The Unusual Mechanism of Partial Fermi Level Pinning at Metal–MoS₂ Interfaces
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ABSTRACT: Density functional theory calculations are performed to unravel the nature of the contact between metal electrodes and monolayer MoS₂. Schottky barriers are shown to be present for a variety of metals with the work functions spanning over 4.2–6.1 eV. Except for the p-type Schottky contact with platinum, the Fermi levels in all of the studied metal–MoS₂ complexes are situated above the midgap of MoS₂. The mechanism of the Fermi level pinning at metal–MoS₂ contact is shown to be unique for metal–2D-semiconductor interfaces, remarkably different from the well-known Bardeen pinning effect, metal-induced gap states, and defect/disorder induced gap states, which are applicable to traditional metal–semiconductor junctions. At metal–MoS₂ interfaces, the Fermi level is partially pinned as a result of two interface behaviors: first by a metal work function modification by interface dipole formation due to the charge redistribution, and second by the production of gap states mainly of Mo d-orbitals character by the weakened intralayer S–Mo bonding due to the interface metal–S interaction. This finding would provide guidance to develop approaches to form Ohmic contact to MoS₂.
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Monolayer transition metal dichalcogenides (TMDs) have drawn much interest in electronics since the demonstration of single-layer MoS₂ field effect transistors (FETs) with appealing performance a few years ago.1 Single-layer MoS₂ with a sizable direct band gap exhibits a high on/off current ratio of about 10⁸ and a high room-temperature carrier mobility upon scattering suppression through dielectric engineering.2 The ultrathin thickness and inherent intralayer bonding property without surface dangling bonds make MoS₂ advantageous for scaled FETs because of smaller short channel effects,3 absence of gap states when in contact with dielectrics, and excellent electrostatic control. Although MoS₂ exhibits fascinating intrinsic properties for electronics, contacts may severely limit the device performance.

The nature of the metal–MoS₂ contact (Ohmic or Schottky, n- or p-type) is still in much debate with contrasting experimental outcomes, and the underlying mechanisms for contact formation are not well understood yet. For example, although all MoS₂ FETs with Au electrodes are reported as n-type, controversy remains as to whether it is an Ohmic contact4,4 or a Schottky contact.5,6 While Pd is collectively claimed to form a Schottky contact with multilayer MoS₂, Fontana et al. concluded p-type6 behavior and Neal et al. declared n-type.4 Besides the fact that MoS₂ samples with different thicknesses and also unknown amounts of defects are utilized among laboratories, it is important to note that all these experiments are often room-temperature measurements in which thermionic emission may obscure the presence of small Schottky barrier heights (SBH). Qiu et al.7 carried out a temperature-dependent study of bilayer MoS₂ FET with titanium contacts and found an n-type Ohmic contact at room temperature, while a Schottky contact with ~65 meV SBH for electron injection is noted for the same device by low-temperature measurements. On the basis of a temperature-dependent study with multilayer MoS₂, Saptarshi et al.5 concluded universally that all metals, including low work function (WF) metal scandium (3.5 eV) and high WF metal platinum (5.9 eV), favor n-type Schottky contacts, with the Fermi levels (FLs) pinned close to the conduction band. Saptarshi et al. argued that the apparent linear dependence of current with drain voltage had misled researchers to believe that a truly Ohmic contact had already been achieved. In their work, the constant observation of Schottky contacts among a variety of metals with a WF difference larger than 2 eV suggests an interesting Fermi level pinning (FLP) behavior that is still elusive as for the origin. In fact, one recent theoretical study8 predicted a partial FLP behavior based on a comparative study of monolayer MoS₂ interfacing with Ir, Pd, and Ru, but the detailed pinning mechanism was not elucidated. Another theoretical study was focused on the electronic states at Au– and Ti–MoS₂ interfaces, instead of on the Schottky barrier formation.9
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At traditional metal–semiconductor junctions (e.g., Al–Si), there is usually a SB with the Fermi level pinned in the band gap of the semiconductor at the interface region. The pinning positions vary within about 0.2 eV, independent of the metal WF, crystallographic orientation, semiconductor doping concentration, interface impurities, and so forth.  

