$\hat{A}(t) \longrightarrow \hat{A}_{col}(t) \equiv \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{A}(t)\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty) \quad (39)$$

because it offers a simpler interpretation. This approach is suggested by the formal steady-state LS solution⁹⁹ and it is here used for a general time-dependent tunneling case. In such a collision picture we obtain an explicit construction of the exact NEQ collision density matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{col}(t) &\equiv \mathcal{U}(t,-\infty)\hat{\rho}_d\mathcal{U}^\dagger(t,-\infty) \\ &= \sum_\xi |\Psi_\xi(t)\rangle \exp[-\beta(E_\xi - Y_\xi)] \langle \Psi_\xi(t)|. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The time evaluation of the density matrix is

$$i \frac{d\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}}{dt} = [H(t), \hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)]. \quad (41)$$

The formal time-evolution of other operators are also simpler than in the Heisenberg picture because of the opposite ordering of time-evolution operators in (40). In using the collision picture for thermodynamic operators (39) care is taken to verify that the resulting formulation remains exact and fully equivalent with the traditional formulations of the QKA.¹⁰ For the collision density matrix (40) the formal equivalence

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\text{col}}(t) \equiv \frac{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d \hat{O}_{\mathcal{H}}(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}} = \frac{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t) \hat{O}(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}}. \quad (42)$$

follows simply from a cyclic permutations of operators.

C. Thermodynamical description of nonequilibrium tunneling

The emerging nature of the collision density matrix (40) can be expressed in terms of an evolving Gibbs-weighting factor $\hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t)$. We start from the disconnected-equilibrium Gibbs weighting

$$\hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t \rightarrow -\infty) = \hat{X}_d \equiv H_d - \hat{Y}_d, \quad (43)$$

and express the evolution

$$\hat{X}_{\text{col}} = \mathcal{U}(t, -\infty) \hat{X}_d \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t, -\infty), \quad (44)$$

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t) = \exp[-\beta \hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t)]. \quad (45)$$

thus identifying (44) as the emerging Gibbs weighting.

The introduction of a NEQ Gibbs weighting factor motivates, in turn, a definition of the thermodynamic grand potential

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{col}}(t) &\equiv -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \text{Tr}\{\exp[-\beta \hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t)]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The exact ReNQSM^{55,56,88} shows that $H - Y_{\text{LS}}$ serves as a Gibbs weighting factor in steady state. For the general tunneling problem I define

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) \equiv H(t) - \hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t), \quad (47)$$

corresponding to a reformulation the normalized collision density matrix

$$\frac{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}} = \exp[\beta[\Omega_{\text{col}}(t) - H(t) + \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)]]. \quad (48)$$

A formal evaluation of the entropy $S_{\text{col}}(t)$ in the exact collision density matrix can therefore be expressed

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{col}}(t) &\equiv -\langle \ln(\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}) \rangle_{\text{col}} + \langle \ln(\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}\}) \rangle_{\text{col}} \\ &= -\beta \Omega_{\text{col}}(t) + \beta \langle H(t) \rangle_{\text{col}} - \beta \langle \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) \rangle_{\text{col}} \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

I consequently make the natural identification of $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ as the operator for the NEQ Gibbs free energy and I stress that the operator can be seen as emerging, with a time-evolution given by the LS collision picture (39). This interpretation is consistent with the boundary condition,

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t \rightarrow -\infty) = \hat{Y}_d = \sum_{\lambda, i} \mu_i \hat{c}_{\lambda, i}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\lambda, i}, \quad (50)$$

which obviously provides an explicit formulation of the Gibbs free energy in the original, disconnected-equilibria system. I note that, irrespectively of the interpretation, the operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ is uniquely specified by the collision nature of the Gibbs weighting operator $\hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t)$ or, equivalently, of the exact collision density matrix (45).

D. Nonequilibrium Gibbs free energy

An actual evaluation of the exact collision density matrix (45) requires an explicit determination of the operator for NEQ Gibbs free energy, $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$. This was (with the interpretation stated above) a central achievement of the exact steady-state ReNQSM, proceeding through an explicit construction \hat{Y}_{LS} order by order in the formal perturbation term.⁵⁵ Here I start instead with the collision nature of the problem, to obtain a generalization to general tunneling and to clarify the explicit connection to a full NEQ thermodynamic theory.

By the emerging nature of the Gibbs free energy operator (47), we can directly extract formal time evolution

$$i \frac{d\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)}{dt} = [H(t), \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)] + i \frac{dH(t)}{dt}, \quad (51)$$

a differential equation which, of course, must be solved subject to the (collision) boundary condition $Y_{\text{col}}(t \rightarrow -\infty) = \hat{Y}_d$. For the set of operators $\{\hat{c}_{\lambda, i=L/R/C}^\dagger\}$ which (at $t \rightarrow -\infty$) describes creation of single-particle H_d eigenstates (of single-particle energies $\epsilon_{\lambda, i=L/R/C}$.) we can formally establish the time-evolution in the collision picture

$$\hat{c}_{\lambda, i}^\dagger \longrightarrow \hat{\psi}_{\lambda, i}^\dagger(t) = \mathcal{U}(t, -\infty) \hat{c}_{\lambda, i}^\dagger \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t, -\infty). \quad (52)$$

In turn, the formal solution (52) provides an explicit determination of the operator for the emerging Gibbs free energy operator

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) = \sum_{\lambda, i=L/R/C} \hat{\psi}_{\lambda, i}^\dagger(t) \hat{\psi}_{\lambda, i}(t). \quad (53)$$

The exact NEQ Gibbs free energy value is calculated from (53) and from the uniquely specified NEQ solution density matrix,

$$Y_{\text{col}}(t) = \frac{\text{Tr}\{\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) \hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}}. \quad (54)$$

For problems with a time-independent scattering potential $v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$, and when an actual steady-state transport results, the emerging Gibbs free energy \hat{Y}_{sc} must coincide exactly with the ReNQSM redistribution operator,

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{sc}} = \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}. \quad (55)$$

The time evaluation is formally described by

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{sc}}(t) = \mathcal{U}(t, -\infty) \hat{Y}_d \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t, -\infty), \quad (56)$$

but it is alone the MB Hamiltonian [$H \equiv H(t=0)$] and the open boundary conditions which determine the properties of this emerging Gibbs free energy. The formal time dependence is therefore limited to the adiabatic turn on itself,

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{sc}} \approx \hat{Y}_d + \exp(\eta t) [\hat{Y}_{\text{sc}}(t=0) - \hat{Y}_d], \quad (57)$$

and there must be a cancellation of the time-dependence in the creation and destruction operators in (56). As a consequence, the resulting Gibbs free energy is characterized by a time evolution

$$i \frac{d\hat{Y}_{\text{sc}}}{dt} \propto \eta, \quad (58)$$

which is identical to that derived for the steady-state electron-redistribution operator \hat{Y}_{LS} derived and analyzed by Hershfield and Schiller.^{55,56}

E. Total-internal energy and state renormalization

When dealing with a fully time-dependent problem we obtain the exact total internal energy content directly from the NEQ density-matrix solution

$$U_{\text{col}}(t) = \frac{\text{Tr}\{H \hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\}} \quad (59)$$

This expression has just a trivial denominator, $\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)\} = \text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_d\}$, because of the unitary character of the time-evolution operator, and the conserving nature of the NEQ solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize an apparent (but not actual) difference which arises in the evaluation of steady-state thermodynamic quantities depending on whether one retains the full NEQ time dependence or whether one exploits the ReNEQSM [and the connection to formal MB LS solution via (36)]. The apparent differences is most clearly evident in the definition of a meaningful, i.e., system-specific evaluations of the steady-state total internal-energy content,

$$U_{\text{LS}} = \frac{\text{Tr}\{H \hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}\}}. \quad (60)$$

Because the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}$ commutes⁵⁵ with the fully interacting Hamiltonian (H), it is tempting (but

wrong) to conclude that the set of initial $t \rightarrow -\infty$ disconnected equilibria eigenstates E_ξ (along with the initial thermal distribution) provides a complete specification of U_{LS} . Such a conclusion would not only render the thermodynamic description of total internal energies meaningless but would also be in conflict with the formally exact, system-specific evaluation (59).

For a steady-state tunneling problem there can be no difference between the formally exact evaluation evaluation and the steady-state description. The evaluation (60) must be a meaningful determination of the total internal energy content. The apparent difference arises because the formal MB LS solution to the collision problem implies a projection (further discussed in appendix B) of the full dynamics upon the eigenstates of the ($t \approx 0$) Hamiltonian.^{99,114,137} However, for extended systems it is then essential to also include effects of both collision-state renormalization^{114,138} (which arises whenever the problem is not asymptotically free) and of level shifts^{135,137} (which, for example, reflects the effects of band-structure formations). Since the steady-state ReNEQSM, the LSC-DFT, and the here-presented thermodynamic theory make use of the MB LS projection for steady state tunneling, there is no relation between the normalization of the H_d and the H eigenstates, and there is no relation between the normalizations of the disconnected-equilibria and NEQ solution density matrices. For condensed matter systems, we have no binding of the steady-state total internal energy content (60) to an arbitrary initial energy spectra.

