Single Nanoflake Photoelectrochemistry Reveals Intrananoflake Doping Heterogeneity That Explains Ensemble-Level Photoelectrochemical Behavior
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ABSTRACT: Transition metal dichalcogenide (TMD) nanoflake thin films are attractive electrode materials for photoelectrochemical (PEC) solar energy conversion and sensing applications, but their photocurrent quantum yields are generally lower than those of bulk TMD electrodes. The poor PEC performance has been primarily attributed to enhanced charge carrier recombination at exposed defect and edge sites introduced by the exfoliation process. Here, a single nanoflake PEC approach reveals how an alternative effect, doping heterogeneity, limits ensemble-level PEC performance. Photocurrent mapping and local photocurrent–potential (i–E) measurements of MoS₂ nanoflakes exfoliated from naturally occurring bulk crystals revealed the presence of n- and p-type domains within the same nanoflake. Interestingly, the n- and p-type domains in the natural MoS₂ nanoflakes were equally efficient for iodide oxidation and tri-iodide reduction (IQE values exceed 80%). At the single domain-level, the natural MoS₂ nanoflakes were nearly as efficient as nanoflakes exfoliated from synthetic n-type MoS₂ crystals. Single domain-level i–E measurements explain why natural MoS₂ nanoflakes exhibit an n-type to p-type photocurrent switching effect in ensemble-level measurements: the n- and p-type diode currents from individual domains oppose each other upon illuminating the entire nanoflake, resulting in zero photocurrent at the switching potential. The doping heterogeneity effect is likely due to nonideal stoichiometry, where p-type domains are S-rich according to XPS measurements. Although this doping heterogeneity effect limits photoanode or photocathode performance, these findings open the possibility to synthesize efficient TMD nanoflake photocatalysts with well-defined lateral p- and n-type domains for enhanced charge separation.
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INTRODUCTION

Transition metal dichalcogenides (TMDs) such as WSe₂ and MoS₂ are promising light harvesting materials for photoelectrochemical (PEC) solar energy conversion applications because they exhibit long-term stability and nearly optimum band gaps for solar photon capture.¹⁻³ One advantage of their layered crystal structure is bulk TMDs can be exfoliated into two-dimensional (2D) nanoflakes and then processed into large-area thin film photoelectrodes.⁴⁻⁸ For example, Wells et al. demonstrated a high-throughput roll-to-roll deposition process that first exfoliates MoS₂ nanoflakes from commercially available powders using solvents and then deposits 10 cm wide films on electrode surfaces.⁹ Advances in mechanical exfoliation have also led to the production of high-quality macroscopic monolayers and artificial heterostructures,¹⁰⁻¹¹ which opens the exciting possibility of creating macroscopic p–n junctions with controllable properties defined by the parent bulk material. Hence, the 2D materials community is advancing large-scale production methods for potentially low-cost and high-performance thin film photoelectrodes.¹²⁻¹⁴

Unfortunately, TMD nanoflake thin films have not achieved the same photoelectrochemical performance as bulk TMDs. In the 1980s, several groups demonstrated efficient bulk TMD|I⁻|I₂|Pt PEC solar cells.¹,³,¹⁵,¹⁶ The PEC solar cells achieved >70% internal quantum efficiency (IQE) at zero applied bias and maintained >10% power conversion efficiency for more than one month of continuous operation.¹,⁵ On the other hand, TMD nanoflake photoelectrodes produce much lower photocurrent densities for the same iodide oxidation reaction even under applied bias. For example, uniform 0.26 cm² MoS₂/WSe₂ nanoflake electrodes produced 40 μA cm⁻² under 100 mW/cm² illumination,⁹ whereas 0.05 cm² bulk MoS₂, WS₂,
and WS\textsubscript{2} electrodes produced 6–10 mA/cm\textsuperscript{2} under 80–90 mW/cm\textsuperscript{2} illumination.\textsuperscript{17} TMD nanoflakes can exhibit high (60–80%) internal quantum efficiency (IQE) values for the iodide oxidation reaction under applied bias,\textsuperscript{18} but the fill factor of nanoflake electrodes is about a factor of 2 worse than that of bulk TMD photoelectrodes.\textsuperscript{1,5,19} Bulk TMDs\textsuperscript{18} also out-perform nanoflakes in the PEC hydrogen evolution reaction.\textsuperscript{11,22} Light absorption differences between bulk and nanoflake photoelectrodes cannot fully account for the significant performance gap.\textsuperscript{5}

