Electronic and optical properties of two-dimensional flat band triphosphides

Gabriel Elyas Gama Araújo,¹ Lucca Moraes Gomes,² Dominike Pacine de

Andrade Deus,³ Alexandre Cavalheiro Dias,⁴ and Andréia Luisa da Rosa^{1,*}

¹Institute of Physics, Federal University Goiás, Campus Samambaia, 74690-900, Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil. ²Institute of Physics, Federal University of Goiás,

Campus Samambaia, 74690-900, Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil.

³Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Triângulo Mineiro, Uberlândia, 38400 – 970, Minas Gerais, Brazil[†]

⁴Institute of Physics and International Center of Physics, University of Brasília, Brasília 70919-970, Distrito Federal, Brazil[‡]

Abstract

In this work we use first-principles density-functional theory (DFT) calculations combined with the maximally localized Wannier function tight binding Hamiltonian (MLWF-TB) and Bethe-Salpeter equation (BSE) formalism to investigate quasi-particle effects in 2D electronic and optical properties of triphosphide based two-dimensional materials XP_3 (X = Ga, Ge, As; In, Sn, Sb; Tl, Pb and Bi). We find that with exception of InP₃, all structures have indirect band gap. A noticeable feature is the appearance of flat valence bands associated to phosphorous atoms, mainly in InP₃ and GaP₃ structures. Furthermore, AIMD calculations show that 2D-XP₃ is stable at room temperature, with exception of TlP₃ monolayer, which shows a strong distortion yielding to a phase separation of the P and Tl layers. Finally, we show that monolayered XP₃ exhibits optical absorption with strong excitonic effects, thus revealing exciting features of these monolayered materials.

^{*} and reialuisa@ufg.br

 $^{^{\}dagger}~{\rm dominike@iftm.edu.br}$

[‡] alexandre.dias@unb.br

I. INTRODUCTION

Two-dimensional black phosphorus (phosphorene) has recently attracted attention due to its tuneable band gap and promising applications in electronic and optoelectronic devices [1– 8]. Phosphorene has been of particular interest since it has a direct electronic band gap, which varies from 0.3 (bulk) to 2.0 eV (monolayer) [9]. Black phosphorene shows a quasiparticle optical gap of 2.2 eV, with a near-band-edge recombinations are observed at 2 K with excitonic transitions at 0.276 eV and 0.278 eV [10, 11].

Beyond monoelemental low dimensional phosphorous, other combinations of phosphorene with group-III, GaP₃ [12, 13], InP₃ [13], group-IV, GeP₃ [14–16], SnP3[13, 16], PbP3[16] and group V AsP₃ [17], BiP₃[18–24] and SbP₃[12, 13].

Theoretical calculations predict SnP_3 monolayer to have an indirect electronic bandgap of 0.43 eV, which can be tuned by external strain [25]. InP_3 , GaP_3 , SbP_3 and SnP_3 have been theoretically investigated and found promising for low thermal conductivity [26]. Finally, the photocatalytic properties of AlP_3 and GaP_3 for water splitting and hydrogen production have been addressed [27].

In systems with finite band width, electrons can be confined in real space in crystals which possess the so-called flat bands in momentum space. Examples include f-electron systems with Kondo effect and heavy fermions [28], fractional quantum Hall effect [29], and twisted bilayer graphene superlattices which show unconventional superconductivity [30]

Until now, there has been scarse experimental data on XP₃ structures [31]. Therefore, in this work we gather electronic, and optical properties to reveal the main feature of this important class of large gap materials under the same level of approximation. We find that with exception of InP₃, all structures have indirect band gap. We show that monolayered XP₃ exhibits optical absorption with strong excitonic effects. The exciton binding energy is significantly large for X = Ga, Tl, Ge, Sn and Pb. In particular, InP₃, GaP₃ and BiP₃ shows a good solar harvesting efficiency around 20% - 30%, being attractive for solar cell applications.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

We have performed first-principles calculations within the GGA (generalized-gradient approximation according to the parameterization of PBE (Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof) [32] and HSE (Heyd-Scuseria-Ernzenhof) [33] to describe the exchange an correlation potential as implemented in the Vienna *ab initio* Simulation Package (VASP).[34, 35]. The electronic wave-functions were built using the projected augmented wave (PAW) method [36]. The single-electron Kohn-Sham wave-functions were expanded in plane-waves up to the energy cutoff of 400 eV.

