Inelastic effects in molecular junctions in the Coulomb and Kondo regimes: Nonequilibrium equation-of-motion approach
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Inelastic effects in the Coulomb blockade and Kondo regimes of electron transport through molecular junctions are considered within a simple nonequilibrium equation-of-motion (EOM) approach. The scheme is self-consistent and can qualitatively reproduce the main experimental observations of vibrational features in the Coulomb blockade [H. Park et al., Nature (London) 407, 57 (2000)] and Kondo [L. H. Yu et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 266802 (2004)] regimes. Considerations similar to the equilibrium EOM approach by Meir et al. [Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 3048 (1991); 70, 2601 (1993)] are used on the Keldysh contour to account for the nonequilibrium nature of the junction, and dressing by appropriate Franck-Condon factors is used to account for vibrational features. Results of the equilibrium EOM scheme by Meir et al. are reproduced in the appropriate limit.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Fast development of experimental techniques in the area of molecular electronics makes it possible to observe the response of molecular conduction junctions in a wide range of external parameters, such as source-drain and gate voltages.1 Coulomb blockade (that characterizes the weak molecule-lead coupling limit), where transport through the molecular junction is suppressed due to high charging energy, and Kondo effect (encountered at sufficiently low temperature and strong molecule-lead coupling), when a correlation between localized (molecular) and band (contacts) electrons manifests itself in molecular junctions as a maximum in electrical conductance near \( V_{sd} \sim 0 \), were observed in the \( I/V_{sd} \) characteristics of such junctions.2–7 These are often accompanied by vibrational features that result from coupling between electronic and vibrational degrees of freedom. The latter can be associated with molecular center-of-mass motion8 or with intramolecular vibrations.2,4,6

Early theoretical approaches to transport in the Coulomb blockade regime were either based on linear-response theory for near-equilibrium situations9–13 or by treating transport at the level of quasiclassical rate equations.14,15 While the second approach to nonequilibrium transport is justified in the case of pure Coulomb blockade (where hopping between molecule and contacts is rare), the intermediate regime, e.g., the case of stronger molecule-lead coupling relevant for observation of nonequilibrium Kondo resonance, should be treated at a more sophisticated level. Recent approaches dealing with nonequilibrium Coulomb blockade and/or Kondo effect are based on either the slave-boson technique,16–19 the equation-of-motion method,18,20–22 the Fock-space rate equation scheme,15 or the contour perturbation theory.11,23–29 Inelastic effects were not considered in the references above.

Here, we present a simple generalization of the equilibrium equation-of-motion approach used in the Coulomb regime (also later applied to the Kondo31 situation) to the case of nonequilibrium transport. The main difference between our approach and earlier nonequilibrium EOM studies,18,21,22 is the simple appealing structure of the Green function, the evaluation of which (in the absence of electron-phonon coupling) does not require a time-consuming self-consistent procedure. As was indicated earlier,30 this Green function expression reduces to the exact solution both for an isolated molecule and in the limit of noninteracting electrons. We also generalize this basic scheme to include inelastic effects approximately, within an approach based on the Born-Oppenheimer approximation that is commonly used in the Marcus theory of electron transfer.32 Numerical calculations are performed and qualitative correspondence to experimental data is demonstrated.

Our model and theoretical procedure are presented in Sec. II. Numerical results for the Coulomb blockade regime are given and discussed in Sec. III. The Kondo regime is discussed in Sec. IV. Section V concludes.

II. MODEL AND METHOD

We describe the molecular junction within a single resonant level (molecular electronic orbital) model, with electron-electron on-site repulsion (Hubbard term) and polaronic coupling to a local vibrational mode. The latter is coupled to a bosonic thermal bath. The electronic orbital is coupled to two \((L\text{ and }R)\) free-electron reservoirs representing the leads, each at its own equilibrium.

The corresponding Hamiltonian is

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{K=L,R} \sum_{k \in K, \sigma} e_{k \sigma} \alpha_{K \sigma} \hat{c}_{k \sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} e_{\sigma \sigma} \hat{\alpha}_{\sigma} \hat{\alpha}_{\sigma} + \sum_{\beta} \omega_{\beta} \hat{\beta}_{\beta} \hat{\beta}_{\beta} + \sum_{K=\text{L,R}} \sum_{k \in K, \sigma} (V_{k \sigma} \hat{c}_{k \sigma}^{\dagger} \hat{\alpha}_{\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) + U \hat{\sum_{\sigma} \hat{n}_{\sigma} + \sum_{\beta} \hat{\beta}_{\beta} \hat{\beta}_{\beta}}
\]

(1)

where \(\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow\) is the electron spin index, \(\hat{c}_{k \sigma}^{\dagger} \) are creation operators for electronic state \(k \sigma\) in the
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contacts, \( \hat{d}_\sigma (\hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma) \) destroys (creates) electron in the molecular orbital, \( \hat{a} (\hat{a}^\dagger) \) are second quantization operators for the local vibrational mode, and \( \hat{b}_\beta (\hat{b}^\dagger_\beta) \) are the corresponding boson operators for thermal bath modes. Also,

\[
\hat{Q}_\sigma = \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger, \quad \hat{Q}_\beta = \hat{b}_\beta + \hat{b}_\beta^\dagger
\]

(2)

are displacement operators for the corresponding modes and \( \hat{n}_\sigma = \hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma \hat{d}_\sigma \). Here and below, we use \( \hbar = 1 \) and \( e = 1 \). After small polaron (canonical or Lang-Firsov) transformation,\(^{33} \) the Hamiltonian takes the form (for details, see Ref. 34)

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{K=L,R} \sum_{k \in K, \sigma} \varepsilon_{k\sigma} \hat{c}^\dagger_{k\sigma} \hat{c}_{k\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} \hat{e}_\sigma \hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma \hat{d}_\sigma + \sum_{\beta} \omega_{\beta} \hat{b}^\dagger_\beta \hat{b}_\beta + \sum_{K=L,R} \sum_{k \in K, \sigma} (\bar{V}_{k\sigma} \hat{c}^\dagger_{k\sigma} \hat{d}_\sigma + \text{H.c.}) + \bar{U} \hat{n}_1 + \sum_{\beta} \bar{U}_\beta \hat{Q}_\beta \hat{Q}_\beta,
\]