The formation of interfacial gap states plays a key role of FLP. As for the origins of these gap states, different mechanisms have been developed. Bardeen’s theory emphasized the role of surface defects in pinning the FL in band gap of semiconductors, Heine’s metal-induced gap states (MIGS) mechanism basically ascribed the nature of these interfacial gap states to be a decaying metallic wave function into the nanometer depth of semiconductors, and high density of interface states were also found at metal–insulator–metal junctions due to defect/disorder induced gap states (DIGS). It is evident that the reported partial FLP in this work is not related to any surface states and intrinsic defect or disorder (e.g., dangling bonds, point defects, domain boundary, and so forth) because of the modeled pristine MoS2. Therefore, both Bardeen’s theory and DIGS are not applicable in the current model study. Although being aware of the fact that the exfoliated MoS2 is not absolutely free of defects (possibly causing contradictory findings among different experimental studies), our main finding holds that even in the ideal sample without defects (or low density of defects) associated with TMDs, there is still an intrinsic partial FLP mechanism caused by metal–MoS2 interaction. The experimentally observed metal–MoS2 contact behaviors would be explained as a combination of the intrinsic FLP shown in this work and the extrinsic DIGS pinning mechanism. We will discuss in details in this article how the partial FLP occurs and its difference from the MIGS mechanism.

In this Letter, through a systematic first-principles study of the commensurate interfaces between single-layer MoS2 and six types of metals (Al, Ag, Ir, Au, Pd, and Pt) with a WF spanning about 2 eV (4.2–6.1 eV), we confirm the formation of Schottky contacts in all cases. However, we find a partial FLP as the FLs of all of the examined metal–MoS2 complexes vary in a range of 0.5–0.64 eV in the band gap with traced metal WF dependence of FLP positions. The FLP is shown to be a synergic result of two interface behaviors: metal WF modification and the interface gap states formation.

The density functional theory (DFT) calculations are performed by VASP with the projector-augmented wave (PAW) method. The local density approximation (LDA) is used to describe the exchange-correlation functional with the partial core correction included. The (111) surfaces of metals are strained to match the optimized lattice constant of MoS2. During the ionic relaxation of the interface structures, the shape and size of the super cell is fixed with all the atoms fully relaxed. The stopping criterion for the ionic relaxation is the remnant force on each atom below 0.01 eV/Å. A vacuum region (~27 Å) normal to the surface is added to minimize the interaction between adjacent slabs. The Monkhorst-Pack k-point sampling in Brillouin zone (BZ) is Γ-centered with 4 × 4 × 1 and 20 × 20 × 1 meshes in ionic and electronic optimization, respectively. The energy cutoff is chosen at 400 eV, and the electronic optimization stops when the total energies of neighboring optimization loops differ below 10−8 eV.

The local density approximation is appropriate for studying the metal–MoS2 contact. GW calculations showed that the quasiparticle energy gap for monolayer MoS2 is ~2.6–2.8 eV, and the underestimation of the band gap by LDA or GGA is ascribed to overlooking the many body effect among electrons. An exciton binding energy of about 1.0 eV in monolayer MoS2 results in an excitonic gap 1.8–1.9 eV observed in photoluminescence (PL) spectra. Surprisingly, PL measurements of MoS2 samples with and without a high-K dielectric coating show the almost equal excitonic gaps with a negligible difference 30 meV. The experimental evidence tends to convey a concept that the magnitude of the exciton binding energy is similar to that of the many body electron interactions within the MoS2 sheet, resulting in PL spectra without substantial dielectric environment dependence. The strong Coulomb screening by metal slabs with infinite dielectric constant minimizes the many body effect in MoS2 systems. In this work, the calculated band gap of the pristine monolayer MoS2 by LDA is 1.88 eV.

