Manifestation of bound states and coupling to leads in coherent transmission through multiterminal molecular conductors
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We examine analytically a rarely if ever addressed issue: the effects of scattering at the conductor-lead interfaces on the transmittivity of $\mathcal{N}$-terminal molecular conductors. The feeding leads are not one-dimensional and the strength of wire-lead coupling is allowed to be arbitrary. The conductor imbedded into a circuit is supposed to be a Y junction of three identical molecular wires or of two identical wires and one different wire. The wire connector is a C-H group and wires are conjugated and/or saturated oligo(hydro)carbons. The spectrum of branched oligo(hydro)carbons is rationalized in terms of extended and bound states. The junctions, where identical wires are equally coupled to the respective leads (all-symmetric junctions), are compared with hybrid junctions, where nonequivalence of terminal-to-terminal transmission appears due to either not identical wires or not equal coupling, or both. These model systems reveal incredible potentials of branched oligo(hydro)carbons for engineering a variety of molecular electronic devices. In addition, the role of wire connectors, atomic and molecular, is briefly discussed. Some of the obtained results are valid for $\mathcal{N}$-terminal starlike junctions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Miniaturization has become a crucial challenge to be met for further downscaling of electronic devices and circuits.¹⁻³ This drives a considerable effort aiming to use molecules as active elements of electronic devices, transistors in particular. Many experimental as well as theoretical studies are focused on various realizations of field-effect transistors,⁴⁻⁶ where the role of one of the transistor terminals is played by a gate electrode. The charge carriers in such devices move from the source to drain electrodes, whereas the gate is closed for the charge transport. In other words, one deals with the two-terminal electron transport. On the other hand, any device inside a molecular-size circuit is a multiterminal, at least a three-terminal, system, where the charge-carrier motion from any in-terminal to any out-terminal occurs coherently. There are not many calculations referring to this kind of devices. Most of them have been based on the Green’s-function formalism.¹⁰⁻¹²

In a series of articles,¹³⁻¹⁵ three- and four-terminal models of logic gates, described by either the tight-binding (TB) or extended Hückel Hamiltonian, have been discussed by using the scattering matrix method. The approximate approaches to the problem have also been developed on the basis of model Hamiltonians¹⁶ and the density-functional theory (DFT) methods as well.¹⁷,¹⁸

As shown recently,¹⁹,²⁰ the starlike junctions of molecular wires exhibit $I$-$V$ characteristics which contrast those that are known for the same arrangement of conventional resistors. If, for example, the junction is comprised of $\mathcal{N}$ identical molecular wires, as illustrated in Fig. 1, where $\mathcal{N} = 3$, and these wires are equally coupled to the feeding leads, the branched current is proportional to $\mathcal{N}^{-2}$. For this law to be valid, all electron pathways inside the junction must be equivalent.

However, Y junctions of not identical wires are of special interest. The wires can be coupled to the respective leads equally or not equally. An analogy with T-shaped and cross-shaped two-dimensional (2D) nanostructures, which are examples of 2D wire junctions, also deserves attention. In particular, the electronic spectrum of such junctions contains bound states that give rise to the transmission resonances at the classically forbidden energies. To our knowledge, the physics of bound states in molecular multiterminal devices has not been addressed yet. These are topics for examination in the present report.

II. FORMAL FRAMEWORK

To study molecular wire junctions exemplified in Fig. 1, we have used the standard formula relating the terminal-to-terminal, energy dependent transmission probabilities $T_{j,j'}$, $j,j' = 1,2,\ldots,\mathcal{N}$, to the respective matrix elements of the system Green’s function $G_{j,j'}^{(1)}$.²¹

$$T_{j,j'} = 4\operatorname{Im}A_{j}A_{j'}G_{j,j'}^{(1)}.$$

In this equation, $A_{j'}(E) = V_{j,j'}^{\text{lead}_{j'}}G_{j,j'}^{\text{lead}_{j'}}(E)$ with $G_{j,j'}^{\text{lead}_{j'}}$ denoting the $(1,1)$ matrix element of the $j$-lead Green’s function. $A_{j}$ has the same meaning as the self-energy in the Fisher-Lee-Datta trace formula. This correspondence does not hold, however, in general.¹⁹,²⁰,²²

As known, Eq. (1) has been derived for noninteracting electrons. The effects of electron-electron correlation can essentially modify the transmission of charge carriers and hence the electric performance prescribed by this equation.²³ The development of one-particle theory presented in this study should therefore be considered as a necessary zero approximation that forms the basis for further elaboration.

