Recursive approach to study transport properties of atomic wire
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Abstract. In this study, we propose a recursive approach to study the transport properties of atomic wires. It is based upon a real-space block-recursion technique with Landauer’s formula being used to express the conductance as a scattering problem. To illustrate the method, we have applied it on a model system described by a single band tight-binding Hamiltonian. Results of our calculation therefore may be compared with the reported results on Na-atom wire. Upon tuning the tight-binding parameters, we can distinctly identify the controlling parameters responsible to decide the width as well as the phase of odd-even oscillations in the conductance.
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1 Introduction

A mono-atomic quantum wire has a cross-section of one atom and is several atoms long. Such a system can be formed by pulling atomic contacts using a scanning tunneling microscope (STM) or a mechanically controllable break junction (MCBJ). The experimental evidences of formation of such atomic wires have been reported by Yanson et al [1] and Ohnishi et al [2]. However, issues involving electronic structure, transport properties and the influence of contacts with macroscopic conductors are still not fully settled. The most striking feature of such a mono-atomic wire is the non-monotonic behavior of its conductance as a function of the number of atoms along its length. Oscillatory behavior of conductance as a function of the length of the wire has been experimentally observed in Al, Pt and Ir wires by Smit et al [3], in Au and Ag wires by Thijssen et al [4], in Na wires by Krans et al [5] and in wires of atoms of higher valency by Yanson et al [1]. This oscillatory behavior has been attributed to interference effect resulting from the changes in the connection between the wire and the edge of the electrode when new atoms are pulled into the wire.

Theoretically, the conductance of atomic wires can be calculated using the Landauer formalism in which one relates the conductance $G$ in the linear response regime to the transmittance at the Fermi energy, $T(E_F)$, as $G = (e^2/h)T(E_F)$. There are several numerical methods to calculate transmittance. They may be broadly classified into wavefunction and Green function methods. In wavefunction technique, one solves for scattering wavefunction of the system using methods like transfer matrix method [6,7,8,9,10], finite difference method [11] or by solving Lippman-Schwinger equation [12,13]. All these methods use various level of approximations to describe the electronic structure of the system, starting from semi-empirical models like extended Hückel [6,7] to fully atomistic descriptions based on the density functional theory (DFT) of Kohn and Sham. In most of the wave function methods, however, the electronic structure of the scattering region is resolved in detail, while the leads are modeled by a free electron gas [8,9,12,13]. Alternatively, conductance can be calculated by Green’s function method which does not require the explicit calculation of the scattering wave function. The main effort in this approach is to calculate the Green function of the central wire in the presence of the coupling to the leads. The effect of coupling to the leads is taken into account through self-energy terms. Various methods based on this approach, mainly differ in the choice of basis set used to represent the Hamiltonian and self-energy matrix, e.g Gaussians [14], numerical atomic orbitals [15], wavelets [16] and plane wave basis [17]. Although implementations within the Green function as well as the wavefunction approaches have been carried forward using various different techniques, it can be shown that the approaches are completely equivalent for non-interacting electrons [18]. In this paper we propose a combination of the scalar and vector recursion techniques [19,20] as a viable and efficient means to study the transport properties within the general scheme of wavefunction approach of a lead-wire-lead system.

As a first step, starting from the junction point of the leads and the wire, we have used the recursion method of Haydock et al [19,20] to map the quasi-1D semi-infinite
leads with finite extensions along lateral directions onto equivalent chains. In the process, the information of the shape of the leads is encoded in the recursion coefficients. The recursion coefficients converge and the asymptotic part of the chains (or terminators) resembles periodic one-dimensional leads. This naturally divides the whole system unambiguously into an effective scattering region and two attached ballistic, periodic chain leads. The initial variation of the recursion coefficients contributes to the scattering region.

In the second step, the scattering matrix has been calculated by solving the Schrödinger equation using the vector or block recursion method of Godin and Haydock \[21\] and applying the wave-function matching conditions at the lead–wire interfaces.

In the final step, we have applied Landauer’s formula to express the conductance of the quantum wire.