One likely contribution to the poor performance of nanoflake photoelectrodes is the high number of exposed defect and edge sites after the exfoliation process.\textsuperscript{18,22} Exposed edge sites of TMD photoanodes were identified as potent recombination centers decades ago.\textsuperscript{4,5,23} Additional single nanoflake-level PEC and electrocatalytic measurements reported performance variations among different basal planes on the same nanoflake.\textsuperscript{33–38} However, the materials chemistry origin of PEC performance variation among nanoflake basal planes has not been elucidated.

One possible explanation for PEC performance variation among apparently smooth basal planes is doping heterogeneity. Hill and co-workers observed anodic to cathodic photocurrent switching behavior for different basal planes of single nanoflakes,\textsuperscript{35,39} suggesting doping heterogeneity exists within the flakes. In the early 1980s, Menezes and Lewerenz reported doping heterogeneity limits the photoelectrochemical efficiency of synthetic bulk TMD crystals.\textsuperscript{40,41} Similarly, Kline and Parkin provided some evidence that bulk MoS\textsubscript{2} and WSe\textsubscript{2} planes to surface defects and impurities.\textsuperscript{18} Bulk TMDs\textsuperscript{18,20} also exhibit poor performance due to the presence of n- and p-type domains within the same nanoflake. Interestingly, the n- and p-type domains were efficient for iodide oxidation and tri-iodide reduction, respectively (IQE values within single flakes exceed 80%). The single nanoflake-level i–E measurements explain the poor ensemble-level photocurrent from the natural MoS\textsubscript{2} nanoflake sample: the n- and p-type diode currents from individual domains oppose each other upon illuminating the entire nanoflake, resulting in a negligible total photocurrent. Although this doping heterogeneity effect limits photoanode or photocathode performance, these findings open the possibility to synthesize TMD nanoflakes with lateral p- and n-type domains for enhanced charge separation efficiency. This approach could be beneficial for photocatalytic applications.

### EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

**Electrode Preparation and Ensemble-Level Electrochemical Measurements.** MoS\textsubscript{2} nanoflake-coated ITO electrodes were prepared by mechanical exfoliation of commercially available bulk MoS\textsubscript{2} crystals: Re-doped n-type MoS\textsubscript{2} (2D semiconductors, BLK-MoS2-N, doping density 10\textsuperscript{12}–10\textsuperscript{15} cm\textsuperscript{-3}) and naturally occurring bulk MoS\textsubscript{2} (SPI, 470MOS2L-AB). In a typical mechanical exfoliation procedure, low residue Nitto tape (BT-150E-CM, Nitto) was manually pressed onto the surface of bulk crystals for 10 min and then gently removed. Gentle, manual pressure was applied to the crystal surface to remove air bubbles. A commercially available gel (Film from Gelpak)\textsuperscript{46} was used to transfer exfoliated MoS\textsubscript{2} from the Nitto tape to a pre-cleaned ITO electrode (4–10 Ω, 25 × 75 × 1.1 mm, Delta Technologies). The ITO cleaning procedure is provided in our previous study.\textsuperscript{18} The nanoflake-coated ITO electrodes were assembled into a three-electrode electrochemical flow cell as described previously.\textsuperscript{18} A Pt wire served as the counter electrode and a Ag/AgI wire was used as the reference electrode. All ensemble-level electrochemical measurements of MoS\textsubscript{2} nanoflake-coated ITO electrodes were performed in 1 M NaI/1 mM I\textsubscript{2} electrolyte. Electrochemical measurements with a polished 7 mm\textsuperscript{2} glassy carbon (GC) disc electrode (CHI Instruments, CH1104) were performed in 3 mM NaI electrolyte. An Ivium potentiostat (CompactStat.h) measured current–voltage curves in a three-electrode configuration. An 8 mW 530 nm LED (ThorLabs, MS503H) illuminated the nanoflake films for ensemble-level measurements.