VI. VARIATIONAL NONEQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMIC GRAND POTENTIAL

Section II provides a summary of the central results of this paper, namely a description of the nature and properties of the exact NEQ thermodynamic grand potential. Appendix A contains the proof of the variational properties, generalizing the equilibrium results of Mermin.¹⁶ Here I only summarize the findings.

A. Notation and motivation

The evaluation of expectation values [for a general operator $\hat{A}(t)$] is viewed as a functional

$$\langle \hat{A}(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)} \equiv \frac{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t) \hat{A}\}}{\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\}} \quad (61)$$

of a general NEQ, time-dependent density matrix $\rho(t)$.

For a general NEQ density matrix (electron distribution) there exists a natural functional evaluation of the entropy

$$S[\hat{\rho}(t)] = -\langle \ln \hat{\rho}(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)} + \langle \ln[\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}(t)\}] \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}. \quad (62)$$

Similarly, the evaluations of the NEQ internal energies and Gibbs free energy

$$U_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \langle H(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)} \quad (63)$$

$$Y_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \langle \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}. \quad (64)$$

are set directly by the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ and by the emerging Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$.

The NEQ evaluations of entropy, internal energy, and Gibbs free energy functionals suggest, in turn, a functional form for the NEQ grand potential:

$$\Omega_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}(t)] = -\frac{1}{\beta} S[\hat{\rho}(t)] + U_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] - Y_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)]. \quad (65)$$

This expression is a generalization (9) of Mermin's (equilibrium) result to a NEQ thermodynamic grand potential for collision problems. The formulation (65) is relevant for tunneling systems described by the continuum Caroli partition scheme.

For a compact presentations of for example derivatives and forces it is convenient to view the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential functional (9) as a special (collision) instance of the more general functional

$$\Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)}[\rho(t)] \equiv \langle \tilde{X}(t) + \beta^{-1} \ln \hat{\rho}(t) - \beta^{-1} \ln[\text{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}\}(t)] \rangle_{\hat{\rho}(t)}. \quad (66)$$

Obviously, we have

$$\Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \Omega_{\tilde{X}(t) \equiv H(T) - \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)}[\hat{\rho}(t)]. \quad (67)$$

B. Variational thermodynamics

The variational and extremal property, Eqs. (10), applies among the class of density matrices which is defined in (12). This class of density matrices obviously encompasses all possible NEQ density matrices that emerge (with conserving dynamics) in a general collision problem, Eqs. (44) and (45). The extremal property provides us with a tool to identify the correct NEQ collision density matrix (40) for a given (interacting) tunneling problem specified as continuum Caroli partition scheme, Sec. III.

As in Mermin's analysis one immediately finds a stationary property of

$$\Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)} \equiv \Omega_{\tilde{X}(t)}[\hat{\rho}_{\tilde{X}(t)}] \quad (68)$$

which can be formulated from the functional expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \Omega_{\hat{X}_0(t) + \lambda \hat{\Delta}(t)}}{\partial \lambda} \right|_{\lambda=0} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t) + \lambda \hat{\Delta}(t)} \right|_{\lambda=0} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t)}} \\ &= \langle \hat{\Delta}(t) \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\hat{X}_0(t)}} \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

As in the corresponding equilibrium case,¹⁶ this property is central to demonstrating the variational and extremal properties of the thermodynamic grand potential at the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$.

C. Extremal property as a tempered maximization of entropy

The NEQ solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$ is unique and can be identified by the minimum of the variational thermodynamical grand potential functional. From the construction of the thermodynamic potential it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} S[\hat{\rho}] = -\frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} \{ \Omega_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - (U_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]) \}, \quad (70)$$

and that, following a system perturbation, $\hat{\rho}(t) \neq \hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)$, we expect a relaxation because it corresponds to a maximization of electron entropy. This maximization is naturally limited or tempered by a functional for the total-internal-energy and Gibbs-free energy difference, $U_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]$.

The maximum-entropy character of the here-presented variational thermodynamic theory makes it clear that there are very close relations to the range of constrained maximum entropy formulations.^{71,72,74} However, the are also important differences. While the constrained maximum entropy approaches use Langrange multipliers to specify selected expectation values (for example, the current flow), the explicit need for constraints is bypassed in the ReNQSM and in this variational thermodynamic description. Specifically, I stress that the approach does not impose a value for the internal energy or Gibbs free energy content and that $U_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]$ is itself uniquely specified by the boundary conditions and by the actual time evolution.

D. Generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem

The fact that the exact NEQ solution can be viewed as a maximization of entropy (subject to exact evaluations of thermodynamic boundary conditions) also provides a rationale for introducing generalized thermodynamic forces

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{col},\hat{\rho}} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \Omega_{\text{col}}(t)[\hat{\rho}]. \quad (71)$$

The more specific thermodynamic-force definition

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{col},\mathbf{R}_i}(t) \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\text{col}}(t) \quad (72)$$

is given by a parametric dependence of the density matrix (as will be further motivated for steady-state problems in the following section). The combined electron-nuclei system is here simply assumed to further the maximization of the entropy content (in the electron system).

A GHF theorem exists to simplify the determination of such thermodynamic forces, here as discussed for time-dependent tunneling. As an explicit expression of (69), one can specify the perturbation

$$\hat{\Delta}(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \hat{X}_{\text{col}}(t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{R}_i \quad (73)$$

and evaluate the changes corresponding to a derivative of the thermodynamic potential along a coordinate-line element $\delta\mathbf{R}_i$:

$$\delta\mathbf{R}_i \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\text{col}}(t) = \delta\mathbf{R}_i \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{X}_{\text{col}}}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}=\rho_{\text{col}}(t)}. \quad (74)$$

This provides a demonstration of a NEQ GHF,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i} \Omega_{\text{col}}(t) = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{R}_i} \left[H - \hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t) \right] \right\rangle_{\rho_{\text{col}}(t)}, \quad (75)$$

for a thermodynamic description of tunneling.

E. Density functional theory of nonequilibrium thermodynamics

The proof of the variational property (10) of the NEQ grand potential does not require nor by itself provide uniqueness of density in NEQ tunneling, Ref. 28. This is in contrast to the case of thermal properties in equilibrium.¹⁶ The emerging (rather than fixed) expression for the NEQ Gibbs free energy operator $\hat{Y}_{\text{col}}(t)$ does not seem to provide any reductio ad absurdum argument; changes in the term V_{col} will make themselves felt both in the Hamiltonian and in the Gibbs free energy operator.

Nevertheless, the previously formulated LSC-DFT still provides a proof for uniqueness of density²⁸ for collision problems.¹³⁴ The unitary evolution provides an explicit construction for the mapping

$$\mathcal{N} : v_{\text{col}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \longrightarrow n(\mathbf{r}, t) = \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{\text{col}}(t) \quad (76)$$

The LSC-DFT proof for uniqueness of density, Ref. 28 explores the time-evolution in the collision picture to prove that \mathcal{N} is unique, i.e., that for every $v_{\text{col}}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ there can be at most one time-dependent density. Also, the case of steady-state tunneling resulting from the adiabatic turn on is just a particular form of time-dependent behavior and the uniqueness of density extends also to cases when the collision term reduces to a time-independent scattering potential $v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$. Under the assumption that a steady-state behavior emerges from $v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$ the mapping \mathcal{N} is then instead completely described by the steady-state density matrix (7):

$$\mathcal{N} : v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r}) \longrightarrow n(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{\text{sc}}. \quad (77)$$

It follows either by the boundary conditions discussed in Ref. 55 or directly by differentiating the mapping (76) that the resulting density can have no more than an adiabatic time dependence, $n(\mathbf{r}, t) \sim n(\mathbf{r}) \exp(\eta t)$.

This unique mapping between density and external potential allows an explicit construction of density functionals for the thermodynamics of NEQ tunneling. I observe that it is possible to choose a detailed form of the adiabatic turn on such that it is compatible, even in a stringent mathematical sense, with both the requirement of LSC-DFT²⁸ and with the present NEQ thermodynamic description¹³³; this is discussed further in

Appendix B. A robust, universally applicable, linking of the LSC-DFT with the NEQ thermodynamics also requires an assumption of a V-representability,¹³⁹ i.e., that for every NEQ electron density there exists an external potential for which the solution density matrix produces that density.¹⁴⁰

A solution NEQ density matrix corresponding to a given density $n'(\mathbf{r}, t)$ can therefore be viewed as density functional

$$\hat{\rho}_{n'}(t) = \hat{\rho}[n'(\mathbf{r}, t)] \equiv \hat{\rho}_{\text{col}, V' \leftarrow n'}(t). \quad (78)$$

Similarly, we can define the corresponding solution NEQ thermodynamic grand potential value as a density functional by the assignment

$$\Omega[n'(\mathbf{r}, t)] \equiv \Omega_{\text{col}, V' \leftarrow n'}(t). \quad (79)$$

One can thus formally obtain a reformulation of the thermodynamic density variational principle,

$$\Omega[n'(\mathbf{r}, t)] > \Omega[n(\mathbf{r}, t)] \equiv \Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{col}}(t)] = \Omega_{\text{col}}(t), \quad (80)$$

where $n(\mathbf{r}, t)$ denotes the exact density, the density which corresponds to the actual collision problem.