The optimized planar lattice constant of single-layer MoS2 by LDA is 3.12 Å, close to the experimental value 3.16 Å. The maximum and minimum strain in the six metals is 6.6% compression for Al and 0.7% compression for Ir, respectively. Although a small amount of strain (e.g., 0.8% by Au deposition) was shown to be applied by metal deposition on monolayer MoS2 flake, in order to catch the detailed electronic behaviors at the studied interface in a comparative manner, the lattice constant of MoS2 is kept constant in all the metal–MoS2 models. The side and top views of the interfaces are illustrated in Figure 1. The WF span among the six metals is about 2 eV between Al (4.2 eV) and Pt (6.1 eV), providing a good platform for exploring the energy realignment at metal–MoS2 interfaces.

![Figure 1. Side and top views of metal–MoS2 interface. The total thickness of vacuum region is 27 Å. The black boundary indicates the super cell in simulation. “S-con” and “S-non” indicate sulfur atoms in direct contact and not in direct contact with metal slabs, respectively. Golden, blue, and orange balls represent metal contact, S, and Mo atoms, respectively.](image-url)
The band structures of the six metal–MoS₂ interfaces are shown in Figure 2, from which the edges of MoS₂ band gap are deduced, demonstrating the formation of Schottky contacts in all cases. As shown in the projected band structures in Figure 2, the band gap of MoS₂ is determined by the main Mo d-orbitals states (the evident black dots) at Γ-points. Because of the splitting of the states caused by the interface electronic hybridization, the extraction of the band gap size in this way has a minor degree of variance (see Figure S1 and the related text in Supporting Information). Strictly speaking, the terminology band is appropriate for homogeneous crystals, whereas for heterogeneous interfaces with strong orbital hybridization, the band gap of the semiconductor side can be identified by regarding the spilled hybridization states as gap states. This explains why the band gap sizes (the sum of CBO and VBO) in Table 1 vary from 1.78 to 2.01 eV. Band offset information is summarized in Table 1. Apart from platinum with the high WF of about 6.1 eV, all of the other five metals form n-type contacts. The results indicate a partial FLP behavior at the interfaces: that is, FLs are not strictly pinned at a specific energy but distribute in a 0.5–0.64 eV window in the gap for the six different contacts.

Considering that most of the studied metals have higher WFs than MoS₂, the formation of n-type contacts implies significant energy level realignment in metal–MoS₂ complexes. The decrease of the metal WF has been demonstrated at the metal–graphene interfaces due to the presence of interface dipole as a result of charge redistribution. It has been established that, even without a notable net charge transfer between a metal substrate and an adsorbate, the surface charge repulsion effect tends to drive the charge redistribution within the two contacted materials. In fact, the dipole moment of a system may have different contributions, such as from charge transfer in ionic bonded system, rearrangement of charge in covalent bonds and polarization of electronic states, etc. Through a similar charge difference analysis in Figure 3, a decrease of the metal WF (except Al) due to the adsorption of single-layer MoS₂ is corroborated.

Charge difference analysis is performed between complexes and isolated materials, that is, $\Delta \rho = \rho_{\text{complex}} - \rho_{\text{metal}} - \rho_{\text{MoS}_2}$. The charge density is averaged in the plane parallel to the interface. Hence, the charge redistribution along the Z-direction normal to the interface is derived. Figure 3 shows similar results to those presented by Chen et al. Zooming into the details at interface region of Figure 3, the major difference for the weak metal–MoS₂ and metal–graphene contacts is the presence of a charge accumulation region (red zone in Figure 3) at metal–MoS₂ interfaces. This observation is consistent with the fact that MoS₂ is chemically more reactive than graphene. The common feature for both metal–MoS₂ and metal–graphene contacts is the charge depletion region (yellow zone in Figure 3). In a general sense, both the charge depletion and the charge accumulation constitute the interface charge redistribution behavior, leading to electron wave function polarization, that is, the interface electric dipole formation. The presence of the interface dipole modifies the interface band alignment.