The advantage of the proposed method is that it is a real space based method. Moreover, to solve the scattering problem, one does not need to calculate the wave function explicitly. By putting the boundary conditions at the lead–wire junctions and at the end of vector chain, one can directly calculate the scattering matrix. The basic inputs in the above described procedure are the tight-binding (TB) Hamiltonians for the wire and the leads. In order to illustrate the method we have applied it to a model system described by a single-band TB Hamiltonian. We demonstrate the validity of this approach by comparing the results obtained out of a simple model system with the reported results on monoatomic Na-wire calculated by solving the Schrödinger equation using the vector or block recursion method of Godin and Haydock \[21\]. The proposed technique being based on recursion explicitly. By putting the boundary conditions at the opposite ends of the wire are coupled to the semi-infinite effective 1D chain via hopping matrix element $t_c$. Note that as the starting state is same in the recursion process, the coupling coefficient $t_c$ remains same during the change of tight-binding basis set. The procedure therefore converts the whole system into an infinite linear chain in which effective scattering region is of extension $2M + 2c$ sites and the rest represents the ballistic parts of the leads which do not participate in the scattering process.

2.2 Calculation of the scattering matrix
Let us consider $2M + 2c = 2N$ and for convenience, rename the sites as follows (cf. Fig.1b):

$$H_{\text{lead}} = \sum_{i,\mu} \sum_{j,\mu'} \hat{H}_{ij}^{\mu\mu'} |j,\mu'\rangle \langle i,\mu|$$

$$\hat{H}_{ij}^{\mu\mu'} = \epsilon_{\text{lead}} \delta_{\mu\mu'} \delta_{ij} + t_{\text{lead}} \delta_{j,i+1} \chi$$

where $\chi$ are the $N_i$ nearest neighbors of site $i$ on the lattice. To obtain the equivalent ‘chain’ or a tri-diagonal representation of the Hamiltonian, one needs to change the tight-binding basis \{\(|i\mu\rangle\)\} to a new one: \{\(|n\rangle\)\}, obtained recursively.

Taking \(|1\rangle = |1\mu\rangle\) as the starting state, where 1 labels the site at the middle of the cross-sectional edge of the lead where it is connected to the wire (cf. Fig.1a) and $\mu$ is any one of the ‘orbital’ indices, we generate:

$$|n + 1\rangle = H_{\text{lead}}|n\rangle - \alpha_n^n |n\rangle - \beta_n^n |n - 1\rangle$$

and

$$\alpha_n^n = \frac{\langle n|H_{\text{lead}}|n\rangle}{\langle n|n\rangle} \quad \beta_n^n = \frac{\langle n - 1|H_{\text{lead}}|n\rangle}{\langle n|n\rangle \langle n - 1|n - 1\rangle}^{1/2}$$

The equivalent Hamiltonian in this new basis is tri-diagonal (chain-like):

$$H_{\text{lead}}^n = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n^n |n\rangle \langle n| + N |n\rangle \langle n + 1| + |n + 1\rangle \langle n|$$

where the index $n$ labels the ‘atoms’ of the equivalent linear chain for the $\mu$ channel and $\alpha_n^n$ and $\beta_n^n$ signify its on-site and the hopping terms respectively. The sequences \{\(\alpha_n^n, \beta_n^n\}\} converge, so that for a given error tolerance $\epsilon$, there exists an integer $c$ such that for $n > c$, $|\alpha_n^n - \alpha_c^n| < \epsilon$ and $|\beta_n^n - \beta_c^n| < \epsilon$. The ‘terminator’ approximation puts $\alpha_n^n, \beta_n^n = \alpha_c^n, \beta_c^n$ for all $n > c$. The initial $c$ ‘sites’ of both the equivalent input and output chain leads, therefore, contribute to the effective scattering region in addition to the wire. The wire of length $2M$ atoms is described by a Hamiltonian in the tight-binding basis as:

$$H_{\text{wire}} = \sum_{i,\mu} \sum_{j,\mu'} \hat{H}_{ij}^{\mu\mu'} |j,\mu'\rangle \langle i,\mu|$$

$$\hat{H}_{ij}^{\mu\mu'} = \epsilon_{\text{wire}} \delta_{\mu\mu'} \delta_{ij} + t_{\text{wire}}^{\mu\mu'} \delta_{j,i+1} + \delta_{j,i-1}$$