Usually, Eq. (1) is a starting point to proceed with numerical calculations. But for the given class of molecular devices (which covers the models discussed in Refs. ¹⁰⁻¹⁵ as particular cases), matrix $[G_{j,j'}^{(1)}]$ can be expressed in terms of column vector $[G_{M,j}^{(1)}]$ = $(G_{M,j}^{M} G_{M,j+1}^{M} G_{M,j+2}^{M} G_{M,j}^{N} G_{M,j}^{N})^T$ whose components are determined by the matrix elements of the Green’s function of the isolated junction $\mathcal{M}$. This vector
is subject to matrix equation\textsuperscript{19,20}
\begin{equation}
L(j \neq j')[G_{j,j'}] = [G_{j',j}]^M,
\end{equation}
with
\begin{equation}
L_{j,j'}(j) = (1 - A_j G_{j,j}) \delta_{j,j'} - A_j A_{j'} G_{j,j'} G_{j',j}.
\end{equation}
We shall pay most of our attention to Y junctions, \( N = 3 \), in which case combining Eqs. (1) and (2) yields\textsuperscript{20}
\begin{align}
T_{2,1} &= \frac{4i M_1 M_2 [G_{1,2}^M L_{3,3}^2(1) - G_{1,3}^M L_{2,3}^2(1)]^2}{[L_{3,3}^2(1) - L_{3,3}(1) L_{3,3}(2)]^2} , \\
T_{3,1} &= \frac{4i M_1 M_3 [G_{1,2}^M L_{3,2}^2(1) - G_{1,3}^M L_{3,3}^2(1)]^2}{[L_{3,3}^2(1) - L_{3,3}(1) L_{3,3}(2)]^2} , \\
T_{3,2} &= \frac{4i M_2 M_3 [G_{2,1}^M L_{3,2}^2(2) - G_{1,3}^M L_{3,3}^2(2)]^2}{[L_{1,2}^2(1) L_{3,3}^2(2) - L_{1,2}(1) L_{3,3}(2)]^2} .
\end{align}

Notice that these expressions can be used for any molecular conductor connected to three semi-infinite leads which can be identical or not and may have an arbitrary electronic structure and arbitrary dimensionality. In this sense, the above expressions are more general than any tight-binding transmission formula for three-terminal molecular devices investigated thus far.

Furthermore, provided matrix \([G_{j,j'}]^M\) is known, the utilization of Eq. (4) substantially facilitates calculations of transmission probabilities \( T_{j,j'} \). For instance, the inversion of high-order matrices, which one faces when using the S-matrix description of three-terminal logic gates,\textsuperscript{13-15} can be replaced by Eq. (4), where all entries are known. More importantly, for many actual molecular junctions, the analysis of Eq. (4) can be performed analytically.

III. EXTENDED AND BOUNDED STATES

It is instructive to have a look at the junction electronic structure as it comes out from one-particle Green’s function \( G^M \). Consider a junction of chainlike wires which are connected with each other via a C-H group (hopping integral \( V_c^{(j)} \); see Fig. 1). The end atom of each wire, denoted as \( N_j \), is coupled with the \( j \) lead by hopping integral \( V_j \). The matrix elements \( G_{j',j}^M \), which enter Eq. (2), refer to different junction sites \( N_j \) and \( N_{j'} \). They can be expressed in terms of wire Green’s function\textsuperscript{19}
\begin{equation}
G_{N_i, N_j}^M = \delta_{N_i, N_j} G_{N_i, N_j}^{(j)} + \frac{V_c^{(j)} G_{N_i, N_j}^{(j)} V_c^{(j)} G_{N_i, N_j}^{(j)}}{D_{N_i, N_j}},
\end{equation}
where
\begin{equation}
D_{N_i, N_j} = E - \sum_{j=1}^{N} |V_c^{(j)}|^2 G_{N_i, N_j}^{(j)} .
\end{equation}

As seen, \( G^M \) may have two kinds of poles. One set of poles corresponds to zeros of determinants \( D_{N_i, N_j} \) which stand for the \( j \) set of isolated \( N_j \)-long wires; another one corresponds to zeros of \( D_{N_i, N_j} \).