VII. STEADY-STATE THERMODYNAMICS AND ADIABATIC FORCES

The formulation in terms of a NEQ grand potential functional (above) is by construction fully equivalent to the exact solution in the QKA.¹⁰ Specifically, a minimization of the general NEQ grand potential functional difference $\Omega_{\text{col}}[\hat{\rho}(t)] - \Omega_{\text{col}}(t)$ will uniquely identify the exact NEQ density matrix $\rho_{\text{col}}(t)$. Access to a formally exact thermodynamic theory provides a precise starting point for a discussion of adiabatic relaxations by suitably defined thermodynamic forces in the NEQ tunneling systems.

Needless to say, a full discussion and evaluation of wind forces and of electromigration is beyond the present analysis. The same applies for non-adiabatic forces (following sudden system changes) and for tunneling systems where the electrons exhibit an unstable, intermittent behavior.⁹² To emphasize that we are working with steady-state tunneling, I choose here and in the rest of the paper to replace the subscript ‘col’ by ‘LS’ on the thermodynamic expressions. This notation is consistent with the fact that ρ_{LS} is the steady-state density-matrix solution. Below I also assume that the time-independent scattering potential $v_{\text{sc}}(\mathbf{r})$ is entirely specified by the position of the fixed nuclei $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$.

A. State functions for steady-state tunneling

I explore the NEQ thermodynamics of tunneling subject to the assumption that the NEQ density matrix (and

thus all physical properties) has, in fact relaxed to a steady state. To create a framework for a discussion of a NEQ implementation of the BOA, I investigate the variation in the set of thermodynamic quantities with infinitely slow deformations of the morphology (that is, infinitely slow changes in the set of nuclei positions $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$) and I inquire what forces would then guide the relaxations arising with the tunneling transport.

An exact evaluation of the steady-state NEQ density matrix ρ_{LS} directly provides the corresponding exact NEQ evaluations

$$\bar{U}_{\text{LS}}(\mu_L, \mu_R, \mu_C; \{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv U_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}], \quad (81)$$

$$\bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}(\mu_L, \mu_R, \mu_C; \{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv Y_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}], \quad (82)$$

$$\bar{S}_{\text{LS}}(\mu_L, \mu_R, \mu_C; \{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv S[\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}] \quad (83)$$

$$\bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}(\mu_L, \mu_R, \mu_C; \{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \equiv \Omega_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}] \quad (84)$$

for the internal energy, the Gibbs free energy, the entropy, and of the NEQ grand potential, respectively. The functions (81)-(84) are by construction state functions of the indicated parameters.

B. Electrostatic atomic forces

It is possible to ignore all thermodynamics, that is, all effects of including the Gibbs free energy, when calculating the forces on the nuclei

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{LS}, \mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{C, NEQ}} \equiv -\left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} H \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}}. \quad (85)$$

The forces (85) are identified by a superscript ‘C’ since they are purely Coulombic or electrostatic in nature. A number of papers^{47,50–52,57–59} analyze and discuss the complications which arise when these forces are used to model structural relaxation in nanoscale structures. It has been shown that such electrostatic forces are not conservative^{57–59} and may produce unstable or even runaway time evolution for the nuclei configuration.^{47,58}

The electrostatic forces can do work and will therefore contribute to the total internal energy. However, the NEQ thermodynamic theory permits a quantification of the breakdown of the traditional HF theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{U}_{\text{LS}} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} + \\ &\frac{\text{Tr}\{(H - \bar{U}_{\text{LS}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} e^{-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}\}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}\}} \quad (86) \end{aligned}$$

$$\neq \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} H \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \quad (87)$$

The changes in the total internal energy content is not exclusively set by the work performed by electrostatic forces.

Before proceeding, I stress that the lack of variational property for the total internal energy content is mirrored by a corresponding behavior for the Gibbs free energy

state function. Taking the formal derivative, one obtains by the variational property

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\rho_{\text{LS}}} + \\ &\frac{\text{Tr}\{(\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} e^{-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}\}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}\}} \quad (88) \end{aligned}$$

$$\neq \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \quad (89)$$

C. Thermodynamic or effective forces

I argue that it is more natural to describe (i.e., mimic from an electron QKA through use of a NEQ BOA) structure optimization for a working NEQ tunneling systems in terms of thermodynamic or effective forces

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{LS}, \mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} \equiv -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}(\mu_i; \{\mathbf{R}_i\}) \quad (90)$$

here restated to emphasize the dependence on state variables. I repeat that ergodicity in steady-state transport motivates a consideration of an ensemble of tunneling systems and makes it important to also follow the effects of the electron distributions on MB energy levels.⁵⁵ The thermodynamic forces (90) act on the statistical ensemble of tunneling systems.

In a thermodynamic description, the classical nuclei are still free to respond to electrostatic forces but the adiabatic relaxations (of very heavy classical nuclei) will *also* reflect a tendency to seek favorable electron distributions (as expressed in the electron Gibbs free energy). I note that, (unlike in the equilibrium case) the NEQ scattering causes actual changes in the electron distributions^{75,79,83,94,95} and the extent and effects of such electron-distribution changes will depend on the nuclei positions. With a statistical ensemble approach and under NEQ transport conditions, a force evaluation also requires that we consider a slightly different statistical behavior of the ensemble when comparing two different atomic configurations. The force description must in steady state reflect the preference for the ensemble to simultaneously optimize both the electrostatics and the electron distribution on quasi-particle energy levels, i.e., the NEQ Gibbs free energy contribution.⁵⁵

D. Adiabatic nature of thermodynamic forces

The state function $\Omega_{\text{LS}}(\mu_i; \{\mathbf{R}_i\})$ is by construction a conservative potential for the forces (90). For a given applied bias (set of external chemical potentials) we can also vary the positions to optimize the configuration with the lowest possible NEQ grand potential value. Use of the GHF theorem (75) yields the formal determination

(15) of the thermodynamic forces by the electron system on the nuclei. In contrast, there are no such arguments for the derivatives of the total-internal-energy or of the Gibbs-free-energy state functions, Eqs. (87) and (89), when evaluated individually.

In steady-state tunneling, the derivatives of the state functions are formally related by

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} S[\hat{\rho}] = -\frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{\rho}} \{ \Omega_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}] - (U_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}] - Y_{\text{LS}}[\hat{\rho}]) \}. \quad (91)$$

As discussed for the general time-dependent tunneling case in the previous section, the minimization of the thermodynamic grand potential reflects a maximization of the entropy *tempered* by the value of the total-internal and Gibbs free energy (which is given by the boundary conditions).

The fact that a GHF theorem (75) *does* hold for the thermodynamic forces (90) implies that they are, in fact, adiabatic. This follows because implementing the thermodynamic forces (90) with a sufficiently slow (external) nuclei dynamics allows the GHF to automatically ensure that the system is always kept at the local state-function value $\bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}$ value. By the extremal nature of the thermodynamic grand potential it therefore also follows that the density matrix must then be the actual solution of the NEQ tunneling problem (in the configuration to which the system has evolved).

The adiabatic relaxations by the thermodynamic forces will proceed and further maximize the entropy of the combined electron-nuclei systems until, eventually, the system reaches a globally or locally optimized maximum-entropy morphology. This is exactly what we want from a nonempirical theory and modeling of relaxations in steady-state tunneling systems.

E. Conserving adiabatic forces and stability

The demonstration of a conservative nature of adiabatic thermodynamic forces also has consequences for the consistency of making a steady-state transport assumption. Having a conservative nature of suitable adiabatic forces implies that we cannot (contrary to recent discussions) expect an abundance of possible current-induced instabilities, at least not when solely investigating the effects of electron tunneling on the nuclei motion.

Of course, there are systems that do not reach a steady state⁹² and for which the thermodynamic state function and adiabatic forces cannot be defined. However, in spite of the ability of the nonconservative electrostatic forces to do work, I find that there is no intrinsic property of adiabatic NEQ forces which would necessarily drive a potentially steady-state system away from a stable morphology. Specifically, if we succeed in moving a nuclei in a tunneling system along a closed path (subject to the adiabatic property which is suggested by the large difference in nuclei and electron masses) we can expect no

accumulation or depletion to arise in any of the thermodynamic state functions.