The opposite ends of the wire are coupled to the semi-infinite effective 1D leads via hopping matrix element $t_c$. Note that as the starting state is same in the recursion process, the coupling coefficient $t_c$ remains same during the change of tight-binding basis set. The procedure therefore converts the whole system into an infinite linear chain in which effective scattering region is of extension $2M + 2c$ sites and the rest represents the ballistic parts of the leads which do not participate in the scattering process.
\[ H = \sum_{n,m} \sum_{\mu,\nu} \hat{H}_{nm}^{\mu\nu} |n\mu\rangle \langle n\mu| \]

\[ \hat{H}_{nm}^{\mu\nu} = c_n^{\mu} \delta_{n\mu} \delta_{m\nu} + v_n^{\mu\nu} \left( \delta_{n',n+1} + \delta_{n,n'-1} \right) \]

with

\[ c_n^{\mu} = \begin{cases} \alpha_n^{\mu} & n \leq n_1 \\ \alpha_{n+1-n}^{\mu} & n_1 < n \leq n_2 \\ \epsilon_{wire}^{\mu} & n_2 < n \leq n_3 \\ \alpha_{n-(c+2M)}^{\mu} & n_3 < n \leq n_4 \\ \alpha_{c}^{\mu} & n > n_4 \end{cases} \]

left ballistic lead
left scattering lead
scattering wire
right scattering lead
right ballistic lead

\[ v_n^{\mu\nu} = \begin{cases} \beta_n^{\mu} & n \leq n_1 \\ \beta_{n+1-n}^{\mu} & n_1 < n \leq n_2 \\ t_{wire}^{\mu\nu} & n_2 < n \leq n_3 \\ t_{wire}^{\mu} & n_3 < n \leq n_4 \\ \beta_{n-(c+2M)}^{\mu\nu} & n_3 < n \leq n_4 \\ \beta_{c}^{\mu\nu} & n > n_4 \end{cases} \]

left ballistic lead
left scattering lead
scattering wire
right junction
right scattering lead
right ballistic lead

where \( n_1 = 0, n_2 = c, n_3 = c+2M \) and \( n_4 = 2c+2M = 2N \).

We then compute the scattering matrix of the above mentioned system using the block or vector recursion technique introduced by Godin and Haydock [21]. The essence of the vector recursion technique is the block tridiagonalization of the system Hamiltonian by changing to a new orthogonal set of vector basis, with the restriction that the ballistic part of effective 1D lead Hamiltonian remains unchanged. In this last aspect, it differs from the standard Lanczos method [20]. The numerical stability of this method [22] has been established in studying problems related to Anderson localization and quantum percolation model [23] and layering transition in 2D nano-strip [24] previously. Below we describe the method briefly.

Let us consider, for the sake of demonstration, that we have two 1D ballistic leads, one incoming and and another outgoing connected to the opposite ends of the scattering region at positions [1] and [2N] (cf. Fig.1). The leads and the scatterer have \( \mu = 1, 2, \ldots, L \) scattering channels. The member of the new basis are generated by clubbing the input and output leads together as the vector lead and so is the scattering region (cf. Fig.1). The lead states are chosen to be

\[ |\Phi_n\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |n, \mu = 1\rangle \\ \vdots \\ |n, \mu = L\rangle \end{pmatrix} \]

with \( m = 2N + 1 - n \) and \( n = 0, -1, -2, \ldots, \infty \). The starting state within the scattering region is chosen to be

\[ |\Phi_1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |1, \mu = 1\rangle \\ \vdots \\ |1, \mu = L\rangle \end{pmatrix} \]

The subsequent members of the basis are generated from

\[ B_{21}^L |\psi_2\rangle = (H - A_1) |\psi_1\rangle, \]

\[ B_{n+1}^L |\psi_{n+1}\rangle = (H - A_n) |\psi_n\rangle - B_n |\psi_{n-1}\rangle \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq 2 \]

The matrix inner product is defined as the \( 2L \times 2L \) matrix

\[ \langle \Phi_1 | \circ | \Phi_1 \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \]

where the \( L \times L \) matrices \( A, B, C \) and \( D \) are:

\[ A = \langle 1\mu | 1\mu' \rangle, \quad B = \langle 1\mu | 2N\mu' \rangle, \quad C = \langle 2N\mu | 1\mu' \rangle, \quad D = \langle 2N\mu | 2N\mu' \rangle \]

If this matrix is \( I \) then the states are called orthogonal.

It can be shown that the \( 2L \times 2L \) matrices \( A_n \) and \( B_n \) are block-tridiagonal members of the matrix representation of the Hamiltonian in the new basis:

\[ A_n = \{ \Phi_n \circ H | \Phi_n \} \quad B_n = \{ \Phi_n \circ H | \Phi_{n-1} \} \]

so that the transformed Hamiltonian matrix can be divided in \( 2L \times 2L \) blocks, with only non-zero diagonal and sub-diagonal blocks.

