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Abstract

Probing Atomic-Scale Properties of Organic and Organometallic Molecules by Scanning Tunneling Spectroscopy

by

Ryan Tsuyoshi Yamachika

Doctor of Philosophy in Physics

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Michael F. Crommie, Chair

The study of molecular physics has become increasingly important from both a scientific and technological viewpoint. The physical behavior of materials at nanometer length scales holds many surprises and the potential technological applications of molecular science are vast. This dissertation focuses on the fundamental physics of molecules adsorbed to metallic and semiconducting surfaces.

Using a scanning tunneling microscope, four different molecular systems, C\textsubscript{60}, Gd@C\textsubscript{82}, tetramantane, and tetracyanoethylene (TCNE), were studied. The main effects investigated were (1) how can the properties of these molecules be atomically controlled, (2) how do metal surfaces affect molecular properties, (3) how do electron-electron and electron-vibration coupling influence molecular behavior, and (4) how do spins behave in molecule-scale structures. For C\textsubscript{60} we demonstrate a fine control of molecular properties such as energy levels, electron-electron interactions, and electron-vibration interactions via potassium doping. We also find that metal surfaces strongly influence the electronic screening and ordering of adsorbed molecules. In Gd@C\textsubscript{82} and tetramantane molecules, the spatial distribution of the electron-vibration coupling is found to be very inhomogeneous at sub-nanometer (< 10\textsuperscript{-9} m) length scales. In titanocene, we find that Au(111) induces molecular dissociation, with titanocene fragments displaying a spin-induced Kondo effect. The final molecule, TCNE, displays variable surface coupling and also enables tunable magnetic exchange coupling between covalently bonded spin centers in $V_x(TCNE)_y$ complexes.
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Part I

Introduction
Why Study Single Molecules?

In technology as well as in physics, we strive to push the limits of what is possible. One particular limit is size. Semiconductor devices are getting smaller on a yearly basis, and are nearing nanometer length scales ($10^{-9}$ m). Physicists are also trying to delve deeper into what happens at these tiny length scales, a regime where counter-intuitive quantum effects dominate. Since this size regime is the length scale of single molecules, the study and understanding of what happens to single molecules in a condensed matter environment is becoming increasingly important for both science and technology. For this reason, the study of single molecules at surfaces will be the main topic of this dissertation.

This chapter is devoted to introducing single molecule behavior from both the technological, as well as the physics viewpoints. Since new technology is based on new underlying physics, an overview of single molecule devices will be described first, followed by a summary of some underlying molecular physics. The chapter will close with an overview of this thesis.

1.1 Molecular Devices

One of the often cited laws in electronics is Moore’s law [148], published in 1965 by Gordon Moore (who went to UC Berkeley as an undergrad). His law states that the number of components on an integrated circuit will double every two years, implying that the size of the components will shrink to improve performance. Moore’s law has held up well in the last thirty years and will eventually lead us to nanometer sized circuit components.

At nanometer length scales, however, electrical devices are governed by quantum mechanical effects, such as electron tunneling, and will not behave as more familiar present-day devices [155]. Current semiconductor technology will likely reach its speed and power efficiency limits before this size scale is reached. To advance beyond this will require new technology, which in turn will require a new understanding of fundamental scientific issues.

Nanoscience is an emerging field of science that is concerned with these issues. This is the science of materials structured at the nanometer scale. Nanoscience has the potential
to transform our current technology since it points the way toward creating devices based on the properties of nanometer-sized molecular structures instead of bulk semiconductors. Many nanometer-size devices have already been realized [9], such as the C_{60} molecular transistor [158], the nanotube radio [97], logic gates via molecular motion [78], and rotational actuators [49]. In addition, molecule-based spintronics raises new possibilities for electronic and magnetic devices [19, 90]. The promise and potential of such devices helps motivate the research presented in this dissertation.

1.2 Molecular Physics Overview

At nanometer sizes, many bulk properties are transformed. This forces us to rethink the underlying physics of devices in the single molecule regime. The physics of such devices are affected drastically by properties such as molecule-molecule interactions, molecule-electrode interactions, and electron-electron interactions.

Molecule-molecule interactions, for example, are typically much weaker than atom-atom interactions in a bulk semiconductor device. Atoms in a molecule tend to arrange in a way that saturates dangling bonds, causing molecules to interact weakly with other molecules. This is unlike semiconductors which are comprised of atoms that interact strongly with each other due to dangling bonds. For example, in bulk C_{60}, the C_{60}-C_{60} binding energy is \( \sim 0.1 \text{ eV} \), about 10 times smaller than typical atomic binding energies [62]. The weak interactions between molecules causes clusters or multilayers of molecules to have properties similar to single molecule properties. This is unlike bulk semiconductors whose band properties deviate substantially from atomic properties due to strong atom-atom interactions.

In molecular devices, the molecules contact other substances, such as electrodes, and the molecule-electrode interaction can differ from bulk semiconductor-electrode interactions. Since molecules have discrete energy levels, these discrete states will interact with the continuum of states of electrodes, an effect which does not occur in semiconductor devices which contain no discrete states. Understanding molecule-electrode interactions requires new theories incorporating ideas such as the Fano-Anderson model (§4.4.1), and new experiments.

Electron-electron interactions in single molecules can also behave quite differently from what is seen in solids. Electron-electron interactions (§3.4.2) are neglected in many solids due to electronic screening (§9.2), but typically cannot be neglected in single-molecule-based systems. Electron-electron interactions, for example, can lead to metal-insulator transitions (§4.3, chapter 9), an effect not normally seen in semiconductor devices.

One of the most important classes of molecules for different applications are carbon-based molecules, since this class of molecules is easily fabricated, has a wide range of useful properties, and is potentially biologically compatible. This class of molecules will be the focus of this dissertation. The next sections of this chapter provide a brief overview of the physics of carbon-based molecules that is relevant for molecular nanostructures embedded in a condensed matter environment. We will focus on three types of molecules: \( sp^2 \) bonded fullerenes, \( sp^3 \) bonded diamondoids, and molecules having a magnetic component.
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1.2.1 Fullerenes and Diamondoids: Overview

The most useful molecules are those with many experimentally controllable interactions. Fullerences fit this prerequisite nicely since many of their interactions, such as electron-electron interactions, are tunable via exohedral potassium (K) doping. This is why many of the studies in this dissertation involve the fullerene C$_{60}$.

A ball and stick model of C$_{60}$ and a rough sketch of its energy levels are given in figure 1.1. When we dope C$_{60}$ with K, the K atom donates one of its electrons to C$_{60}$. This electron then occupies one of the C$_{60}$ LUMO states. This process of electron donation has a number of consequences: it changes the energy of the molecular states relative to the chemical potential (chapter 6), it changes the electron-electron interactions (chapter 9), and it can modify the molecular electron-vibration interaction in the form of changes to the Jahn-Teller effect (chapter 7).

The relative magnitudes of the various interactions in C$_{60}$ are unusual in that electron-vibration interactions, inter-molecular hybridization [207, 62], and electron-electron interactions [3, 139] are all at the same energy scale ($\sim$0.5–3 eV). These interactions compete with each other to determine the properties of the system, and since they are all similar in magnitude, small changes in any of these parameters can make one interaction win out over another. This competition between interactions causes fullerene systems to display a wide variety of behavior when the strengths of the interactions are modified via alkali metal doping, such as metal-to-insulator transitions (chapters 7, 9), superconductivity and magnetism in bulk compounds [75, 1], and novel electronic and orientational phases in thin films (chapter 8, [189, 86, 207, 22, 156]).

The unusual combination of competing interactions in C$_{60}$ can lead to electronic properties very analogous to those seen in high-$T_C$ superconductors. High-$T_C$ superconductors, for example, are hole-doped Mott insulators where the mechanism of superconductivity is still controversial. Since hole-doping K$_x$C$_{60}$ can be performed by removing one K per C$_{60}$, hole-doping the Mott insulator K$_4$C$_{60}$ (ref. [55]) gives a superconductor (K$_3$C$_{60}$), analogous

Figure 1.1: (a) Ball and stick model of C$_{60}$. (b) Energy levels of C$_{60}$ from [60].
to what is seen for high-$T_C$ materials. The qualitative phase diagrams in figure 1.2 of both high-$T_C$ superconductors and C$_{60}$ are strikingly similar. Since the physics behind high-$T_C$

![High $T_C$ superconductor](image)

![A$_x$C$_{60}$](image)

Figure 1.2: Phase diagrams of a high-$T_C$ superconductor and A$_x$C$_{60}$, where A = alkali metal, from [209].

superconductors is unusual, the similarity between high-$T_C$ superconductors and fullerenes helps to demonstrate the unusual physics that can happen in fullerene-based molecular materials.

In addition to modifying the properties of fullerenes by exohedral K doping, they can also be modified by endohedral doping. Gd@C$_{82}$ (where a single Gd atom is inserted into a C$_{82}$ cage) is an example of this. The structure of Gd@C$_{82}$ and a sketch of its electronic energy levels, derived from [52, 128, 106], are given in figure 1.3. There is a 3 electron charge transfer from Gd to C$_{82}$ which can give rise to magnetism.

![Gd@C$_{82}$](image)

![Electronic energy levels of Gd and C$_{82}$](image)

Figure 1.3: (a) Ball and stick model of Gd@C$_{82}$. (b) Electronic energy levels of Gd and C$_{82}$ in a Gd@C$_{82}$ fullerene.
1.3. DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

While fullerenes are $sp^2$ bonded carbon molecules, carbon can also form $sp^3$ bonds, the best known example being diamond. Molecules derived from $sp^3$ bonded carbon, with dangling bonds terminated with hydrogen, are known as diamondoids. They represent another class of carbon molecules with potential interesting field emission [208], thermal, and mechanical properties [137, 172].

1.2.2 Magnetic molecules: Overview

The growing field of molecule-based magnetism involves understanding magnetism at molecular sizes. Here it is important to understand the influence of substrates on the properties of magnetic molecules since molecular charge, spin, and magnetic anisotropy can change as molecules come into contact with a surface [179, 14]. To study these effects, two magnetic molecules, titanocene chloride dimers and tetracyanoethylene (TCNE), were studied in this dissertation.

The titanocene chloride dimer, $[\text{Cp}_2\text{TiCl}]_2$ with $\text{Cp} = \text{C}_5\text{H}_5$, is known in chemistry for its utility as an inexpensive reducing agent in organic synthesis [170, 54, 12, 6], but it also has magnetic properties [101]. The magnetic properties originate from the anti-ferromagnetic coupling between the spins of the two titanium atoms and make the molecule an interesting choice for studying molecular magnetism.

Tetracyanoethylene (TCNE) is a strong $\pi$-electron acceptor with a large electron affinity [33] that easily forms charge-transfer complexes where it pulls electrons from neighboring metal atoms or molecules [50, 140]. For complexes of the form $M(\text{TCNE})_x$, where $M$ is a paramagnetic transition-metal ion, molecule-based ferromagnetism is present in these complexes and the Curie temperatures can be high [136, 212, 146, 93]. Bulk $V(\text{TCNE})_x$ ($x \sim 2$), for example, has a Curie temperature $T_C \sim 400$ K (references [136, 167, 185, 113]). However, the origin of the ferromagnetism is not well understood, making TCNE an interesting candidate to explore molecule-based magnetism.

1.3 Dissertation Overview

This dissertation will focus on the fundamental physics of molecular nanostructures in contact with a surface. Some of the outstanding questions that will be addressed are

1. How can we modify and control the properties of adsorbed molecules at the atomic scale?

2. How do different substrates, such as metal electrodes, affect the properties of a molecule?

3. How do electron-electron, electron-vibration, and molecule-molecule interactions influence the properties of single molecules in a condensed matter environment?

Some of the main conclusions of this work are that the electronic properties of molecules can be precisely modified and controlled at the atomic scale, a metallic surface can substantially
change the energies and ordering of molecules, electron-electron and electron-vibration interactions can induce metal to insulator transitions, and electron-vibration interactions are inhomogeneous at molecular length scales.

To perform the studies described here, it is critical to utilize a local probe with sub-nanometer resolution. This is why a scanning tunneling microscope (STM) is used in all the experiments in this dissertation. The unique combination of high spatial resolution ($\lesssim 1 \text{ Å}$) and the ability to modify and manipulate molecules makes the STM ideal for studying the properties of molecular nanostructures at surfaces.

This dissertation contains three main parts. The first part is an introduction to the theory and experimental techniques necessary to understand the work performed here. This is comprised of four chapters. The first (chapter 2) gives a simplified view of the theory of tunneling. The second (chapter 3) presents a more general description with corrections to many commonly made approximations. The third (chapter 4) describes much of the background physics of nanostructures used in the dissertation. The fourth (chapter 5) describes the instrumental details of the scanning tunneling microscope and related equipment used for all the experiments.

The second part of the dissertation describes specific experimental studies performed on three carbon-based molecules: $C_{60}$, Gd@C$_{82}$, and diamondoids. The main results for $C_{60}$ are that metal surfaces substantially affect the electron-electron interactions in $C_{60}$, and that the properties of single $C_{60}$ molecules and $C_{60}$ films can be controlled via atomic doping with K atoms. These properties include molecular energy levels, electron-phonon interactions, electron-electron interactions, and local ordering. For the second molecule, Gd@C$_{82}$, we are able to spatially map out the strength of the electron-vibration interaction, and show that it is spatially very inhomogeneous. In the last molecule, diamondoid tetramantane, we see a very inhomogeneous electron-vibration interaction, but we also see very localized HOMO orbital behavior and a large ($> 5 \text{ eV}$) quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap, unlike $C_{60}$ and Gd@C$_{82}$.

The third part of this dissertation describes our studies of titanocene and TCNE molecules on surfaces. Titanocene is seen to display fragmentation on Au(111). The fragments form well-ordered phases where one type of fragment has a magnetic moment. The other magnetic molecule, TCNE, exhibits variable substrate interaction with different metal surfaces. On Ag(001), the TCNE-substrate interaction leads to strong charge transfer and the molecules on this surface can be combined with vanadium via molecular manipulation with the STM tip to form $V_x(TCNE)_y$ structures. Depending on the particular structure of the $V_x(TCNE)_y$ complex and its orientation relative to the Ag(001) substrate, the strength of the TCNE-mediated spin coupling between V atoms can be adjusted.
This chapter will introduce a standard theory to describe scanning tunneling microscopy. This theory will be used often in the dissertation to explain intuitively and quantitatively what an STM measures. However, there are important corrections to the standard theory that should be known, and these corrections will be discussed in the following chapter.

In scanning tunneling microscopy (STM), a sharp metal tip is placed very close (~6 Å) to a conducting sample that we wish to study (figure 2.2). Although the tip and sample are not touching, when a voltage is applied to the tip relative to the sample, the electrons from the tip may still move into the sample by a quantum mechanical process called tunneling. Qualitatively, the probability for an electron to travel across the vacuum between tip and sample depends exponentially on the tip-sample distance, which is what gives the STM its high spatial resolution. Quantitatively, the formal mathematical theory of electron tunneling in STM was given first by Bardeen [11] and then by Tersoff and Hamann in [186]. A slightly different and more detailed derivation will be given in this section. The main results will be the general equation for the tunneling current (2.2) and the simplified form for differential conductance (2.5).

2.1 Tunneling

2.1.1 General expression for tunneling

To formally describe electron tunneling in STM, we would like to apply Fermi’s Golden Rule to calculate the transition rate for electrons to move from the tip to the sample. This rate of transition multiplied by the electron charge is the tunneling current measured in STM experiments. Fermi’s Golden Rule states that if \( \psi_i \) and \( \psi_f \) are eigenstates of a Hamiltonian \( H \), then the transition rate \( W \) from state \( \psi_i \) to \( \psi_f \) due to the presence of a perturbing Hamiltonian \( H' \) is

\[
W_{i\rightarrow f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left| \langle \psi_f | H' | \psi_i \rangle \right|^2 \rho_f(E_i)
\]

(2.1)
where $\rho_f(E_i)$ is the density of states at the energy of the initial state $\psi_i$ (page 332 in [174]). The only problem to applying Fermi’s Golden Rule to tunneling is that the initial state $|\psi_i\rangle$ and final state $|\psi_f\rangle$ should be eigenstates of a single system, but for tunneling we like to separate the initial state (a tip state) from the final state (a sample state) and treat the initial and final states as existing on two different systems. Despite this problem, in the case of tunneling we may still justify the use of Fermi’s Golden rule. This will be discussed in §2.2 and in this section we will assume that Fermi’s Golden Rule can be applied.

Starting with Fermi’s Golden Rule, to describe electron tunneling in STM we will need to make 5 additional assumptions. These additions will assume that the initial state is in the STM tip and the final state is in the sample, as follows:

1. The tip states may form a continuum. In this case, we must multiply (2.1) by the number of tip electrons that participate in tunneling $\rho_t(E_t) \, dE_t$. The transition rate $dW_{t\rightarrow s}$ of electrons from tip to sample due to states within an energy range $dE_t$ around energy $E_t$ is

$$
dW_{t\rightarrow s} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle \psi_s | H' | \psi_t \rangle|^2 \rho_s(E_t) \rho_t(E_t) \, dE_t
$$

where $\psi_s$ and $\psi_t$ represent the sample and tip wavefunctions respectively, while $\rho_s$ and $\rho_t$ represent the sample and tip density of states, respectively.

2. An electron transition from a state $\psi_t$ to $\psi_s$ can only take place if $\psi_t$ is occupied by an electron and $\psi_s$ is unoccupied. Since the electron occupancy is given by the Fermi-Dirac distribution $f(E) = [\exp(E - \mu/kT) + 1]^{-1}$, we must multiply $\rho_t$ by the probability $f(E)$ that the states are occupied and multiply $\rho_s$ by the probability $1 - f(E)$ that the states are unoccupied

$$
dW_{t\rightarrow s} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle \psi_s | H' | \psi_t \rangle|^2 \rho_s(E_t)(1 - f(E_t)) \rho_t(E_t) f(E_t) \, dE_t
$$

3. When we apply a voltage difference $V_t$ to the STM tip relative to the sample, we assume we simply shift the density of states of the tip by $-e_cV_t$, where $e_c$ is the absolute value of the electron charge. The Fermi-Dirac distribution also shifts since the voltage changes the chemical potential by $-e_cV_t$. The shifted Fermi-Dirac distribution can be written as $f(E + e_cV_t) = [\exp(E + e_cV_t - \mu/kT) + 1]^{-1}$ where $\mu$ is the chemical potential with no applied voltage. The transition rate is now

$$
dW_{t\rightarrow s} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle \psi_s | H' | \psi_t \rangle|^2 \rho_s(E_t)(1 - f(E_t)) \rho_t(E_t + e_cV_t) f(E_t + e_cV_t) \, dE_t.
$$

4. If the wavefunctions $\psi_{s,1}$, $\psi_{s,2}$, ..., $\psi_{s,N(E_t)}$ on the sample give rise to $N(E_t)$ distinct matrix elements at energy $E_t$, we must sum over the $N(E_t)$ contributions from each
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different matrix element [174]

\[
dW_{t\rightarrow s} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \sum_{n} |\langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_{t}\rangle|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t)(1 - f(E_t))\rho_t(E_t + e_cV_t)f(E_t + e_cV_t)dE_t
\]

where \( \rho_{s,n} \) now represents the number of states per energy on the sample with matrix element \( \langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_{t}\rangle \).

5. We must take into account transitions from the sample states back to the tip states at energy \( E_t \)

\[
dW_{s\rightarrow t} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \sum_{n} |\langle \psi_{t}|H'|\psi_{s,n}\rangle|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t)f(E_t)\rho_t(E_t + e_cV_t)(1 - f(E_t + e_cV_t))dE_t.
\]

We will subtract this off of \( dW_{t\rightarrow s} \) next.

Using the previous assumptions, the total electron transition rate between sample and tip is then

\[
W = \int (dW_{s\rightarrow t} - dW_{t\rightarrow s})
\]

\[
= \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n} |\langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_{t}\rangle|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t)\rho_t(E_t + e_cV_t)[f(E_t) - f(E_t + e_cV_t)]dE_t
\]

and the total tunneling current at voltage \( V_t \) is

\[
I(V_t) = -e_cW
\]

\[
= \frac{2\pi e_c}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n} |\langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_{t}\rangle|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t)\rho_t(E_t + e_cV_t)[f(E_t + e_cV_t) - f(E_t)]dE_t
\]

(we have defined positive current to mean electrons tunnel from tip to sample). Normally in STM, we express everything in terms of the sample bias which is the voltage of the sample relative to the tip \( V_{\text{sample}} = -V_t \). This is the convention even when we apply the voltage to the tip. In terms of the sample bias \( V_{\text{sample}} = V \),

\[
I(V) = \frac{2\pi e_c}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n} |\langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_{t}\rangle|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t)\rho_t(E_t - e_cV)[f(E_t - e_cV) - f(E_t)]dE_t. \tag{2.2}
\]

This is a general first order expression for the tunneling current for non-interacting electrons.
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2.1.2 Simplified expression for tunneling

In order to simplify (2.2), a few standard approximations are used, as follows:

1. We assume in STM that the tip DOS is a constant, \( \rho_T \).

2. We approximate the matrix elements using Bardeen’s matrix element expression (§2.2). Tersoff and Hamann [186] have calculated the Bardeen matrix element assuming that the wave functions at the end of the tip are s-waves centered at position \( \vec{r}_0 \). The matrix element has the form \( A(\phi, R)\psi_{s,n}(\vec{r}_0) \) where \( \phi \) is the work function, assumed to be the same for both tip and sample, \( R \) is the radius of the potential at the end of the tip, and \( A \) is a function which depends on both \( \phi \) and \( R \). Using these approximations, the tunneling current at tip position \( \vec{r}_0 \) and sample voltage \( V \) is

\[
I(\vec{r}_0, V) = \frac{2\pi e_c}{\hbar} \rho_T A^2(\phi, R) \sum_{n} |\psi_{s,n}(\vec{r}_0)|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t) \left[ f(E_t - e_c V) - f(E_t) \right] dE_t
\]

Usually, the differential conductance, \( dI/dV \), at tip position \( \vec{r}_0 \) and sample voltage \( V \) is a more useful quantity:

\[
\frac{dI}{dV}(\vec{r}_0, V) = \frac{2\pi e_c}{\hbar} \rho_T A^2(\phi, R) \sum_{n} |\psi_{s,n}(\vec{r}_0)|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_t) \frac{\partial f(E_t - e_c V)}{\partial V} dE_t. \tag{2.3}
\]

3. Since most data is taken at low temperatures, \( \partial f(E_t - e_c V)/\partial V \approx e_c \delta(E_F + e_c V) \), and \( dI/dV \) takes a simpler form

\[
\frac{dI}{dV}(\vec{r}, V) = \frac{2\pi e_c^2}{\hbar} \rho_T A^2(\phi, R) \sum_{n} |\psi_{s,n}(\vec{r})|^2 \rho_{s,n}(E_F + e_c V) \tag{2.4}
\]

Equation (2.4) describes what an STM measures. It is slightly different from what is normally written, e.g. in [186]. To see the usual form, we think of the sample density of states \( \rho_s \) as being the sum over many delta functions, very closely spaced energetically: \( \rho_s(E) = \sum_k \delta(E - E_k) \). Since, in general, every wavefunction \( \psi_{s,n} \) of the sample has a different matrix element, and since \( \rho_{s,n} \) is defined as the density of states with matrix element \( \langle \psi_{s,n}|H'|\psi_t \rangle \), then \( \rho_{s,n} \) is just the density of states of the wavefunction \( \psi_{s,n} \); i.e., \( \rho_{s,n}(E) = \delta(E - E_n) \). The expression for \( dI/dV \) then simplifies to

\[
\frac{dI}{dV}(\vec{r}, V) \propto \sum_{n} |\psi_{s,n}(\vec{r})|^2 \delta((E_F + e_c V) - E_n) = \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_F + e_c V) \tag{2.5}
\]

where LDOS stands for local density of states (defined by (4.1)) of the sample. This is the familiar expression for \( dI/dV \) and is the fundamental equation that describes what an STM
measures. All of the various STM measurement techniques described below will use the result \((2.5)\).

### 2.2 Tunneling matrix elements

Sometimes Fermi’s Golden Rule is used to calculate electron tunneling rates, but this is not necessarily justified, as pointed out in [186]: Fermi’s Golden Rule describes transitions between eigenstates of one system and not transitions between an eigenstate of one system (the tip) and an eigenstate of another system (the sample). However, Fermi’s Golden Rule can be extended so that it is applicable to tunneling. This section will discuss the extended version of Fermi’s Golden Rule and how this extended rule can be applied to tunneling. Then the tunneling matrix element in Fermi’s Golden Rule will be rewritten in the more symmetric form known as the Bardeen matrix element.

#### 2.2.1 Extended Fermi’s Golden Rule

Fermi’s Golden Rule is usually stated as the following: for a system with Hamiltonian \(H_0\) and eigenstates \(H_0|\psi_n\rangle = E_n|\psi_n\rangle\), if a constant perturbation with Hamiltonian \(H'\) is applied to the system, then after a long enough time, \((2.1)\) may be applied to calculate the first order transition rate between two eigenstates of the unperturbed system. From this statement, we see that Fermi’s Golden Rule describes transitions between eigenstates \(|\psi_n\rangle\) of \(H_0\) and not transitions between an eigenstate \(|\psi_n\rangle\) and an arbitrary state \(|\alpha\rangle\). While this restriction that we only consider transitions between eigenstates of \(H_0\) is sufficient to prove Fermi’s Golden Rule, we will see that it is not a necessary condition.

This is a statement of an extended version of Fermi’s Golden Rule. Suppose \(|\psi_n\rangle\) are eigenstates with energies \(E_n\) of the time-independent Hamiltonian \(H_0\) and

\[
H_P(t) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{for } t < 0 \\
H', & \text{for } t \geq 0
\end{cases}
\]

is a perturbing Hamiltonian as a function of time \(t\). \(H'\) is a constant and the total Hamiltonian for the system is \(H = H_0 + H_P\). If the time-independent normalized state \(|\alpha\rangle\) satisfies the following conditions

\[
(H_0 + H')|\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha|\alpha\rangle \quad (2.6)
\]

and \(\langle \alpha|\psi_n\rangle = 0\) for all \(n\). \(2.7\)

Then, in the limit \(t \to \infty\), the transition rate from \(|\psi_I\rangle\) to \(|\alpha\rangle\) is

\[
W_{I\to\alpha} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left| \langle \alpha|H'|\psi_I\rangle \right|^2 \rho_f(E_I) . \quad (2.8)
\]
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where \( \rho_f \) is the density of final states. This result means Fermi’s Golden Rule can be used to calculate the transition rate between \( |\psi_I\rangle \) and \( |\alpha\rangle \) as long as \( |\alpha\rangle \) satisfies (2.6) and (2.7).

To prove this result, we first assume that the system is in the state \( |\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iE_It/\hbar}|\psi_I\rangle \) for \( t < 0 \), which is an eigenstate of the total Hamiltonian \( H = H_0 + H_P = H_0 \) for \( t < 0 \). Then for \( t \geq 0 \), the perturbing Hamiltonian causes \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) to not be an eigenstate of the total Hamiltonian \( H = H_0 + H' \) anymore. In general, \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) for \( t \geq 0 \) will be in a superposition of eigenstates

\[
|\Psi(t)\rangle = a(t)e^{-iE_\alpha t/\hbar}|\alpha\rangle + \sum_n c_n(t)e^{-iE_n t/\hbar}|\psi_n\rangle.
\]

Note that \( |a(t)|^2 \) represents the probability of being in state \( |\alpha\rangle \) after time \( t \). If we plug \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) into the time dependent Schrödinger equation

\[
(H_0 + H')|\Psi(t)\rangle = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\Psi(t)\rangle
\]

we can simplify the result using (2.6) and \( H_0|\psi_n\rangle = E_n|\psi_n\rangle \). After this simplification, we can multiply the resulting equation on the left by \( \langle \alpha | \) and simplify the result using \( \langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle = 1 \) and (2.7) to get

\[
\frac{d}{dt}a(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} \sum_n c_n(t)e^{i(E_\alpha - E_n)t/\hbar}\langle \alpha | H'|n \rangle
\]

This expression may be solved by successive approximation. For example, we take the right hand side of the equation as the zeroth order approximation (to zeroth order, \( |\Psi(t)\rangle \) is in state \( I \), so \( c_n(t) = \delta_{n,I} \)), then the resultant equation

\[
\frac{d}{dt}a(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} e^{i(E_\alpha - E_I)t/\hbar}\langle \alpha | H' | I \rangle
\]

determines the first order approximation to \( a(t) \). If we now look at the derivation of Fermi’s Golden Rule in §5.6 in [174], we see that this result is exactly equation 5.6.17, and hence, the rest of the steps leading to (2.8) will be exactly the same as those in §5.6 in [174].

### 2.2.2 Extended Golden Rule in tunneling

To justify using Fermi’s Golden Rule to describe electrons tunneling from an STM tip to a sample, one must then argue why the sample eigenstates \( |\psi_{s,n}\rangle \) satisfy conditions (2.6) and (2.7). This is where the approximations of Bardeen come in. These are the approximations:

1. Assume that the potential for the sample is localized to the sample and potential for the tip is localized to the tip. This is a reasonable approximation for tunneling.

2. Assume that all tip wavefunctions are localized to the tip and all sample wavefunctions are localized to the sample. This should be a reasonable approximation for the bound states.
3. Assume that the tip and sample are sufficiently far apart so that there is little overlap between tip and sample wavefunctions, and tip and sample are sufficiently far apart so that the tip potential is zero in the region of space occupied by the sample and sample potential zero in the region of space occupied by the tip.

A sketch of the potentials and wavefunctions under these approximations is given in figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Approximate potentials (solid lines) and wavefunctions (dashed lines) for the STM tip and sample in Bardeen’s approximation. Only certain regions have non-zero potential and non-zero wavefunctions.

We will now use these assumptions to show (2.6) and (2.7). Suppose

\[
H_s = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + U_s, \quad H_t = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + U_t, \quad \text{with} \quad \vec{p} = \frac{\hbar}{i} \nabla \tag{2.9}
\]

are the Hamiltonians for the sample and tip, respectively. The sample eigenstates are \(\psi_{s,n}\) while the tip eigenstates are \(\psi_{t,n}\). We then consider the sample potential \(U_s\) as a perturbation to the tip, so \(H_0 = H_t\) and \(H' = U_s\). We want to show that \(\psi_{s,n}\) satisfies (2.6) and (2.7).

We first show (2.6). We want to show \(\psi_{s,n}\) satisfies \((H_0 + H')\psi_{s,n} = E_{s,n}\psi_{s,n}\). Since \(H_0 + H' = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + U_t + U_s\),

\[
(H_0 + H')\psi_{s,n} = (H_s + U_t)\psi_{s,n} = E_{s,n}\psi_{s,n} + U_t\psi_{s,n}.
\]

To satisfy (2.6), we must show \(U_t\psi_{s,n} = 0\). By assumption 1, the potential \(U_t\) is localized to the tip while assumption 2 states \(\psi_{s,n}\) is localized to the sample; more precisely, by assumption 3, \(U_t\) is zero in the sample while \(\psi_{s,n}\) is zero in the tip. Hence, \(U_t\) is zero whenever \(\psi_{s,n}\) is non-zero and \(U_t\) is non-zero whenever \(\psi_{s,n}\) is zero. The product \(U_t\psi_{s,n}\) must then be zero everywhere. We may also see that the product \(U_t\psi_{s,n}\) is zero from figure 2.1. Therefore, \((H_0 + H')\psi_{s,n} = E_{s,n}\psi_{s,n}\) and (2.6) is satisfied.

Next, show (2.7). By assumption 3, the sample and tip wavefunctions have little overlap, so that \(\langle \psi_{s,n} | \psi_{t,n} \rangle \approx 0\). So (2.7) is satisfied approximately. This can also be seen in figure 2.1. We have now shown that all conditions to apply Fermi’s Golden rule have been satisfied,
which means we may apply (2.1) to electrons tunneling between tip and sample; i.e.,

$$W_{t \rightarrow s} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle \psi_{s,n} | H' | \psi_{t,m} \rangle|^2 \rho_s(E_t),$$

where $\rho_s(E_t)$ is the sample DOS at the energy $E_t$ of the state $|\psi_{t,m}\rangle$.

### 2.2.3 Bardeen’s matrix elements

From the derivation above, we see that the perturbing Hamiltonian is just the potential energy of the sample $H' = U_s$. In this case, one can simply write the matrix elements in Fermi’s Golden Rule as

$$M_{nm} \equiv \langle \psi_{s,n} | H' | \psi_{t,m} \rangle = \langle \psi_{s,n} | U_s | \psi_{t,m} \rangle = \int_V \psi_{s,n}^*(\vec{r}) U_s \psi_{t,m}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}$$

where the integral is taken over the volume $V$ where $U_s \neq 0$. In principle, this is all that must be calculated to find the transition probabilities. However, by doing a few mathematical manipulations, the matrix element can be written in a more symmetric form completely in terms of the tip and sample wavefunctions.

One first rewrites $\psi_{s,n}^* U_s$ in the integral in terms of derivatives of $\psi_{s,n}^*$ by using $H_s \psi_{s,n}^* = E_{s,n} \psi_{s,n}^*$ (equation 2.9). One then has an integral with $E_{s,n} \psi_{t,m}$ in it. One may rewrite this term as $E_{t,m} \psi_{t,m}$ since energy is conserved, so $E_{s,n} = E_{t,m}$, and one may then substitute for $E_{t,m} \psi_{t,m}$ using $H_t \psi_{t,m} = E_{t,m} \psi_{t,m}$ (equation 2.9). Writing $H_t$ explicitly in terms of derivatives then allows us to use the derivative identity $\nabla \cdot (f \vec{A}) = f \nabla \cdot \vec{A} + \nabla f \cdot \vec{A}$ to rewrite the matrix element as

$$M_{nm} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int_V \nabla \cdot (\psi_{t,m} \nabla \psi_{s,n}^* - \psi_{s,n}^* \nabla \psi_{t,m}) d\vec{r} + \int_V \psi_{s,n}^* U_t \psi_{t,m} d\vec{r}.$$

The second integral is zero since we integrate over the volume where $U_s \neq 0$ and $U_t = 0$ in that region (figure 2.1). Applying the divergence theorem to the remaining integral gives the Bardeen matrix element

$$M_{nm} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int_A (\psi_{t,m} \nabla \psi_{s,n}^* - \psi_{s,n}^* \nabla \psi_{t,m}) \cdot d\vec{A}$$

where the integral is taken over any surface that separates tip from sample. More details about the Bardeen matrix elements can be found in §2.2 of [29], while corrections to the matrix elements can be found in chapter 3 of [29].
2.3 STM Topography

We first define the plane of the sample's surface to be the $xy$-plane and the direction perpendicular to the surface as the $z$ direction (figure 2.2). In STM topography, we apply a constant voltage to the tip or sample (figure 2.2 shows it applied to the tip, which is equivalent to applying $V = -V_{\text{tip}}$ to the sample) and move the tip in the $xy$-plane with a feedback mechanism that controls the movement of the tip in the $z$ direction so that the tunneling current $I(V)$ is kept constant (figure 2.2). The plot of the change in the $z$ position of the tip as a function of $x$ and $y$ is a constant-current topograph. Since the current is given by

$$I(\vec{r}, V) = \int_{0}^{V} \frac{dI}{dV}(\vec{r}, V) \, dV \propto \int_{0}^{V} \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_F + eV) \, dV$$

Figure 2.2: Diagram showing the basic setup of an STM. A constant voltage $V_{\text{tip}}$ is applied to the tip while voltages are applied to piezos to move the tip in the $x$ and $y$ directions. The tunneling current is measured by a current to voltage converter connected to the sample and the tunneling current (after conversion to a voltage) enters feedback electronics which applies a voltage to the $z$ piezo to move the tip in the $z$ direction so that the tunneling current is kept constant.
the feedback adjusts the tip height to keep the integral of the LDOS from 0 to $V$ constant. What we then plot in a topograph is a surface where the integral of the LDOS is constant. If the voltage is sufficiently small, then $I(\vec{r}, V_0) = \int_0^{V_0} dI/dV \, dV \sim dI(\vec{r}, V_0)/dV \propto \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_F + e_c V_0)$, so that the topograph shows a surface of constant LDOS near the Fermi energy. Since $\text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_F + e_c V) \sim \sum |\psi(\vec{r})|^2$ what a low bias topograph shows is a surface where the sum of the squares of the wavefunctions near $E_F$ is constant; i.e., it shows the spatial distribution of the orbitals near $E_F$.

## 2.4 Elastic Spectroscopy

In $dI/dV$ spectroscopy (also simply called spectroscopy), we keep the tip at a fixed position $\vec{r}_0$ and measure $dI/dV$ as we change the voltage. We normally do not numerically differentiate $I(V)$; instead, we use a lock-in amplifier to measure $dI/dV$ (appendix A). Since $dI(\vec{r}_0)/dV \propto \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}_0, E_F + e_c V)$, what we then measure is the sample’s LDOS at position $\vec{r}_0$ as a function of energy. Since $\text{DOS}(E) = \sum_n \delta(E - E_n)$, we may think of $\text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_0) = \sum_m |\psi(\vec{r})|^2 \delta(E - E_0)$ roughly as the density of states at energy $E_0$ multiplied by the square of all wavefunctions with energy $E_0$ at position $\vec{r}$.

Since the $dI/dV$ measures LDOS which is not the same as the DOS, to get a better measure of the density of states of the sample, we may average $dI/dV$ spectroscopy curves taken at various positions over the sample. This gives a better measure of the DOS because the integral of $\text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E)$ over all space is $\text{DOS}(E)$ ($\S 4.1$); hence, by averaging spectroscopy curves over different points in space, we are effectively integrating LDOS over space, and the more positions in space we average over, the closer the average becomes to the integral, and the closer the average $dI/dV$ is to the DOS.

### 2.5 $dI/dV$ maps

A $dI/dV$ map is taken by keeping the tip voltage constant and scanning the surface in the $x$ and $y$ directions while keeping the feedback on (so that $I$ is constant). We then measure $dI/dV$ during this process and plot it as a function of $(x, y)$. The resulting plot is called a $dI/dV$ map.

Since $dI(\vec{r}, V_0)/dV \propto \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E_F + e_c V_0) \sim \sum |\psi(\vec{r})|^2$ where we sum over all orbitals with energy $e_c V_0$, when we take a $dI/dV$ map, we map out the values of the sum of the squares of the orbitals at energy $e_c V_0$ at the position $\vec{r}$. The position $\vec{r}$ is determined by the current $I$ since, as we scan, the feedback moves the tip to keep the current constant. This means that a $dI/dV$ map measures $\sum |\psi(\vec{r})|^2$ along a surface where $I$ is constant. This is not the same as mapping out an orbital since an orbital is usually drawn as an isosurface, a surface where $\sum |\psi(\vec{r})|^2 = C$ for some constant $C$. This distinction is important when comparing data to calculations [129].
2.6 Inelastic Spectroscopy

We normally assume that when electrons tunnel into a molecule, the electrons then hop off the molecule onto the surface without losing energy. This is called elastic tunneling. However, it is also possible for the electrons to lose energy in the molecule via some other mechanism. Such a process is called inelastic tunneling. For example, the electron could excite a molecular vibration. This would cause the electron to lose energy $\hbar \omega$ where $\omega$ is the frequency of the vibrational mode. Since the electron must have energy $E \geq \hbar \omega$ to excite the vibration, we will see a sudden onset of current due to inelastic tunneling when $|E| \geq \hbar \omega$. Normally, the additional inelastic current increases the total current, resulting in a sudden rise in $dI/dV$ at the energies $E = \pm \hbar \omega$.

The change in the $dI/dV$ signal due to the excitation of a vibration can be quantitatively calculated as [58]

$$\Delta \left. \frac{dI}{dV} \right|_{E_cV=\hbar \omega} \sim \left| \langle \psi_{EF}\mid V_{el-ph}\mid \psi_{EF}+\hbar \omega \rangle \right|^2$$

which can be written as

$$\Delta \left. \frac{dI}{dV} \right|_{E_cV=\hbar \omega} \sim \left| \sum_i \frac{dE_{\psi_{EF}}}{dQ_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} \right|^2$$

(2.10)

where $Q_i$ represents the displacement of the $i^{th}$ atom in the direction of the molecular vibration and the sum is taken over all atoms in the molecule.

When the atoms vibrate, the molecular energies will change slightly since the position of the atoms are changing. Equation (2.10) tells us that the more the energy of the molecular states near $E_F$ change due to the vibration mode, the larger $d^2I/dV^2$ is. It also tells us that larger frequency phonons have smaller $d^2I/dV^2$.

2.7 $d^2I/dV^2$ maps

For a $d^2I/dV^2$ map, we keep $V$ constant and keep the feedback on so that $I$ is also constant. We then scan the surface in the $x$ and $y$ directions and measure $d^2I/dV^2$ as a function of $(x,y)$. A plot of $d^2I/dV^2$ as a function of $(x,y)$ is called a $d^2I/dV^2$ map. Normally we choose $V$ so that $e_cV$ is the energy where strong inelastic tunneling occurs. In this case, a $d^2I/dV^2$ map plots the strength of the inelastic signal as a function of position.

For the case of a molecular vibrational mode, the $dI/dV$ signal will again change suddenly at $V = \pm \hbar \omega/e_c$ due to the vibrational mode. The spatial dependence of the change in $dI/dV$ at this voltage is [58]

$$\Delta \left. \frac{dI}{dV} \right|_{E_cV=\hbar \omega} (\vec{r}) = \left| \sum_i \left( \frac{d\psi_{EF}}{dQ_i} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} \right|^2$$

(2.11)

where $Q_i$ has the same meaning as in (2.10).
When the atoms in the molecule oscillate due to a vibrational mode, the wavefunctions will change slightly since the positions of the atoms are changing. Equation (2.11) means that the position with the largest $d^2I/dV^2$ signal is the position where the molecular wavefunctions near $E_F$ change the most due to the vibration.
Corrections to the STM Theory

The theory presented in chapter 2 is the basic theory of the scanning tunneling microscope, and has been successfully used to explain qualitatively and quantitatively the STM data of many samples, such as metal surfaces. Although it may be sufficient from a theoretical viewpoint, for experiments the basic theory has approximations that do not always exist in the real world. As a result, there are corrections to the theory that are important for anyone interpreting STM data to know. This chapter will describe corrections to the basic STM theory that are important to correctly interpret the experimental data presented in this dissertation. The following is a list of corrections; each will be explained in more detail in the next sections:

1. The basic theory assumes $T = 0$ K which is not true in experiments. The effect of non-zero temperatures will be to broaden features in spectroscopy.

2. The tunneling matrix elements were derived assuming spherically symmetric wavefunctions on the tip, which is not always true. Atomic resolution cannot be explained with spherically symmetric tip wavefunctions.

3. The tunneling matrix elements are not constant, which was assumed earlier. They are a function of the voltage applied to the tip. This causes a non-constant tip DOS (usually the tip DOS is assumed constant) to become noticeable at negative sample biases. It also leads to negative differential resistance, which is most prominent when the sample has localized states, such as a molecule on an insulating surface.

4. Whenever electrons tunnel from tip to sample or sample to tip, we are either adding an electron or removing an electron from a sample which contains many electrons. This means that we need to take into account many-body effects, such as electron-electron interactions, which were not taken into account in chapter 2. In a metal, the electron-electron interactions are usually screened, so we do not have to consider them. This is not the case in a single molecule.
3.1 Thermal broadening

3.1.1 Elastic tunneling

Instead of $T = 0 \text{K}$ assumed before, consider elastic tunneling when $T \neq 0 \text{K}$. From (2.3), if the tunneling matrix elements are constant, we see that the sample DOS is convoluted with the derivative of the Fermi-Dirac distribution:

$$\frac{dI}{dV} \propto \int \rho_s(E) B_{T1}(E - e_c V) dE \equiv \rho_s \ast B_{T1} \quad \text{with} \quad B_{T1} = -\frac{df(E)}{dE}.$$ 

Since $-f'(E) = -df/dE$ is a peak with a maximum value of $1/4k_B T$ at $E = \mu$ and a FWHM given by $2k_B T \ln(3 + 2\sqrt{2}) \approx 3.5k_B T$, the effect of non-zero temperatures is to convolute the DOS with this peak. Effectively, this means that peaks in the STM-measured DOS will be broader than peaks in the true DOS by about $3.5k_B T$, an effect called thermal broadening.