This robustness, the argument that a steady-state assumption is generally consistent, is a simple consequence of the conservative nature of thermodynamic forces; an argument is nevertheless included for completeness. The initial state (before the transformation around a loop) is uniquely characterized by the solution density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}$ and potential value $\bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}$. Following any transformation around a closed loop we obtain a new density matrix $\hat{\rho}^f$ and a new thermodynamic potential value Ω_{LS}^f . However, with adiabatic transformations one can ensure that $\mathbf{F}_{\text{LS}, \mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}}$ will always characterize the potential changes and that

$$\Omega_{\text{LS}}^f = \Omega_{\text{LS}}[\rho^f] = \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}}, \quad (92)$$

By the extremal property of the thermodynamic grand potential it therefore also follows that we have returned to the exact same density matrix, $\hat{\rho}^f \equiv \hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}$. In other words, the conserving nature of the thermodynamic forces ensures that all state functions must attain the exact same value as the initial state functions,

$$\delta \bar{S}_{\text{LS}} = \delta \bar{U}_{\text{LS}} = \delta \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}} = \delta \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}} \equiv 0. \quad (93)$$

The argument above applies for investigations of the electron-dynamics problem, outside Joule heating or other possible current-stimulation effects arising with an inclusion of an electron-vibrational coupling.^{44,61} I find that the conservative nature of steady-state thermodynamic forces provides a robustness which is consistent with the common expectation that generic tunneling systems will relax to a steady state behavior.^{25,28,28,55,72,74,75,89,91,92}

F. Variational evaluations of adiabatic changes in thermodynamic state-function values

I conclude the discussion of the new, conserving thermodynamic forces by providing a formal characterization of adiabatic-relaxation induced changes in the steady-state entropy, total-internal energy, and Gibbs free energy contents.

The key observation is that the operator analysis of Mermin, summarized in Appendix A, can be used to obtain the parametric derivatives of the unnormalized NEQ solution density matrix, $\exp[-\beta(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})]$. For example, use of (A10) and (A13) directly leads to an evaluation of the entropy content,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{S}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = -\beta^2 \langle [(H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}) - (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}})] \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}}. \quad (94)$$

There is, of course, a corresponding formal simplification in evaluation of the expectation value of the Gibbs weighting factor,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \left(\bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}} + \frac{1}{\beta} \bar{S}_{\text{LS}} \right), \quad (95)$$

and one can, in turn, provide an alternative formulation of the here-defined thermodynamic forces. Using a cyclic permutation of operators it is also possible to reformulate entropy derivative,

$$\frac{1}{\beta^2} \frac{\partial \bar{S}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}} - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})^2 \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \quad (96)$$

It follows that,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) = \left[1 + \beta (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{LS}} - \frac{\beta}{2} \left\langle \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})^2}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}}. \quad (97)$$

These reformulations lead to an alternative formal expression of the here-defined thermodynamic forces,

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{LS}, \mathbf{R}_i}^{\text{NEQ}} = - \frac{\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \langle H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} + (\beta/2) \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})^2 \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \right]}{1 + \beta (\bar{U}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}})} \quad (98)$$

This alternative force expression also suggests that there could be a relation of the here-presented variational thermodynamic theory and the variance principle explored in Ref. 90.

Finally, I note that it is possible to complete the formal evaluation of the derivatives of total-internal energy and Gibbs free energy (also when evaluated in isolation) thanks to the nature⁵⁵ of the Gibbs free energy or electron-redistribution operator. In steady state tunneling the Gibbs free energy must, of course, also be time independent. The time evolution is naturally formulated in terms of the Liouville operation

$$\mathcal{L}_H[\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}] \equiv [\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}, H] \propto \eta(\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} - \hat{Y}_d) \rightarrow 0. \quad (99)$$

It follows that the Gibbs free energy operator commutes with interacting steady-state Hamiltonian $H \equiv H(t=0)$ in steady-state tunneling problems; the role of \hat{Y}_{LS} is to redistribute the electrons among the MB eigenstates of H , Ref. 55. Using the commutator result, $[H, \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}] = 0$, together with Mermin's observation, (A13), leads to the formal evaluations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \bar{U}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\rho_{\text{LS}}} + \beta \left\langle (H - \bar{U}_{\text{LS}}) \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \quad (100) \\ \frac{\partial \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} &= \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\rho_{\text{LS}}} + \beta \left\langle (\hat{Y}_{\text{LS}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{LS}}) \frac{\partial (H - \hat{Y}_{\text{LS}})}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} \right\rangle_{\hat{\rho}_{\text{LS}}} \quad (101) \end{aligned}$$

of the total internal energy and Gibbs free energy derivatives, respectively.

VIII. SUMMARY

A complete NEQ theory of tunneling must be able to reliably describe the structure of a tunneling system under operating condition and, in particular, to determine

transport-induced morphology changes. This has been a challenge because in actual NEQ QSM calculations, the focus is on the electron behavior. Previous investigations have used electrostatic forces in a description of such relaxations. I observe that a natural assumption of ergodicity in steady-state transport makes it necessary to move to a thermodynamic description of tunneling and of forces and relaxations. I therefore find it important to consider and evaluate an additional force contribution, one which arises from the sensitivity of the NEQ electron distribution to the scattering potential, i.e., the nuclei positions.⁵⁵

To deliver a description of such effective forces, this paper recasts a rigorous thermodynamic description which is based on formal (electron) QKA¹⁰ and which is closely related to the exact steady-state ReNQSM.⁵⁵ Specifically, this paper formulates a functional for the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential. In part, this result is made possible by a definition of an operator for the NEQ Gibbs free energy under general NEQ tunneling conditions. The paper demonstrates a variational property of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential as a straightforward generalization of Mermin's previous results for equilibrium thermodynamics.¹⁶ The paper furthermore demonstrates that using the uniqueness of density proof of the LSC-DFT²⁸ permits the formulation of the exact NEQ thermodynamic theory in terms of density functionals.

I define exact thermodynamic forces, that is, effective forces which describe the behavior of the ensemble that characterizes the NEQ tunneling system. The thermodynamic forces are different from the electrostatic forces, satisfy a GHF theorem, and are thus explicitly conservative. The paper demonstrates that these thermodynamics forces are adiabatic.

In conclusion, I propose that use of the here-defined conservative, adiabatic thermodynamic forces (rather than electrostatic forces) constitutes a more natural implementation of the BOA for use with a NEQ electron QKA of tunneling. The adiabatic nature suggests that the thermodynamic forces will provide a better modeling of the actual relaxations of morphology which arise under operating condition.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful and thankful to David C. Langreth (who, sadly, is no longer with us) for interest and for input far beyond Ref. 114. The author also gratefully acknowledges discussions with Selman P. Hershfield and Gerald D. Mahan. The research was supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR).

Appendix A: Mermin-type variational thermodynamics for nonequilibrium tunneling

This section presents a summary of the proof of the variational nature of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential and of the global-minimum property of the exact (solution) NEQ collision density matrix. The arguments are in many ways a straightforward generalization of Mermin's proof¹⁶ for corresponding properties of the equilibrium thermodynamic theory. The generalizations applies for time-independent or time-dependent interacting tunneling systems under NEQ conditions defined as a collision problem, Sec. III. The proof of the variational property is only summarized here with weight given to a detail that differs slightly from the equilibrium case.

The first observation is that it is sufficient to proof the extremal property for any given time and hence I shall suppress all mentioning of subscripts 'col', 'sc', or 'LS' (as well as possible temporal argument) in the following. A more compressed formulation of the extremal properties of the NEQ thermodynamic grand potential, the NEQ variational property can thus be formulated

$$\Omega[\rho] > \Omega[\rho_0] \equiv \Omega_0 \quad (\text{A1})$$

where (for a Hermitian \hat{X}_0)

$$\rho_0 \equiv \frac{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_0}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_0}\}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\Omega_0 \equiv -\frac{1}{\beta}\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_0}\}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\Omega[\rho] \equiv \text{Tr}\{\rho[X_0 + \beta^{-1}\ln\rho]\} \quad (\text{A4})$$

with trial NEQ density matrices

$$\rho = \frac{e^{-\beta\hat{X}}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}}\}} \quad (\text{A5})$$

are given by any Hermitian operator \hat{X} .

As in the equilibrium theory, it is advantageous to define a set of intermediate density matrices

$$\rho_\lambda \equiv \frac{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_\lambda}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_\lambda}\}}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\hat{X}_\lambda \equiv \hat{X}_0 + \lambda\Delta, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where $\Delta \equiv -(1/\beta)\ln(\rho) - \hat{X}_0$. This family of possible NEQ density matrices form a line ρ and ρ_0 and correspond (in the notation introduced in Sec. II) to thermodynamic grand potentials

$$\Omega_{\hat{X}_\lambda} \equiv \frac{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_\lambda}(\hat{X}_\lambda + \beta^{-1}\ln\hat{\rho}_\lambda)\}}{\text{Tr}\{e^{-\beta\hat{X}_\lambda}\}} \neq \Omega[\rho_\lambda], \quad (\text{A8})$$

I note that, unlike in the equilibrium case, a separate argument (for example, V-representability) would be

needed to conclude that all members, ρ_λ , of this density-matrix line correspond to an actual density matrix solution for a physical NEQ tunneling system. However, such a representability assumption is not of consequence for the proof and discussion of the extremal nature of the NEQ thermodynamic theory. The essential observation is that all of the intermediate NEQ density matrices (A6) are still specified in the form given in Eq. (A5).

