Electronic correlation in nanoscale junctions: Comparison of the GW approximation to a numerically exact solution of the single-impurity Anderson model
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The impact of electronic correlation in nanoscale junctions, e.g., formed by single molecules, is analyzed using the single-impurity Anderson model. Numerically exact quantum Monte Carlo calculations are performed to map out the orbital filling, linear response conductance, and spectral function as a function of the Coulomb interaction strength and the impurity level position. These numerical results form a benchmark against which approximate but more broadly applicable approaches to include electronic correlation in transport can be compared. As an example, the self-consistent GW approximation has been implemented for the Anderson model and the results have been compared to this benchmark. For weak coupling or for level positions such that the impurity is either nearly empty or nearly full, the GW approximation is found to be accurate. However, for intermediate or strong coupling, the GW approximation does not properly represent the impact of spin or charge fluctuations. Neither the spectral function nor the linear response conductance is accurately given across the Coulomb blockade plateau and well into the mixed valence regimes.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Electrical circuits containing nanoscale junctions are central to nanoscience and condensed matter physics. The importance comes both from the conceptual issues they raise and the possibility of qualitatively smaller electronic devices with new electrical properties. Examples include metallic atomic scale point contacts that exhibit quantized conductance and organic molecules linking conducting leads. These latter may form nonresonant tunnel junctions or single molecule devices whose conductance is controlled by a Kondo resonance.

The challenge to theory is twofold. First, the atomic scale specifics of chemical bonding and local structure can profoundly influence local potentials and energy alignments for the electronic states that control conduction. Second, even if electron-electron interactions in the leads are well screened and may be effectively incorporated into the energy bands, interactions on the molecule are typically not small and may strongly affect the conductance and the spectrum.

The important role played by the chemical and structural details has led to a strong emphasis in the literature on self-consistent theories, often utilizing approximate implementations of density functional theory (DFT). In these theories, the atomic scale potential and the local bonding structure are treated in detail, while the conductance is calculated via a Landauer approach based on the electronic states derived from the self-consistent Hamiltonian. However, these approaches treat excited states in a mean field manner and there remain significant questions concerning the role of electron correlations and whether the important energy levels are accurately represented by the mean field theories that are utilized.

The self-consistent DFT approach has proved to be relatively accurate for metallic point contacts and certain molecular junctions with conductance near $G_0 = 2e^2/h$, the quantum of conductance. However, detailed comparison between experiment and self-consistent calculations of conductance through single molecule junctions has generally shown a large discrepancy, up to several orders of magnitude in the nonresonant tunneling regime. Typically, the measured conductance is smaller than the calculated conductance. Unfortunately, these comparisons are complicated by substantial variability in the measured values for the same molecule and significant uncertainty about the atomic scale structure of the junction near the single molecule link. Calculations are typically performed for relatively idealized junction structures and the conductance can be sensitive to the local geometry for widely used thiol linkages.

The impact of uncertainties in the junction structure on the comparison (i.e., of not performing the calculations for the relevant bonding configuration) has recently been clarified following the discovery that amine linked junctions produce single molecule junctions with reproducible conductance measurements, a result that was understood to derive from a selective bonding motif. A study of the impact of amine-gold link structures on junction conductance for benzenediamine gave strong support to the selectivity of the bonding and showed good agreement between theory and experiment for the distribution of conductance. However, the magnitude of the calculated conductance exceeded the measured value by a factor of 7. This suggests that even after the junction structure is reliably accounted for, discrepancies remain and points to the importance of correlation effects beyond the commonly used DFT based self-consistent approach.

These challenges have stimulated theoretical research along a number of lines, including implementing self-interaction corrections in order to obtain improved estimates of energy level alignment, correlated basis function techniques to improve the description of the electronic wave functions, fundamental analyses of the application of...
DFT to electronic transport to go beyond the Landauer approach while remaining within the DFT framework, and, finally, diagrammatic perturbation analyses of beyond-DFT correlation effects.

In this paper, we focus on the last issue, namely, the dynamical consequences of the on-molecule interactions. To discuss the essential physics, we restrict attention to a single resonance coupled to metallic leads and including the local Coulomb interaction, the single-impurity Anderson model. We do not consider many-body effects associated with interactions in the leads or between the molecule and the leads. The present work examines equilibrium properties and conductance in the linear response regime only.