With the reference to Fig. 1 which represents parameters of the respective tight-binding Hamiltonians, let us first discuss starlike junctions composed of either \( N \)-long \( (N_j = N) \) equal-bond, tight-binding chains, \( D_{N_i, N} \Rightarrow t D_{N}, D_{N_i, N_j} \Rightarrow t D_{N}, \)
\begin{equation}
E = -2t \cos k, \quad D_{N}(k) = \sin(N + 1)k ,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
t G_{N,N}^{TB}(E) = -\frac{\sin(Nk)}{D_{N}(k)} , \quad t G_{N,N}^{TB}(E) = -\frac{\sin k}{D_{N}(k)} ,
\end{equation}

or \((N = 2N_d)\)-long, tight-binding chains with alternating bonds [polyene (PE) oligomers], \( D_{N_i, N_{j'}} \Rightarrow t D_{N_d}, D_{N_i, N_j} \Rightarrow t D_{N_d}, \)
\begin{align}
E^2 &= 2t^2 (\cos(2\eta) + \cos \xi) , \\
D_{N_d}(\xi) &= e^{-2t} \sin(N_d\xi) + \sin[(N_d + 1)\xi],
\end{align}
\begin{align}
t^2 G_{N_d, N_d}^{PE}(E) &= E \sin(N_d\xi) , \quad t G_{N_d, N_d}^{PE}(E) = -e^t \sin \xi , \\
D_{N_d, N_d}(\xi) &= E t^{-1} [1 - N \sin(N_d\xi) D_{N_d}^{(j)}(\xi)] ,
\end{align}
where \( N_d \) is the number of double bonds. This choice covers the wires with a metallic (gapless) spectrum, Eq. (7), and a semiconductor two-band spectrum with a gap \( E_g = 4t \sin \eta \) between the valence and conduction bands, Eq. (8). The derivation of these equations can be found in Ref. 22.

The analysis of the junction spectrum shows that a part of it repeats the spectrum of the respective isolated wire. These are given by poles of \( G^{TB}(E) \): \( E = -2t \cos[\pi v/(N + 1)], \quad v = 1, 2, \ldots, N \), or by poles of \( G^{PE}(E) \): \( E = \mp t \sqrt{2(\cos(2\eta) + \cos \xi)}, \quad v = 1, 2, \ldots, N_d \). The rest of the level energies, denoted henceforth as \( E_\mu \), must satisfy equation \( D_{N,N_j} = 0 \) or \( D_{N_i, N_j} = 0 \).

Specifically, the spectrum of junctions built up of \((N-N)\) TB chains and \( n \) PE chains is determined by the transcendent equation
\begin{equation}
f_{N,N_d}(E) = F_{N}(E),
\end{equation}
where (for \( V_c^{(j)} = t \))
\begin{equation}
f_{N,N_d}(E) \equiv E/t + (N - n) \sin(Nk) \sin((N + 1)k) .
\end{equation}
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and where we have used explicit expressions Eqs. (7) and (8) for \(D_N(k)\) and \(D_{N_0}(\xi)\). In Fig. 2, graphic solutions to Eq. (9) \(E = E_n\) are marked by triangles.

For the star junctions of identical TB (PE) chains, the energies of \(\mu\) levels are determined by solutions to equation \(f_{3,0}(E) = E_n\) which describes Y junctions with three TB chains (\(n = 0\)), two TB chains and one PE chain (\(n = 1\), one TB chain and two PE chains (\(n = 2\)), and three PE chains (\(n = 3\)). Functions \(f_{3,0}(E)\) and \(f_{3,2,3}(E)\), which are calculated for \(\eta = 0.133\), \(V_0^{(j)} = 1\), are represented by solid and dashed lines, respectively. The level closest to zero-energy is always present in the spectrum of semiconducting-wire junctions. For both types of all-symmetric junctions, composed of either metallic or semiconducting wires, the energy of bound states \(E_b^\pm\) is practically \(N\) independent, if \(N \geq 10\):

\[
E_b^\pm = \pm t \begin{cases} 
2 \cosh \delta_0, & \delta_0 = 0.5 \ln(N - 1), \\
\sqrt{2(2\nu + \cosh \delta_0)}, & \delta_0 = \ln(N - e^{-2\nu}). 
\end{cases}
\]

Now, let us turn our attention to hybrid Y junctions composed of metallic and semiconducting wires. This case is represented in Fig. 2 by the central and right columns. The upper central panel illustrates the spectra of the Y junction, where two wires have a metal-like spectrum and one has a semiconductor-like spectrum. In the lower central panel, the proportion between the different wires is reversed. We see the number of solutions to Eq. (9) (triangles) increases from \(N + 1 = 7\) for all-symmetric junctions to \(2N + 1 = 13\) for hybrid junctions, whereas the energies of \(N\) \(\nu\) levels are determined by solutions to either \(D_N(k) = 0\) (panels in the upper row) or \(D_{N_0}(\xi) = 0\) (lower row). Thus in the hybrid junctions, the spectrum degeneracy is completely removed. However, the energies of \(\mu\) and \(\nu\) levels are so close that the number of resonances in the transmission spectra, Fig. 3, looks like it is the same for all-symmetric and hybrid junctions.