The central step in the proof and argument is a demonstration of the variational property,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\Omega_{\hat{X}_\lambda} = \text{Tr}\{\Delta\rho_\lambda\}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

that is, a compact formulation of the generalized Hellmann-Feynman theorem (75). Here the key observation is the operator identity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}e^{-\beta(A+\lambda\Delta)} = -e^{-\beta(A+\lambda\Delta)}\int_0^\beta d\beta'\Delta_\lambda(\beta') \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\Delta_\lambda(\beta') \equiv e^{\beta'(A+\lambda\Delta)}\Delta e^{-\beta'(A+\lambda\Delta)}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The proof of this lemma follows the exact same steps as in the equilibrium case.¹⁶ Introducing also $\langle\hat{O}\rangle_\lambda \equiv \text{Tr}\{\rho_\lambda\hat{O}\}$, one can thus formulate the parametric density matrix changes,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\rho_\lambda = -\int_0^\beta d\beta'\rho_\lambda[\Delta_\lambda(\beta') - \langle\Delta\rangle_\lambda], \quad (\text{A12})$$

Mermin also makes the observation that a cyclic permutation of operators permits a significant simplification in the evaluation of expectation values, for example,

$$\langle\Delta_\lambda(\beta')\rangle_\lambda = \langle\Delta\rangle_\lambda. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Finally, from (A10) follows a proof for the reformulation of the derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\Omega[\rho_\lambda] = -\lambda\text{Tr}\{\Delta\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\rho_\lambda\} \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$= \lambda\int_0^\beta d\beta'|\langle\Delta_\lambda(\beta'/2) - \langle\Delta\rangle_\lambda|^2. \quad (\text{A15})$$

As in equilibrium thermodynamics, this results is sufficient to ensure that $\Omega[\rho] - \Omega[\rho_0] > 0$ must vanish except when $\rho \equiv \rho_0$.

In summary, the operator analysis of Mermin¹⁶ is sufficient to ensure (not only for the equilibrium case but also for the present NEQ thermodynamics) that the thermodynamic grand potential is both variational and extremal at the exact solution ρ_0 .

Appendix B: Linking LSC-DFT and the quantum kinetics accounts of tunneling

The choice of the continuum Caroli partition scheme is designed to allow a combination of the LSC-DFT²⁸

with the present general NEQ thermodynamic account. To accomplish that, it is necessary to also ensure that the choice of details in the adiabatic turn (for the electron QKA) is made such that it permits the LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density. The underlying issue is purely technical, but for completeness, I include here a mathematical analysis.

While Ref. 28 never explicitly stated this, the formal LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density does, in principle, require that the adiabatic-turn-on factor $a_\eta(t)$ vanishes not only at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, but also for all times $t < t_0$ where $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$. In a strict mathematical sense, this is necessary because the LSC-DFT proof implicitly assumes one can work with a Taylor expansion in the temporal evolution. With the simple adiabatic turn on [$\tilde{a}_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t)$] that we normally employ in the QKA, we have that all Taylor-expansions coefficient of the temporal evolution vanish as we take the limit $t \rightarrow -\infty$. It is clear, that alone an extremely soft modification of the adiabatic turn on is required to ensure a rigorous mathematical description in the LSC-DFT analysis. It is also clear (because of the entropy flow) that such an extremely soft modification of the adiabatic turn on can have no consequences for the tunneling dynamics at relevant time, for example, as expressed in the steady-state LS solution to the MB collision problem. The argument can be made formal.

To be specific I investigate adiabatic turn off which [instead of the standard LS or QKA form, $\tilde{a}_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t)$] is identically zero until some far away time $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$. I assume that $a_\eta(t > t_0)$ is real, monotonously increasing, and satisfies $0 \leq a_\eta(t) \leq 1$, with a bounded derivative ($da_\eta/dt \leq \eta a_\eta(t)$). The choice of slightly modified adiabatic turn on factors can be expressed

$$a_\eta(t) = \exp(\eta t) b_\eta(t; t_0^\eta, t_1^\eta) \quad (\text{B1})$$

where I have introduced a monotonously increasing positive function $b_\eta(t; t_0^\eta, t_1^\eta)$ with $b_\eta(t < t_0^\eta) \equiv 0$, $b_\eta(t > t_1^\eta) \equiv 1$ and $db_\eta(t)/dt \ll \eta$. To have a more explicit discussion, I choose $t_1^\eta = -\eta^{-(\alpha+1)}$ (with $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) and $t_0^\eta = t_1^\eta/\eta^2$. I note that this set of choices removes any possible $t = -\infty$ singularities in the LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density and I proceed to demonstrate that this modified adiabatic turn on still leaves all details of the formal LS solutions in the QKA unchanged (in the relevant limit $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$).

The important fact is that $da_\eta(t)/dt$ remains completely dominated by $\eta \exp(\eta t)$ since this factor, in turn, determines the denominator in the formal MB LS solution (34). I introduce

$$\hat{f}_\xi(t) \equiv e^{-i(H-E_\xi+i\eta)t} \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_\xi(t) &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^t dt' \hat{f}_\xi(t') \\ &= \frac{i}{H - E_\xi + i\eta} e^{-i(H-E_\xi+i\eta)t} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

and note that the boundary conditions, i.e., the original choice of adiabatic turn on $\exp(\eta t)$, enters the MB LS solution through the formal evaluation^{99,137}

$$|\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \eta \hat{F}_\xi(0) |\Phi_\xi\rangle. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Using instead the present collision picture with slightly modified adiabatic turn on (B1), the boundary conditions instead enters the formal MB solution through

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 dt' \hat{f}_\xi(t') b_\eta(t') = \hat{F}_\xi(t=0) - \hat{B}_\xi(\eta) \quad (\text{B5})$$

$$\hat{B}_\xi(\eta) = \int_{t_0^\eta}^{t_1^\eta} dt' \hat{F}_\xi(t') \frac{db_\eta}{dt}(t'), \quad (\text{B6})$$

as obtained by partial integration. The resulting LS solution therefore has the form

$$|\bar{\Psi}_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = |\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle - |\delta\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle, \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$|\delta\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle = \eta \hat{B}_\xi(\eta) |\Phi_\xi\rangle. \quad (\text{B8})$$

However, the relative normalization of the additional term in the modified MB LS solution (B8) is strongly bounded,

$$\left\| \delta|\bar{\Psi}_\xi^{(+)}\rangle \right\| \ll \eta \int_{t_0^\eta}^{t_1^\eta} dt' \left\| e^{\eta t'} \hat{F}_\xi(0) |\Phi_\xi\rangle \right\|, \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$< \mathcal{B}(\eta) \left\| |\Psi_\xi^{(+)}\rangle \right\|, \quad (\text{B10})$$

by the (state-independent) evaluation

$$\mathcal{B}(\eta) \equiv \exp(\eta t_1^\eta) = \exp[-(1/\eta)^\alpha]. \quad (\text{B11})$$

The choice $t_1^\eta = \eta^{-(\alpha+1)}$ with $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ certainly ensures that $\mathcal{B}(\eta)$ and hence the modification (B8) of the LS solution become irrelevant in the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$.

In summary, I find that the LSC-DFT analysis²⁸ can be adapted to both provide an independent proof for uniqueness of density while leaving the formal LS solutions of the MB collision problems unchanged. This opens for a density functional formulation of the NEQ thermodynamic quantities in a description which resembles the equilibrium case presented in Ref. 16.