We present a numerically exact quantum Monte Carlo solution to this simple model as a benchmark against which other approximate approaches can be compared. As an example of such a comparison, we analyze the GW approximation for the electron self-energy. The GW approach has been applied in full detail to successfully predict the quasiparticle energies for a wide range of solids, surfaces, molecules, and nanosystems. Motivated by these successes and noting that it is a conserving approximation, several authors have begun to apply the GW approximation to calculate the electronic properties of single molecule conductors. However, it is far from clear under what circumstances the GW approximation will accurately treat the local correlations and the resulting transport phenomena. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the model, Sec. III describes the methods (touching on the issue of the proper definition of the GW approximation for a local orbital), Sec. IV presents results for the level filling, conductance, and spectral function, Sec. V discusses the GW approximation, and Sec. VI is a conclusion. An appendix presents some details of the derivation of the GW equations we use.

II. MODEL

We study the simplest possible model of a molecule junction: a single level which may hold 0, one, or two electrons has an interaction term which controls the energy of the two electron states and is coupled to an electronic continuum which represents the leads and is taken to be noninteracting. This is the Anderson impurity model, represented by the Hamiltonian

\[ H = \sum_{\kappa \sigma} e_{\kappa} c_{\kappa \sigma}^\dagger c_{\kappa \sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} e_d d_{\sigma}^\dagger d_{\sigma} + \sum_{\kappa \sigma} V_{\kappa} (d_{\sigma}^\dagger c_{\kappa \sigma} + d_{\kappa \sigma} c_{\kappa \sigma}^\dagger) + U n_{d\uparrow} n_{d\downarrow}. \]

Here, \( d_{\sigma}^\dagger \) creates an electron of spin \( \sigma \) on the localized level (energy \( e_d \)) and the \( U \) term describes the \( d-d \) interaction. \( c_{\kappa \sigma}^\dagger \) creates an electron of spin \( \sigma \) in the lead state with energy \( e_{\kappa} \). Because we will be concerned only with equilibrium properties, a restriction to a single electronic continuum is possible. In a two-lead situation, one combination of lead states decouples from the problem and the state created by \( c_{\kappa}^\dagger \) really refers to an electron in the appropriate “hybridizing” linear combination. \( V_{\kappa} \) describes the hybridization between the level and the lead.

The crucial quantity that describes the lead electrons is the hybridization function \( \Delta(\varepsilon) = \pi \sum_{\nu} |V_{\nu}|^2 \delta(\varepsilon - e_{\nu}) \). In our work, we assume a semicircular density of states and a \( k \)-independent \( V \):

\[ \Delta(\varepsilon) = V^2 \frac{4t^2 - \varepsilon^2}{2\tau^2}, \quad |\varepsilon| < 2t. \]

We choose parameters so that \( \Delta(\varepsilon=0) \approx t \) but our conclusions do not depend in any important way on this assumption. We shall be interested in correlations of the \( d \) electrons, in particular, the retarded Green function,

\[ G_{\rho\sigma}(\omega) = -i \int_0^\infty dt e^{i(\sigma+\rho)\omega t} \langle [d_{\rho}(t), d_{\sigma}^\dagger(0)] \rangle, \]

from which we obtain the spectral function (index \( d \) is dropped):

\[ A_{\rho}(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} G_{\rho\rho}(\omega). \]

The \( d \) occupancy \( \langle n_d \rangle \) is given by

\[ \langle n_d \rangle = \int d\omega A_d(\omega)f(\omega). \]

Here, the Fermi function \( f(\omega)=1/(\exp(\beta\omega)+1) \) and we have chosen the zero of energy such that the chemical potential \( \mu=0 \). The linear response conductance \( \sigma \) is given by

\[ \sigma = \frac{e^2}{h} \sum_{\sigma} \int d\omega \left[ -\frac{\partial f(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right] \frac{\Delta(\omega)}{2} A_{\sigma\sigma}(\omega). \]

The noninteracting \((U=0)\) model can be solved exactly, we obtain

\[ G(\omega)|_{U=0} = G_0(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - e_d - \Sigma^V(\omega)}, \]

with the lead self-energy

\[ \Sigma^V(\omega) = \sum_{\kappa} \frac{|V_{\kappa}|^2}{\omega - e_{\kappa} + i0^+}. \]

For the semicircular density of states, the lead self-energy has a simple analytical form (although attention must be paid to the branch cut structure). On the real and imaginary frequency axes, we have, respectively,

\[ \Sigma^V(\omega) = -i \Delta(\omega) \Theta(2t - |\omega|) + V^2 \frac{\omega - \text{sgn}(\omega)\Theta(\omega - 2t)\sqrt{\omega^2 - 4t^2}}{2t^2}, \]

\[ \Sigma^V(i\omega_n) = V^2 \frac{i\omega_n - i \text{sgn}(\omega_n)\sqrt{(\omega_n)^2 + 4t^2}}{2t^2}. \]