The wave function \( |\psi\rangle \) may be represented in this new basis by a set \( \{ \psi_n \} \) so that \( |\psi\rangle = \sum_n \psi_n |\Phi_n\rangle \). These wave function amplitudes \( \psi_n \) also satisfy an equation identical with (10).

In the ballistic part of the effective 1D lead chain, the onsite and hopping terms do not vary. Therefore, electron potential must be periodic in this region and the solution to the Schrödinger’s equation in the \( \mu \) channel of the ballistic leads are traveling Bloch waves:

\[ A \sum_m \exp(\pm i m \theta^\mu) |m\rangle \]

As the wave travels in the leads, the phase of its wave function changes by \( \theta^\mu = \cos^{-1} \left( (E - \alpha_c)/(2\beta_c) \right) \), where \( E \) is the energy of the incoming electron. In order to have only propagating solutions, we fix \( E \) as real and \( |E - \alpha_c| < 2\beta_c \). This sets the energy window. It is reasonable because eventually only the propagating modes enter in the expression of transmission matrix elements, as evanescent modes do not contribute to the transmission directly. In the \( \mu \) channel of the incoming lead, the incident and the reflected waves can be expressed as a sum

\[ A \sum_m \sum_{\mu'} \left[ \exp(i m \theta^\mu) \delta_{\mu\mu'} + r^{\mu\mu'}(E) \exp(-i m \theta^\mu) \right] |m\rangle \]

The second term is the reflected wave in the \( \mu \) channel from incident waves in \( \mu' \) channels.

In the \( \mu \) channel of the output lead there is a transmitted wave from incident waves in \( \mu' \) channels.

\[ A \sum_m \sum_{\mu'} t^{\mu\mu'}(E) \exp(-i m \theta^\mu') |m\rangle \]
$r^{\mu \nu^\prime}(E)$ and $t^{\mu \nu}(E)$ are the complex reflection and transmission coefficients. The boundary conditions are then imposed from the known solution in the leads at the junction labeled by 0 and 1:

$$\psi_0 = \left( \frac{\sum_\mu (\delta^{\mu \mu^\prime} + r^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E))}{\sum_\mu t^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$\psi_1 = \left( \sum_\mu \left\{ \exp[i\theta^\nu]\delta^{\mu \mu^\prime} + r^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) \exp[-i\theta^\mu]\right\} \right) \frac{1}{\sum_\mu t^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) \exp[-i\theta^\mu]}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

The amplitude at the $n$-th basis $\psi_n$ may be written as

$$\psi_n = X_n \psi_0 + Y_n \psi_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $X_n$ and $Y_n$ satisfy the same recurrence relation as (10) with $EI$ replacing $H$ and also satisfy the boundary conditions $X_0 = I$ and $X_1 = 0$, while $Y_0 = 0$ and $Y_1 = I$. Note that $X$ and $Y$ are $2L \times 2L$ matrices and $\psi_n$'s are column matrices of dimension $2L$.

This new basis terminates after $\nu = N$ steps, as the rank of the space spanned by the original tight-binding basis remains unchanged after the transformation. Hence the recursion also terminates after $\nu$ steps. This gives an additional boundary condition,

$$X_{\nu+1} \psi_0 + Y_{\nu+1} \psi_1 = 0_{2L \times 2L}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

If we now interchange the incoming and outgoing leads, we get a similar pair of equations for $r^{\mu \mu^\prime}$ and $t^{\mu \mu^\prime}$, the transmission and reflection coefficients for a wave incident from either lead so that $t^{\mu \mu^\prime} = t^{\mu \mu^\prime}$. In addition, $r^{\mu \mu^\prime}$ and $r^{\mu \mu^\prime}$ differ only by a phase factor. Solving these equations for the S-matrix in the effective scattering region, one has,

$$S(E) = -(X_{\nu+1} + Y_{\nu+1} E^*(\theta))^{-1} (X_{\nu+1} + Y_{\nu+1} E(\theta))$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} r^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) & t^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) \\ t^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) & r^{\mu \mu^\prime}(E) \end{pmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where

$$E(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(i\theta^\mu) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(i\theta^\nu) \end{pmatrix}$$

The various steps of our approach are shown schematically in Fig. 1.