(3)

where

\[
\bar{V}_{k\sigma} = V_{k\sigma} \hat{\chi}_\sigma, \quad \bar{U} = U - 2M^2/\omega_0,
\]

(4)

\[
\bar{V}_{k\sigma} = V_{k\sigma} \hat{\chi}_\sigma, \quad \bar{U} = U - 2M^2/\omega_0,
\]

(5)

\[
\bar{V}_{k\sigma} = V_{k\sigma} \hat{\chi}_\sigma, \quad \bar{U} = U - 2M^2/\omega_0,
\]

(6)

and where

\[
\hat{\chi}_\sigma = \exp(\im \lambda_a \hat{P}_\sigma), \quad \lambda_a = \frac{M}{\omega_0}
\]

(7)

is the phonon shift generator operator with

\[
\hat{P}_\sigma = -\im (\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger).
\]

(8)

\( \hat{P}_\sigma \) [Eq. (8)] is the phonon momentum operator; we use the term phonon to characterize both molecular and bath vibrations.

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (3) is our starting point for the calculation of the steady-state current across the junction, using the nonequilibrium Green function (NEGF) expression derived in Refs. 30 and 35,

\[
I_K = \frac{e}{\hbar} \sum_{\sigma} \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} \left[ \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) - \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E) \right].
\]

(9)

Here \( \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} \) are lesser and greater projections of the self-energy due to coupling to the contact \( K = (L,R) \),

\[
\Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E) = i \Sigma_{K,\sigma} (E) \Gamma_{K,\sigma} (E),
\]

(10)

\[
\Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) = -i \left[ 1 - \Sigma_{K,\sigma} (E) \right] \Gamma_{K,\sigma} (E),
\]

(11)

with \( \Sigma_{K,\sigma} (E) \) the Fermi distribution in the contact \( K \) and

\[
\Gamma_{K,\sigma} (E) = 2\pi \sum_{k \in K} |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \delta(E - \varepsilon_k).
\]

(12)

The lesser and greater Green functions in Eq. (9) are Fourier transforms to energy space of projections onto the real time axis of the electron Green function on the Keldysh contour,

\[
G_{\sigma}^{\less} (\tau_1, \tau_2) = -i \langle T_\sigma (\hat{a}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma (\tau_2) \rangle_H
\]

\[
= -i \langle T_\sigma (\hat{a}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{X}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma (\tau_2) \hat{X}_\sigma^\dagger (\tau_2) \rangle_H, \tag{13}
\]

where the subscripts \( H \) and \( \bar{H} \) indicate which Hamiltonian, Eq. (1) or (3), respectively, determines evolution of the system, and \( T_c \) is the contour ordering operator. In what follows, we use the second form and will drop the subscript \( \bar{H} \) while keeping in mind that time evolution is determined by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3). We next decouple electron and phonon dynamics in the spirit of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation within the Condon approximation,

\[
G_{\sigma} (\tau_1, \tau_2) = \frac{\Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) - \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E)}{\Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) - \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\gtr} (E) \Sigma_{K,\sigma}^{\less} (E)},
\]

(14)

where

\[
G_{\sigma}^{\less} (\tau_1, \tau_2) = -i \langle T_\sigma (\hat{a}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{d}^\dagger_\sigma (\tau_2)) \rangle,
\]

(15)

\[
K(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (T_c \hat{X}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{X}_\sigma^\dagger (\tau_2)).
\]

(16)

The shift generator correlation function \( K \) can be expressed within the second-order cumulant expansion in terms of the phonon Green function (for derivation, see Ref. 34),

\[
K(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \exp \left\{ \lambda_a^2 \left[ i D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau_1, \tau_2) - \langle \hat{P}_{\sigma}^{(0)} \rangle \right] \right\},
\]

(17)

\[
D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau_1, \tau_2) = -i \langle T_c \hat{P}_\sigma (\tau_1) \hat{P}_\sigma (\tau_2) \rangle,
\]

(18)

while the phonon Green function \( D \) obeys approximately an equation which resembles the usual Dyson equation,

\[
D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau, \tau') = D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau, \tau') + \int_c \frac{d\tau_1}{\tau_1} \int_c \frac{d\tau_2}{\tau_2} D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau_1, \tau_2)
\]

\[
\times \Pi_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}} (\tau_1, \tau_2) D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau_2, \tau'),
\]

(19)

with

\[
\Pi_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}} (\tau_1, \tau_2) = \sum_{\beta} \left| U_{\beta} \right|^2 D_{P_{\sigma} P_{\sigma}}^{(0)} (\tau_1, \tau_2)
\]

\[
- i \lambda_a^2 \sum_{k \in [L,R], \sigma} |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \langle X_{k\sigma} | (\tau_1, \tau_1) \rangle \times G_{\sigma}^{\less} (\tau_1, \tau_2) K(\tau_1, \tau_2) + (\tau_1 \leftrightarrow \tau_2)
\]

(20)

the analog of a self-energy. \( \langle X_{k\sigma} | \rangle \) is the free-electron GF in the contact, defined in Eq. (31) below.

To obtain an expression for the Green function \( G_{\sigma}^{\less} \), we follow the equation-of-motion (EOM) method of Meir et al.\(^{10,30} \) where it was applied for a near-equilibrium situation, except that we consider the EOMs on the Keldysh contour in order to take into account the nonequilibrium condition. In the spirit of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, we regard the shift generator operators \( \hat{X}_\sigma \) as parameters incorporated into transfer-matrix elements \( \bar{V}_{k\sigma} \). The solution of the electronic problem is thus carried out as in the absence of electron-phonon coupling\(^{10,30} \) with renormalized parameters \( U (-\bar{U}) \) and \( V (-\bar{V}) \). The result is then averaged over the phonon subspace. This average is obviously not needed in
the absence of electron-phonon coupling, \( M=0 \), in which case \( G_{\sigma} = G_{\sigma}^{(c)} \). This leads to (for derivation, see Appendix A)

\[
G_{\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \left[ 1 - (\hat{n}_{\sigma}) \right] G_{\sigma,\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) + (\hat{n}_{\sigma}) G_{\sigma,\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau_1, \tau_2),
\]

(21)

where the GFs \( G_{\sigma,\sigma}^{(c)}(i=1,2,3,4) \) obey

\[
\int \, d\tau \hat{G}_{\sigma,\sigma}^{-1}(\tau_1, \tau) G_{\sigma,\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau, \tau_2) = \delta(\tau_1, \tau_2),
\]

