Electron transport enhanced by electrode surface reconstruction: a case study of C$_{60}$-based molecular junctions$^\dagger$
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The effects of surface reconstruction on electron transport of two monolayers of C$_{60}$ sandwiched between two Cu(111) bulk electrodes have been investigated by density functional theory (DFT) calculations combined with a nonequilibrium Green's function technique. Two markedly different electrode surface structures have been considered, which have been obtained in previous experimental works: one with an unreconstructed perfect surface and the other with a surface reconstruction with a 7-atom-missing hole per (4 × 4) Cu(111) cell. The results indicate that surface reconstruction induces an increase of more than 50% in the current at low bias. Molecular-orbital projected density of states (MO-PDOS) analysis reveals that the change in transport properties originates from the enhanced orbital-dependent electrode–molecule coupling and the increased charge transfer from electrodes to molecules. Our current work suggests that surface reconstruction could play a very important role in the electron transport properties; and hence surface reconstruction (or more generally realistic atomic contact details) should be taken into full consideration in the simulation and design of molecular devices, especially when it is expected to reproduce computationally the experimental observations.

1 Introduction

Molecular junctions composed of individual or monolayer of molecules sandwiched between two conducting electrodes have been the focus of both theoretical and experimental scientists over the past decades.$^{1–12}$ Due to the rich interesting transport behaviors that have been observed, such as negative differential resistance (NDR),$^{6,6}$ current rectification and amplification,$^{7,8}$ electrical switching,$^{9,11}$ spin filtering,$^{12}$ magnetoresistance,$^{13}$ and so on, such devices are expected to be promising alternatives to traditional silicon-based components in the future integrated electronic circuits. However, for real applications of molecular devices, there are still many fundamental issues that have to be resolved. One of the most important problems is the full understanding of the electrode–molecule contact details at the atomic-scale. On one hand, experimentally, in many situations, the electrode–molecule contact details may be dominant in determining the electron transport behaviors in molecular devices.$^{14}$ Hipps et al. even claimed that the investigation of electron transport is all about contacts.$^{15}$ On the other hand, theoretically, density functional theory combined with nonequilibrium Green’s function has proven to be a very powerful technique for the study of molecular devices at the atomic-scale. However, large discrepancies are observed between the magnitudes of electric current and conductance of theoretical results and the experimental ones.$^{16–19}$ One important reason is that the electrode–molecule contact details were not fully considered since all the simulated structures were based on hypothesized ones and probably far from the experimentally measured ones. Consequently, it is critical to take into consideration the interface atomic details as much as we can in molecular electronics simulations.

As a matter of fact, great attention has been paid to this problem. For example, to obtain a robust electrode–molecule coupling, some special anchoring groups are used to serve as linkers between the metallic electrodes and the sandwiched molecules, such as thiol groups, amine groups, and C$_{60}$ molecules.$^{20–22}$ In addition, it is well known that charge transfer between the electrodes and molecules is a very important factor in the transport mechanisms of molecular devices and it is suggested that it can be tuned by controlling the number or type of chemical bonds at the molecule/electrode interface. For example, Schull and coworkers demonstrated that the charge injection efficiency varies with the atomic contact details between the scanning tunneling microscope (STM) tip and the
C$_{60}$ molecule: the charge injection efficiency at a contact with C$\equiv$C double bond (6 : 6 bond) is higher than that with C$-$C single bond (5 : 6 bond) and that the lowest charge injection efficiency is presented at a contact with a single C atom. In another STM experiment, the conductance is modulated in a very large range by increasing the number of metal atoms (from one to five) composing the metallic tip in contact with the C$_{60}$ molecule. Over the past years, the discovery of superconductivity in metal-doped fullerene has spurred intense surveys on structural and electronic properties of highly symmetric C$_{60}$ molecule adsorbed on noble metal surface, the electron transport and thermopower properties of C$_{60}$ molecules sandwiched between metallic electrodes both theoretically and experimentally. Interestingly, it is reported that C$_{60}$ molecules adsorbed on Cu(111) surfaces can induce surface reconstruction, i.e., with 7 of 16 Cu atoms missing per 4 \times 4 cell, thus a pit is formed and the C$_{60}$ sinks into the pit and bonds with both the top and second layer of Cu; and the electronic properties are influenced dramatically at 300–400 K according to STM observations. Other studies demonstrated that metal surface reconstruction induced by molecule adsorption, such as C$_{60}$, graphene and thiolate (SCH$_3$) adsorption, has been frequently observed.