**Scanning Photoelectrochemical Microscopy.** The electrochemical flow cells were mounted on an Olympus IX73 inverted microscope equipped with confocal Raman and photoelectrochemical mapping capabilities.\textsuperscript{4,19} In this study, 0.30–0.7 μW 415 nm laser light (Oxxius, LBX-415–120-CSB-PPA) was directed through the back port of the microscope, reflected by a 414 nm dichroic mirror (Edmund Optics, 86330) in the filter cube, and aligned on the back aperture of a 60× objective (UPLANSAPO60x/W), yielding a 0.86 μm diameter laser spot (as determined by a knife-edge scan in Figure S1) and a laser power density of 52–121 W/cm\textsuperscript{2}. All photoelectrochemical mapping experiments were performed at fixed 0.600 V vs Ag/AgI, whereas 1 M NaI/1 mM I\textsubscript{2} electrolyte was flowed through the cell at a rate of 25 μL/min. The total current from the electrochemical cell was measured by an Ivium CompactStat potentiostat. The analog current output from the potentiostat was measured by a Measurement Computing Data Acquisition (DAQ) card (USB-1608FS-Plus) at a rate of 25 Hz. At the same time, the DAQ card measured the XY stage position (Marzhauser SCANPlus 1M). The typical step size for mapping experiments was 1 μm. The step size was adjusted to 2 μm for large area nanoflakes (e.g., >6000
μm²). The photocurrent value at each stage position (i.e., pixel) represents the average current during a 400 ms time period, corresponding to 10 data points. The average current from the ITO background pixels was subtracted from the current at each illumination nanoflake location. We correlate the photocurrent and structural images of nanoflakes using our correlated laser reflection-photocurrent mapping procedure (details may be found in the Supporting Information of ref 47). Supporting Information Note 1 of this work describes the detailed image analysis procedures to calculate IQE values from the EQE maps.

**Local Photocurrent–Potential Measurements.** A focused 415 nm laser spot excited 2.3 μm² areas of single nanoflakes to measure local i–E curves. A lock-in detection scheme was used to sensitively measure the photoinduced current from single nanoflakes. In a typical local photocurrent–voltage curve measurement, the excitation laser was chopped at 37 Hz to induce a modulating photocurrent due to iodide oxidation or tri-iodide reduction. The chopper frequency (TTI-C995) and the analog current output from the potentiostat were fed into a Stanford Research Systems SR830 lock-in amplifier. The lock-in detected current was measured at a fixed applied potential and averaged over an 8 s period. The measurement was repeated in 3 mV increments. The signal from the lock-in was converted from arbitrary units to amperes by determining the proportional constant from direct current measurements.

**XPS Characterization.** Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ crystals were freshly cleaved using double-sided conductive carbon tape (Nisshin-EM). The MoS₂-coated tape samples were analyzed in a PHI PE-5800 X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) system. High-resolution XPS spectra of the C, Mo, and S regions were acquired at multiple locations on each sample using an 800 μm² aperture. The spectra were analyzed with PHI Multipak software. The Mo 3d peaks were fit with two mixed Gaussian–Lorentzian peak shapes at a fixed peak separation of 3.13 eV. The S 2p peaks were fit with two mixed Gaussian–Lorentzian peak shapes at a fixed peak separation of 1.1 eV. The C 1s peak was used to correct each spectrum for charging effects.

**Elemental Analysis.** Following Sales et al., Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ were immersed in a vial containing aqueous 3 M HNO₃ solution and the vial was placed in a water bath at 40 °C for 4 days. Mo and S concentrations in each sample were determined via inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) analysis of the acidic solutions (PerkinElmer, Optima 7300 DV). Because solid Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ material remained in the vial after 4 days, we normalized the concentration of dissolved elements to the dissolved Mo content to account for the undissolved solid (following ref 56).

**Electron Microscopy.** The morphology of exfoliated Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ samples were analyzed using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) in a JEOL 6500 FE-SEM electron microscope. SEM images and EDS spectra were acquired with 2 and 15 keV accelerating voltages, respectively.