(22)

with

\[
\hat{G}_{\sigma,\sigma}^{-1}(\tau, \tau') = \left[ \delta(\tau, \tau') \left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_\sigma - U \right) - \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') \right].
\]

(23)

\[
\hat{G}_{2,\alpha}^{-1}(\tau, \tau') = \left[ \delta(\tau, \tau') \left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_\sigma - U \right) - \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') \right] + U \int \, d\tau'' G_{1,\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau, \tau'') \Sigma_{\sigma 1}(\tau'', \tau'),
\]

(24)

\[
\hat{G}_{3,\alpha}^{-1}(\tau, \tau') = \left[ \delta(\tau, \tau') \left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_\sigma - U \right) - \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') \right] - U \int \, d\tau'' G_{2,\sigma}^{(c)}(\tau, \tau'') \Sigma_{\sigma 2}(\tau'', \tau'),
\]

(25)

\[
\hat{G}_{4,\alpha}^{-1}(\tau, \tau') = \left[ \delta(\tau, \tau') \left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_\sigma \right) - \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') - \Sigma_{\sigma 3}(\tau, \tau') \right].
\]

(26)

Expressions for “self-energies” \( \Sigma_{\alpha i} \) \((i=0,1,2,3)\) are given by

\[
\Sigma_{\alpha 0}(\tau, \tau') = \sum_k |V_{k\sigma}|^2 g_{k,\sigma}(\tau, \tau')(\tau, \tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau)\tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau')).
\]

(27)

\[
\Sigma_{\alpha 1}(\tau, \tau') = \sum_k \langle \hat{n}_{k\sigma} \rangle |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \langle g_{k,\sigma}^{(1)}(\tau, \tau') \rangle (\tau, \tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau)\tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau'))
\]

\[
+ |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \langle g_{k,\sigma}^{(2)}(\tau, \tau') \rangle (\tau, \tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau)\tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau'))],
\]

(28)

\[
\Sigma_{\alpha 2}(\tau, \tau') = \Sigma_{\alpha 3}(\tau, \tau') - \Sigma_{\alpha 1}(\tau, \tau'),
\]

(29)

\[
\Sigma_{\alpha 3}(\tau, \tau') = \sum_k |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \langle g_{k,\sigma}^{(1)}(\tau, \tau') \rangle (\tau, \tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau)\tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau'))
\]

\[
+ |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \langle g_{k,\sigma}^{(2)}(\tau, \tau') \rangle (\tau, \tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau)\tilde{X}_{\alpha}(\tau'))],
\]

(30)

with \( \tilde{\sigma} \) denoting the spin opposite to \( \sigma \). The free-electron propagators \( g_{k,\sigma}^{(i)} \) and \( g_{k,\tilde{\sigma}}^{(i)} \), \( j=1,2 \) are defined by

\[
\left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_{k\sigma} \right) g_{k,\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = \delta(\tau, \tau'),
\]

(31)

\[
\left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} + \epsilon_{k\sigma} - \epsilon_{k\tilde{\sigma}} - U \right) g_{k,\sigma}^{(1)}(\tau, \tau') = \delta(\tau, \tau'),
\]

(32)

\[
\left( \frac{i}{\partial \tau} - \epsilon_{k\sigma} - \epsilon_{k\tilde{\sigma}} + U \right) g_{k,\sigma}^{(2)}(\tau, \tau') = \delta(\tau, \tau').
\]

(33)

For \( M=0 \), \( \tilde{V} \) Franck-Condon (FC) factors (i.e., shift generator correlation functions \( \langle XX' \rangle \) and \( \langle X'X \rangle \)) should be taken as 1 in Eqs. \((27)-(30)\). Below the SEs in this case will be denoted \( \Sigma_{\alpha i}^{(c)} \) \((j=0,1,2,3)\). Note that the retarded projections of these are equivalent to the SEs introduced in Ref. \( 10 \). For example, taking the retarded projection of Eq. \((30)\) and Fourier transforming to energy space leads to

\[
\Sigma_{\alpha i}^{(c)}(\tau') = \sum_{k \in L,R} |V_{k\sigma}|^2 \left( \frac{1}{E + \epsilon_{k\sigma} - \epsilon_{k\tilde{\sigma}} - U} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_{k\sigma} - \epsilon_{k\tilde{\sigma}} + U},
\]

(34)

which is identical to Eq. \((9)\) in Ref. \( 10 \) for \( i=3 \). Other expressions are obtained in a similar way.

Consider first the case with no electron-phonon coupling. The structure of expression \((21)\) for the nonequilibrium GF \( G_{\sigma}^{(c)} \) is appealingly simple and has two important implications. First, it provides a convenient way for handling the Hubbard repulsion term \( U \). While the case of weak electron-electron interaction can be handled by taking this term as a perturbation,\( 26 \) the case of strong interaction cannot be handled in this way, but including \( U \) in \( H_0 \) makes standard diagrammatic techniques unusable.\( 36 \) This difficulty is circumvented by Eq. \((21)\), which expresses the system GF as a superposition (with the level population \( n \) defining weight parameters) of simpler GFs associated with Hamiltonians that do not depend on \( U \) (apart from a parametric energy shift) for which Wick’s theorem is applicable. Secondly, by using the EOM method on the Keldysh contour, we are able to derive not only the retarded GF as in Ref. \( 10 \) but also the other projections, in particular, the lesser GF that can be used to evaluate the level populations,

\[
\langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle = -i2\pi \int dE \langle G^{(c)}_{\sigma} \rangle < (E).
\]

(35)

This, together with Eq. \((21)\), leads to an explicit expression for \( \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle \). Denoting

\[
I_{\sigma} = -i2\pi \int dE \langle G^{(c)}_{\sigma} \rangle < (E),
\]

(36)

one gets from Eq. \((21)\)

\[
\langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle = (1 - \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle) I_{2,\sigma} + \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle I_{3,\sigma},
\]

(37)

and hence

\[
\langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle = \frac{I_{2,\sigma} - I_{2,\sigma} I_{2,\sigma} - I_{3,\sigma}}{1 - (I_{2,\sigma} - I_{3,\sigma})(I_{2,\sigma} - I_{3,\sigma})}.
\]

(38)