For \( U \neq 0 \), the model is no longer analytically solvable. The effect of the many-body interaction is expressed mathematically by the self-energy \( \Sigma^V(\omega) \), defined by the relation
Ground state is one of a removal peak at relevant energy range we are considering is well inside the band $2t \gg |\omega|$, we can take $\Delta(\epsilon)=\Delta(=V^2/t$ in our case) and neglect the real part of $\Sigma^r$ so that $\Sigma^r=-i\Delta$. The important parameter is $U/\Delta$. For $U/\Delta \to 0$, the occupancy smoothly with $\epsilon_d$ and the spectral function has a single, approximately Lorentzian peak centered at $\epsilon_d$ with half-width $\Delta$:

$$A_d(\omega) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Delta}{(\omega-\epsilon_d)^2 + \Delta^2}. \quad (12)$$

For $\Delta \to 0 \ (U/\Delta \to \infty)$, we have an isolated ion decoupled from the leads. There are four states: the empty state $|0\rangle$ with energy $E=0$, the fully occupied state $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ with energy $E=2e_d+U$, and a magnetic doublet $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ with energy $E=\epsilon_d$. The $T=0$ spectral function depends on the occupancy. If $\epsilon_d \gg 0$, the ground state is $|0\rangle$ and the spectral function consists of an addition peak at $\omega=\epsilon_d$. If $\epsilon_d < 0$ but $\epsilon_d+U > 0$, the ground state is one of $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ and the spectral function has a removal peak at $\omega=\epsilon_d < 0$ and an addition peak at $\omega=\epsilon_d + U > 0$. Finally, if $\epsilon_d + U < 0$, the ground state is $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and the spectral function has only a removal peak, centered at $\omega=\epsilon_d + U < 0$.

These elementary considerations suggest that (provided the $d$-level occupancy is neither 0 nor 2) there exists a critical $U_c$ at which the single-peaked spectral function characteristic of small $U/\Delta$ changes to the multipeaked form found in the large $U$ approximation. A reasonable estimate for the relevant $U$ scale is provided by the Hartree-Fock (HF) approximation which, for the model used here, yields $U_c/\Delta = \pi$ at occupancy $n=1$. In the Hartree-Fock approximation, the interaction term $U \Psi_1 \Psi_0$ is approximated by $U \langle n|n \rangle + U \langle n \rangle - U \langle n \rangle \langle n \rangle$ implying $\Sigma^U = U \langle n \rangle$, so that

$$G_d(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - (\epsilon_d + U \langle n \rangle) - \Sigma^U(\omega)}. \quad (13)$$

with $\langle n \rangle$ fixed from Eq. (5).

The Hartree-Fock approximation incorrectly predicts that for $U > U_c$, the ground state is spin polarized. Corrections to the Hartree-Fock approximation allow the spin to fluctuate, leading to the Kondo effect. The ground state is nonmagnetic, characterized by a Kondo energy scale given approximately by

$$T_K = 0.2 \sqrt{2 \Delta U \exp[2\pi e_d(\epsilon_d + U)/(2\Delta U)]}. \quad (14)$$

Equation (14) is valid only if $\epsilon_d(\epsilon_d + U) < 0$. Qualitatively, Eq. (14) shows that the Kondo temperature $T_K$ is minimal at the half-filling point $\epsilon_d = -U/2$.

The Kondo ground state is a Fermi liquid, for which the low frequency behavior of the many-body self-energy is

$$\Sigma^U(\omega) = U \langle n \rangle + \Sigma_0 + (1 - Z^{-1}) \omega + \Theta(\omega^2, T^2). \quad (15)$$

Here, the $U \langle n \rangle$ is the Hartree shift in the $d$-level energy and $\Sigma_0$ is any extra chemical potential shift arising from interactions beyond Hartree-Fock. An important consequence of Eq. (15) is that at sufficiently low temperatures,

$$A(\omega=0) = \frac{1}{\pi c^2} \frac{\Delta(\omega=0)}{(\omega^2 + \Delta(\omega=0))^2}, \quad (16)$$

with $c^2 = \epsilon_d + \text{Re} \Sigma^U(\omega=0) + \Sigma^U(\omega=0)$, so that at density $n=1$ ($\epsilon_d=0$) and $A(\omega=0)=1/\pi$, and from Eq. (6), the conductance $G \to 2 e^2/h$.