Structure optimizations ensured that the forces on the atoms were below 0.01 eV/Å. In order to eliminate any spurious interactions between the monolayer and its periodic images in the z-direction, we incorporated a vacuum layer with a thickness of 16 Å in each monolayer unit cell. For all calculations, **k**-meshes were automatically generated utilizing the Monkhorst-Pack scheme [37]. Electronic structure calculations using (5x5x1) **k**-points show negligible difference to results using a (9x9x1) **k**-point sampling.

Ab-initio molecular dynamics (AIMD) calculations were performed using a $(3 \times 3 \times 1)$ supercell with a $(2 \times 2 \times 1)$ k-points sampling at T = 300K and a NVT ensemble. The And ersen thermostat was coupled to the XP_3 monolayers. Simulation times between of 10 ps with time steps of 5 fs have been performed. In order to calculate the optical properties, we solve the Bethe-Salpeter equation (BSE) by employing the the Coulomb truncated 2D potential (V2DT), [38]. Based on that, the linear optical response of the materials was computed to include excitonic effects by solving the Bethe–Salpeter equation (BSE)[39] by employing the WanTiBEXOS package [40]. We first created a maximally localized Wannier function tight-binding (MLWF-TB) Hamiltonian to conduct these evaluations derived from DFT-HSE06 calculations including SOC through the Wannier90 package, [41] Our calculations were performed with a 120Å density of **k**-points to determine the real and imaginary parts of the dielectric function. The optical properties were calculated at the Independent Particle Approximation (IPA) and BSE levels, considering the necessary number of conduction and valence bands to describe the optical properties in the solar emission region (i.e. 0 eV to 4 eV). [42] Additional information concerning the BSE parameters is available in the SI section S3.

The solar harvesting efficiency of these monolayers was estimated through the power con-

version efficiency (PCE), considering the AM1.5G model for the solar emission spectrum,[42] employing the Shockley–Queisser limit (SQ-limit)[43] and the spectroscopy limited maximum efficiency (SLME) method.[44] These simulations considers the solar cell operating at 300 K. The absorbance, used for the PCE estimative at SLME, was evaluated using the total absorption coefficient, obtained at BSE or IPA levels, from the summation of the dielectric function diagonal components. In our simulations, we also assumed the XP₃ monolayer thickness equals to the material thickness plus de van der Waals (vdW) length (i.e 3.21 Å),[45] detailed in SI section S5. The addition of vdW length to XP₃ monolayer thickness is justified in the work of Bernardi et. al.,[45] where this procedure was shown necessary to estimate graphene absorbance due its atomic layer thickness, in order to reach results closer to experimental measures. Production of images have been provided by the VESTA [46] and grace packages [47].

A. Structural properties



Figure 1: a) Top view and b) side view of hexagonal monolayered XP₃ (X = Ga, Ge, As; In, Sn, Sb; Tl, Pb and Bi). The lattice parameter a, θ and the buckling Δ .

Monolayered XP₃ has a honeycomb structure in which each X atom forms three X-P bonds with three adjacent P atoms. Each P atom forms two P-P bonds and one X-P bond, respectively, as shown in Fig. 1. Table I shows the optimized lattice parameters for groups III-, IV- and V-P₃. It is possible to see that group III and group V, have similar buckling Δ , with exception of TlP₃. The enthalpy of formation at T = 0 K of the investigated XP₃ compounds was calculated as:

$$\Delta H_f^{\mathrm{T=0K}}(\mathrm{XP}_3) = E_{\mathrm{XP}_3} - E_{\mathrm{X}} - E_{\mathrm{BP-bulk}},\tag{1}$$

where E_{XP_3} , E_X and E_P are the total energies of monolayered XP₃, monoelemental bulk metal X and bulk black phosphorous at both GGA-PBE and HSE levels, respectively. The results are shown in Table I. As a general behavior, most of the compounds have formation enthalpies between 1.0 and 2.0 eV. In particular for AsP₃ a very small value is found.