The conductance is then given by Landauer formalism. It expresses the electronic conductance in one-dimensional conductor as a quantum mechanical scattering problem and relates to the total transmission probability of the electron at the Fermi level $T(E_F)$, as

$$G = \left( \frac{e^2}{\pi \hbar} \right) T(E_F) = \left( \frac{e^2}{\pi \hbar} \right) \left| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\mu \nu^\prime} t^{\mu \nu^\prime}(E_F) \right|^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

We have assumed in our derivation the leads to have finite lateral dimensions, though in actual experiments, the leads are three dimensional. In order to study the influence of the extend of the lateral dimension of the leads, we have checked our results with increasing size of the lateral cross-section of the leads. Though the quantitative values do change with the change of the lateral dimension, the qualitative nature holds good in every case. In addition, we find for sufficiently large choice of lateral cross-section, the recursion coefficients ($\alpha$, $\beta$) for the leads converge to that of a bulk system (see for details section 3.1), indicating for such large lateral cross-section, the leads behave as truly three-dimensional leads. The other approach to the problem could have been inclusion of periodic boundary condition as have been adopted in various works [15][16][17][18][19][20]. If we impose periodic boundary conditions on the lead surfaces, only those modes which are consistent with the boundary conditions can travel through them. In an earlier paper we have shown [20], that it is possible to change over from a site to a mode basis and reformulate the vector recursion in the new basis. The lead is broken up into slices perpendicular to its length and the composite site label $i$ is partitioned into two : one is the slice label $s$ and the other is the position on this slice $k$. The basis $\{|sk\rangle\}$ is then converted into a slice-mode basis $\{|s\nu^\prime\rangle\}$ and the Hamiltonian is expressed in this new basis. Exactly as the Hamiltonian (6) mixes orbital labeled channels because of off-diagonal terms $v^{\mu \nu^\prime}$, in the mode based formalism off-diagonal terms in the corresponding Hamiltonian causes the outgoing wave to be of a mixed mode type even if the incoming wave is in a single mode. Otherwise, the formal methodology is identical in the two

![Fig. 1. Recursive reduction of (a) a system of two quasi 1D semi-infinite leads plus 1D wire into (b) a system of infinite linear chain. The numbering of sites of the equivalent 1D infinite chain is shown in (b). The directions of incident wave $e^{-i\theta^\nu}$ to the scattering region, the reflected wave $e^{-i\theta^\mu}$ and transmitted wave $e^{-i\theta^\mu^\prime}$ from the scattering region are shown with arrows. (c) Formation of vector basis by folding the infinite chain and clubbing the two sites together.](image-url)
3 Application

3.1 The model

Since our aim here is to propose a method rather than to evaluate the properties of any particular system in quantitative detail, we present the study of a simple model system. It consists of a wire, few atoms long, sandwiched between two identical semi-infinite leads. Both the wire and the leads have only a single channel \((L = 1)\) corresponding to single \(s\)-band. The cross-sectional size of each lead in our calculation was \(5 \times 5\). The atoms in the leads form a simple cubic lattice. Each lead is described by a single-band nearest-neighbor TB Hamiltonian. Two TB parameters in equation \((1)\) : the on-site and the hopping terms, which are material specific in realistic cases, have been chosen as \(\epsilon^l = \epsilon_{\text{lead}} = 0\) and \(t^l = t_{\text{lead}} = 2\) in some arbitrary energy unit. As a first step, we performed scalar recursion on the leads to convert them into equivalent chains and determined the contribution of each lead to the effective scattering region. We took the starting state of recursion to be the sites which bound the leads to the wire. For a simple cubic lead, the recursion coefficients \(\alpha_n = \epsilon_{\text{lead}} = 0\) while the other coefficients \(\beta_n\) fluctuate with recursion steps converging to an asymptotic value \(\beta_c\). The convergence of \(\beta_n\) depends on the lattice structure and lateral cross-sectional size of lead. We have not used any periodic boundary conditions in the lateral direction. To see the finite size effect of lead in the lateral direction, we have repeated our calculations for different cross-sectional sizes. Convergence of \(\beta\) with recursion steps for different cross-sectional sizes is shown in Fig 2. As the cross-section increases, the number of recursion steps required to converge \(\beta\) decreases (i.e size of effective scattering region decreases which facilitates to easier computational execution). Variation of converged value \(\beta\) (\(\beta_c\)) with lateral cross-sectional size of the lead is shown within the inset. Notice after a certain cross-sectional size (\(30 \times 30\) with the present choice of parameters), \(\beta\) converges to that of the bulk cubic system, which is 6 for choice of \(\epsilon_{\text{lead}} = 0\) and \(t_{\text{lead}} = 2.0\). This implies that there is no further effect of finite cross-section on \(\beta_c\) and therefore on conductance. In changing cross-section from \(5 \times 5\) to \(30 \times 30\), \(\beta_c\) changes by 9% (The change is mostly coming in going from \(5 \times 5\) to \(11 \times 11\) and after that change is very minute). The corresponding change in conductance is much smaller : 5% for even numbered wire, less than 1% for odd numbered wire (cf. Fig 2). We have checked that qualitatively results are same for any cross-sectional size, but if one is concerned about the quantitative value, then convergence of \(\beta_c\) with cross-sectional size has to be checked. For our chosen case, \(\beta_n\) converged after around 80 recursions. So in our calculation, \(c\) was taken to be 80 and \(\beta_n = \beta_{80}\) for \(n \geq 80\). For a model simple cubic lead, the Fermi energy is at \(E_{\text{F}} = \epsilon_{\text{lead}}\) which is obvious from the dispersion relation \(E = \epsilon_{\text{lead}} + \delta_{\text{lead}} \cos(ka)\) for a half-filled band with Fermi wave number \(k_F = \pi / 2a\). Fermi energy \(E_F\) of the lead-wire-lead system tends to align with the Fermi energy of the semi-infinite lead. Conductance is therefore calculated at \(E_F = \epsilon_{\text{lead}}\).