As we know, surface reconstruction will unavoidably affect the bonding of molecules to the substrates. Naturally, the transport properties could be also affected, which is, however, still not well understood. Although generally the band structure or density of states obtained with conventional DFT calculations could provide useful information about the conductivity of a material, how they will behave in a device, particularly how large the conductance is and how the I–V characteristics will be quantitatively can never be obtained by a conventional DFT calculation. Especially, the electronic structures may change greatly under finite bias. In certain situations, even two different conducting materials connected together into a device may produce an insulating state, which obviously cannot be predicted just by an inspection of the band structure or density of states. Thus, a fully quantitative calculation of the electron transport in a device configuration is quite necessary if we want to know the surface reconstruction effects on the performance of molecular devices accurately.

In this work, the effects of electrode surface reconstruction on the electron transport of the C$_{60}$ molecule interface are shown. The device models consist of two C$_{60}$ monolayers sandwiched between two Cu(111) surfaces. The stacking mode of two C$_{60}$ monolayers are taken from the C$_{60}$ molecular solid with fcc structure along the (111) direction. Two layers instead of one layer of C$_{60}$ are selected in order to avoid direct electron transmission between electrodes. A 4 \times 4 supercell with lattice constants of 10.0 Å \times 10.0 Å is chosen for the Cu(111) surface in the xy plane (see Fig. 1). Interestingly, in this way, exactly a 4 \times 4 Cu(111) supercell holds one C$_{60}$ molecule and the lattice mismatch between the Cu(111) surface and the C$_{60}$ monolayer is negligible. For the unreconstructed case, the C$_{60}$ is adsorbed on Cu(111) surface above the hcp hollow site with a hexagon oriented to the metal surface, while in the case of reconstructed configuration, since a 7-atom vacancy induced by C$_{60}$ adsorption, with 7 atoms missing at the first layer, tends to be developed in the Cu(111) surface, the C$_{60}$ cage just sinks into the 7-atom vacancy and lies at the fcc site of the second layer. The relative stability of the unreconstructed and reconstructed configurations has been fully discussed. The definitions of the Cu(111) surface reconstruction greatly affects the performances of C$_{60}$-based electronic devices.

### 2 Computational details

The device models consist of two C$_{60}$ monolayers sandwiched between two Cu(111) surfaces. The stacking mode of two C$_{60}$ monolayers are taken from the C$_{60}$ molecular solid with fcc structure along the (111) direction. Two layers instead of one layer of C$_{60}$ are selected in order to avoid direct electron transmission between electrodes. A 4 \times 4 supercell with lattice constants of 10.0 Å \times 10.0 Å is chosen for the Cu(111) surface in the xy plane (see Fig. 1). Interestingly, in this way, exactly a 4 \times 4 Cu(111) supercell holds one C$_{60}$ molecule and the lattice mismatch between the Cu(111) surface and the C$_{60}$ monolayer is negligible. For the unreconstructed case, the C$_{60}$ is adsorbed on Cu(111) surface above the hcp hollow site with a hexagon oriented to the metal surface, while in the case of reconstructed configuration, since a 7-atom vacancy induced by C$_{60}$ adsorption, with 7 atoms missing at the first layer, tends to be developed in the Cu(111) surface, the C$_{60}$ cage just sinks into the 7-atom vacancy and lies at the fcc site of the second layer. The relative stability of the unreconstructed and reconstructed configurations has been fully discussed. The definitions of