\( G_{\sigma}^{(c)} < \) can be calculated from the Keldysh equation.
\[ G_{i\sigma}^{<}(E) = G_{i\sigma}^{>}(E) \Sigma_{i\sigma}^{<}(E) G_{i\sigma}^{<}(E), \]

with \( \Sigma_{i\sigma}^{<}(i=1,2,3,4) \) being lesser projections of the corresponding self-energies presented in Eqs. (23)–(26), i.e.,

\[ \Sigma_{1\sigma}^{<}(\tau, \tau') = \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') + \Sigma_{\sigma 3}(\tau, \tau'), \]

\[ \Sigma_{2\sigma}^{<}(\tau, \tau') = \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') - U \int d\tau'' G_{i\sigma}^{<}(\tau, \tau'') \Sigma_{\sigma 1}(\tau'', \tau'), \]

\[ \Sigma_{3\sigma}^{<}(\tau, \tau') = \Sigma_{\sigma 0}(\tau, \tau') + U \int d\tau'' G_{i\sigma}^{<}(\tau, \tau'') \Sigma_{\sigma 2}(\tau'', \tau'), \]

and expressions for \( \Sigma_{ni} \) \((i=0,1,2,3)\) given by Eqs. (27)–(30).

Since \( G_{i\sigma}^{<}(i=1,2,3,4) \) and therefore \( I_{i\sigma} \) do not depend on \( \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle \), Eq. (38) is an explicit expression for \( \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle \) and not, as might have been expected, an equation that needs to be solved self-consistently. Equation (21) therefore constitutes an explicit expression for \( G_{\sigma}^{<} \) that can be evaluated directly once the \( G_{i\sigma}^{<} \) are known. Thus, the Keldysh contour based consideration provides full information on the nonequilibrium system, and no separate considerations (as noncrossing approximation used in Ref. 32) are needed in order to estimate the level population. Note that both Ref. 32 and our consideration give only qualitative description of the Kondo effect, since correlation between localized spin at the level and opposite spin cloud in the contacts is treated perturbatively.

When electron-phonon interaction is present, Eq. (35) remains valid. This results from the fact that \( \Sigma_{i\sigma}^{<}(t,t)=1 \), so that \( G_{i\sigma}^{<}(t,t)=G_{i\sigma}^{<}(t,t) \), still, one has to deal with a self-consistent procedure. Indeed, the phonon GF \( D_{p\sigma} \) and hence shift generator correlation function \( K \), see Eq. (17), depends on the electronic GF \( G_{\sigma}^{<} \) through its self-energy \( \Pi_{p\sigma} \), Eq. (20). On the other hand, the electron GF \( G_{\sigma}^{<} \) depends on the shift generator correlation function \( K \) through its self-energies \( \Sigma_{\sigma} \) \((i=0,1,2,3)\), Eqs. (27)–(30). The resulting procedure is described in detail in Ref. 34. The only difference that enters here is the need to obtain the different self-energies defined in Eqs. (27)–(30).

As discussed in Ref. 34, the calculations involving electron-phonon interaction, when multiplication by the FC factor is necessary, are facilitated by repeatedly moving between the time and energy domains. This is done using fast Fourier transform. In the calculations, we use (following Ref. 17) for the retarded projection of \( \Sigma_{K\sigma 0} \)

\[ \Sigma_{K\sigma 0}^{<}(E) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma_{K\sigma 0}^{(0)} + W_{K\sigma 0}^{(0)}}{E - E_{K\sigma 0} + iW_{K\sigma 0}}. \]

while its lesser projection is given by Eq. (10), where

\[ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}^{(0)}(E) = -2 \text{Im}[\Sigma_{K\sigma 0}^{<}(E)]. \]

We take \( W_{K\sigma 0}^{(0)}=10U \) and \( E_{K\sigma 0}^{(0)} \) taken at the Fermi level, defined to be the zero of energy \( (E_{c}=0) \). This form will ensure convergence of the integrals. A bandwidth ten times the Coulomb repulsion is enough to get essentially constant density of contact states in the relevant energy region (wide band).

The biased junction was characterized by the choice

\[ \mu_{L} = E_{F} + \eta V_{sd}, \quad \mu_{R} = E_{F} - (1 - \eta) eV_{sd}. \]

with voltage division factor \( \eta=0.5 \). In calculations with \( M \neq 0 \), where an iterative procedure was used, convergence was assumed when population differences (electronic population for both spins and vibrational population) between consecutive iteration steps were less than the predefined tolerance, taken to be \( 10^{-4} \). The application of a gate potential was represented by taking

\[ \bar{e}_{\sigma}(V_{g}) = \bar{e}_{\sigma}(V_{g}=0) + eV_{g}. \]

Note that \( V_{g} \) in Eq. (47) is the effective potential at the molecule, which is usually considerably smaller than the bare potential applied to the gate.

In what follows, we apply the procedure outlined above in two situations. In Sec. III, we focus on Coulomb blockade phenomena. In Sec. IV, we describe the application to Kondo physics by keeping the temperature low enough and by assigning finite lifetimes to the metal electrons.

### III. NUMERICAL RESULTS IN THE COULOMB BLOCKADE REGIME

When dealing with the Coulomb-blockade-type calculations, the electronic part (without the FC factors) of the lesser and greater projections of \( \Sigma_{\sigma} \) \((j=1,2,3)\) are obtained from Eqs. (28)–(30) and given by

\[ \Sigma_{1\sigma}^{<}(E) = i \sum_{K=L,R} \{ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{1\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) + \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{2\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{2\sigma}) \}, \]

\[ \Sigma_{1\sigma}^{>}(E) = -i \sum_{K=L,R} \{ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{1\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) \ln f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) \}
+ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{2\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{2\sigma}) [1 - f_{K}(E_{2\sigma})] \}, \]

\[ \Sigma_{2\sigma}^{<}(E) = \Sigma_{3\sigma}^{<}(E) \ln \Sigma_{3\sigma}^{<}(E) - \Sigma_{1\sigma}^{<}(E) \]

\[ \Sigma_{2\sigma}^{>}(E) = i \sum_{K=L,R} \{ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{1\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) + \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{2\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{2\sigma}) \}, \]

\[ \Sigma_{3\sigma}^{<}(E) = i \sum_{K=L,R} \{ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{1\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) \ln f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) \}
+ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{2\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{2\sigma}) [1 - f_{K}(E_{2\sigma})] \}, \]

\[ \Sigma_{3\sigma}^{>}(E) = -i \sum_{K=L,R} \{ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{1\sigma}) \ln f_{K}(E_{1\sigma}) \}
+ \Gamma_{K\sigma 0}(E_{2\sigma}) f_{K}(E_{2\sigma}) [1 - f_{K}(E_{2\sigma})] \}. \]
where $E_{↓σ}=\bar{e}_α+\bar{e}_β+U-E$ and $E_{↑σ}=E-\bar{e}_α+\bar{e}_β$. Retarded projection of the full SEs (after dressing by FC factors) are obtained using Lehmann representation.38