- ¹ For example, based on DNA sequencing that programs and controls three-dimensional organization of DNA-coated gold nanoparticles, D. Nykapanchuk *et al*, Nature **451**, 549 (2008); S.Y. Park *et al*, Nature **451**, 553 (2008).
- ² For example, S.H. Gellman, Chem. Rev. **97**, 1231 (1997); P.J. Edmonson *et al*, Int. J. Mod. Sci. **9**, 154 (2008).
- ³ For example, M. A. Rattner and A. Nitzan, Science **300**, 1384 (2003); S. Pan, Q. Fu, T. Huang, A. Zhao, B. Wang, J. Yang, and J. Hou, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **8**, 15259 (2009).
- ⁴ For example, J. Chen, M. A. Reed, A.M. Rawlett, and J.M. Tour, Science **286**, 1550 (1999).
- ⁵ P. G. Bergmann and J. L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. **99**, 578 (1955); J. L. Lebowitz and P. G. Bergmann, Ann. Phys. **1**, 1 (1957).
- ⁶ U. Fano, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 74 (1957).
- ⁷ G. Baym and L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Rev. **124**, 287 (1961); G. Baym, Phys. Rev. **127**, 1391 (1962).
- ⁸ L. P. Kadanoff and G. Baym, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1962).
- ⁹ L. V. Keldysh, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **47**, 1515 (1964) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **20**, 1018 (1965)].
- ¹⁰ D. C. Langreth, *1975 NATO Advanced Study Institute on Linear and Nonlinear Transport in Solids, Antwerpen, 1975* (Plenum Press, New York, 1976), Vol B17, pp. 2-32; D. C. Langreth and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. B **6**, 3189 (1972).
- ¹¹ G. D. Mahan, Phys. Rep. **145**, 251 (1987).
- ¹² M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 6104 (1991).
- ¹³ W. Grandy, *Foundations of Statistical Mechanics: Volume II: Nonequilibrium Phenomena*, (Springer, New York, 1988).
- ¹⁴ P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964).
- ¹⁵ W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
- ¹⁶ N.D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. **137**, A1441 (1965).
- ¹⁷ E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 997 (1984).
- ¹⁸ E. K. U. Gross and W. Kohn, Adv. Quantum Chem. **21**, 55 (1990).
- ¹⁹ T.-C. Li and P.-Q. Tong, Phys. Rev. A **31**, 1950 (1985).
- ²⁰ G. Vignale and M. Rasolt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2360 (1987).
- ²¹ DFT has also been generalized to a relativistic description, E. Engels and R. M. Dreizler in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), pp. 1-80.
- ²² The action principle of time-dependent DFT can also be used for a formulation of transport within a Liouvillean formulation, A. K. Rajagopal and F. A. Bout, in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), pp. 173-209.
- ²³ G. Vignale and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 2037 (1996); G. Vignale, C. A. Ullrich, and S. Conti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4878 (1997); C. A. Ullrich and G. Vignale, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 245102 (2002).
- ²⁴ M. Lüders, M. A. L. Marques, N. N. Lathiotakis, A. Floris, G. Profeta, L. Fast, A. Continenza, S. Massidda, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 024545 (2005); M. A. L. Marques, M. Lüders, N. N. Lathiotakis, G. Profeta, A. Floris, L. Fast, A. Continenza, E. K. U. Gross and S. Massidda, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 024546 (2005).
- ²⁵ G. Stefanucci and C.-O. Almbladh, Europhys. Lett. **67**, 14 (2004); G. Stefanucci and C.-O. Almbladh, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 195318 (2004); S. Kurth, G. Stefanucci, C.-O. Almbladh, A. Rubio, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 035308 (2005).
- ²⁶ R. Gebauer and R. Car, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 160404 (2004); R. Gebauer and R. Car, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 125324 (2004).
- ²⁷ K. Burke, R. Car, and R. Gebauer Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 146803 (2005); M. Koentopp, C. Chang, K. Burke, and R. Car, J. Phys.:Condens. Matter **20**, 083203 (2008).
- ²⁸ P. Hyldgaard, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 165109 (2008).
- ²⁹ D.C. Langreth, B. I. Lundqvist, S. D. Chakarova-Käck, V. R. Cooper, M. Dion, P. Hyldgaard, A. Kelkkanen, J. Kleis, L. Kong, S. Li, P. G. Moses, E. Murray, A. Puzder, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, and T. Thonhauser, J. Phys.:Condens.Matter **21**, 084203 (2009).
- ³⁰ For example, as summarized in R. S. Sorbello in H. Ehrenreich and F. Spaepen, eds. *Solid State Phys.* (Academic Press, New York, 1997) **51**, pp. 159-231; H. Yasuda and A. Sakai, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 1069 (1997).
- ³¹ J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **1**, 2110 (1970); J. W. Gadzuk and S. Holloway, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 4298 (1986); J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 13466 (1991); J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 12832 (1993); J. W. Gadzuk, Surf. Sci. **342**, 345 (1995).
- ³² P.Kumar and R. S. Sorbello, Thin Solid Films **25**, 25 (1975).
- ³³ L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3142 (1975).
- ³⁴ R. S. Sorbello and B. B. Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 2196 (1980).
- ³⁵ B. N. J. Persson and M. Persson, Surf. Sci. **97**, 609 (1980); B. N. J. Persson and M. Persson, Sol. State Comm. **36**, 175 (1980); M. Persson and B. Hellsing, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 662 (1982).
- ³⁶ B. C. Stipe, M. A. Rezaei, W. Ho, S. Gao, M. Persson, and B. I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4410 (1997); S. W. Gao, M. Persson, and B. I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 4825 (1997); N. Lorente and M. Persson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2997 (2000); N. Lorente, M. Persson, L. J. Lauhon, and W. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2593 (2001).
- ³⁷ M. Brandbyge, J. Schiøtz, M. R. Sørensen, P. Stoltze, K. W. Jacobsen, J. K. Nørskov, L. Olesen, E. Laegsgaard, I. Stensgaard, and F. Besenbacher, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 8499 (1995); M. R. Sørensen, M. Brandbyge, and K. W. Jacobsen, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 3283 (1998).
- ³⁸ M. Plihal and J. W. Gadzuk, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 085404 (2001); J. W. Gadzuk and M. Plihal, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 235413 (2003).
- ³⁹ M. DiVentra, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 046801 (2002).
- ⁴⁰ M. Brandbyge, K. Stokbro, J. Taylor, J. L. Mozos, and P. Ordejón, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 193104 (2003).
- ⁴¹ Both Ref. 39 and Ref. 40 report calculations as well as details of efficient code implementations of an approximative nonempirical description of nanoscale transport and current-induced structural relaxations. Needless to say, this approximative electron-dynamics and nuclei-relaxation description is *ad hoc*. It is made available by combining a (Landauer-Büttiker-type) *independent-*

- particle approximation* for the electron dynamics, *ground-state DFT specifications* of effective single-particle scattering potentials, and the *present-standard assumption* of using electrostatic forces for relaxations in NEQ tunneling.
- ⁴² The nanopipette is an explicit demonstration (by in-situ experiments) that electron currents cause matter transport in a nanoscale system, K. Svensson, H. Olin, and E. Olsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 145901 (2004).
- ⁴³ Switching in tunneling systems can be investigated from within a description of the electron-phonon coupling on the transport, M. Brandbyge and P. Hedegård, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 2919 (1994).
- ⁴⁴ A possible mechanism for frequency-selective control of current-induced vibrational excitations in tunneling is described in P. Hyldgaard, *Low Temp. Phys.* **27**, 585 (2001); *Mat. Sci. Eng. C* **23**, 243 (2003).
- ⁴⁵ It is, in principle, possible for current-induced stimulation of vibrations to create a phaser, or phonon-laser effect which obviously goes beyond Joule heating. Ref. 44 finds that causality (expressed in a NEGF formulation of such current-induced excitations) does ensure that the net stimulated transitions must lead to an adsorption in the generic (single-level) NEQ tunneling cases. To create a would-be run-away nuclei dynamics through a phaser mechanism it seems necessary to carefully engineer the tunneling transport (much like what has, of course, already been done for photon transitions in solid-state lasers).
- ⁴⁶ T. Frederiksen, M. Paulsson, M. Brandbyge, and A.-P. Jauho, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 205413 (2007).
- ⁴⁷ C. Verdozzi, G. Stefanucci, C.-O. Almbladh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 046603 (2006).
- ⁴⁸ Y. F. Wang, J. Kröger, R. Berndt, H. Vazquez, M. Brandbyge, and M. Paulsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 176802 (2010).
- ⁴⁹ T. N. Todorov, J. Hoekstra, and A. P. Sutton, *Phil. Mag. B* **80**, 421 (2000); A. P. Sutton and T. N. Todorov, *Mol. Phys.* **102**, 919 (2004).
- ⁵⁰ M. DiVentra and S. T. Pantelides, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 16207 (2000).
- ⁵¹ T. N. Todorov, *J. Phys.:Condens. Matter* **13**, 10125 (2001);
- ⁵² T. N. Todorov, *J. Phys.:Condens. Matter* **14**, 3049 (2002).
- ⁵³ Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XVII, section 13, and Chapter XVIII, sections 14-16.
- ⁵⁴ W. R. Frensley, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62**, 745 (1990).
- ⁵⁵ S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2134 (1993).
- ⁵⁶ A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, R12896 (1995); A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 14978 (1998).
- ⁵⁷ M. DiVentra, Y.-C. Chen, and T. N. Todorov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 176803 (2004).
- ⁵⁸ D. Dundas, E. J. McEniry, and T. N. Todorov, *Nature Nanotech.* **4**, 99 (2009).
- ⁵⁹ T. N. Todorov, D. Dundas, and E. J. McEniry, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 075416 (2010).
- ⁶⁰ J.-T. Lü, M. Brandbyge, and P. Hedegård, *Nano Lett.* **10**, 1657 (2010); details on the current description are given in the supplementary material.
- ⁶¹ Including an electron-phonon coupling will obviously provide a modeling of Joule heating of the lattice and, hence, of a friction mechanism. However, it also opens up for both possible topological effects⁶⁰ and frequency-selective, current-induced spontaneous emission as well as stimulated transistions.^{44,45}
- ⁶² C. Caroli, R. Combescot, P. Nozieres, and D. Saint-James, *J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys.* **4**, 916 (1971); C. Caroli, R. Combescot, P. Nozieres and D. Saint-James, *J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys.* **5**, 21 (1972).
- ⁶³ A corresponding continuum version (often termed partition free because there introduction of an initial separation is arbitrary and can have no resulting effect when treating the corresponding formal perturbation to all orders) of the Caroli computational framework⁶² is presented in T. E. Feuchtwang, *Phys. Rev. B*, **10**, 4121 (1974).
- ⁶⁴ R. Landauer, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **1**, 233 (1957); M. Büttiker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 1761 (1986).
- ⁶⁵ G. B. Lesovik, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **49**, 513 (1989) [*JETP Lett.* **49**, 592 (1989)]; B. Yurke and G. P. Kochanski, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 8184 (1990); M. Büttiker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 2901 (1990); R. Landauer and T. Martin, *Physica B* **175**, 167 (1991).
- ⁶⁶ H. U. Baranger and A. D. Stone, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 8169 (1989).
- ⁶⁷ S. Datta, *J. Phys.:Condens.Matter* **2**, 8023 (1990).
- ⁶⁸ Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 3048 (1991).
- ⁶⁹ S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3720 (1991); S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 7046 (1992); S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 7061 (1992); J. W. Wilkins, S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, P. Hyldgaard, and C. J. Stanton, *Physica Scripta* **T42**, 115 (1992).
- ⁷⁰ Y. Meir and N. S. Wingreen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2512 (1992).
- ⁷¹ T. K. Ng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1018 (1992).
- ⁷² O. Heinonen and M. D. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1447 (1993).
- ⁷³ Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2601 (1993).
- ⁷⁴ P. Bokes and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 125414 (2003); P. Bokes, H. Mera, and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 165425 (2005).
- ⁷⁵ J. H. Davies, S. Hershfield, P. Hyldgaard, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 4603 (1993); P. Hyldgaard and B. I. Lundqvist, *Sol. State Comm.* **116**, 569 (2000).
- ⁷⁶ N. S. Wingreen, K. W. Jacobsen, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1396 (1988); N. S. Wingreen, K. W. Jacobsen, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 11834 (1989).
- ⁷⁷ E. V. Anda and F. Flores, *J. Phys.:Condens. Mat.* **3**, 9087 (1991); R. Lake, G. Klimeck, S. Datta, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 6427 (1993); E. Runge and H. Ehrenreich, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 9145 (1992); E. Runge and H. Ehrenreich, *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* **219**, 55 (1992); C. H. Grein, E. Runge, H. Ehrenreich, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 12590 (1993).
- ⁷⁸ E. Runge, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 2003 (1993).
- ⁷⁹ For examples of NEGF studies which determine and discuss the effects of the electron-vibrational coupling on the current density (per quasi-particle energy) along with associated limitations of interpretations within a simple Landauer-Büttiker-type description, please see, for example, P. Hyldgaard, S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, and J. W. Wilkins, *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* **236**, 1 (1994), and