**RESULTS**

**Photoelectrochemical Characterization.** Synthetic n-type Re-doped MoS₂ and naturally occurring MoS₂ crystals were purchased from 2Dsemiconductors and SPI Supplies, respectively. The crystals were mechanically exfoliated using low residue Nitto Tape and transferred to ITO electrodes with a commercially available gel-film. We refer to these nanoflake-coated ITO electrodes as Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂. Figure 1a, b shows representative optical transmission images of the Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ samples as well as the parent bulk crystals (additional images provided in Figure S2). Mechanical exfoliation produces a heterogeneous distribution of nanoflakes ranging from 25 to 210 μm in diameter and 15–70 nm in thickness. Supporting Information Note 2 describes the procedure for thickness determination. The heterogeneous nanoflake population motivates our single nanoflake-level PEC approach, which allows us to quantitatively compare IQE values of individual Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ nanoflakes that have different light absorption properties.

**Figure 1.** Optical and ensemble-level photoelectrochemical characterization of MoS₂ nanoflake photoelectrodes. Optical transmission images of (a) Re-MoS₂ and (b) SPI-MoS₂. Insets show photographs of the parent bulk crystals. Scale bars represent 100 μm. (c) LSV of Re-MoS₂ (blue) and SPI-MoS₂ (red) nanoflake films in aqueous 1 M NaI/1 mM I₂ electrolyte and under chopped light illumination (8 mW 532 nm LED illuminating a 2.5 cm² area). The black line represents a polished glassy carbon (GC) disk working electrode under dark conditions. The vertical red and blue arrows indicate the photocurrent onset potential (E_on).

**Figure 1c shows current–potential measurements of SPI-MoS₂ (top) and Re-MoS₂ (middle) in aqueous 1 M NaI/1 mM I₂ electrolyte under chopped light conditions. The anodic photocurrent for both samples increases with increasing positive potential, consistent with n-type semiconducting behavior.**

The anodic photocurrent onset potential (E_on) of Re-MoS₂ and SPI-MoS₂ samples were 0.39 and 0.56 V vs Ag/AgCl, respectively (indicated by vertical arrows in Figure 1c). These E_on values occur at more negative potentials than the iodide oxidation reaction on a polished GC disk electrode (Figure 1c, black trace). We also observed an anodic-to-cathodic photocurrent switching effect for SPI-MoS₂ (indicated by E_switch in Figure 1c, top). For potentials more negative than E_switch, SPI-MoS₂ exhibits an increasing cathodic photocurrent with increasing negative potential, consistent with p-type semiconducting behavior. This photocurrent switching has previously been shown for natural MoS₂ by Chen et al. The photocurrent switching behavior suggests SPI-MoS₂ exhibits both p- and n-type photoelectrochemical properties. However, interpreting the ensemble-level observations in Figure 1c is challenging because the measurements do not reveal what fraction of SPI-MoS₂ nanoflakes are either n-type, p-type, or both. In this work, we use single nanoflake-level PEC measurements to address the sample heterogeneity.
issue and explore the origin of the n- and p-type photocurrent response in SPI-MoS2.

Figure 2. Single nanoflake photoelectrochemical measurements of Re-MoS2. (a) Bright-field transmission image, (b) reflection image, and (c) IQE map of a 45 nm thick nanoflake. The IQE map was measured at +0.600 V vs Ag/AgI in aqueous 1 M NaI/1 mM I2 electrolyte using a 860 nm-diameter 0.50 μW 415 nm laser. (d) Histogram of IQE values from the IQE map in c. (e–h) Same as in a–d, but for a 48 nm thick Re-MoS2 nanoflake. All scale bars represent 10 μm.

In a typical single nanoflake PEC experiment, a 415 nm laser excites a 0.86 μm diameter spot on the nanoflake-coated ITO electrode, whereas a potentiostat measures the current of the entire electrochemical cell as a function of laser illumination position. We chose to map the photocurrent at fixed 0.600 V vs Ag/AgI because the photocurrent reaches a light-limited and potential-independent value at this potential, as evidenced by our previous ensemble-level studies and local i–E measurements in Figure 4. IQE mapping with the 415 nm laser measures charge separation and collection efficiency of photogenerated electrons in the space charge region at the solid–liquid interface because the penetration depth (d) of the 415 nm light is 10 nm (d = 1/α(λ) and α(415 nm) = 9 × 105 cm−1) and we estimate from the Mott–Schottky equation that the space charge region thickness is 20 nm at an applied potential of 0.21 V versus the flatband potential (E–E0) and a doping density of 5 × 1017 cm−3. Hence, the photocurrent dominantly stems from photons absorbed within the space charge region under these experimental conditions.