In hybrid junctions with two semiconducting wires and one metallic wire, there can be more than one in-gap state
with energies \(|E_j| < 2r \sinh \eta\). It is clear that these states can no longer be regarded as bound states because all energies \(|E| < 2r \cosh \eta\) are allowed. The number of in-gap states increases with the increase of \(N\). To illustrate this point, panels on the right in Fig. 2 represent hybrid junctions with longer TB chains. Four in-gap states are seen instead of only one which is observed in the spectrum of all-symmetric junctions.

One can expect that distinctions between the energy spectra of all-symmetric and hybrid junctions are manifested in the transmission spectra which are to be discussed next.

IV. THROUGH JUNCTION TRANSMISSION

When electron-phonon and electron-electron interactions play a minor role, electrons traveling through a junction of molecular wires can be scattered only at the structure imperfections. For systems in focus, these are the wire-connector and wire-lead interfaces. The resulting effect of the wire-lead coupling on the through junction transmission depends on the connector structure and on how it is connected with the wires. The reverse is also true: the effects on transmission produced by the connector manifest themselves distinctively for equal or not equal wire-lead couplings at different terminals.

\[
T(N, 0) = \frac{4\alpha \alpha_N \sin^4 k}{\left| [D_N(k) - i\alpha_N D_{N-1}(k)][\Pi_{N, N'}(k) - i\alpha \Pi_{N-1, N'}(k)] - i\alpha - \alpha_N \right| \sin^2 k },
\]

\[
T(N', N) = \frac{4\alpha \alpha_N \sin^4 k}{\left| [iD_N(\xi) + i\alpha \alpha_N^2 \sin(N_\xi)] [\Pi_{N, N'}(\xi) + i\alpha E^{-1} \alpha \eta \Pi_{N-1, N'}(\xi) + \Pi_{N, N'}(\xi)] - i\alpha \alpha_N \sin^2 \xi \right|^2}. \tag{13}
\]

where \(\Pi_{N, N'} \equiv D_{N, N'}(k)D_N(k)\), \(\Pi_{N, N'} \equiv D_N(\xi)D_{N'}(\xi)\). Note that the pair of equations above represents the particular cases of the transmission probability expressed in terms of two matrix elements \(G^j_{N, N'} \equiv G^j_{N, N'}, G^j_{N, N'} \equiv G^j_{N, N'}\). For \(\alpha_N = \alpha\), the corresponding expression, where the wire electronic structure can be arbitrary, has been derived in Ref. 20.

It has been proven that if \(A_j = A\) the maximum transmission through \(N\)-terminal, all-symmetric junctions equals \(4/\pi N^2\). This result is valid for any junction with transmitting ability at the given energy limited by a single current-carrying state. In particular, these are junctions composed of identical saturated or conjugated oligo(hydro)carbons, oligomers of poly(paraphenylene), etc., where either \(\sigma\) - or \(\pi\)-electron transmission dominates. It is seen in Fig. 3 that max\((T_{12}(3, 1)) = 4/9\) with a sufficient accuracy, but the maximal value of \(T_{12}(3, 1)\) is more than two times larger, showing that the latter quantity is close to unity. In other words, in the vicinity of the resonant structure this three-terminal junction provides nearly a one-way traffic for charge carriers.

In the limit of weak junction-lead coupling \(\alpha \ll 1\), the spectra exhibit a sharp resonant structure. Probably, it is somewhat counterintuitive that the resonant structure of the junction transmission spectrum is smoothed out at \(\alpha \sim 1\) but not by a strong coupling \(\alpha \gg 1\). Since the largest integral transmission is attained for \(\alpha \approx 1\), such coupling can be regarded as an optimal contact with the outer electrodes.

The role of wire-lead coupling in junctions with a single-atom connector will be discussed first. Then, a look will be taken at the molecular connectors which already have received some attention in literature but not in the present context.