### III. Methods

In this section, we describe both the GW method and the numerically exact quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) method to which we compare it.

#### A. GW

In the GW approximation, one defines a screened interaction $W$ and approximates the electron self-energy as

$$\Sigma_{\omega}^{U,GW}(i\omega_n) = -T \sum_{iv_{\nu}} G_d(i\omega_n - iv_{\nu}) W_{d}(iv_{\nu}), \quad (17)$$

here written as a function of Matsubara frequency, $T$ stands for temperature in unit of energy. In the extended solid state problem for which the GW approximation was originally introduced, $W$ is taken to be the screened Coulomb interaction in the charge channel. In the impurity model considered here, it is essential to retain the spin channel, which controls the low energy physics. Care must also be taken to respect the Pauli principle. The GW approximation corresponds to a partial resummation of the infinite set of diagrams which define the theory and one must ensure that this partial resummation includes all the diagrams necessary to respect antisymmetry.

We rewrite the Hubbard interaction $U\Psi_1 \Psi_0$ as a $2 \times 2$ matrix in spin space $\hat{V}$ with components

$$V_{\alpha\beta} = U(1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}). \quad (18)$$

An alternative definition $V_{\alpha\beta} = U$ is sometimes used in the literature. The two definitions are compared in the Appendix.

The screened interaction is derived from the irreducible polarizability $P$ through

$$\hat{W} = (\hat{I} - \hat{V}\hat{\Phi})^{-1}\hat{V}. \quad (19)$$

In the GW approximation, no vertex corrections are included, so the polarizability is just the random phase approximation bubble,

$$P_{d}(i\omega_n) = -T \sum_{iv_{\nu}} G_d(i\omega_n - iv_{\nu}) G_d(iv_{\nu}). \quad (20)$$

Explicitly, the screened interaction is then

$$W_{d}(\Omega_n) = \frac{U^2 P_{d}(\Omega_n)}{1 - U^2 P_{d}(\Omega_n) P_{\sigma}(\Omega_n)}. \quad (21)$$

For later use, we note that the quantity $W$ defined in Eq. (19) may be expressed as a correlation function which for a paramagnetic ground state on the imaginary time contour is
\[ W_{\sigma,\tau}(\tau) = \frac{U^2}{4} [\langle T\rho(\tau)\rho(0) \rangle + \langle T\sigma(\tau)\sigma(0) \rangle], \tag{22} \]

with \[ \rho = n_{\uparrow} + n_{\downarrow} - (n_{\uparrow} + n_{\downarrow}) \] and \[ \sigma = n_{\uparrow} - n_{\downarrow}. \] Equation (22) will be used below in our analysis of the differences between the GW approximation and the exact results.

Equations (17), (20), and (21) define a self-consistent set of equations which are solved numerically by iteration. All quantities are calculated on a real frequency grid, with a frequency range of \( \pm 4\tau \) and a frequency spacing as small as \( \tau/10^4 \). Where convergence issues arise (intermediate coupling and the nonmagnetic phase), we use the Pulay mixing.\(^{32,51}\)

### B. Quantum Monte Carlo

A numerically exact solution to the Anderson impurity model may be obtained using quantum Monte Carlo techniques. For most of the results obtained here, we used the Hirsch-Fye method;\(^{52,53}\) for some of the lowest temperature data, we used the recently developed continuous time method.\(^{54,55}\) The QMC calculations were mostly performed on a parallel computer cluster with 20 dual core, 2.2 GHz nodes; a typical point requires about 10 h of computer time per CPU. For Hirsch-Fye, either 256 or 512 time slices were used and the lowest accessible temperature was \( T=0.025 \). Convergence was verified by comparing two different time slices or by comparison to the continuous time method. For the continuous time method, the perturbation orders were typically 20–80, but at the lowest \( T \), orders up to \( \sim 140 \) were needed. We typically use \( 10^4 \) time slices for the lowest accessible temperature \( T=0.006 \).

The central object in the calculation is the imaginary time Green’s function, related to the spectral function via

\[ G(\tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega A(\omega) e^{-\tau \omega} \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta \omega}}. \] \( \tag{23} \)

d-electron density and spin correlation functions were also measured. Inversion of Eq. (23) to obtain \( A(\omega) \) from a computed \( G(\tau) \) is a numerically ill-posed problem. We used the maximum entropy method;\(^{56}\) while this method sometimes produces unphysical feature, no difficulties were encountered in the results described here. Once \( A(\omega) \) is determined, \( \text{Re} \ G(\omega) \) is obtained from the Kramers-Kronig relation and then the self-energy from Eq. (11).