Figure 2a–d shows representative optical images and photocurrent mapping results from a single 45 nm thick Re-MoS2 nanoflake under 415 nm excitation. The optical transmission images reveal differences in flake thickness (Figure 2a), whereas the reflection contrast reveals variations in surface step features (Figure 2b). Comparing the reflection and transmission images to the IQE map in Figure 2c reveals how nanoflake structural properties influence the photocurrent response: the photocurrent is uniform within a single basal plane and decreases when the laser spot moves across step edges. In addition, the dark red contrast at the nanoflake perimeter indicates lower anodic photocurrents at perimeter edge sites. Hence, illuminated edge sites produce lower anodic photocurrents, in agreement with previous spatially resolved measurements of bulk n-type WSe2, WS2, and MoSe2 photoelectrodes that showed edge sites are recombination centers in iodide-based electrolytes. Figure 2d shows the IQE distribution from the nanoflake in Figure 2a–c. The average IQE value is 55.0 ± 8.0% (S.D.), in agreement with IQE values for n-type WSe2 single crystals reported by Kline and Parkinson.1 We observed similarly high IQE values for other nanoflakes (Figure 2e–h). The average IQE from 21 nanoflakes studied herein was 38.2 ± 15.3% (Figure S3). Differences in charge separation efficiency or interfacial charge transfer kinetics could explain the IQE differences between Re-MoS2 nanoflakes of similar thickness (see Figure 2). Spatial variations in bulk or surface defects can influence charge recombination in the space charge region or interfacial charge transfer rates. Another possibility is the nanoflake surface area; larger nanoflakes generally have longer charge transport distances from the illumination spot to perimeter edge sites where electron–hole recombination can occur.

Our group previously mapped 53 mechanically exfoliated MoSe2 nanoflakes and observed 66% of nanoflakes were inactive “spectators”, meaning the flakes did not produce a photocurrent larger than the indium tin oxide (ITO) substrate. In that study, we hypothesized that poor electrical contact between MoSe2 nanoflakes and ITO substrate was responsible for the large spectator population. The results in Figure 2 suggest that poor electrical contact cannot entirely account for the large population of inactive MoSe2 nanoflakes because all active Re-MoS2 nanoflakes in this work share the same contact with the ITO substrate in the MoSe2 study. This work explores an alternative hypothesis to explain the origin of poor photocurrent collection efficiency in mechanically exfoliated nanoflakes: doping heterogeneity in the parent material limits PEC performance.

Photocurrent mapping experiments of SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes revealed strikingly different photoelectrochemical behavior
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than the Re-MoS2 nanoflakes. We classified SPI-MoS2 nanoflake behaviors into three categories: (1) dominant n-type behavior, (2) dominant p-type behavior, and (3) mixed n- and p-type behavior. The categories were quantitatively based on the area fraction of a nanoflake that exhibited an n- or p-type photocurrent response. We defined dominant n-type behavior as >75% of the nanoflake area producing EQE values >1%. Figure 3a shows representative photocurrent mapping results of an n-type SPI-MoS2 nanoflake. The nanoflake exhibits uniform n-type photoactivity across the main basal plane and low or no activity near the perimeter edges. Twelve out of 52 (23%) SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes exhibited similar behavior (Figure S4 shows more examples). The inactive perimeter edges were striking in SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes and were also present in our previous study of MoSe2 nanoflakes. The inactive perimeter edges cannot be explained by the exfoliation process because the Re-MoS2 nanoflakes did not show this effect and undergo the same exfoliation procedure. Instead, the inactive edges in SPI-MoS2 and synthetic MoSe2 are likely due to the doping heterogeneity effects discussed below.

On the other hand, 9 out of 52 (17%) SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes exhibited dominant p-type behavior (Figure 3b and Figure S5). We defined dominant p-type nanoflakes as those flakes with >75% of the nanoflake area producing EQE < −1%. The negative EQE values indicate steady-state cathodic photocurrents due to the photoelectrochemical reduction of I3− and are represented as blue contrast in IQE maps. Interestingly, the mean cathodic IQE of p-type nanoflakes is nearly as efficient as the mean anodic IQE of n-type nanoflakes (Figure 3a-iii vs Figure 3b-iii). We observed no clear trend between IQE and layer thickness for either the n- or p-type domains (Figure S6). This trend indicates that photocurrent generation stems from carriers generated within the 20 nm thick space charge region. These results show the parent SPI-MoS2 crystal contains both n- and p-type domains and the individual domains are nearly equally efficient under focused laser illumination (i.e., upon photoexcitation of a single domain).