![Fig. 1.](image-url) The C$_{60}$ molecule on the Cu(111) surface in a 4 \times 4 supercell: (a) at the hcp hollow site in the unreconstructed case (abbreviated as “Unrec”); (b) at the fcc hollow site in the reconstructed case (abbreviated as “Rec”). In order to see more clearly the bonding features between Cu(111) and C$_{60}$, only two complete layers of Cu atoms and 21 C atoms closest to the electrode–molecule interface are shown. For contrast, the complete layer closest to C$_{60}$ is shown in green, and the deeper layer in grey. The layer with a 7-atom vacancy (9 atoms remaining) in the reconstructed case is shown in purple. All C atoms are in yellow. (c) and (d) show the scattering region of two-terminal molecular junctions without and with reconstruction. In (c) and (d), all the Cu atoms are in grey.
different adsorption sites on Cu(111) (such as hcp and fcc above) can be found in the literature.25

Both the unreconstructed and the reconstructed structures are fully relaxed by the Vienna Ab-initio Simulation Package (VASP)40–41 and the same parameters as used in ref. 30 are adopted. For the structure relaxation, five Cu(111) atomic layers on each side were selected and the distance between the two C60 monolayers along the z direction is eventually relaxed to be 1.10 Å, which is approximately the same as the value in the bulk C60 solid. For the calculations of electron transport, the electrode supercell consists of 6 Cu(111) atomic layers with ABCABC stacking, in a lattice constant of 12.228 Å along the z direction. On the left and right sides of the C60 monolayers, besides the layer with missing atoms in the reconstructed case, four and five complete atomic layers with ABCA and BCABC stacking respectively from the electrodes are selected as the buffer layers.

The electronic structure calculations are performed by the SIESTA package42 and the transport calculations are performed by TranSIESTA.43 The ion–electron interaction is described by norm-conserving pseudopotentials and the local density approximation (LDA) in the Ceperley–Alder (CA) form is adopted for the exchange-correlation functional. Single-ζ (SZ) for Cu and double-ζ plus polarization (DZP) for C are chosen as the basis set. We choose the basis set this way since it best reproduces the electronic structures (such as density of states and charge transfer) obtained with VASP in the systems concerned in this work. The Brillouin zone for the electrodes is sampled by a 3 × 3 × 20 Monkhorst–Pack grid and that for the scattering region is by 3 × 3 × 1. The choice of a 3 × 3 k-grid in the xy plane is based on a balance between the accuracy and computational burden and it has been adopted in other literatures for the same size of Cu(111) surface supercells.25 In order to reduce the computation time in the present study, we have implemented GPU acceleration to speed up the computation of the density matrix which takes up to more than 80% of the total CPU time in the nonequilibrium Green’s function scheme and a speed up of 20 times has been achieved with a single Tesla K20 card for a moderate system.44

The transmission function at energy E and bias V is calculated through the Landauer formula:45,46

$$T(E, V) = Tr[G^R(E, V)G^G(E, V)],$$

(1)

where $G^{AV}$ represent the retarded and advanced Green functions of the scattering region and $\Gamma^{LR}$ are the coupling functions from the left and right electrodes. The current is calculated by integrating the transmission function over the energy bias window by the following formula:

$$I(V) = \frac{2e}{h} \int_{\mu_L}^{\mu_R} T(E, V) \left[ f(E - \mu_L) - f(E - \mu_R) \right] dE,$$

(2)

where $f(E - \mu_{L,R})$ are the Fermi distribution functions of electrons in the electrodes, $\mu_L = E_f + eV/2$ and $\mu_R = E_f - eV/2$ are the chemical potentials of the left and right electrodes, with $E_f$ the Fermi energy at zero bias.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 I–V curve & transmission

For both the unreconstructed and reconstructed configurations, the current as a function of bias is shown in Fig. 2. Two features can be clearly observed. First, at low bias ($\leq 0.3$ V), the current in the reconstructed case is much larger than that in the unreconstructed case (see Fig. 2a). For example, at $V = 0.2$ V, the current in the reconstructed case is 11.08 mA, in contrast to that (7.02 mA) in the unreconstructed case; the ratio of them is as high as 158%. Apparently, surface reconstruction greatly enhances the current in these devices. Second, with the further increase of the bias, the difference finally becomes very small. As the current is the transmission function dependence over the energy bias window, the behavior of the transmission functions at zero bias will provide the understanding on the origins of the above characteristics presented in the $I$–$V$ curves, which will be analyzed in the following.