It should be noted that the QMC method is formulated at \( T>0 \). The computational expense increases rapidly as \( T \to 0 \), limiting the temperatures which can be reached.

### IV. RESULTS

#### A. \( d \) occupancy

Figure 1 shows the \( d \) occupancy as a function of \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 \) (the \( U/2 \) shift puts the particle-hole symmetric point at zero). The left panel shows the level occupancy obtained from the HF and GW approximations. The unphysical magnetic solutions occurring at \( U > U_c \) are visible as a difference between \( \langle n_{\uparrow} \rangle \) and \( \langle n_{\downarrow} \rangle \). [The QMC calculations yield \( \langle n_{\uparrow} \rangle \) and \( \langle n_{\downarrow} \rangle \) versus level energy curve, in particular, giving approximately correct widths for the Coulomb blockade plateau. At very weak interaction strength \( (U=1.05) \), all three methods agree in detail. As the interaction is increased, differences appear between the approximate and exact results. The differences are most pronounced near the edges of the Coulomb blockade plateau, in the mixed valence regime where charge fluctuations are significant.]

#### B. Spectral function

The computed spectral function \( A(\omega) \) is shown in Fig. 2. Focus first on the QMC results over the wide frequency range (left panels, solid lines). At \( U=1.05 \approx U_c^{\text{HF}}/2 \), the spectral function is very close to the noninteracting value. Moving to the middle panel, we see that when \( U \) is increased from \( U=2.1 \approx U_c^{\text{HF}} \) to \( U=4.2 \), the Hubbard bands begin to form; however, a central peak remains. At \( T=0 \), the height of the central peak should be \( 1/\pi \Delta \approx 0.5 \). The reduced height \( A(\omega=0)/\Delta \approx 0.4 \) is an effect of the nonzero temperature used in the simulations. For \( U=4.2 \), Eq. (14) implies \( T_c=0.04 \), approximately equal to the studied \( T \). For \( U=8.4 \), the Hubbard band is well formed, and the central peak now clearly interpreted as a “Kondo resonance” remains. It is interesting that traces of the Kondo resonance are visible even though the
temperature $T=0.05$ studied is much greater than the Kondo temperature $T_k=0.004$ estimated from Eq. (14), as previously noted by Meir et al.\textsuperscript{99}

The dotted lines in Fig. 2 show the results of the GW approximation. The left panels show that GW agrees reasonably well with the exact results at $U \leq 2.1 = U_{c}^{\text{HF}}$, but at $U = 4.2 < U_{c}^{\text{GW}}$, the GW does not produce the Hubbard bands and underestimates the height of the central peak. At $U = 8.4 > U_{c}^{\text{GW}}$, the GW approximation by contrast produces the Hubbard bands but misses the central peak. The right column is an expanded view of the central peak. For $U = 1.05 = U_{c}^{\text{HF}}/2$, the two methods agree well with each other, essentially because the interaction corrections are weak. As the correlations are increased, differences appear. We see that even in the $U = U_{c}^{\text{HF}}$ regime where the GW approximation is reasonably accurate, the low frequency line shape is incorrect, with $A_{\omega}^{\text{GW}}$ being too low near $\omega = 0$ and too high in the wings of the central peak. The differences become more severe for higher $U$.

**C. Conductance**

Figure 3 compares the QMC and GW predictions for the linear response conductance at several $U$ values. We see that the GW approximation systematically underestimates the conductance, with noticeable differences from the QMC values even for the smallest $U$ value, $U=2.0 = U_{c}^{\text{HF}}$, where the GW and QMC spectral functions agree reasonably well. We also note that general Fermi-liquid arguments imply that as $T \to 0$, $\sigma = \sigma_{T=0} - T^{2}/\Theta^{2}$, with $\Theta$ a temperature scale of order $T_{k}$.

However, none of the calculations reveal a clear $T^{2}$ behavior except for the QMC calculations at $U = 2.1$; we expect that this is because in all of the other cases, the Kondo temperature is close to or below the temperatures studied.