A. Equal and different wire-lead couplings

In the wide band limit (WBL) that has been often used within the framework of the Landauer approach (see, e.g., Ref. 25 and references therein), the coupling functions are approximated by constants \(A_j = -i\alpha_0\). Figure 3 represents the transmission spectra of the hybrid junctions which are calculated in the WBL approximation. The energy dependence of \(T_{12}(3, n) = T_{23}(3, n)\) is shown by dashed lines, and transmission probability \(T_{12}(3, n)\) is represented by dotted-dashed lines; \(n = 1, 2, 3\). Three different values of \(\alpha_j = \alpha = 0.2, 1\), and 5 have been used in calculations. For reference, the transmission spectra \(T_{j'j}(3, 0) \equiv T(N = 3, 0)\), \(T_{j'j}(3, 3) \equiv T(N = 3, 3)\) obtained for the same values of \(\alpha\) are depicted in Fig. 3 by solid lines.

Analytical forms of \(T(N, 0)\) and \(T(N', N)\) with one coupling constant \(\alpha\) distinct from all others read

\[
T(N, 0) = \frac{4\alpha \alpha_N \sin^4 k}{\left| [D_N(k) - i\alpha_N D_{N-1}(k)][\Pi_{N, N'}(k) - i\alpha \Pi_{N-1, N'}(k)] - i\alpha - \alpha_N \right| \sin^2 k },
\]

\[
T(N', N) = \frac{4\alpha \alpha_N \sin^4 k}{\left| [iD_N(\xi) + i\alpha \alpha_N^2 \sin(N_\xi)] [\Pi_{N, N'}(\xi) + i\alpha E^{-1} \alpha \eta \Pi_{N-1, N'}(\xi) + \Pi_{N, N'}(\xi)] - i\alpha \alpha_N \sin^2 \xi \right|^2 \tag{13}
\]

The similarity of transmission spectra obtained for the weak and strong coupling of all-symmetric metallic junctions is worth paying attention to. In the WBL approximation, it can rigorously be proved that the central part of the spectrum is not changed if \(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha^{-1}\). In addition, under these restrictions,

\[
T(N, 0) = \frac{4}{N^2} T(2, 0). \tag{14}
\]

It should be stressed that this simple relation is valid only for star junctions of TB wires.

In the above discussion, the junction-lead coupling was supposed to be equal at all terminals. The effect of coupling asymmetry is illustrated in Fig. 4, where the first two panels in the upper row show the transmission spectra \(T_{12}(3, n)\), \(T_{23}(3, n)\), \(n = 1, 2\), for identical coupling \(\alpha_j = 0.2\). Their counterparts in the lower row represent asymmetric coupling \(\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 5\), \(\alpha_3 = 0.2\). As seen, in the vicinity of Fermi energy, \(E_F\), the coupling asymmetry results in an appreciable increase of \(T_{12}(3, 1)\) and decrease of \(T_{13}(3, 1)\). The associated changes in I-V characteristics can be really impressive. For instance, at a fixed terminal voltage \(U_3 = 0\), current \(I_2(0 \leq U_1 \leq U_2)\), calculated according to Büttiker’s formula,

\[
I_2 = \frac{2e}{h} \sum_{j' = 1}^3 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} T_{j'j}(E) [f_3(E) - f_j(E)] dE, \tag{15}
\]
calculations show branched oligo(hydro)carbons as essential that exemplified in Fig. 3 except that in upper panels \( \alpha_j = 0.2 \) and in lower panels \( \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 5, \alpha_3 = 0.2 \). The same line styles are used for \( T_{15}(3,n) \) and \( T_{12}(3,n) \). Right column: Current-voltage characteristics \( I_s(0 \leq U_1 \leq U_2) \), calculated for \( n = 1, U_3 = 0, U_2 = 0.38 \text{ V} \) (shorter curves) and 0.75 V (longer curves).

\[ f_j = [1 + \exp\left(\frac{E-E_j}{kT}\right)]^{-126} \]

exhibits a five-times variation for equal couplings, and more than 30-60 times variation for unequal couplings, if the terminal voltage \( U_2 \) is fixed at \( \approx 0.7 \) and 0.4 V, respectively (right column in Fig. 4). Calculated for zero and room temperatures, these \( I-V \) curves are practically indistinguishable.