The transmission spectra are given in Fig. 3. It is seen that in both the unreconstructed and reconstructed cases, the transmission peaks mediated by the highest occupied molecular orbitals (HOMO) and the lowest unoccupied molecular orbitals (LUMO) of the C60 are clearly observed. The HOMO peaks are located around $-1.0$ eV, while the LUMO peaks are located close to the Fermi level in both cases. Between these transmission peaks, there is a transmission gap about 0.5 eV. The LUMO mediated transmission peak of C60 around the Fermi level is consistent with all other studies in the literature.25,31,46 However, big differences are also found in the two cases. The most important two differences lie in the height and the position of the LUMO peaks. The LUMO transmission peak (with height $\sim 1.5$) in the unreconstructed case is much higher than that (with height $\sim 0.9$) in the reconstructed case, but the peak position ($\sim 0.1$ eV) in the reconstructed case is much closer to the Fermi level than that ($\sim 0.4$ eV) in the reconstructed case. Besides the change of shape and peak height, the overall transmission function in the reconstructed case is shifted to lower energy relative to the unreconstructed case. Especially, although the LUMO peak in the unreconstructed case is much higher than the reconstructed one, at around the Fermi level the

![Fig. 2](image-url)
transmission coefficient is much larger in the reconstructed case. Specifically, the equilibrium conductance \((0.87 G_0)\) in the reconstructed case is much larger than that \((0.49 G_0)\) in the unreconstructed one. This explains why the current at low bias in the reconstructed case is much larger. Another point to note is that, although the reconstruction lowers the height of the LUMO peak, it greatly enhances the transmission in the HOMO–LUMO gap. In clear contrast, in this gap, the transmission in the unreconstructed case is almost zero.

3.2 PDOS & MO-PDOS

In order to understand the differences in the transmission function, the projected density of states (PDOS) of the whole C\(_{60}\)s has been analyzed. By comparing the PDOS in Fig. 4 and the transmission in Fig. 3, we find that the PDOS follows exactly the same trend in the transmission, namely, the LUMO peak in the PDOS of the reconstructed case is much more broadened, much lower and much closer to the Fermi level. Meanwhile, the PDOS in the HOMO–LUMO gap is much larger in the reconstructed structure. These characteristics of course arise from the differences in the electrode–molecule interface structures and the local bonding features. In the unreconstructed case, the C\(_{60}\) molecule just sits with a hexagon at the hcp hollow site of the Cu(111) surface, thus only 3 bonds are formed between the molecule and the electrode surface. However, in the reconstructed case, besides the 3 bonds formed between the bottom hexagon of the molecule and the fcc hollow site of the first complete atomic layer of the Cu(111) surface, there are other 9 C–Cu bonds formed between the C\(_{60}\) molecule and the layer with missing atoms (see Fig. 1b). Thus, the electrode–molecule coupling in the reconstructed case is much stronger and it leads to many different consequences indicated above.

It is well known that, when a metal is deposited onto a semiconductor, the wave function of an electron in the semiconductor must match that of an electron in the metal at the metal–semiconductor interface. Since the Fermi levels of the two materials must match at the interface, gap states will be formed and decay deep into the semiconductor. The Cu(111)–C\(_{60}\) interface is effectively just such a metal–semiconductor system and gap states are naturally formed. These gap states arise from the hybridization between the Cu(111) surface and the C\(_{60}\) and thus the strength of the coupling between them directly determines the magnitudes of the gap states. In order to see how the molecular orbitals are changed and how they contribute to the gap states, we have projected the total density of states onto the molecular orbitals (MO-PDOS) in a surface adsorption system which contains five Cu(111) atomic layers and a C\(_{60}\) monolayer. To see the change of the molecular orbitals, for comparison, we have also considered a hypothetical system which excludes the Cu(111) atomic layers and keeps the coordinates of the C atoms exactly the same as those in the fully relaxed Cu(111)–C\(_{60}\) system. The total density of states of the monolayer are also projected onto the individual molecular orbitals.