3.2 Results and discussions

Our calculated conductance as a function of number of atoms in the wire is shown in Fig 3. The inter-atomic hopping within the wire was fixed to \(t_{\text{wire}} = 2 = t_{\text{lead}}\). To consider the effect of charge transfer between the leads and the wire \(|\Delta e| = \epsilon_{\text{lead}} - \epsilon_{\text{wire}} \neq 0\), we considered the cases \(|\Delta e| = 0.2\) and \(|\Delta e| = 0.4\) along with no charge transfer condition \(|\Delta e| = 0\). Non zero values of \(\Delta e\) were achieved by changing \(\epsilon_{\text{wire}}\). For each case, we considered three types of coupling between lead and atomic wire, given by lead-wire hopping coefficient \(t_c\) : (i) \(t_c = 0.9\) \(t_{\text{lead}}\) for weak coupling, (ii) \(t_c = t_{\text{lead}}\) for direct coupling and (iii) \(t_c = 1.1\) \(t_{\text{lead}}\) for strong coupling.

The odd-even oscillation in conductance for no charge transfer situation is obvious from Fig 3b. i.e wires with odd-number of atoms have larger conductance as compared to the even numbered ones, for all the three types of couplings. In this ideal case of no charge transfer situation, all odd numbered atomic wires have conductances equal to quantum unit \(G_0 = \left( e^2 / \pi \hbar \right)\) for all the three coupling cases, while for even numbered wires the conductances are lower. The conductance of even-numbered wires decreases as one moves from strong to direct to weak coupling. This means that the amplitude of conductance oscillation is a maximum for the weak coupling case \((t_c = 0.9 \ t_{\text{lead}}))\) and it is a minimum for the strong coupling case \((t_c = 1.1 \ t_{\text{lead}}))\). Similar results have been predicted by Khomyakov et al for a system of 1D wire connected with 1D leads using tight-binding calculation [35]. The dependence of conductance on \(t_c\) for even numbered wire

![Fig. 2. (Color online) Variation of recursion coefficient \(\beta\) with recursion steps for different cross-sectional sizes of the lead, with \(t_{\text{lead}} = 2.0\) and \(\epsilon_{\text{lead}} = 0.0\). The lower left inset shows the variation of converged values of \(\beta\) (\(\beta_c\)) with cross-sectional size.](image-url)
Fig. 3. Variation of conductance with cross-sectional sizes for an even numbered wire, \( N = 4 \) considering direct coupling and \( |\Delta \epsilon| = 0.2 \). Variation in conductance is around 5% for even numbered wire. For odd numbered wire (not shown in the above plot), it is less than 1%.

The conductance is given by

\[
G = G_0 \frac{4t_c^4/t_{\text{wire}}^2}{[1 + 4t_c^2/t_{\text{wire}}^2]^2}
\]

It follows the same trend as observed in the top panel of Fig 4. Another point to notice from Fig 4 is that the length of the wire does not have any effect in this case either on amplitude or phase of the oscillation. All odd numbered atomic wires and also all even numbered atomic wires have equal conductances for a fixed coupling type. The odd-even oscillations for our single band model system is in agreement with the results on Na-atom wires [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36].