The presence of an interface charge depletion region is direct evidence of the surface charge repulsion effect. Two dimen-

### Table 1. Calculated Equilibrium Interface Distance ($D_{eq}$), Binding Energy (BE), Work Function (WF) of Isolated Metals, Strain Applied in Metals (%), Conduction Band Offset (CBO), and Valence Band Offset (VBO) at Metal–MoS₂ Interfaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>WF (eV)</th>
<th>strain (%)</th>
<th>$D_{eq}$ (Å)</th>
<th>BE (eV/S atom)</th>
<th>CBO (eV)</th>
<th>VBO (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>−0.56</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>−0.48</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The strain applied in all metals to match the lattice constant of MoS₂ is compressive strain. The calculated band gap edges for monolayer MoS₂ is −4.28 and −6.16 eV with the reference vacuum level at 0 eV. The Fermi levels in the six interfaces are partially pinned at 0.51–1.01 eV (0.5 eV window) below the semiconductor conduction band edge, and at 0.77–1.41 eV (0.64 eV window) above the semiconductor valence band edge. Conduction and valence band edges at heterogeneous interfaces are identified by the projected main Mo d-orbital states while neglecting the minor Mo d-orbital states as gap states.*
sional semiconductors do not have the bulk materials' reservoir of a large amount of electrons, particularly compared to the electron sea in metals. Therefore, surface charge repulsion causes metal d-orbital rehybridization easily, leading to a larger WF change of metal (see Figure S2 and the related text in Supporting Information). Upon the modification of WFs, the FLs of the metals are raised. Therefore, aluminum with much deeper d-band than s- and p-bands would not experience the similar large WF decrease by contacting MoS$_2$. The quantitative calculation of the change of the dipole moments at these interfaces shows that Al experiences work function increase while other metals incur work function reduction upon MoS$_2$ adsorption due to the opposite interface dipole orientations (see Figure S3 and the related text in Supporting Information). The exception for the Al case is confirmed by the results in Figure 2g where the FL of Al is lowered relatively, while all the other metal FLs are raised relatively.

Quantitative analysis shows that the shift of a metal FL relative to the conduction band minimum (CBM) of MoS$_2$ has a linear dependence with the metal WF with a slope 0.71. If the linear dependence has a slope close to 1, the FLs of different metals would shift to the same level when in contact with MoS$_2$, which is an indicator of a strong FLP. Therefore, the calculated linear dependence with a slope well below unity implies that the FL is not strongly pinned at a specific energy level in band gap (see data in Table 1).

The charge accumulation region discloses another significant interface behavior: a strong metal–MoS$_2$ hybridization, which is further substantiated by the partial DOS (PDOS) analysis shown in Figure 4. Apparently, the direct orbital hybridization should occur between contact metals and sulfur atoms. The vertical physical separation between Mo layer and the metal slab is $3.73 - 4.48$ Å for the six studied metals, larger than the van der Waals separation (for example, in graphite) 3.34 Å. Therefore, there is no direct wave function overlap, and correspondingly a direct hybridization of Mo and metal electronic states is not anticipated. However, a detailed PDOS analysis reveals that the gap states are predominantly of Mo d-orbitals character with larger contribution in the upper part of the MoS$_2$ band gap. In the PDOS profiles of Figure 4, the similarity between Mo d-orbitals and contact metals d-orbitals indicates the strong correlation between contact metals and MoS$_2$.

Figure 3. Plane averaged charge difference ($\Delta \rho = \rho_{complex} - \rho_{metal} - \rho_{MoS_2}$) along the vertical Z-direction normal to the interface. Red color filled areas represent a charge accumulation region, and yellow color filled areas represent a charge depletion region.

Figure 4. PDOS of metal–MoS$_2$ interfaces for (a) Ag, (b) Al, (c) Au, (d) Ir, (e) Pd, and (f) Pt, respectively. The yellow shaded zone in each figure indicates the conduction band and valence band edges, determined by the Mo d-orbitals projection in the band structures, as shown in Figure 2. "1/2 Ir-d" in (d) means the d-orbital DOS of surface Ir atoms is intentionally reduced to half in plot for comparison with other curves. 1/4 Pd in (e) and 1/2 Pt in (f) are similarly represented.
and Mo atoms. Essentially, Figure 4 shows more Mo d-states than S sp-states in the band gap.