It is sometimes possible to remove the effect of this broadening to recover $\rho_s$. Since $dI/dV$ is a convolution between $\rho_s$ and $-f'(E)$, we may deconvolute $dI/dV$ from $-f'(E)$ using the convolution theorem to get back $\rho_s$. Let $\text{FT}[g(E)](y) \equiv \text{FT}[g(E)]$ denote the Fourier transform as a function of $y$ of the function $g(E)$. Then $\text{FT}[dI/dV] \propto \text{FT}[\rho_s \ast -f'] = \text{FT}[\rho_s] \text{FT}[-f']$. Since we know the temperature and $\mu = 0$, we may then calculate $\text{FT}[-f']$ and divide this part out, yielding

$$\rho_s \propto \text{FT}^{-1} \left[ \frac{\text{FT}[dI/dV]}{\text{FT}[-f']} \right],$$

where $\text{FT}^{-1}$ represents the inverse Fourier transform. However, numerically this procedure does not always work since $\text{FT}[-f'](y)$ is almost 0 for large values of $y$. We are then dividing by a function which is almost 0 and the result tends towards $\infty$. Ideally, the numerator $\text{FT}[dI/dV]$ would also go to 0 whenever $\text{FT}[-f']$ does, but this is not the case due to noise or other experimental errors.

However, if one knows that $\rho_s$ should be the function $h(E)$, one may get around this problem. In this case, what is normally done is to convolute $h(E)$ with $-f'$, then fit this curve to $dI/dV$; i.e., we fit $h \ast -f'$ to $dI/dV$. The best fit then yields parameters which tell us the function $h(E) = \rho_s$.

3.1.2 Inelastic tunneling

For inelastic tunneling, the thermal broadening of $d^2I/dV^2$ is a little different [109]. In this case, the measured second derivative is related to the true (unbroadened) second derivative...
by the convolution

\[
\left[ \frac{d^2I(V)}{dV^2} \right]_{\text{measured}} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{d^2I(V - E)}{dV^2} \right]_{\text{true}} B_{T2}(E) \, dE = \left[ \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \right]_{\text{true}} \ast B_{T2}
\]

where \( B_{T2}(E) = \frac{1}{k_B T} e^{x} \left( x - 2 \right) e^{x} + x + 2 \) with \( x = \frac{E}{k_B T} \).

Since we have a convolution between two functions, in principle one may use the same methods for elastic tunneling to remove the effect of thermal broadening.

### 3.2 Non-spherical tip states and atomic resolution

In general, the wavefunction of the atoms at the end of the STM tip is what should matter the most. Usually W or PtIr tips are used in STM and these are transition metals with \( d \) orbitals. These \( d \) orbitals are more localized than the valence \( s \) orbitals, so as long as the tip-sample distance is large enough (\( \gtrsim 4 \text{ Å} \), which is true for almost all experiments in this dissertation), the spherically symmetric tip wavefunctions assumed in chapter 2 is a good approximation.

However, spherically symmetric tip states may not be true for transition metal tips when the tip-sample separation is \( \sim 4 \text{ Å} \), as tunneling into the \( d \) orbital may be important in this regime. Furthermore, theory predicts that one cannot get atomic resolution in STM images from spherically symmetric tip states (§1.3, 6.3, chapter 7 in [29]). This is consistent with the experimental observation that atomic resolution is easiest to achieve when molecules with non-spherically symmetric states, such as CO, are on the tip.

To address this issue, the effect of other orbitals have been included (chapter 3 in [29]) to improve on the spherical-tip approximation, as well as tip-sample interactions (chapter 7 in [29]). These corrections give a better approximation to the tunneling matrix elements, especially at close (\( \sim 4 \text{ Å} \)) tip-sample separations. Atomic resolution, as well as other effects, such as the inversion of topography images (bumps appear as dips and dips appear as bumps) can be explained by including non-spherically symmetric tip states and tip-sample interactions.

### 3.3 Tunneling matrix elements

#### 3.3.1 Negative differential resistance

The tunneling matrix elements can also be affected by the voltage that is applied to the STM tip. A simple one dimensional model based on the WKB approximation can be used to estimate the magnitude of this effect [59]. Qualitatively, as we increase the STM sample voltage, the effective tunneling barrier that the electrons see increases; hence, it is possible to see the tunneling current decrease when the STM sample voltage is increasing. For
voltages where \( I(V) \) decreases as \( V \) increases, \( dI/dV < 0 \), so the differential conductance is negative. A negative \( dI/dV \) is known as negative differential resistance (NDR) \([59]\) (or negative differential conductance). The lower panel in figure 3.2 shows a simulated \( dI/dV \) spectrum with NDR around \( V \sim 1.5 \text{ V} \) and \( V \sim 3.1 \text{ V} \). The details of the simulation are discussed next.

### 3.3.2 Enhancement of tip states at negative bias

Figure 3.1 shows an energy diagram for tunneling when the sample bias \( V \) is negative and positive. From figure 3.1a, we see that the electrons on the tip with lower energy will see a larger tunneling barrier, and hence, will have a smaller probability of tunneling (the length of the blue arrows in the diagram represents the relative probability of tunneling). So at positive sample bias, the tunneling current (and also \( dI/dV \)) will be dominated by tunneling into the empty states of the sample with energy \( E_F + e_c V \). Similarly, in figure 3.1b, at negative sample bias, the tunneling current (and \( dI/dV \)) will be dominated by DOS of the tip at energy \( E_F + e_c V \). Therefore, if the DOS of the tip is not constant, it will have a large impact on the \( dI/dV \) at negative sample bias.

This qualitative result can be quantified for a one dimensional system. Starting from equation (2.2), we use the Tersoff-Hamann approximation to Bardeen’s matrix elements (§2.1.2), so that

\[
\left| \langle \psi_{s,n} | H' | \psi_t \rangle \right|^2 \propto \left| \psi_{s,n}(\vec{r}_0) \right|^2.
\]

We then use the WKB approximation to calculate \( |\psi_{s,n}|^2 \) in the vacuum region, assuming the energy barrier is a trapezoid (as in figure 3.1)

\[
|\psi_{s,n}|^2 \approx \exp \left( -2\kappa \int_0^L \sqrt{\phi - E + e_c V x} dx \right)
\]

where \( \kappa = \sqrt{2m_e/\hbar^2} \), \( \phi \) is the work function, and \( L \) is the length of the vacuum region. In this approximation, the tunneling matrix elements depend only on the energy, hence, they may be taken out of the sum in (2.2). Everything else except for \( \rho_{s,n} \) may be taken out of the sum as well, so the summation can be performed using \( \sum_n \rho_{s,n} = \rho_s \). We further take \( T = 0 \text{ K} \) so that the Fermi functions become step functions. The tunneling current becomes (with \( E_F = 0 \))

\[
I(V) \sim \int_0^{e_c V} \exp \left( -2\kappa \int_0^L \sqrt{\phi - E + e_c V x/L} dx \right) \rho_s(E) \rho_t(E - e_c V) dE.
\]

After plugging in the reasonable values \( \phi = 5 \text{ eV} \) and \( L = 5 \text{ Å} \), \( dI/dV \) may be calculated numerically from this expression for a given \( \rho_s \) and \( \rho_t \).

Figure 3.2 shows the results of a numerical simulation using (3.1). The top panel shows the DOS for the tip and sample that was used to calculate the \( dI/dV \) curve shown in the bottom panel. There are a few important features to note in the simulated \( dI/dV \).
Figure 3.1: Enhancement of tip DOS at negative sample bias. The blue shaded areas under the tip and sample DOS curves represent states which are occupied by electrons. (a) Tunneling at positive sample bias is dominated by tunneling into empty sample states. (b) Tunneling at negative sample bias is dominated by tunneling into empty tip states. The length of the blue arrows represent the relative size of the tunneling probability. Electrons with higher energy have a higher probability of tunneling (since they see a smaller tunneling barrier) and contribute the most to the tunneling current.

1. The $dI/dV$ curve has NDR around $V = 1.5\,\text{V}$ and $V = 3.1\,\text{V}$.

2. Although the sample DOS has peaks with the sample amplitude, the corresponding peaks in $dI/dV$ are not the same amplitude. The peak amplitudes at positive sample bias are larger than those at negative sample bias.

3. The tip DOS is not constant, and this affects the $dI/dV$ curve the most at negative sample biases, which was explained qualitatively earlier.

### 3.4 Many-body corrections

When an electron tunnels from the STM tip into the sample, it can interact with other particles in the sample, for example, phonons, plasmons, or other electrons. These extra interactions which arise from the added electron will modify the DOS of the sample, so the STM actually measures this modified DOS, and not the DOS $\rho_s(E)$ in §2, which does not include many-body interactions. So, to describe what STM measures, we need to describe
Figure 3.2: The lower panel shows the simulated $dI/dV$ spectrum obtained by using the tip and sample DOS shown in the upper panel. Although the sample DOS has periodic peaks of the same amplitude, the amplitude of the corresponding peaks in the simulated $dI/dV$ changes drastically. Also, the tip DOS has a substantial impact on the simulated $dI/dV$ when $V < 0$. NDR occurs when the sample bias is around $V \sim 1.5$ V and $V \sim 3.1$ V.

how these many-body interactions affect the DOS. In general, to take into account many body interactions, we may replace the tip and sample DOS in chapter 2 with tip and sample spectral functions [5]. This is not always so simple since the spectral functions (§4.1.2) for the tip and sample are not always known. Luckily, there still are simple models to help describe many-body effects in terms of quasiparticles, and these will be discussed next.

### 3.4.1 Quasiparticles

It is usually difficult to consider how interactions with other particles affects the electron DOS; it is easier to calculate the DOS for a system of non-interacting particles. So, normally the combined system of electron added by STM + other particles the electron interacts with is treated as a single particle called a *quasiparticle*, and if these electron quasiparticles are defined cleverly, they can be treated as a non-interacting (or at least weakly interacting) system of particles. When the quasiparticles are weakly interacting instead of non-interacting,
we can apply perturbation theory to correct for the weak interactions. Since the quasiparticles already include many-body interactions, their energy levels are the energy levels of the electron including many-body interactions. Thus, to describe STM measurements, we need to find the quasiparticle density of states. This is normally a difficult theoretical problem which require techniques such as Green’s functions (§4.1.2), but sometimes simple models can be used, such as the one that will be given in §3.4.2.

A common example of a quasiparticle in condensed matter physics is the particle which consists of an electron + the lattice the electron is in. The interactions between the electron and lattice are complicated, but this complex system can be treated as a new particle with charge $-e_c$ and mass $m^*$, the effective mass of the electron. These quasiparticles are then treated as almost non-interacting particles, and most electronic properties of the system are calculated in terms of these non-interacting quasiparticles.

### 3.4.2 Electron-electron interactions

The main many-body effect to consider for the experiments presented in this dissertation is the electron-electron interaction. This effect is significant in molecules such as C$_{60}$ [130]. This section will describe how to define the effect of electron-electron interactions in single molecules as quasiparticles and what the density of quasiparticle states is. We will find that the quasiparticle DOS, which is the STM measured DOS, will have an energetic separation between HOMO and LUMO which is larger than the HOMO-LUMO energetic separation in the non-interacting electron DOS. This will be the main difference between the quasiparticle DOS and the non-interacting electron DOS.

**Quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap**

Suppose that a molecule contains $N$ electrons. The $i^{\text{th}}$ electron on the molecule will repel the $j^{\text{th}}$ electron; call the electrostatic energy of these two electrons $U_{ij} \geq 0$. We define average electron-electron repulsion energy, called the charging energy or on-site Coulomb interaction, as $U = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{i>j} U_{ij}$, where $P = 1 + 2 + \cdots + N - 1 = N(N - 1)/2$ is the number of distinct electron-electron pairs. Let $\epsilon_i$ represent the energy levels of the molecule without electron-electron interactions, then the total electronic energy of the molecule including electron-electron interactions is

$$E_N = \frac{N(N - 1)}{2} U + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \epsilon_i .$$

(3.2)

In STM, electrons are either tunneling from the tip to the molecule or from molecule to tip. First consider an electron tunneling from the tip to an unoccupied state of the molecule, the LUMO$+n$ (the $(n + 1)^{\text{th}}$ lowest unoccupied orbital). The LUMO$+n$ is now occupied by
an electron, so the total electronic energy of molecule is

\[ E_{N+1}^{\text{LUMO}+n} = \frac{(N+1)N}{2} U + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \epsilon_i + \epsilon_{N+n+1} = E_N + NU + \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+n}. \]

where \( \epsilon_{N+n+1} = \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+n} \). We assumed that both \( \epsilon_i \) and \( U \) do not change much from the addition of one electron.

We now define the electron quasiparticle as the added electron plus all other electrons it interacts with. The energy of this quasiparticle will be the energy of the added electron which includes the electron-electron interactions, and will be the energy we actually measure in STM. We now need to define the quasiparticle’s energy. To understand how to define it, consider first a simpler system. For any system of non-interacting electrons, if we calculate the total electronic energy of the system after adding an electron and subtract this from the neutral system’s ground state energy, we get the energy of the state the electron was added to. Using this as a guide, we define the energy of the quasiparticle’s LUMO+\( n \) as

\[ EQP_{\text{LUMO}+n} = E_{N+1}^{\text{LUMO}+n} - E_N = NU + \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+n}. \]

This expression makes sense since when we add an electron to the molecule, the other \( N \) electrons already on the molecule will repel it. The repulsion from each electron on the molecule adds an energy \( U \). Hence, the actual energy that we measure for the LUMO+\( n \), the energy of the quasiparticle’s LUMO+\( n \), is increased from \( \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+n} \) by \( NU \).

Now consider the case when an electron tunnels from an occupied molecular state, the HOMO−\( m \) (the \( (m+1) \)th highest molecular orbital), to the tip. The HOMO−\( m \) now has an electron missing, so the total electronic energy of the molecule is

\[ E_{N-1}^{\text{HOMO}−m} = \frac{(N-1)(N-2)}{2} U + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{N-m} = E_N - (N-1)U - \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}−m} \]

with \( \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}−m} = \epsilon_{N-m} \). Again, if we consider any system of non-interacting electrons, the energy of the HOMO−\( m \) is the energy of the neutral system minus the energy of the system after an electron has been removed from the HOMO−\( m \). So we will define the energy of the quasiparticle’s HOMO−\( m \) as

\[ EQP_{\text{HOMO}−m} = E_N - E_{N-1}^{\text{HOMO}−m} = (N-1)U + \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}−m}. \]

Again, this makes sense since the electron in the HOMO−\( m \) is repelled by \( N-1 \) other electrons, each increasing \( \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}−m} \) by \( U \).

The difference in energy between the quasiparticle’s LUMO and HOMO (called the quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap) is then

\[ EQP_{\text{gap}} = EQP_{\text{LUMO}} - EQP_{\text{HOMO}} = \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}} - \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}} + U. \]
We see that the effect of the electron-electron interactions is to increase the energy separation between HOMO and LUMO by the charging energy $U$ \cite{130}.

If we now calculate the difference in energy between any two unoccupied states, we get

$$E_{QP_{\text{LUMO}+i}} - E_{QP_{\text{LUMO}+j}} = \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+i} - \epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+j}.$$  

So the energetic separation between unoccupied states is the same whether we include electron-electron interactions or not. Similarly, the energetic separation between any two occupied states is independent of whether we include electron-electron interactions or not. So the main effect of electron-electron interactions using this simple model is to increase the non-interacting electron’s HOMO-LUMO gap by $U$. This quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap is what we then expect to measure in STM experiments.

**Experimentally determining the quasiparticle gap**

It is possible to experimentally extract the value of $E_{QP_{\text{gap}}}$ using two commonly measured experimental quantities, the ionization energy and electron affinity. The ionization energy is the minimum energy necessary to remove an electron from the neutral molecule; i.e., it is the difference in energy between the molecule with one electron removed from the HOMO and the neutral molecule with $N$ electrons

$$IE = E_{N-1}^{\text{HOMO}} - E_N = -E_{QP_{\text{HOMO}}}.$$  

We have defined the potential energy of the electron removed from the HOMO to be zero when the electron is infinitely far away from the molecule.

The electron affinity is the ionization energy of a singly negatively charged molecule. A singly negatively charged molecule has an extra electron in the LUMO, so the minimum energy necessary to remove an electron from the negatively charge molecule is the energy necessary to remove the electron from the LUMO. This is the difference in energy between the molecule with $N$ electrons and the molecule with an extra electron in the LUMO

$$EA = E_N - E_{N+1}^{\text{LUMO}} = -E_{QP_{\text{LUMO}}}.$$  

The quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap can then be written as

$$E_{QP_{\text{gap}}} = IE - EA. \quad (3.4)$$  

So the ionization energy and electron affinity gives us an idea of how large we can expect the STM measured gap $E_{QP_{\text{gap}}}$ to be. The only problem with using (3.4) is that $IE$ and $EA$ are normally measured for molecules in gas phase while in STM, we normally have molecules on a conducting surface. On a conducting surface, $U$ is smaller since electrons on a molecule form image charges in the metal, and these positive image charges tend to attract the electrons on the molecule together \cite{151}. This tends to cancel the electron-electron repulsion, effectively reducing $U$. 
4 Theoretical Background for Molecular Nanostructures

The purpose of this chapter is to both introduce the necessary theory to understand this dissertation and to introduce important theoretical concepts and notation frequently encountered in publications in this field.

4.1 LDOS, PDOS, and DOS

One of the important quantities to understand in STM is the local density of states (LDOS) since the STM directly measures it (chapter 2). However, different people will define the LDOS in different ways, so a particular definition of LDOS in one publication may not be exactly what an STM measures (e.g., the definition in §18.33 in [138]). This may be especially confusing to those who are new to this field. To remove any potential confusion, in this dissertation, the LDOS will be defined below so that it is always what the STM measures. Another quantity called the projected density of states (PDOS) will be defined, and all other definitions of LDOS seen in publications can be stated in terms of a PDOS. The exact definitions of LDOS and PDOS, as well as how they are related to each other, will be given in this section.

Furthermore, many theoretical results in many-body physics are stated in terms of Green’s and spectral functions, and to compare these theoretical results to STM data, one must understand how they are related to the LDOS and PDOS. For this reason, Green’s and spectral functions will be introduced, and it will be shown how they are related to the LDOS and PDOS.

4.1.1 Definitions

The LDOS of a system with Hamiltonian $H$ and eigenstates $\psi_n(\vec{r})$ at position $\vec{r}$ and energy $E$ is defined as

$$\text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E) \equiv \sum_n |\psi_n(\vec{r})|^2 \delta(E - E_n)$$

(4.1)
where the sum is taken over all eigenstates (although only the terms with $E_n = E$ actually contribute to the sum). The LDOS of a system at energy $E$ and position $\vec{r}$ can be thought of as the value of the sum of the squares of all the system’s wavefunctions with energy $E$ at position $\vec{r}$.

The LDOS is related to the DOS, which can be seen if we integrate the LDOS over all space

$$\int_{\text{all space}} \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E) \, dV = \sum_n \int_{\text{all space}} |\psi_n(\vec{r})|^2 \delta(E - E_n) \, dV$$

$$= \sum_n \delta(E - E_n)$$

$$\equiv \text{DOS}(E).$$

So the LDOS integrated over all space is just the DOS for that system.

The PDOS is closely related to the LDOS. The PDOS for a system with eigenstates $|n\rangle$ projected onto the state $|\Phi\rangle$ at energy $E$ is defined as

$$\text{PDOS}(|\Phi\rangle, E) \equiv \sum_n |\langle \Phi | n \rangle|^2 \delta(E - E_n)$$

The PDOS of a system at energy $E$ projected onto state $|\Phi\rangle$ represents roughly the amount of the system’s wavefunctions at energy $E$ contained in the state $|\Phi\rangle$. We can also think of a PDOS at energy $E$ roughly as LDOS($\vec{r}$, $E$) integrated over the region of space taken up by the wavefunction $\Phi(\vec{r}) = \langle \vec{r} | \Phi \rangle$, but this is only a rough way of thinking of the PDOS, and is not always true.

To see how the PDOS and LDOS are related, let $|\vec{r}\rangle$ denote an eigenstate of the position operator, then

$$\text{PDOS}(|\vec{r}\rangle, E) = \sum_n |\langle \vec{r} | n \rangle|^2 \delta(E - E_n)$$

$$= \sum_n |\psi_n(\vec{r})|^2 \delta(E - E_n)$$

$$= \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E)$$

where $\psi_n(\vec{r}) = \langle \vec{r} | n \rangle$ is the position space representation of the wavefunction. So we see that the LDOS is just a special case of the PDOS.

### 4.1.2 Green’s and spectral functions

The Green’s function and spectral functions will be introduced briefly in this section, and in the next section, it will be shown how they are related to the LDOS and PDOS.

One of the systematic and powerful ways of solving many-body problems is to use Green’s
functions. Once we know the Green’s function for a system, we can calculate various properties of that system, such as the DOS. The problem of calculating various properties of a system can then be boiled down to one problem: find the Green’s function for that system.

The Green’s function may be obtained from the Green’s operator. In general, the Green’s operator for a linear differential operator \( \hat{D}(t) \), which contains derivatives with respect to the variable \( t \), is the operator \( \hat{G}(t) \) which satisfies
\[
\hat{D}(t)\hat{G}(t) = \delta(t) .
\]

Since the Schrödinger equation \( \hat{H}\psi = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi \) can be rewritten as
\[
\hat{D}_S(t)\psi = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{D}_S(t) = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \hat{H} ,
\]
\( \hat{D}_S(t) \) is an important differential operator for quantum mechanics and condensed matter physics. The Green’s operator in condensed matter physics is then defined as the Green’s operator for the linear differential operator \( \hat{D}_S(t) \); this means that \( \hat{G}(t) \) satisfies
\[
\hat{D}_S(t)\hat{G}(t) = \left(i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \hat{H}\right)\hat{G}(t) = \delta(t) . \tag{4.2}
\]

At this point, the usage of \( \hat{D}_S \) to construct the Green’s operator seems somewhat arbitrary. We may have used other differential operators to define the Green’s operator, such as the kinetic energy operator, but in the next section, we will see that using \( \hat{D}_S \) to define the Green’s operator will allow us to calculate many quantities from it.

We may now explicitly construct \( \hat{G}(t) \) for a time independent Hamiltonian. Since the time evolution operator \( \hat{U}(t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \) satisfies \( \hat{D}_S(t)\hat{U}(t) = 0 \) (equation 2.1.25 in [174]), \( \hat{U}(t) \) almost satisfies (4.2); it only does not satisfy the equation when \( t = 0 \). To satisfy (4.2) at \( t = 0 \), note that the derivative of a step function \( \theta(t) \) (defined below) is \( \delta(t) \), so we may construct the Green’s operator from \( \theta(t) \) and \( \hat{U}(t) \). If we let \( \hat{G}(t) = \frac{1}{i\hbar}\theta(t)\hat{U}(t) \), then a quick calculation shows \( \hat{D}_S(t)\hat{G}(t) = \hat{U}(t)\delta(t) = \hat{U}(0)\delta(t) = \delta(t) \), so that \( \hat{G}(t) \) satisfies (4.2).

Finally, the Green’s operator for a time independent Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) is (§7.11 in [174])
\[
\hat{G}(t) = \frac{1}{i\hbar}\theta(t)e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \quad \text{with} \quad \theta(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x > 1 \\ 0 & \text{for } x \leq 0 \end{cases} .
\]

\( \hat{G}(t) \) defined in this way is called a \textit{retarded Green’s operator}. We see that the Green’s operator for a system is essentially the time evolution operator for that system.

The Green’s operator contains all the information about how a system evolves over time. However, we normally want information related to the energy of the system. To extract information about the energy of a system from the Green’s operator, it is more convenient to convert \( \hat{G}(t) \) to an operator that depends on energy. As a function of energy,
the Green’s operator is defined as the Fourier transform of $\hat{G}(t)$:

$$\hat{G}(E) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(E+\alpha)t/\hbar} \hat{G}(t) dt = \frac{1}{i\hbar} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{i(E+i\alpha-\hat{H})t/\hbar} dt = \frac{1}{E + i\alpha - \hat{H}}.$$  

The small imaginary part $i\alpha$ was added to the exponential in the integral in order for the integral to converge. In the end, we will take $\alpha \to 0$.

Often, we must deal with many-body systems. For these systems, it is convenient to express the many-body Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ as

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{SP} + \hat{\Sigma}$$

where $\hat{H}_{SP}$ is a single particle Hamiltonian and $\hat{\Sigma}$ takes into account the interactions of a single particle with all the other particles in the system. The term $\hat{\Sigma}$ is usually complex and is called the *self-energy* since it takes into account the contributions to the total energy of a system due to one part of a system interacting with another part of the same system.

With this notation, the Green’s operator becomes

$$\hat{G}(E) = \frac{1}{E + i\alpha - \hat{H}_{SP} - \hat{\Sigma}}.$$  

The Green’s function can finally be defined as the function which is the expectation of the operator $\hat{G}(E)$ in the state $|n\rangle$

$$G(n, E) = \langle n | \hat{G}(E) | n \rangle .$$

This is the form of the Green’s function that is often used, such as in [133]. However, sometimes the Green’s operator $\hat{G}(t)$ is called the Green’s function, even though it is an operator. This convention appears in [138].

It will be convenient later to represent the Green’s operator in another form. If the states $|n\rangle$ with energy $E_n$ denote the eigenvalues of the total (many-body) Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$, then $\hat{G}(E)$ can be expressed using the identity operator $\hat{I} = \sum_n |n\rangle\langle n|$ as

$$\hat{G}(E) = \hat{G}(E)\hat{I} = \sum_n \frac{|n\rangle\langle n|}{E + i\alpha - E_n} . \quad (4.3)$$

Another important operator which appears frequently in theoretical calculations is the electron spectral operator $\hat{A}(E)$. This operator is proportional to the imaginary part of $\hat{G}(E)$ (§3.3 in [133])

$$\hat{A}(E) = -2 \text{Im} \{ \hat{G}(E) \} . \quad (4.4)$$

The spectral function is then the imaginary part of the Green’s function.

From the spectral operator or function, many measurable properties of a system can be calculated. For example, two important quantities for STM, the local density of states
(LDOS) and projected density of states (PDOS), can be obtained from the spectral operator.

### 4.1.3 LDOS and PDOS in terms of spectral functions

In this section, we will show how two important quantities, the LDOS and PDOS can be derived from the Green’s and spectral operators and functions. We first write the LDOS in terms of the spectral operator. Using (4.3) and (4.4), the spectral operator can be written as

\[ \hat{A}(E) = 2 \sum_n \frac{\alpha}{(E - E_n)^2 + \alpha^2} |n\rangle\langle n| \]

Since the coefficient of $|n\rangle\langle n|$ in the sum is just a Lorentzian, as $\alpha \to 0$, the Lorentzian tends to $\pi \delta(E - E_n)$. If we now calculate $\langle \vec{r} | \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \hat{A}(E) | \vec{r} \rangle$ we get

\[ \langle \vec{r} | \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \hat{A}(E) | \vec{r} \rangle = 2 \sum_n \langle \vec{r} | n \rangle \langle n | \vec{r} \rangle \pi \delta(E - E_n) \]
\[ = 2\pi \sum_n |\psi_n(\vec{r})|^2 \delta(E - E_n) \]
\[ = 2\pi \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E) \]

where $\psi_n(\vec{r}) = \langle \vec{r} | n \rangle$ denotes the representation of state $|n\rangle$ in position space. This implies

\[ \text{LDOS}(\vec{r}, E) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle \vec{r} | \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \hat{A}(E) | \vec{r} \rangle \]

Section 2.1 shows that the STM measures the LDOS of a system, hence the STM essentially measures the spectral function in position space.

The PDOS is obtained from the spectral function in a similar way to the LDOS; the difference is that we use an arbitrary state $|\Phi\rangle$ instead of the position eigenstate $|\vec{r}\rangle$. Following a derivation similar to the derivation for LDOS, the PDOS can be written as

\[ \text{PDOS}(|\Phi\rangle, E) \equiv \sum_n |\langle \Phi | n \rangle|^2 \delta(E - E_n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle \Phi | \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \hat{A}(E) | \Phi \rangle \]

Hence, as $\alpha \to 0$, the PDOS is proportional to the spectral function $A(\Phi, E) = \langle \Phi | \hat{A}(E) | \Phi \rangle$.

### 4.2 Tight Binding

Since the wavefunctions in a solid arise from hybridization between atomic orbitals, one would think that there is a way of deriving, or at least approximating, the wavefunctions of a solid in terms of localized atomic orbitals. We would especially expect this when the atomic orbitals on neighboring atoms do not overlap much, resulting in little hybridization between atomic orbitals. In this regime, the wavefunctions for the solid should be similar.
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to the atomic wavefunctions, and we may be able to write the solids’ wavefunctions simply
as linear combinations of atomic wavefunctions. This leads to the main idea behind what
is called tight binding: little overlap between neighboring atoms’ wavefunctions in a solid
leads to wavefunctions for the solid which can be expressed as linear combinations of the
atomic orbitals. This section will describe how this idea can be put into a more precise
mathematical form. The presentation here will be different from the presentation of tight
binding given in §8.4 in [138] and chapter 10 in [7], but the concepts will be the same.

To develop tight binding, start with a solid with \( N \) atoms located at positions \( \vec{R}_n \). Then
we may write the Hamiltonian for a single electron in this system as

\[
\hat{H} = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i)
\]

where \( U(\vec{r}) = -Ze^2/r \) is the coulomb potential for an atom with nuclear charge \( Z \). Now
suppose each atom in the solid has one atomic state \( |i\rangle \) which satisfies \( \left( \frac{p^2}{2m} + U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_i) \right)|i\rangle = E_0|i\rangle \). Then assume that the set of all atomic orbitals \( \{|i\rangle\} \) forms an orthonormal basis for
the wavefunctions of the solid. This is not necessarily true, but is a reasonable approximation
if the atomic orbitals of neighboring atoms do not overlap much, in which case we would
expect weak interaction between the neighboring atoms, and the wavefunctions for the solid
should be similar to the atomic wavefunctions. With this assumption, we can calculate the
matrix elements of the Hamiltonian using the \( \{|i\rangle\} \) basis

\[
H_{ij} = \langle i | \left( \frac{p^2}{2m} + U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_j) \right) | j \rangle + \langle i | \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n) | j \rangle
= E_0 \langle i | j \rangle + \langle i | \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n) | j \rangle
= E_0 \delta_{ij} + \langle i | \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n) | j \rangle
\]

where \( \delta_{ij} \) is the Kronecker delta. The matrix \( H \) can be written simply as

\[
H = E_0 I + t \quad \text{with} \quad t_{ij} = \langle i | \Delta U | j \rangle, \quad \Delta U = \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n)
\]

where \( I \) is the identity matrix. This is the tight binding Hamiltonian. From this matrix ex-
pression for \( H \), we may then calculate the eigenvalues and eigenvectors for the Hamiltonian.
Since the first term \( E_0 I \) is a diagonal matrix, the eigenvalues \( E_n \) of \( H \) can be written as

\[
E_n = E_0 + E_n^t
\]

where \( E_n^t \) is the \( n \)th eigenvalue of \( t \). Hence, the eigenvalues of \( H \) can be found from the
eigenvalues of the matrix \( t \), and we may think of the eigenvalues of \( t \) as being corrections
to the atomic energy $E_0$ due to the presence of all the atoms. The matrix element $t_{ij}$ when $i \neq j$ is also called the hopping integral while the matrix element $t_{ii}$ is called the on-site energy. The reason for this terminology will be more apparent when the Hamiltonian is written in second quantized notation. The way one calculates the value of $t_{ij}$ will be given in §4.2.4.

If pairs of atomic eigenstates $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ contain significant overlap (i.e., $\langle i|j\rangle \neq 0$), then the set of eigenstates $\{|i\rangle\}$ is not truly orthogonal. Although we assumed an orthogonal basis when deriving tight binding, this does not matter to first order, as discussed in appendix B of [71].

### 4.2.1 Tight binding of $H_2$

Although most textbooks apply tight binding to a periodic lattice, it may also be applied to any system, even single molecules. As an example, consider the hydrogen molecule $H_2$. We will take the $1s$ orbitals as the basis. If we assume that the hopping matrix element between the $1s$ orbitals on different atoms is $t_{12} = t_{21} = t_s$ while the on-site energy is $t_{11} = t_{22} = \epsilon$, then the Hamiltonian matrix is

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} E_{1s} & 0 \\ 0 & E_{1s} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & t_s \\ t_s & \epsilon \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E_{1s} + \epsilon & t_s \\ t_s & E_{1s} + \epsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

which has eigenvalues

$$E = E_{1s} + \epsilon \pm t_s$$

with eigenvectors

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|s, 1\rangle \pm |s, 2\rangle)$$

where $|s, 1\rangle$ represents the $1s$ orbital on H atom 1 and $|s, 2\rangle$ is the $1s$ orbital on H atom 2. We see that the energy levels of $H_2$ are offset from the energy of the $1s$ orbitals by the amounts $\epsilon \pm t_s$. Since $t_s$ is normally negative, tight binding predicts that the ground state wavefunction of $H_2$ is the bonding orbital $\langle |s, 1\rangle + |s, 2\rangle \rangle / \sqrt{2}$ with energy $E_0 = E_{1s} + \epsilon + t$ while the anti-bonding orbital $\langle |s, 1\rangle - |s, 2\rangle \rangle / \sqrt{2}$ is higher than the energy of the bonding orbital by $2t_s$; hence we see in this case that the hopping integral is also a measure of the energetic splitting between orbitals.

### 4.2.2 Tight binding in second quantization

Any function or operator $V$ which acts on single particles can be represented in second quantized notation ($\S2.1$ in [184] has a thorough introduction to second quantization) as

$$V = \sum_{i,j} \langle i|V|j\rangle \langle j|\langle i\rangle = \sum_{i,j} \langle i|V|j\rangle \langle j|\langle i\rangle = \sum_{i,j} \langle i|V|j\rangle c_i^\dagger c_j$$
where the operators $c_i^\dagger$ and $c_j$ create an electron in state $|i\rangle$ and destroy an electron in state $|j\rangle$ and the sum is taken over all possible values of $i$ and $j$. Applying this to (4.5) gives the tight binding Hamiltonian in second quantized notation

\[
\hat{H} = E_0 \sum_{i,\sigma} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,\sigma} + \sum_{i,j,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} \tag{4.9}
\]

where $c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ and $c_{i,\sigma}$ create and destroy an electron with spin $\sigma$ on atom $i$ and $t_{ij}$ is again the hopping integral. From this expression, we see that the Hamiltonian represents destroying an electron on atom $i$ and then creating one on atom $j$ with energy $t_{ij}$. Hence, the hopping integral can be thought of as the energy gain when electrons are allowed to hop from one atom to another in the solid. Delocalization of particles tends to reduce the kinetic energy of the particles, so when electrons hop between different atoms, the electrons become more delocalized, and that reduces the energy of the electrons. In addition, the potential energy of the electron is lowered by the attractive Coulomb potential of all the atoms in the solid. So combined, the kinetic and potential energies of the electron are lower in a solid than in an isolated atom.

There are various other approximations that can be made to the tight binding Hamiltonian (4.9). The differing approximations lead to the different forms of the tight binding Hamiltonian seen in the literature. A short list will given below of the various assumptions made to (4.9) that appear in the literature, as well as the resulting Hamiltonians.

1. The first term is usually ignored since it only shifts all energies by a constant $E_0$, and we normally do not care about uniform shifts to the energies. The Hamiltonian is then

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{i,j,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} . \tag{4.10}
\]

2. In addition to the previous assumption, the on-site energies, $t_{ii}$, are often the same value for all $i$; i.e., $t_{ii} = t_0$. To see why this may be true, consider a lattice with one atom per unit cell. From the definition of $t_{ij}$ in (4.5), we can interpret $t_{ii}$ as the shift in energy from first order perturbation theory of the atomic orbital energy on the $i^{th}$ atom due to the potential of all other atoms. However, due to translational symmetry, it cannot matter which atom we consider; the potential that atom 1 feels due to all other atoms is the same as the potential that atom 10 feels due to all other atoms. This means all matrix elements $t_{ii}$ are the same. When all diagonal elements of $t$ are the same, all eigenvalues $E_n^t$ of $t$ can be written as $E_n^t = t_0 + E_n^0$, where $E_n^0$ are the eigenvalues of $t$ with $t_{ii} = 0$. Hence, we may take $t_{ii} = t_0 = 0$ since any non-zero $t_0$ only shifts all eigenvalues by the constant $t_0$, and we usually do not care about constant shifts to the eigenvalues. The Hamiltonian in this case is

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{i\neq j,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} . \tag{4.11}
\]
3. In addition to the previous assumptions, since hopping of an electron between atoms that are a few lattice constants apart is unlikely, we normally restrict the sum to only include hopping between nearest neighbors. The resulting Hamiltonian is

\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{(i,j),\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}, \]  

(4.12)

where the notation \((i, j)\) means that atoms \(i\) and \(j\) are nearest neighbors.

4. In general, \(t_{ij} = t_{ji}^*\). However, the matrix elements \(t_{ij}\) are sometimes real, hence \(t_{ij} = t_{ji}\). Assuming \(t_{ij}\) is real and assuming all the previous assumptions, the Hamiltonian becomes

\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{(i,j),\sigma} t_{ij} [c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}], \]  

(4.13)

however the sum is taken over distinct nearest neighbors pairs; i.e., if \(i\) and \(j\) are nearest neighbors, then \((i, j)\) appears in the sum, but not \((j, i)\). The notation \((i, j)\) in this case is the same as the notation in (4.12), but the meanings are different. The two meanings are used interchangeably in the literature, so one must infer the meaning from the Hamiltonian.

5. Usually \(t_{ij} < 0\), so the Hamiltonian (4.13) is sometimes written

\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{(i,j),\sigma} -t_{ij} [c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}], \]  

(4.14)

where \(t_{ij}\) in this equation is defined as the negative of \(t_{ij}\) in the definition (4.5). The various forms of the Hamiltonian (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14) can be seen in the literature.

### 4.2.3 Tight binding and perturbation theory

In tight binding, we start with a large number of degenerate atomic orbitals and construct the \(t\) matrix using the degenerate atomic states, then calculate the eigenvalues of \(t\) to get the corrections to the atomic energies, as mentioned earlier (equation (4.6)). This reminds one of degenerate perturbation theory [57], where one has degenerate states and calculates the matrix elements of a perturbation using the degenerate states, then finds the eigenvalues of the resulting perturbation matrix, which gives the first order correction to the energies. In the case of tight binding, the perturbation for the \(j^{th}\) atom would be the potential \(U_j = \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n)\) from (4.5). However, this perturbation changes for each atom, so it is not clear how to write the Hamiltonian in the form \(H = H_0 + H'\) where \(H'\) is a single perturbation to the solvable Hamiltonian \(H_0\).

Since there is still a strong similarity between tight binding and degenerate perturbation theory, there may be some underlying reason for the similarity. The origin of the similarity
can be seen from the Hamiltonian in second quantized notation, equation (4.9). If we write the tight binding Hamiltonian as

\[
H = H_0 + H'
\]

\[
H_0 = E_0 \sum_{i,\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}
\]

\[
H' = \sum_{i,j,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}
\]

then, for a single electron in the system described by this Hamiltonian, we can calculate exactly the solutions of \(H_0\) (they are just the degenerate atomic states \(|\ell\rangle\)) and treat \(H'\) as a perturbation. From degenerate perturbation theory, we first calculate the matrix elements of \(H'\) using the degenerate states \(|\ell\rangle\); they are just \(t_{ij}\). Then we calculate the eigenvalues of the matrix \(t\) to get the first order energy corrections to the atomic energies \(E_0\). This shows that we may think of tight binding as the first order correction to the atomic energies to get the energies of a solid.

The relationship between tight binding and perturbation theory will be useful since we may then use perturbation theory to calculate higher order corrections to the energy. For example, for the case of non-degenerate orbitals, the second order correction to the atomic energies are

\[
\Delta E_2 = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{|t_{ij}|^2}{E_j - E_i}.
\]

(4.15)

In this case, when hopping is between orbitals of differing energies, the hopping is called virtual hopping.

### 4.2.4 Calculating the hopping integral

In the previous examples and equations, everything is written in terms of the hopping integral \(t_{ij}\) and there is no explicit calculation of this matrix element. This is because in tight binding, one does not calculate \(t_{ij}\) from first principles; i.e., one does not calculate \(\langle i | \sum_{n \neq j} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_n) | j \rangle\) from the atomic potential \(U(\vec{r})\). Instead, to calculate \(t\), one normally compares the tight binding expressions to experiment or another theoretical calculation and chooses a value for \(t\) so that the tight binding results agree numerically with these other methods.

For example, one can experimentally measure the difference in energy \(E_\Delta\) between the \(H_2\) bonding and anti-bonding orbitals. Since, according to tight binding (4.8), this energy difference must be \(2t_s\), we can calculate that \(t_s = E_\Delta/2\). Another common method for calculating \(t\) is to calculate a band structure using DFT (§4.5), and calculate the band structure for the same system using tight binding, then choose \(t\) so that the two band structures are numerically similar.

This procedure for finding \(t\) may seem unusual, since we need to know the energies of a
system from another calculation method or from experiment to calculate \( t \), but if we already have the energies for a system, then why do we need tight binding to calculate those same energies? The reason is, once we have calculated \( t \) for one system, we may then use this value for other systems. For example, once we know \( t \) for graphite, we may use the same value for carbon nanotubes or C\(_{60}\).

### 4.2.5 Basis functions

In tight binding, we normally assume that the matrix elements \( t_{ij} \) are non-zero only for nearest neighbors (e.g., in equation (4.12)). This assumption will be true as long as the basis functions we use to calculate \( t_{ij} \) are localized at atomic sites, so they do not necessarily have to be atomic orbitals. In the situation where the localized basis functions are taken as atomic orbitals, tight binding is also called linear combination of atomic orbitals (LCAO). Another possible localized basis is the set of Wannier functions since Wannier functions are often (but not always) localized at the atomic sites and form an orthonormal basis (§8.4 in [138]).

### 4.3 Mott-Hubbard insulators

The tight binding model is a simple model which can work well in many situations. However, for certain substances such as MnO, tight binding would predict it to be a conductor when it is in fact an insulator. Tight binding completely fails to predict the electronic properties for this material. When a substance which should be a conductor according to single particle theories, such as tight binding, is actually an insulator, it is called a Mott insulator. One theory behind why this occurs is due to Hubbard and such insulators are sometimes also called Mott-Hubbard insulators. Hubbard took the simple tight binding Hamiltonian (equation (4.14)) and added a term which takes into account electron-electron repulsion (§26.6 in [138]).

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} -t_{ij} [c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}] + U \sum_j c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}.
\]

This Hamiltonian is called the Hubbard Hamiltonian. The term \( c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \) is non-zero only when state \( j \) has two electrons on it, one with spin \( \uparrow \) and one with spin \( \downarrow \). So the second term in the Hamiltonian adds an additional energy \( U \) whenever an orbital has two electrons on it. The energy \( U \) represents the electrostatic repulsion energy between two electrons in the same state, and is sometimes called the Hubbard \( U \) (Hubbard argued that the repulsion energy between an electron in one state and an electron in another state is \( \sim 10 \) times smaller, so did not include this effect in the Hamiltonian).

The addition of the Coulomb repulsion term to the tight binding Hamiltonian makes the Hubbard Hamiltonian much harder to solve. However, one can still get a qualitative idea of its behavior. For example, take the case where each atomic orbital contains one electron (so that it is half filled) (figure 4.1). When an electron from one orbital hops to a neighboring
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Figure 4.1: In the Hubbard model, when an electron hops from one atom to another, it reduces its energy by the amount $t_{ij}$, but increases in energy by $U$ due to the Coulomb repulsion between electrons.

orbital, the tight binding term in the Hubbard Hamiltonian predicts that the energy of the electron will change by $-t_{ij}$. However, since the neighboring orbital already has an electron, the Coulomb repulsion between the electrons increases the energy of the hopping electron by $U$. Hence, qualitatively, we see that if $-t_{ij} + U < 0$, it is energetically favorable for electrons to move from one atom to another, and we have a conductor, but if $-t_{ij} + U > 0$, it is energetically unfavorable for electrons to hop between atoms, and the electrons remain immobile at their atomic sites, leading to an insulator.