In the hypothetical system, we see that the PDOS of each molecular orbital still consists of an isolated peak (see Fig. 5a and b). However, in the Cu(111)–C\(_{60}\) system, the contribution of each molecular orbital consists of a main peak and many secondary peaks in a very large energy range (see Fig. 5c and d). In both the reconstructed and the unreconstructed cases, although there may be some differences in the coordinates of the C atoms, the two hypothetical systems give almost the same
orbital projected density of states. If we focus on the LUMOs, we see that the threefold degenerate LUMOs are split into two groups. The first group contains two degenerate orbitals labeled by $m = \pm 1$ with lower energy and the second group contains one orbital labeled by $m = 0$ which is higher in energy. The heights of the three peaks with $m = -1, 0$ and +1 are the same. When the monolayer are deposited onto the Cu(111) substrate, the main peaks of $m = 0$ orbital become much lower than the $m = -1$ orbital in the unreconstructed case and their contributions extend to a very large energy range. Such changes in the MO-PDOS from an isolated peak to a main peak accompanied by many secondary peaks arise from the hybridization between the electrode and the C$_{60}$ molecule and are the origin of the gap states. In this case, the contributions of all the three LUMO orbitals decrease further from the main peak position and increases to other energy region. Especially, the main peak of the $m = 0$ orbital further splits into double peaks (see Fig. 5d), which greatly decreases the height of the $m = 0$ orbital. The sum of the $m = -1$, 0 and +1 at the main peak position is much smaller than the unreconstructed case, which results in a much lower LUMO transmission peak.

Besides the height of the transmission peak, the electrode–molecule coupling also affects the charge transfer between the electrode and the molecule. Mulliken population analysis shows that charge transfer of 2.0 electrons from the electrodes to the two C$_{60}$ molecules occurs in the unreconstructed configuration. In comparison, the charge transfer in the reconstructed case is 5.5 electrons. Thus the average excess charge per C$_{60}$ is about 1.0 and 2.8 electrons respectively, which is in good agreement with the literatures, where it is proposed that a C$_{60}$ generally obtains 1–3 electrons from the electrodes. Consequently, it is easy to understand why the LUMO-mediated transmission peak position of the reconstructed case is shifted to lower energy relative to the other case since the larger charge transfer fills more states and thus pushes the Fermi level to higher energy. Eventually, the Fermi level lies almost in the middle of the LUMO peak in the reconstructed case, while it lies at the lower edge in the unreconstructed case (see Fig. 3). Consequently, around the Fermi level, the transmission in the
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**Fig. 5** Density of states of C$_{60}$ projected on different molecular orbitals for: (a) the unreconstructed structure with the Cu(111) substrate excluded; (b) the reconstructed structure with the Cu(111) substrate excluded; (c) the unreconstructed Cu(111)–C$_{60}$ system; (d) the reconstructed Cu(111)–C$_{60}$ system. Since we focus on the LUMOs, only the three LUMO orbitals are given separately while the HOMO orbitals and LUMO+1 orbitals are added together, respectively. In addition, the wave functions of the three LUMO orbitals, labelled by $m = -1, 0, +1$, are plotted at the top of the figure. It is obvious that the $m = 0$ orbital is threefold rotationally symmetrical with respect to the z axis while $m = -1$ and $m = +1$ are not, which gives rise to the fact that the energy of $m = 0$ orbital is different from $m = -1$ and $m = +1$. 
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reconstructed case is much larger than the unreconstructed case.