Single nanoflake doping-level measurements also revealed intrananoflake doping heterogeneity in SPI-MoS2. For 31 out of 52 nanoflakes, n- and p-type domains appeared within a single nanoflake (Figure 3c-i–iii and more examples in Figure S7). In 39% of nanoflakes, we observed large n- and p-type domains separated by sharp boundaries (Figure 3d,i–iii and more examples in Figure S8). The average fractional areas of the n- and p-type domains were 17 ± 27% and 37 ± 41%, respectively. Of all the nanoflakes with intrananoflake doping heterogeneity, 71% exhibited a mean anodic current response at fixed +0.6 V (Figure 3d-ii). The remaining 29% yielded a net cathodic photocurrent response (Figure 3c-iii). The fact that more nanoflakes exhibit n-type behavior agrees with the net anodic photocurrent magnitude at +0.6 V in ensemble-average photocurrent–voltage curves (Figure 1c, top). The average IQE value of SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes is five times smaller than that of Re-MoS2 (Figure S3b). Interestingly, the locations of the n- and p-type domains in Figure 3c, d did not necessarily correlate with structural features apparent in optical reflection images or transmission images, suggesting that materials chemistry properties influence the local doping heterogeneity instead of physical properties such as layer thickness or step edges. We note that optical transmission and reflection images cannot reveal fine structural details such as monolayer steps and variations in surface terminations at the boundary between n- and p-type domains. Another interesting feature of the mixed behavior nanoflakes is that the average value of the IQE distribution approaches 0% even though the IQE values from the individual n- and p-type regions exceed 10% (Figure 3c-iii). This low average value suggests that, upon illuminating the entire nanoflake, the sum of the photocurrents is nearly zero even though there are highly active n- and p-type domains within the nanoflake.

To further understand how the presence of n- and p-type domains in a single nanoflake contribute to the total nanoflake photocurrent, we measured i–E curves at single domains with a focused laser spot. The filled red circles in Figure 4a show i–E curves from three different n-type domains located on three different SPI-MoS2 nanoflakes. Each curve displays n-type Schottky diode behavior: the photocurrent increases rapidly within 25 mV of €on and increases steadily with increasingly positive potentials. Salvador and Pujadas previously observed a steep rise in initial photocurrent versus applied potential curves that mimic the lock-in detection conditions employed in this work.53 The i–E curves from SPI-MoS2 n-type domains varied more than those from Re-MoS2 (filled blue circles in Figure...
4a). As a result, the distribution of \( E_{\text{on}} \) values from natural SPI-MoS\(_2\) nanoflakes was significantly larger than that on synthetic Re-MoS\(_2\) nanoflakes (filled red versus filled blue circles in Figure 4b). Chaparro et al. also reported variations in \( E_{\text{on}} \) and \( i^{-E} \) curve shapes from different regions of bulk n-WSe\(_2\) and n-MoSe\(_2\) crystals.\(^{43}\) Figure 4b quantitatively compares \( E_{\text{on}} \) values from SPI-MoS\(_2\) and Re-MoS\(_2\). The average \( E_{\text{on}} \) value of Re-MoS\(_2\) was about 100 mV more negative than SPI-MoS\(_2\) (0.223 ± 0.004 V versus 0.316 ± 0.032 V, see diamond symbols in Figure 4b). As \( E_{\text{on}} \) is equivalent to \( E_F \) for ideal semiconductor/electrolyte interfaces (i.e., \( E_{\text{on}} \approx E_F = E_0 - \frac{E_F^0}{I/I_0} \)),\(^{54}\) the more negative \( E_{\text{on}} \) value for Re-MoS\(_2\) is likely due to a more negative Fermi level position on the electrochemical scale (\( E_F \)) as a result of higher doping density in the synthetic Re-doped crystals.