Normally, the hopping matrix element $t_{ij}$ is related to the bandwidth $W \approx t_{ij}$ (figure 4.2). Therefore, when

$$\frac{U}{W} \approx 1$$

we get a metal to insulator transition. When $U/W > 1$ we have an insulator while for $U/W < 1$ we have a conductor. Figure 4.2 shows a qualitative sketch of the DOS for a system when $U/W < 1$ and $U/W > 1$. For $U/W > 1$, we see two peaks; the lower energy peak is called the lower Hubbard band while the higher energy peak is called the upper Hubbard band. The Fermi energy lies between these peaks and DOS($E_F$) = 0, meaning we have an insulator. For $U/W < 1$, the lower and upper Hubbard bands overlap, resulting in a non-zero DOS at $E_F$, implying the system is a conductor. In the limit $U = 0$, the lower and upper Hubbard bands become a single peak; this is the limit where the electrons are non-interacting. Hence, we see that the effect of electron-electron repulsion energy $U$ is to take single peaks in the non-interacting electron DOS and split them into two peaks.

There has been much theoretical work on Hubbard Hamiltonian, but not many exactly solvable cases. A general review is given in [8]. An exact solution exists in one dimension [124]. Unfortunately, the intuitive model given above does not seem to apply in this case since $U = 0$ gives a conductor while $U > 0$ gives an insulator. Other approximate solutions also exist which predict a metal to insulator transition for $U/W \approx 1.15$ (§13.2 in [48]) or $U/W \approx 1.5$ [98] for half filled bands.
4.4 Adsorbates on Surfaces

We would often like to study the intrinsic properties of molecules or atoms, but to study them by STM, we must first place them on a conducting surface. So to understand the intrinsic properties of the molecules we wish to study, we must first understand how the conducting surface modifies the electronic and magnetic properties of that molecule. This section will present simple theories behind electronic and magnetic interactions between molecules and surfaces. These theories are not exact solutions to the problem of molecule-substrate interactions, so experiments are still needed to better understand molecule-substrate interactions.

4.4.1 The Fano-Anderson model

When a molecule with discrete energy levels is placed on a surface with a continuous set of energy levels, the molecular orbitals can hybridize with the surface orbitals to produce new states. Theories treating the interaction between discrete states and continuum states as a perturbation exist [53], and may be intuitively easier to grasp, but exact solutions which neglect electron-electron interactions also exist. These exact solutions were derived by Fano [47] and Anderson [2]. Their discrete state-continuum state interaction model will be called the Fano-Anderson model here and will be discussed next.

A complete derivation of the result can be found in chapter 6 of [166] (by taking $U = 0$ in the Hamiltonian) and derivations can also be found in chapter 4 of [133] and in [152]. A statement of the results will be presented here.

When an atom or molecule with a localized state $|\phi\rangle$ with energy $E_\phi$ is placed in contact
with a bulk metal, then the electronic states of the metal can interact with and hybridize with the localized state to produce new states. If \( a^\dagger \) and \( a \) are the creation and destruction operators for an electron on the initially localized state \( \langle \phi \rangle \) while \( c_k^\dagger \) and \( c_k \) are the creation and destruction operators for a bulk metal electron with wavevector \( \vec{k} \) and energy \( E_{k'} \), then the Hamiltonian (§4.2 in [133]) for this system neglecting electron-electron interactions is

\[
\hat{H} = E_{\phi} a^\dagger a + \sum_{\vec{k}} \left[ E_{k'} c_{k'}^\dagger c_{k'} + V_{k'} c_{k'}^\dagger a + V_{k'}^* a^\dagger c_{k'} \right].
\] (4.16)

The first term describes the energy of an electron on the localized state while the second term describes the energy of the bulk metal electrons. The third and fourth terms describe the energy gain \( V_{k'} \) when an electron hops from the metal to the localized state or vice versa.

If the states \( |n\rangle \) with energy \( E_n \) represent the solutions to this Hamiltonian, then the expectation value of the Green’s operator (§4.1.2) for this system in the localized state \( |\phi\rangle \) can be calculated:

\[
\langle \phi | \text{lim}_{\alpha \to 0} \hat{G}(E) | \phi \rangle = \lim_{\alpha \to 0} \frac{\sum_n |\langle \phi | n\rangle|^2}{E + i\alpha - E_n} = \frac{1}{E - E_{\phi} - \Sigma_{\text{ret}}(E)}
\]

where \( \Sigma_{\text{ret}}(E) = \Delta(E) + i\Gamma(E) \) is called the retarded self-energy with

\[
\Gamma(E) = \text{Im} \{ \Sigma_{\text{ret}}(E) \} = \pi \sum_{\vec{k}} |V_{\vec{k}}|^2 \delta(E - E_{\vec{k}})
\]

and \( \Delta(E) \) is just the Hilbert transform (which is the same as the Kramers-Kronig transform) of \( \Gamma(E) \)

\[
\Delta(E) = \text{Re} \{ \Sigma_{\text{ret}}(E) \} = \frac{1}{\pi} P \int \frac{\Gamma(E')}{E - E'} dE'
\]

where \( P \) denotes the Cauchy principal value of the integral. This Green’s function leads to the result

\[
\text{PDOS}(\langle \phi \rangle, E) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma(E)}{\left[ E - E_{\phi} - \Delta(E) \right]^2 + \Gamma(E)^2}.
\] (4.17)

### 4.4.2 Electronic properties of adsorbates

To understand what the Fano-Anderson model implies for the electronic properties of adsorbates on surfaces, take an example. Assume that \( \Gamma(E) \) is roughly independent of energy, then \( \Delta(E) \approx 0 \), and (4.17) represents a Lorentzian centered at energy \( E_{\phi} + \Delta(E) \approx E_{\phi} \) with width (FWHM) \( 2\Gamma(E) \). This means that when a localized state \( |\phi\rangle \) hybridizes with states from a continuum, the new system they form contains hybridized states which resemble \( |\phi\rangle \) within an energy range of \( 2\Gamma(E) \) around the localized state energy \( E_{\phi} \). Outside of this energy range, the states of the new system are essentially the same as the continuum.
states before addition of the localized state. Hence, the hybridization happens in an energy window of \(2\Gamma(E)\) around \(E_\phi\).

A more mathematical way to interpret the PDOS in (4.17) comes from Fano [47]. The states \(|\Psi_E\rangle\) for the system consisting of the localized state hybridized with continuum can be written as a linear combination of the localized state \(|\phi\rangle\) plus the metal states \(|\psi_E\rangle\)

\[
|\Psi_E\rangle = \lambda_E |\phi\rangle + \int b_{E,E'} |\psi_{E'}\rangle dE'.
\]

Then Fano showed that

\[
|\lambda_E|^2 = \text{PDOS}(|\phi\rangle, E) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma(E)}{[E - E_\phi - \Delta(E)]^2 + \Gamma(E)^2}.
\]

Since \(\lambda_E\) tells us the amount of the localized state \(|\phi\rangle\) in the total wavefunction \(|\Psi_E\rangle\) for the entire system, we see that the amount of the original wavefunction \(|\phi\rangle\) contained in the total wavefunction \(|\Psi_E\rangle\) is maximum at an energy \(\Delta(E)\) above the original energy \(E_\phi\) of the localized state and the amount of \(|\phi\rangle\) in \(|\Psi_E\rangle\) decreases quickly away from this maximum. The average lifetime of an electron in the state \(|\phi\rangle\) is \(\hbar \Gamma(E)/2\pi\) from [47].

Although (4.17) is an exact solution to the Hamiltonian, there is still an unknown parameter \(V_{\vec{k}}\), which is an energy that measures how strongly the localized state interacts with the continuum. If \(|V_{\vec{k}}|\) is small compared to typical binding energies in a solid (\(\sim 3\) eV), then the interaction between localized state and continuum is weak and the adsorbate is said to be physisorbed. There are no significant changes to the localized state in this regime, and the adsorbate may be bonded to the surface only by weak Van der Waals forces. However, if \(|V_{\vec{k}}|\) is comparable to typical binding energies in a solid, then the interaction between localized state and the continuum is large and the adsorbate is said to be chemisorbed. In this regime, there may be significant changes to the localized state.

**The Fano resonance**

Fano also described the probability for an electron to be excited from an initial state \(|i\rangle\) to either the hybridized impurity state \(|\Psi\rangle\) or the unhybridized continuum state \(|\psi\rangle\). If the operator which describes transitions between states is \(T\), then the ratio \(f(E)\) of these transition probabilities is

\[
f(E) = \frac{|\langle \Psi |T|i\rangle|^2}{|\langle \psi |T|i\rangle|^2} = \frac{(\epsilon + q)^2}{\epsilon^2 + 1} \text{ with } \epsilon = \frac{E - E_\phi - \Delta(E)}{\Gamma(E)/2}
\]

and \(q\) is related to the relative strengths of transitions from \(|i\rangle\) to \(|\psi\rangle\) and from \(|i\rangle\) to a modified localized state (different from the hybridized localized state) described in [47]. The line shape described by \(f(E)\) is called a Fano line shape or Fano resonance. The expression for the Fano resonance can be generalized using self-energies to obtain other expressions of
the Fano resonance [131].

4.4.3 Magnetic properties of adsorbates

Magnetic adsorbates can interact with surfaces in various ways, such as the RKKY interaction. Spin sensitive local probes, such as spin polarized STM, have the ability to obtain local magnetic and spin properties of a system. However, even without a spin sensitive probe, one may still access certain spin properties of a system.

One way to detect spin indirectly would be through inelastic excitation of one spin state to another [83]. When the tunneling electrons’ energy exceeds the spin excitation energy, then one may induce spin transitions.

Another way of detecting spins is through an effect known as the Kondo effect. When a magnetic impurity such as a molecule or atom is placed in contact with a bulk metal, the resistance of the sample begins to increase as the temperature is lowered below a certain temperature, which is the opposite of what is normally expected (it usually decreases or remains constant). In this situation, what is happening is that the spin of the impurity interacts with the spins of the conduction electrons at low temperatures, forming a many-body impurity-conduction electron ground state. This interaction between impurity spin and conduction spins is known as the Kondo effect.

This effect can be described mathematically. Let $a^\dagger_\sigma$ and $a_\sigma$ be the creation and destruction operators for an electron on the localized state with spin $\sigma$ and $c^\dagger_\vec{k}\sigma$ and $c_\vec{k}\sigma$ be the creation and destruction operators for an electron with wavevector $\vec{k}$ and spin $\sigma$ in the continuum, then the Hamiltonian which describes the Kondo effect, called the Kondo Hamiltonian, is given by (§7.1 in [166])

$$\hat{H}_K = \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} E_{\vec{k}\sigma} c^\dagger_{\vec{k}\sigma} c_{\vec{k}\sigma} - \sum_{\vec{k},\vec{k}'\sigma} J_{\vec{k}\vec{k}'} \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left( c^\dagger_{\vec{k}\uparrow} c^\dagger_{\vec{k}'\downarrow} \hat{S} \left( c_{\vec{k}\downarrow} c_{\vec{k}'\uparrow} \right) \right) \cdot \left( a^\dagger_\uparrow a^\dagger_\downarrow \right) \hat{S} \left( a_\uparrow a_\downarrow \right)$$

where $\hat{S} = \hbar\hat{\sigma}/2$ and the components of $\hat{\sigma}$ are the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The Kondo Hamiltonian can be derived from the more fundamental Fano-Anderson model [2], but we need to add an extra term to the Hamiltonian (4.16) to describe the electron-electron interactions and will explicitly include spin in the Hamiltonian (§6.2 in [133], §26.5 in [138]). The more general Fano-Anderson Hamiltonian (normally called the Anderson Hamiltonian) is

$$\hat{H} = E_{\phi}[a^\dagger_\uparrow a_\uparrow + a^\dagger_\downarrow a_\downarrow] + U a^\dagger_\uparrow a_\uparrow a^\dagger_\downarrow a_\downarrow + \sum_{\vec{k}\sigma} [E_{\vec{k}\sigma} c^\dagger_{\vec{k}\sigma} c_{\vec{k}\sigma} + V_{\vec{k}\sigma} a^\dagger_\sigma c_{\vec{k}\sigma} + V^*_\vec{k}\sigma a_\sigma c^\dagger_{\vec{k}\sigma}]$$.
This Hamiltonian can be transformed into the Kondo Hamiltonian using a similarity transformation. Since similarity transformations do not change the eigenvalues of a Hamiltonian, this type of transformation is allowable. By using a similarity transformation called the Schrieffer-Wolff transformation (chapter 11 in [184], chapter 7 in [166]), the Hamiltonian above can be converted to a Hamiltonian

\[ \hat{H}' = \hat{H}_K + \hat{H}_{\text{other}} \]

where \( \hat{H}_K \) is the Kondo Hamiltonian and \( \hat{H}_{\text{other}} \) represents terms which do not involve single occupancy of the impurity orbital. In the Kondo effect, we assume that we have magnetic impurities, so that the impurity must have a singly occupied state, hence, \( \hat{H}_{\text{other}} \) is not relevant to describe the Kondo effect. So to second order in \( V \vec{k} \), the Anderson Hamiltonian leads to the Kondo Hamiltonian with a spin interaction energy given by

\[
J_{\vec{k}\vec{k}'} = V_{\vec{k}} V_{\vec{k}'} \left[ \frac{1}{E_{\vec{k}} - (E_\phi + U)} + \frac{1}{E_{\vec{k}'} - (E_\phi + U)} - \frac{1}{E_{\vec{k}} - E_\phi} - \frac{1}{E_{\vec{k}'} - E_\phi} \right]
\]

The relationship between the Kondo and Anderson Hamiltonians allows us to view the Kondo effect in terms of virtual hopping of electrons on and off the impurity (chapter 7 in [166]), where the electrons hopping from the continuum have opposite spin to the spin of the impurity. Because of this anti-alignment of continuum and impurity spins, we can then think of the continuum electrons as forming a singlet state with electron on the impurity state.

The Kondo many-body singlet state can be characterized by a quantity known as the Kondo temperature \( T_K \)

\[
T_K = \frac{1}{k_B} \frac{D}{\sqrt{\frac{U}{|E_\phi||E_\phi + U|}}} \exp\left(-\pi \frac{|E_\phi||E_\phi + U|}{2UT} \right).
\]

where \( \Gamma = \pi |V|^2 \rho(E_F) \) is the width of the hybridized localized state \( |\phi\rangle \) and \( D \) is the bandwidth of the conduction band. The energy \( k_B T_K \) represents roughly the binding energy of the Kondo singlet state, and hence, we will only see the Kondo singlet state below a temperature \( T_K \).

To understand the effect of the Kondo resonance on the electronic properties of the system, the PDOS of the localized impurity for \( T < T_K \) can be calculated using Fermi liquid theory [150]

\[
\text{PDOS}(|\phi\rangle, E) \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\Gamma + \gamma(E,T)}
\]

with \( \gamma(E,T) = \frac{\Gamma}{2} \left( \frac{E}{k_BT_K} \right)^2 + \pi^2 \frac{\Gamma}{2} \left( \frac{T}{T_K} \right)^2 \)

where \( \Gamma \sim 100 \text{meV} \) is the energy for electrons to hop on or off the localized state \( |\phi\rangle \). This
PDOS is a Lorentzian with a FWHM of \(2\sqrt{(\pi k_B T)^2 + 2(k_B T_K)^2}\) centered at \(E = 0 = E_F\). This Lorentzian is known as the Kondo resonance. For low temperatures \((T \ll T_K)\), the FWHM is \(\sim 2.8 k_B T_K\).

Often in STM, the Kondo resonance does not appear as a peak, but as various different line shapes. This can be explained by electrons tunneling into two different possible states, the hybridized magnetic impurity states, or the unhybridized conduction electron states. This ability to tunnel into two different states gives rise to a Fano resonance instead of a Lorentzian (§4.4.2). Near \(E_F\) and for \(T < T_K\), the tunneling differential conductance can be written in terms of the Fano line shape as [131]

\[
\frac{dI(V)}{dV} \propto \frac{(q + \epsilon)^2}{1 + \epsilon^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \epsilon = \frac{e_c V - E_0}{k_B T_K}
\]

where \(E_0\) is a parameter measuring the offset of the Fano resonance from \(E_F\) and \(q\) represents the relative strengths of tunneling into the modified localized state and the unhybridized continuum states (§4.4.2). The STM \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy curves for the Kondo resonance are usually fit to the Fano line shape with \(E_0\), \(q\), and \(T_K\) taken as fit parameters. Fitting spectroscopy data to the Fano line shape is normally how one obtains the Kondo temperature \(T_K\) from STM data.

### 4.5 Density Functional Theory

It is usually difficult to include many-body interactions in a computation, since the computational time grows quickly with the number of electrons. For example, for \(N_e\) electrons and \(N_B\) basis functions, we need to consider \(N_B!/N_e!(N_B - N_e)!\) Fock states; so when we construct the Hamiltonian matrix from these states, it will be a square matrix with \(N_B!/N_e!(N_B - N_e)!\) rows (§5.1 in [184]). With only 10 electrons and 50 basis functions the Hamiltonian matrix has \(\approx 10^{10}\) rows, while with 100 electrons and 200 basis functions, the Hamiltonian matrix has \(\approx 9 \times 10^{38}\) rows. These are large matrices to diagonalize. To do any calculation with a large number of electrons, for example \(N_e \geq 100\), we need a better method than diagonalizing a Hamiltonian.

One of the important breakthroughs came in the 1960’s and 1970’s. Hohenberg and Kohn proved an important theorem, that one only needs to calculate the ground state electron number density \(n(\vec{r})\) to get the ground state properties of a system (§5.1 in [184], §9.3 in [138]). One does not need to calculate the wavefunction of every electron, just a single function, the electron number density. This result dramatically reduces the amount of computations necessary to calculate the ground state properties of a system.

From Hohenberg and Kohn’s theorem, it can be derived that there is a universal functional \(F[n]\) such that when a potential energy \(U[n]\) for a particular system is added to it, the function \(n\) which minimizes \(F[n] + U[n]\) is the ground state electron number density of the system (§9.3 in [138]). This theory which relates ground state properties of a system to minimization of functionals of electron densities is known as density functional theory. It
has been extremely successful at predicting the properties of systems where other methods such as Hartree-Fock fail and earned Kohn the Nobel prize in chemistry in 1998.

4.5.1 The Kohn-Sham equations

The functional \( F[n] + U[n] \) that we need to minimize is in general unknown, but can still be written in a more explicit form. Since it is easier to solve for the wavefunctions for a system of non-interacting particles, expressing \( F[n] + U[n] \) as a non-interacting particle equation can make it easier to solve. This is done by first assuming the total number density \( n(\vec{r}) \) can be written as the sum of \( N \) wavefunctions \( n(\vec{r}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |\psi_j(\vec{r})|^2 \), but these wavefunctions are not necessarily the electron wavefunctions. Kohn and Sham then derived that the functions \( \psi_j \) which minimizes \( F[n] + U[n] \) must satisfy the Kohn-Sham equations

\[
H_{KS}[n] \psi_j(\vec{r}) = E_j \psi_j(\vec{r}) \tag{4.18}
\]

\[
\text{with } H_{KS}[n] = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V_{\text{eff}}[n] \tag{4.19}
\]

and

\[
V_{\text{eff}}[n] = \left[ U(\vec{r}) + \int \frac{e^2 n(\vec{r}')}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \, d\vec{r}' + \frac{\partial E_{xc}[n]}{\partial n} \right]. \tag{4.20}
\]

This is effectively like the Schrödinger equation for a single particle in the potential \( V_{\text{eff}} \) and the solutions \( \psi_j \) of the Kohn-Sham equations would allow us to calculate an exact many-body ground state number density for the system. However, there are two important differences between the Kohn-Sham equations and the Schrödinger equation. First, \( V_{\text{eff}} \) depends on \( n \), and \( n \) depends on \( \psi_j \), hence, we cannot find \( V_{\text{eff}} \) unless we already know the solutions to the Kohn-Sham equations. Second, everything unknown about \( F \) has now been pushed into the functional \( E_{xc} \), called the exchange-correlation functional. The exact form of this functional is unknown and is normally approximated. One approximate functional commonly used in calculations is \( E_{xc} = -\frac{3}{\pi} n(\vec{r})^{1/3} \) which is just the energy of a free electron gas with density \( n(\vec{r}) \), however, in a free electron gas, the number density is a constant whereas in general it is a function of position. Hence, this approximate functional assumes that locally, the electrons behave like a free electron gas and the approximation is called the local density approximation (LDA). Since a free electron gas does not include interactions between electrons, a DFT calculation using LDA also does not correctly include all electron-electron interactions.

4.5.2 DFT calculations

A DFT calculation is usually based on the Kohn-Sham equations (4.18). One first needs an initial guess for \( n \) so that one knows \( H_{KS}[n] \). One also needs a complete basis set of functions \( \{|i\} \}. Then the following steps are iterated.

1. The matrix elements \( \langle i | H_{KS}[n] | j \rangle \) are calculated to find \( H_{KS}[n] \) in a matrix form.
2. Once one constructs the matrix representation for $H_{KS}[n]$, then one can calculate its eigenvalues, which are energies $\epsilon_j$, and eigenvectors $\phi_j$.

3. Once one has the functions $\phi_j$, then $n'(\vec{r}) = \sum_j |\phi_j|^2$ can be recalculated and a new Hamiltonian $H_{KS}[n']$ can be constructed.

4. The first step is now repeated with $H_{KS}[n']$.

Hopefully, at some point, $n$ does not change with any more iterations, at which point we have found the solution to (4.18). This iteration procedure is called a self-consistent field (SCF) iteration.

The next parts below will describe the details of the various components of a DFT calculation.

**Basis functions and $E_{xc}$**

The main parameters that limit the accuracy of DFT calculations in theory are the basis functions used to calculate the matrix elements of $H_{KS}[n]$ and the exchange-correlation functional $E_{xc}$. The basis functions limit the accuracy of the calculation since a complete basis has an infinite number of functions, so a finite set of functions must be used in any calculation. This finite set of functions is normally called the *basis* in DFT calculations.

Most DFT codes allow you to choose different sets of functions for a basis. A single function in the basis which is localized on an atom is commonly called $\zeta$ (zeta), so sets of basis functions are often defined in terms of $\zeta$. For example, if one has a system with $N$ atoms and uses a set of basis functions where one basis function is localized on each atom ($N$ basis functions total), this set of basis functions would be referred to as a single-$\zeta$ or single-zeta (SZ) basis. If one uses instead a set of functions with two functions localized on each atom ($2N$ basis functions total), this would be referred to as a double-$\zeta$ or double-zeta (DZ) basis. Basis functions localized to atoms tend to be like atomic wavefunctions, so they may be similar to atomic $s$ or $p$ orbitals. For example, a DZ basis may consist of two functions per atom, one like a $1s$ orbital, and the other like a $2s$ orbital. If we take this DZ basis and add yet another function for every atom to this basis, a $p$ like orbital, this would be referred to as including polarization, and the resultant basis would be called double-$\zeta$ + polarization (DZP). In general, adding polarization means one adds another atomic-like wavefunction per atom to a set of basis functions, but the additional functions have higher angular momentum then the functions already in the basis. For example if a basis consists of one $p$ orbital per atom, including polarization would mean adding one $d$ orbital per atom.

The set of basis functions will influence the numerical solutions to the Kohn-Sham equations. For example, when using the SIESTA code to do a DFT calculation on a system with $N$ atoms, SIESTA uses basis functions which are localized to the positions of the atoms; i.e., the basis functions are zero beyond a certain distance away from the atoms. In general, this basis can work well [66]. However, since the basis functions are localized, SIESTA cannot reproduce delocalized wavefunctions well.
One way of getting around artifacts due to the localized basis in SIESTA is to use another program, such as VASP, which uses a plane wave basis. This basis will give more accurate results for delocalized wavefunctions, but usually takes much longer to run a calculation. Another way to get around a localized basis is to add *ghost atoms*. Ghost atoms are atoms with negative atomic numbers, and SIESTA assumes such atoms have no charge, mass, or electrons, so adding such atoms to a system does not change it. However, SIESTA still takes these non-existent atoms into account when constructing the basis, so the code includes atomic-wavefunction-like functions localized at the positions of ghost atoms in the basis. This effectively increases the number basis functions as well as the spatial extent of the set of basis functions.

The exchange-correlation functional $E_{xc}$ also limits the accuracy of DFT calculations since its exact form is not known and one must always approximate it. In addition to LDA, there are other approximate functionals for $E_{xc}$ such as GGA and BLYP (chapter 5 in [184]). These functionals try to build on LDA by adding corrections to it, but are not necessarily more accurate than LDA.

**Pseudopotentials**

We are normally interested in the electronic properties of systems near the Fermi energy. Since these properties arise mainly from the valence orbitals and electrons of atoms, it is not necessary to take into account the atoms’ core electrons in the calculation. Removing the core electrons will reduce unnecessary calculations by a considerable amount. Removing the core electrons is done by using a *pseudopotential*. A pseudopotential is a potential that, when used as the potential energy in Schrödinger’s equation, would produce eigenstates of the Schrödinger equation that mimic the valence wavefunctions of atoms correctly, but not the core electron wavefunctions. They have been shown to reproduce many important features of solids correctly [210].

**Relaxation**

Normally, the coordinates of the atoms in a system are not known exactly. Since DFT can find the energy of a system as a function of the coordinates of the atoms, by finding the positions of the atoms which minimizes the total energy of the system, we will find the equilibrium position of the atoms. The process of finding the position of the atoms to minimize the energy of the system is called *relaxation*. This process uses a numerical method such as steepest descent or conjugate gradient [24] to iteratively move the atomic positions from an initial starting point to find the positions of the atoms which minimize the total energy. Since most numerical methods will only find a relative minimum in energy close to the initial energy (except for Monte Carlo methods [121]), many DFT calculations will also only find relative minima in energy, and not the absolute lowest energy configuration. However, finding a relative minimum in energy instead of the absolute minimum is a problem of the numerical technique used, not a problem of DFT.
Many-body corrections

The Kohn-Sham equation (4.18) with LDA does not correctly take into account many-body effects such as electron-electron interactions. These may be taken into account using methods such as LDA+U [176], or the GW approximation [76]. In the LDA+U method presented in [176], the effect of the electron-electron interaction in a molecule can be taken into account by finding the on-site Coulomb repulsion $U$ (§3.4.2). Once we find $U$, we know the correction to the HOMO-LUMO gap (equation 3.3). In general, the Coulomb repulsion energy $U$ depends on which orbital we add an electron to. If we add an electron to the LUMO+$n$, the Coulomb repulsion $U_{\text{LUMO}+n}$ to add an electron to this state may be calculated by simply adding an electron to the LUMO+$n$ and recalculating the LUMO+$n$ energy using DFT with LDA for $E_{xc}$. The difference between the LUMO+$n$ energy with one electron in it and the LUMO+$n$ energy with no electrons in it gives $U_{\text{LUMO}+n}/2$. Similarly, one may calculate the $U$ for the HOMO$-n$ with the same procedure, except we remove an electron from the state instead of adding it. The quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap (§3.4.2) is larger than the non-interacting HOMO-LUMO gap by $U_{\text{HOMO}}/2 + U_{\text{LUMO}}/2$. This method is quite simple and can be done on a laptop in under an hour, even for molecules of 60 atoms.

However, if a molecule is near a metallic surface, then the image charge from the surface can effectively reduce $U$. Effects from image charges are not correctly taken into account when LDA is used in a DFT calculation since image charges are a result of electron-electron interactions (an electron near a metal repels the nearby electrons in the metal, creating a net positive image charge). Luckily, simple image charge models based on classical electrostatics can take this into account [176, 151].

A more systematic approach to calculating many-body energy corrections is a first order approximation called the GW approximation. In the name GW, $G$ stands for the Green’s function for the system while $W$ is the screened Coulomb potential. One may take, for example, $W = V_{\text{ext}}/\epsilon$, where $V_{\text{ext}}$ is the externally applied potential and $\epsilon$ is the Lindhard dielectric function (equations (5.15) and (5.16) in [213]). The first order correction to the self-energy is found from the product of $G$ and $W$. In the GW approximation method, one first finds the number density $n$ from the Kohn-Sham equations with LDA. Then the screened Coulomb potential $W$ can be found from $n$, and $G$ can be written in terms of $W$ and $G$ (so $G$ is expressed in terms of itself). To solve for $G$ when it is defined in terms of itself, it can be numerically calculated self-consistently, and once we know $G$, we can find the electronic properties of the system (§4.1.2). However, this method is computationally intensive and is usually done on a computing cluster, unlike LDA+U, which can be done on a laptop.
5.1 Scanning Tunneling Microscope

The STM used for all the experiments is a home-built ultra-high vacuum (UHV) STM. The base pressure is $\sim 1 \times 10^{-10}$ torr and base temperature $\sim 7$ K. The original STM design and construction was carried out by M. F. Crommie, W. Chen, and V. Madhavan. The details of the STM used in the experiments have been presented in the theses of Wei Chen [31], Vidya Madhavan [132], and Tiberiu Jamneala [95], and Michael Grobis [60]. Only an overview of the system will be presented here. Modifications of the STM which are not included in the previous theses will be given in §5.1.7. Details of how to build specific parts of the STM will be given in appendix C.

An overview of the cryogenic UHV STM is shown in figure 5.1. The various parts of the system can be broken down into the following categories:

1. UHV chambers
2. cryogenic system
3. vibrational isolation
4. STM scanner
5. electronics and software

A brief description will be given below for each category.

5.1.1 STM chambers

The chamber and pumping system allow for base chamber pressures at or below $1 \times 10^{-10}$ torr. The STM chambers are made from 304 stainless steel to allow for baking above 100°C during initial pump down and for low outgassing once at UHV. A combination of a
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5.1.2 Cryogenics

The microscope chamber sits inside an 80 liter liquid He dewar. The hold time for this dewar is 12 days. A He exchange gas can separates the chamber from direct contact with the liquid He. The He exchange gas is important for three reasons: (1) minimize vibrations from He boil off, (2) avoid the Paschen effect; i.e., avoid pressure ranges ($\sim 100 \text{ mTorr}$)
where high voltage arcing (corona discharge) can occur, and (3) control desired operating temperature. A series of radiation shields in the exchange gas can are employed to minimize the thermal radiation from the transfer chamber, which is at room temperature, from getting to the microscope chamber. All the wires in the exchange gas can that run from room temperature down to the microscope chamber are stainless steel coaxial cables (Cooner wire part #AS632-1SSF) to reduce heat loss since stainless steel has low thermal conductivity (which means it has high electrical resistance). This cryogenic setup allows operation at a base temperature of 7 K when the exchange gas pressure is $\sim 5 \text{ mTorr}$ of He gas.

5.1.3 Vibration Isolation

Extensive care is taken to minimize vibrational coupling to the STM. The UHV chambers are mounted on a dual stage optical table with vibrational isolation legs between each stage. The microscope chamber is suspended by two bellows which allow for acoustic mismatch between the transfer chamber and microscope chamber. The whole UHV system is enclosed in a sound proof room to minimize acoustic disturbances. Under normal conditions, ambient vibrational disturbances do not limit the noise. Though typically $3 \text{ mA}$ rms of “vibrational” noise can be seen on the tip, this noise is thought to be electronic in origin. Even with this noise, high quality images can be readily achieved with $0.5 \text{ pA}$ stabilization currents. Images have also been obtained with lower currents, however, the Ithaco 1211 preamp is only calibrated to an accuracy of $1 \text{ pA}$, so while stabilization currents as low as $5 \text{ fA}$ have been used, the accuracy of such a current cannot be guaranteed.

5.1.4 STM scanner

The main part of the STM where most experimental data is taken is the STM scan stage (located in the microscope chamber), which is shown in figure 5.2. The STM scanner, called the bug, consists of a series of carefully machined macor pieces (body and support), piezoelectric (piezos) ceramics (coarse and fine motion), and a shielded metallic tip (shield cannot be seen in the figure). Fine ($50 \mu\text{m}$) gold wires bring electrical contact to the various STM components. The STM bug rests on a piece called the walker plate. This plate consists of a thin glass plate ($75 \mu\text{m}$ thick) below which reside a series of metallic electrodes, below which lies another glass plate (not shown in figure 5.2). Details on the construction of the walker plate is given in appendix C. The electrodes are used for (1) clamping the bug electrostatically to the glass plate and (2) coarse motion of the bug along the glass plate. The STM tip is made from either W or PtIr(80:20) wire (10 mil thick). Since a sharp tip apex is desired, it is common practice to chemically etch the tips (§5.2.1).

5.1.5 STM electronics and software

The essential STM functionality is controlled by a combination of home built electronics boxes (Z-Box, XY-Box, FE Box, Walker Box, Ground breaking box), commercial elec-
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Figure 5.2: STM stage and scanner. The X piezo lies directly behind the Y piezo in this view and cannot be seen in the diagram. The sample receiver (the part that holds the sample holder) is not shown in the diagram.

tronics (Ithaco 1211, Electronic Development Corporation 522, Data Precision 8200), and computer DAQ boards (GPIB, NI PCI-6052E, NI PCI-MIO16XE) all controlled by a central computer. In addition to the essential electronics, there is additional commercial electronics to do spectroscopy (HP 33120A function generator, Princeton Applied Research 5210 lock-in amplifier), an STM temperature controller (LakeShore 340), and a home built audio box to aid with atomic/molecular manipulation (built by the UC Berkeley Physics Electronics Shop, Job # 98-05).

The Z Box, XY Box, FE Box, and Walker Box were designed by Bill Earle at Boston University and were built there. There are manuals for all these boxes. To help test if these boxes are operating properly, there are, in addition, two electronics boxes that were built at UC Berkeley. The first is a digital control word generator (figure 5.3) that can be used to control the home built boxes in place of a computer (built by the UC Berkeley physics electronics shop, job # 99-30). This box is useful for testing and repairing the home built electronics (especially if the physics electronics shop does the repairing) since one would need a computer with the STM software installed to control these boxes otherwise. The new Z-Box (used from 2009 on) has its own digital signal generator (figure 5.3). The second electronics box is an exponentiating box; it takes an input voltage and the output voltage is the exponential of the input: $V_{out} \sim e^{V_{in}}$. This box is used to check if the Z-Box feedback is working properly since it simulates the exponential dependence of the tunneling current on the -Z output voltage.

There are a few notes about the commercial electronics. The Data Precision 8200
voltage calibrators that are used for the -X and -Y voltages are no longer made. Only used/refurbished units can be bought. A spare one was purchased from REPCAL Test equipment (www.repcaltestequip.com). However, the standard Data Precision 8200 has a resistor that may burn out. This resistor is number R51 and is located near the rear panel, next to the J301 output. It is normally a 68 kΩ ± 5%, 1/4 W carbon resistor and should be replaced with a 68 kΩ ± 5%, 1 W carbon resistor. The spare Data Precision 8200 from REPCAL has the standard R51 resistor which should be replaced before using it.

The second note about the commercial electronics is that the Ithaco 1211 input voltage should not be larger than 15 V. A resistor can be placed directly onto the input to prevent high voltages on the tip in FE mode from destroying the Ithaco 1211. After correspondence with Ithaco about our setup in 2009, they recommended using a low noise 47 kΩ, 1 W resistor such as Vishay Dale part # RN70E4702FB14 inside of a pomona aluminum box, pomona part # 2391 (some of these specifications and part numbers are in the Ithaco manual, but are listed incorrectly).

All of the electronics for the STM is controlled by home-written software. The original version of the software was written in LabView, but since around 2002, newer versions have been written in C++. Nate Jenkins wrote most of this software with help from Mike Grobis. Yuri Zuev, Xiaowei Zhang, and I have corrected bugs and added new features to the software.
5.1.6 Coarse movement and approach

Coarse movement

Coarse motion is achieved by a sequence voltages applied to the body piezo and walker plate electrodes. For example to move forward, one first clamps the rear of the body piezo by applying high voltages to the two back electrodes. One then expands the body piezo (which then expands forward since its back is clamped) by removing any high voltage across of the piezo’s electrodes. Then one clamps the front of the body piezo by applying high voltages to the front two electrodes and releases the rear of the body piezo by removing the high voltages from the real electrodes. Next, one contracts the body piezo by applying a high voltage across of its electrodes. This entire sequence is called one step. Typical step sizes at $T = 7\, \text{K}$ vary between $0.1\, \mu\text{m}$ when the walking is not too good, to $1\, \mu\text{m}$ when the walking is good. Moving by a sequence of these steps is called walking. To move the STM bug to a desired location one then takes as many steps as necessary in the correct direction.

The coarse motion does not always work ideally. A number of different things can aid the coarse motion. The stage can be tilted forward to help move the STM forward. The step size also depends on where the STM bug is on the walker plate, so if the STM does not walk backwards, for example, then moving left first and walking backwards next may help it move backwards. If the STM gets stuck somewhere, then tapping on the sample tilt feedthrough can help move the STM to a new area, and the walking may be better in that area. It is also believed that the glass plates on the walker plate can charge up, effectively creating a voltage between the glass plate and body piezo, making it harder for the STM to move. Warming up the STM for a few hours at least to $\sim 40\, \text{K}$ while the walker plate electrodes are grounded seems to help remove the charge. Higher temperatures help more; e.g., warming up the STM to room temperature seems to remove more charge. After cooling the STM back down to $\sim 7\, \text{K}$, the walking is usually good again.

Field emission approach

The coarse movement step size ($\sim 0.1\, \mu\text{m}$ to $1\, \mu\text{m}$) is typically larger than the range of the $Z$-piezo ($\lesssim 0.1\, \mu\text{m}$). This means that we can easily crash into the surface with one coarse step forward if we do not know how close the STM is to the surface. To get a rough idea of how close the STM tip is to a surface, we may apply a high voltage to the tip to get a small current (a process called field emission), where the magnitudes of the current and voltage gives us an idea of how far away the tip is from the surface. Typically, when $V_{\text{tip}} \sim -450\, \text{V}$ and $I \sim 1\, \text{nA}$, then the tip is $\sim 80\, \mu\text{m}$ from the surface. Field emission (FE) can be used to help approach a surface. To use FE to approach a surface, one moves the STM tip towards a sample with the coarse approach while applying a high voltage to the tip and the feedback electronics in the Z-Box changes the voltage on the tip to keep the field emission current ($\sim 1\, \text{nA}$) constant. By monitoring the voltage applied to the tip, we have an idea of how close the tip is to the sample. Typically, the initial voltage applied to the tip is the maximum voltage $\sim -450\, \text{V}$ when the tip is far (a few mm) from the surface and $I = 0\, \text{nA}$
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in this case. When the tip is $\sim 80 \mu m$ from the surface, $V_{\text{tip}} \sim -450 V$ and $I \sim 1 nA$. When the tip voltage is around $-30 V$ and $I = 1 nA$, the tip is a few hundred Ångstroms from the sample, and one may use the $z$-piezo to move the tip towards the surface from that point on.

**Capacitance approach**

Approaching a sample using field emission can destroy a sample due to the large voltages and electric fields required. This is why another method of approaching the surface was necessary. Since the tip and sample form a capacitor, by measuring the tip-sample capacitance, we get an idea of how close the tip is to the surface. The tip-sample capacitance is measured by applying an ac voltage (1 V, 1 kHz) to the tip and measuring the induced current in the sample through the Ithaco 1211 current to voltage converter. Output of the Ithaco 1211 then goes to a lock-in, whose output is proportional to the tip-sample capacitance. When the tip is several Ångstroms away from the sample, the typical $R_{\text{output}}$ of the lock-in (§A.1.2) will be 70–80 mV when the Ithaco 1211 has a $10^{-10} \text{A/V}$ gain and 1 ms time constant.

5.1.7 Modifications

This section will describe some of the important changes to the STM as of December 2009 which are not in previous theses.

- Braces to level and guide the position of the optical floating tables when they are not floated have been installed. The optical tables must be positioned correctly when unfloated so that samples can be transferred in and out of the STM stage without dropping them (which has happened in the past).
- There are small changes to the STM scanner; these will be discussed in detail in appendix C.
- Starting in 2002, a newer version of the STM software, written in C++ instead of LabView, has been used.
- We either ground or filter all lines that go into the exchange gas can with in-line RF filters by Mini-circuits (part # BLP-1.9+).
- The Data Precision 8200 voltage supply used for the -X and -Y electrodes on the X and Y piezos have a resistor that has been replaced, as described in the previous section.
- There is a new home-built electronics box that is not essential, but is useful. This box was built by Annie Endozo and allows us to measure the capacitance between the body piezo and the walker plate electrodes (figure 5.2) using a computer instead of by hand. This box allows us to quickly figure out the general position of the STM by
measuring the capacitance between the body piezo bottom electrode and each of the four electrodes on the walker plate.

- There is a second new home-built electronics box built by Yuri Zuev that prevents the STM tip from crashing into the surface when the software crashes or when the computer is restarted. This box is again not essential, but is useful. When a switch on this box is turned on, this box keeps the body piezo and walker plate voltages turned on, even if the computer is restarted (restarting the computer would normally cause these voltages to turn off, making the tip crash).

- In the FE Box, the power supply that generates the high voltage for the tip in FE mode burned out and was replaced with a 500 V power supply, so the maximum voltage that can be applied to the tip in FE mode is now around 500 V instead of around 900 V.

- A new Z-box has been used starting in January 2009. This Z-box was designed by Bill Earle and built at Boston University, like the old Z-box. There are many internal changes in the new Z-box, but there are only a few changes relevant for the user.

1. The voltages on all outputs are set to 0 V when the new 2009 Z-box is first turned on. The old pre-2009 Z-box would apply +200 V to \(-Z\) and \(-70\) V to \(+Z\) when it was turned on, which may cause the Z-piezo to depolarize when the Z-box turns back on after a power outage.

2. The range of the \(-Z\) output can be controlled on the new 2009 Z-box. The range can be set to \(\pm 400\) V, \(\pm 200\) V, \(\pm 100\) V, or \(\pm 50\) V. The old pre-2009 Z-box only had one \(-Z\) range, \(\pm 200\) V. Note that the maximum voltage range on the old pre-2009 Z-box (400 V) is smaller than the maximum voltage range on the new 2009 Z-box (800 V). This means that the Z-piezo can expand twice as much with the new Z-box as on the old one, allowing us to scan taller objects. However, the larger voltage range on the new Z-box may also mean more noise and less resolution, which is why smaller voltage ranges are also available.

3. The \(+Z\) voltage range is smaller on the new Z-box. It is around \(-70\) V to around \(+475\) V instead of \(-70\) V to \(+900\) V on the old Z-box.

4. The Z-monitor gains are different on the new Z-box. They are 0.025, 0.05, 0.2, 1, instead of 0.05, 0.2, 1, 10, on the old Z-box. Since we need to read the Z-monitor into the computer and the computer card can only read voltages in the range \(\pm 10\) V, this change was made so that the new \(-Z\) voltages ranges can be scaled down to the \(\pm 10\) V range.

We chose not to get proportional gain on the new Z-box since it would have added an unknown amount of time and expense to the development of the new Z-box.

The new Z-Box also has its own digital control word generator (figure 5.3) so that it may be controlled without a computer, which is useful when the electronics shop needs to repair the new Z-Box.
5.2 Tip Preparation

The STM tips used in the experiments were prepared outside of vacuum before inserting them into the STM tip holder. The STM has no tip exchange mechanism; i.e., there is no way of replacing the tip without venting the chamber. Since regaining UHV after venting the chamber takes around 1 week, it would be very time consuming to replace the tip. So once a tip is placed in the STM tip holder and the chambers are under UHV, any additional tip preparation should be done in vacuum.

The STM tips used in the experiments were either W or PtIr. The W tips were 10 mil W wire where one end was cut at an angle to create a pointed end. The PtIr tips were 10 mil wire which were chemically etched to create a sharp, pointed end.

5.2.1 PtIr Tip etching

There are general methods to chemically etch a PtIr tip so that it has a sharp apex \cite{173}. The PtIr tips used in our experiments were etched using a procedure from Katsumi Nagaoka. There seems to be a better tip etching method given in \cite{144} used by J. A. Stroscio with a larger yield of sharper and smoother tips; Victor Brar knows the details of this method.

The PtIr tip used for all the experiments in this dissertation was etched in February 2003. The same tip was used for all the experiments. It was made using Katsumi Nagaoka’s method, which will be described below.

PtIr wire (80% Pt, 20% Ir, 10 mil diameter) was purchased from Goodfellow. A Ni wire with one end wound into a loop is placed in a 10 mL beaker and the PtIr wire, held by tweezers, is placed through the Ni wire loop (figure 5.4). A hose clamp may be used to hold the Ni wire in place. A 4 : 1 mixture of NaNO$_3$ : NaCl by weight is placed in the beaker, enough to cover the Ni wire loop. A hot plate (Thermolyne Cimarec 1 in this case) is needed to heat the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl mixture until it melts (\textasciitilde300°C). A glass funnel is placed over the entire setup to trap hot air or else the temperature will not be high enough to melt the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl mixture.