		$a(\text{\AA})$	Δ (Å)	P-P (Å)	$X-P(\text{\AA})$	X-X (Å)	$\Delta H_f^{T=0K} \ (\text{eV})$
Group III	GaP_3	7.19	1.21	2.23	2.23	4.15	0.71
	InP_3	7.53	1.22	2.23	2.56	4.35	1.34
	TlP_3	7.18	2.34	2.19	3.11	4.76	2.32
Group IV	GeP_3	6.95	2.38	2.17	2.50	4.67	1.62
	SnP_3	7.15	2.84	2.17	2.70	5.01	1.14
	PbP_3	7.28	2.92	2.17	2.79	5.12	1.13
Group V	AsP_3	6.72	1.48	2.25	3.39	4.16	0.16
	SbP_3	7.00	1.79	2.25	2.60	4.42	0.53
	BiP_3	7.14	1.91	2.24	2.70	4.55	0.63

Table I: Lattice parameter a, buckling Δ , bond lengths P-P, X-P and X-X and formation enthalpy $\Delta H_f^{T=0K}$ for XP₃ (X = Ga, Ge, As; In, Sn, Sb; Tl, Pb and Bi) within GGA-PBE.

B. Electronic properties

According to the periodic table of elements, the electronegativity of should follow the trend from left to right: Ga < Ge < As; In < Sn < Sb; Tl < Pb < Bi and from top to bottom: Ga > In > Tl; Ge > Sn > Pb; As > Sb > Bi. The larger the electronegativity,

the smaller the band gap. For group III and V this is very clear according to Table II. On the other hand, group IV -P₃ does not seem to follow this trend. HSE improves the gap by around 50 % in most cases. In particular, for GeP₃ this value almost doubles at HSE compared to calculations at GGA-PBE level. For group IV, as the buckling Δ increases, the electronic band gap also increases. Finally for group V, as the buckling increases, the band gap decreases for both GGA-PBE and HSE functionals. Therefore, there is an interplay between ionicity, band gap and buckling.

For group IV, as the buckling Δ increases, the electronic band gap follows this behavior and also increases. Finally for group V, as the buckling increases, the band gap decreases for both GGA-PBE and HSE functionals, suggesting an interplay between ionicity, band gap and buckling.

From Fig. 2 with exception of InP_3 , all triphosphides have indirect gap. The top of the valence band has majoritarily X-p orbitals. At the K-point the major contribution comes from the p_z orbitals. As a general features, all layers have flat band character, specially along the M-K direction. In flat band materials the energy does not depend on crystal momentum and the charge carriers have a zero group velocity and an infinite effective mass. This feature could lead to several interesting properties, such as ferromagnetism, superconductivity and topological states [48, 49]. From Fig. 3 we see that the lowest unocuppied molecular orbital (LUMO) is localized at the cation X-atom.

		E_{gap} (eV)		Work function (eV)	
		GGA-PBE	HSE	HSE	
	GaP_3	0.78	1.45 (ind.)	5.54	
Group 3A	InP_3	0.70	1.32 (dir.)	5.25	
	TlP_3	0.57	0.90 (ind.)	4.65	
Group 4A	GeP_3	0.28	0.54 (ind.)	5.21	
	SnP_3	0.45	$0.71 \ (ind.)$	5.00	
	PbP_3	0.55	0.84 (ind.)	4.66	
	AsP_3	1.89	2.61 (ind.)	6.19	
Group 5A	SbP_3	1.64	2.34 (ind.)	5.90	
	BiP_3	1.42	2.00 (ind.)	5.31	

Table II: Electronic band gap E_{gap} calculated within the GGA-PBE and HSE06 and work function within HSE. All calculations include SOC.

The work function is one critical parameter in electronic and optoelectronic devices. Work function and electron affinity are among the most important properties of semiconductors, which play essential roles in functional properties and device performance once interfaces or junctions are involved, such as metal-semiconductor junctions in devices or hetero/homojunctions for photovoltaic cells.

Moreover, the role of the exchange-correlation functional was also addressed. Because PBE tends to underestimate the band gap, we have used the HSE functional with 25% Hartree-Fock exchange to perform band structure calculations. The electronic band gap varies drastically from from GGA-PBE to HSE. For example, the difference increases 27% for AsP₃ and 48,% for GeP₃, highlighting the importance of correct exchange-correlation treatment.

The work function is the energy needed to remove an electron from the surface of a solid to the vacuum level. Here, we report a large modulation of the work function in XP₃ by changing the X atom. In Table II we can see that the work function varies from 4.65-6.19 eV. As matter of comparison, in XP₃, the small value we find is comparable to the lower limit of graphene work function, reported to be 4.30 eV [50, 51]. In other semiconductors, the work function for p-type (n-type) Si is 4.55-4.74 eV (4.63-4.66) eV. We therefore expect that even large work function modifications can be achieved in XP₃ materials by surface adsorption.