By varying the wire length, \( I-V \) characteristics of \( Y \) junctions can be obtained in any subvalence range. The replacement of the carbon-atom connector by nitrogen or another heteroatom changes the transmission spectrum (and hence \( I-V \) curves) quite radically. Also, changing the value of reference voltage \( U_2 \) and the terminal of its application results in a variety of different \( I-V \) curves. Since the DFT calculations show branched oligo(hydro)carbons as essentially plane molecules (see Fig. 1) they can be physisorbed on a substrate to be contacted electrically. Taken together these properties of branched oligo(hydro)carbons make them very attractive for a diversity of well-predictable device applications.

**B. Effect of connector**

Equations (1)–(4) relate through junction transmission probabilities to the Green’s function that describes the molecular complex composed of a molecule plus wires attached to it. Following this design, \( G^M \) can be defragmented into the wire and connector Green’s functions, \( G^0 \) and \( G^\infty \), by using the Dyson equation

\[ G^M_{m,m'} = G^0_{m,m'} + \sum_{m,m''} G^0_{m,m''} V_{m'',m'} G^M_{m'',m'}, \]  

where \( V \) is the connector-wire interaction matrix. The solution gives an expression of \( G^M_{m,m'} \) for needed atomic coordinates \( n_j \) and \( n_{j'} \), as a functional of related matrix elements \( G^0_{m,m''} \), \( G^\infty_{p_j,p_{j'}} \), and \( V_{m,m'} \).

For the symmetric and hybrid \( Y \) junctions similar to that exemplified in Fig. 5, the system of equations to solve reads

\[ G^M_{11,m} = G^0_{11,m} + G^0_{11,1} \left( tG^M_{11,m} + \beta G^M_{12,m} \right), \]
\[ G^M_{12,m} = G^0_{12,m} + G^0_{11,1} \left( tG^M_{12,m} + \beta G^M_{11,m} \right), \]
\[ G^M_{13,m} = G^0_{13,m} - tG^0_{11,1} G^M_{11,m} + G^M_{12,m}, \]

where \( G^0_{11,1} \) denotes the wire Green’s-function matrix element which refers to the \( i \) wire first site and which, at the same time, is the \( i \) th site of the molecular connectors in Figs. 5(b) and 5(c). The meaning of coordinate indices is easily understood by considering the forthcoming examples. In these examples, we shall concentrate exclusively on the explicit analytical results. These can be obtained for one-dimensional (1D) leads only.

**1. Heteroatom connector**

As known, finding the solution to the Lippman-Schwinger equation often suggests a useful alternative to the scheme of calculations enclosed in Eqs. (1)–(4). For a single-atom scatterer characterized by the site energy \( \varepsilon \) and resonant interaction \( V_j \) with the nearest atom of \( j \) wire \( 1_j \), the general expression for the wire \( j \) to wire \( j' \) transmission probability can be obtained straightforwardly. It reads

\[ T^\infty_{jj'} = \frac{\psi_j^2(\varepsilon)V^2_j \left| G_1(k_j)G_{1j}(k_j) \right| F(k_j,k_{j'})}{|E - \varepsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} V^2_j G^0_{1j}(k_j)G^0_{j'}(k_{j'})|}, \]

where \( E = E(k_j) \) is the dispersion relation for the \( j \) wire, \( G_1(k_j) \) stands for the prefactor in \( G^{(j)}_{11,1} = G_1(k_j)e^{\imath k_{j}}, \)

\[ F(k_j,k_{j'}) = \frac{\left| \psi_1^j(k_j)\psi_-^j(k_{j'}) \right|}{\left| \psi_1^\infty(k_j)\psi_-^\infty(k_{j'}) \right|}, \]

where \( \psi_n^0(k_j) = \psi_1^\infty(k_j)e^{-\imath k_{j}n} \) — complex conjugate describes the superposition of incident and reflected waves in the semi-infinite 1D wire \( M^{(j)} \), with identical monomers \( M^{(j)} = M^{(j)}, n = 1, 2, \ldots \), and \( \psi_n^\infty(k_j) = \psi_1^\infty(k_j)e^{\imath k_{j}n} \) is an electron wave propagating over equivalent \( 1_j \) sites in the infinite 1D wire \( \ldots M^{(j)} \), \( \ldots \). To emphasize the academic character of this and similar models of multiterminal transmission the respective transmission probabilities are marked by label \( \infty \).

An interesting particular case of a nonsymmetrical \( Y \) junction was discussed by Ami and Joachim. Using the TB wire model defined in Eq. (7), they noticed that if \( \varepsilon = 0 \), \( V_{j=1,2} = t/\sqrt{2} \), and \( V_{j=3} = t \), the transmission \( 3 \rightarrow 1 = 3 \rightarrow 2 \) occurs without backscattering, that is, \( T^\infty_{13} = T^\infty_{23} = 0.5 \).