After the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl mixture melts, apply a DC voltage \textasciitilde+2 V to +3 V to the PtIr wire relative to the Ni wire. This will cause the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl to chemically eat away at the PtIr around the area where the Ni wire loop is. After it looks like the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl has eaten through the entire wire near the Ni wire loop, remove the PtIr wire and rinse it with distilled water. Sometimes the melted NaNO$_3$ : NaCl becomes hard to see through as the PtIr is being etched, so it may be hard to see when the PtIr wire has been eaten up by the NaNO$_3$ : NaCl. In this case, one may have to periodically pull the wire out to see if it has been completely etched. The tip etching process takes a few minutes.

Sometimes, a small area near the tip apex have black residue on it due to the tip etching procedure. This residue does not seem to be removed with HF. However, the tip may be periodically rinsed in distilled water during the tip etching process to help prevent this black residue from building up near the tip apex.

After the tips have been etched, they were further cleaned by annealing them in vacuum.
However, annealing may also make the tip apex blunt, so this process need not be done for tips etched in the future. The etched tips were annealed by spot welding the non-etched end of the PtIr wire to a 12 mil W wire, then running $\sim 5.5 \, \text{A}$ through the W wire in high vacuum ($\sim 1 \times 10^{-7} \, \text{Torr}$) for around 10 hours. The PtIr wire may also be annealed before the tip etching procedure (in addition to annealing it after), but this was not done on every tip, and may not help much since the tips were annealed after etching anyway.

### 5.2.2 Tip preparation in vacuum

There are two general ways of modifying the tip in vacuum. The first involves field emission (FE): A high voltage and high current is applied to the tip when it is far from the surface; this is called field emitting the tip. This procedure is normally used when large changes to the tip are desired; for example, after exposing the tip to air, FE should be used to clean the tip. This procedure is done by going into FE mode and setting the set current to $\sim 10 \, \mu \text{A}$, then moving the tip with the coarse approach until the voltage on the tip is around $-400 \, \text{V}$.

The second way of modifying the tip is by moving it into a metal substrate, then pulling it out again, a process called tip poking. If the tip is very unstable, or if the tip apex is very jagged instead of a smoothly tapering to a point, then poking using higher voltages ($\sim \pm 10 \, \text{V}$) and high currents ($\sim 50 \, \text{nA}$) can help to stabilize the tip and make it less jagged,
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but it may also destroy a large area (50 nm × 50 nm) of the sample.

If larger tip changes are desired, then changing the current to voltage converter gain is important when poking to get higher currents through the tip. If one leaves the gain at $10^{-9} \text{ A/V}$ when poking the tip for example, then the current to voltage converter limits the maximum current through the tip to $\sim 10 \text{ nA}$, and one cannot achieve the larger currents necessary for large tip modifications.

In general, moving the tip in and out of the surface with a slower speed is less damaging to the tip; i.e., it causes less tip changes and may give sharper tips.

Molecules tend to stick better at step edges, so if a molecule is stuck on the tip, then moving the tip close to a step edge can get the molecule off.

5.3 Surface Preparation

Preparing clean and flat surfaces of substrates is critical for studying the intrinsic properties of molecules since impurities on the substrates may affect the properties of the molecules adsorbed on them. For this reason, substrates are cleaned and kept in ultra high vacuum (UHV); the base pressure of the chambers is typically $\sim 2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ Torr}$.

5.3.1 Sputtering and annealing

Cleaning the single crystal noble metal substrates (Ag, Au, Cu) used for all the experiments follows standard procedures \cite{149} which consists of Ar sputtering and annealing. Argon sputtering is when the substrate surface is bombarded with Ar$^+$ ions with a kinetic energy between 0.5 keV and 2 keV. The sputtering knocks off impurities from the surface. The sputtering is followed by annealing the substrate, which is heating the substrate to desorb impurities from the surface and smoothen out the surface. Annealing is done by $e$-beam heating, where we bombard the substrate with high energy ($\sim 1 \text{ keV}$) electrons, which then lose their energy in the substrate in the form of heat. The methods used for $e$-beam heating are similar to the methods used for $e$-beam evaporation (§5.4.2).

5.3.2 Hydrogen artifacts and removal

After the sample is moved to the STM stage at 7 K, it can remain clean for around four to five weeks. After that amount of time, the sample has accumulated significant amounts of hydrogen, although it cannot be seen directly; there are no noticeable protrusions or depressions on the surface in the STM images due to hydrogen. The evidence for hydrogen accumulation comes from other sources:

1. The tunneling current becomes more noisy and images become more streaky.

2. Spectroscopy done in a $-100 \text{ mV}$ to $100 \text{ mV}$ range can give curves that resemble that of a superconductor \cite{65}.
3. Spectroscopy within ±100 mV will depend strongly on tip lateral position and tip height from the sample.

Figure 5.5: After the STM was not warmed up to ~40 K for four weeks, the following spectra were acquired. All spectra were taken with the same STM tip. Top panel: Spectroscopy taken at one lateral position on the sample (over the center of a TCNE molecule) using initial settings $V = 50$ mV, $I = 0.5$ nA, 0.5 mV rms ac modulation. Middle panel: Spectroscopy taken with the same settings as the top panel, but at a different lateral position on the sample (over the center of a nearby V(TCNE)$_2$ complex). Bottom panel: Spectroscopy taken at the same lateral position on the sample as the middle panel (center of the same V(TCNE)$_2$ complex), but with initial settings $V = 100$ mV, $I = 0.5$ nA, 1 mV (rms) ac modulation.

Figure 5.5 shows the different types of spectra in a ±60 mV range on a sample that can result after the sample has been in the STM stage for four weeks. These spectra are due to accumulated hydrogen in the system [65], and are not due to the intrinsic properties of the
sample. The graphs also demonstrate how sensitive the spectra are to tip lateral position and tip height. The spectra in the top and middle panels were taken using the same stabilization parameters (so the tip height above the sample is roughly the same), but the top spectrum was taken over the center of a TCNE molecule while the middle taken over the center of a V(TCNE)$_2$. The middle and bottom graphs were taken at the same lateral position on the surface (over the center of the same V(TCNE)$_2$), but the stabilization parameters were different, making the tip further away from the sample for the bottom graph.

To remove hydrogen from the system, standard tip preparation procedures in vacuum (§5.2.2) do not work (at least, not for long); the STM must be warmed up to remove hydrogen, usually to $\sim 40$ K for a few hours. However, since warming up the microscope chamber also desorbs adsorbed gas from the chamber walls, the desorbed gas contaminates the sample, and the sample should be cleaned again.

Before the publication of [65], spectra such as those in figure 5.5 were known to be due to artifacts, but the origin of the artifacts were unknown. Since such artifacts due to hydrogen are sensitive to tip position and difficult to remove by tip preparation in vacuum, a tip which displayed such artifacts was called a “tip from hell.”

## 5.4 Deposition Techniques

In our experiments, we need to deposit molecules or atoms onto a surface such that they are separated from each other. This is usually accomplished by sublimating a macroscopic quantity of the molecule or atom so that it forms a gas. When a substrate such as a Ag(001) crystal is placed in this gas, individual molecules or atoms will hit and stick to the substrate’s surface. By controlling the pressure of the gas, we can control the number of molecules or atoms which hit the surface, and with a low enough pressure, we can get isolated molecules or atoms on a surface. However, molecules and atoms are often mobile on a surface at room temperature, so to keep them isolated, we need to cool the sample.

A device which allows us to sublimate molecules or atoms and control their sublimation pressure is called an evaporator. There are four types of evaporators used for our experiments.

### 5.4.1 Knudsen cell evaporator

All of the molecules studied except TCNE will sublimate in ultra high vacuum at temperatures above room temperature. This allows us to put the molecules in a quartz tube and heat the tube by running current through a W wire to sublimate the molecules (figure 5.6). This type of evaporator is called a Knudsen cell evaporator. The sublimated molecules then hit the sample surface.

The temperature that we heat the quartz determines the pressure of molecules and is used to control the amount of molecules deposited onto the surface. The temperature is measured using a thermocouple.
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5.4.2 Electron beam evaporator

For depositing metals, which usually have much higher evaporation temperatures than molecules (higher than the melting point of the quartz crucible in the Knudsen cell), a Knudsen cell cannot be used. A different type of evaporator, called an electron beam evaporator (e-beam evaporator), is required. For this evaporator, a high voltage (2 kV) is applied to the metal which we want to deposit and a filament is placed near the high voltage metal (figure 5.7a). The feedthrough is usually a TSP feedthrough. The filament is either thoriated W wire, which begins to glow when $\sim 2$ A is passed through it, or a Granville-Phillips ion gauge filament, which requires $\sim 5$ A to glow. The metal is either directly attached to a Mo rod by wrapping W wire around it and the Mo rod (figure 5.7a), or one end of a wire (W, Mo, or Ta) is wrapped around and spot welded to the metal while the other end of the wire is wrapped around and spot welded to the Mo rod (figure 5.7b). The second method (figure 5.7b) of attaching the metal to the Mo rod has the advantage that there is less heat loss to the Mo rod since there is no direct contact between the hot metal and the Mo rod, which means we require less current through the filament to heat the metal and the Mo rod will outgas less. However, this method has the disadvantage that when the metal and wire get hot, they can bend and touch the shield, causing a short.

When the filament is heated by passing a current through it, thermally emitted electrons are accelerated to the metal because of the high voltage applied to it, and when the electrons hit the metal with high energy, they release their energy in the form of heat, rapidly heating the metal. By controlling the current that flows from the filament to the metal through vacuum (called the emission current) we can control the temperature of the metal. A shield is also normally placed around the metal and filament for two reasons: 1) It prevents metal from being evaporated in all directions, which prevents the metal from contaminating other...
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Figure 5.7: e-beam evaporator setup. (a) Complete schematic of an e-beam evaporator with the metal directly attached to the Mo rod and the shield is drawn transparent. (b) A second way of attaching the metal to the Mo rod by using a W, Mo, or Ta wire.

evaporators or covering viewports with metal. It also changes the local electric field around the metal that we evaporate. Since we apply a high voltage to this metal, the evaporated metal atoms are charged and the electric fields can alter the direction the metal atoms are flying. The shield can significantly alter the number of atoms that fly towards the sample.

5.4.3 K getter evaporator

The deposition of K atoms is more difficult due to the high reactivity of K when exposed to moisture in the air. For the deposition of K atoms, K getters were purchased from SAES getters in Milan, Italy. To use these getters, a current of ∼5 to 8 A were passed through the getter, which causes K atoms to be released.

5.4.4 Leak valve evaporator

Since TCNE sublimates at room temperature in UHV, a different method was used to deposit this molecule. The molecules were placed as a solid in a small glass belljar which was attached to a UHV leak valve (figure 5.8). The belljar was first pumped to rough
vacuum ($\sim 10$ mTorr) and then filled with 1 atm of Ar gas. Since TCNE is toxic, when we pump on it, we must make sure that the exhaust of the pump goes into the fume hood. This process of pumping and flushing with Ar was repeated at least ten times. Then finally the belljar is pumped to rough vacuum and the pump/flush valve is closed. The TCNE at room temperature and in rough vacuum will sublimate, forming a gas of TCNE in the belljar and leak valve. Opening the leak valve then allows this gas to hit the sample.

Since the TCNE gas can diffuse everywhere in the chamber, we must turn off ion gauges, ion pumps, or anything else which has hot filaments or high energy electrons since these may break the molecules. Any broken molecules may end up on the sample surface, contaminating the surface.

With leak valve evaporators, we want the distance between the leak valve and the sample to be small (a few inches) so that most of the molecules which come out of the leak valve will hit the sample surface. If the distance between leak valve and sample is large, many molecules which come out of the leak valve will not hit the surface, so we will need a higher pressure of TCNE gas in the chamber to get the same amount of molecules on the surface. A higher pressure of TCNE in the chamber means more TCNE will contaminate the chamber and the base pressure in the chamber will be worse. For this reason, because of the geometry of our chamber, the setup used to deposit TCNE onto a sample at room temperature is different from the setup used to deposit TCNE onto a sample at low temperature, which will be explained below.

**RT leak valve evaporator**

To deposit TCNE onto a sample at room temperature, we must first turn off ion gauges and ion pumps in the load lock so that they do not break the molecules. Then we can simply move the sample into the sample-transfer load lock (figure 5.1). When the leak valve is opened, the TCNE gas then hits the sample. The distance between leak valve and sample is $\sim 3$ in with this setup.

**LT leak valve evaporator**

To deposit TCNE molecules onto a sample that has been cooled below room temperature, we cannot use the sample-transfer load lock since we cannot cool the sample in that load lock. The sample can only be cooled in the transfer chamber (figure 5.1), and the distance between the sample and the leak valve on the main chamber would be relatively large (around 12 inches). So to reduce the distance between the evaporator and sample, we attached a long threaded tube to a modified double-sided blank flange which was attached to the leak valve (figure 5.9). This modified double-sided blank flange (with knife edges on both sides) has a hole drilled completely through it and one side of the hole has 1/8” NPT threads so that we may screw a the threaded tube of pipe onto the end of it. The tube was made out of stainless steel 304. This assembly was then attached to a linear motion feedthrough which was attached to the deposition load lock (figure 5.1) on the main chamber. When the tube
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Figure 5.8: Leak valve evaporator setup for depositing TCNE onto a sample at room temperature

is completely moved toward the sample, the distance between the end of the tube and the sample is \( \sim 5 \text{ in.} \)

To deposit TCNE using this evaporator,

1. the sample is first moved into the STM at 7K.

2. The load lock is normally baked with the gate valve closed until the base pressure after the load lock has cooled to room temperature is \( \sim 1 \times 10^{-8} \text{ torr.} \)

3. After the sample is cooled for a few hours, it is picked up using the vertical manipulator (figure 5.1) and moved it into the main chamber.

4. The load lock gate valve is opened and the tube is moved toward the cold sample using the linear motion feedthrough.

5. The leak valve is opened to deposit the molecules onto the surface.
Figure 5.9: Leak valve evaporator for depositing TCNE onto a sample held at low temperature (~80 K). The schematic shows the evaporator when the tube has been moved toward the sample using the linear motion feedthrough. When the tube is moved sufficiently far away from the sample, the end of the tube is in the load lock, so we may close the gate valve.
Part II

Fullerenes and Diamondoids
Controllably Doping a Single $C_{60}$ Molecule

A central technique for controlling the functionality of bulk semiconductor devices is the ability to tune the electronic properties of semiconductors via charge doping atoms [183]. Now that semiconductor devices are shrinking down to nanometer length scales, questions arise as to whether charge doping will have the same effect at these small length scales. Progress has been made using new compounds [73] and electronic gating [158], but directly attaching single dopant atoms to individual molecules has not been accomplished yet. This chapter will present our progress towards accomplishing this goal by controllably doping single $C_{60}$ molecules through the attachment and/or removal of single potassium (K) atoms. This study will address one of the central questions in this dissertation: how to modify and control the properties of single molecules at the atomic scale. Although $C_{60}$ has been doped with K in the past [201, 45, 189, 207, 26], the experiments were not done on single $C_{60}$ molecules, only molecules in bulk or monolayers.

To modify the properties of a single $C_{60}$ molecule (i.e., an isolated adsorbed molecule at a surface), we need to be able to control the molecule over nanometer length scales. Since the development of the STM, such minute adjustments to structure are possible. The STM has the impressive ability to manipulate and move nanometer-size structures, giving one the capability to alter the characteristics of single molecules such as $C_{60}$.

Sliding individual $C_{60}$ molecules over K atoms with the STM causes the K atoms to attach to the $C_{60}$ molecule, which dopes the molecules with electrons donated from the K atoms. This process causes the $C_{60}$ molecular energy levels to rigidly shift in energy, as well as to split degeneracies and induce a Kondo effect.

This chapter will discuss using the STM as both an experimental tool to construct individual $K_xC_{60}$ complexes, as well as a measurement tool to analyze the electronic properties of the created complexes. It is based on our published paper, ref. [205].

The experiments were performed with our home-built LT UHV STM ($T = 7$ K) with a PtIr tip and a Ag(001) substrate. The Ag(001) single crystal was cleaned by sputtering and annealing (§5.3), cooled to $\sim 80$ K, then $C_{60}$ molecules were deposited onto the substrate from a Knudsen cell evaporator (§5.4.1). The $C_{60}$/Ag(001) sample was then cooled to
$T = 7 \text{K}$ before deposition of K atoms from a K getter (§5.4.3).

### 6.1 Doping $C_{60}$ by STM manipulation

By using the molecular manipulation capabilities of the STM [42, 100], we can construct $K_xC_{60}$ individual complexes [205]. Initially, we had tried to move the K atoms on Ag(001), but were unable to. So we moved the $C_{60}$ molecules towards the K atoms. We then found that the K atoms will attach themselves to the $C_{60}$ molecule. This allows us to create $K_xC_{60}$ by simply moving the $C_{60}$ to $x$ K atoms, one at a time. Figure 6.1a shows this process. $K_xC_{60}$ can easily be made using this method. More than six K atoms are difficult to attach since the $K_6C_{60}$ complexes seem to repel K away. However, stoichiometries as high as $K_7C_{60}$ have also been made with this method.

The topograph of a $K_xC_{60}$ complex, in general, changes very little. Figure 6.1b shows the average of many radial cross-sections taken on a $K_6C_{60}$ complex and a $C_{60}$ molecule. The $K_6C_{60}$ complex is shorter than $C_{60}$ by 2%, but is wider by 21% at a height of 0.25 Å.

To study the electronic structure of $K_xC_{60}$, $dI/dV$ spectroscopy was performed (§2.4). Figure 6.1c shows the typical spectrum for $K_xC_{60}$ for $0 \leq x \leq 7$. Each curve is the average of spectroscopy performed on many different molecules at various points over the same molecule. These curves demonstrate a few trends when $C_{60}$ is doped with K atoms. (1) The LUMO+1 resonance (around 1.7 V in $C_{60}$) and LUMO resonances (around 0.5 and 0.05 V in $C_{60}$, [129]) shift closer to $E_F$ with increased K doping. (2) The LUMO resonance shape changes substantially as the K doping increases. (3) The width of one LUMO resonance narrows substantially with K doping. These changes were only observed when the K atoms were close enough to the $C_{60}$ molecule so that they were not resolvable from the $C_{60}$ molecule.

To see the effect of K doping on the spatial distribution of $C_{60}$ molecular orbitals, $dI/dV$ maps were done (figure 6.2). $dI/dV$ maps of the LUMO+1 orbital on $K_6C_{60}$ and $C_{60}$ (figures 6.2b and c) both reveal bright rings (figure 6.2a), which are known to appear near the $C_{60}$ pentagons [129]. $dI/dV$ maps on $K_6C_{60}$ reveal three distinct states at around $-0.4$ V, $-0.1$ V, and 0.03 V. The state at 0.03 V on $K_6C_{60}$ looks similar to the state on $C_{60}$ at 0.5 V (figure 6.2g). These $dI/dV$ maps (figures 6.2f and g) both have a bright triangular center surrounded by bright spots. These $dI/dV$ maps show that, although K doping shifts the energy of the states, it does not significantly alter the spatial distribution of $C_{60}$'s molecular orbitals. Differences in the $dI/dV$ maps are likely due to different configurations of the atoms at the end of the STM tip.

The doping process can also be reversed. Figure 6.3a shows the process where a $K_4C_{60}$ is moved over an impurity to form $K_3C_{60}$. The impurity is likely oxygen or carbon monoxide. These impurities also form stable complexes with K, and when the $K_4C_{60}$ is moved over them, a single K atom sticks to them, creating $K_3C_{60}$. Spectroscopy (figure 6.3b) shows that a single K atom was removed. This process has been used to reverse the doping levels on $K_xC_{60}$ for $x = 1$ to 4.
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Figure 6.1: (a) STM constant current topographs ($V = 2\, V$, $I = 500\, fA$, $227\, \text{Å} \times 115\, \text{Å}$) showing the construction of $K_xC_{60}$ by STM manipulation. The arrows show the direction the molecule was moved using the STM tip. (b) Averaged radial cross-sections taken over $K_6C_{60}$ and $C_{60}$. (c) $dI/dV$ spectra taken on $K_xC_{60}$, $x = 0$ to 7. Each spectrum is averaged over many $K_xC_{60}$ complexes (except $K_7C_{60}$) and is normalized so the LUMO+1 has the same height.
Figure 6.2: \(dI/dV\) maps taken on \(C_{60}\) and \(K_6C_{60}\) showing the spatial distribution of their molecular orbitals. (a) Structural model showing the orientation of the \(C_{60}\) molecule in the \(dI/dV\) maps. The pentagons are highlighted in blue. \(dI/dV\) maps taken at the LUMO+1 energy of (b) \(K_6C_{60}\) at 1.35 V, (c) \(C_{60}\) at 1.55 V. \(dI/dV\) maps taken near \(E_F\) on \(K_6C_{60}\) at (d) \(V = -0.4\) V, (e) \(-0.1\) V, (f) 0.03 V, and a \(dI/dV\) map on \(C_{60}\) at (g) 0.5 V. (h) \(dI/dV\) spectra on \(K_6C_{60}\) and \(C_{60}\).

6.2 Modeling \(K_xC_{60}\)

6.2.1 Charge Transfer

We can estimate the amount of charge transferred from K atoms to the \(C_{60}\) molecule using a simple method which relates charge transfer to changes in the energetic position of the
molecular resonances. This model is similar to the one presented in photoemission experiments [85]. This model assumes that the DOS does not change with electron addition, only the occupancy of the states change [26]. Changes to the molecular DOS with K doping limit the accuracy of this model. Since the LUMO can accommodate 6 electrons (including spin degeneracy), if the LUMO is completely filled, it must be completely below \( E_F \), while if the LUMO is completely empty, it must be completely above \( E_F \). Therefore, if the LUMO starts out as completely empty and we add 6 electrons to it, \( E_F \) must increase by roughly the width of the LUMO, which is 0.8 eV from the spectroscopy data. Since \( E_F \) always corresponds to \( V = 0 \) in \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy, we should see the LUMO resonance (and all other resonances) shift down by \( \sim 0.8 \) V in the data when the LUMO is completely filled. To calculate the charge transfer using this simple model, we then need to calculate the shift in the \( C_{60} \) resonances with the addition of K atoms.

We use Gaussian fits of the \( K_{x}C_{60} \) LUMO+1 resonances (figure 6.4) to track the shifts of the molecular resonances since the LUMO+1 does not change its shape with K addition, making it simpler to fit. A linear background was subtracted from the data before fitting the resonance. An example of the fit quality is shown in figure 6.4a, which is a fit of the \( C_{60} \) LUMO+1. Fits for \( K_{x}C_{60} \), \( x = 1 \) to 4 were of comparable quality. When the center of each Gaussian is plotted as a function of number of K atoms added to \( C_{60} \) (figure 6.4), we see that the centers of the Gaussians shift at a rate of \( 85 \) mV \( \pm 15 \) mV per added K atom. This means that only \( 85 \) mV/800 mV = 11% of the LUMO is getting filled with the addition of

Figure 6.3: Reversing the doping process. (a) Topographs (\( V = 2 \) V, \( I = 0.5 \) pA, 285 Å \( \times 75 \) Å) showing \( K_4C_{60} \) being converted to \( K_3C_{60} \) by moving it over an impurity. (b) Spectroscopy on \( K_3C_{60} \) before converting it to \( K_4C_{60} \) (black curve), after conversion to \( K_4C_{60} \) (red curve), and after reversing it back to \( K_3C_{60} \) (dotted green curve).
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Figure 6.4: Two-Gaussian fits to the LUMO+1 of K$_x$C$_{60}$. (a) Experimental C$_{60}$ LUMO+1 resonance (black curve) after a linear background was subtracted. The best fit to the LUMO+1 is the green curve and the two Gaussians that make up the best fit are the red and purple dotted curves. (b) Voltages of the center of the two Gaussians in the best fit plotted as a function of K doping level.

Each K atom. This corresponds to a charge transfer of around 11% of 6 electrons, which is $\sim$0.6 electrons per K atom. This is less than what is seen in K doped bulk [201, 45] C$_{60}$ and monolayer C$_{60}$ [189, 207, 26] samples, where K donates an entire electron to C$_{60}$. This difference is likely because of differences in the local environment of each K atom: each K atom is surrounded by C$_{60}$ molecules in bulk and monolayer samples, but they are not in single K$_x$C$_{60}$.

However, this simple charge transfer model does not explain the change in the line shapes of the LUMO resonance under K doping and does not taken into account the effect of the K atoms. To get a more quantitative idea of the electronic properties of K$_x$C$_{60}$, a combination of DFT and NRG was used.

### 6.2.2 DFT and NRG

We use density functional theory (DFT) calculations to explain the effect of adding K atoms to a C$_{60}$ molecule on a Ag(001) surface. However, although DFT reproduces the shift of electronic states and the observed LUMO degeneracy breaking well, it does not explain the experimental appearance of the sharp resonance pinned at the Fermi energy for K$_x$C$_{60}$, $x > 4$. To investigate this anomalous peak further, numerical renormalization group (NRG) calculations were performed and show that one of the three split C$_{60}$ LUMO states interacts
with the surface in a way to produce a narrow resonance (the Kondo resonance, §4.4.3) near $E_F$.

The results of the DFT calculations are shown below. All calculations were performed by Jeff Neaton, who was working in Steven Louie’s group at that time, using SIESTA (§4.5, [180]) with norm-conserving pseudopotentials [190] and a double-$\zeta$ basis set [175] (s and d orbitals for Ag, and s and p orbitals for C). The supercell contained a $K_xC_{60}$ molecule ($x = 0, 3, 6$), on 200 Ag atoms in 4 atomic layers. The $C_{60}$ molecule is initially positioned with a hexagon facing the surface, as experimentally observed, and the atomic positions of all atoms, except the bottom two Ag layers, are relaxed until the force on each atom is less than 0.025 eV/Å. The calculation was repeated for a $C_{60}$ molecule positioned at different adsorption sites, and in the calculated lowest-energy configuration, the molecule sits 1.85 Å above a Ag(001) hollow site. The relaxed structures for $K_3C_{60}$ and $K_6C_{60}$ are plotted in figure 6.5d. The K atoms in $K_3C_{60}$ form an equilateral triangle in a plane $\sim 3$ Å above the Ag(001) plane and lie near the centers of the $C_{60}$ hexagons. The K atoms in $K_6C_{60}$ are also nearly coplanar, but $\sim 0.1$ Å higher off Ag(001) than in $K_3C_{60}$ and prefer to be next to the centers of the $C_{60}$ hexagons.

To compare the DFT results with the averaged experimental dI/dV spectra, the PDOS was calculated for the atoms on the upper hemisphere of the $C_{60}$ molecule (away from the substrate). These results are presented in figure 6.5b for $K_xC_{60}$, $x = 0, 3, 6$ adsorbed on Ag(001). (Similar results were obtained by integrating the LDOS onto the tails of wavefunctions in a hemispherical spatial region 2 Å above the $C_{60}$ molecule.) For all three dopant levels, our calculations reveal broad LUMO-like molecular resonances near $E_F$, and a single, broadened LUMO+1 resonances centered $\sim 1.2$ eV higher in energy, in agreement with experiment and previous studies [129]. As the number of surrounding K atoms increases, the LUMO resonances drift toward lower energies relative to $E_F$, indicating a systematic charge transfer to the molecule with increasing K. The LUMO+1 resonance also shifts toward the Fermi level with increasing potassium concentration, in excellent agreement with the experimental trend (figure 6.5a). The DFT energy of the LUMO+1 resonance relative to the Fermi level is underestimated by about 0.5 eV compared with experiment because of the usual errors associated with unoccupied states in DFT. Quasiparticle self-energy corrections (§3.4.2) should better align these energies with experiment [87, 151, 176], but are beyond the scope of this work.

With no K atoms attached to $C_{60}$, our calculations (figure 6.5b) reveal two resonances just above $E_F$, one slightly weaker centered at $\sim 0.13$ eV and another slightly stronger at $\sim 0.38$ eV, in remarkable agreement with the experimental spectrum.

To better understand the origin of the calculated splitting, the $C_{60}$ molecule is lifted off the substrate by 1.5 Å (without subsequent relaxation). The recalculated PDOS is shown in figure 6.5c, and the width of the molecular resonances and their splitting can be seen to decrease with increasing molecule-substrate separation. The four-fold symmetric hollow adsorption site breaks the $t_{1u}$ symmetry of the LUMO, which, in the gas-phase, has three-fold orbital degeneracy. Thus, the hollow site symmetry results in three singly-degenerate levels, two of which remain relatively close together. As the molecule is moved away from the
Figure 6.5: DFT on $K_xC_{60}$ on Ag(001). (a) Experimental $dI/dV$ spectra shown earlier. (b) DFT calculated PDOS for $K_xC_{60}$, $x = 0, 3, 6$. (c) PDOS for $C_{60}$ on Ag(001) for two different heights above the Ag(001) plane. $\Delta z$ represents the increase in $C_{60}$-Ag distance from the relaxed $C_{60}$-Ag distance. (d) DFT relaxed structures for $K_3C_{60}$ and $K_6C_{60}$.
surface, the electronic coupling between the LUMO and the substrate diminishes, resulting in a reduction of the magnitude of the splitting of the LUMO manifold.

Although the agreement between experiment and the DFT calculations is excellent for $C_{60}$ on Ag(001), the narrow peak appearing near $E_F$ for $K_xC_{60}$, $x \geq 4$, is absent from the DFT calculated PDOS. Due to the unusually narrow widths of the experimental peaks for $K_xC_{60}$, $x \geq 4$, which is not expected for molecules on surfaces, and the lack of any narrow peaks in the DFT calculations, we conclude that the narrow resonance near $E_F$ must be due to a correlated electronic excitation that is not captured by DFT. The fractional charge state of $K_xC_{60}$ for $x \geq 4$ calculated by DFT suggests that there is a partially filled orbital which can lead to a Kondo effect: this is a strong correlation phenomenon which produces narrow features near $E_F$ that DFT would not be expected to reproduce.

To explore further the possibility of a Kondo resonance for $x \geq 4$, Noah Bray-Ali in Joel Moore’s group performed numerical renormalization group (NRG) calculations [81] using a model Hamiltonian that best fits the information provided by experiment and our DFT calculations. Our main assumption is that there is only one $C_{60}$ resonance moving through $E_F$ for $K_xC_{60}$, $x \geq 4$. Because the substrate removes the three-fold LUMO degeneracy, this approximation is acceptable. This is different from previous theories [39] which assume degenerate LUMO states. The resulting single-orbital Anderson model contains three parameters: the bare resonance energy $E_d$, the non-interacting (bare) level width ($\Delta = 135$ meV for all curves in the top panel in figure 6.6), and the intra-orbital interaction energy ($U = 405$ meV for all curves in the top panel of figure 6.6).

The results of these calculations are shown in figure 6.6. The only adjustable parameter is $E_d$, which is taken to move linearly with doping from $81.5$ meV ($x = 4$) to $-121.5$ meV ($x = 7$). For these parameters, the number of electrons in the impurity orbital is intermediate between zero and one; this range of parameters is referred to as the “mixed-valence” regime of the Anderson model. Although the widths of the NRG spectral functions are slightly wider than the observed widths, the energetic positions of the resonances agree with experiment. Strong correlations slow down the motion of the center of the observed resonance with doping as it nears the Fermi level from above and cause the resonance to narrow. The narrowing of the density of states peak in the mixed-valence regime was previously obtained using the NRG technique [81, 34]. A slightly improved fit to the data can be obtained by increasing the number of fit parameters, but an adequate model of the evolution of the center orbital with increasing K doping as a mixed-valence Kondo effect requires only a linearly decreasing bare orbital energy, with all other parameters kept constant.

6.3 $K_xC_{60}$ Heterostructures

Once a $K_xC_{60}$ complex is created, it can be manipulated by STM towards a $K_yC_{60}$ complex. These two complexes stick together forming a heterostructure. One important way these structures deviate from the behavior of isolated $K_xC_{60}$ complexes is in the amount of charge transfer between K and $C_{60}$. K seems to donate more charge to $C_{60}$ in these heterostructures
Figure 6.6: Top panel: the bare resonances used for the NRG calculations. Middle panel: NRG calculated PDOS. Lower panel: $dI/dV$ spectra from experiment.

than in isolated $K_xC_{60}$ complexes.

Figure 6.7a shows the topograph of a $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ heterostructure. The $K_6C_{60}$ and $C_{60}$ molecules are hard to distinguish in the topography. They are easier to distinguish in the $dI/dV$ map of the same heterostructure in figure 6.7b, where the $K_6C_{60}$ appears brighter than the $C_{60}$. 
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Figure 6.7: A $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ heterostructure. (a) Topograph of the heterostructure. (b) $dI/dV$ map of the same heterostructure taken at 1.2 V. (c) Spectroscopy of the $K_6C_{60}$ and $C_{60}$ in the heterostructure compared to the spectroscopy of isolated $K_6C_{60}$ and $C_{60}$ complexes. $K_6/K_0$ in the caption refers to $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$.

$dI/dV$ spectroscopy on the $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ heterostructure (figure 6.7c) reveals that the spectrum of a $K_6C_{60}$ complex in the $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ heterostructure (blue curve) looks almost identical to an isolated $K_6C_{60}$ spectrum (green curve), while the spectrum for a $C_{60}$ molecule in $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ looks substantially different from the spectrum of an isolated $C_{60}$ (black curve).

Since changes in the spectroscopy are related to charge transfer, the spectroscopy results suggest that attaching $C_{60}$ to $K_6C_{60}$ does not significantly alter the charge state of $K_6C_{60}$ but it does change the charge state of the isolated $C_{60}$ appreciably. The amount of charge transfer can be estimated from the position of the LUMO+1, as in §6.2.1. Since the energetic position of the left LUMO+1 shoulder for $C_{60}$ in $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ is around 0.1 V lower than the energetic position of the left LUMO+1 shoulder in isolated $C_{60}$, the $C_{60}$ in $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ has gained an additional charge of around 0.6 electrons after it is attached to $K_6C_{60}$. Hence, the total electron charge on the heterostructure is larger than the charge on each molecule when separated.

This effect may be due to the influence of the local environment of $K$ on the $K$-$C_{60}$ charge transfer. In K doped bulk $C_{60}$ [201, 45] and monolayer $C_{60}$ [189, 207, 26] samples, K donates an entire electron to $C_{60}$. Hence, if $K$ is surrounded by numerous $C_{60}$ molecules, as it is in bulk and monolayer samples, then the charge transfer is different than the 0.6 electron charge transfer from K to $C_{60}$ in isolated $K_xC_{60}$ complexes, where the K atoms...
are surrounded by only one $C_{60}$. By adding a $C_{60}$ molecule to $K_6C_{60}$, the K atoms in the $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ complex are now surrounded by more $C_{60}$ molecules, causing the charge transfer from K to $C_{60}$ in $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ to become more like the bulk and monolayer charge transfer values. Since the bulk and monolayer charge transfers are higher than the isolated $K_xC_{60}$ charge transfers, the charge transfer from K to $C_{60}$ in $K_6C_{60}/C_{60}$ is also higher. The exact mechanisms behind the additional charge transfer will require further study.

6.4 Conclusions

Using the STM, single $C_{60}$ molecules have been reversibly doped with individual K atoms on Ag(001). Experimental $dI/dV$ spectra show that the main effect of this doping process is to rigidly shift $C_{60}$ molecular states with doping. In addition, other more subtle features also appear in the experimental spectra, such as splittings, dips, and peaks near $E_F$. DFT calculations reproduce most of the essential features of the spectroscopy, except for the sharp peak near $E_F$ in $K_xC_{60}$ for $4 \leq x \leq 7$. This peak can be accounted for with NRG calculations, which show it arises from a mixed-valence Kondo effect.

It is still not clear why the narrow resonance at $E_F$ is only seen in $K_xC_{60}$ when $x \geq 4$. One reason for the lack of a Kondo peak for $x < 4$ is that the Kondo temperature might be too low to see a Kondo effect: instead a Coulomb-blockade dip appears at the Fermi level at temperatures above the Kondo temperature. Alternately, the Fano-like dips that appear for $K_xC_{60}$, $x < 4$, suggest that there might also be a Kondo effect at lower dopings, but instead of a sharp resonance, we observe a Fano line shape caused by tunneling through multiple channels. The underlying physics behind the lower doped $C_{60}$’s is not completely understood and requires further study.
The interplay between molecular electronic and atomic structure is particularly important in fullerenes, because of the unusual combination of large electron-vibration interaction and large electron-electron interactions with small electronic bandwidths, causing all interactions to be of comparable energies [207, 62]. Since the conductive characteristics of a system are heavily influenced by the relative magnitude of these properties, small changes in these properties due to changes in interactions such as intermolecular hybridization, electron-electron interactions, and structural distortions can tip these systems from one side of the metal-insulator divide to the other. Metal-to-insulator transitions have been studied extensively in C$_{60}$ based systems [105, 41, 89, 21], but the role played by the structural distortions is still under debate [21, 160, 46, 32, 69, 25, 38, 104].

The STM gives one the unique ability to simultaneously investigate local structural distortions and electronic properties of a system, allowing one to analyze the effect of structural distortions on electronic properties, thus allowing one to determine the role these distortions play in C$_{60}$ metal-to-insulator transitions. This ability stems from the capability of STM to measure the DOS, giving us electronic information, as well as from the capability of STM to directly image electronic wavefunctions at various energies, giving us structural distortion information, since the spatial distribution of wavefunctions are directly related to structural distortions.

Our STM imaging of the wavefunctions of individual K$_x$C$_{60}$ complexes in a K$_x$C$_{60}$ monolayer (ML) on Au(111) gives strong evidence that a specific type of structural distortion caused by the Jahn-Teller (JT) effect exists in this system and that this distortion plays a crucial role in driving the K$_x$C$_{60}$ ML from a metal for $x = 3$ to an insulator at $x = 4$.

Since the JT effect is related to electron-vibration interactions, this chapter will address one of the central questions in this dissertation: how do electron-vibration interactions in single molecules affect their isolated and aggregate properties. It will discuss how the electron-vibration induced structural JT distortions in K$_x$C$_{60}$ monolayers on Au(111) result in a metal-to-insulator transition in this system. This chapter is based mainly on a paper we published in ref. [191].
7.1 The Jahn-Teller Effect

Symmetries are inevitably linked to degeneracies by Noether’s theorem. Structural symmetries are closely linked to electronic degeneracies with high structural symmetry leading to large degeneracies in the electronic energy levels. Breaking the structural symmetry can result in breaking the electronic degeneracy. For a molecule with degenerate orbitals, only some of which are occupied by electrons, structural distortion of the molecule can lower the energy of occupied electronic levels while raising the energy of empty ones, reducing the molecular total electronic energy (figure 7.1). Hence, under the right circumstances, it will be energetically favorable to break structural symmetries. Structural symmetry breaking resulting in the lowering of electronic energy via degeneracy breaking is known as the Jahn-Teller effect [92].

Jahn and Teller derived the conditions under which the JT effect occurs in the 1937 [92]. For molecules that are not linear, a structural distortion will cause degeneracy breaking in any set of degenerate states whose degeneracy is not due to Kramer’s degeneracy. (Kramer’s degeneracy occurs when the Hamiltonian \( H \) for a system commutes with the time reversal operator \( \Theta \) and the system has a half-odd integer spin. In this situation, any eigenstate \( |\psi\rangle \) of \( H \) is degenerate with \( \Theta |\psi\rangle \)). However, the magnitude of the energetic splitting between the JT split states depends on the strength of the electron-vibration interaction, and may be too small to observe in some molecules.

7.2 JT effect in \( K_xC_{60} \) monolayers

The high symmetry (icosahedral) of \( C_{60} \) leads to large degeneracies, and this combined with its strong electron-vibration interactions makes \( C_{60} \) a good candidate to observe the
JT effect. Although the energetic splitting of degenerate C\textsubscript{60} orbitals has been seen in previous experiments, the JT split wavefunctions have not been imaged before, and it is this additional information which links the electronic and structural properties.

The electronic wavefunctions at one particular energy in a JT\textsuperscript{\textdagger} distorted molecule are directly impacted by the symmetry of the JT distortion since the JT splitting of degenerate states leads to very different occupied and empty wavefunctions compared with undistorted molecules. By comparing STM images of the molecular wavefunctions above and below \(E_F\), we can determine the presence or absence of a JT splitting, and furthermore, with the aid of theoretical analyses, can determine the structure which lead to the wavefunctions.

STM images above and below \(E_F\) reveal that K\textsubscript{4}C\textsubscript{60} has a JT distortion while \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy shows it is an insulator. This provides evidence that the lack of DOS near \(E_F\) in K\textsubscript{4}C\textsubscript{60}, and hence its insulating behavior, is related to the JT splitting of the C\textsubscript{60} orbitals, since the JT splitting tends to reduce the energy of occupied states while increasing the energy of unoccupied states, creating a lack of states in the DOS near \(E_F\). STM images on K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60}, on the other hand, reveal the lack of a JT\textsuperscript{\textdagger} distortion while \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy on K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} reveals it is metallic. This combination of results on both K\textsubscript{4}C\textsubscript{60} and K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} strongly suggests that the transition from metal to insulator in K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} monolayers when \(x\) changes from 3 to 4 is related to the Jahn-Teller effect.

The JT effect only happens when not all orbitals in a degenerate set of orbitals are filled, which is not the case in pure C\textsubscript{60}. To obtain the situation which makes the JT effect possible, we added charge to the molecule. To accomplish this experimentally, we add K atoms to C\textsubscript{60}. Since each K atom donates approximately one electron to the physisorbed C\textsubscript{60} molecules, the charge state of C\textsubscript{60} molecules in the K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} ML was controlled by controlling the local K concentration [207, 189, 26].

All experiments were performed using a home-built UHV STM at \(T = 7\) K with a PtIr tip. The Au(111) surface was cleaned by sputtering and annealing (§5.3). C\textsubscript{60} was then deposited at coverages between 80\% ML and 90\% ML onto the clean Au(111) substrate cooled to 80 K. C\textsubscript{60} coverages were determined from STM images. K was deposited progressively from a calibrated K getter (§5.4.3) onto the C\textsubscript{60}/Au(111) sample, followed each time by an anneal at 490 ± 10 K for 15 min. K evaporators were calibrated by deposition of K onto a clean Ag(100) substrate cooled to 80 K and counting single K atoms in topographic STM images acquired at 7 K. \(dI/dV\) spectra acquired using standard lock-in techniques (§2.4).

Low-temperature STM studies were performed on K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} monolayers on Au(111) for \(0 \leq x \leq 5\). At lower K concentrations \(0 \leq x \leq 3\), the energetic position of the C\textsubscript{60} states rigidly shift to lower energies as the K concentration increases (figure 7.2). However, this trend stops at \(x = 4\) where the STM spectrum evolves from a metal at \(x = 3\) to one that is characteristic of an insulator at \(x = 4\). This electronic transition is accompanied by a dramatic orientational rearrangement of the C\textsubscript{60} molecules. This data strongly suggests that something special happens between \(x = 3\) and 4.

We will now focus on K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} for \(x = 3\) and 4. When the average \(x\) in K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} falls between 3 and 4, the system is an inhomogeneous mixture of two stoichiometries. The local phase separation can be seen in figure 7.3. K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} exhibits a triangular lattice backbone with a
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Figure 7.2: Topography and \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy on K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} monolayers on Au(111). The LUMO and LUMO+1 resonances for C\textsubscript{60} shift to lower energies in K\textsubscript{2}C\textsubscript{60} and K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60}. However, \(x \geq 4\), this trend stops. Individual C\textsubscript{60} molecules are circled in red in the topographic images.

“bright molecule” supermodulation (figure 7.4B), which may be a K-induced ordering. The exact form of the supermodulation varies across the K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} surface and exhibits pronounced disorder in some regions, whereas it disappears altogether in others. However, metallic \(dI/dV\) spectra (figure 7.3) are observed regardless of the details of the supermodulation. The K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} ML undergoes a dramatic restructuring from \(x = 3\) to 4 that transforms the underlying triangular supermodulation into a nearly rectangular structure with four molecules per unit cell (figure 7.5A). This structure is free of supermodulation and contains much larger ordered areas than the K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} structures. The \(dI/dV\) spectrum for K\textsubscript{4}C\textsubscript{60} exhibits an energy gap of 200 \(\pm\) 20 mV that is roughly symmetrical about \(E\textsubscript{F}\) (figure 7.3).