The three panels of Fig. 4 show the dependence of $\sigma$ on level position $\epsilon_{d}$ at different temperatures. At $T=0$, we expect an approximately Lorentzian resonance line shape, broadened from the noninteracting value by the density-dependent level shift encoded in the real part of the self-energy. As $T$ is increased, the conductance decreases; the decrease from the $T=0$ value is a consequence of many-body scattering. It is expected to be most pronounced at the particle-hole symmetric point $\epsilon_{d}+U/2=0$. This may be seen mathematically from Eq. (14) for the Kondo temperature. In physical terms, the conductance involves valence fluctuation from the state $n=1$ to $n=0$ or $n=2$; at the half-filled point, these states are most widely separated in energy, so the fluctuations are most easily disrupted by temperature.

The top panel shows results for $U=2.1 \approx U_{c}^{\text{HF}}$, along with the $U=0$ curve for comparison. The increased width of the interacting curve relative to the noninteracting one is evident as is the approximately Lorentzian form. The GW and QMC results agree in the wings of the curve but disagree in the small $\epsilon_{d}+U/2$ regime, with the GW approximation overestimating the suppression of conductance by thermal fluctuations.

The middle panel shows results for $U=4.2 \approx 2U_{c}^{\text{HF}}$ at two different temperatures. The QMC curves display the theoretically expected evolution with temperature and level position. In the wings of the line shape (say, for $|\epsilon_{d}+U/2| > 2$), the $n(\epsilon_{d})$ curves are temperature independent (for the temperatures studied) and have an approximately Lorentzian form. In the central region ($|\epsilon_{d}+U/2| < 1.5$), the $n(\epsilon_{d})$ curves shown in Fig. 1 indicate the beginning of a Coulomb blockade plateau and we see, correspondingly, a strongly temperature dependent suppression of the conductance. For these parameters, the Kondo temperature estimated from Eq. (14) is $\approx 0.04$ for...
\( \varepsilon_d + U/2 = 0 \); we see that for our lower temperature \( T = 0.025 = 0.6T_c \), the conductance approaches the noninteracting value, as expected. While the GW approximation shows \( T \) dependence, it is too small for \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 = 0 \) while extending strong \( T \) dependence too far with respect to the level position. The shape of the \( \varepsilon_d \) dependence of the conductance for a given \( T \) is generally wrong through the Coulomb blockade region.

FIG. 5. Real (left column) and imaginary (right column) parts of the real axis self-energy calculated using QMC (solid lines) and GW (dashed lines) at the particle-hole symmetric point \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 = 0 \) for parameters \( V = 2.55, t = 10, \Delta = 0.65, T = 0.05, U = 1.05 \) (top), \( 2.1, 4.2 \) (bottom). The Hartree shift \( U(n) \) is subtracted from \( \text{Re} \Sigma \). Note the different vertical axes on the left and right panels.

Finally, the lowest panel shows results for the strongest coupling, \( U = 8.4 \approx 4U_c^{\text{HF}} \). Reference to Fig. 1 shows that for this interaction strength, the Coulomb blockade plateau is well formed. The theoretically estimated Kondo temperature at \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 = 0 \) is \( \approx 0.004 \), rather lower than the lowest temperature studied; correspondingly, the QMC conductance in the Coulomb blockade regime is small and strongly temperature dependent. In this regime, the GW approximation predicts a magnetic state with a gap at the Fermi energy and no Kondo resonance, so that the conductance at small \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 \) is qualitatively incorrect. The GW approximation produces the correct scale of \( \varepsilon_d + U/2 \) at which conductance is restored (because it produces a Coulomb blockade plateau of the correct width) but gives an incorrect description of the details of the conductance as a function of level position until beyond the edge of the plateau.

D. Self-energy

Figure 5 shows the real frequency behavior of the self-energy. We observe that the low frequency part of \( \text{Re} \Sigma(\omega) \) is linear with a negative slope, which is consistent with Eq. (15) and the statement that \( Z < 1 \). QMC and GW give essentially the same values of \( Z \) for all interaction strengths shown. The weak structure visible for the smallest \( U \) near \( \omega = 0 \) is a numerical artifact of the analytical continuation. At higher frequencies, differences between GW and QMC are evident. In particular, the high frequency tail of the GW curve disagrees with the exact analytical result (see Fig. 7 below). Turning now to the imaginary part of the self-energy, we first note that the low frequency part of \( \text{Im} \Sigma(\omega) \) is approximately quadratic, which is consistent with Eq. (15). Again, the weak structures visible very close to \( \omega = 0 \) are believed to be artifacts of the analytical continuation procedure. The nonzero value at \( \omega = 0 \) is a temperature effect. The QMC \( \text{Im} \Sigma(\omega) \) is highly peaked; however, GW fails to produce these peaks.