Figure 2: Orbital projected band structure of XP₃ compounds calculated within DFT-HSE06. Red: p_x , green: p_y and blue: p_z . The size of the dots is proportional to the orbital contribution to the state. The horizontal dotted line is the work function value. All calculations include SOC.

In Fig. 3 we can see that the charge is more localized on the phosphor atom.



R













Figure 3: Projected charge at LUMO of $\rm XP_3$ structures. The isosurface is equal to 0.002 $\rm e/Å^3.$

III. MOLECULAR DYNAMICS SIMULATIONS

In order to In Fig.4 we show the AIMD calculations for XP_3 (X= Ga, In, Tl, Ge, Sn, Pb, As, Bi, Sb) structures. Snapshots were taken at the final step at 10 ps. One can see that all structures maintain the hexagonal symmetry. However, the bonds are somewhat distorted from the pristine structure, indicating the metastability of XP_3 monolayers at room temperature. In Fig.5 we show the total energy profile of the AIMD calculations for XP_3 monolayers for 10 ps simulation time. In Fig.6 we show the total energy profile of the AIMD calculations for XP_3 monolayers for 10 ps simulation time. In Fig.6 we show the total energy profile of the AIMD calculations for XP_3 monolayers for 10 ps simulation time. Surprisingly the TlP₃ monolayer shows a strong distortion, apparently yielding to a phase separation of the P and Tl layers. Further investigations need to be performed to understand why the phase segregation occurs.



Figure 4: AIMD calculations for XP_3 (X= Ga, In, Tl, Ge, Sn, Pb, As, Bi, Sb) structures. Snapshots shown at 10 ps.



Figure 5: Total energy profile of AIMD calculations for XP_3 (X= Ga, In, Tl, Ge, Sn, Pb, As, Bi, Sb) monolayers.



Figure 6: Radial distribution function extracted from the AIMD calculations for XP_3 (X= Ga, In, Tl, Ge, Sn, Pb, As, Bi, Sb) monolayers.

IV. EXCITONIC AND OPTICAL PROPERTIES

The excitonic effects are fundamental for an accurate description of the linear optical response in 2D materials. [52, 53] Due the significant quantum confinement in their non-

		E_g (eV)	E_g^d (eV)	Ex_{gs} (eV)	Ex_{gs}^d (eV)	$Ex_b \text{ (meV)}$
Group III	GaP_3	1.44	1.61	1.10	1.47	334.91
	InP_3	1.31	1.31	1.16	1.27	148.84
	TlP_3	0.89	0.95	0.56	0.56	334.43
Group IV	GeP_3	0.53	1.12	0.18	0.65	347.43
	SnP_3	0.70	1.38	0.34	0.87	358.22
	PbP_3	0.83	1.43	0.50	0.98	328.93
Group V	AsP_3	2.59	2.72	2.37	2.49	211.84
	BiP_3	1.97	2.23	1.85	1.89	123.42
	SbP_3	2.31	2.46	2.07	2.14	242.60

periodic direction, these quasi-particle effects can results in a significant optical band gap red-shift around 100 meV to 500 meV.[53–55]

Table III: Excitonic properties obtained using MLWF-TB+BSE at DFT-HSE06: fundamental band gap E_g , direct band gap E_g^d , exciton ground state Ex_{gs} and direct exciton ground state Ex_{gs}^d . The exciton binding energy Ex_b is calculated as $E_g - Ex_{gs}$. All calculations include SOC.

We start our investigation of the excitonic effects in XP₃ monolayers from the exciton band structure, shown in Fig. 7, the exciton binding energy (Ex_b) was estimated by the difference of the fundamental band gap (E_g) and the exciton ground state (Ex_{gs}) energies, shown in Table III. As expected, for all monolayers, except TlP₃ the exciton ground state was indirect (i.e out of Γ point), which can be justified from the indirect electronic band gap of these system, being, in this case, InP₃ the only exception, as it is a direct band gap semiconductor. This kind of behavior for TlP₃ and InP₃ was not common, but similar cases was previously reported in the literature,[56–58] being justified by the different Coulomb strength in each electron-hole pair and its correspondent wave-functions. In group III for GaP₃ and TlP₃ the exciton binding energy lies around 330 meV, a behavior that is different from InP₃ that has 148.84 meV, a difference that could be justified by its direct electronic band gap nature and the electrons and holes wavefunctions. In group IV for the 3 monolayers Ex_b lies in the range of 328.93 meV to 358.22 meV and in Group V 123.42 meV to 242.60 meV, showing that the exciton binding energy is high dependent of XP₃ chemical composition. These presence of indirect excitonic ground state, also indicates the possibility of phonon-assisted optical transitions, which absorption peaks with excitation energies lowers than the ones predicted by the optical band gap (estimated by the direct excitonic ground state Ex_{qs}^d) at BSE level.