The difference in electronic wavefunctions between the \(x = 3\) and \(x = 4\) phases can be seen by comparing STM images of the filled and empty states straddling \(E\textsubscript{F}\) (figures 7.4 and 7.5). Constant current topographic images at \(V = -200\) mV (filled states) and \(V = +200\) mV (empty states) for the same patch of K\textsubscript{3}C\textsubscript{60} surface (figure 7.4A and B) show
Figure 7.3: Phase separation in $K_xC_{60}$ for $3 \leq x \leq 4$. The topograph ($V = 0.5$ V, $I = 10$ pA) shows the two coexisting phases $K_3C_{60}$ and $K_4C_{60}$. The spatially averaged $dI/dV$ spectrum taken on only $K_3C_{60}$ shows metallic behavior, while the spatially averaged $dI/dV$ spectrum for $K_4C_{60}$ shows an energy gap at $E_F$. A bare $C_{60}$ spectrum is shown for comparison. All spectra were normalized so that the highest peak has a maximum value of 1.

Little change upon bias reversal. A collection of $dI/dV$ spectra measured at different points within a $4 \AA \times 4 \AA$ region of the $K_3C_{60}$ ML (figure 7.4C) shows some variability, but all of the spectra reveal a similar peak near $E_F$ ($V = 0$), indicative of a metal.

However, empty and filled state images of $K_4C_{60}$ shows a striking difference (measured at $V = -200$ mV and $V = +200$ mV, respectively). Filled-state images (figure 7.5A) show that each $C_{60}$ molecule is bisected by a single nodal line (i.e., a dark stripe), while empty-state images (figure 7.5B), display an additional nodal line on each molecule that is rotated by 90° with respect to the node seen in the filled-state image. This prominent difference in topography for filled and empty states does not exist in $K_3C_{60}$. $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on the $K_4C_{60}$ phase (figure 7.5C) shows that instead of a peak at $E_F$, a 200 mV energy gap exists, indicating that $K_4C_{60}$ is an insulator.

The dramatic difference in the filled- and empty-state topography of figure 7.5 can be attributed to a JT distortion. When four K atoms are added to $C_{60}$, the molecule receives four extra electrons, and a $C_{60}$ molecule is expected to undergo a JT distortion whereby the three degenerate LUMO states split (figure 7.1) into a group of twofold orbitally degenerate levels at lower energy and one orbital at higher energy [27, 112, 134]. The four extra electrons reside in the two lower energy levels, making the distortion energetically favorable.
Figure 7.4: $K_3C_{60}$ ML on Au(111). (A) Constant current STM topograph of $K_3C_{60}$ on Au(111) at $V = -0.2\,\text{V}$, $I = 20\,\text{pA}$, showing occupied electronic states near $E_F$. (B) Topograph of the same region at $V = +0.2\,\text{V}$, $I = 20\,\text{pA}$, showing empty electronic states near $E_F$. Single molecules are circled in red. (C) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on $K_3C_{60}$ taken on a $3 \times 3$ grid of equally spaced points with a $2\,\text{Å}$ spacing between points.
Figure 7.5: $K_4C_{60}$ ML on Au(111). (A) Constant current STM topograph of $K_4C_{60}$ on Au(111) at $V = -0.2$ V, $I = 10$ pA, showing occupied electronic states near $E_F$. The topography does not change over the bias range $-0.10$ V to $-0.7$ V. (B) Topograph of the same region at $V = +0.2$ V, $I = 10$ pA, showing empty electronic states near $E_F$. Single $C_{60}$ molecules are circled in red. The topography does not change over the bias range $+0.10$ V to $+0.6$ V. (C) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on $K_4C_{60}$ taken at various points.
7.3 DFT calculations on $K_4C_{60}$

The effect of a small molecular distortion can be thought of as adding a perturbing Hamiltonian $H'$ to an undistorted molecule's Hamiltonian, and by degenerate perturbation theory, $H'$ will split degenerate states, like the $C_{60}$ LUMO, in a way that diagonalizes $H'$. Different distortions will yield different perturbations $H'$, which then lead to different splittings. This implies an intimate relation between the electronic orbitals and the specific type of distortion induced by the JT effect. To determine that relation, we compared our STM topographic images with calculated molecular LDOS by using the density functional theory (DFT) code SIESTA with ab initio pseudopotentials, a local orbital basis, and the local density approximation for the exchange-correlation functional. The calculations were performed by Khoonghong Khoo in Steven Louie’s group. Different locally stable distorted structures for isolated $C_{60}^{4-}$ were found by total energy minimization. Their electronic LDOS’s were then compared to our STM topography and the distorted structure which best reproduced the experimental images was selected. Figure 7.6 shows two views of the best-fit structure, which has $D_{2h}$ symmetry, where the atomic displacements have been exaggerated by a factor of 30. Apart from using an improved basis set [102], a finer real space grid (0.1 Å mesh), and excluding the surface, details of the calculation method are similar to those in [130].

![C$_{60}$ JT distortion with $D_{2h}$ symmetry](image)

Figure 7.6: Two views of the JT distorted $C_{60}^{4-}$ structure whose LDOS best reproduces experimental images. This structure has $D_{2h}$ symmetry. The Au(111) surface would lie in the $xy$-plane if one compares this to experiment. The distortion has been exaggerated by a factor of 30 to make it visible.

To calculate the various stable structures, the molecule was given a small initial distortion having either $D_{2h}$, $D_{3d}$, or $D_{5d}$ symmetry, and then allowed to relax to minimize the energy. These distortions were chosen by symmetry considerations [27, 112, 134]. The resulting displacements can be expressed in terms of phonon modes within the $H_g$ and $A_g$ even symmetry classes. The lowest energy deformation having $D_{2h}$, $D_{3d}$, or $D_{5d}$ symmetry each show an essentially identical total energy reduction from the undistorted structure of 0.3 eV per molecule. In all three cases, the molecular JT distortion splits the 3-fold degenerate LUMO by 0.11 eV into doubly degenerate occupied levels and a single unoccupied level. However, only the $D_{2h}$ distortion results in electronic wave functions that match the STM
images above and below $E_F$; see figure 7.7 for the calculated wavefunctions with $D_{3d}$ and $D_{5d}$ symmetry. Therefore, we believe that the $D_{2h}$ distortion is stabilized in the K$_4$C$_{60}$ ML on Au(111), possibly due to the K-C$_{60}$ interaction or Au-C$_{60}$ interaction, which were not included in the calculation. The calculated $D_{2h}$ distortion of the C$_{60}$ cage (figure 7.5) creates

![Diagram of DFT calculations on K$_4$C$_{60}$](image)

Figure 7.7: DFT calculated C$_{60}^{-}$ JT distortions having $D_{3d}$ or $D_{5d}$ symmetry. The red circles mark the position of a single C$_{60}$ molecule. (A) Theoretical 2-D projection of a $D_{3d}$ distorted C$_{60}^{-}$ molecule isosurface and simulated unit cell showing empty state wavefunctions. (B) HOMO wavefunctions for the $D_{3d}$ JT split levels. Iso-surfaces are about 3 Å outward from carbon centers. All single molecule projected isosurfaces have an orientation such that a horizontal 6-6 bond would be in the center of the structural model. Regions within black dashed circles are preferentially imaged in monolayer topographs due to finite tip size. (C) and (D): same as (A) and (B), but for a $D_{5d}$ distorted C$_{60}^{-}$. (E) Experimental STM topography for the K$_4$C$_{60}$ ML unit cell empty states and (F) filled states.

an oblate spheroid, with the short axis along the $y$ direction of the figure. Most of the bond distortion occurs in the equatorial $xz$ plane.

The isosurfaces of the LDOS (plot of the set \{$\vec{r}$; $\sum_n |\Psi_n(\vec{r})|^2 = C$\}, where $\vec{r}$ is the position vector, $\Psi_n(\vec{r})$ is an eigenstate, $n$ ranges over degenerate eigenstates at a particular energy, and $C$ is a real constant) of the energy-split states for the $D_{2h}$ distorted C$_{60}^{-}$ can be seen in figure 7.8A and B, for the unique orientation that fits our experimental data (here the Au surface lies in the $xy$ plane of the figure).

The most pronounced feature in the calculated C$_{60}^{-}$ HOMO wavefunctions (figure 7.8B)
Figure 7.8: Comparison between the DFT calculated $D_{2h}$ JT distorted $C_{60}^{4-}$ and experiment. The Au(111) surface lies parallel to the $xy$ plane of the figure. (A) Two-dimensional projection of the $C_{60}^{-}$ isosurface showing the wavefunction for the highest filled-state and (B) wavefunctions for the lowest empty states at $\sim 3\,\text{Å}$ outward from carbon centers. Regions within the dashed circles are preferentially imaged by STM in ML topographs because of finite tip size. The regions within the dashed circles are repeated and arranged in (C) and (D) to simulate the experimental unit cell. Nodal lines are marked in purple and green and single molecules are circled in red. (E) and (F) are experimental $K_4C_{60}$ unit cells for comparison.

is a strong linear depression that bisects the highest region (red regions) into two areas. The highest regions of the LUMO wavefunction (figure 7.8A) are similar to the highest regions of the occupied wavefunctions, except for the addition of a pronounced linear depression that lies at an angle of $90^\circ$ from the linear depression seen in the occupied wavefunctions. This new node lies exactly in the $xz$ equatorial plane, where the greatest JT-induced changes in bond length occur, thus marking the spatial location of the JT distortion in the molecular wavefunction. By taking the regions enclosed by dashed circles in figures 7.8A and B, and repeating and arranging them, simulated ML topographs (figure 7.8C and D) have been constructed, and are in good agreement with experimentally observed $K_4C_{60}$ filled and empty state topography. Empty-state imaging of the $K_4C_{60}$ ML thus allows us to
directly determine the spatial location where the largest structural distortion occurs for each individual C$_{60}$ molecule.

7.4 Conclusions

Our combined DFT and STM results provide strong evidence that the JT distortion plays a central role in the metal-to-insulator transition from K$_3$C$_{60}$ MLs to K$_4$C$_{60}$ MLs. In particular, the JT effect and the intra-molecular Coulomb interaction act cooperatively. For an even number of electrons, the JT effect suppresses intermolecular electron hopping (via Pauli exclusion) and hence reduces metallicity. Less metallicity causes worsened screening which enhances intra-molecular Coulomb interaction [62, 130, 80] and thus enhances electron localization. Increased electronic localization, in turn, favors JT distortion (by reducing electron-number fluctuation on each molecule). Both Coulomb and JT interactions cooperatively contribute towards the insulating K$_4$C$_{60}$ ML ground state.

A better understanding of the details in K$_x$C$_{60}$ spectroscopic features will likely have to include interaction of the molecules with the K ions and with the Au substrate, as well as quasiparticle effects that go beyond DFT in the standard local-density approximation.
The previous chapter focused on the electronic properties of $K_xC_{60}$ monolayers, but did not discuss the mechanisms that drive the ordering of the molecules. This chapter will discuss the possible underlying mechanisms causing $C_{60}$ molecules to order in $K_xC_{60}$ monolayers ($3 \leq x \leq 5$). It will address one of the main themes in this dissertation: how do molecule-molecule interactions influence the properties (in this case orientational ordering) of the constituent molecules. It is based mainly on our published paper, ref. [197].

8.1 Orientational Ordering

Unlike atoms, molecules have various distinct orientations, which leads to an additional type of ordering not possible in atoms: orientational ordering. In a lattice consisting of one type of molecule, orientational ordering is when the orientations of the molecules repeat in a pattern. Like the Jahn-Teller effect, orientational ordering also originates from symmetry breaking, but this time it is the broken symmetry of the environment of the molecule. When the molecular environment is not perfectly symmetric, the interaction between the molecule and the environment will cause certain molecular orientations to have a lower energy than others, creating preferred molecular orientations.

The high (icosahedral) symmetry of a $C_{60}$ molecule makes monolayers of potassium doped $C_{60}$ ideal systems for studying new orientational phases [77]. Orientational order also plays a vital role in shaping the rich electronic phase diagram of the fullerides that involves superconducting, metallic, insulating, and magnetic phases [62]. For example, the effect of molecular orientation on electronic structure was seen in angle-resolved photoemission experiments that reveal significant differences between metallic $K_3C_{60}$ MLs on Ag(111) and Ag(001) [22].


8.2 \( K_x C_{60} \) Pinwheels

By performing STM experiments on \( K_x C_{60} \) MLs on Au(111), we find that \( K_{4+\delta} C_{60} \) MLs with \( 0.1 < \delta < 0.5 \) exhibit \( C_{60} \) molecules that retain the JT-split \( K_4C_{60} \) states (chapter 7), but display a new, complex 7-sublattice pinwheel-like orientational ordering. At \( x = 5 \) the system reenters a metallic phase (chapter 9) that exhibits a novel orientational structure markedly similar to the \( x = 3 \) metallic phase. In the JT-insulating \( K_x C_{60} \) MLs (\( x \sim 4 \)), an intermolecular electron virtual hopping mechanism is proposed to be a crucial driving force for the cross and pinwheel phases. In the metallic phases \( x = 3,5 \) the dominant mechanism for orientational ordering is the maximization of the overlap of partially occupied electron wave functions, resulting in direct intermolecular electron hopping.

Our experiments were conducted in UHV at \( T = 7 \) K with a PtIr tip. \( C_{60} \) thin films were made by evaporating \( C_{60} \) molecules onto a clean Au(111) surface from a Knudsen cell evaporator (\$5.4.1). Appropriate amounts of K atoms were dosed onto the \( C_{60} \) films from a SAES Getter (\$5.4.3). The evaporation rates of the K and \( C_{60} \) evaporators were calibrated by depositing them separately onto a clean metal substrate, followed by directly counting the number of K atoms and \( C_{60} \) molecules per area in the STM images. This calibration was used to calculate the value of \( x \) in a \( K_x C_{60} \) monolayer. The \( K_x C_{60} \) monolayers were annealed at 200°C for 20 minutes before being cooled to 7 K for the experiments. Progressive doping was obtained by adding more K atoms onto the existing film followed by re-annealing. We found that in the highly doped samples (\( x > 4 \)), the K content may be decreased by 200°C annealing; therefore, a lower annealing temperature of 140°C was used in this regime to avoid K loss. \( dI/dV \) spectra were measured through lock-in detection (\$2.4) of the a.c. tunneling current driven by a 450 Hz, 1–10 mV (rms) signal added to the sample bias with the feedback off.

Figure 8.1a shows a typical STM image of the new “pinwheel” phase that occurs in \( K_{4+\delta} C_{60} \) (\( 0.1 < \delta < 0.5 \)) MLs. An average K content in the range \( 4 < x < 5 \) induces a rearrangement of the \( C_{60} \) molecules that destroys the long-range “cross” phase previously observed in \( K_4 C_{60} \) MLs (figure 7.5), leading to a new locally ordered pinwheel-like structure (each pinwheel is highlighted in purple). \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy of the pinwheel molecules (figure 8.1b) reveals a DOS very similar to that of the insulating \( K_4 C_{60} \) cross phase, suggesting that the \( C_{60} \) molecules in \( K_{4+\delta} C_{60} \) still retain the \( C_{60}^{4-} \) charge state seen in the stoichiometric \( K_4 C_{60} \) cross phase [191]. The difference between the cross and pinwheel phases lies purely in the \( C_{60} \) lattice structure and intermolecular orientational order.

As shown in figure 8.2b, each pinwheel consists of six “wheel” \( C_{60} \) molecules arranged hexagonally around a central “pin” molecule (each wheel molecule is rotated by \( \sim 60^\circ \) relative to its neighboring wheel molecule). The seven molecules in a pinwheel sit on a close-packed triangular lattice, which is a denser packing (by \( \sim 5\% \)) than the more open cross phase. Figure 8.2a shows an ordered domain of the 7-sublattice pinwheels forming a \( \sqrt{7} \times \sqrt{7} R0.9^\circ \) hexagonal superstructure. This suggests that the pinwheels are the structural unit of a new phase rather than merely defects. Both the number and size of the domains grow continuously as the average K content increases from \( x \sim 4.1 \) to 4.5, with a
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Figure 8.1: $K_{4+\delta}C_{60}$ pinwheels and $K_5C_{60}$. (a) Topography ($V = -0.2\text{ V}, I = 5\text{ pA}$) on a $K_{4+\delta}C_{60}$ ML showing pinwheels colored in purple. (b) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on $K_{4+\delta}C_{60}$ (red curve) compared with $K_4C_{60}$ spectroscopy (black curve). (c) $K_5C_{60}$ topography ($V = -0.2\text{ V}, I = 5\text{ pA}$) and (d) spectroscopy. Flower centers are the bright molecules and flower petals are the dim molecules. Single $C_{60}$ molecules are circled in red in the topographs.

maximum of $\sim 10\%$ of the ML covered with pinwheels. This is accompanied by the growth of small $C_{60}$-free voids containing only K atoms on Au(111). Figure 8.3 shows an image with $C_{60}$-free voids and the inset shows a zoom-in on the edge of a void.

The orientation of the center pin molecule reveals another novel aspect of the pinwheel structure. Because of the threefold rotational symmetry of the underlying triangular lattice and the symmetry of the $C_{60}$ molecule, the pin molecules are free to choose among three orientations. Experimentally, the three possible orientations are uniformly distributed among the pin molecules. This equivalency among different structures and orientation disorder it induces is a hallmark of geometric frustration for orientational ordering on a triangular lattice.

When the K content is increased further to $x \sim 5$, a new metallic phase emerges, as shown
by the ordered domain of bright molecules in figure 8.1c. $dI/dV$ spectra (figure 8.1d) reveals that the JT-insulating $C_{60}^{4-}$ state disappears and a non-zero DOS exists at $E_F$, indicating a metallic ground state. This indicates that $C_{60}$ molecules in this new phase are in a $C_{60}^{5-}$ charge state where the fifth electron occupies an upper JT split band, as illustrated in figure 8.4b.

The $K_5C_{60}$ molecules form a triangular lattice with a prominent $2 \times 2$ superstructure composed of bright molecules resembling a three pointed star, referred to here as a tri-star. Each tri-star molecule and its nearest neighbors form a “flowerlike” structural unit, where the tri-star (flower center) exhibits a $C_{60}$ molecule with a hexagon facing up and the surrounding molecules (flower petals) exhibit $C_{60}$ molecules with a 6-6 bond facing up (figure 8.4c) [129]. The orientational ordering of $K_5C_{60}$ closely resembles that found in the metallic $K_3C_{60}$ ML (figure 8.4a) in which $C_{60}$ molecules form a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ superstructure of bright molecules [191]. Figure 8.4c presents models of the orientational structure of $K_3C_{60}$, $K_4C_{60}$, and $K_5C_{60}$. In both metallic phases ($K_3C_{60}$ and $K_5C_{60}$), the $C_{60}$ molecules form a triangular lattice with all neighboring $C_{60}$ molecules (except the central “bright” ones) contacting each other through their equatorial pentagons (blue regions).
8.3 Ordering mechanisms

$C_{60}$ molecules will order in a way that minimizes their configurational energy. In general, there are two contributions to the electronic energy, potential and kinetic. Since molecules like $C_{60}$ in a molecular solid tend to interact weakly, we may consider only the potential and kinetic energy of electrons in $C_{60}$ due to interactions with the molecule’s local surroundings. The local surroundings of a $C_{60}$ molecule in $K_xC_{60}$ MLs on Au(111) are the nearest K atoms, the nearest $C_{60}$ molecule neighbors, and the Au(111) surface. The change in $C_{60}$ energy due to interactions with K and Au(111) vary from $\sim 10$ meV to $\sim 100$ meV [194, 62]. The K-$C_{60}$ interaction is difficult to take into account since the exact locations of the K atoms in $K_xC_{60}$ are unknown. The effect of the Au(111) surface is also difficult to calculate.

However, the energy of the $C_{60}$-$C_{60}$ interaction is straightforward to calculate and can be done quantitatively. This section will focus on the potential and kinetic contributions to the $C_{60}$-$C_{60}$ energy. The potential energy is due to mainly electrostatic interactions while the kinetic interaction energy is mainly due to delocalization of electrons.

We will find that an important mechanism for all $K_xC_{60}$ orientational phases is the minimization of electron kinetic energy by maximizing the overlap of relevant molecular orbitals. For the JT-insulating cross and pinwheel phases ($4 \leq x < 5$) the HOMO and
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Figure 8.4: Orientation ordering found in K$_x$C$_{60}$ for $x = 3, 4, 5$. (a) Topography of K$_3$C$_{60}$ ($V = 0.4$ V, $I = 20$ pA), K$_4$C$_{60}$ ($V = -0.1$ V, $I = 10$ pA), K$_5$C$_{60}$ ($V = -0.2$ V, $I = 5$ pA). (b) Energy diagrams showing electron hopping between C$_{60}$ LUMO orbitals on neighboring C$_{60}$ molecules. The 3-fold degenerate LUMO in K$_3$C$_{60}$ splits in K$_4$C$_{60}$ and K$_5$C$_{60}$. (c) Structural models of K$_x$C$_{60}$. The blue regions mark equatorial pentagons.

LUMO orbitals maximize overlap to maximize virtual hopping of an electron between the HOMO of one C$_{60}^{4-}$ to the LUMO of a neighboring C$_{60}^{4-}$. In the $x = 3$ and 5 phases, the LUMO orbitals maximize overlap to maximize direct electron hopping.

First, consider the $x = 3$ and 5 phases. These phases contain partially filled LUMO orbitals (figure 8.4b), between which electrons can directly hop. DFT calculations show these orbitals tend to be localized on the C$_{60}$ pentagons [129, 63], so if we highlight the pentagons in blue (figure 8.4c), we see that the experimentally observed ordering tends to maximize overlap of the partially occupied C$_{60}$ LUMO wavefunctions, thereby maximizing kinetic energy reduction by maximizing electron hopping.

Next, consider the potential and kinetic energies for the $x = 4$ phase. For the K$_4$C$_{60}$ molecules in this phase, the potential energy is caused by electrostatic interactions. The leading order multipole moment of this molecule is the quadrupole moment, hence the electrostatic C$_{60}$-C$_{60}$ interaction will be dominated by quadrupole-quadrupole interactions.
between the $C_{60}$ molecules in $K_4C_{60}$. DFT calculation indicates that JT distorted $C_{60}^{-}$ has a quadrupole moment of order $1e_c A^2$, where $e_c$ is the absolute value of the electron charge.

The orientation ordering of $K_4C_{60}$ seen in figure 8.4b is reminiscent of orderings arising from electrostatic quadrupole interactions [17], which was proposed for other systems [211, 119, 70]. However, the energy difference between the observed structure and other metastable structures is small (on the order of 1 meV per molecule) and extensive computer simulations cannot reproduce the experimentally observed structures using only quadrupole interactions.

The other contribution to the $C_{60}$-$C_{60}$ interaction energy is the kinetic energy arising from electron delocalization. This mechanism originates in the anisotropic electronic overlap integral between molecules [62, 63]. Because the HOMO orbitals peak near the $C_{60}$ pentagons, one might expect pentagons on neighboring molecules to align so that intermolecular electron hopping can occur. However, for the $K_4C_{60}$ and $K_4+\delta C_{60}$, the HOMO states are completely occupied, and direct hopping cannot occur. Virtual hopping (§4.2), on the other hand, can occur in these insulating systems. To get an idea of the effect of virtual hopping, tight binding calculations were performed.

### 8.4 Virtual hopping energies

From second order perturbation theory in tight binding (§4.2), the energy for an electron to hop from an occupied orbital to a neighboring unoccupied orbital is [63]

$$E = -2 \sum_{i \text{ occupied}} \sum_{j \text{ unoccupied}} \frac{|t_{ij}|^2}{E_j - E_i}$$

where the factor of 2 takes into account spin degeneracy and $t_{ij}$ is the hopping integral (§4.2). Since the denominator is the smallest for the HOMO and LUMO states, the energy is approximately given by

$$E \approx -2 \sum \frac{|t_{\text{HOMO,LUMO}}|^2}{E_{\text{LUMO}} - E_{\text{HOMO}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8.1)

where the sum is taken over degenerate HOMO and LUMO orbitals. $t_{\text{HOMO,LUMO}} \equiv t_{HL}$ is the hopping integral between HOMO and LUMO, which depends on the overlap between the HOMO and LUMO of adjacent molecules, and thus depends on their relative orientations.

Tight binding calculations were also used to calculate the HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions from which $t_{HL}$ is found. The coordinates of the C atoms in $C_{60}^{4-}$ were obtained from previous DFT calculations [191]. From previous $C_{60}$ tight binding calculations [135, 188], only the $p_z$ of the $sp^2$ bonded carbon atoms contribute to the HOMO and LUMO orbitals (page 8258 in [188]). Then the tight binding wavefunctions for the HOMO and
LUMO states can be written in terms of $\phi_i$, the $p_z$ orbital located on atom $i$,

$$
\psi_{\text{HOMO}} = \sum_{i=1}^{60} a_i \phi_i, \quad \psi_{\text{LUMO}} = \sum_{j=1}^{60} b_j \phi_j.
$$

The coefficients $a_i$ and $b_j$ are found by diagonalizing the tight binding Hamiltonian in the $\phi_i$ basis, taking the electron hopping between neighboring C atoms to be $t_c = -2.3(0.145 \text{ nm}/d)^2 \text{ eV}$, where $d$ is the distance between nearest neighboring C atoms ([188], §4.2). The calculated wavefunctions from tight binding are shown in figure [8.5]. They seem reasonable since they agree well with the DFT calculated wavefunctions shown below them.

Figure 8.5: Comparison of the $\text{C}_{60}^{-}$ HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions calculated by tight binding and DFT. The HOMO wavefunctions is an isosurface plot of $|\psi_{\text{HOMO} 1}|^2 + |\psi_{\text{HOMO} 2}|^2$ while the LUMO wavefunctions are isosurface plots of $|\psi_{\text{LUMO}}|^2$.

The intermolecular hopping $t_{HL}$ can be calculated from these expressions and from its
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definition (equation (4.5))

\[ t_{HL} = \langle \psi_{HOMO} | \Delta U | \psi_{LUMO} \rangle \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{60} a_i \phi_i | \Delta U | \sum_{j=1}^{60} b_j \phi_j \]

\[ = \sum_{i,j=1}^{60} a_i^* b_j \langle \phi_i | \Delta U | \phi_j \rangle \]

\[ = \sum_{i,j=1}^{60} a_i^* b_j p_{ij}. \]

The matrix element \( p_{ij} = \langle \phi_i | \Delta U | \phi_j \rangle \) represents electron hopping between \( p_z \) orbitals on atoms \( i \) and \( j \) on neighboring \( C_{60} \) molecules. We take the following semi-empirical form for it [188]

\[
p_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
V_0 \frac{T_{ij}}{d_0} e^{-(r_{ij}-d_0)/\lambda} & \text{for } 0 \leq r_{ij} \leq d_0, \\
0 & \text{for } r_{ij} > d_0.
\end{cases}
\]

where \( r_{ij} = |\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j| \), \( \vec{r}_i \) is the position of atom \( i \), \( \lambda = 0.45 \, \text{Å}, d_0 = 1.54 \, \text{Å}, V_0 = 6.2 \, \text{eV}, \) and \( d_c = 6.5 \, \text{Å} \) [21].

The energy (8.1) was calculated between the two closest molecules in the unit cell of the \( x = 4 \) cross structure. We summed the contributions to the energy from the two HOMO wave functions. Energy from hopping between HOMO states of molecule 1 and the LUMO state of molecule 2 (figure 8.6) was summed with energy from hopping between HOMO states of molecule 2 and the LUMO state of molecule 1. \( E_{\text{LUMO}} - E_{\text{HOMO}} = \Delta JT + U = 200 \, \text{meV} \) (the experimental HOMO-LUMO gap) was used. Molecule 1 was rotated in plane from the experimentally observed orientation by an amount \( \Delta \theta_1 \) and molecule 2 was rotated in plane from its experimentally observed orientation by \( \Delta \theta_2 \). The total virtual hopping energy of the two molecule system is plotted in figure [8.6] as a function of \( \Delta \theta_1 \) and \( \Delta \theta_2 \). (\( \Delta \theta_1, \Delta \theta_2 \) = (0, 0) (the experimentally observed orientations) is found to be in the trough of a local minimum in energy, with a value of \(-15 \, \text{meV}\). This represents a significant energy gain for the cross-phase structure, and is much larger than the estimated quadrupole interaction (\( \sim 1 \, \text{meV} \)). We take this level of agreement as an encouraging sign for the virtual hopping mechanism for orientational ordering.

In \( K_{4+6}C_{60} \), the K-C\(_{60}\) interaction becomes important. The \( C_{60}^{4-} \) charge state seems more energetically favorable since the increase in K concentration causes the \( C_{60} \) packing density to increase over that of the more open \( K_4C_{60} \) cross phase, creating a \( C_{60}^{4-} \) charge state, even though more K atoms are present. The extra added K atoms reside in the \( C_{60} \)-voids created when the \( C_{60} \) molecules pack closer (figure 8.3). The new pinwheel ordering arises from this increase in \( C_{60} \) packing density. Adding K atoms to the \( K_4C_{60} \) ML thus has essentially the same effect as applying an external pressure, compressing the ML, which is a common
8.5 Conclusions

We find that K$_x$C$_{60}$ MLs undergo a metal-insulator-metal transition as $x$ is varied from 3 to 5. Each electronic phase has a novel orientational ordering associated with it, including a highly complex, 7-sublattice pinwheel orientational structure in the insulating K$_{4+d}$C$_{60}$ phase and flower type of ordering in the $x = 3$ and 5 phases. Direct electron hopping or virtual electron hopping plays an important role in the orientational ordering of the phases and highlight the close interplay between orientational order and electronic structure in the fullerides.
One type of many-body interaction, the electron-electron interaction, is relatively strong ($\sim 3$ eV) in $C_{60}$ [3, 139]. Strong electron-electron interactions, also called strong correlations, can have a substantial affect on the properties of substances. For example, it is known that strong electron-electron interactions can cause a metal to become an insulator, known as a Mott-Hubbard insulator (§4.3).

The effects of electron-electron interactions are theoretically difficult to predict, and remain a subject of substantial research. Experiments where one can tune the strength of the interaction and analyze the resultant effects on the electronic properties of the system are of considerable importance to better understand both this interaction and many-body interactions in general. This chapter will discuss experimentally controlling the strength of the electron-electron interaction in $K_xC_{60}$ multilayers on Au(111), and discuss how this leads to the transition of $K_xC_{60}$ multilayers from metals to insulators. It addresses two of the principal topics in this dissertation: how do electron-electron and molecule-substrate interactions affect the properties of adsorbed molecules and molecular aggregates. Most of these results are presented in our published paper, ref. [198].

### 9.1 $K_xC_{60}$ multilayers

The complexity of fulleride properties stems from the existence of many competing interactions, such as electron-electron repulsion, electron-vibration coupling and intermolecular electron hopping. The exact role of each interaction is controversial due to the difficulty of experimentally isolating the effects of a single interaction. Here, we isolate the effect of electron-electron interactions in $K_xC_{60}$ ultrathin films experimentally through precise control of the layer thickness and accurate doping concentrations. We observe by STM a series of electronic and structural phase transitions as the fullerides evolve from two-dimensional monolayers to quasi three-dimensional multilayers. These results demonstrate the systematic evolution of fulleride electronic structure and molecular ordering by varying the $K_xC_{60}$
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film layer thickness, and provide essential information about the electron-electron interactions in these systems.

Our experiments were conducted in UHV at \( T = 7 \) K with a PtIr tip. \( C_{60} \) thin films with desired thickness were made by evaporating \( C_{60} \) molecules onto a clean \( \text{Au}(111) \) surface from a Knudsen cell evaporator (\S 5.4.1). Appropriate amounts of K atoms were dosed onto the \( C_{60} \) films from a SAES Getter (\S 5.4.3). The evaporation rates of the K and \( C_{60} \) evaporators were calibrated by dosing them separately onto a clean metal substrate, followed by directly counting the number of K atoms and \( C_{60} \) molecules per area in the STM images. This calibration was used to calculate the value of \( x \) in a \( K_x C_{60} \) multilayer. The \( K_x C_{60} \) thin films were annealed at 200\(^\circ\)C for 20 minutes before being cooled to 7 K for the experiments. Progressive doping was obtained by adding more K atoms onto the existing film followed by re-annealing. We found that in the highly doped samples \( (x > 4) \), the K content may be decreased by 200\(^\circ\)C annealing; therefore, a lower annealing temperature of 140\(^\circ\)C was used in this regime to avoid K loss. \( dI/dV \) spectra were measured through lock-in detection (\S 2.4) of the a.c. tunneling current driven by a 450 Hz, 1–10 mV (rms) signal added to the sample bias with the feedback off.

The ability to tune interactions in the fullerides arises from our ability to grow well-controlled heterogeneous molecular films. Here, we describe measurements on \( K_x C_{60} \) ultrathin films having variable thickness from one to three layers (layer index \( i = 1, 2, \) and 3) for four specific doping concentrations \( (x = 0, 3, 4, \) and 5). Figure 9.1a shows an STM topograph of a representative \( K_x C_{60} \) multilayer on \( \text{Au}(111) \) \( (x = 4 \) in this particular image), where the color scale highlights the different layer indices. Narrow slivers of \( C_{60} \)-free voids containing only K atoms (purple) exist between continuous patches of \( K_x C_{60} \). Islands of second layer (blue) and third layer (red) \( K_x C_{60} \) can be seen residing on top of the first \( K_x C_{60} \) layer (green). The average layer thickness measured by STM is \( \sim 9.9 \) Å for \( K_x C_{60} \) \( (x = 3, 4, 5) \) while for \( C_{60} \) it is only 8 Å [59].

![Figure 9.1: \( K_x C_{60} \) multilayer thin film on \( \text{Au}(111) \).](image)

(a) STM topograph of a \( K_x C_{60} \) multilayer thin film \( (x = 4 \) for this image) on \( \text{Au}(111) \) \( (V = 1 V, I = 5 \) pA). The \( C_{60} \)-free voids are purple, the first layer green, second layer blue, and third layer red. (b) Schematic side view of the multilayer (the actual position of the K atoms are unknown). The distances between the center of a \( C_{60} \) in each layer and the \( \text{Au} \) surface are \( d_1, d_2, \) and \( d_3 \).
We begin by describing our results for a C$_{60}$ multilayer with no K (figure 9.2). $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on the first layer shows the shoulder of the HOMO in the first layer around $-1.7$ V. This shoulder turns into a split peak centered at $-2.5$ V for the second layer and $-2.7$ V for the third layer. The LUMO of the first layer is centered around $0.8$ V. This peak increases to $1.5$ V and $1.7$ V in the second and third layers. Similarly the LUMO+1 peak increases in voltage, from $2.0$ V to $3.0$ V to $3.4$ V for the first, second and third layers. The second and layers also show negative differential resistance (NDR) around $2.2$ V, but this is due to the voltage dependence of the tunneling barrier [59]. Topography on the first and second layer shows C$_{60}$ molecules with various orientations.

Figure 9.2: C$_{60}$ multilayers on Au(111). (a) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on three different layers of C$_{60}$ on Au(111). Each spectrum has been normalized so that the maximum $dI/dV$ of the LUMO+1 is one. (b) Schematic diagram showing the STM measured HOMO-LUMO gap due to a combination of the real HOMO-LUMO gap $\Delta_{HL}$ and $U$. (c) Topography of the first layer showing a locally ordered area ($V = 2.8$ V, $I = 10$ pA). (d) Topography of the second layer showing more orientational variation ($V = 3$ V, $I = 10$ pA).

Next is the metallic K$_3$C$_{60}$ multilayer system. Layer-dependent electronic structure in K$_3$C$_{60}$ can be seen in figure 9.3a, which shows spatially averaged $dI/dV$ spectra measured for three different layer indices. Within each layer, the spectrum is highly uniform with no sign of spatial inhomogeneity such as that found in the surface of bulk fullerides [177]. The first layer $dI/dV$ exhibits a wide peak at the $E_F$, arising from the half filled LUMO-derived C$_{60}$ band. In contrast, the second-layer spectrum shows a sharp dip at $E_F$, indicating the
emergence of an energy gap that tends to split the band in two. The gap-like feature persists in the third layer. The width of the gap-like feature (measured between adjacent local maxima) is $\sim 0.2$ eV, a much larger value than the superconducting gap $2\Delta_{SC} \sim 6$ meV found in bulk $K_3C_{60}$ (ref. [61]). The spectra at energies far above $E_F$, on the other hand, are nearly identical in all three layers. As these higher-energy features, such as the position of the LUMO+1 resonance, are sensitive to the doping level of $K_xC_{60}$ (ref. [205]), this shows that there is no significant difference in K content for the different layers.

The orientational ordering of $C_{60}$ molecules also changes markedly with layer index. The first layer of $K_3C_{60}$ (figure 9.3c) exhibits a complex $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ superstructure of bright molecules having different orientations from their dimmer nearest neighbors [191]. However, in the second layer (figure 9.3d), $C_{60}$ molecules form a very simple hexagonal lattice (lattice constant $a \sim 10.5$ Å) with all molecules in the same orientation. The third-layer topograph (not shown) is the same as that of the second layer.

The insulating $K_xC_{60}$ with $x = 4$ multilayer system exhibits a trend similar to $K_3C_{60}$. Figure 9.4a shows $dI/dV$ spectra measured on a $K_4C_{60}$ for layer indices $i = 1$ to 3. First layer spectra ($i = 1$) exhibit an insulating energy gap $\Delta \sim 0.2$ eV that is induced by the molecular Jahn-Teller (JT) distortion [191]. As the layer index increases from $i = 1$ to 3, the energy gap increases continuously (by layer 3, the gap has well-defined edges and a flat bottom). The gap widths observed here are estimated to be $\Delta \sim 0.6$ eV and 0.8 eV for layers 2 and 3 respectively. As seen in the metallic $x = 3$ system, the geometric structure of the insulating $x = 4$ system simplifies as the layer index is increased. Complex ‘cross-phase’ orientational ordering observed in the $K_4C_{60}$ first layer [191] (figure 9.4c) evolves to a much simpler hexagonal lattice (figure 9.4d) for higher layers. Layers 2 and 3 for the $x = 4$ film exhibit featureless $C_{60}$ molecules with little discernible orientational ordering.

As doping is increased to $x = 5$, $K_xC_{60}$ multilayers show metallicity for layer 1 (ref. [197]) and an evolution to insulating behavior by layer 3. At this doping level, the upper JT-split LUMO is only partially filled and the first-layer spectrum (figure 9.5a) exhibits a finite (although suppressed) electronic DOS at $E_F$. The DOS at $E_F$ is suppressed further in the second layer, and develops into a pronounced energy gap $\Delta \sim 0.4$ eV by the third layer. As with the $x = 3$ and $x = 4$ doping levels, complex structural ordering in the first layer of $K_5C_{60}$ (the $2 \times 2$ superstructure in figure 9.5c) evolves into a much simpler hexagonal lattice in the second layer (figure 9.5d) and third layer (not shown).

9.2 Electron screening

Taken collectively, the experimental results clearly show that, for a fixed doping level, increasing film thickness suppresses metallicity and enhances the insulating tendency of $K_xC_{60}$ thin films on Au(111). We propose that this trend arises from electron-electron Coulomb repulsion, characterized by the Hubbard $U$ (§4.3). In fullerides, $U$ is of the same order as the narrow bandwidth $W$ (ref. [62]). The fullerides thus exist at the verge of a Mott insulator phase transition (§4.3) and small perturbations to the strength of $U$ may significantly
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Figure 9.3: Electronic and structural properties of K$_3$C$_{60}$ multilayers on Au(111). (a) Spatially averaged $dI/dV$ spectra measured on three different layer indices of K$_3$C$_{60}$. The first-layer spectrum has a peak at $E_F$, whereas the second- and third-layer spectra show a sharp dip having a width of $\sim 0.2$ eV. (b) Schematic diagram showing the effect of the Hubbard $U$ on the electronic structure of K$_3$C$_{60}$. A small $U_{\text{eff}}$ in the first layer (left) has negligible effect on the DOS, but a larger $U_{\text{eff}}$ in higher layers (right) causes a dip around $E_F$. (c) K$_3$C$_{60}$ first-layer topograph ($V = -0.1$ V and $I = 20$ pA) shows a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ superstructure. Each red circle represents one C$_{60}$ molecule. (d) Topograph of the second layer ($V = -0.1$ V and $I = 10$ pA) shows a simple hexagonal lattice with no superstructure.

Electron screening or screening refers to the attraction of positive charges around electrons in a material. Since positive charges attract other electrons, their presence around electrons reduces the electrostatic repulsion between electrons in the material. We now examine the effect of screening on electron-electron interactions in K$_x$C$_{60}$ molecular films. For an isolated single C$_{60}$ molecule, the bare Hubbard $U$ (denoted by $U_0$) has been estimated to be approximately 3.0 eV (refs. [35, 3, 139, 125]). When C$_{60}$ molecules form a solid, the value of $U$ can be greatly reduced by screening from neighboring molecules. In our K$_x$C$_{60}$ multilayers, screening originates from three distinct sources: the metal substrate, surrounding polarizable molecules, and itinerant charge carriers.
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Figure 9.4: Electronic and structural properties of K$_4$C$_{60}$ multilayers on Au(111). (a) $dI/dV$ spectra of the JT-insulating K$_4$C$_{60}$ measured on three different layers. The observed gap $\Delta$ increases from 0.2 eV in layer 1 to 0.6 eV and 0.8 eV in layers 2 and 3. (b) Schematic DOS of K$_4$C$_{60}$. Larger $U_{\text{eff}}$ in layer 3 (right) leads to a much wider gap than that in layer 1 (left). (c) Topograph of K$_4$C$_{60}$ layer 1 ($V = -0.2$ V and $I = 10$ pA) shows a ‘cross’-like orientational ordering. (d) Topograph of K$_4$C$_{60}$ layer 2 ($V = -0.4$ V and $I = 10$ pA) shows a simple hexagonal lattice with orientational ordering different from that of layer 1.

The first two screening mechanisms can be treated using simple electrostatics. As discussed by Hesper et al. [80], the change in $U$ due to a nearby metal can be modeled using an image charge potential as

$$\delta U_S = \frac{1}{4\pi \epsilon_0} \frac{e_c^2}{2d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9.1)

where $d$ is the distance from the center of a C$_{60}$ molecule to the metal substrate (figure 9.1b) and $e_c$ is the magnitude of the electron charge. The screening from nearby polarized molecules, which arises from induced molecular dipole moments, can be expressed as the electrostatic energy of two dipoles

$$\delta U_P = \frac{1}{4\pi \epsilon_0} \frac{z \alpha e_c^2}{R^4}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9.2)

where $z$ is the number of nearest neighbors, $\alpha$ is the molecular polarizability, and $R$ is the
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Figure 9.5: Electronic and structural properties of $K_5C_{60}$ multilayers on Au(111). (a) $dI/dV$ spectra of $K_5C_{60}$ measured at three different layer indices. (b) Schematic electronic structure of $K_5C_{60}$. In layer 1 (left), $U_{eff}$ causes a small suppression of DOS near $E_F$, but in layer 3 (right), the larger $U_{eff}$ induces an energy gap around $E_F$. (c) Topography of layer 1 ($V = -0.2$ V and $I = 5$ pA) shows complex orientational ordering with a $2 \times 2$ superstructure. (d) $K_5C_{60}$ layer 2 shows a simpler hexagonal lattice ($V = +0.2$ V and $I = 5$ pA).
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Figure 9.6: Screening of $U$. (a) Screening from the metallic substrate arising from the formation of an image charge. (b) Screening from neighboring molecules arising from the molecular polarization.

The intermolecular distance $[125]$. The third mechanism, the change in $U$ by itinerant electrons ($\delta U_e$), depends sensitively on the doping concentrations of the fullerides and is a more complex term $[3, 139, 164, 118, 143]$. The total change in the isolated molecule $U_0$ due to the molecular environment is the sum of the three terms:

$$\delta U = \delta U_S + \delta U_P + \delta U_e$$  \hspace{1cm} (9.3)

and $U_{\text{eff}} = U_0 - \delta U$ is the final effective Hubbard $U$ in the $K_xC_{60}$ multilayer system. These relations show how varying the number of layers in our $K_xC_{60}$ ultrathin films can provide a systematic technique to control electron-electron interactions ($U_{\text{eff}}$) by changing both the distance to the metal substrate ($d$) and the number of nearest neighbors ($z$).