For \( |\Delta \epsilon| = 0.2 \) in Fig 4, the odd-even oscillation in conductance is again obvious within the range of our plot. However, a close view to these curves, indicates that the conductance of the odd numbered atomic wires gradually decreases while that of the even numbered atomic wires slowly increases. If we increase the number of atoms in the wire to more than 10 (not shown in Fig 4), we find that the parity of conductance oscillation changes from odd-even to even-odd, i.e. even numbered atomic wires now have larger conductance than the odd numbered atomic wires.

Increasing \( |\Delta \epsilon| \) to 0.4, there will be larger charge transfer between the lead and wire. This causes a change in the parity of conductance oscillation from odd-even to even-odd for even shorter lengths : around wire lengths of 7 atoms as shown in Fig 4. From our study, it is therefore clear that the amplitude of conductance oscillation is mainly controlled by coupling coefficient between the leads and the wire, while the parity of the oscillation is controlled by the length of the wire and onsite energy difference between wire and lead Hamiltonians. There are few reports [37, 38] which indicate the change of parity of conductance oscillation and variation of oscillation amplitude for Na-atom wire.

To understand the odd-even oscillation in the conductance, we have calculated the density of states (DOS) and transmittance as a function of energy for wires of lengths \( N = 1, N = 2 \) and \( N = 3 \) for the case of zero charge transfer. The results shown in Fig 5 bring out the essential mechanism which has been discussed also in ref. [39]. For odd-numbered atomic wires, the Fermi-energy falls in the non-bonding peak and it gives a maximum in the transmittance at \( E = E_F \). On the other hand, for even numbered wire, the Fermi level lies in the minimum between the bonding and non-bonding peaks and consequently it exhibits a less transmission at \( E = E_F \).

In order to explain the flipping of conductance oscillation from odd-even to even-odd, we have plotted in Fig 6 the DOS around Fermi energy of several even numbered atomic wires for two cases of no charge transfer and finite charge transfer situations. When there is no charge transfer \((|\Delta \epsilon| = 0)\), all the even numbered wires have a minimum in DOS at \( E_F \). When we allow sufficient charge transfer to take place between wire and lead, DOS at \( E_F \)
transmittance (right panel) in no charge transfer ($|\Delta \epsilon| = 0$) and direct coupling ($t_c = t_{\text{lead}}$) situation for wires of lengths $N = 1$, $N = 2$ and $N = 3$ (from top to bottom). The dashed lines label the Fermi energy.

Fig. 5. (Color online) Density of states (left panel) and total transmittance (right panel) in no charge transfer ($|\Delta \epsilon| = 0$) and direct coupling ($t_c = t_{\text{lead}}$) situation for wires of lengths $N = 1$, $N = 2$ and $N = 3$ (from top to bottom). The dashed lines label the Fermi energy.

The opposite occurs for odd-numbered atomic wire (not shown in the Fig.6) and nature of conductance oscillations flips from odd-even to even-odd. If we increase the wire size further, again after another critical size, the odd-even nature of oscillations is restored. This repetition of even-odd or odd-even oscillation continues with increasing wire size.

To investigate the effect of $|\Delta \epsilon|$ on the period of parity flip, we have plotted the conductance as a function of number of atoms in the wires in Fig.7 for two different values of $|\Delta \epsilon|$ keeping coupling parameter fixed. One can see clearly that as $|\Delta \epsilon|$ increases, frequency of parity flip increases i.e. period of parity flip decreases. To get a better insight into parity flip, we have shown in Fig.7 the conductance variation of odd numbered and even numbered wires separately in insets (a) and (b) for $|\Delta \epsilon| = 0.6$ and $|\Delta \epsilon| = 0.8$ respectively. Each curve shows sinusoidal-like variations. Curves of even numbered and odd numbered wires together constitute loops. Length of one loop indicates the wire size required to flip the oscillation from odd-even to even-odd. The nodal points of loop indicate the boundaries between odd-even and even-odd. Two consecutive loops constitute a period. Number of loops in inset (b) is larger than in inset (a). Variation of period of parity-flip with $|\Delta \epsilon|$ is shown by right triangles in inset (c). For $|\Delta \epsilon| = 0$, there is no parity flip i.e period is infinity. As $|\Delta \epsilon|$ increases, the period decreases. For sufficiently large value of $|\Delta \epsilon| (\gg t_c)$, odd-even nature of conductance oscillation no longer persists. Period of conductance oscillation then changes to more than two atoms which is the characteristic of wires consisting of atoms of higher valency. Within the odd-even nature of conductance oscillations, the period of parity flip goes roughly as $(A/|\Delta \epsilon|) + B$ with $A = 12.605$ and $B = -0.253$.