- H. Ness, L. K. Dash, and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 085426 (2010).
- ⁸⁰ N. D. Lang, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 5335 (1995).
- ⁸¹ M. Di Ventura, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 139902(E) (2002); M. Di Ventura, S. T. Pantelides, and N. D. Lang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 979 (2000).
- ⁸² M. Brandbyge, J. L. Mozos, P. Ordejón, J. Taylor, and K. Stokbro, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 165401 (2002); E. Artacho, J. D. Gale, A. Garcia, J. Junquera, P. Ordejón, and D. Sánchez-Portal, *J. Phys. C* **14**, 2745 (2002).
- ⁸³ For an example of significant bias-induced enhancement of electron-electron scattering in a resonant-tunneling (quantum-cascade-laser) system, please see P. Hyldgaard and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 6889 (1996).
- ⁸⁴ A. Wacker, A.-P. Jauho, S. Zeuner, and S. J. Allen, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 13268 (1997); A. Wacker and A.-P. Jauho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 369 (1998); S. C. Lee and A. Wacker, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 245314 (2002); C. Weber, A. Wacker, A. Knorr, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 165322 (2009).
- ⁸⁵ P. Havu, V. Havu, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 115325 (2004); P. Havu, M. J. Puska, R. M. Nieminen, and V. Havu, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 233308 (2004); P. Havu, N. Tuomisto, R. Väänänen, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 235301 (2005).
- ⁸⁶ M. H. Hettler, W. Wenzel, M. R. Wegewijs, and H. Schoeller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 076805 (2003); C. Romeike, M. R. Wegewijs, W. Hofstetter, and H. Schoeller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 196601 (2006).
- ⁸⁷ K. S. Thygesen and K. W. Jacobsen, *Chem. Phys.* **319**, 146801 (2005); K. S. Thygesen, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 035309 (2006); K. S. Thygesen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 166804 (2008).
- ⁸⁸ M. F. Gelin, D. S. Kosov, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 011116 (2008).
- ⁸⁹ M. F. Gelin, D. S. Kosov, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 022101 (2009).
- ⁹⁰ N. Lanatà, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 195326 (2010).
- ⁹¹ I note that the combined NEGF and time-dependent DFT study, Ref. 25, demonstrated how the entropy flow caused the time-dependent tunneling behavior to approach a steady-state behavior under a number of initial starting conditions.
- ⁹² Clearly, tunneling in a system, described by a time-independent scattering potential need not always have stationary electron dynamics. As also discussed in Ref. 28, a time-dependent tunneling behavior can arise through an intermittent behavior, for example, in an ordinary avalanche diode.
- ⁹³ A common approximation consists of fixing the drop in the electrostatic potential (between points far in opposite leads) by the applied bias even under operating conditions. This approximation is not rigorous, and it has been found to cause a deviation from charge neutrality far in the lead, H. Mera, P. Bokes, and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 085311 (2005).
- ⁹⁴ G. Vignale and M. Di Ventura, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 014201 (2009).
- ⁹⁵ H. Mera and Y. M. Niquet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 216408 (2010).
- ⁹⁶ H. Mera, P. Bokes, and R. W. Godby, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 125319 (2007).
- ⁹⁷ S. P. Hershfield, private communication.
- ⁹⁸ P. Hyldgaard, unpublished.
- ⁹⁹ B. A. Lippmann and J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **79**, 469 (1950).
- ¹⁰⁰ Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX.
- ¹⁰¹ For example, J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- ¹⁰² For example, A. Tkatchenko, L. Romaner, O. Hoffman, E. Zojer, C. Ambrosch-Draxl, and M. Scheffler, *MRS Bul.* **35**, 435 (2010); S. Grimme, *Comput. Mol. Sci.* **1**, 211 (2011).
- ¹⁰³ R. Ahlrichs, R. Penco, and G. Scoles, *Chem. Phys.* **19**, 119 (1977); Q. Wu and W. Yang, *J. Chem. Phys.* **116**, 515 (2002); S. Grimme, *J. Comput. Chem.* **25**, 1463 (2004); P. Jurecka, J. Cerny, P. Hobza, and D. R. Salahub, *J. Comput. Chem.* **28**, 555 (2007); S. Grimme, J. Antony, T. Schwabe, and C. Mück-Lichtenfeld, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **5**, 741 (2007); C. Morgado, M. A. Vincent, I. H. Hiller, and X. Shan, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **9**, 448 (2007); M. Pavone, N. Rega, and V. Barone, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **452**, 333 (2008); A. Tkatchenko and M. Scheffler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 073005 (2009); F. O. Kannemann and A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Theory and Comput.*, **6**, 1081 (2010); S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich, and H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 1541004 (2010); and references therein.
- ¹⁰⁴ W. Kohn, Y. Meir, D. E. Makarov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4153 (1998), S. Kurth and J. P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 10461 (1999); J. F. Dobson and J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2123 (1999); J. F. Dobson and B. P. Dinte, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 1780 (1996); J. M. Pitarke and J. P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 045101 (2003); O. A. Vydrov and T. Van Voorhis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 063004 (2009); O. A. Vydrov and T. Van Voorhis, *J. Chem. Phys.* **133**, 244103 (2010).
- ¹⁰⁵ H. Rydberg, B. I. Lundqvist, D. C. Langreth, and M. Dion, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 6997 (2000); H. Rydberg, M. Dion, N. Jacobson, E. Schröder, P. Hyldgaard, S.I. Simak, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 126402 (2003); M. Dion, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 246401 (2004); M. Dion, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 109902(E) (2005); G. Román-Peréz, and J. M. Soler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 096102 (2009); A. Gulans, M. J. Puska, and R. M. Nieminen, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 201105 (2009); V. R. Cooper, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 161104 (2010); J. Klimes, D. R. Bowler, and A. Michaelides, *J. Phys.:Condens. Matter* **22**, 022201 (2010); K. Lee, E. D. Murray, L. Kong, B. I. Lundqvist, and D. C. Langreth, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 081101(R) (2010).
- ¹⁰⁶ T. Thonhauser, V. R. Cooper, S. Li, A. Puzder, P. Hyldgaard, and D.C. Langreth, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 125112 (2007).
- ¹⁰⁷ L. Bartels, *Nature Chem.* **2**, 87 (2010).
- ¹⁰⁸ For examples of nonempirical studies of molecular-overlayer interaction problems, please see, e.g., P. Sony, P. Puschnig, D. Nabok, and C. Ambrosch-Draxl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 176401 (2007); K. Johnston, J. Kleis, B. I. Lundqvist, and R. M. Nieminen, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 121404 (2008); K. Berland, T.L. Einstein, and P. Hyldgaard, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 155431 (2009); K. Toyoda, Y. Nakano, I. Hamada, K. Lee, S. Yanagisawa, and Y. Morikawa, *Surf. Science* **603**, 2912 (2009); P.G. Moses, J. J. Mortensen, B. I. Lundqvist, and