V. ANALYSIS OF THE GW APPROXIMATION

In this section, the input to the GW approximation is compared to the QMC results. The results provide an explicit
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properties of molecular conductors for a range of intermediate

is characterized by a three-peak structure with upper and
lower Hubbard bands at $\omega \approx \pm U/2$ and a central “Kondo”
peak which controls the linear response conductance.

Our results are intended as benchmarks against which
other, more approximate but more widely applicable meth-
ods may be compared. We compared our results to those
obtained from the GW approximation, a self-consistent partial
resummation of diagrammatic perturbation theory. The
GW method is attractive because it can be combined with
band theory to yield material-specific results, but its efficacy
at treating strong correlations is unclear. Recent literature has
argued that the GW method provides a reasonable descrip-
tion of the physics of the low $T$ ($T=0$ limit) transport prop-
erties of molecular conductors for a range of intermediate
$U>U_c$.31,32

We showed that for weak to moderate coupling regime
($0 < U < U_c^{HF}$) or for a nearly full or nearly empty $d$ level, the
GW approximation provides a reasonable description. As the
interaction $U$ approaches $U_c^{HF}$, some systematic deviations are
observed in the shape of the spectral function near $\omega
=0$ and the dependence of the conductance on the level po-

tion near $\epsilon_d+U/2=0$. For the intermediate coupling regime
($U_c^{HF} < U < U_c^{GW}$) and the strong coupling regime ($U
> U_c^{GW}$), the GW approximation gives an accurate represen-
tation of the spectrum and the linear response conduc-
tance across the Coulomb blockade plateau. The accuracy is
also limited for the mixed valence regions at the boundaries.

These findings are summarized in Fig. 9, which shows the
regions where GW does and does not work well in the plane
of interaction strength and level position. “Works well” is of
course an imprecise definition; in constructing Fig. 9, we
defined “works well” as “GW conductance within 15% of
QMC conductance at $T=0.1$. “The criterion is temperature
dependent, as can be seen from Fig. 3, and interaction de-
pendent, as can be seen from the slope of the boundary line,
which is less than 1/2. We find that the GW approximation is
reliable when the level is tuned so that the density is far
enough outside the Coulomb blockade region. For $U=4.2$,
the GW approximation becomes reasonable for densities at
the edge of the Coulomb blockade plateau, but for $U=8.4$,

FIG. 8. Comparison of the spectral functions at half-filling
point. $G_{OMC}W_{QMC}$ curve is the analytical continuation result from
$\Sigma = iG_{OMC} W_{QMC}$. Parameters: $T=0.1$, $U=4.2$, $V=2.55$, $t=10$, $\Delta
=0.65$.

FIG. 9. Phase plane of interaction strength $U$ and bare level
energy $\epsilon_d+U/2$ shows regions where GW approximation works
poorly (white, region I) and well (gray, region II). Our criterion for
the latter is $\left|G^{GW}-G^{QMC}\right|/\sigma^{QMC} < 15\%$. Parameters: $T=0.1$, $V
=2.55$, $t=10$, $\Delta=0.65$.

the density must be tuned well away from the plateau before
GW becomes accurate.

Qualitatively, in the parameter regime in which GW pro-
duces a central peak in the spectral function, it does not
produce the Hubbard sidebands, while the Hubbard side-
bands are produced only as a consequence of an unphysical
magnetic ordering instability. Papers in the literature inter-
pret the central peak found in the nonmagnetic GW calcula-
tion as a Kondo resonance. We believe that this interpreta-
tion is not correct. It is interesting to note, however, that some
aspects of the many-body physics (for example, the low fre-
quency “mass renormalization” $\partial \delta / \partial \omega$ or the spin correla-
tion function) are correctly given by GW. This has been seen
for the self-consistent second order self-energy as well.57

The self-consistent GW approximation has the virtue of
being a conserving approximation.31,42 In physical systems
where the local molecular levels remain nearly filled or
nearly empty or where the hybridization is large, our results
show that the GW approximation will be reasonably ac-
curate. This suggests that an approach based on the GW ap-
proximation may be very useful for molecular conductors in
the nonresonant tunneling regime where large discrepancies
exist between theory and experiment. However, when the
local Coulomb interactions on the molecule are strong, the
GW approximation does not accurately represent the impact
of local spin and charge fluctuations. Neither the spectral
distribution nor the linear response conductance is given
properly. Application of the GW approximation to nanoscale
junctions in the Kondo regime is not well justified. The
analysis of the screened Coulomb interaction $W$ and the eval-
uation of the GW approximation for the self-energy op-
erator with the exact (QMC) $G$ and $W$ showed that vertex
corrections are quite significant in these cases. Unfortunately,
while there are systematic guidelines for including vertex
corrections properly so as to maintain a conserving approxi-
mation, the resulting theory is substantially more complex.60