The \( i^{-E} \) curves from p-type domains display p-type Schottky diode behavior: the cathodic current rises sharply at \( E_{\text{on}} \) and increases steadily with increasingly negative potentials (open red circles in Figure 4a). The \( i^{-E} \) curves from the natural SPI-MoS\(_2\) varied significantly from domain to domain, yielding a large distribution of \( E_{\text{on}} \) values (open red circles in Figure 4b). The differences between the individual \( i^{-E} \) curves are likely due to spatial variations in doping density as well as bulk or surface defects that can influence charge recombination in the space charge region or interfacial charge transfer rates.\(^{39,52}\) The average \( E_{\text{on}} \) value from the p-type domains was 0.831 ± 0.021 V. Importantly, none of the single domain \( i^{-E} \) curves from SPI-MoS\(_2\) exhibited a photocurrent switching effect that was apparent in the ensemble-level measurement in Figure 1c. Therefore, the photocurrent switching effect observed at the ensemble-level in Figure 1c is likely caused by summing n- and p-type domain currents, which will be discussed below.

**Materials Characterization.** To understand the origin of doping heterogeneity in SPI-MoS\(_2\), we analyzed the morphol-
ogy and composition of Re-MoS2 and SPI-MoS2 samples using ICP-AES, SEM-EDS, and XPS. Elemental analysis did not show significant composition variations between the samples (Table S1). If impurities are responsible for the p-type domains in SPI-MoS2, then they are likely present in less than parts per billion concentrations, which is lower than the detection limit of the ICP-AES instrument. The flake morphologies appear qualitatively similar in SEM images (Figure S9) and no significant composition differences between the samples were observed in SEM-EDS, in agreement with the ICP-AES elemental analysis results.

XPS analysis revealed major differences between Re-MoS2 and SPI-MoS2. Figure 5a shows XPS spectra of the Mo 3d region measured from three different 800 μm² regions of freshly cleaved Re-MoS2. The peak positions did not depend on sample position and the average binding energy from three locations was 229.0 ± 0.03 eV. On the other hand, the Mo 3d spectra from SPI-MoS2 crystals vary from location to location (Figure 5b). Figure 5c compares the Mo 3d5/2 peak binding energy values from different regions of Re-MoS2 and SPI-MoS2 (see Figure S10 for S peak fitting results). The SPI-MoS2 Mo 3d5/2 peak binding energy varies from 230.0 to 228.5 eV, whereas the Re-MoS2 peak binding energy remains constant at 229.0 eV. For the SPI-MoS2 sample, the peak shifts are accompanied by changes in the S:Mo atomic ratio (indicated by the large red oval in Figure 5d). The Mo 3d5/2 peak shifts to lower binding energy are correlated with higher S:Mo ratios. McDonnell et al. reported that this peak shift to lower binding energy can be explained by S-rich, p-type domains.65,66 In this scenario, the peak shifts to lower binding energy because the Fermi level moves toward the valence band. The shifts in Mo binding energy are not attributed to a new chemical state as similar shifts in binding energy are observed for S 2p spectra. On the other hand, the Re-MoS2 data localizes to a constant binding energy and S:Mo ratio (indicated by the small blue oval in Figure 5d).

### DISCUSSION

Here we (1) discuss the likely origin and mechanism of doping heterogeneity in SPI-MoS2, and (2) describe how the n- and p-type diode response of individual domains contributes to the total current of a single nanoflake.

Nonideal stoichiometry likely causes the doping heterogeneity in SPI-MoS2. Our XPS data showed a sample location-dependent correlation between the S:Mo ratio and the Mo 3d5/2 peak binding energy (Figure 5). In 1968, Upadhyayula et al. linked the presence of excess chalcogen to p-type conductivity in synthetic WSe2 crystals,67 suggesting that the S-rich locations of the SPI-MoS2 crystal studied herein are responsible for p-type photoelectrochemical behavior. Recent scanning tunneling spectroscopy (STS) and XPS measurements of SPI-MoS2 crystals showed similar trends: S-rich regions of MoS2 exhibit p-type behavior.65 In addition, the Mo 3d and S 2p binding energies shifted to lower binding energy in S-rich regions, in agreement with our data in Figure 5. In 1981, Menezes and Lewerenz first demonstrated how the doping heterogeneity effect influenced photoelectrochemical performance in a 1/1 electrolyte similar to the one employed in this work.40 The authors showed n- and p-type domains coexist in synthetic WSe2 photoelectrodes grown by chemical vapor transport. The 0.06 mm² 633 nm laser spot in those experiments was 10⁴ times larger than the light spot employed herein, which prevented direct observation and quantification of domain sizes. Regardless, Menezes et al. attributed the doping heterogeneity to variations in Se concentration or segregation of impurities. The doping heterogeneity effect was also reported for other TMD materials and growth methods.48