- J. K. Nørskov, *J. Chem. Phys.* **130**, 104709 (2009); C. J. Villagomez, O. Guillermet, S. Goudeau, F. Ample, H. Xu, C. Coudret, X. Bouju, T. Zambelli, and S. Gauthier, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 074705 (2010); L. Zoppi, A. Garcia, and K. K. Baldrige, *J. Phys. Chem.* **114**, 8864 (2010); K. Lee, Y. Morikawa, and D. C. Langreth, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155461 (2010); H. Ruuska, E. Arola, T. Kortelainen, T. T. Rantala, T. Tapio, K. Kannus, and S. Valkealahti, *J. Chem Phys.* **134**, 134904 (2011); J. Klimes, D. R. Bowler, and A. Michaelides, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 195131 (2011).
- ¹⁰⁹ An example of a van der Waals interaction study for larger-scale molecular-overlayer assembly is included in J. Wyrick, D.-H. Kim, D. Sun, Z. Cheng, W. Lu, Y. Zhu, K. Berland, Y. S. Kim, E. Rotenberg, M. Luo, P. Hyldgaard, T. L. Einstein, and L. Bartels, *Nano Letters* **11**, 2944 (2011).
- ¹¹⁰ For formulations based on renormalization group theory, see, for example, F. B. Anders and A. Schiller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 196801 (2005); F. B. Anders and A. Schiller, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 245113 (2006).
- ¹¹¹ For formulations based on Lindblad functional see, for example, S. W. Gao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3101 (1997); P. Saalfrank, *Chem. Rev.* **106**, 4116 (2006).
- ¹¹² A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1821 (1996).
- ¹¹³ A. Schiller and S. Hershfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, R16271 (2000).
- ¹¹⁴ D. C. Langreth, *Theory of polaron mobility*, (Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois, 1964).
- ¹¹⁵ N. S. Wingreen, A.-P. Jauho, and Y. Meir, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, R8487 (1993); A.-P. Jauho, N. S. Wingreen, and Y. Meir, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 5528 (1994).
- ¹¹⁶ P. Nordlander, M. Pustilnik, Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and D. C. Langreth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 808 (1999); M. Plihal, D. C. Langreth, and P. Nordlander, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, R13341 (2000); P. Nordlander, N. S. Wingreen, Y. Meir, and D. C. Langreth, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 2146 (2000); M. Plihal, D. C. Langreth, and P. Nordlander, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 165321 (2005).
- ¹¹⁷ J. B. Neaton, M. S. Hybertsen, and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 216405 (2006).
- ¹¹⁸ K. Kaasberg and K. Flensberg, *Nano Lett.* **8**, 3809 (2008).
- ¹¹⁹ K. S. Thygesen and A. Rubio, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 091101 (2007); K. S. Thygesen and A. Rubio, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 115333 (2008).
- ¹²⁰ P. Myohanen, A. Stan, G. Stefanucci, and R. van Leeuwen, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 115107 (2009).
- ¹²¹ Eugene Merzbacher, *Quantum Mechanics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York), p. 41.
- ¹²² One can demonstrate Ehrenfest theorem for a general equilibrium system by first utilizing the standard Green theorem, then assume an infinite repetition, and finally employ the periodic-cell Green's theorem, Neil W. Ashcroft and N. David Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1976,) p. 772.
- ¹²³ Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX, section 3.
- ¹²⁴ Albert Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. II (North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Chapter XIX, section 29.
- ¹²⁵ For example, E. K. U. Gross, J. F. Dobson, and M. Petersilka, in R. F. Nalewajski, ed., *Density Functional Theory II* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1996), p. 96.
- ¹²⁶ M. Koentopp, C. Chang, K. Burke, and R. Car, *J. Phys.;Condens.Mat.* **20**, 083203 (2008).
- ¹²⁷ The proof for uniqueness of density in regular time-dependent DFTs requires that the potential has a finite extension. An early overview of time-dependent DFT¹⁸ and the LSC-DFT adaptation to MB collision problems²⁸ points out that it is sufficient that the support of the system-specific addition, $v_{col}(\mathbf{r}, t)$, is finite (and that one can assume that support to be arbitrarily large, for example, much larger than the tunneling region).
- ¹²⁸ The role of the Green-theorem surface terms (in a consistent determination of noninteracting Green's functions for tunneling⁶⁹) is seldom expressed but they are nevertheless essential⁷⁵ (unless we include MB scattering and associated dephasing effects everywhere). In the NEGF descriptions, we traditionally seek to separate the perturbing single-particle terms (for example, changes in the kinetic energy and in an external potential and here denoted δKV) for which we require an exact treatment, *plus* remaining terms (MB interactions and, possibly, potential fluctuations) for which we often seek a systematic approximation described by self-energy terms σ . I denote the Greens' function of the full (H) and initial (H_d) Hamiltonian by g and g^d , respectively. For bulk systems, the presence of dephasing mechanisms makes it correct to express the less-than function $g_{<} = g_r \sigma_{<} g_a$, i.e., in a form where the δKV perturbation are exactly treated and are entirely included in $g_{<,r,a}$. However, this formulation obviously fails in the case of non-interacting tunneling⁷⁵ (where $\sigma \equiv 0$). For the typical NEGF study of tunneling (with no MB interactions in the leads) the Green-theorem surface terms requires, instead, that we work with the more complete expression⁷⁵ $g_{<} = [1 + g_r(\delta KV + \sigma_r)]g_{<}^d[(\delta KV + \sigma_a)g_a + 1] + g_r \sigma_{<} g_a$. While many NEGF descriptions choose to formally set a lead self-energy term, using $g_{<} \equiv g_r(\sigma_{<} + \Sigma_{<}^{leads})g_a$, it is still the Green-theorem surface terms which ensures a consistent formulation of the tunneling.⁷⁵
- ¹²⁹ A. van der Ziel, *Noise in Solid State Devices and Circuits*, (Wiley, Ney York, 1986).
- ¹³⁰ Early NEGF and scattering-state formulations^{65,69,78} was soon supplemented by a masters-equation approach¹²⁹ to explore (NEQ) noise signatures of interaction effects in, for example, resonant and Coulomb-blockade tunneling, J. H. Davies, S. Hershfield, P. Hyldgaard, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 9620 (1992); S. Hershfield, J. H. Davies, P. Hyldgaard, C. J. Stanton, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 1967 (1993).
- ¹³¹ Hershfield and others term the electron-redistribution operator ' \hat{Y} '. Here it is here labeled by a subscript 'LS' to emphasize that it and the NEQ steady-state density matrix solution (7) is exactly related to the formal Lippmann-Schwinger (LS) solution⁹⁹ for MB collision problems.
- ¹³² In fact, the steady-state ReNQSM^{55,97} contains an explicit construction of the operator \hat{Y}_{LS} which is order-by-order in the perturbation term (which includes the external potential). This construction makes it impossible to ignore an explicit dependence on the nuclei positions in the resulting operator \hat{Y}_{LS} .
- ¹³³ It is possible to link the LSC-DFT²⁸ with the present NEQ thermodynamic account because one can make compatible choices in the details of adiabatic turn on and thus sat-

isfy even stringent mathematical conditions. On physical grounds it is clear that any extremely soft modification of distant-past details in the form of adiabatic turn on can have no consequences because of the inherent entropy flows which characterize the open tunneling systems. Appendix B provides details on the mathematical issues and a rigorous proof that one can ensure compatibility between the LSC-DFT description and the present NEQ thermodynamic theory (or, in fact, any QKA method).

¹³⁴ I stress that identical continuum Caroli partition schemes^{62,63} are used in the LSC-DFT paper²⁸ (for a uniqueness of density proof) and in the present study of thermodynamic study. Given a discussion of the details of the adiabatic turn on,¹³³ the LSC-DFT argument²⁸ for uniqueness of density applies *verbatim* also for the present investigation of thermodynamics.

¹³⁵ J. Pirene, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **21**, 226 (1948); J. Pirene, *Phys. Rev.* **86**, 395 (1952).

¹³⁶ F. J. Dyson, *Phys. Rev.* **75**, 486 (1949).

¹³⁷ M. Gellmann and M. L. Goldberger, *Phys. Rev.* **91**, 398 (1953).

¹³⁸ B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* **100**, 905 (1955).

¹³⁹ For traditional time-dependent DFT calculations, where

one can assume a finite extension of the system and hence system-specific potential, there exists a proof of uniqueness of density, R. van Leeuwen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3863 (1999).

¹⁴⁰ There is no rigorous argument for assuming that the proof of time-dependent DFT (TD-DFT) V-representability¹³⁹ also extends to transport calculations based on infinite-system TD-DFT²⁵, to LSC-DFT²⁸ or (via the LSC-DFT proof of uniqueness of density) to the here-presented construction of thermodynamic density functional. Given a finite support of the system-specific single-particle potential, it is not clear that one can represent all changes in density variations arising also outside that potential support. However, since the support can be made much larger than the extension of the actually laboratory and much larger than any four-probe measurement setup, I here follow a practice of simply assuming that there exists an approximative V-representability. I stress that such an assumption is exclusively relevant *when* seeking a density functional description of the thermodynamics of tunneling.