Consider first the situation where no electron-phonon coupling is present, $M=0$. Figure 1(c) shows a conductance contour plot as a function of the gate and source-drain voltages for a system characterized by $\epsilon_α=-0.5$, $\Gamma^{(0)}_{σ,α}=0.01$, and $T=10^{-4}$ (all parameters are in units of $U$). Figure 1(a) presents average level population (solid line) and current (dotted line) plotted as a function of $V_{sd}$ at fixed $V_g=-U/4$. $I/V_{sd}$ curve shows two Coulomb addition plateaus, as is expected for a doubly degenerate single level. Figure 1(b) is a similar graph as a function of $V_g$ at fixed $V_{sd}=U/2$. The usual Coulomb blockade diamond structure is observed in the bottom graph. Naturally, at high positive $V_g$, the level is unpopulated, while at high negative $V_g$, it is fully populated ($\langle \tilde{n} \rangle = 2$). Within the conduction diamond, the average population is 1, indicating the Coulomb blockade situation. Intermediate regions provide fractional average populations due to partial occupation of the levels.

The case $\epsilon_α\ne\epsilon_β$, which may correspond to magnetic-field removal of spin degeneracy, is shown in Fig. 2. We take the split levels to be $\epsilon_α=0.6$ and $\epsilon_β=0.4$, other parameters are identical to those of Fig. 1. This split results in splitting of the conductance lines, as is shown in the bottom graph. Perturbative explanation can be understood within a simple argument. The molecule in the junction can be in either of the two states sketched in the inset of the top graph by solid and dashed lines. The observed average is the sum of the two states presented, as is shown in the bottom graph. The usual Coulomb blockade diamond structure is observed in the bottom graph. Naturally, at high positive $V_g$, the level is unpopulated, while at high negative $V_g$, it is fully populated ($\langle \tilde{n} \rangle = 2$). Within the conduction diamond, the average population is 1, indicating the Coulomb blockade situation. Intermediate regions provide fractional average populations due to partial occupation of the levels.
In the presence of vibrational degrees of freedom, inelastic cotunneling (vibrational inelasticity) can be observed in conductance.\(^6,7,37\) The situation is illustrated within a zero-order calculation\(^38\) using the parameters following points should be noted:

1. Figure 3(a) shows the main Coulomb steps in the conductance map. In addition to elastic, vibrational sidebands corresponding to phonon creation by the tunneling electron are observed. Peaks corresponding to phonon absorption are not seen due to the low temperature employed in the calculation.

2. Figure 3(b) represents the second derivative of current vs source-drain voltage map. In addition to resonant vibrational sidebands (lines along main Coulomb steps) observed in Fig. 3(a), here, one sees also inelastic electron tunneling spectroscopy (IETS) vibrational features (gate-voltage-independent off-resonant vibrational features), as well as weak lines corresponding to phonon annihilation.

3. The absence of vibrational sidebands or variable \(V_g\) for \(V_{sd} < \omega_0\) is clearly seen from Fig. 3(a). This issue was first addressed in Ref. 39 and later confirmed by us.\(^34\)

4. Suppression of the conduction signal at low source-drain voltage (the so-called Franck-Condon blockade\(^40\)) is seen from Fig. 3(a) as well. At even stronger electron-phonon coupling [Fig. 3(c); a zero-order calculation with the same parameters as in Fig. 3(a) except that \(M=0.6\)], the low-voltage signal is suppressed completely.

5. Note that while experimentally the scales in \(V_g\) and \(V_{sd}\) where Coulomb blockade diamonds are observed are very different (\(V_{sd}\) is of order of Coulomb repulsion energy, \(100\) mV, while \(V_g\) spans \(\sim 1\) V), in our calculations, they are comparable. The reason for this is that experimentally, only part of the applied gate voltage affects the position of the molecular level relative to contact Fermi energy. This is due to two reasons: first, capacitance factors (charging of the junction) play a role, and second, gate voltage cannot be tuned to strongly affect the molecule because of small sizes of the junction.\(^41\) In our calculations, however, a rigid shift of molecular level is assumed.

### IV. THE KONDO REGIME

The Kondo effect,\(^42\) a crossover from weak to strong coupling between localized (molecular) and band (contacts) electrons, manifests itself in molecular junctions as a maximum in electrical conductance near \(V_{sd} \approx 0\) at low temperatures. Conduction in this regime was described by Meir et al.\(^31\) within an EOM scheme. The treatment has focused on the retarded GFs, making it necessary to get level populations from a separate calculation using the noncrossing approximation. In contrast, the NEGF EOM approach yields both the retarded and lesser GFs, and the needed level populations are obtained from the latter. This provides a single consistent theoretical framework that, as we show below, reproduces the results of Ref. 31. It should be noted, however, that this approach is still an approximation, since truncating the EOM hierarchy, Eqs. (A12)–(A17), implies neglect of correlations that may become important in the mixed valence situation when the level \(e_p\) (shifted by \(V_g\)) is close to the Fermi energy. Therefore, our nonequilibrium treatment of the Kondo regime is questionable beyond the low bias regime \(E_F - e_p \gg e V_{sd}\), similar to the mean-field slave-boson approach\(^19,42–44\) where charge correlations are neglected by the mean-field approximation. In both approaches though, the needed correlations in spin fluctuations are maintained; in the present approach, this is done by keeping the correlation functions in Eqs. (A6)–(A8) as essential ingredients of the calculation.