This is seen most clearly in the insulating $K_4C_{60}$ multilayers. The $K_4C_{60}$ monolayer was found to be an insulator $[191]$ since the strong Jahn-Teller effect at filling level $x = 4$ splits the degenerate $C_{60}$ LUMO states and opens an energy gap in the DOS at $E_F$ (figure 3b; ref. $[69]$). This implies $U_e = 0$ since there are no itinerant charge carriers. Assuming that the Jahn-Teller splitting remains unchanged with varied layer index, the layer dependence of $U_{\text{eff}}$ in $K_xC_{60}$, and hence the layer dependence of the gap in the DOS around $E_F$ ($\S3.4.2$), is accounted for completely by equations (9.1) and (9.2). As the layer index increases from $i = 1$ to 3, $\delta U_S$ (substrate screening) decreases from 1.5 eV to 0.3 eV according to equation (9.1). In contrast, $z$ increases from 6 in the first layer to 9 for both the second and third layer (for molecules not at the edge of a layer), causing $\delta U_P$ to increase from 0.6 eV to 0.9 eV via equation (9.2) (here we use $\alpha = 90 \text{Å}^3$, the value for undoped $C_{60}$) $[74]$. The total reduction in $U_{\text{eff}}$ due to screening (equation (9.3)) is thus $\delta U = 2.1, 1.4$ and 1.2 eV for $i = 1, 2$ and 3, respectively, leading to an increase in $U_{\text{eff}}$ from 0.9 eV to 1.8 eV as $i$ increases from 1 to 3. The calculated relative increase of $U_{\text{eff}}$ by 0.7 eV (from $i = 1$ to 2) and 0.2 eV (from $i = 2$ to 3) is in reasonable agreement with the relative increase of the experimentally observed gap by 0.4 eV (from $i = 1$ to 2) and 0.2 eV (from $i = 2$ to 3). This agreement becomes much better if we use a larger $\alpha$ value for $K_4C_{60}$ (a reasonable assumption). We note that some factors, such as screening from the STM tip, the effect of intermolecular electron hopping on the bandwidth, and correlations between different screening mechanisms are not
included in our simple phenomenological model. Nevertheless, the agreement between the observed experimental trend and the semi-quantitative analysis demonstrates that stronger electron-electron interactions in higher layers is responsible for the observed layer-dependent increase of gap in $K_4C_{60}$.

The electronic behavior of the $K_3C_{60}$ multilayers is quite different from the insulating $K_4C_{60}$ multilayers above due to itinerant charge carriers. The Jahn-Teller effect is much weaker at an uneven filling level $x = 3$, leading to a metallic ground state in bulk $K_3C_{60}$ (refs [68, 69]) and itinerant charge carriers. In $K_3C_{60}$ multilayers, the itinerant electron screening term $(\delta U_e)$ becomes important, although the layer dependent DOS is still caused by layer dependence in $U$. How to determine the itinerant electron screening contribution to the renormalized $U_{\text{eff}}$ in $K_3C_{60}$ is quite controversial [62, 3, 164, 143]. Various theoretical calculations in bulk $K_3C_{60}$ ($z = 12$) produce a combined screening strength $(\delta U_e + \delta U_P)$ that ranges widely from 2.2 to 3.2 eV (refs [62,118]). Using a mean value of $(\delta U_e + \delta U_P) = 2.7$ eV, and including Au(111) substrate screening $(\delta U_S)$ through equation (9.1), we find that the effective $U$ becomes $U_{\text{eff}} = U_0 - \delta U = 0.2, 0.5$, and 0.7 eV for $i = 1, 2$ and 3. However, note that since $K_3C_{60}$ is metallic, the lower layers act as a metal substrate for the higher layers, so the distance of a $C_{60}$ molecule to the metal substrate is no longer the distance to the Au(111) surface. This means that the substrate screening should be the same in the second and third layers since the distance to the metallic $K_3C_{60}$ layer directly below them is the same. For $i = 1$, $U_{\text{eff}}$ is too small compared with the bandwidth $W$ to open a gap, whereas in layers 2 and 3, we expect a small gap of the same magnitude to begin opening as $U_{\text{eff}}$ becomes comparable to $W$ (figure 9.3b). This explains the appearance of the gap-like structure in the $K_3C_{60}$ LDOS in figure 9.3a.

$K_5C_{60}$ is an intermediate case between $K_4C_{60}$ and $K_3C_{60}$. It is not insulating like $K_4C_{60}$, but it is not as good of a metal like $K_3C_{60}$. Here, the odd doping level makes the Jahn-Teller effect is weaker than in $K_4C_{60}$, and hence it is not insulating [69], but the high doping level also makes the effective bandwidth narrower than in $K_3C_{60}$, making it less metallic [111]. We thus expect the layer-dependent $U_{\text{eff}}$ for $K_5C_{60}$ to lie between the two extremes. This is indeed the case, as we see a relatively small suppression of electronic DOS in layer 1 (figure 9.5a), but by layer 3, a well-defined gap of width $\Delta \sim 0.4$ eV has emerged. This gap is about 0.4 eV smaller than that of the $i = 3$ layer in $K_4C_{60}$, (due to the reduced Jahn-Teller effect and enhanced metallic screening), while it is about 0.2 eV larger than the gap observed in the $i = 3$ layer of $K_3C_{60}$ (due to the narrower bandwidth in $K_5C_{60}$).

9.3 Orientational ordering

The layer-index-dependent change in ordering seen for the three doping levels ($x = 3, 4,$ and 5) as the index increases above $i = 1$ is less a direct result of electronic screening and more likely due to substrate-molecule interactions and intermolecular electron hopping via the overlap of molecular orbitals [22, 197] [63]. The complex structures found in layer 1 of $K_xC_{60}$, $x = 3$–5 (figures 9.3a, 9.4c and 9.5e) are characteristic of geometric frustration of
molecular orientational ordering in a two-dimensional (2D) lattice [171]. As the layer index is increased, the lack of interaction between the molecules and the Au(111) substrate, as well as further interaction with adjacent C\textsubscript{60} molecules in the lower layers leads to quasi-3D-like intermolecular interactions. This creates a more isotropic local molecular environment and creates less geometric frustration, limiting the possibility of exotic molecular ordering. Therefore, the much simpler and more homogeneous spatial structures found in the higher layers of K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} (figures 9.3d, 9.4d, and 9.5d) can be seen as a natural consequence of reduced frustration due to dimensional crossover from the 2D limit to the quasi-3D bulk regime.

### 9.4 Conclusions

Using accurately fabricated K\textsubscript{x}C\textsubscript{60} ultrathin films, we have demonstrated how electron correlation strength, a key factor in determining the properties of fullerides, can be experimentally controlled by varying the thickness of the layers and doping level. These results support the notion of tuning molecular electronics by controlling the layer structure and distance to metal contacts, and opens new routes towards engineering novel molecular devices and controlling electronic phases in strongly correlated molecular materials.
Modification of fullerenes can be achieved by exohedral doping, such as in the $K_xC_{60}$ experiments presented in the previous chapters, but can also be done endohedrally. The fullerene $C_{82}$ with $D_{2h}$ symmetry with a Gd atom inside, called Gd@C$_{82}$, is such an endohedral fullerene.

Gd@C$_{82}$ should have a net spin due to charge transfer from the Gd atom to the $C_{82}$ [52, 128, 106]. However, in our STM experiments on this molecule, we were not able to see any magnetic effect. Instead, we imaged the molecular orbitals and saw a $C_{82}$ vibrational mode in IETS, as well as mapped out the spatial distribution of the IETS signal, which is also an important result. Comparison of DFT calculated electron-vibration coupling to the STM measured IETS shows that one vibrational mode of $C_{82}$ dominates the IETS spectrum. The spatial distribution of the IETS signal is very inhomogeneous, and shows that the strongest IETS signal occurs where the LUMO wavefunction is modified the most due to the vibration, and not where the vibration has its largest amplitude of vibration (§2.6). This study verifies that the $d^2I/dV^2$ map is a map of electron-vibration coupling when the IETS signal arises from a molecular vibration. These results help us answer one of the fundamental questions in this dissertation: how do electron-vibration interactions affect molecular properties. Most of this work is based on our published paper, ref. [58].

The substrate used for the experiments was Ag(001) and the STM tip was W or PtIr. The surface was cleaned by sputtering and annealing (§5.3). The Ag substrate was then cooled to $\sim$ 80 K prior to depositing Gd@C$_{82}$ onto the surface. The Gd@C$_{82}$ molecules were synthesized by H. Kato and H. Shinohara. A small amount of $C_{60}$ was simultaneously deposited with Gd@C$_{82}$. The Gd@C$_{82}$ and $C_{60}$ molecules were deposited from a Knudsen cell evaporator (§5.4.1) onto the Ag surface and the Ag substrate was placed into the 7 K STM. All sample preparation was done in UHV and experiments performed at 7 K. Over 50 Gd@C$_{82}$ molecules were studied.

Figure 10.1 shows a typical STM image of two Gd@C$_{82}$ molecules next to a $C_{60}$ molecule. The $C_{60}$ molecule was used as a reference to check the condition of the STM tip. Reproducible topographs and spectra on Gd@C$_{82}$ molecules were achieved only when the same
tip gave C$_{60}$ topographs and spectra similar to those in [129]. The spectroscopy and $dI/dV$ maps taken on Gd@C$_{82}$ can be found in [58].

![Figure 10.1: Constant current topographs (65 Å × 65 Å) of two Gd@C$_{82}$ and a C$_{60}$ molecule at step edges on Ag(001). (a) $V = 2.0$ V, $I = 1$ nA and (b) $V = 0.1$ V, $I = 1$ nA.](image)

$d^2I/dV^2$ spectra (figure 10.2) were obtained in the ±100 mV range by numerically differentiating $dI/dV$ spectra taken in the same voltage range. The $d^2I/dV^2$ spectrum on Gd@C$_{82}$ reveals three main inelastic peaks at 43, 60, and 70 mV (±1 mV) not present on the Ag(001) surface.

![Figure 10.2: Inelastic spectroscopy on Gd@C$_{82}$. (a) $d^2I/dV^2$ measured on Gd@C$_{82}$ as well as on the Ag surface. (b) $d^2I/dV^2$ map of Gd@C$_{82}$ at $V = 60$ mV. (c) $d^2I/dV^2$ map taken at $V = 80$ mV.](image)

d$^2I/dV^2$ maps taken at the voltage of the largest peak (60 mV) reveals the spatial localization of the inelastic signal (figure 10.2b). This image shows that the strongest $d^2I/dV^2$ signal (red region) occurs only on one small area of the molecule. A second $d^2I/dV^2$ map taken at 80 mV does not show the same features, indicating that the features seen in the
Gd@C_{82} \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} map are due solely to the IETS signal and not other factors, such as tip trajectory.

It is unexpected that the main Gd@C_{82} vibrational mode produces such a spatially localized IETS signal, since molecular vibrations tend to be more delocalized. IETS images of simpler molecules, such as acetylene [182] and oxygen [67], typically reflect the spatial extent of the measured vibrational modes. In order to understand the localized behavior seen here, the inelastic theory presented in §2.6 combined with density functional theory was used. The calculations were done by K. H. Khoo in Steven G. Louie’s group.

The details of the calculation are described in [130]. To simplify the computation, calculations on a free C_{82} with no interior Gd atom were done. Only the charge transfer from Gd to C_{82} was considered. Neglecting the inner Gd atom is justified by noting that (1) electronic cage states near \( E_F \) are only weakly perturbed by the inner atom [128, 178] and (2) our observed vibrational energies are in the range of bare C_{82} vibrational energies, indicating that C_{82} phonons are responsible for the inelastic signal [114]. Hence, the presence of the Gd atom should be only a small perturbation of C_{82} vibrations in our energy range. Charge transfer to the C_{82} cage from the Gd atom and substrate was treated as a single fitting parameter. The best theoretical fits were obtained for a molecular charge state of \(-4.01 \approx -4\). This, as well as the molecular orientation on the surface, was determined by comparison of STS spectra, \( \frac{dI}{dV} \) maps, and electronic wavefunction symmetries. The charge state determines which molecular state is at \( E_F \). The \(-4\) charge state is reasonable since Gd is known to donate three electrons to the C_{82} cage [153] and Ag substrates are expected to donate charge to fullerenes [130].

The theoretical vibrational spectrum for an isolated C_{82} is shown in figure 10.3(a), with each vibrational mode shown as a black vertical line. The theoretical \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) as a function of energy (red lines) was obtained by calculating the electron-vibration coupling of each molecular vibrational mode to the C_{82} electronic states at \( E_F \) using equation 2.10. Only a few of the vibrational modes in this energy window show appreciable coupling to the C_{82} state at \( E_F \), and in particular, there is one dominant mode, similar to the experimental \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) where one vibrational mode dominates the spectrum. The relative strength of the electron-vibration coupling of these modes is in reasonable agreement with the experimental \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) spectrum and indicates that the C_{82} mode with the theoretical energy of 52 meV is responsible for the dominant experimental inelastic tunneling channel.

To understand the origin of the spatial localization of the \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) signal, the spatial dependence of the electron-vibration coupling for the 52 meV mode was calculated using equation (2.11). A simulated STM constant current surface was used, as in [129]. The resulting theoretical \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) map shown in figure 10.3(b) shows that the strongest \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) signal (red region) is localized to the upper half of the molecule, in good agreement with the experimental \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) map [figure 10.2(b)]. The small deviation between calculated and experimental vibrational energies is likely due to effects of the substrate [108] and inner atom [106], which were not directly included in the calculation; they were only used to determine the charge state of C_{82}. However, the general agreement between theory and experiment suggests that these effects do not strongly influence the qualitative behavior of
electron-vibration coupling in Gd@C$_{82}$.

When we compare the spatial dependence of the molecular electron-vibration coupling at 52 meV with the spatial distribution of atomic displacement magnitudes for the C$_{82}$ vibrational mode at 52 meV [figure 10.3(b) vs figure 10.3(c)], we see that regions of large atomic displacement (red regions) are nearly anti-correlated with the regions of large $d^2I/dV^2$ (red regions). This occurs since the spatial distribution of inelastic tunneling is determined by the amount electronic wave functions change due to molecular vibrations (§2.6). Regions where the wavefunction changes the most will have the largest inelastic tunneling signal and these regions need not be where the atoms have the largest displacement. This can produce a surprising localization in the inelastic tunneling, as seen in Gd@C$_{82}$. Localization may explain the larger number of vibrational modes detected in molecular film transport measurements compared to IETS measurements. Molecular films contain a large number of molecular configurations and transport measurements on such films are thus more likely to average over many configurations with the resulting inelastic signal containing vibrational signals due to many different parts of the molecule.

In this chapter, we have demonstrated how IETS can be used to spatially map the strength of the electron-vibration interaction of a single molecule. By using DFT, we found that the strong localization of the electron-vibration interaction can be explained by changes in the LUMO wavefunction due to the oscillation of a vibration. The parts of the LUMO wavefunction which change the most due to a particular vibrational mode will show the strongest IETS signal. For this particular molecule, Gd@C$_{82}$, it was also found that the
inner Gd atom did not significantly affect the electron-vibration coupling.
Electronic Properties of Molecular Diamond

$sp^2$ bonded carbon molecular materials have unique and useful properties due to the influence of delocalized $\pi$-bond networks, as demonstrated in the previous chapters. Here we describe our studies of $sp^3$-bonded carbon molecular structures, where novel behavior arises from a very different source: tetrahedrally arranged carbon $\sigma$-bonds. These molecules are nanometer-sized pieces of diamond with dangling bonds terminated with hydrogen, and are called diamondoids. There are many types of diamondoids; the one we studied is called [121]tetramantane. Figure 11.1a has a ball and stick model of this molecule. The [121]tetramantane diamondoid studied here consists of four diamond cages face-fused into a straight rod with a chemical formula $C_{22}H_{28}$ (ref. [36]). The 28 surface dangling carbon bonds are all saturated by hydrogen atoms.

In this chapter, the atomic-scale properties of tetramantane will be investigated. In the $sp^3$ bonded tetramantane, we find a number of differences from the $sp^2$ bonded fullerenes. The topographs of tetramantane were almost featureless at negative biases while they showed much structure at positive biases, unlike fullerenes which show topographic features at both polarities. This difference was directly due to the $sp^3$ bonding: the HOMO orbital is localized between atoms and is difficult to image since the STM tip is a few Ångstroms above the molecule, while the LUMO orbital extends very far away from the molecule and contains much structure due to the CH$_2$ bonds that do not exist in fullerenes. The spectroscopy on tetramantane showed no resonances (unlike fullerenes which show many resonances), which is due to the large gap in $sp^3$ bonded materials, as well as the localization of the HOMO between atoms in $sp^3$ bonded materials. However, like Gd@C$_{82}$, there was strong electron-vibration coupling in tetramantane which was spatially localized. These results will help us understand two main topics of this dissertation: how do electron-vibration and molecule-substrate interactions affect molecular properties? Most of the results presented in this chapter are based on our published paper, ref. [196].

The molecules were provided by Jeremy E. Dahl and Robert M. K. Carlson at Chevron Technology Ventures. The [121]tetramantane molecules were extracted from petroleum and isolated and purified to a white crystalline powder with purity greater than 99% by
weight. Purification procedures included distillation, thermal processing and both size- and shape selective high-performance liquid chromatography, as described in [37]. Tetramantane molecules were thermally evaporated from a Knudsen cell evaporator (§5.4.1) onto a clean Au(111) substrate held at room temperature in ultrahigh vacuum. The sample was then placed into the STM at $T = 7$ K and all data was taken at that temperature. Topography was performed in constant-current mode, and $dI/dV$ spectra and images were measured through lock-in detection of the a.c. tunneling current driven by a 450 Hz, 1-10mV (rms) signal added to the sample bias (§2.4). The molecular manipulation method used here is the ‘sliding’ technique [42], with typical manipulation parameters $V = 5$ mV and $I = 1$ nA.

### 11.1 Tetramantane Electronic Structure

Tetramantane self assembles into an ordered overlayer on Au(111). Figure 11.1b shows an STM topograph taken of a sub-monolayer of tetramantane on Au(111) where the oval-shaped tetramantane molecules form a close-packed structure with lattice constants $11.4 \, \text{Å} \times 8.3 \, \text{Å}$ (see red arrows) and an apparent height of $3.3 \, \text{Å}$. The Au(111) surface herringbone reconstruction has negligible effect on the molecular ordering. Long-range ordering at room temperature implies high molecular mobility and weak bonding between the diamondoids and the Au(111) surface.

Figure 11.1: (a) Ball and stick model of [121]tetramantane. (b) Ordered layer of tetramantane on Au(111). (c) individual tetramantane at $-2$ V and (d) same molecule at $V = +2$ V.

To study single isolated molecules, individual tetramantane diamondoids were manipulated from the edge of an island onto an empty Au(111) terrace at $T = 7$ K using the STM tip (ref. [42]). Figures 11.1c,d show STM topographs of the same individual diamondoid taken with different sample biases. The image taken at sample bias $V = +2$ V (figure 11.1c), shows pronounced line nodes across the molecular surface, while the image taken at $V = -2$ V (figure 11.1d) is smoother, showing a much weaker spatial dependence of the occupied electronic states.

Individual tetramantane molecules were found to have a number of different orientations on Au(111). Figure 11.2a shows STM topographs of three individual tetramantane molecules on Au(111) with different orientations, as seen by the different line node patterns.
11.1. TETRAMANTANE ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE

Figure 11.2: (a) Experimental topographs of three different orientations of individual tetramantane molecules on Au(111). (b) DFT simulated topographs of the same three orientations shown in (a). (c) Ball and stick models corresponding to the topographs shown in (b). (d) DFT calculated HOMO and (e) DFT calculated LUMO. The values of the isosurfaces are the same for both states.

Figure 11.3 shows that individual tetramantane molecules can be switched between different orientations by dragging and rotating the molecules with the STM tip.

STS was used to examine the local electronic properties of tetramantane. Figure 11.4a shows the $dI/dV$ spectrum of the bare Au(111) substrate (black curve), the spatially averaged $dI/dV$ spectrum of an individual tetramantane molecule on Au(111) (green curve), and the difference between these two spectra (red curve). The red curve shows that the diamondoid makes a small contribution to the total surface electronic LDOS. The molecular electronic LDOS (red curve) is quite low in the energy range from $-2.5$ eV to $+2.5$ eV, consistent with an insulating ground state having an energy gap $> 5$ eV around $E_F$ (refs [40, 203, 202]). Although no sharp resonances related to the HOMO or the LUMO were observed, the gentle increase of subtracted $dI/dV$ (red curve) above $E_F$ may represent the end of a broad resonance arising from hybridization between the LUMO and the Au states.
11.1. TETRAMANTANE ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE

Figure 11.3: Constant current topographs showing the same individual tetramantane molecule (a) before and (b) after rotation with the STM tip. The images have been differentiated in the horizontal direction.

Figure 11.4: (a) $dI/dV$ Spectroscopy of tetramantane in a $\pm 2.5$ V range shows no features different from spectroscopy on Au(111). (b) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy in a $\pm 450$ mV range shows inelastic features at $\pm 356$ mV which can be seen as a dip at $-356$ mV and a peak at $356$ mV in $d^2I/dV^2$. (c) DFT calculations of the energy levels of tetramantane. (c) Tetramantane DFT DOS compared with the experimental LDOS.
11.2 Tetramantane Electron-Vibration Coupling

$dI/dV$ spectroscopy in the low bias range (±450 mV) reveals a V-like feature centered at $E_F$ and two sudden jumps in $dI/dV$ at ±356 mV (upper panel in figure 11.4b). The numerical derivative of this curve ($d^2I/dV^2$) correspondingly shows a narrow dip at −356 mV and a narrow peak at +356 mV (lower panel in figure 11.4b). This is the signature of inelastic electron tunneling spectroscopy (IETS), in which electronic excitations open a new tunneling channel, which causes a sudden increase in $dI/dV$ (ref. [181]). In this case, the excitation is a vibration since the energy 356 meV corresponds with the known vibrational energy of a C-H bond stretch mode, as has been observed in numerous other hydrocarbons [84].

The V-like feature in $dI/dV$ between ±200 mV might also be related to inelastic tunneling of electrons, where the electrons excite the quasi-continuous, low-frequency vibrations of tetramantane [107].

To understand the spatial dependence of the electron-vibration coupling across the surface of an individual tetramantane, we performed $d^2I/dV^2$ maps on the molecules [182, 67, 58]. We find that the pronounced inelastic signals at ±356 mV only exist on certain parts of the molecules, and become negligibly small elsewhere. Figure 11.5a shows $d^2I/dV^2$ maps of the inelastic signal at 356 mV for three individual diamondoids having different orientations, demonstrating unambiguously that the vibronic coupling strength is strongly localized to narrow slices on the molecular surfaces. Comparing the $d^2I/dV^2$ maps of the tetramantane molecules with their respective topographs directly below (figure 11.5b) reveals an anti-correlation between the topography and $d^2I/dV^2$ maps: the IETS signal is the strongest at the depressions in topography.

Such localization of the inelastic signal is unexpected because the 28 C-H bonds surrounding the tetramantane form a dense and nearly uniform surface which one might expect to give rise to a spatially uniform inelastic signal. Moreover, it might naively be expected that regions with a higher topography also have larger inelastic tunneling (as there is then more electron density in those regions and thus a higher probability for electrons to excite vibrations) [126], opposite to the anti-correlation observed here.

11.3 DFT Calculations of Tetramantane

To understand the anti-correlation between topography and $d^2I/dV^2$ maps, *ab initio* pseudopotential density functional theory (DFT) calculations within the local density approximation (LDA) were performed on a [121]tetramantane molecule on Au(111) by Emmanouil Kioupakis in Steven Louie’s group. Calculations were first done by using a plane-wave pseudopotential (PW-PP) code (60 Ry cutoff, 40 × 40 × 50 grid in units of Bohr radii) to obtain the properties of isolated tetramantane without the Au(111) surface [88]. The Au(111) surface was then added to the molecule as three layers of 56 gold atoms each (in a supercell geometry) and the properties of the combined diamondoid/Au(111) system were calculated using the SIESTA code [180], which uses a localized double-$\zeta$+polarization ba-
11.3. DFT CALCULATIONS OF TETRAMANTANE

Figure 11.5: IETS on Tetramantane. (a) Experimental \( \frac{d^2I}{dV^2} \) maps taken at \( V = +36 \) mV on three individual tetramantane molecules in different orientations. (b) Topographs of the same molecules shown in (a).

sis set, because the use of plane waves for the combined calculation would be much more expensive (§4.5). We expect that the PW-PP code will reproduce states which extend far away (> 4 Å) from the molecule better than the SIESTA code due to the localized basis used in SIESTA (see §4.5). To ensure that the SIESTA results reproduce states which extend far away from the molecule accurately, the SIESTA results for an isolated molecule were checked to be consistent with the plane-wave code when a grid of ghost atoms (§4.5) were introduced that were spaced 4 Bohr radii apart, with 2 \( s \)-like orbitals per ghost atom.

Figure 11.4c shows the schematic energy diagram of the tetramantane-Au(111) system. The theoretical Kohn-Sham HOMO-LUMO gap of the isolated molecule (no Au surface) is found to be 5.2 eV, which is an underestimation of the true quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap (§3.4.2, §4.5 and [87]). The electron affinity (EA) and ionization energy (IE) for isolated molecules (no Au surface) were obtained by computing the total energy of singly negatively and positively charged molecules, and were calculated to be \(-0.3\) eV and 7.6 eV respectively. This implies a quasiparticle HOMO-LUMO gap of 7.9 eV (§3.4.2). The values of the Kohn-Sham HOMO-LUMO gap and the quasiparticle gap calculated from IE and EA agree well with quantum Monte Carlo calculations reported previously for the larger diamondoid \( \text{C}_{29}\text{H}_{35} \) (ref. [40]). We find that diamondoids have an intrinsic negative electron affinity, as first pointed out in [40], which means that an electron in the LUMO is not
stable there and will readily leave the molecule, releasing an energy 0.3 eV. This makes diamondoids promising candidates for electron-emission devices. Recent photoemission data have indeed demonstrated strong monochromatic low-kinetic-energy electron emission from functionalized diamondoid monolayers on Au(111) (ref. [208]).

Figure 11.4d shows the DFT-calculated electronic DOS of a tetramantane molecule on Au(111). The calculated HOMO and LUMO levels are approximately at $-1.0 \text{ eV}$ and $+3.9 \text{ eV}$ relative to $E_F$, leading to a reduced Kohn-Sham HOMO-LUMO gap of 4.9 eV due to screening from the metal substrate. The LDOS of the LUMO is energy-broadened due to interaction with the surface (§4.4.1), and extends into the HOMO-LUMO gap as a shallow tail, consistent with the experimental LDOS (the $dI/dV$ curve). However, the theoretical HOMO LDOS resonance at $-1.0 \text{ eV}$ is not observed in the experimental LDOS, even down to $-2.5 \text{ eV}$.

This discrepancy can be understood by calculating the spatial distribution of the HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions $\psi_{\text{HOMO}}$ and $\psi_{\text{LUMO}}$. Figures 11.2d and e show the calculated isosurfaces of $|\psi_{\text{HOMO}}|^2$ and $|\psi_{\text{LUMO}}|^2$ at an isosurface where 50% of $|\psi|^2$ for each state is contained within the isosurface. The calculations were done for an isolated tetramantane molecule with the molecular orientation shown in figure 11.2d. The HOMO orbital is concentrated on the centers of the C-C bonds, reflecting the spatial localization of the $sp^3$ bonding orbitals. Such confined states are difficult for STM to detect (with the tip at several angstroms above the molecule), which explains the featureless negative-bias topographies and the absence of the HOMO resonance in the $dI/dV$ spectrum of tetramantane. The calculated LUMO orbital, on the other hand, is much more delocalized in space and exhibits pronounced line nodes similar to those seen experimentally. The LUMO state has previously been shown to be responsible for the negative electron affinity and anomalous quantum size effect of the diamondoids [40].

Closer comparison of the tetramantane LUMO isosurface and its corresponding molecular structure uncovers an intriguing trend: the strong line nodes in the LUMO orbitals is closely related to the surface hydrogen terminations. The large, delocalized LUMO wavefunction exists only at the 12 singly hydrogenated CH sites, and the LUMO wavefunction forms a continuous region in these CH-rich areas. The 8 doubly hydrogenated CH$_2$ sites (circled by red dashed lines in figure 11.2c), in contrast, exhibit little wavefunction density and form line nodes in the LUMO isosurface plot. This is can be explained by a simple tight binding model. The LUMO orbital on the CH$_2$ sites is constructed by a linear combination of the anti-bonding wavefunctions formed between the two canted carbon $sp^3$ orbitals and between the two hydrogen s orbitals [99]. The derived CH$_2$ wavefunction, called the $\sigma^*_{\text{CH}_2}$ orbital, has a pronounced node on the mirror plane that bisects the H-C-H complex.

This behavior can be seen better in figure 11.2b, which shows calculated LUMO STM topographs of isolated tetramantane molecules in three different orientations (Au surface not included in calculation). The schematic top views in figure 11.2c reveal that the three molecules lie on the Au substrate so that the substrate [111] direction is parallel to the diamond crystallographic [111], [110] and [100] directions, respectively (from left to right). These simulated topographs agree well with the essential features (the line nodes) of the
corresponding STM topographs taken at +2.0 V (figure 11.2a). The agreement between theory and experiment demonstrates that the pronounced nodal features found in the tetramantane STM images result from the suppressed LUMO wavefunction density at the CH$_2$ sites.

Next, we turn to IETS. The strength of electronic coupling to the C-H stretch mode has been evaluated using DFT by calculating the change of the molecular electronic energy eigenvalues with respect to displacements along the canonical phonon coordinates [58, 126]. Out of the 28 C-H stretch modes, we have identified three that interact strongly with electrons within 15 meV of the experimental signal at 356 meV. Simulations of the spatial distribution of the IETS signal, however, did not reproduce the experimental $d^2I/dV^2$ maps, so the question remains as to why the experimental IETS signal is enhanced in the CH$_2$-terminated regions of tetramantane and suppressed in the CH regions. One possibility this occurs is because the CH$_2$ region has a denser concentration of C-H bonds, and hence a higher probability of electronic interactions with the C-H stretch mode compared with the singly hydrogenated CH region.

11.4 Conclusions

The $sp^3$ bonded tetramantane shows distinct differences from the $sp^2$ bonded fullerenes. Both the electronic as well as the vibrational properties of the diamondoid depend substantially on the type of hydrogen termination. The LUMO contains nodes at the CH$_2$ sites, and the strongest electron-vibration coupling happens at exactly these same sites. This information is potentially useful for molecular electronics since substitution of other atoms for hydrogen may significantly alter the electronic and vibrational properties of the diamondoids, allowing one to control the functionality of a specific device incorporating diamondoids.
Part III

Magnetic Molecules
Molecular Dissociation of Titanocene

The titanocene chloride dimer, \([\text{Cp}_2\text{TiCl}]_2\) with \(\text{Cp} = \text{C}_5\text{H}_5\) (figure 12.1a), is known for its utility as an inexpensive reducing agent in organic synthesis, as well as for its magnetic properties. Its various uses in synthesis include catalysis of radical ring opening in epoxides [170], reduction and pinacol coupling of carbonyls [54], and an agent in single electron transfer [12, 6]. Its magnetic properties stem from the anti-ferromagnetic coupling between the spins of the two titanium atoms and makes the molecule a promising candidate for studying magnetism at nanometer length scales [101].

One goal of this study was to measure intra-molecular exchange coupling through spin excitations caused by inelastic tunneling. Unfortunately, we did not see spin excitations in our experiments, but we did discover new molecular orderings on the gold surface, and strong ordering-dependent electronic structure. This result is important since potential nanotechnological applications of this molecule (e.g., single molecule transistors) would involve attaching it to conducting surfaces, which requires precise control and detailed knowledge of molecule-surface chemistry [159,122,187]. Since the influence of metal substrates on the adsorption and catalytic properties of titanocene chloride dimers is currently not well-known, and previous studies on other molecules have shown that the metal substrate may have a substantial influence on the molecular properties [82,141,13], the results here are potentially useful for future applications of this molecule, and will address one of the important themes of this dissertation, the impact of a metal substrate on molecular properties.

To investigate the impact of a metal substrate on the behavior of titanocene chloride dimers, we used a combination of STM and DFT methods to study titanocene chloride dimer molecules on Au(111). Our STM topographs reveal isolated molecules at gold step edges for low molecular coverages, as well as two different coexisting phases at higher coverages closer to a monolayer. The LDOS of both the isolated molecules and the higher coverage monolayer phases were experimentally studied via \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy. Large and reproducible differences in \(dI/dV\) spectra were observed between the different molecular morphologies. To explain this behavior, the DOS of an isolated (gas phase) titanocene chloride dimer was calculated using DFT. The calculated properties of a dimer, however, do not
account for all of the experimental spectra. One possible explanation for the unaccounted for spectra (which include a spin-induced Kondo resonance) is the coexistence of \( \text{Cp}_2\text{Ti} \) and \( \text{Cp}_2\text{TiCl}_2 \) monomers in one of the monolayer phases, suggesting that a fraction of titanocene chloride dimers split into monomers on Au(111). This chapter will describe the influence of the Au(111) substrate on the properties of titanocene chloride dimers, most of which is published in our paper, reference [206].

12.1 Various titanocene phases

All experimental data presented here were taken in UHV at 7 K with a PtIr tip. Titanocene chloride molecules were synthesized by using the second method provided by Green and Lucas [56], and further purified by sublimation. The single-crystal Au(111) substrate was cleaned in UHV prior to deposition of titanocene chloride dimers from a Knudsen cell at 85°С onto a room temperature substrate. The \( dI/dV \) spectra were measured with a lock-in (§2.4) using a 451 Hz, 1–10 mV (rms) signal added to the sample bias with feedback off.

We first used an Omicron VT-STM to scan titanocene on Au(111). These experiments showed substantial molecular ordering on Au(111). However, when we did these experiments on the home built LT STM, we saw very disordered structures on the surface. Spectroscopy on these disordered structures showed inelastic effects and the Kondo effect, but these effects were not reproducible. We eventually found that the lack of ordering in the home built LT STM experiments was due to the FE coarse approach which is why we now use mainly the capacitance approach (§5.1.6). The high voltages used during the FE approach was destroying either the molecules or the molecular ordering. The Omicron VT-STM does not use the FE coarse approach.

Isolated titanocene chloride dimer molecules preferentially stick at Au(111) step edges (figure [12.1b]). Individual molecules appear as slightly asymmetrical protrusions with an apparent height of 2.2 Å, measured at \( V = 1.0 \) V and \( I = 20 \) pA. The molecular shape remains mostly featureless when imaged at different biases in a (1.5 V window). The exact orientation of the molecule on the surface cannot be determined from STM topographs, but little variation was observed between different isolated molecules. The \( dI/dV \) spectrum of single molecules (figure [12.1c]) clearly shows a LUMO resonance around 0.8 V.

When greater than \( \sim 10 \% \) of a monolayer of titanocene is deposited onto Au(111), two new phases were discovered to coexist, here referred to as phase 1 and phase 2 (figure [12.2a]). Topographs of phase 1 (figure [12.2b]) reveal a periodic network of protrusions having varying shapes and heights. When imaged with \( V = -1.0 \) V, dim protrusions in this phase appear elongated while brighter protrusions are circular (seven dim protrusions surround each bright one). The morphology of phase 2 is quite different, as the shapes of all protrusions here appear more circular, and the molecular arrangement has a honeycomb-like structure (every phase 2 bright protrusion is surrounded by three bright and three dim protrusions, when imaged at \( V = -0.5 \) V). Attempts to match the experimentally observed two-dimensional structures to surface terminations of known bulk geometries of \([\text{Cp}_2\text{TiCl}_2]\) were unsuccess-
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Figure 12.1: (a) Titanocene chloride dimer ball and stick model, as calculated by DFT (b) Topograph of single titanocene at narrow terraces on Au(111) \( (V = 1.0 \text{ V}, I = 20 \text{ pA}, T = 7 \text{ K}) \). (c) \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy of isolated titanocene averaged over many molecules. The LUMO resonance appears around 0.8 V.

ful \([101, 16, 115]\) implying that the Au(111) surface induces a new two-dimensional molecular ordering.

The LDOS of phase 1 and phase 2 monolayers was measured by \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy. \( dI/dV \) spectra of phase 1 (figure 12.3a) reveal peaks at different energies and peak amplitudes that depend on the spatial location of the spectrum. Spectra taken over the brighter phase 1 protrusions (circled in red in figure 12.3b) show two distinct peaks, a LUMO at about 0.5 V and a HOMO at about −1.0 V as well as a shoulder around 1.3 V. However, spectroscopy on the dimmer regions (circled in green) show only one distinct resonance at around 1.3 V. The slight dip in both curves is due to the Au(111) surface state. Spectroscopy at higher voltages was not possible since it caused irreversible damage to the monolayer phases.

\( dI/dV \) spectroscopy on monolayer phase 2 (figure 12.4a) again shows resonant peaks, but at different energies than those seen in phase 1. The brighter protrusions (circled in red in figure 12.4b) display one significant peak at −0.3 V while the dimmer regions (circled in green) display two peaks at −1.1 V and 0.3 V. The spectrum in the dimmer region stops at 0.3 V since the \( dI/dV \) signal becomes unstable at larger biases. If we zoom in on \( V = 0 \text{ V} \) in the dim region spectrum, a Kondo peak can be seen (figure 12.4a, inset). Such a peak is only seen in phase 2 and never seen in phase 1. Fitting the Kondo resonance to a Fano line shape (including thermal deconvolution \([150, 3.1]\) yields a line width of \( \Gamma = 8.6 \text{ meV} \), from which a Kondo temperature of \( T = 50 \text{ K} \) is derived \([81, 4.4.3]\).
12.2 DFT on Titanocene

To understand the wide range of experimental spectra, Mark Pederson performed first-principles DFT calculations on free titanocene chloride dimers using the NRLMOL code [161, 169]. Effects of the surface can be important, but were not included since we do not know the exact molecular arrangement from experiment and performing a calculation for every one of the many possible arrangements is prohibitively expensive. However, free molecule calculations can still give a qualitative understanding of the experimental data. All atoms in the calculation were treated within an all-electron approach (no pseudopotentials) [161], §4.5. The basis sets used in these calculations are roughly equivalent to triple-ζ or better [168]. The generalized gradient approximation (PBE-GGA) was used to approximate the exchange-correlation functional [165]. The free molecules were relaxed until all forces were below 0.01 eV/Å.

Roughly, the two Cp rings attached to a Ti atom each suck up one electron, while each Cl atom sucks up around $\frac{1}{2}$ of an electron from Ti. This means each Ti is in a Ti(III) state; i.e., each Ti has a net charge of +3. As each neutral Ti atom has four valence
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Figure 12.3: Spectroscopy on titanocene monolayer phase 1. (a) The green curve is the spatial average of $dI/dV$ spectra taken over different dim regions, while the red curve is the spatial average of spectra taken at different bright regions. (b) Topograph ($V = 0.5\,\text{V}, I = 10\,\text{pA}$) of phase 1 showing the dim regions (green circles) and red regions (red circles).

Figure 12.4: Spectroscopy on titanocene monolayer phase 2. (a) Both curves are the spatial average of $dI/dV$ spectroscopy taken over different regions in the phase 2 monolayer. Green curve = average over dim regions, red curve = average over brighter regions. A Kondo resonance (inset) appears only in the dim regions of phase 2. (b) Topograph of phase 2 ($V = -0.5\,\text{V}, I = 5\,\text{pA}$) showing both dim regions (green circles) and brighter regions (red circles).

electrons, the Ti(III) atom then has only one valence electron. The DFT calculated ground state of $[\text{Cp}_2\text{TiCl}]_2$ is found to have anti-ferromagnetic coupling between the two Ti(III) atoms’ spins with a singlet-to-triplet transition energy of 13.3 meV, consistent with previous bulk measurements [101]. Figure 12.5a (lower panel) shows the DOS calculated for a free titanocene chloride dimer. The calculated DOS has been rigidly energetically shifted to
align the energetic positions of the theoretical HOMO/LUMO peaks with our experimental HOMO/LUMO peaks since the precise location of the Fermi energy is not well defined for a free molecule with a wide HOMO-LUMO gap. As seen in figure 12.5a (top panel) the calculated peaks line up reasonably well with the experimental peaks for both the isolated dimer molecules as well as the phase 1 monolayer. This suggests that the experimentally observed isolated molecules and phase 1 monolayer molecules are both titanocene chloride dimers. However, the peak positions and magnitudes of the isolated molecule and phase 1 monolayer spectra differ. These variations are likely due to differing molecular orientations on the surface. The specific orientations are difficult to determine from STM topographs and a wide number of possible structures could potentially fit our data.

The peaks seen in the experimental spectra for phase 2 molecules show a dramatic departure from the isolated molecule and phase 1 behavior, which the DFT dimer calculations do not account for. We also note that the phase 2 topographic molecular features are more circular in comparison to the elongated features of phase 1 molecules. As a result of
these spectroscopic and topographic differences between phase 1 and phase 2, we propose that phase 2 does not consist of titanocene chloride dimers; it is composed of dissociated titanocene dimers (titanocene monomers). Molecular dissociation may happen during the thermal evaporation process, or may occur on the surface, which is known to occur for other metallocenes [20]. A well-known stable fragment of the titanocene chloride dimer is titanocene dichloride (Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$). Since Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ + Cp$_2$Ti = [Cp$_2$TiCl]$_2$, the presence of titanocene dichloride on the Au(111) surface suggests the simultaneous existence of the non-chlorinated titanocene monomer (Cp$_2$Ti).

This interpretation is supported by comparisons of our measured $dI/dV$ spectra with DFT calculations of the DOS of Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ and Cp$_2$Ti. The lower panel of figure 12.5b shows the calculated DOS for both free Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ and Cp$_2$Ti monomers (these results are also consistent with previous total DOS calculations [195, 51]). The element which contributes the most to the DOS in a specific energy window is written above the DOS. The Fermi energy of a free molecule is not well defined; it can be anywhere in the HOMO-LUMO gap. So, to compare the free molecule calculations with the experimental LDOS (with a well defined $E_F$), we may energetically shift the theoretical spectrum of Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ rigidly within the HOMO-LUMO gap to align the calculated and experimental peaks. The calculated free molecule Cp$_2$Ti DOS, on the other hand, has a more well-defined $E_F$ since the HOMO-LUMO gap here is small, and so its energy alignment is pinned. Both types of monomers are seen to have new states near $E_F$ in the calculated DOS that do not exist in the dimer calculations, consistent with experimental phase 2 spectra, and thus supporting the proposal that phase 2 consists of titanocene monomers instead of dimers. The calculated Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ spectrum, for example, has filled states similar to filled state features seen in the experimental spectra for phase 2 bright regions (figure 12.5b, top panel) while the calculated spectrum for Cp$_2$Ti has unoccupied states near $E_F$, similar to the unoccupied states in dim regions of phase 2. This suggests that the bright regions in phase 2 are Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ monomers while the dim regions are Cp$_2$Ti monomers. The experimentally observed Kondo peak in the phase 2 dim regions is consistent with magnetism predicted in the calculations for Cp$_2$Ti ($S = 1$), while the lack of a Kondo peak in phase 2 bright regions is consistent with the non-magnetic $S = 0$ ground state of Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ from the calculations [51]. The exact molecular orientations and adsorption sites of the two monomers in this phase could not be uniquely determined from STM topographs, so the Au(111) surface was not included in the calculation for the same reasons stated above regarding phase 1. We also note that the experimental ratio of Cp$_2$Ti to Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ is 1:2, which deviates from the expected 1:1 ratio. This is possibly due to a smaller sticking probability for Cp$_2$Ti on Au(111) at room temperature, which causes a fraction of them to desorb from the Au(111) surface.

12.3 Conclusions

We have studied the behavior of titanocene chloride dimers on Au(111) using STM and DFT. Isolated molecules and two new monolayer phases were experimentally observed on
the Au(111) surface. DFT calculations of free molecules suggest that titanocene chloride dimers, as well as dissociated dimers, the non-magnetic Cp$_2$TiCl$_2$ and magnetic Cp$_2$Ti, coexist on Au(111). The molecular adsorption geometries could not be uniquely determined by STM, so effects of the surface were not included in the calculations. The agreement between experimental spectroscopy and theoretical DOS can be improved if effects of the surface (such as surface hybridization, relaxation, and charge transfer) and overlap between tip and molecule wave functions were included in future calculations.
Spin Coupling Mediated by TCNE

Magnetic molecule-based spintronics raises new possibilities for electronic and magnetic devices [19, 90]. In this field, molecules based on transition metal atoms and cyano-organic molecules show much promise due to their high Curie temperatures. An important cyano-organic molecule is tetracyanoethylene (TCNE) since $V_x($TCNE)$ with x \sim 2$ has an unusually high Curie temperature of around 400 K [136, 167, 185, 113]. The structure of TCNE is shown in figure 13.1. However, the mechanisms which cause the high Curie temperature are not well understood, mainly due to the disordered growth of bulk TCNE compounds. Experimental probes to determine the spin interactions, such as XMCD and XPS, have not been conclusive [167, 72, 185].