Our conclusions are based on linear response. Other sit-
uations, in particular, the out-of-equilibrium Coulomb block-
ade regime, remain to be studied.
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This appendix discusses technical details of the GW calculations. The local interaction depends on electron spin. One may consider two forms:

\[ V_{ab} = U, \quad \text{“spin independent,”} \]  
\[ V_{ab} = U(1 - \delta_{ab}), \quad \text{“spin dependent.”} \]  

We now show that the asymptotic high frequency behavior of the GW self-energy implies that the spin-dependent interaction, Eq. (A2), is more appropriate than the spin-independent interaction, Eq. (A1).

It is convenient to separate out the Hartree and Fock terms, writing \( \Sigma = \Sigma_{HF} + \Sigma^{GW} \). For the spin-independent interaction, the Hartree term for spin \( \sigma \) is \( U(n_{\uparrow} + n_{\downarrow}) \), while the Fock term is \(-U\langle n_{\sigma}\rangle\); for the spin-dependent interaction, the Fock term vanishes and the Hartree term is \( U\langle n_{\sigma}\rangle \). In either case, we have

\[ \Sigma^{GW}_{\sigma}(\omega \to \infty) = -\frac{1}{\pi\omega} \int_{0}^{\infty} d\epsilon \text{ Im } W_{\sigma}(\epsilon) = -\frac{\text{Im } W_{\sigma}^{TO}(t=0)}{\omega}, \]  

where TO stands for time ordered. In the exact perturbation theory analysis, the screened interaction \( W \) is related to the spin-spin correlation function through the polarizability \( \Pi \).

\[ \hat{\Pi}^{TO}(t) = \hat{V}\hat{\delta}(t) + \hat{V}\hat{\Pi}^{TO}(0)\hat{V}, \]  

where

\[ \Pi^{TO}_{\sigma\sigma'}(t) = -i\langle \{ n_{\sigma}(t) - \langle n_{\sigma}\rangle \} [n_{\sigma'}(0) - \langle n_{\sigma'}(0)\rangle] \rangle. \]  

In the spin-dependent case, the \((1-\delta_{ab})\) term in the interaction implies that \( W_{\sigma\sigma'} \) involves only the correlator for the opposite spin, so one finds the following asymptotic behavior:

\[ \Sigma^{GW}_{\sigma}(\omega \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow \frac{U^2}{\omega} \left( \langle n_{\sigma}^2 \rangle - \langle n_{\sigma} \rangle^2 \right). \]

On the other hand, for the spin-independent interaction, all spin indices are involved and one obtains

\[ \Sigma^{GW}_{\sigma}(\omega \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow \frac{U^2}{\omega} \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \left( \langle n_{\sigma} n_{\sigma'} \rangle - \langle n_{\sigma} \rangle \langle n_{\sigma'} \rangle \right). \]

Thus, we see that the spin-dependent interaction reproduces approximately the analytically known asymptotic behavior of the self-energy \( \Sigma^{GW}_{\sigma}(i\omega_n) = \frac{U^2}{\omega} \langle n_{\sigma}^2(1-\langle n_{\sigma}\rangle) \rangle \), whereas the spin-independent interaction does not. The asymptotic behavior is only approximately reproduced because GW cannot account correctly for \( \langle n_{\sigma}^2 \rangle \). We show in the main text that using the exact \( W \) yields the correct asymptotic behavior of \( \Sigma \) but still does not produce an accurate approximation at general \( \omega \). The spin-independent case provides a much worse approximation which would be wrong even if the exact correlation functions were used. This is an indication that the spin-dependent two-particle interaction is to be preferred over the spin-independent one in the context of the GW approximation applied to the Anderson model.

Figure 10 shows a comparison of spin-dependent and spin-independent GW at zero temperature. Comparison to the lowest temperature QMC result shows that the line shape calculated from the spin-dependent GW approximation is closer to the QMC line shape than the result of the spin-independent calculation. This is because the spin-dependent approach is free of self-interaction effects and it accounts for some of spin-spin quantum fluctuations, whereas the spin-independent approach accounts only for density-density quantum fluctuations.