Consider first the purely electronic case, \(M=0\). Following Ref. 31, we limit our consideration to the \(U \to \infty\) limit. This leads to significant simplification while at the same time limiting the site to at most single occupancy, as required for observation of the Kondo effect.\(^45\) From Eqs. (22)–(26), it follows that \(G_{2,\sigma}^{\text{off}} \to 1/U \to 0\) in this limit, while \(G_{2,\sigma}^{\text{on}} = G_{2,\sigma}^{\text{on}}\) satisfies the following Dyson equation:
The parameters of the calculation are from the lesser projection, Thus from Eq. (27) and from Eq. (28) [because $g_{k,\sigma}^{(1)} \to 0$ in the $U \to \infty$ limit; cf. Eq. (32)],

$$\Sigma_{\sigma}(\tau', \tau') = \sum_{k=\text{L,R}} \sum_{K} |V_{k0}|^2 |\tilde{\eta}_{k0}|^2 G_{\sigma}^{(2)}(\tau', \tau').$$  \quad (54)

Thus from Eq. (21), it follows that the total GF in the $U \to \infty$ limit is

$$G_{\sigma}^{(e,\infty)} = (1 - \langle \tilde{\eta}_\sigma \rangle) G_{2,\sigma}^{(e,\infty)}(\tau_1, \tau_2).$$  \quad (55)

The Kondo peak diverges unless the finite lifetime of metal electrons is taken into account. We incorporate this lifetime in the form introduced in Eq. (5) of Ref. 32 (which associates lifetime with scattering off the molecular state). Note that the Lorentzian form adopted following Ref. 17 for the coupling between molecule and contacts, Eq. (44), prevents ultraviolet divergence of integrals such as Eq. (B1) and allows analytic evaluation of $\Sigma_{\sigma}^{(0)}$ projections [see Appendix B, Eqs. (B10) and (B11)].

Equations (53)–(55) lead to the following form for the retarded projection of $G_{\sigma}^{(e,\infty)}$:

$$G_{\sigma}^{(e,\infty)}(E) = \frac{1 - \langle \tilde{\eta}_\sigma \rangle}{E - \epsilon_\sigma - \Sigma_{\sigma}(E) - \Sigma_{\sigma}^{(0)}(E)},$$  \quad (56)

where $\Sigma_{\sigma}(E)$ and $\Sigma_{\sigma}^{(0)}(E)$ are defined in Eqs. (44) and (B10), respectively. These expressions are identical to Eqs. (3) and (4) of Ref. 32. Note, however, that $\langle \tilde{\eta}_\sigma \rangle$ is now calculated from the lesser projection,

$$G_{\sigma}^{(e,\infty)}(E) = (1 - \langle \tilde{\eta}_\sigma \rangle) G_{2,\sigma}^{(e,\infty)}(E).$$  \quad (57)

Figure 4 presents the bridge density of states in equilibrium (dashed line) and nonequilibrium (solid line) situations. Parameters of the calculation are (in units of $\Gamma_{\sigma}^{(0)} = \Gamma_{\text{L,\sigma}}^{(0)} + \Gamma_{\text{R,\sigma}}^{(0)}$) $T=0.005$, $e_1 = -e_2 = -2$, and $W_{K,\sigma}^{(0)} = 100$. As before, the equilibrium Fermi energy defines the energy origin, and the nonequilibrium situation is characterized by $\mu_L = E_F + |eV|$ and $\mu_R = E_F$. In equilibrium, a Kondo peak at the Fermi energy is seen. It splits into two (at each of the electrode Fermi energies) when finite bias is applied. Comparing to Figs. 1(a) and 1(b) of Ref. 32, we see that the present formalism essentially reproduces these results.

Inelastic effects are introduced into the picture as before, by dressing transfer-matrix elements by the shift operators, see Eqs. (14), (27), and (28). Figure 5 shows the result, obtained from such calculation for the second derivative of the current with respect to the source-drain voltage, for three choices of the electron-vibration coupling strength. Parameters of the calculation are (in units of $\Gamma_{\sigma}^{(0)}$) $T=0.025$, $e_\sigma = -2$, $W_{K,\sigma}^{(0)} = 100$, and $\epsilon_{0}\sigma = 0.5$. The solid, dashed, and dotted lines correspond to $M=0.5$, 0.75, and 1, respectively. As is expected, increase in electron-vibration interaction destroys the Kondo effect. The reasons for this are (a) dephasing due to electron-vibration interaction and (b) shift of the energy level due to phonon reorganization. Electronic level shift downward decreases the Kondo temperature ($T_K \sim \exp - \pi |e_\sigma| / \Gamma_{\sigma}$, see Ref. 42), thus destroying the Kondo peak.

It should be emphasized that the vibrational structure seen in Fig. 5 is a normal inelastic tunneling feature that is seen to persist also in the Kondo regime. This feature appears both in the Kondo and normal blockade regimes [see Figs. 3(b) and 5], as indeed was recently observed in the molecular junction experiment of Yu et al.\(^6\) The transition between these regimes (when a molecular orbital crosses the Fermi energy) cannot be described by our approach for reasons outlined above. Also, Paaske and Flensberg\(^{38}\) have recently applied a perturbative renormalization group to a limiting form of the same model in which the molecular electronic level is always in equilibrium with one side of the junction (the substrate in a scanning tunnelling microscopy configuration) and have shown that maintaining quantum coherence of vibrations, the effect disregarded in our treatment due to the approximation in Eq. (14), may lead to enhancement of the exchange coupling, and hence the Kondo temperature.

V. CONCLUSION

We study inelastic effects in electron transport through a model molecular junction in the Coulomb blockade and
Kondo regimes. The approach is based on nonequilibrium generalization of the equation-of-motion scheme introduced by Meir et al.\textsuperscript{30,31} and is appealingly simple. Inelastic effects are treated within a diabatic Born-Oppenheimer scheme. Important features of this approach are correct analytical results for both isolated molecule (no contacts) and noninteracting ($U=0$) cases, ability to reproduce results by Meir et al.\textsuperscript{31} without necessity of additional considerations to get the level population, no necessity for self-consistency to get exact (within the scheme) results when the electron-vibration interaction is switched off, and unified treatment of both Coulomb and (to some extent) Kondo at nonequilibrium. The approach is able to reproduce experimental features qualitatively.

Inelastic effects obtained within the model are resonant vibrational sidebands in the allowed part and IETS signal in the blocked part of the conductance map in $V_d-V_{ad}$ coordinates, Franck-Condon blockade of transport for relatively strong electron-vibration interaction in the Coulomb blockade regime, and vibrational sidebands of the Kondo peak, as well as its quenching for strong vibronic coupling.