![Structure of TCNE molecule from DFT calculations.](image)

To address this problem, a local probe such as an STM is ideal. Using the molecular manipulation capabilities of an STM, we can manipulate TCNE to vanadium atoms and can control both the stoichiometry and structure of $V_x$TCNE$_y$ complexes. We can then study the electronic and magnetic properties of these structures while knowing precisely what the
13.1. TCNE-SUBSTRATE INTERACTIONS

structure of the complexes are. This work sheds light on a number of important themes in this dissertation—how can we control properties of single molecules at atomic scales, and how do molecule-substrate and molecule-atom interactions affect molecular properties.

We will see that the TCNE-substrate interaction is largely determined by the lattice structure of the noble metal substrate. We will also see evidence for controllable spin coupling through TCNE in \( V_x (\text{TCNE})_y \) structures created by STM manipulation, suggesting that spin coupling can be controlled at atomic length scales. These results are based on our published papers, refs. [199, 200].

13.1 TCNE-Substrate Interactions

The first step in this work was to find a suitable substrate to do the experiments on, since there is not much previous work exploring TCNE on different substrates [43, 44, 157]. TCNE molecules were deposited onto various substrates at room temperature using a room temperature leak valve evaporator (§5.4.4). Three noble metal single crystal substrates were used, Au(111), Ag(001), Cu(001). All substrates were cleaned according to §5.3. The TCNE molecules had a purity of 99% and were prepared before evaporation according to §5.4.4. All substrates were at room temperature during the deposition of TCNE.

On Au(111), the TCNE molecules saturated the step edges and formed small islands in the fcc corners of the Au(111) Herringbone reconstruction [204]. Most of the surface displayed disordered arrangements of TCNE except for small ordered islands. Each molecule appears as a 6 Å × 9 Å kidney-bean shaped protrusion with an apparent height of \( \sim 1.2 \) Å (figure 13.2). The molecules do not seem to stick to the Au(111) surface very strongly since we need low currents to image them (\( \sim 1 \) pA). Manipulation performed with settings around

Figure 13.2: TCNE deposited onto Au(111) at RT and imaged at \( T = 7 \) K. (a) Topography of a small island of TCNE \( (V = 0.1 \text{ V}, I = 5 \text{ pA}) \). A single TCNE molecule is circled in red. (b) \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy of TCNE on Au(111), showing the HOMO and LUMO. The feature around \(-0.5 \) V is due to the Au(111) surface state.
50 mV, 3 nA would usually pick the molecules off the surface.

$dI/dV$ spectroscopy was also performed on the molecules in the islands (figure 13.2). The spectrum shows two peaks which are the HOMO at around $-1.5$ V and LUMO around 2.5 V. There is little difference between $dI/dV$ maps taken at different energies.

For TCNE on Ag(001) (figure 13.3), the molecules also saturate the step edges, but exist as isolated molecules on terraces at low coverages. At higher coverages, the molecules can exist either as isolated molecules or as ordered islands. The isolated molecules appear as an oval with dark stripes around it. $dI/dV$ spectroscopy on the isolated molecules shows only one molecular state, a HOMO at around $-0.6$ V. $dI/dV$ maps of the isolated molecules taken at the energy of the HOMO shows the spatial distribution of the HOMO (§2.5).

TCNE on Cu(001) forms long ordered chains (figure 13.4), unlike TCNE on Ag(001) or Au(111). Topographs of these long chains have a different structure from TCNE on Ag(001). At low biases, we can see a central oval shaped protrusion, but a few of these protrusions

---

**Figure 13.3**: TCNE on Ag(001). (a) Topography at $V = -0.6$ V, $I = 10$ pA. (b) $dI/dV$ spectroscopy of TCNE on Ag(001), showing the HOMO resonance at $V = -0.6$ V. (c) Topography of four TCNE molecules ($V = -0.6$ V, $I = 30$ pA). (d) $dI/dV$ map at $V = -0.6$ V (the HOMO energy). (e) Structural model of the images in (c) and (d).
have additional circular protrusions around them. \(dI/dV\) spectroscopy on TCNE on Cu(001) shows no distinct peaks within \(\pm 2\) eV of \(E_F\).

The behavior of TCNE on the different noble metals can be explained in terms of the different metals’ work functions, as well as the TCNE electron affinity. Since TCNE has a high electron affinity, 3.1 eV [33], it likes to suck up electrons. The work function gives us an idea of how much the metal is willing to give up its electrons. So lower work function metals are more likely to donate electrons to TCNE and create an ionic bond. The work functions for Au(111), Ag(100), and Cu(100) are 5.3 eV, 4.6 eV, and 5.1 eV [123]. We would then expect the ionic bonding between TCNE and Au to be the weakest while the ionic bonding between TCNE and Cu to be weak while the bonding between TCNE and Ag to be the strongest.

We would then naively expect the behavior of TCNE on Ag(001) and Cu(001) to be opposite of what is experimentally observed: TCNE should cause larger interactions with Ag than with Cu, but that is not the case. To explain the discrepancy, we must also take into account the differing lattice constants of Ag and Cu, as well as the differing binding energies between Ag atoms and Cu atoms.

Since the lattice constant of Cu is 2.55 Å, the nitrogen atoms of TCNE are all close to a Cu atom; the distance between Cu and N is 2.37 Å from the structural model. This is similar to the distance between transition metals and TCNE in metal-TCNE complexes [72, 79, 103, 147]. However, Ag has a larger lattice constant and so the distance between Ag and N would be 3.13 Å, which is substantially larger than for Cu. Hence, due to a better structural fit with the lattice, we expect the interaction between Cu and TCNE to be stronger than the interaction between Ag and TCNE.

We must also consider the Ag-Ag and Cu-Cu binding energies, since the metal with a smaller binding energy is more likely to buckle. These energies may be found from the heat of vaporization. We find that the Cu-Cu binding energy is actually larger than the Ag-Ag binding energy. So it seems that the lattice matching between TCNE and Cu plays the dominant role in determining the lattice buckling.

Figure 13.4: TCNE on Cu(001). (a) Topography \((V = 1\) V, \(I = 5\) pA. (b) Topograph of a small island \((V = 10\) mV, \(I = 5\) nA. (c) Topograph of a chain \((V = 1\) mV, \(I = 5\) nA. (d) Structural model of part of the image in (c). The green circle around the buckled Cu atom in the model corresponds to the green circle in (c).
Figure 13.5: DFT calculated isosurfaces for the HOMO and LUMO of TCNE and TCNE$^{2-}$, with the experimental $dI/dV$ map of the HOMO in the middle for comparison.

Another possibility for Cu atoms attached to the TCNE molecules on Cu(001) is from adatom diffusion. Since we deposit TCNE onto a Cu(001) substrate at room temperature and Cu atoms are diffusing on the surface at room temperature, it is possible that the diffusing TCNE and Cu hit each other and grow into ordered structures. There is experimental and theoretical evidence, however, that this is not the case. Experimentally, the height of the observed circular protrusions are small, $\lesssim 0.3 \, \text{Å}$ (imaged at $V = 0.01 \, \text{V}, I = 10 \, \text{pA}$), much smaller than the $0.7 \, \text{Å}$ to $1.2 \, \text{Å}$ heights of Cu adatoms or small Cu clusters on other Cu substrates [154, 116, 117], suggesting that the observed protrusions are not Cu adatoms. Also, we experimentally observe holes near the circular protrusions, suggesting that they are Cu atoms that have been pulled out of the surface. Theoretically, DFT calculations that support the buckling model and not the adatom diffusion model have been done [15].

13.2 DFT Calculations on TCNE

To model the observed molecular orbital, DFT calculations were performed using SIESTA. A double-$\zeta$ + polarization basis was used and the local density approximation was used for the exchange-correlation functional (§4.5). The free TCNE molecule was relaxed until all forces were less than 0.001 eV/Å.

The energy eigenvalues of the free TCNE molecule were calculated and the HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions were also calculated. The agreement between the $dI/dV$ HOMO images and the calculated free molecule HOMO do not agree well (figure [13.5]). However, if one or two negative charges are added and the calculation repeated, we find that the HOMO wavefunction does indeed look like the experimental $dI/dV$ images (figure [13.5]). This implies that the TCNE absorbs electrons from the Ag(001) surface, which is likely since TCNE is known to have a high electron affinity ($\sim 3 \, \text{eV}$).
13.3 $V_x(TCNE)_y$ Complexes

Once we found that Ag(001) works the best for manipulation, we created various $V_xTCNE_y$ structures on Ag(001). The main structures that were built were $V(TCNE)$, $V_2(TCNE)$, and $V(TCNE)_2$. Although direct (atom-atom) and substrate-mediated (atom-substrate-atom) magnetic coupling between atomic spin centers has been measured previously using STM-based techniques [30, 94, 83, 192, 142], precisely controlling the spin coupling through a single molecular linker (atom-molecule-atom) in an artificial molecular structure has not yet been performed.

After depositing TCNE from a leak valve evaporator (§5.4.4) onto a Ag(001) single crystal held at room temperature, the Ag(001) was moved to the STM until it cooled down to 7 K. Vanadium atoms were then deposited from an e-beam evaporator (§5.4.2). Figure 13.6 shows the surface after the deposition of TCNE and V.

The V atoms cannot be manipulated on the Ag(001) surface, but the TCNE molecules can be moved towards the V atoms using the sliding technique [42]. After TCNE is moved towards a V atom, it spontaneously combines with it to form $V(TCNE)$ (figure 13.6b,e). This $V(TCNE)$ complex can then be manipulated as a single unit towards another V to create $V_2(TCNE)$ (figure 13.6f). A TCNE molecule can also be moved towards $V(TCNE)$ to create $V(TCNE)_2$ (figure 13.6c).

![Figure 13.6: Construction of $V_x(TCNE)_y$ on Ag(001) using molecular manipulation. (a)–(c): formation of $V(TCNE)_2$ ($V = 1$ V, $I = 5$ pA). (d)–(f): formation of trans-$V_2(TCNE)$ ($V = 1$ V, $I = 10$ pA).](image-url)
There are many different structures which can be built by manipulation (13.7). However, there are also various different stable isomers for each \( V_x(TCNE)_y \). A particular isomer can sometimes be obtained by carefully controlling the manipulation process, but often one constructs an undesired isomer instead. This lack of complete control makes it difficult to reproducibly create large \( V_x(TCNE)_y \) structures, and makes it harder to get good statistics on each structure. However, for the smaller \( V_x(TCNE)_y \) structures, there are less possible ways a V atom can attach to the V(TCNE), making it easier to get reproducibility.

The structures that we were able to get good statistics on were V(TCNE), linear V(TCNE)\(_2\), cis-V\(_2\)(TCNE), trans-V\(_2\)(TCNE)@27° and trans-V\(_2\)(TCNE)@11°. The angle in the names of the two trans-V\(_2\)(TCNE)s denotes the different orientations with respect to the [100] direction of the Ag(001) surface. The first orientation has the line joining the two V atoms rotated 27° counterclockwise from the [100] direction while the second orientation has the line joining the V atoms rotated by 11° from the [100] direction. By analyzing the molecular resonances and Kondo effect in these various structures, and by comparison with DFT calculations, we can draw some conclusions about the magnetic interactions in these structures.

Figure 13.8 shows STM topographs, as well as structural models derived from atomic resolution images of these structures. Atomic resolution was achieved by getting adsorbates on the tip (§3.2).

Spectroscopy done at higher biases (±1 V) on V-TCNE, V(TCNE)\(_2\), trans-V\(_2\)(TCNE), and cis-V\(_2\)(TCNE) is shown in figure 13.9. The main feature in the spectroscopy in this energy range is the peak at around −0.2 V. This peak exists on both the V and TCNE in V-TCNE, but only on V in V(TCNE)\(_2\).

Figure 13.10 shows spectroscopy in the low bias ±80 mV range for TCNE, V-TCNE, and V(TCNE)\(_2\). Data for V\(_2\)(TCNE) will be presented later. TCNE shows a sharp decrease in \( dI/dV \) near −30 mV and a sharp rise in \( dI/dV \) near +30 mV (figure 13.10a). These features are easier to see in \( d^2I/dV^2 \), where they appear as a dip and a peak. In V-TCNE, a sharp resonance around 0 V and additional faint features appear at ±45 mV on V and ±30 mV.
13.3. $V_x(\text{TCNE})_y$ COMPLEXES

Figure 13.8: Topographs and structural models of (a) $V$-TCNE (1 V, 10 pA), (b) $V(\text{TCNE})_2$ (1 V, 5 pA), (c) trans-$V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ$ (1 V, 50 pA), (d) trans-$V_2(\text{TCNE})@11^\circ$ (1 V, 5 pA), and (e) cis-$V_2(\text{TCNE})$ 1 V, 5 pA.

on TCNE. These faint features in $dI/dV$ are more apparent in $d^2I/dV^2$, where they appear as dips at $-45$ mV (on V) and $-30$ mV (on TCNE) and peaks at 45 mV (on V) and 30 mV (on TCNE). On $V(\text{TCNE})_2$, there is a sharp peak near 0 V, and again faint features in $d^2I/dV^2$ at $\pm30$ mV on TCNE. The peak near 0 V in V-TCNE and $V(\text{TCNE})_2$ is likely due to a Kondo effect (§4.4.3). The dips and peaks in $d^2I/dV^2$ in all spectra are inelastic features (§2.6) which are likely due to molecular vibrations. The IETS feature at 30 mV is likely the known wagging or rocking mode of TCNE from DFT and optical spectroscopy measurements [145, 23]. The inelastic feature at 45 mV is likely due to V-N vibrations since the V-N stretch mode of other structures lies at this energy [10]. The existence of this mode only when V is attached to TCNE shows that a true covalent bond is being formed between V and TCNE.

The final types of structures we analyzed in detail are the trans-$V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ$ and trans-$V_2(\text{TCNE})@11^\circ$ complexes shown in figure [13.8]. In $V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ$, spectroscopy in
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Figure 13.9: Spectroscopy on (a) V-TCNE, (b) V(TCNE)$_2$, and (c) a comparison of spectroscopy between V-TCNE, trans-$V_2$(TCNE), and cis-$V_2$(TCNE). The state believed to arise from the V $d$-orbital is labeled with $E_d$.

Figure 13.10: $dI/dV$ and $d^2I/dV^2$ spectra for (a) TCNE, (b) V-TCNE, (c) V(TCNE)$_2$. The arrows mark the position of either IETS signals caused by molecular vibrations (labeled $E_{\text{vib}}$) or the Kondo resonance. The Ag(001) spectroscopy curve (green curve in (a)), was subtracted from all other $dI/dV$ spectra to help deconvolute the non-constant tip DOS from the spectra (appendix B).

The ±1 V range shows a resonance around $-0.15$ V on both V and TCNE, although the resonance on TCNE is broader (figure 13.11a). In the ±80 mV range, a narrow resonance appears near $E_F$ (figure 13.11c).

In $V_2$(TCNE)@11°, spectroscopy in the ±1 V range looks very similar to the spectroscopy
13.3. \( V_x(\text{TCNE})_y \) COMPLEXES

Figure 13.11: High bias \( dI/dV \) spectroscopy on (a) \( V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ \), (b) \( V_2(\text{TCNE})@11^\circ \), and low bias spectroscopy on (c) \( V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ \), and (d) \( V_2(\text{TCNE})@11^\circ \). The Ag background was subtracted from the spectra in (c) and (d) to deconvolute the non-constant tip DOS (appendix B). The state believed to arise from the \( V \) \( d \)-orbital is labeled \( E_d \).

on trans-\( V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ \) in the same voltage range—there is a resonance around \( -0.15 \) V on both \( V \) and TCNE, and the resonance on TCNE is broader. However, at lower biases, unlike spectroscopy on trans-\( V_2(\text{TCNE})@27^\circ \), spectroscopy on trans-\( V_2(\text{TCNE})@11^\circ \) reveals no narrow resonance near \( E_F \).

To help explain the data, SP-DFT calculations by Tunna Baruah and Mark Pederson were done using NRLMOL [162, 91, 163, 161]. The basis functions were similar to triple-\( \zeta \) and PBE-GGA was used for the exchange-correlation functional [165].

Calculations were performed on free \( V(\text{TCNE}) \) and \( V_2(\text{TCNE}) \). The substrate was not included in the calculations, but we suspect that an electron is donated from the surface to \( V_x(\text{TCNE}) \), so the structures were singly negatively charged. \( V \) atoms on Ag(001) are found to be neutral. It is assumed that they acquire no additional charge from the substrate in \( V_x(\text{TCNE}) \) complexes. The DFT LDOS of these structures reveal a resonance at \( \sim -0.2 \) V, which is due to a singly occupied \( V \) atom \( d \)-state (figure 13.12). This is in good agreement with the experimentally observed peak at \( \sim -0.2 \) V in both \( V(\text{TCNE}) \) and \( V_2(\text{TCNE}) \). The
agreement between experiment and theory only occurs when the $V_x(TCNE)$ structures are singly negatively charged; neutral and twice negatively charged structures do not have the strong resonance near $-0.2 \, V$.

![Figure 13.12: V-TCNE and $V_2(TCNE)$ SP-DFT calculations. The state believed to arise from the V $d$-orbital is marked with $E_d$.](image)

Since the resonance near 0 V is has a narrow width $\sim 20 \, mV$, it is much narrower than expected for molecular orbitals hybridized with a surface. This suggests that the resonance near 0 V is a Kondo resonance (§4.4.3, [120, 131]). We expect that the spatial distribution of the Kondo state is the same as the molecular orbital which leads to it. Since the narrow resonance near 0 V has the same spatial distribution as the resonance near $-0.2 \, V$ for all $V_x(TCNE)_y$ structures, it is likely that the Kondo resonance is caused by the single electron in the V $d$-orbital.

Since the Kondo effect is a many body effect due to the interaction between the $V_x(TCNE)_y$ complex and the surface, DFT cannot reproduce this effect correctly. However, we may still explain qualitatively why $V_2(TCNE)@27^\circ$ has a Kondo while $V_2(TCNE)@11^\circ$ does not. We first note that the distance between V atoms is around 1 nm, which is much larger than expected for coupling through the surface [30, 192]. Hence, we expect coupling through the TCNE molecule. We then note that the distance between V atoms in $V_2(TCNE)@11^\circ$ is $\approx 1 \, \text{Å}$ smaller than in $V_2(TCNE)@27^\circ$. This means that the V atoms will interact more strongly with TCNE in $V_2(TCNE)@11^\circ$. SP-DFT predicts that the singly charged $V_2(TCNE)$ will have a single spin on each V atom that interacts ferromagnetically, and hence the ferromagnetic interaction will be stronger in $V_2(TCNE)@11^\circ$. It is known that ferromagnetic interactions between spins can lower the Kondo temperature [96], and hence, $V_2(TCNE)@11^\circ$ has no Kondo resonance due to its lower Kondo temperature.

The Kondo temperature may also change due to changes in the energy of the $d$-state, changes in the hybridization, or changes in the Coulomb energy $U$. However, changes in
these variables are not likely since the $d$-state energy and width are the same for both $V_2$(TCNE) structures, according to the data. The lowering of the Kondo temperature due to ferromagnetic interaction is then supported by the data.

### 13.4 V(TCNE) on NaCl

Magnetic structures on a metallic surfaces can interact with the electrons of the surface, altering its intrinsic magnetic properties. To overcome this problem, a thin insulating layer can be grown on a metallic surface. NaCl is an easily grown insulator which was used to accomplish this. Figure 13.13 shows topography of TCNE on second and third layers of NaCl. Spectroscopy shows a LUMO around 1.5 V for TCNE on a second layer NaCl and 1.8 V for TCNE on a third layer of NaCl. Unfortunately, after depositing V and manipulating TCNE molecules and V atoms together (only TCNE could be manipulated controllably on NaCl), we did not see any evidence of spin in V(TCNE) and we were not able to manipulate V(TCNE) or V to create larger structures.

### 13.5 Conclusions

This chapter discussed both the interactions between TCNE and noble metal substrates, as well as controlling the TCNE-mediated spin coupling between electrons on different V atoms via STM molecular manipulation. We found that the ionic binding between TCNE and noble metals, as well as any TCNE-induced surface reconstruction, is more strongly influenced by the lattice structure of the metal surface than by the surface work functions of the different metals. We also found that $V_x$(TCNE)$_y$ complexes on Ag(001) can be created with STM molecular manipulation, and in trans-$V_2$(TCNE), there is evidence suggesting that the TCNE-mediated coupling of spins between the two V atoms can be controlled by changing the distance between V and TCNE.

This concludes part III of this dissertation. Following this chapter are extensive technical appendices describing the experimental techniques in greater detail.
Figure 13.13: Topograph of TCNE on NaCl (a) Large area showing mainly second layer NaCl islands with isolated TCNE colored brown on it (V = 1.4 V, I = 1 pA). (b) Zoom in on a second layer NaCl island with isolated TCNE molecules colored brown. (c) Spectroscopy on TCNE on the second and third layer NaCl islands. The NDR around 2.4 V is likely due to the voltage dependence of the tunneling barrier (§3.3.1).
When we calculate $dI/dV$, we may simply numerically differentiate $I(V)$ with respect to $V$. However, to take a numerical derivative, we need $I(V)$ to be very noise-free, since any noise in $I(V)$ will become much larger in its derivative. Since $I(V)$ contains noise at many different frequencies, its derivative $dI/dV$ will also contain much noise. To calculate $dI/dV$ with little noise, we need a way of removing the noise at various frequencies. The lock-in amplifier allows us to do that, and it does it with a much better quality factor than a typical band-pass filter.

We will see that if we apply a small oscillating voltage with angular frequency $\omega_0$ to the STM tip and measure the tunneling current with a lock-in amplifier, the output of the lock-in amplifier will be proportional to $dI/dV$ (§A.3). However, the noise in $dI/dV$ will be due to only the noise at frequency $\omega_0$ and no other frequency, so the lock-in amplifier allows us to eliminate most of the noise from $dI/dV$.

### A.1 The Ideal Lock-in

Here we describe the theoretical basis of the ideal lock-in amplifier. If we have a voltage signal $f(t)$ that oscillates with periodicity $T$, we may write it as a Fourier series

$$f(t) = \frac{B_0}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \sin(n\omega_0 t) + B_n \cos(n\omega_0 t).$$

where $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$. $A_n$ and $B_n$ are called the Fourier coefficients.

Often, we want to find $A_n$ and $B_n$. To calculate the Fourier coefficients $A_n$ or $B_n$ by hand, we would multiply $f(t)$ by $\sin n\omega_0 t$ or $\cos n\omega_0 t$ and integrate over a complete period.
$T = 2\pi/\omega_0$, then multiply the result by $\omega_0/\pi$. Mathematically, this is

$$A_n = \frac{\omega_0}{\pi} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \sin n\omega_0 t \, dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)$$

$$B_n = \frac{\omega_0}{\pi} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \cos n\omega_0 t \, dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3)$$

where $t_0$ is any real number.

A **lock-in amplifier** (or simply, a **lock-in**) is a device that allows us to extract the Fourier coefficients from the periodic signal $f(t)$ by doing something very similar (via analog or digital electronics) to the process described above: it takes the input signal $f(t)$, multiplies it by another signal $\sin(n\omega_{\text{ref}} t + \phi_n)$, integrates over a complete period, then multiplies the result by $\omega_0/(\pi \sqrt{2})$. Mathematically, the process that the ideal lock-in performs can be written as

$$V_{\text{ideal}} = \frac{\omega_0}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \sin(n\omega_{\text{ref}} t + \phi_n) \, dt.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.4)$$

This expression leads to a voltage which is proportional to the voltage on one of the outputs of the lock-in.

When we compare the mathematical procedure for calculating Fourier coefficients [equation (A.2)] with the procedure the lock-in performs [equation (A.4)], we see that they are very similar; they only differ in three places: $\omega_{\text{ref}}$ instead of $\omega_0$, an additional phase $\phi_n$ in the sine, and an overall extra factor of $\sqrt{2}$. Since $\omega_{\text{ref}}$ and $\phi_n$ are user-adjustable parameters, if we set $\omega_{\text{ref}} = \omega_0$ and $\phi_n = 0$, then the lock-in will calculate the voltage $A_n/\sqrt{2}$. Hence, the lock-in allows us to measure the Fourier coefficients of a periodic signal.

This was a brief introduction to what an ideal lock-in is supposed to do and how it does it. The next sections will describe in greater detail the inputs, outputs, and adjustable parameters of an ideal lock-in.

### A.1.1 Inputs

A lock-in amplifier generally takes two input signals. One input signal is the experimental signal, which is a periodic signal $f(t)$ [equation (A.1)] from which we want to extract Fourier coefficients from, and the other is called the reference signal $V_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(\omega_{\text{ref}} t + \phi)$ (in units of volts), which normally comes from a function generator. Sometimes the lock-in has a built-in function generator, so the reference signal is an internal signal in the lock-in, and the reference signal input is not used. As discussed above, normally we choose $\omega_{\text{ref}} = \omega_0$.

### A.1.2 Outputs

A lock-in has two output signals (this assumes we have a dual-phase lock-in); the value of these signals depends on what output mode the user selects. The most common output signals are called $X$, $Y$, $R$, and $\theta$, and the user can select any two of these four to output.
Different lock-in’s will have different ways of selecting these outputs; for example, on a PAR 5210, one must select $XY$-mode to get outputs $X$ and $Y$, or $R\theta$-mode to get $R$ and $\theta$.

**X and Y**

This is how the lock-in calculates the values of the $X$ and $Y$ outputs. If we input the two signals, $f(t)$ [equation (A.1)] and $V_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(\omega_{\text{ref}}t + \phi)$ into the lock-in, the lock-in first internally multiplies the reference signal frequency by an integer factor $n$ and changes the phase of it to $\phi_n$ (both $n$ and $\phi_n$ are chosen by the user as described in the next section). The phase $\phi_n$ is not necessarily the same as the reference voltage phase $\phi$. The modified reference signal is then $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(n\omega_{\text{ref}}t + \phi_n)$.

The procedure to calculate the $X$ output then follows that given in deriving (A.4): we multiply $f(t)$ by $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t)$, integrate the result over a complete period $T = 2\pi/\omega_0$, and multiply that result by $\omega_0/\pi\sqrt{2}$. The $Y$ output has the exact same procedure, except we shift the phase of $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t)$ by $90^\circ$ before multiplying with $f(t)$.

This procedure yields voltages, which are normally displayed on the front panel of the lock-in. With $\omega_{\text{ref}} = \omega_0$, they are

$$V_x = \frac{\omega_0}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \sin(n\omega_0t + \phi_n) \, dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

$$V_y = \frac{\omega_0}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \cos(n\omega_0t + \phi_n) \, dt.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

By plugging in $f(t)$ [equation (A.1)] and performing the integral, these expressions simplify to

$$V_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.7)

$$V_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \cos \phi_n - A_n \sin \phi_n).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.8)

The number $n$ [which denotes the $n^{\text{th}}$ term in the Fourier series of $f(t)$] is also referred to as the $n^{\text{th}}$ harmonic, so, for example, $n = 2$ would be the second harmonic.

The actual voltages on the output of the lock-in are different than the numbers displayed on the front panel. The actual output voltages are proportional to $V_x$ and $V_y$

$$V_{\text{out 1}} = C V_x$$

$$V_{\text{out 2}} = C V_y$$

where the constant of proportionality $C$ is determined by the settings of the lock-in and may be different for different lock-in’s. One must read the manual for the lock-in to determine its value. Alternatively, to determine $C$, one may apply a signal $f(t) = V_0 \sin(\omega t)$ with a known amplitude $V_0$ to the input of the lock-in and compare the two output voltages
of the lock-in to the values $V_x$ and $V_y$.

$R$ and $\theta$

If we consider the two voltages $V_x$ and $V_y$ of the lock-in as the $x$ and $y$ components of a 2-D vector in Cartesian coordinates $\vec{r} = (V_x, V_y)$, then this vector would have polar coordinates

$$R = \sqrt{V_x^2 + V_y^2}$$

$$\theta = \tan^{-1} \frac{V_y}{V_x}$$

These values of $R$ and $\theta$ are the values displayed on the lock-in front panel. The actual output voltages are proportional to the $R$ and $\theta$ values, with the same proportionality factor $C$ as for the $X$ and $Y$ outputs.

A.1.3 Adjustable parameters

The ideal lock-in also has two adjustable parameters, the harmonic number $n$, and the phase $\phi_n$, which are chosen based on what we want to measure (§A.3.4, §A.4.2 discuss how to choose the phase to measure $dI/dV$ and $d^2I/dV^2$). Normally we set $n = 1$ or 2, and $\phi_n = 0$.

For example, if we want to measure the Fourier coefficients of the signal $f(t)$ at the frequency $\omega_0$ (the first harmonic), we set $n = 1$ and adjust the phase $\phi_1 = 0$, so that the lock-in will display the voltages

$$V_x = A_1/\sqrt{2}$$

$$V_y = B_1/\sqrt{2}.$$  

If we set $n = 1$ and adjust the phase so that $\phi_1 = 90^\circ$, the lock-in will display $B_1/\sqrt{2}$ and $-A_1/\sqrt{2}$.

This is all that is really needed to know to use a lock-in. However, to truly understand any measurement using a lock-in, it is important to understand how the real lock-in computes the Fourier coefficients $A_n$ and $B_n$.

A.2 The Real Lock-in

The real lock-in has the same inputs and outputs as the ideal lock-in. The difference comes in how it calculates the Fourier coefficients. The non-ideal behavior of the lock-in will also force us to have additional adjustable parameters described in §A.2.3 which help us optimize the lock-in performance.
A.2.1 Calculating the Fourier coefficients

The main point of this section is to show that the way the ideal lock-in calculates Fourier coefficients is a good approximation to the way a real lock-in does it.

The real lock-in uses a slightly different method to measure Fourier coefficients than the ideal lock-in. It first multiplies the signal $f(t)$ given by (A.1) by $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$, like the ideal lock-in, but then it passes this signal through a low-pass filter instead of actually integrating the signal. By working through all the mathematical details, we will see next that the low pass filter is a good approximation to integrating over a complete period. Consider how the real lock-in calculates the $X$ output for the $n$th harmonic.

1. As stated earlier, the lock-in multiplies the frequency of the reference signal by $n$ to get the modified reference signal $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$, where $\phi_n$ is a phase which depends on $n$ and is not necessarily the same as the original reference signal phase $\phi$.

2. The lock-in then multiples $f(t)$ by $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t)$ to get $f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$. The resulting function may be expanded in a series as

$$f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} B_{n-m} \sin(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) + A_{n-m} \cos(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) \quad (A.9)$$

where we define $A_{-m} = -A_m$ (which implies $A_0 = 0$) and $B_{-m} = B_m$. This can be rewritten in terms of a constant part (the $m = 0$ term) and oscillating parts

$$f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n) = \frac{1}{2} (B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} B_{n-m} \sin(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) + A_{n-m} \cos(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$$

So the Fourier coefficients that we want, $A_n$ and $B_n$, are proportional to the constant part of $f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$, or equivalently, it is proportional to the DC part of the oscillating signal $f(t)(\sin n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$.

3. So after the lock-in multiplies $f(t)$ by $\sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$, it passes the result through a low pass filter to recover $\frac{1}{2} (B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)$, the DC part of $f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n)$.

In reality, the low pass filter is not ideal. If the gain of the low pass filter at frequency $\omega$ is $G(\omega, \omega_c)$ where $\omega_c$ is an adjustable parameter (§A.2.3) called the cutoff frequency
of the filter, then the actual output of the low pass filter will be

\[
\frac{1}{2}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} G(|m\omega_0|, \omega_c) \left[ B_{n-m} \sin(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) + A_{n-m} \cos(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) \right]
\]

4. The lock-in then multiplies the result of part 3 by \(2/\sqrt{2}\) to give us a voltage \(V_x\). The value of this voltage is normally displayed on the front panel of the lock-in.

Voltage \(V_x\) for a real lock-in can then be written as

\[
V_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} G(|m\omega_0|, \omega_c) \left[ B_{n-m} \sin(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) + A_{n-m} \cos(m\omega_0 t + \phi_n) \right]
\]

Equation (A.10)

Ideally, the low pass filter will only allow the DC part of the signal to get through, so that \(V_x \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)\). To get an idea of how good an approximation this is, consider a typical filter, a second order Butterworth filter. A second order Butterworth low pass filter has a slope of \(12\) dB/octave and gain \(G(\omega, \omega_c) = (1 + (\omega/\omega_c)^4)^{-1/2}\), and typically we adjust \(\omega_c\) so that \(\omega_c = \omega_0/10\) \((A.2.3)\). With this filter, the amplitude of every AC term in the Fourier series \((A.10)\), will be reduced by at least \(10^2\). Hence, to a good approximation, we may filter out the AC components of the signal \((A.10)\), and we will recover its DC component, \(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)\).

So finally, when a signal \(f(t)\) given by \((A.1)\) with period \(T = 2\pi/\omega_0\) is put into a lock-in, we see that to a good approximation, the voltage \(V_x\) displayed on the lock-in front panel will simply be \(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n)\), which is exactly the same as the ideal lock-in expression for \(V_x\), equation \((A.7)\). We may then use the ideal lock-in equations \((A.5)\) and \((A.7)\) to calculate \(V_x\)

\[
V_x \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(B_n \sin \phi_n + A_n \cos \phi_n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega_0 \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n) \, dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \omega_0 \int_{t_0}^{t_0+2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) \, dt.
\]

Equation (A.11)

Equation (A.12)

This is a useful approximation that will be used often in the next sections.

To calculate the actual voltage on output 1 from the displayed voltage \(V_x\), one must
multiply by the constant $C$, as discussed in §A.1.2

$$V_{\text{out }1} = C V_x \approx \frac{C}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\omega_0}{\pi} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + 2\pi/\omega_0} f(t) \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n) \, dt.$$  

**A.2.2 Effects of noise**

In the preceding section, the signal was assumed to be periodic with period $T$. However, if there is noise in the signal, the noise need not be periodic, and this is where the real lock-in output will deviate from the approximate lock-in output given by (A.11). From the preceding section, we can get an idea of how noise on the input to the lock-in will affect the output.

Suppose that the noise has angular frequency $\gamma$ and amplitude $A(\gamma)$, so that the noise can be written as $N(t) = A(\gamma) \sin \gamma t$. Following the steps in the preceding section, output 1 of the lock-in due to this noise will be

$$V_{\text{out }1} = C \frac{A(\gamma)}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ G(n\omega_0 - \gamma, \omega_c) \cos(n\omega_0 - \gamma)t - G(n\omega_0 + \gamma, \omega_c) \cos(n\omega_0 + \gamma)t \right]$$

Since $G(\omega, \omega_c) \approx 1$ for $\omega \leq \omega_c$ and is approximately zero otherwise, from this expression for $V_{\text{out }1}$, we see that by choosing $\omega_c < \omega_0$, we can always make the second term vanish. However, no matter how small $\omega_c$ is, for frequencies $\gamma$ which satisfy $|n\omega_0 - \gamma| \leq \omega_c$ (or equivalently $n\omega_0 - \omega_c \leq \gamma \leq n\omega_0 + \omega_c$), the first term will still contribute to the output of the lock-in. So the lock-in does not filter out noise at frequencies within $\omega_c$ of $n\omega_0$. The smaller we adjust $\omega_c$ in the low pass filter (§A.2.3), the more noise we will filter out.

**A.2.3 Additional adjustable parameters**

The real lock-in has many parameters in addition to the parameters of the ideal lock-in. The two most important are the output range (usually called the sensitivity) and the time constant mentioned in §A.2.1. If the output voltage of the lock-in will only be between $-100 \text{ mV}$ to $100 \text{ mV}$, we should set the output voltage range to $100 \text{ mV}$. This will optimize the signal-to-noise ratio of the lock-in output voltages.

The cutoff frequency $\omega_c$ of the low pass filter described in the previous sections can be adjusted. The parameter that controls it is called the lock-in time constant. The lock-in time constant $\tau$ is related to $\omega_c$ by $\tau = 2\pi/\omega_c$. As mentioned in §A.2.1, if we want to measure the Fourier coefficient at frequency $n\omega_0$, we must adjust the time constant properly so we effectively filter out the effect of all frequencies not at $n\omega_0$. However, in addition, there is usually noise at various frequencies, and a larger time constant means we filter out more of that noise (§A.2.2). So choosing a larger time constant is always better to achieve lower noise on the lock-in output. The only drawback to a longer time constant is that the lock-in takes a few time constants ($\sim 3\tau$) to adjust its output voltage to its final value. This
means that a larger time constant means we have to wait longer before the voltage displayed on the front panel on the lock-in is at the value given by (A.11).

Typically we have $\tau = 30 \text{ms}$ and $\omega_0 = 2\pi (451 \text{Hz}) \approx 2834 \text{Hz}$, so that $\omega_c = 2\pi / \tau \approx 209 \text{Hz} \approx \omega_0 / 14$.

### A.3 $dI/dV$ Measurements

To measure $dI/dV$ with a lock-in, we first add a small oscillating voltage $\Delta V = \delta V \sin \omega_0 t$ to the DC voltage $V$ on the STM tip, so that the tunneling current becomes $I(V + \Delta V)$. We then pass the tunneling current through a current to voltage converter to get $I(V + \Delta V) / G$ where $G$ is the gain of the current to voltage converter; typically $G = 10^{-9}$ A/V. Next, the output of the current to voltage converter is put into a lock-in to measure the rms amplitude of its first harmonic (the rms Fourier component of $I(V + \Delta V) / G$ at the frequency $\omega_0$ and phase $\phi_1 = 0$). We will see below [equation (A.16)] that the $X$ output voltage of the lock-in is proportional to $dI(V) / dV$ in the limit of small $\delta V$, and hence the lock-in can be used to measure $dI/dV$. Furthermore, equation (A.14) will show exactly how the lock-in broadens $dI/dV$ when $\delta V$ is non-zero.

To see why the first harmonic of $I(V + \Delta V)$ is $\propto dI/dV$ qualitatively, expand $I(V + \Delta V)$ in a Taylor series to first order $I(V + \Delta V) \approx I(V) + \frac{dI(V)}{dV} \Delta V = I(V) + \frac{dI(V)}{dV} \delta V \sin \omega_0 t$. To first order, the tunneling current is then sinusoidal with frequency $\omega_0$, and if we use the lock-in to find the Fourier component at frequency $\omega_0$, then the $X$ output of the lock-in will be proportional to $dI(V) / dV$.

#### A.3.1 $dI/dV$ measured by a lock-in

For the situation mentioned above, the $X$ output voltage $V_x$ displayed on the front panel of the lock-in can be calculated with (A.11). With $\phi_n = 0$, $f(t) = I(V + \Delta V) / G = I(V + \delta V \sin \omega_0 t) / G$, $t_0 = -\frac{\pi}{2 \omega_0}$, and $x = -\delta V \sin \omega_0 t$, (A.11) can be partially written in terms of $x$ as

$$V_x(V) = \frac{1}{G} \frac{\omega_0}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \int_{t = -\pi / 2 \omega_0}^{t = 3\pi / 2 \omega_0} I(V - x) \frac{x}{\delta V \delta V \omega_0 \cos \omega_0 t} \, dx$$

To completely write the integral as a function of $x$, substitute

$$\cos \omega_0 t = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{\delta V \omega_0}} & \text{for } -\frac{\pi}{2 \omega_0} \leq t < -\frac{\pi}{2 \omega_0} \\ \sqrt{1 - \frac{x^2}{\delta V \omega_0}} & \text{for } \frac{\pi}{2 \omega_0} \leq t < \frac{3\pi}{2 \omega_0} \end{cases}$$

(A.13)
and split the integral into two parts, \( \int_{-\pi/2\omega_0}^{\pi/2\omega_0} + \int_{\pi/2\omega_0}^{3\pi/2\omega_0} \), using the appropriate substitution of \( \cos \omega_0 t \) for each part. These two parts are equal to each other so their sum gives

\[
V_x(V) = -\frac{1}{G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{2}{\pi \delta V^2} \int_{-\delta V}^{\delta V} I(V-x)x \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\delta V^2}\right)^{-1/2} dx
\]

Applying integration by parts to this expression gives

\[
V_x(V) = \frac{1}{G} \frac{\delta V}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\delta V}^{\delta V} \frac{dI(V-x)}{dV} \frac{2}{\pi \delta V^2} \sqrt{\delta V^2 - x^2} dx
\]

which can be written as the convolution

\[
V_x(V) = \frac{1}{G} \frac{\delta V}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{dI}{dV} \ast B_{L1} \right) = \frac{1}{G} \frac{\delta V}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dI(V-x)}{dV} B_{L1}(x) dx \quad (A.14)
\]

with

\[
B_{L1}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{2}{\pi \delta V^2} \sqrt{\delta V^2 - x^2} & \text{for } |x| < \delta V \\
0 & \text{for } |x| \geq \delta V
\end{cases}
\quad (A.15)
\]

Hence, we see that voltage \( V_x \) displayed on the front of the lock-in will be \( dI/dV \) convoluted with the broadening function \( B_{L1} \). \( B_{L1}(x) \) is sketched in figure [A.1].

Figure A.1: Lock-in \( dI/dV \) broadening function \( B_{L1}(x) \). It has a height \( 2/\pi \delta V \) and FWHM 1.7\( \delta V \).
In the limit \( \delta V \to 0 \), the broadening function \( B_{L1}(x) \to \delta(x) \), and hence,

\[
\lim_{\delta V \to 0} V_x \frac{G}{\delta V/\sqrt{2}} = \frac{dI(V)}{dV}.
\]

This means that for small \( \delta V \), we may calculate \( \frac{dI}{dV} \) as

\[
\frac{dI(V)}{dV} \approx G \frac{V_x}{\delta V_{\text{rms}}}
\]

where \( \delta V_{\text{rms}} = \delta V/\sqrt{2} \), and \( G \) is again the current to voltage converter gain in A/V. This equation shows that the \( X \) output of the lock-in when we apply a voltage \( V + \delta V \sin \omega_0 t \) to the tip is proportional to \( dI(V)/dV \).

To relate this result to the actual voltage output of the lock-in \( V_{\text{out}} \), we must divide this result by the constant \( C \), as discussed in §A.1.2

\[
\frac{dI(V)}{dV} \approx G \frac{V_x}{\delta V_{\text{rms}}} = \frac{G V_{\text{out}}}{C \delta V_{\text{rms}}}.
\]

This equation gives us \( dI/dV \) with the correct units in terms of the output voltage of the lock-in.

### A.3.2 \( dI/dV \) broadening from the lock-in

Equation (A.14) gives us a way to think about how the lock-in measured \( dI/dV \), \( [dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}} = GV_x/\delta V_{\text{rms}} \), deviates from the true \( dI/dV \), call it \( [dI/dV]_{\text{true}} \). It shows that peaks in \( [dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}} \) are broadened relative to peaks in \( [dI/dV]_{\text{true}} \). For example, if \( G = 1 \) A/V and \( [dI/dV]_{\text{true}} \) is an infinitely sharp delta-function peak, \( [dI(V)/dV]_{\text{true}} = \delta(V) \) (in arbitrary units), then

\[
\left[ \frac{dI}{dV} \right]_{\text{lock-in}} = \frac{V_x}{\delta V_{\text{rms}}} = B_{L1}(V).
\]

So \([dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}}\) in this case is not a infinitely sharp peak, it is the broadening function \( B_{L1} \) shown in figure [A.1]. Since the FWHM of \( B_{L1}(V) \) is \( \delta V \sqrt{3} \), we see that peaks in \( [dI/dV]_{\text{true}} \) are broader in \([dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}}\) by about \( \delta V \sqrt{3} = 1.7\delta V = 2.4\delta V_{\text{rms}} \).

However, the effect of broadening is not always so intuitive. For example, if \( G = 1 \) A/V and \( I(V) \) is quadratic, \( I(V) = V^2 \), then \([dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}}\) calculated from (A.14), will be the exact first derivative

\[
\left[ \frac{dI}{dV} \right]_{\text{lock-in}} = \frac{V_x}{\delta V_{\text{rms}}} = 2V = \left[ \frac{dI}{dV} \right]_{\text{true}}.
\]

However, if \( I(V) = V^3 \), then \([dI/dV]_{\text{lock-in}}\) will be

\[
\left[ \frac{dI}{dV} \right]_{\text{lock-in}} = \frac{V_x}{\delta V_{\text{rms}}} = 3V^2 + \frac{3}{4} \delta V^2 = \left[ \frac{dI}{dV} \right]_{\text{true}} + \frac{3}{4} \delta V^2.
\]
So \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{lock-in}} in this case is not really a broadened \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}}; it is shifted from \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}} by the constant \(3\delta V^{2}/4\).