Figure 7: Exciton band structure of a) GaP_3 , (b) InP_3 , (c) TlP_3 d) GeP_3 , (e) SnP_3 and (f) PbP_3 (g) AsP_3 , (h) BiP_3 and (i) SbP_3 . All calculations were carried out using MLWF-TB+BSE at DFT-HSE06 and include SOC.

Complementary we can also see that for Group III and IV, the exciton ground state was degenerated and localized in the vicinity of K and K' high symmetry points, except for TlP₃

which was located at Γ . For Group V the behavior is different, with a degenerated excitonic ground state located between Γ and K/K' high symmetry points, except for AsP₃ where it is non-degenerated and located between K and K' points. This degeneracy for the excitonic states at K/K' can be justified by the time-reversal symmetry in these monolayers.



Figure 8: Absorption coefficients for XP₃ compounds at IPA (dashed curves) and BSE (solid curves). The results for response to a linear polarized light along \hat{x} (blue curves) and \hat{y} (red curves) directions are shown.

The linear optical response was shown through the absorption coefficient, considering an

incident polarized light at \hat{x} (blue curves) and \hat{y} (red curves) directions, depicted in Fig. 8 at IPA (dashed curves) and BSE (solid curves) levels, these results are complemented by the refractive index and reflectibility in SI section S4. The absorption spectrum also shows that Group III and V absorbs in the visible and UV regions, except for TlP₃ that also absorbs in the infrared region; Group V in infrared and visible regions, with a weak optical response in UV region. At IPA level group IV and group V, except from AsP₃ are isotropic, in group III all monolayers are anisotropic. When quasi-particle effects are considered a small optical anisotropy emerges in the isotropic systems, despite the linear response at \hat{x} and \hat{y} are not so much different. For all systems we can easily observes the red-shift in the optical band gap due excitonic effects, despite the optical anisotropy, the optical band gap doesn't changes due incident light polarization, excitonic effects also lowers the absorption coefficient for higher photon excitations, an effect that could be expected due the optical band gap red-shift.

V. INSIGHTS INTO SOLAR HARVESTING EFFICIENCY

The XP₃ monolayer solar harvesting efficiency was estimated by the PCE, calculated at IPA and BSE levels, using the SQ-limit [43] and SLME [44] methods, as shown in Table IV. In SQ-limit the PCE was estimate straightforwardly from the optical band gap from IPA and BSE calculations, in SLME approach beyond the optical band gap, we also need additional factors such as layer thickness, the nature of the fundamental band gap (IPA) or excitonic ground state (BSE) and the monolayer total absorption spectrum. It's also important to understand that the present results, corresponds to the superior limit of the solar harvesting efficiency of these materials, and other engineering problems in the solar device can lowers these values. Achieving values closer to the shown upper limit can often requires years of research, being one example the case of MaPbI₃ perovskite which has a significant increase of experimental PCE in the last decade being from 3.8% to 25.2%.[59, 60]

			IPA		BSE			
	System	PCE ^{SLME}	PCE_{max}^{SLME}	PCE ^{SQ}	PCE ^{SLME}	PCE_{max}^{SLME}	PCE^{SQ}	
Group III	GaP_3	0.10	25.24	29.53	0.09	20.99	31.65	
	InP_3	0.18	32.23	32.23	0.18	27.92	31.88	
	TlP_3	1.03	26.81	29.68	0.64	15.70	15.70	
Group IV	GeP_3	0.36	7.87	32.18	0.00	0.05	19.57	
	SnP_3	0.70	10.75	32.62	0.14	2.17	26.64	
	PbP_3	0.86	13.83	32.09	0.40	8.02	30.03	
Group V	AsP_3	0.07	7.70	8.22	0.10	11.71	12.45	
	BiP_3	0.22	14.99	17.58	0.29	23.86	24.62	
	SbP_3	0.12	12.04	13.03	0.15	18.54	19.38	

Table IV: Maximum achieved PCE at the IPA and BSE levels, PCE^{SLME} (%), power conversion efficiency determined by SLME and considering that 100 % of photon absorbance starts from direct band gap, PCE^{SLME}_{max} (%) obtained in the Shockley–Queisser limit (considering direct band gap), and PCE^{SQ} (%), all calculated at T = 300 K.