Generalization of these considerations to the case of a two-site molecular bridge in the junction is straightforward. The only problem is the large number of equations needed to be taken into account in this case. We postpone such generalization for future study.

\section*{ACKNOWLEDGMENTS}

We are grateful to the MURI/DURINT program, to the NASA/URETI program, and to the NSF/MRSEC program for support of this research. A.N. thanks the Israel Science Foundation, the U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation, and the German-Israeli Foundation for financial support of this research.

\section*{APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF EQUATION (21)}

Here, we derive Eq. (21). Note that the derivation does not depend on whether $V$ or $\tilde{V}$ (and similarly $U$ or $\tilde{U}$) is used for the system-lead coupling as long as the shift generator operator $X$ is regarded as a scalar. We follow the procedure invented by Meir et al.\textsuperscript{10,30} for the equilibrium situation and generalize it to the Keldysh contour case, in order to take into account the nonequilibrium nature of molecular junction transport. During the derivation, we will treat transfer-matrix elements $\tilde{V}_{k\sigma}$, Eq. (6), as numbers with the shift generator operators $\tilde{X}_\alpha$, Eq. (7), incorporated into them as scalar parameters (a Born-Oppenheimer-type approximation). However, we will have to keep track of their dependence on time (or more precisely contour variable) in order to get the phonon correlation functions $K$ correctly at the end.

We start from EOM for GF $G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau')$, Eq. (15), on the Keldysh contour,

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \tilde{e}_\sigma\right) G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = \delta(\tau, \tau') + \tilde{U} G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') + \sum_{k \in \{\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{R}\}} \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(1c)}_{k\sigma}(\tau, \tau').
\end{equation}

New GFs on the right-hand side have the forms

\begin{equation}
\Gamma^{(1c)}_{k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -i\langle T_c \hat{c}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau') \rangle,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
G^{(2c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -i\langle T_c \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{n}_k(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau') \rangle.
\end{equation}

Now we write EOMs for these GFs,

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - e_{k\sigma}\right) \Gamma^{(1c)}_{k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau'),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \tilde{e}_\sigma - \tilde{U}\right) G^{(2c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = \delta(\tau, \tau') + \sum_k [\tilde{V}^\dagger_{k\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(1c)}_{k\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(2c)}_{2,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') - \tilde{V}^\dagger_{k\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(2c)}_{3,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau').] \right).
\end{equation}

While the EOM in Eq. (A4) closes the chain of equations (its right-hand side contains only $G^{(c)}_{\sigma}$), the EOM for $G^{(2c)}_{\sigma}$ yields new correlations in its right-hand side defined by

\begin{equation}
\Gamma^{(2c)}_{1,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -i\langle T_c \hat{c}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{n}_k(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau') \rangle,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\Gamma^{(2c)}_{2,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -i\langle T_c \hat{c}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{n}_k(\tau') \rangle,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\Gamma^{(2c)}_{3,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau') = -i\langle T_c \hat{c}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau) \hat{d}_{k\sigma}(\tau') \rangle.
\end{equation}

As a last step in the chain of EOMs, we follow Refs. 10 and 30 by writing equations for the GFs, in Eqs. (A6)–(A8),

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - e_{k\sigma}\right) \Gamma^{(2c)}_{3,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) (G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') + \sum_{k'} [\tilde{V}^\dagger_{k'\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(3c)}_{1,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
- \tilde{V}_{k'\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(3c)}_{2,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau')],
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + e_{k\sigma} - \tilde{e}_\sigma - \tilde{U}\right) \Gamma^{(2c)}_{2,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) (G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') - \sum_{k'} [\tilde{V}^\dagger_{k'\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(3c)}_{3,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ \tilde{V}_{k'\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(3c)}_{4,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau')],
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - e_{k\sigma} + \tilde{e}_\sigma - \tilde{U}\right) \Gamma^{(2c)}_{1,k\sigma}(\tau, \tau')
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \tilde{V}_{k\sigma}(\tau) [G^{(c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau') - G^{(2c)}_{\sigma}(\tau, \tau')] - \sum_{k'} [\tilde{V}^\dagger_{k'\sigma}(\tau)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\times \Gamma^{(3c)}_{5,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau') - \tilde{V}^\dagger_{k'\sigma}(\tau) \Gamma^{(3c)}_{6,k'\sigma}(\tau, \tau')].
\end{equation}

On the right-hand side of these equations, we now have new, higher-order GFs, $\Gamma^{(3c)}$, defined by the middle terms of Eqs. (A12)–(A17). GFs $\Gamma^{(2c)}$ and $\Gamma^{(3c)}$ take account of spin corre-
lations in the leads. Closure of the (in principle infinite) EOM chain is achieved assuming that higher-order spin correlations in the leads can be neglected. Thus, following Ref. 10, the terms \( \Gamma^{(3c)} \) are expressed in terms of lower-order GFs,\

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{1,k,k',\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau')) = 0,
\]

(A12)

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{2,k',k,\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau')) = 0,
\]

(A13)

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{3,k',k,\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau')) = 0,
\]

(A14)

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{4,k',k,\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau'))
= \delta_{k,k'}(\hat{n}_{k,\sigma})G^{(e)}_{\sigma}(\tau,\tau'),
\]

(A15)

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{5,k',k,\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau'))
= \delta_{k,k'}[1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k,\sigma} \rangle]G^{(e)}_{\sigma}(\tau,\tau'),
\]

(A16)

\[
\Gamma^{(3c)}_{6,k',k,\sigma}(\tau,\tau') = -i(T_e\hat{c}^\dagger_{k',\sigma}(\tau)\hat{c}_{k,\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}(\tau)\hat{d}_{\sigma}^\dagger(\tau')) = 0.
\]

(A17)

Now, using Eqs. (A12)–(A17) in Eqs. (A9)–(A11), one can solve for \( \Gamma^{(2e)}_{i,k,\sigma}(i=\{1,2,3\}) \) in terms of \( G^{(e)}_{\sigma} \) and \( G^{(2e)}_{\sigma} \),\

\[
\Gamma^{(2e)}_{i,k,\sigma} = g_{k,\sigma}\bar{v}_{k,\sigma} \circ G^{(2e)}_{\sigma},
\]