For junctions with arbitrary numbers \( N - n \) and \( n \) referring to TB and PE wires, which are equally coupled with the
connector, the dependence of transmission coefficients on energy can be represented in an explicit form:

\[ T_{ij}^\infty(N,n) = \frac{4V_e^4}{|t(E - \varepsilon) + (N - n)V_e^2E\,e^{i\theta} - ntV_e^2(1 + e^{2\varepsilon}e^{i\theta})|^2} \]

\[ \times \begin{cases} E^2 \sin^2 k, & n = 0 \text{ (TB $\to$ TB)} \\ t^2 e^{2\varepsilon} \sin^2 \xi, & n = 3 \text{ (PE $\to$ PE)} \\ t^2 e^{2\varepsilon} \sin \xi \sin k, & n = 1,2 \text{ (TB $\leftrightarrow$ PE).} \end{cases} \] (20)

It is fundamentally important that Eq. (20) takes into account an unavoidable mismatch between site energies and hopping integrals in different wires. The mismatch mentioned enters the transmission probability via dispersion relations \( E = \varepsilon_{\text{TB}} - 2t \cos k \) and \( (E - \varepsilon_{\text{PE}})^2 = 2t^2(\cosh 2\varepsilon + \cos \xi) \). In Fig. 6, these parameters are set to be equal, which is not realistic. It is easy to foresee the main qualitative changes in the presented transmission spectra, which correspond to nonzero values of \( \beta - t \) and/or \( \varepsilon_{\text{PE}} = \varepsilon_{\text{TB}} \). However, the instructive quantitative estimates require reliable values of these parameters. This is a disputable subject, far beyond the scope of this work.

The effect of mismatch between the site energies of the connector and wires is also included explicitly into Eq. (20). For the star junction shown in Fig. 5(a), the transmission probability \( T^\infty(N,0) \equiv T^\infty(N,0) \) is equal to

\[ T^\infty(N,0) = \frac{V_e^4(4 - E^2/t^2)}{t^2(E - \varepsilon)^2 - N^2V_e^2(E - \varepsilon) + (N^2V_e^2)^2}, \] (21)

or, in the particular case \( \varepsilon = 0 \),

\[ T^\infty(N,0)|_{\varepsilon = 0} = \frac{4}{N^2} \frac{1 - E^2/(4t^2)}{1 - E^2/(4t^2)} \] (22)

An equivalent formula for the reflection coefficient in the Y junction, \( R^\infty(3,0) = 1 - 2T^\infty(3,0) \), was obtained in Ref. 13.

It immediately follows from Eq. (21) that any nonzero \( \varepsilon \) shifts the energy of the transmission maximum from \( E_{\text{max}} = 0 \) to

\[ E_{\text{max}} = \frac{2t\varepsilon}{2t^2 - N^2V_e^2}. \] (23)

Also, it is obvious that if \( \varepsilon = 0 \) and \( V_e^2 = 2t^2/N \) the transmission is maximal for all energies, \( T^\infty(N,0)(E)|_{\varepsilon = 0} = 4/N^2 \).

The authors of the above-quoted paper have come to the same conclusion. However, they stated it without the proof of its validity for an arbitrary number of wires.

Figure 6 visualizes the dependence of transmission on the ratio \( V_e^2/t^2 \) (an analog of coupling parameter \( \alpha \)) as well as the difference between all-symmetric and hybrid junctions of the type in Fig. 5(a). As long as the perturbation parameters remain small, \( \varepsilon, V_e^2/t^2 < 1 \) (in practice \( < 0.2 \)), the transmission spectra for these junctions undergo no qualitative changes.

Specifying the latter statement for the junctions of TB wires, the transmission spectrum does have a maximum \( T^\infty(N,0) = 4/N^2 \), if the junction parameters satisfy the following conditions:

\[ \frac{V_e^2}{t^2} < 2 - \frac{|\varepsilon|}{N}, \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{V_e^2}{t^2} < \frac{2}{N^2}, \]

or

\[ \frac{V_e^2}{t^2} > 2 + \frac{|\varepsilon|}{N}, \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{V_e^2}{t^2} > \frac{2}{N}. \]

Otherwise, such a maximum does not exist.

The data presented above are far from exhausting the rich physics that the model of junctions of semi-infinite wires actually contains. However, as emphasized above this model has little to do with the transmission of real junctions which are in contact with the outer electrodes. One can see a drastic disagreement with the predictions that take into account the presence of wire-lead interfaces. The corresponding transmission spectra are depicted in the upper row in Fig. 3.