At SQ-Limit the PCE^{SQ} lies between 29% to 32% at IPA and 15% to 31% at BSE levels for Group III and IV, in Group V these values are lower, lying between 7% to 14% at IPA and 12% to 19% at BSE levels. However these values can be not realistic for Group IV, as SQ-limit assumes that all photons with excitation energies higher or equals the optical band gap are absorbed, but when we look the optical response of this group, we see that it has regions of the visible and UV spectrum that does not show optical absorption.

SLME, as considers the optical absorption spectrum, can provide a more realistic picture of the solar harvesting efficiency of these monolayer. However the PCE^{SLME} values are much smaller than the ones obtained from SQ-limit, showing values lowers than 2% independent of IPA or BSE levels, for all monolayers. These huge difference can be attributed to the small thickness of these monolayers, which consequently results in a lower absorbance rate of these materials, which means that the material only absorbs a small fraction of the incident photons. This characteristic makes the material practically transparent, posing a significant challenge for their applications in photovoltaic devices.

Indeed the application of light trapping techniques, as proposed by Jariwala and coworkers, 61 offers a promising solution to enhance the absorbance of 2D materials, which can potentially boost their solar harvesting performance, achieving an absorbance rate closer to 100%. To address this scenario, we considered the application of SLME method (PCE_{max}^{SLME}) that approximates the absorbance curve, by a Heaviside function, in the same way of SQ-limit, but also considering the recombination fraction obtained in SLME from the difference of direct and fundamental band gaps in IPA and excitonic ground state and direct excitonic ground states, which lowers the PCE when compared with SQ-limit results (PCE^{SQ}). In Group III PCE^{SLME}_{max} lies in the range of 15.70 % to 27.62 % (25.24 % to 32.23 %) at BSE(IPA), Group IV 0.005% to 8.02%(7.87% to 13.83%) at BSE(IPA) and Group V $11.71\,\%$ to $23.86\,\% (7.70\,\%$ to $14.99\,\%)$ at BSE (IPA). The huge difference from $\mathrm{PCE}_{max}^{\mathrm{SLME}}$ and PCE^{SQ} are justified from the recombination fraction, as for the majority of these systems the electronic band gap and excitonic ground state are indirect, in group IV this was also justified by the small or null absorption coefficient in parts of visible and UV spectrum. $\rm InP_3,~GaP_3$ and $\rm BiP_3$ shows a good solar harvesting efficiency around 20 % - 30 %, being attractive for solar cell applications.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we use density-functional theory and molecular dynamics simulations to investigate the thermal, electronic and optical properties of triphosphide based twodimensional materials (XP₃). We find that with exception of InP₃, all structures have indirect band gap. Furthermore, all systems show strong excitonic effects. We show that mono-layered XP₃ exhibits optical absorption with strong excitonic effects. In particular, the exciton binding energy is significantly large for X = Ga, Tl, Ge, Sn and Pb. Finally, AIMD calculations show that 2D-XP₃ is stable at room temperature, with exception of TlP₃ monolayer, which shows a strong distortion yielding to a phase separation of the P and Tl layers. Finally, we show that InP₃, GaP₃ and BiP₃ shows a good solar harvesting efficiency around 20 % - 30 %, being attractive for solar cell applications.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the financial support from the Brazilian funding agency CNPq under grant numbers 305174/2023-1, 313081/2017-4, 305335/2020-0, 309599/2021-0, 408144/2022-0, 305952/2023-4, 444069/2024-0 and 444431/2024-1. A.C.D also acknowledge FAPDF grants numbers 00193-00001817/2023-43 and 00193-00002073/2023-84. A.C.D and A.L.R also acknowledges DPG-FAPDF-CAPES Centro-Oeste grant 00193-00000867/2024-94. We thank computational resources from LaMCAD/UFG, Santos Dumont/LNCC, CENAPAD-SP/Unicamp (project number 897 and 761) and Lobo Carneiro HPC (project number 133).