(A18)

\[
\Gamma^{(2e)}_{2,k,\sigma} = \frac{g_{k,\sigma}}{(1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k,\sigma} \rangle)G^{(e)}_{\sigma} - \langle \hat{n}_{k,\sigma} \rangle G^{(c)}_{\sigma}},
\]

(A19)

\[
\Gamma^{(2e)}_{3,k,\sigma} = \frac{g_{k,\sigma}}{g_{k,\sigma}\bar{v}_{k,\sigma} \circ G^{(2e)}_{\sigma} - \langle \hat{n}_{k,\sigma} \rangle G^{(c)}_{\sigma} - \langle \hat{n}_{k,\sigma} \rangle G^{(e)}_{\sigma}},
\]

(A20)

where we have used the short notation style with \( \circ \) implying convolution of two functions on the contour \( A \circ B(\tau,\tau') = \int A(\tau,\tau')B(\tau',\tau') \). These solutions are substituted into Eq. (A5) which gives \( G^{(2e)}_{\sigma} \) in terms of \( G^{(e)}_{\sigma} \). Finally, the last result, together with Eq. (A4), can be used in Eq. (A1) to get an equation for \( G^{(e)}_{\sigma} \) in the form\

\[
\Gamma^{(e)}_{\sigma} = G^{(2e)}_{\sigma} + U(\langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle)G^{(c)}_{\sigma},
\]

(A21)

\( \Gamma^{(e)}_{\sigma} \) \((i=\{1,2,3,4\})\) are defined in Eqs. (22)–(26) while self-energies entering these definitions are given by Eqs. (27)–(30).

In order to simplify the structure, we rewrite it in the form\

\[
G^{(e)}_{\sigma} = (1 - \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle)G^{(2e)}_{\sigma} + \langle \hat{n}_{\sigma} \rangle G^{(c)}_{\sigma} + UG^{(c)}_{\sigma} \circ G^{(e)}_{\sigma},
\]

(A22)

and note that\

\[
\{ \cdots \} = G^{(c)}_{\sigma} \circ G^{(c)}_{\sigma} (G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} + U) = G^{(c)}_{\sigma} \circ G^{(c)}_{\sigma} G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} = G^{(c)}_{\sigma}.
\]

(A23)

The last equation follows from \( G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} = G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} G^{(-1)}_{\sigma} \). Substitution of Eq. (A23) into Eq. (A22) leads to Eq. (21). The retarded projection of Eq. (21) is the final result of Ref. 10.

APPENDIX B: ANALYTICAL EXPRESSION FOR SELF-ENERGY \( \Sigma^{(e)}_{\sigma} \)

Here, we derive analytical expressions for retarded and lesser projections of \( \Sigma^{(e)}_{\sigma} \). Eq. (54), under Lorentzian assumption for coupling between molecule and contacts, Eq. (44). In the case of a dense continuum of states in the contacts (assumed here), the sum in Eq. (54) can be converted to an integral, then, retarded and lesser projections of the SE (in energy domain) are\

\[
\Sigma^{(e)}_{\sigma}(E) = \sum_{K=L,R} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma_{K,\sigma}(\epsilon)f_K(\epsilon)}{E - \epsilon - \epsilon_{\sigma} - \epsilon_{\sigma} + i\gamma_{\sigma}/2},
\]

\[\text{B1}\]

\[
\Sigma^{(e)}_{\sigma}(E) = i \sum_{K=L,R} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma_{K,\sigma}(\epsilon)f_K^2(\epsilon)}{(E - \epsilon - \epsilon_{\sigma} + \epsilon_{\sigma})^2 + (\gamma_{\sigma}/2)^2},
\]

\[\text{B2}\]

where the second line of Eq. (B2) is correct for the case of \( T \rightarrow 0 \) (relevant for observation of the Kondo peak).

Introducing\

\[x = \beta(\epsilon - \mu_K),\]

\[\text{B3}\]

we arrive at integrals of the forms\

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left( x - x_1 \right) \left( x - x_2 \right) \left( x - x_3 \right) \left( x - x_4 \right) \frac{1}{e^x + 1},
\]

\[\text{B4}\]

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \left( x - x_1 \right) \left( x - x_2 \right) \left( x - x_3 \right) \left( x - x_4 \right) \frac{1}{e^x + 1},
\]

\[\text{B5}\]

for Eqs. (B1) and (B2), respectively, where\

\[x_1 = \beta(E_{K,\sigma}^{00} - \mu_K + iW_{K,\sigma}^{00}),\]

\[\text{B6}\]

\[x_2 = x_1^*,\]

\[\text{B7}\]

\[x_3 = \beta \left( E_{\epsilon,\sigma} - \epsilon_{\sigma} - \mu_K + \frac{i\gamma_{\sigma}}{2} \right),\]

\[\text{B8}\]

\[x_4 = x_3^*,\]

\[\text{B9}\]

with \( K=L,R \). These integrals can be taken analytically by complex contour integration; the poles are at \( x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \) in the case of the integral in Eq. (B5) and also at \( y_n = i\pi(2n + 1); n=0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots \). Performing the integration, one arrives at the following expressions for the SE projections:
\[
\Sigma_{\sigma_1}^{(\nu)\nu}(E) = \sum_{k=L,R} \left\{ \frac{i \Gamma_k^{(0)} W_k^{(0)}}{2 \pi} \right\} \left[ \left( \frac{\pi - i x}{2 \pi} \right) \frac{\psi\left(\frac{\pi - i x}{2}\right)}{E_2 + i (W_k^{(0)} + \gamma_\nu/2)} - \frac{\psi\left(\frac{\pi - i x}{2}\right)}{E_2 - i (W_k^{(0)} - \gamma_\nu/2)} \right] + \frac{\Gamma_k^{(0)} \gamma_\nu}{4 \pi} \left[ E_2 - i (W_k^{(0)} - \gamma_\nu/2) \right]\left[ E_2 + i (W_k^{(0)} + \gamma_\nu/2) \right] + \frac{\Gamma_k^{(0)} \gamma_\nu^2}{2 (E_2 + (W_k^{(0)} + \gamma_\nu/2)^2),}
\]

with \(E_2 = E - \varepsilon_r + \varepsilon_s - E_k^{(0)}\) and where \(\psi\) is a psi (digamma) function. Note that it is the second term in Eq. (B10) which is responsible for the Kondo effect appearance.
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