However, coupling parameter $t_c$ does not have any effect on period of parity flip. To check this, we have plotted the conductance variation with wire size in Fig.8 for two different coupling constant $t_c$ keeping $|\Delta \epsilon|$ fixed, while insets (a) and (b) show the conductance variation of odd
numbered wires and even numbered wires separately. The number of loops in both the cases are same indicating $t_c$ has no effect on the period. Larger width of loops in inset (b) compared to that in inset (a) indicates that $t_c$ controls the amplitude of odd-even oscillations.

So far we have studied the role of the charge neutrality on the conductance oscillations of monoatomic wires considering the mirror symmetry between the two junctions. We found odd-even oscillation in the conductance. Moreover, for no charge transfer situation, conductance of odd numbered wires is quantized to $G_0$, while for even numbered wires conductance is less than $G_0$. Now we consider the situation where mirror symmetry between two lead-wire junctions is broken by using two different coupling coefficients for two junctions, keeping charge-neutrality intact. Table 1 contains our result. Clearly, odd-even oscillations still occur, but the conductance quantization for odd numbered wires is weakened by reducing the value less than $G_0$. This observation is in accordance with the previous study [33, 40].

![Graph](image)

Fig. 8. (Color online) Plot of conductance as a function of wire size for two values of $t_c$ - circles connected by solid line for $t_c = 1.1 \, t_{lead}$ and squares connected by dashed line for $t_c = 0.9 \, t_{lead}$. Conductances for all even numbered wires and all odd numbered wires are shown separately by red line and green line respectively. Left inset corresponds to $t_c = 1.1 \, t_{lead}$ and right one to $t_c = 0.9 \, t_{lead}$.

| wire length (N) | $t_{c1} = t_{lead}$ | $t_{c2} = t_{lead}$ | $t_{c2} = 1.1 \, t_{lead}$ | $t_{c2} = 1.2 \, t_{lead}$ |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1              | 0.9996              | 0.9906              | 0.9672              | 0.9542              |
| 2              | 0.7164              | 0.7876              | 0.8482              | 0.9072              |
| 3              | 0.9996              | 0.9906              | 0.9672              | 0.9542              |
| 4              | 0.7164              | 0.7876              | 0.8482              | 0.9072              |
| 5              | 0.9996              | 0.9906              | 0.9672              | 0.9542              |

Table 1. Values of conductances for various wire lengths in absence of mirror symmetry. $t_{c1}$ and $t_{c2}$ are the two lead-wire couplings of the two junctions.

To conclude, we have used combination of real-space based scalar and vector recursion techniques to study the transport properties of a lead-wire-lead system. Our study on model system described by single band TB Hamiltonian provides a detailed understanding of the effect of lead-wire coupling on the conductance of monoatomic wire. Working with model system, gives us the freedom of changing the model parameters and allows us to work with much longer wires than usually considered in literature. Odd-even oscillation in the conductance with increasing length of wire has been observed in agreement with earlier studies [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39]. In presence of charge neutrality between the leads and the wire and in presence of perfect mirror symmetry between the incoming and outgoing leads, the conductance of odd numbered wires is quantized to $G_0$, while it is less than $G_0$ for even numbered wires. As the charge neutrality is broken, the oscillation in conductance still exists, but with the distinction that for a given choice of charge transfer ($\Delta \epsilon$) and lead-wire hopping ($t_c$), the conductance values of the odd numbered and even numbered wires are no longer fixed quantities as the size of the wires is changed. For such systems, we further found a change of phase of conductance oscillation from odd-even to even-odd with increasing number of atoms in the wire. We found that while the amplitude of oscillation depends on lead-wire coupling parameter $t_c$, it is the amount of charge transfer between lead and wire, which affects the period of oscillation. Lifting of mirror symmetry between two lead-wire junctions in no charge transfer condition is found to reduce the conductance of odd numbered wires below the quantized value of $G_0$. The proposed technique can be easily generalized for application to realistic cases. To apply this approach to real systems, one needs to generate TB parameters of lead and wire via self consistent calculations while multi-orbital effect can be taken into account via multi-channel generalization of Landauer-Büttiker formula (see equation [17]). The proposed real space technique of calculation of conductance coupled with localized Wannier basis generated out of self-consistent DFT calculation [41, 42] can lead to a viable technique for study of quantum transmittance and conductance of nanoscale systems of various geometries in general. Work is in progress along this direction.
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