- J. Gao, G. Zhang, and Y.-W. Zhang, Journal of the American Chemical Society 138, 4763 (2016).
- [2] H. Liu, A. T. Neal, Z. Zhu, Z. Luo, X. Xu, D. Tománek, and P. D. Ye, ACS nano 8, 4033 (2014).
- [3] J. O. Island, G. A. Steele, H. S. van der Zant, and A. Castellanos-Gomez, 2D Materials 2, 011002 (2015).
- [4] L. Qiu, J. Dong, and F. Ding, Nanoscale 10, 2255 (2018).
- [5] J. Qiao, X. Kong, Z.-X. Hu, F. Yang, and W. Ji, Nature communications 5, 1 (2014).
- [6] N. Lu, Z. Zhuo, H. Guo, P. Wu, W. Fa, X. Wu, and X. C. Zeng, The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters 9, 1728 (2018).
- [7] L. Li, Y. Yu, G. J. Ye, Q. Ge, X. Ou, H. Wu, D. Feng, X. H. Chen, and Y. Zhang, Nature nanotechnology 9, 372 (2014).
- [8] V. Chaudhary, P. Neugebauer, O. Mounkachi, S. Lahbabi, and A. E. Fatimy, 2D Materials 9, 032001 (2022).
- [9] J. Yang, R. Xu, J. Pei, Y. W. Myint, F. Wang, Z. Wang, S. Zhang, Z. Yu, and Y. Lu, Light: Science & Applications 4, e312 (2015).
- [10] E. Carré, L. Sponza, A. Lusson, I. Stenger, E. Gaufrès, A. Loiseau, and J. Barjon, 2D Materials
 8, 021001 (2021).
- [11] X. Wang, A. M. Jones, K. L. Seyler, V. Tran, Y. Jia, H. Zhao, H. Wang, L. Yang, X. Xu, and F. Xia, Nature Nanotechnology 10, 517–521 (2015).

- [12] S. Yao, X. Zhang, Z. Zhang, A. Chen, and Z. Zhou, International Journal of Hydrogen Energy 44, 5948 (2019).
- [13] Z. Sun, K. Yuan, Z. Chang, S. Bi, X. Zhang, and D. Tang, Nanoscale 12, 3330 (2020).
- [14] D. P. de A. Deus, I. S. S. de Oliveira, J. a. B. Oliveira, W. a. L. Scopel, and R. H. Miwa, Phys. Rev. Mater. 5, 054002 (2021).
- [15] Y. Jing, Y. Ma, Y. Li, and T. Heine, Nano Letters 17, 1833 (2017), pMID: 28125237.
- [16] M. S. Ramzan, V. Bacic, Y. Jing, and A. Kuc, The Journal of Physical Chemistry C 123, 25470 (2019).
- [17] S. A. Asghar, A. Jalil, N. U. Ain, and A. Kanwal, New J. Chem. 48, 10599 (2024).
- [18] D. Liu, C. Fang, Q. Zhang, X. Zhang, X. Cui, C. Shi, J. Xu, and M. Yang, Langmuir 39, 12890 (2023).
- [19] Y.-Y. Wu, Q. Wei, J. Zou, and H. Yang, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 23, 19834 (2021).
- [20] H.-Y. Liu, C.-L. Yang, M.-S. Wang, and X.-G. Ma, Applied Surface Science 501, 144263 (2020).
- [21] Y. Jing, Y. Ma, Y. Li, and T. Heine, Nano Letters 17, 1833 (2017).
- [22] I. S. de Oliveira, E. N. Lima, R. H. Miwa, and D. Pacine, Applied Surface Science 662, 160041 (2024).
- [23] X. Cheng, Z. Ji, X. Yang, X. Wang, D. Han, M. Wang, and W. Ding, Materials Science in Semiconductor Processing 176, 108332 (2024).
- [24] Y.-Y. Wu, Q. Wei, J. Zou, and H. Yang, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 23, 19834 (2021).
- [25] A. A. Sara, X. Cai, X. Li, and H. Wang, physica status solidi (b) 260, 2300235 (2023), https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/pssb.202300235.
- [26] Z. Sun, K. Yuan, Z. Chang, S. Bi, X. Zhang, and D. Tang, Nanoscale 12, 3330 (2020).
- [27] B. Lu, X. Zheng, and Z. Li, ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces 12, 53731 (2020).
- [28] Q. Si and F. Steglich, Science **329**, 1161 (2010), https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1191195.
- [29] D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, and A. C. Gossard, Physical Review Letters 48, 1559–1562 (1982).
- [30] Y. e. a. Cao, Nature **556**, 43–50 (2018).
- [31] Y. Chang, B. Wang, Y. Huo, K. Zhai, L. Liu, P. Li, A. Nie, C. Mu, J. Xiang, Z. Zhao, F. Wen,Z. Liu, and Y. Tian, Journal of Power Sources 438, 227010 (2019).
- [32] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzenhof, Physical review (1996).
- [33] J. Heyd and G. E. Scuseria, The Journal of chemical physics **121**, 1187 (2004).