3.3 Further discussions

In the following, we take an insight into why in the HOMO–LUMO gap it exhibits a considerable density of states from the C60 while the transmission is almost zero in the unreconstructed case (see Fig. 4a and 3). We extract the PDOS for each C atom and observe the difference in the PDOS between the C atoms close to the electrodes and those at the C60–C60 interface. It is obvious that, the PDOS in the HOMO–LUMO gap is mainly contributed by the C atoms close to the electrodes and the contributions at the C60–C60 interface is negligible. From Fig. 4b, we find that PDOS in the HOMO–LUMO gap (the gap states) decay rapidly to the center of the two C60 monolayers. Due to the greatly suppressed density of states in the HOMO–LUMO gap at the C60–C60 interface, it effectively acts as a potential barrier, thus the electron transmission is greatly blocked. In contrast, in the reconstructed case, stronger coupling between the C60 and the electrodes increases the PDOS of C atoms at the C60–C60 interface (see Fig. 5b) and thus enhances the electron transmission in the HOMO–LUMO gap (see Fig. 3).

Next, we turn to see the origin why the difference between the currents in the two cases becomes gradually smaller and finally neglectable at higher bias (with $V \geq 0.6 \, \text{V}$). We have gathered the transmission functions at different biases together (see Fig. 6). It is seen that, due to the relative shi of the LUMOs of two C60 monolayers with the increase of the bias and thus the decrease of the coupling between them, the heights of the LUMO peaks in the transmission functions of both the reconstructed and unreconstructed cases decrease very fast. Since at higher bias, in the reconstructed case, the LUMO peak becomes lower and flatter, the current increases much slower. In contrast, in the unreconstructed case, the main part of the LUMO peak enters the bias windows, thus the current increases quickly and the difference between the two cases becomes rapidly small.

Finally, for molecule–molecule interacting systems, the van der Waals (vdW) interaction should be generally taken into consideration. However, we want to point out that, the vdW interaction between the C60 molecules and in the adsorption on electrodes has been neglected due to the following reasons: First, LDA is already able to produce an accurate C60–C60 distance. The error is less than 1% in bulk C60 compared with the experimental value. Our structures are also relaxed by taking the experimental value as the initial distance using LDA. At the C60–Cu interface, the chemical bonds are much stronger than the vdW interaction. Thus, from geometry, the neglect of the vdW interaction is reasonable. Second, it is well known that the vdW interaction mainly changes the molecule–molecule distance. It has very little effects on the electronic structure. Therefore, in the electron transport calculations, the correction of vdW interaction can also be safely neglected.

4 Conclusion

In summary, by combining density functional theory with the nonequilibrium Green’s function, we have investigated the electronic structures and transport properties of C60 on Cu(111) with reconstructed and unreconstructed surfaces. Due to the formation of the 7-atom vacancy in the Cu(111) surface, the coupling and hybridization between the metallic electrodes and the C60 molecule is greatly strengthened, which results in many consequences, such as lower LUMO DOS peak, more PDOS contribution to the transmission in the HOMO–LUMO gap and more charge transfer from the electrodes to C60 molecule. Although the LUMO transmission peak decreases greatly, the Fermi level almost shifts to the center of this transmission peak. Thus the transmission around the Fermi level in the reconstructed case is much larger than the unreconstructed one. These changes directly lead to the great enhancement of the current at low bias. The equilibrium conductance is increased from $0.49G_0$ to $0.87G_0$ and the current at low bias is increased by more than 50% due to the surface reconstruction. Consequently, the metal surface reconstruction plays a very

![Fig. 6](image_url) The evolution of transmission spectra with an increase of finite bias: (a) for the unreconstructed case and (b) for the reconstructed case. The two vertical lines with the same color indicate the bias windows.
important role in the electronic structures and transport properties of two-terminal molecular junctions. In the simulation and design of molecular devices, especially when it is expected to reproduce computationally the experimental observations, it is crucial to take the contact details (such as surface reconstruction, adatoms on metallic surface\cite{22} and so on) into full consideration.
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