2. Cyclopropane connector

Figure 5(b) specifies parameters of the tight-binding Hamiltonian for a three-site connector. With all equal site energies and hopping integrals, it corresponds to the tight-binding model of cyclopropane. The Green’s-function matrix elements needed to describe this connector according to Eq. (16) are the following:

\[ G_{m,1}^{(M)} D_M = -tG_{1,1}^{(0)}G_{m,1}^{(0)} + G_{m,1}^{(0)}(1 - t^2G_{1,1}^{(0)}G_{1,1}^{(0)}) - tG_{1,1}^{(0)}G_{m,1}^{(0)}(\beta - t^2G_{1,1}^{(0)}) \]

\[ = 1 - \beta G_{1,1}^{(0)}, \]

\[ G_{m,1}^{(M)} D_M = (1 + \beta G_{1,1}^{(0)})G_{m,1}^{(0)} - tG_{1,1}^{(0)}G_{m,1}^{(0)} + G_{1,1}^{(0)}. \] (24)

where \( D_M = 1 + \beta G_{1,1}^{(0)} - 2t^2G_{1,1}^{(0)}G_{1,1}^{(0)} \). Combined with Eq. (4), the above equation includes as particular cases all models of three-terminal molecular devices discussed in Ref. 13.

The equation above can be used in two ways. The first is to substitute it into Eq. (16). This gives the Green’s function \( G^{(M)} \) for the molecular complex consisting of cyclopropane, two identical wires attached to sites 1 and 2, and a different wire attached to site 3. In this case, \( G_{m,1}^{(0)} \) has the meaning of the matrix elements of wire \( (m = 1,l = 1,2,3) \) or connector \( (m = i = 1,2,3) \) Green’s functions. For oligomers M-M-...-M with a variety of monomers M, the needed expressions of \( G_{m,1}^{(0)} \) are collected in Ref. 22.
The second is to use in this equation \( G_{m_{1,2}}^0 = \delta_{m1,13}(E - \varepsilon)^{-1} \) and \( G_{m1,1}^0 = \delta_{m1,13}(E - \varepsilon)^{-1} \). In this case, Eq. (24) determines the Green’s function for the cyclopropane connector:

\[
G_{1,1}^c = 1 - \frac{1}{D_c}(E - \varepsilon + \beta), \quad G_{1,3}^c = G_{2,3}^c = -\frac{1}{D_c},
\]

where \( D_c = (E - \varepsilon)(E - \varepsilon) + \beta(E - \varepsilon - 2\varepsilon) - 2t^2 \).

As an application of this equation, Fig. 7 represents the transmission spectra that are calculated with the use of \( G_{j,j'}^c \) instead of \( G_{j,j'}^M \) in Eq. (4) and coupling functions \( A_1 = A_2 = -V_c^2e^{-it}/t, A_3 = V_c^2(1 + e^{it+2\varepsilon})E^{-1} \).

These calculations show that the use of a propane molecule as a connector is not restricted to two connecting central panel, might be of practical interest because of the strongly asymmetric transmission spectrum in the vicinity of Fermi energy. This asymmetry clearly originates from the asymmetry of the propane electronic spectrum. It is further enhanced by the interference effect. However, the realization of propane-based Y junctions is questionable. One reason is that cyclopropane is chemically unstable. Another hindrance for the synthesis may arise because of steric constraints.

### 3. Annulene connector

The annulene connector, where the binding atoms form an equilateral or isosceles triangle, can be treated similarly. For example, the probability of transmission through an all-symmetric Y junction, where three semi-infinite TB chains are coupled with carbon atoms and these binding atoms are separated from each other by \( N \)-long carbon chains, takes the form

\[
\tau^N = \frac{4(t/V_c^2)^2 \sin^2 k(G_{1,2}^c)^2}{(t/V_c^2)\exp^{-ik+G_{1,1}^c-G_{1,2}^c}(t/V_c^2)\exp^{-ik+G_{1,1}^c+2G_{1,2}^c}}.
\]

where \( E = -2t \cos k = \varepsilon - 2t \cos k, \varepsilon \) is the site energy within the annulene ring, and

\[
\tau G_{1,1}^c = \frac{1}{\sin k \sin[(N + 1)k/2]}, \quad \tau G_{1,2}^c = \frac{1}{\sin[(N + 1)k]},
\]
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