### A.3.3 Deconvoluting the lock-in broadening

Since (A.14) represents the convolution of \(\frac{dI}{dV}\) with the function \(B_{L1}\), in principle, we may recover \(\frac{dI}{dV}\) from the lock-in signal by deconvolution. We use the convolution theorem to express the true \(\frac{dI}{dV}\) in terms of the Fourier transforms of \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{lock-in}} = \(GV_{x}/\delta V_{\text{rms}}\) and \(B_{L1}\)

\[
\left[\frac{dI(V)}{dV}\right]\text{\textsubscript{true}} = \text{FT}^{-1}\left[\frac{\text{FT}\left[\frac{dI}{dV}\right]\text{\textsubscript{lock-in}}}{\text{FT}\left[B_{L1}\right]}\right].
\] (A.17)

Although in principle we may deconvolute \(B_{L1}\) from \(\frac{dI}{dV}\), in reality, the function \(\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\) is a Bessel function with many zeros, and whenever \(\text{FT}[B_{L1}] = 0\), the right hand side of (A.17) goes to \(\infty\), unless the numerator is also zero. The numerator is rarely zero because of noise or offsets in the data. One way to overcome this problem is to deconvolute only a certain range of values in \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}}, where we limit the deconvolution to the range where \(\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\) is not zero.

Figure [A.2] shows the result of using (A.17) where the modified function

\[
\text{FT}[B_{L1}] = \begin{cases} 
\text{FT}[B_{L1}] & \text{for } \text{FT}[B_{L1}] > \max\left\{\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\right\}/5 \\
\max\left\{\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\right\}/5 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

was used instead of \(\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\). This modified function effectively limits the range of data that is deconvoluted to the range where \(\text{FT}[B_{L1}]\) is not too small. The black curve in figure [A.2] is a spectrum taken on Au(111) with an rms modulation voltage of \(\delta V_{\text{rms}} = 20\text{ mV}\). The red curve is the deconvolution of the black curve. The green curve is a spectrum taken at the exact same location and using the exact same settings as the black curve, but the rms modulation voltage was \(\delta V_{\text{rms}} = 2\text{ mV}\). Ideally, the red and green curves would look the same, and there are features like the two peaks around \(-0.4\text{ V}\) in the red curve that look like the features in the green curve. These features are not visible in the black curve, so the deconvolution worked to remove the broadening in the black curve and make these peaks resolvable. However, there are artifacts around \(\pm 1\text{ V}\) in the red curve that make this method not always reliable.

Another more reliable method of deconvolution is the same as the one presented in §3.1, but one must know the exact functional form of \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}} for this method to work. In this scheme, one fits the convolution \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}} * \(B_{L1}\) to the data \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{lock-in}}. The best fit then yields parameters that tells one what \(\frac{dI}{dV}\)\text{\textsubscript{true}} is.
Figure A.2: Deconvoluting the broadening due to a non-zero modulation voltage from a dI/dV signal. The black curve is a spectrum taken with an rms modulation voltage of $\delta V_{\text{rms}} = 20 \text{ mV}$. The red curve is the black curve with the modulation induced broadening removed. The green curve was taken using the same settings as the black curve, except $\delta V_{\text{rms}} = 2 \text{ mV}$.

A.3.4 Adjusting the Phase

When we measure $dI/dV$ with a lock-in, we need to adjust the phase difference $\phi_1$ between the reference signal and the modified tunneling current so that $\phi_1 = 0$; the modified tunneling current is the tunneling current after it has passed through electronics, like the current to voltage converter, before entering the lock-in. The phase difference $\phi_1$ is complicated since it depends on all the electronics that the tunneling current passes through before reaching the lock-in.

There is also another complication in a $dI/dV$ measurement. To measure $dI/dV$, we need to apply a small oscillating voltage to the STM tip and measure the oscillating tunneling current. The tip and sample are two conducting materials that are placed close together, so they are also a capacitor. Any change in voltage on the tip will induce a current in the sample, purely due to the tip-sample capacitance. When we apply an oscillating voltage to the tip, we want to only measure the contribution to the current due to the oscillating tunneling current, not from the tip-sample capacitance current.

Both issues of determining the phase $\phi_1$ and removing the tip-sample capacitance current can be dealt with using a procedure which will now be explained. The tunneling barrier acts as a resistor, so the tunneling current is the current through a resistor, which is in
phase with any oscillating voltage applied to the tip. The current due to the tip-sample capacitance is $90^\circ$ behind any oscillating voltage applied to the tip, which means it is also $90^\circ$ behind the oscillating tunneling current. If we can first find the phase of the capacitance current (after it has passed through all the electronics between the sample and lock-in) relative to the reference signal, we can then adjust that phase by $90^\circ$ to get the phase of the modified tunneling current (the current after it has passed through the same electronics as the capacitance current) relative to the reference signal. Once we know the phase of the modified tunneling current relative to the reference signal, we can then adjust the lock-in phase so that the reference signal is in phase with the modified tunneling current ($\phi_1 = 0$), which is the phase we need. When the reference signal and modified tunneling current are in phase, the $X$ output of the lock-in (the output used to measure $dI/dV$) will be determined solely by the tunneling current, since any signal $90^\circ$ out of phase with the reference signal (like the capacitance current) will not contribute to the lock-in $X$ output signal; this can be derived from equation (A.11).

To summarize, once we determine the phase of the capacitance current relative to the reference signal, we can adjust the phase so that the reference signal and the tunneling current are in phase ($\phi_1 = 0$), which eliminates the capacitance current from the $X$ output of the lock-in, and since the $X$ output is the one we use to measure $dI/dV$, the $dI/dV$ signal contains no contribution from the capacitance. Hence, once we determine the phase of the capacitance current relative to the reference signal, we can eliminate the two problems of adjusting the lock-in to the correct phase and removing the capacitance current from the $dI/dV$ measurements.

The procedure above relies on finding the phase of the tip-sample capacitance current relative to the reference signal. To find this phase,

1. we first position the tip so that we have a tunneling current.

2. Then we move the tip a few Ångstroms away from the surface, so that there is no tunneling current.

3. We apply an oscillating voltage to the tip. The current is converted to a voltage using the same current to voltage converter that we use to measure the tunneling current. The current we measure will be mainly due to the tip-sample capacitance.

4. The output voltage from the current to voltage converter goes into the lock-in. (The other input to the lock-in is the reference signal at the same frequency as the oscillating tip voltage). We then “autophase” the lock-in. It does not matter what output mode (§A.1.2) we are in when we do this. “Autophase” will adjust the lock-in reference signal phase to maximize the $X$ output voltage (§A.1.2) of the lock-in (and the $Y$ output will be 0). The lock-in can display what this phase is; call it $\theta_c$. $\theta_c$ represents the phase that must be added to the reference signal so that the reference signal is in phase with the tip-sample capacitance current.
Once we know the phase $\theta_c$, if we subtract 90° from it, we get the phase $\theta_I = \theta_c - 90°$, which is the phase that must be added to the reference signal so that it is in phase with the tunneling current. We can then set the lock-in phase equal to $\theta_I$, which will add $\theta_I$ to the reference signal, making it in phase with the tunneling current, and eliminating the tip-sample capacitance current from $dI/dV$, as mentioned earlier.

### A.4 $d^2I/dV^2$ Measurements

There are different ways of calculating $d^2I/dV^2$: one can numerically differentiate $dI/dV$, or one can use a lock-in amplifier. For the first method, one needs to average over many $dI/dV$ curves to get a curve sufficiently low in noise to take a numerical derivative since noise from random fluctuations decreases like $1/\sqrt{N}$ [18].

Measuring $d^2I/dV^2$ with a lock-in is similar to measuring $dI/dV$, we first add a small oscillating voltage $\Delta V = \delta V \sin \omega_0 t$ to the DC voltage $V$ on the STM tip, so that the tunneling current becomes $I(V + \Delta V)$. We then pass the tunneling current through a current to voltage converter to get $I(V + \Delta V)/G$ where $G$ is the gain (in A/V) of the converter. Next, the output of the current to voltage converter is put into a lock-in, but instead of measuring the $n = 1$ first harmonic, we set the lock-in to measure the $n = 2$ second harmonic. The $X$ output voltage then gives us the Fourier component of $I(V + \Delta V)/G$ at the frequency $2\omega_0$. In addition, we must be sure that we choose the frequency $\omega_0$ such that we do not filter out the signal at $2\omega_0$ with our other electronics, e.g. the current to voltage preamplifier. We must also adjust the phase between the reference signal and the input signal to the lock-in correctly, as described in §A.4.2.

We will see below [equation (A.20)] that the $X$ output voltage of the lock-in in this situation is proportional to $d^2I(V)/dV^2$ in the limit of small $\delta V$, and hence the lock-in can be used the measure $d^2I/dV^2$. Furthermore, equation (A.18) will show exactly how the lock-in broadens $d^2I/dV^2$ when $\delta V$ is non-zero.

#### A.4.1 $d^2I/dV^2$ measured by a lock-in

To show how the second harmonic is related to $d^2I/dV^2$, we may again use equation (A.11). However, by equation (A.26), we need to adjust the phase $\phi_2$ so that $\phi_2 = -\pi/2$. The modified reference signal in this case is $\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(2\omega_0 t + \phi_2) = -\cos 2\omega_0 t$. With this phase, we detect the coefficient $-B_2$ in the Fourier expansion (A.1). It will be shown below that $-B_2$ is proportional to $d^2I/dV^2$.

With $\phi_2 = -\pi/2$, the voltage $V_x$ of the lock-in [equation (A.11)] is then, with $f(t) = \frac{1}{G}(V + \delta V \sin \omega_0 t)$, $n = 2$, and $t_0 = -\pi/2\omega_0$,

$$V_x = \frac{B_2}{\sqrt{2}} = -\frac{1}{G} \frac{\omega_0}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \int_{t=-\pi/2\omega_0}^{t=3\pi/2\omega_0} (V + \delta V \sin \omega_0 t) \cos 2\omega_0 t \, dt$$
Like the calculation of $dI/dV$, partially rewrite the above integral in terms of the new variable $x$ by using the substitutions $x = -\delta V \sin \omega_0 t$ and $\cos 2\omega_0 t = 1 - 2 \sin^2 \omega_0 t = 1 - 2x^2/\delta V^2$

$$V_x = -\frac{1}{G} \frac{\omega_0}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \int_{t=\pi/2\omega_0}^{t=3\pi/2\omega_0} I(V - x) \left(1 - 2 \frac{x^2}{\delta V^2}\right) \frac{dx}{-\delta V \omega_0 \cos \omega_0 t}.$$

Using the same procedure as for the calculation of $dI/dV$, the integral will be split into the sum of two parts $\int_{t=-\pi/2\omega_0}^{t=\pi/2\omega_0}$ and $\int_{t=\pi/2\omega_0}^{3\pi/2\omega_0}$. Using the appropriate substitution for $\cos \omega_0 t$ [equation (A.13)] for each part gives

$$V_x = -\frac{1}{G} \frac{2}{\pi \sqrt{2} \delta V} \int_{-\delta V}^{\delta V} I(V - x) \left(1 - 2 \frac{x^2}{\delta V^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\delta V^2}\right)^{-1/2} dx.$$

Applying integration by parts once gives

$$V_x = -\frac{1}{G} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi \delta V^2} \int_{-\delta V}^{\delta V} \frac{dI(V - x)}{V} x \sqrt{\delta V^2 - x^2} dx$$

and applying integration by parts again gives

$$V_x = \frac{1}{G} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3\pi \delta V^2} \int_{-\delta V}^{\delta V} \frac{d^2 I(V - x)}{V^2} (\delta V^2 - x^2)^{3/2} dx.$$

This last result can be written as the convolution [109]

$$V_x(V) = \frac{1}{4G} \frac{\delta V^2}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{d^2 I}{dV^2} * B_{L2}\right) = \frac{1}{4G} \frac{\delta V^2}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^2 I(V - x)}{V^2} B_{L2}(x) dx \quad \text{(A.18)}$$

with

$$B_{L2}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{8}{3\pi \delta V^2} (\delta V^2 - x^2)^{3/2} & \text{for } |x| < \delta V \\ 0 & \text{for } |x| \geq \delta V \end{cases} \quad \text{(A.19)}$$

A sketch of $B_{L2}$ is given in figure [A.3].

In the limit $\delta V \to 0$, $B_{L2}(x) \to \delta(x)$, so

$$\lim_{\delta V \to 0} V_x \frac{4G\sqrt{2}}{\delta V^2} = \frac{d^2 I(V)}{dV^2}$$

For small $\delta V$, we may then approximate $d^2 I/dV^2$ as

$$\frac{d^2 I(V)}{dV^2} \approx 2\sqrt{2G} \frac{V_x}{(\delta V_{\text{rms}})^2} \quad \text{(A.20)}$$

To express $d^2 I/dV^2$ in terms of the actual output voltage $V_{\text{out}}$ of the lock-in, we must again
divide this result by the constant \( C \), as described in §A.1.2.

Like \( dI/dV \), equation (A.18) implies that the effect of the lock-in is to convolute the true \( d^2I/dV^2 \) with a broadening function. Like the discussion after equation (A.14), the convolution will broaden peaks in the true \( d^2I/dV^2 \), but with a different broadening function, \( B_{L2} \). The FWHM of \( B_{L2} \) is \( 2\sqrt{1 - 2^{-2/3}}\delta V = 1.22\delta V = 1.72\delta V_{\text{rms}} \), so peaks in \( d^2I/dV^2 \) will appear broadened in the lock-in output by \( \sim 1.72\delta V_{\text{rms}} \).

### A.4.2 Adjusting the phase

For \( d^2I/dV^2 \) measurements, we do not have to worry about the tip-sample capacitance current since it does not contribute to \( d^2I/dV^2 \): \( I = V/(i\omega C_0) \) for a capacitor with capacitance \( C_0 \), so that \( d^2I/dV^2 = 0 \) for a capacitor. This is unlike \( dI/dV \) measurements, where we must take into account the tip-sample capacitance current (§A.3.4). Since the capacitance makes no contribution to \( d^2I/dV^2 \), when we measure \( d^2I/dV^2 \) by measuring the second harmonic, we only get a contribution from the tunneling current.

The correct phase \( \phi_2 \) for \( d^2I/dV^2 \) measurements is still complicated because of all the electronics which alters the phase of the tunneling current before it reaches the lock-in. However, finding the correct phase can be done by simply adjusting the lock-in phase to maximize or minimize the second harmonic lock-in \( X \) output signal \( V_x \). To determine whether the signal should be a maximum or minimum, we must look at \( dI/dV \) at some arbitrary voltage \( V_0 \) where \( dI/dV \neq 0 \) (the phase is independent of voltage, so any voltage \( V_0 \) can be used). If \( dI/dV \) is increasing at voltage \( V_0 \), then we should adjust the phase so that the second harmonic lock-in output is maximum at voltage \( V_0 \). If \( dI/dV \) is decreasing...
at $V_0$, the phase is adjusted to minimize the second harmonic lock-in output at $V_0$.

The justification for the procedure to determine the phase $\phi_2$ comes from equations (A.28) and (A.11). Equation (A.28) implies that when we apply the oscillating voltage $V_0 + \delta V \sin(\omega_0 t)$ to the tip, the second harmonic in the tunneling current only contains a term proportional to $\cos 2\omega_0 t$ (no $\sin 2\omega_0 t$ term). So if we expand the tunneling current $I(V_0 + \delta V \sin \omega_0 t)$ in a Fourier series [equation (A.1)], the Fourier coefficient of $\sin 2\omega_0 t$, which is $A_2$, must be zero. From equation (A.11) with $n = 2$ and $A_2 = 0$, $V_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} B_2 \sin \phi_2$. Note that, if we vary the phase $\phi_2$, the phase that we want, $\phi_2 = -\pi/2$ (from §A.4), will minimize $V_x$ if $B_2 > 0$ and maximize $V_x$ if $B_2 < 0$. By §A.4 since $B_2 \propto -d^2 I/dV^2$, the phase that we want will maximize $V_x$ when $d^2 I/dV^2 > 0$ or minimize $V_x$ when $d^2 I/dV^2 < 0$.

Figure A.4 shows how $V_x$ varies with phase for a EG&G Princeton Applied Research 5210 lock-in. From the graph, the phases which will maximize the second harmonic 2F signal occur at $\theta \approx 70^\circ$ and $\theta \approx 115^\circ$. We may set these phases manually, or alternatively, we can simply press “Autophase” on the lock-in and it will automatically adjust the phase to maximize the second harmonic signal.
A.5 \( d^n I / dV^n \) Measurements

When a small modulation voltage \( \Delta V = \delta V \sin \omega_0 t \) is applied to the tunneling voltage \( V \), the tunneling current \( I(V + \Delta V) \) will also oscillate. In general, if we use a lock-in to measure the \( n \)th harmonic of the oscillating current, the output will be proportional to \( d^n I / dV^n \). To see this, first expand \( I(V + \Delta V) \) in a Taylor series around \( V \)

\[
I(V + \Delta V) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \frac{d^m I(V)}{dV^m} (\Delta V)^m \tag{A.21}
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \frac{d^m I(V)}{dV^m} (\delta V)^m \sin^m \omega_0 t \tag{A.22}
\]

\[
= I(V) + \frac{dI(V)}{dV} \delta V \sin \omega_0 t + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 I(V)}{dV^2} (\delta V \sin \omega_0 t)^2 + \ldots \tag{A.23}
\]

We may substitute for \( \sin^m \omega_0 t \) using the general expression for \( \sin^m \theta \)

\[
\sin^m \theta = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{(-1)^{m/2}}{2^{m-1}} \cos m\theta - \sum_{k=0}^{(m-2)/2} a_k \cos(2k\theta) & \text{for even } m \\
\frac{(-1)^{m-1/2}}{2^{m-1}} \sin m\theta - \sum_{k=0}^{(m-3)/2} b_k \sin(2k+1)\theta & \text{for odd } m
\end{array} \right. \tag{A.24}
\]

where \( a_k \) and \( b_k \) are some coefficients. (The expression (A.24) can be derived using de Moivre’s Theorem \((\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)^m = \cos m\theta + i \sin m\theta \) and the binomial theorem.) From the Taylor expansion of \( I(V + \Delta V) \), we see that the \( n \)th term in the Taylor series expansion for \( I(V + \Delta V) \), which contains the term \( \sin^n \omega_0 t \), actually contains the term \( \sin n\omega_0 t \) or \( \cos n\omega_0 t \) by (A.24). Therefore, if we use a lock-in to measure the \( n \)th harmonic, the main contribution will come from the \( n \)th term in the Taylor series, which is proportional to \( d^n I(V)/dV^n \).

However, by (A.24), the proportionality constant may be negative, and we want a positive proportionality constant. This can be accomplished by adjusting the phase \( \phi_n \) of the lock-in so that the modified reference signal (§A1.2) is

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{ref}}(t) = \sin(n\omega_0 t + \phi_n) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
(-1)^{n/2} \cos n\omega_0 t & \text{for even } n \\
(-1)^{(n-1)/2} \sin n\omega_0 t & \text{for odd } n
\end{array} \right. \tag{A.25}
\]

which implies the phase is

\[
\phi_n = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{(-1)^{n/2} \pi}{2} & \text{for even } n \\
\frac{\pi}{2} - (-1)^{(n-1)/2} \frac{\pi}{2} & \text{for odd } n
\end{array} \right. \tag{A.26}
\]

It is good to note that the \( n \)th term in the Taylor series is not the only term which contributes to the \( n \)th harmonic; i.e., it is not the only term which contains \( \sin n\omega_0 t \) or \( \cos n\omega_0 t \). If we write out the sum in equation [A.24] explicitly, we will see that \( \sin^{n+2} \theta \),
sin^{n+4} \theta$, etc., also contain the $n^{th}$ harmonic. Hence, the \((n+2)^{th}\), \((n+4)^{th}\), \ldots terms in the Taylor series \((A.22)\) will also contain the $n^{th}$ harmonic, but since these terms are higher in the Taylor series, they are typically orders of magnitude smaller than the $n^{th}$ term, and can be neglected. Therefore, when we measure the $n^{th}$ harmonic, the largest contribution comes from the $n^{th}$ term in the Taylor series \((A.22)\), which is proportional to $d^n I/dV^n$.

So if we want to measure $d^n I(V)/dV^n$, we add $\Delta V = \delta V \sin \omega_0 t$ to the tip voltage $V$, pass the tunneling current through a current to voltage converter with gain $G$ (in units of $A/V$), measure the $n^{th}$ harmonic of the output of the current to voltage converter $I(V + \Delta V)/G$ with a lock-in, and adjust the phase $\phi_n$ according to \((A.26)\), then the $X$ output of the lock-in will be proportional to the rms coefficient of the $n^{th}$ term in the Taylor series of $I(V + \Delta V)$

$$V_{\text{out}} = CV_x \approx \frac{C}{G \sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{2^{n-1}n!} (\delta V)^n \frac{d^n I}{dV^n}$$

which is proportional to $d^n I/dV^n$. The constant $C$ is discussed in §A.1.2.

As an explicit example, take $n = 2$. Since $\sin^2 \omega_0 t = (1 - \cos 2\omega_0 t)/2$, we get that

$$I(V + \Delta V) = I(V) + \frac{dI(V)}{dV} \delta V \sin \omega_0 t + \frac{1}{4} \frac{d^2 I(V)}{dV^2} (\delta V)^2 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{d^2 I(V)}{dV^2} (\delta V)^2 \cos(2\omega_0 t) + \ldots$$

\((A.28)\)

So when we use a lock-in amplifier to measure the second harmonic (the coefficient of $\cos 2\omega_0 t$), the main contribution to the signal is proportional to $d^2 I/dV^2$.

Although $d^2 I/dV^2$ is proportional to $\cos 2\omega_0 t$, it is not the only term in \((A.22)\) proportional to $\cos 2\omega_0 t$. Since $\sin^m \omega_0 t = \cos 2\omega_0 t + \cdots + (-1)^{m/2}2^{1-m}\cos m\omega_0 t$ whenever $m$ is even (from \((A.24)\)), every term in \((A.22)\) with even $m \geq 2$ also contains a term proportional to $\cos 2\omega_0 t$. So we can only say that $d^2 I/dV^2$ is the leading contribution to the second harmonic.
Whenever we take a $dI/dV$ spectrum of a sample, what we measure is the convolution of the tip DOS with the sample DOS [equation (2.2)]. We usually assume that the STM tip DOS is constant, so that a $dI/dV$ spectrum tells us the sample DOS. However, in practice, a constant tip DOS rarely occurs, and much tip preparation work is needed to get a constant tip DOS. In fact, for spectra taken at low biases, it is very difficult to get constant tip DOS. We then need a method of deconvoluting the tip DOS from a $dI/dV$ spectrum to recover the sample DOS. General methods to deconvolute the tip DOS from $dI/dV$ spectra using Volterra equations are given in §14.5 in [29]. However, having a simple method which allows one to extract the sample DOS from a spectrum when the tip DOS is non-constant will be helpful as it allows one to roughly extract the deconvoluted spectrum by eye, and it gives us an easy way to check the results of general deconvolution methods. The simple deconvolution method will be presented here.

The main result will be that, at low biases, if we take a $dI/dV$ spectrum over an adsorbate and take another spectrum over the metallic surface, deconvoluting the tip DOS from the adsorbate $dI/dV$ spectrum is approximately the same as subtracting the adsorbate and surface $dI/dV$ spectra. This has been shown in [193] and will be re-derived here.

First, we will approximate the general expression for an STM tunneling current (2.2) for low biases and low temperatures. We may assume for low biases that the matrix element is a constant and at low temperatures

$$f(E - e_cV) - f(E) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 < E < e_cV \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

so that (2.2) may be written as

$$I(V) = M \int_0^{e_cV} \rho_t(E - e_cV)\rho_s(E) \, dE .$$

(B.1)
where $M$ is independent of energy, but depends on the settings used to take the $dI/dV$ spectrum and the object the spectrum is taken over. $\rho_t$ and $\rho_s$ are again the tip DOS and sample DOS.

We will use (B.1) to express $dI/dV$ spectra taken on an adsorbate and on a metallic surface. If we do spectroscopy on a metallic surface at low voltages, we can assume that the surface DOS, $\rho_{\text{surf}}$, is constant. Doing a change of variables $E' = E - e_c V$, combined with the fundamental theorem of calculus $\frac{d}{dx} \int_{a}^{x} f(u) du = f(x)$, we can calculate $dI/dV$ for the surface from (B.1) using $\rho_s(E) = \rho_{\text{surf}}$

$$\frac{dI_{\text{surf}}(V)}{dV} = M_{\text{surf}} \rho_{\text{surf}} \frac{d}{dV} \int_{-e_c V}^{0} \rho_t(E') dE' = M_{\text{surf}} \rho_{\text{surf}} e_c \rho_t(-e_c V). \quad (B.2)$$

We now calculate the $dI/dV$ spectrum taken on the adsorbate from (B.1) by using $\rho_s(E) = \rho_{\text{ads}}(E)$. Using the chain rule

$$\frac{d}{dV} G(x, y) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial x} \frac{dx}{dV} + \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} \frac{dy}{dV}$$

and the fundamental theorem of calculus, one can compute $dI/dV$ using

$$G(x, y) = \int_{0}^{x} \rho_t(E - y) \rho_{\text{ads}}(E) dE$$

with $x = y = e_c V$ to get

$$\frac{dI_{\text{ads}}(V)}{dV} = e_c M_{\text{ads}} \rho_t(E - e_c V) \rho_{\text{ads}}(E) \bigg|_{E=e_c V} + e_c M_{\text{ads}} \int_{0}^{e_c V} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \rho_t(E - y) \rho_{\text{ads}}(E) dE.$$  

Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \rho_t(E - y) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial E} \rho_t(E - y)$, we get

$$\frac{dI_{\text{ads}}(V)}{dV} = M_{\text{ads}} e_c \rho_t(0) \rho_{\text{ads}}(e_c V) - e_c M_{\text{ads}} \int_{0}^{e_c V} \frac{d}{dE} \rho_t(E - e_c V) \rho_{\text{ads}}(E) dE.$$  

What we want is $\rho_{\text{ads}}$. We may solve for $\rho_{\text{ads}}$ if we expand the $\rho_{\text{ads}}$ inside the integral (but not the $\rho_{\text{ads}}$ outside the integral) in a Taylor series around $E = 0$, $\rho_{\text{ads}} = \rho_{\text{ads}}(0) + \rho'_{\text{ads}}(0) E + \cdots$ and keep the zeroth order (constant) term. Then we may evaluate the integral and solve for $\rho_{\text{ads}}(e_c V)$, using (B.2) to express $\rho_t$ in terms of $dI_{\text{surf}}/dV$

$$\rho_{\text{ads}}(e_c V) = C_1 \left( \frac{dI_{\text{ads}}(V)}{dV} - C_2 \frac{dI_{\text{surf}}(V)}{dV} + \frac{dI_{\text{ads}}(0)}{dV} \right)$$

where $C_1 = \frac{\rho_{\text{surf}} M_{\text{surf}}}{M_{\text{ads}} dI_{\text{surf}}(0)/dV}$ and $C_2 = \frac{dI_{\text{ads}}(0)/dV}{dI_{\text{surf}}(0)/dV}$.
This equation implies that if we simply multiply $dI/dV$ taken on the surface by the normalization constant $C_2$, then subtract it from $dI/dV$ taken on the adsorbate, we will get an expression which is approximately proportional to the adsorbate density of states ($\rho_{\text{ads}}(e_c V)$) offset by a constant. The major assumption was that the surface DOS is constant, which is usually a valid assumption at energies within 100 mV of $E_F$.

To get an idea of the accuracy of this subtraction procedure, comparisons between this simple subtraction of spectra method to a true deconvolution of the tip DOS from $dI/dV$ spectra have been done in [193]. From these results, one sees that the simple subtraction method works quite well, and gives some justification for its use in our data. This method also allows one to simply look at the data and quickly get a rough idea of what features in the data may be due to the tip DOS.
This appendix will describe building some of the important parts of the STM that are used for the coarse approach and scanning: the walker plate, the body piezo, and the bug. Figure 5.2 shows a drawing of these various components on the STM stage.

C.1 The walker plate

The walker plate consists of a thick glass slide (a microscope slide cut in half) with electrodes deposited onto it and another 3 mil thin glass slide over the electrodes. A side view of part of a generic walker plate is shown in figure C.1.

The walker plates that are currently being used with the STM, and have been used for at least the last 7 years, were made in UC Berkeley. Although these plates work, sometimes the coarse movement is not always great, as described in §5.1.6. To attempt to improve the coarse movement, we considered making a new walker plate, and contacted Gabriel Zeltzer in Hari Manoharan’s group at Stanford University, who was also building an STM similar to ours. We found from Gabriel that the Stanford Nanofabrication Facility had better equipment for making the walker plate, so walker plates built there may be better than the ones built at Berkeley. We have two walker plates that were made using the Stanford facilities, both of which have never been used in our system. Figure C.2 has a photo of walker plates made at Berkeley and at Stanford.

This section will describe how to build walker plates at Berkeley and at Stanford. The general procedure to build the walker plate are the same at Berkeley and Stanford; it is only the facilities and equipment used that differ. The general procedure is

1. Cut a microscope slide in half. Only half the slide is necessary for one walker plate. The other half may be used to build another walker plate.

2. Clean the $\frac{1}{2}$-microscope slide and a thin glass slide (1 in $\times$ 1 in $\times$ 3 mil, from Ace Glass Inc.) with nitric acid or piranha ($3\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4 : \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$) to remove any metals from the
3. Then clean the \( \frac{1}{2} \)-microscope slide and thin glass slide with trichloroethylene (or tika-pur), acetone, and methanol, so that it is clean for UHV.

4. In vacuum, deposit a thin layer (30 nm thick) of titanium on the \( \frac{1}{2} \)-microscope slide through a shadow mask, then deposit a thick layer (300 nm thick) of aluminum through the shadow mask on the titanium. This step makes the electrodes of the walker plate.
It is necessary to deposit Ti first onto the glass since it sticks better to the glass. However, since Ti is hard to evaporate, it would be difficult to grow a thick electrode with only Ti, so only a thin layer of Ti is evaporated and then a thick layer of Al (which is easier to evaporate) is deposited on the Ti.

5. Anodically bond the thin glass slide onto the electrodes. Anodic bonding is a process where we apply a high voltage between glass and another substance at high temperature, which causes the glass and substance to bond. A general review of anodic bonding and the mechanisms behind it are in [110].

The specific details of the equipment and procedures used to build the Berkeley and Stanford walker plates for each of the steps listed above will be given below.

C.1.1 Berkeley walker plates

All steps to build the walker plate listed above up to step 3 can be done in our lab using our chemicals in the fume hood. The walker plate currently in the STM chamber may not have been cleaned with nitric acid (step 2 above), but if walker plates are made at Berkeley in the future, they should be.

For step 4, the electrodes were deposited using an evaporation chamber from the Séamus Davis group, which probably no longer exists. The shadow mask used is shown in figure C.3. The 30 nm of Ti was evaporated onto the microscope slide by placing Ti in a tungsten boat and running \( \approx 70 \) A through the boat. The 300 nm of Al was deposited by placing Al in a W boat and running \( \approx 20 \) A running through the W boat.

For step 5, the anodic bonding was done manually. Following figure C.4, we place metal on a flat glass microscope slide on the thin glass slide. Then we apply 350 V for 1 hour at
300°C. The metal piece on the glass slide should also have enough weight so that it pushes down on the thin glass slide, causing the thin glass slide to make good contact with the electrodes.

\[
T = 300°C, \text{ 1 hour}
\]

![Diagram](image_url)

Figure C.4: Setup to anodically bond the thin glass slide to the metal electrodes

### C.1.2 Stanford walker plates

The Stanford Nanofabrication Facility at Stanford University has commercial equipment to build the walker plates. The Stanford facilities has the chemicals to clean the glass slides (steps 2 and 3), metal deposition systems to deposit the electrodes (step 4), and an Electronic Visions 501 Bonder to anodically bond the metal to glass (step 5). The anodic bonder bonds the thin glass slide to the electrodes very uniformly, making a flatter glass surface than the Berkeley plates, and should help the bug to move across the thin glass slide without getting stuck.

### C.2 The bug

The STM bug consists of insulating macor parts that were machined in the physics department machine shop, as well as piezoelectrics that were purchased from Staveley Sensors (now EBL Products, Inc.). The parts are glued together using Torr-Seal from Varian. A picture of the bug is given in figure C.5.

AutoCAD drawings and photos of all the bug parts, except for the body piezo, are given in figures C.6 and C.7. The AutoCAD drawings of these parts will be used later to pictorially describe how to build the bug.

There are also special tools to help build the bug. They are shown in figure C.8. There are also AutoCAD files for all the tools in figure C.8.

The general steps to build the bug are

1. Attach the Z-piezo to the cylinder.
2. Attach the front plug to the Z-piezo.

3. Attach the back plug to the cylinder.

4. Attach the tip holder/tip shield to the front and back plugs.

5. Attach the X and Y piezos to the cylinder and foot.

6. Attach the body piezo to the foot.

The next figures will describe each step in the building process above, except for the last step, which will be described in another section due to its complexity. There are many spare or broken bug parts that can be used to practice building the bug.
Figure C.6: AutoCAD drawings and photos of the various bug parts. The top row of bug parts have cross-sectional views for the AutoCAD drawings, while the AutoCAD drawings for the bottom two bug parts are not cross-sectional views. The dots on the piezos in the photos marks their + side. The ruler in all photos is in inches with 1/16” divisions.
Figure C.7: Drawing of the STM tip holder and tip shield with a photo of it above. The ruler in the photo is in inches with 1/16” divisions.

Figure C.8: AutoCAD cross-sectional views, with photos above them, of the various special parts used to help build the bug. The ruler in all the photos is in inches with 1/16” divisions.
(a) Put Z-piezo in the base with the + side down. The plus side is usually marked with a + or a dot. Put dowel 1 into the base through the hole in the Z-piezo. Apply some Torr-seal to the end of the cylinder. Note that the two ends of the cylinder are not the same, so apply Torr-seal to the correct end.

(b) Put the cylinder on the Z-piezo and put the weight on the cylinder. Remove most of the excess Torr-seal from the Z-piezo (we have to glue wires to the Z-piezo later, so it can’t be covered with Torr-seal). Also make sure there is not too much Torr-seal inside the cylinder, or else the dowel may become glued to the cylinder. Methanol removes excess Torr-seal well. Let the Torr-seal harden.

Figure C.9: Step 1: Attaching the Z-piezo.
(a) Remove the weight and dowel, then flip the cylinder upside down. Put dowel 1 in the base and place the cylinder through dowel 1 on the base, as shown. Apply Torr-seal to the z-piezo in the area where the front plug will touch it.

(b) Put the front plug on the Z-piezo and put the weight on the front plug. Remove any excess Torr-seal, especially on the inside of the cylinder, or else the dowel may become glued to the Z-piezo. Allow the Torr-seal to harden.

Figure C.10: Step 2: Attaching the front plug.
(a) Remove the weight and dowel, then flip the cylinder upside down again. Now put dowel 2 (not dowel 1) in the base and put the cylinder on the base. Apply Torr-seal to the rim of the cylinder; i.e., apply Torr-seal to the area that will touch the back plug shown in the next step.

(b) Put the back plug on the cylinder and put the weight on the back plug. Remove excess Torr-seal from the inside and outside of the cylinder and allow the Torr-seal to harden.

Figure C.11: Step 3: Attaching the back plug.
Figure C.12: Step 4. After the Torr-seal hardens, remove the dowel and remove the partially built bug from the base. Put the tip shield and tip holder through the front and back plugs. Then apply Torr-seal between the tip shield and front plug and between the tip shield and back plug. Move the tip holder/tip shield back and forth a little so that some of the Torr-seal goes into the holes in the front and back plugs. Let the Torr-seal harden.

(a) Glue the longer edge of the X and Y piezos into the slots in the cylinder with Torr-seal with the positive sides of the piezos facing outward. The positive side is usually marked with a + or a dot. Do not let the Torr-seal harden.

(b) Then put a little Torr-seal into the slots in the bug foot. Note the orientation of the foot in the figure. Slide the cylinder and X/Y piezos into the slots on the foot. Then add more Torr-seal around the foot slots to glue the X and Y piezos to the foot. Try to position the cylinder so that the X and Y piezos look perpendicular. Allow the Torr-seal to harden.

Figure C.13: Step 5: Attaching the X and Y piezos.
C.2.1 The body piezo

The final step in building the bug is to attach the body piezo. It is more involved since it first requires modification of the body piezo.

Modifying the body piezo

The body piezos were made by EBL Products, Inc. (formerly Staveley Sensors). They are discs 0.75 in in diameter and 16.5 mil thick, made from EBL #2 with Ni electrodes. Usually the positive side of the piezo is marked with a + or a dot. Figure C.14 is a photo of the body piezo with a dot marking the + side.

![Photo of the body piezo with a dot marking the + side.](image)

Figure C.14: Photo of the body piezo. The dot marks the + side of the piezo. The ruler is in inches with 1/16” divisions.

These are the steps to modify the body piezo.

1. As shown in the next figure, with the edge of a diamond file, make a small notch on the negative polarity side of the body piezo (the side without the + or dot). Once a notch is made with the diamond file, one can shape it more precisely with a scalpel or a dentist pick.
2. Glue a 2 mil annealed Au wire in the groove using Epotek H20E silver epoxy, as shown in the next figure. The Au wire was annealed in atmosphere by running a few amps of current through it until it turned red (which took a few seconds).

Figure C.15: The 2 mil annealed Au wire is glued into the groove with H20E silver epoxy.
3. Using the outline below as a guide,

place small amounts of H20E epoxy on the negative side of the body piezo at two additional points so that the additional epoxy, together with the epoxy in the groove, lie at the corners of an equilateral triangle, as shown in the next figure. The epoxy at the three points of the triangle form the legs of a tripod, and when the bug is completed, it will touch the walker plate only at these three points, making it mechanically stable.

4. Next, place the body piezo in the vacuum oven. Then pump out the vacuum oven and vent it with nitrogen. Then heat the oven to 100°C for 1 hour. Do not heat the piezo when the oven is under vacuum, since the epoxy will expand under vacuum and baking it under that condition makes it flaky when hardened.

5. While looking at the body piezo through an optical microscope, file down the hardened H20E epoxy with a diamond file until the epoxy is only around 1–2 mil high, as in the

Figure C.16: Epoxy tripod on the negative polarity side of the body piezo. The sizes of the clumps of epoxy in the bottom view are exaggerated; they should be around half the length and half the width.
front view in figure \[C.17\]. Use a micrometer to measure the height, and make sure all epoxy tripod legs are the same height.

6. Next, flip the piezo over and attach, using H20E epoxy, another annealed 2 mil Au wire to the + side of the piezo, at a point directly above the epoxy on the negative piezo side, as shown in the next figure. The wire should be glued at a position directly over the epoxy that is adjacent clockwise from the wire for the negative piezo electrode.

![Figure C.17: Top of body piezo after filing down the tripod and attaching another Au wire to the positive electrode.](image)

7. In addition to the epoxy for the Au wire, place another small amount of epoxy on the + piezo side, directly above the epoxy on the negative piezo side, as shown in figure \[C.17\]. This epoxy will be used later as a marker to help align the body piezo with the rest of the bug. One may alternatively scratch the surface a little where the epoxy would go instead of actually placing epoxy since the only purpose of the epoxy is to mark the surface of the piezo.

8. Bake the piezo in the oven at 100°C for 1 hour under nitrogen to harden the epoxy.

9. After the epoxy has hardened, pole the piezo by applying 350 V across of it while heating it at 120°C for 1 hour. The current through the piezo during poling is typically less than 0.1 mA. To stop the poling process, first cool down the piezo to room temperature, then reduce the voltage to zero.
Attaching the body piezo

After the body piezo has been modified following the steps in the previous section, it may be attached to the rest of the bug. It is not necessary to build the rest of bug before attaching the body piezo, but it is easier to align the body piezo with the macor bug foot when the rest of the bug is already built, so it’s better to attach the body piezo as the last step.

In the past, we would take a completely built bug that was not walking well and replace only the body piezo, hoping that would improve the walking. This is probably not necessary anymore since the problems with coarse approach are usually fixed by warming up the STM stage while keeping the walker plate electrodes grounded.

However, if there is any reason why only the body piezo needs to be replaced on a bug that is already completely built, there are a few steps to remove the old body piezo.

1. First break off the body piezo with tweezers, cutters, etc.
2. Then sand the bottom of the bug foot so that both the macor tripod and center stump are even. The next figure identifies which parts of the foot are the tripod and stump.

---

Bug Foot

![Bug Foot Diagram]

Figure C.18: Stump and tripod of the bug foot.

3. Once the foot tripod and center stump are even, using a diamond file, make the stump around 1–2 mil shorter than the tripod, as shown in figure C.19. One can measure the height of the stump with a micrometer or by trying to slide a 2 mil Au wire under the stump.

After the steps given above, the new body piezo can be attached.

The next steps below deal with attaching the body piezo to the macor bug foot. These steps are the same whether one is only replacing the body piezo, or building a completely new bug.

To attach the body piezo to the bug foot, one first needs Epotek H20E silver epoxy to glue the piezo to the bug foot and a special tool to hold the piezo against the bug foot while the epoxy hardens. A picture of the tool, called the piezo bower, is shown in figure C.20.
1. Place the new body piezo on the center of the piezo bower, centered on the domed region, with the + side of the piezo facing up, being careful not to break any Au wires on the piezo.

2. Put a little H20E epoxy on the foot stump. This epoxy will be used to attach the
body piezo to the bug foot. The body piezo will be attached to the bug foot only at the stump so that the body piezo can expand and contract in all directions.

3. Place the foot on the body piezo and align the foot and body piezo so that the foot is centered on the piezo and the STM tip is directly over the small amount of epoxy on the + side of the body piezo, as shown in the next figure.

4. Place the metal strip between the X and Y piezos as shown in the next figure, and recheck the alignment between foot and body piezo.

Figure C.21: Alignment of the piezo bower, bug, and body piezo.

Figure C.22: The metal strip is placed between the X and Y piezos.
5. Tighten the screws clamping the metal strip so that the strip bends a little, as shown in the next figure. The ends of the strip should be around 2 to 3 mm above the piezo bower base. Pushing the metal strip against the bug foot forces the bug foot against the body piezo. Since the stump of the bug foot is slightly shorter than the bug foot tripod (figure C.19), the body piezo will bend slightly under this force. This slight bowing of the body piezo makes it rigidly attached to the bug foot, making the entire bug more mechanically stable.

6. Put everything in the oven for 90 minutes at 80 °C.

7. After everything has cooled down, remove the bug from the piezo bower and test the coarse movement with a spare walker plate and test the body piezo capacitance.

**Frequency characterization of the body piezo**

When we bend the piezo, we do not want to bend it so much that it may crack or break. To indirectly test the amount of stress on the body piezo, we measured the piezo impedance as a function of frequency while differing amounts of bowing was applied by the piezo bower. Figure [C.23] shows a graph of the frequency dependence of the impedance of the body piezo, showing the resonant dip at \( \sim 107 \text{ kHz} \) and the anti-resonant peak at \( \sim 126 \text{ kHz} \) (reference [4]). The black curve is when there is no bowing. The green curve is obtained when the amount of bowing is similar to the amount used to attach the body piezo to the bug foot. The red curve is obtained when the piezo is bowed more than the amount used to obtain the green curve.

From the graph, we see that the amount of stress applied to the piezo when we attach it to the bug foot alters the piezo impedance some, but not as much as the amount of stress used to obtain the red curve. So the amount of stress applied to the piezo during attachment to the bug foot is less likely to damage the piezo than the amount of stress used to obtain the red curve. This is how we chose the amount of bowing to use when attaching the body piezo to the bug foot.
Figure C.23: Impedance of the body piezo as a function of frequency for different amounts of stress.
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lower Hubbard band, 40
many-body effects, 24
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on-site energy, 35
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orientational ordering, 93
Paschen effect, 52
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pseudopotential, 49
quasiparticle, 25
$R\theta$-mode, 150
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retarded Green’s operator, 31
sample bias, 10
SCF, 48
screening, 107
second quantization, 35
self-energy, 32
spectral function, 32
sputtering, 61
STM bug, 53, 173
STM stage, 53
strong correlations, 103
thermal broadening, 21
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tight binding, 34
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tip from hell, 63
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ultra high vacuum, 61
upper Hubbard band, 40
virtual hopping, 38
walker plate, 53, 170
XY-mode, 150
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