Sulfur atoms play a role of mediating the hybridization between metal and Mo atoms, resulting in the production of gap states. It is well-known that the gap size of single-layer MoS$_2$ is critically determined by the Mo−S covalent bonding strength, and band gap edges of single-layer MoS$_2$ is over 80% constituted of Mo d-orbitals. For convenience, we denote the sulfur atoms in direct contact with metal layers as S$_{con}$, while the sulfur atoms at the vacuum side is termed as S$_{non}$, as shown in Figure 1. The metal contacts disturb the electron distribution surrounding S$_{con}$ atoms, thus affecting the S$_{con}$−Mo bonding. The interfacial metal−S bonding weakens the intralayer S$_{con}$−Mo bonding, and thus the Mo d-states at the band edges spread into the band gap, producing gap states, which is essential for pinning the FL. Therefore, albeit the interatomic contact occurs between metals and S$_{con}$ instead of Mo$_{con}$ gap states are predominantly formed by the Mo d-orbitals. This mechanism is similar to the band gap reduction of MoS$_2$ by interlayer interaction with increasing number of layers in which conduction band edge is lowered to reduce the band gap from 1.8 eV (for 1 ML) to 1.2 eV (for bulk). The dominant contribution of Mo d-orbitals in the upper part of the band gap explains the driving force to pin the Fermi level in the upper half of the band gap forming n-type Schottky contacts (Figure 5). Note that the overall effect of the presence of the interface metal−S bonding weakens the intralayer S−Mo bonding, spilling band edge states into the gap regions. However, the identification of band edges is by adopting the main Mo d-orbitals states at the specific Γ-point while neglecting the minor Mo d-orbitals states as gap states (see Figure S1 and the related text in Supporting Information). Hence, it is possible that some derived band gap sizes appear to be enlarged as indicated in Table 1.

Electronic features at metal−MoS$_2$ interfaces uncover the difference of the partial FLP mechanism from the MIGS. Albeit minor, there is still a noticeable metal WF dependence of the pinned FLs with 0.5−0.64 eV variance, which spans almost one-third of the band gap. Another striking feature is the favored localization of gap states at Mo atoms instead of S$_{con}$ atoms, deviating from the behavior of the decaying wave function of metals. MIGS is therefore not applicable for the reported partial FLP.

Increased separation of metal contact from MoS$_2$ weakens the modification of the metal WFs and meanwhile mitigates the interface hybridization resulting in fewer gap states and thus...
unpinning the FL. As shown in Figure 3b, when the interface separation is increased to 4.5 Å, the degree of charge redistribution is largely decreased, evidenced by an order of magnitude smaller γ-axis values. Figure 5 shows that with 6.0 Å interface separation, all contacts obey the quantitative prediction of the conventional Schottky–Mott model which dictates the SBH solely by the WF difference of isolated materials. It suggests an insertion of appropriate buffering materials between metals and MoS$_2$ would be a promising technique for unpinning the FLs.$^{31}$

In summary, a systematic DFT study of monolayer MoS$_2$ was conducted interfacing it with six contact metals spanning about 2 eV WF difference. The large deviation of the band alignment at the metal–MoS$_2$ interfaces from the prediction of conventional Schottky–Mott model suggests significant band realignment caused by interface dipole formation. Similar to graphene, the adsorption of MoS$_2$ modifies the WF of the metals through an interface dipole formation resulting from notable interface charge redistribution. Moreover, the formation of gap states, mainly of Mo d-orbitals character, is found as a result of sulfur-mediated interface hybridization. Metal adsorption weakens the S–Mo intralayer bonding, spreading the band edge states (mainly Mo d-orbitals) into the band gap. The modified WF at the metal side and the presence of gap states at MoS$_2$ side synergistically result in a partial Fermi level pinning at metal–MoS$_2$ interfaces, which is intrinsically different from Bardeen’s theory, MIGS, and DIGS. Through the understanding of the origin of this partial Fermi level pinning, we can develop new ideas to form Ohmic junctions between metal and TMD semiconductors.
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(23) The electronic structures of metal with strain are very close to the unstrained system. Therefore, the metal strain effect does not change the finding of the current interface model study.