- [34] G. Kresse and J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B 48, 13115 (1993).
- [35] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B 54, 11169 (1996).
- [36] P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 17953 (1994).
- [37] H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Physical review B 13, 5188 (1976).
- [38] C. A. Rozzi, D. Varsano, A. Marini, E. K. U. Gross, and A. Rubio, Physical Review B 73 (2006), 10.1103/physrevb.73.205119.
- [39] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. 84, 1232 (1951).
- [40] A. C. Dias, J. F. Silveira, and F. Qu, Computer Physics Communications 285, 108636 (2023).
- [41] A. A. Mostofi, J. R. Yates, Y.-S. Lee, I. Souza, D. Vanderbilt, and N. Marzari, Computer physics communications 178, 685 (2008).
- [42] ASTM-G173-03, "Standard tables for reference solar spectral irradiances: Direct normal and hemispherical on 37 degree tilted surface, astm international, west conshohocken, pa (2012)," (2012).
- [43] W. Shockley and H. J. Queisser, J. Appl. Phys. 32, 510 (1961).
- [44] L. Yu and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 068701 (2012).
- [45] M. Bernardi, M. Palummo, and J. C. Grossman, Nano Letters 13, 3664 (2013).
- [46] K. Momma and F. Izumi, J. Appl. Crystallogr. 41, 653 (2008).
- [47] .
- [48] I. Hase, T. Yanagisawa, and K. Kawashima, Nanoscale Res. Lett. 13, 63 (2018).
- [49] K. Kobayashi, M. Okumura, S. Yamada, M. Machida, and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B 94, 214501 (2016).
- [50] I. S. de Oliveira, E. N. Lima, R. H. Miwa, and D. Pacine, Applied Surface Science 662, 160041 (2024).
- [51] E. Rut'kov, E. Afanas'eva, and N. Gall, Diamond and Related Materials 101, 107576 (2020).
- [52] S. Haastrup, M. Strange, M. Pandey, T. Deilmann, P. S. Schmidt, N. F. Hinsche, M. N. Gjerding, D. Torelli, P. M. Larsen, A. C. Riis-Jensen, J. Gath, K. W. Jacobsen, J. Jørgen Mortensen, T. Olsen, and K. S. Thygesen, 2D Materials 5, 042002 (2018).
- [53] A. C. Dias, H. Bragança, J. P. A. de Mendonça, and J. L. F. D. Silva, ACS Appl. Energy Mater. 4, 3265 (2021).
- [54] E. A. Moujaes and A. C. Dias, Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids 182, 111573 (2023).

- [55] A. Cavalheiro Dias, C. D. Almeida Cornélio, M. J. Piotrowski, L. A. Ribeiro Júnior, C. M. de Oliveira Bastos, C. R. Caldeira Rêgo, and D. Guedes-Sobrinho, ACS Applied Energy Materials 7, 8572–8582 (2024).
- [56] J. Lu, F. Qu, H. Zeng, A. Cavalheiro Dias, D. S. Bradão, and J. Ren, The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters 13, 5204–5212 (2022).
- [57] W. O. Santos, F. M. O. Moucherek, A. C. Dias, E. Moreira, and D. L. Azevedo, Journal of Applied Physics 134 (2023), 10.1063/5.0156245.
- [58] W. O. Santos, F. M. O. Moucherek, A. C. Dias, E. Moreira, and D. L. Azevedo, Journal of Materials Research 38, 3677–3689 (2023).
- [59] A. Kojima, K. Teshima, Y. Shirai, and T. Miyasaka, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 131, 6050 (2009).
- [60] L. A. Frolova, A. I. Davlethanov, N. N. Dremova, I. Zhidkov, A. F. Akbulatov, E. Z. Kurmaev, S. M. Aldoshin, K. J. Stevenson, and P. A. Troshin, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **11**, 6772 (2020).
- [61] D. Jariwala, A. R. Davoyan, J. Wong, and H. A. Atwater, ACS Photonics 4, 2962 (2017).