Multiple mechanisms can explain the doping heterogeneity effect in bulk TMDs. Santosh et al. attributed n-type doping properties of MoS2 to S vacancies.59 The S vacancies produce defect states within the band gap, 0.6 eV below the conduction band minimum (CBM). These defect donor levels can contribute to the n-type character of S-deficient domains. However, other reports have disputed this mechanism.60–64 Zhang et al. showed that S vacancies led to the formation of acceptor states just above the valence band maximum (VBM) and an upward shift of the VBM by 0.2 eV toward the Fermi level, consistent with p-type doping.65 The STS study of the same SPI-MoS2 crystals employed herein provide strong evidence that S-rich regions exhibit p-type doping behavior, suggesting the former mechanism can explain doping heterogeneity in these naturally occurring crystals. An alternative hypothesis is that a surface defect layer induces an inverted charge separation effect, as has been reported in Cu2O nanoparticle photocatalysts.66 However, we did not observe a thickness-dependent doping heterogeneity effect (Figure S6) that would likely be consistent with that mechanism. Regardless of the exact mechanism responsible for doping heterogeneity in these natural crystals, our spatially resolved i−E measurements revealed the presence of n- and p-type domains within single exfoliated MoS2 nanoflakes and quantified the distribution of domain sizes.

Differences in materials chemistry properties between the samples are the likely origin of the performance gap, rather than the sample preparation procedure. Both samples were mechanically exfoliated with low residue Nitto tape, consistent with literature.46 The exfoliated Re-MoS2 nanoflakes are highly active for photoelectrochemical iodide oxidation, as evidenced by IQE values on par with single-crystal MoS2 photoelectrodes.67 Hence, we conclude that the exfoliation procedure produces high-quality TMD nanoflakes and is likely not responsible for the differences between Re-MoS2 and SPI-MoS2.

Finally, we discuss how the photoelectrochemical properties of individual domains contribute to the total current under whole-flake illumination. If we illuminate an entire nanoflake, then the total nanoflake current will be the sum of the individual n- and p-type diode currents. The single domain i−E measurements in Figure 4 show that the diode characteristics vary from domain to domain (i.e., onset potentials, ideality factors, and photocurrent saturation values). In the ensemble-level measurement, the large light spot illuminates an unknown number of domains with distinct diode characteristics. Scheme 1 schematically shows the summation current (solid black line) for two domains with different n- and p-type diode characteristics (dashed orange and blue lines, respectively). The summation current is an s-shaped curve that qualitatively agrees with the ensemble-average photoelectrochemical behavior, including the photocurrent switching effect, in Figure 1c (red line in Scheme 1). E_{switch} occurs about halfway between the E_{on} values of the n- and p-type domains.

This photocurrent averaging effect (i.e., summing n- and p-type diode current from neighboring n- and p-type domains) can also explain performance variation among apparently smooth basal planes. When the domain sizes become smaller.
Scheme 1. Schematic Explanation of How Individual n- and p-type Domain Currents with Different Idiety Factors and Onset Potentials Contribute to the Ensemble-Level Photoelectrochemical Behavior

“The dot-dashed lines represent n- and p-type diode curves from individual domains, under constant illumination. The black line represents the sum of the individual curves. The red line is the ensemble-level experimental data for SPI-MoS2 under chopped illumination, from Figure 1c.

than the laser spot size in our photocurrent mapping experiments, the photocurrent averaging effect occurs even though the illumination spot is very small. In this case, the small photocurrent will be assigned to the pixel in the photocurrent map, contributing to performance variation within apparently smooth basal places (see Figure 3c-ii).

■ CONCLUSION

TMD nanoflake electrodes exhibit lower PEC performance than bulk TMDs. Single nanoflake-level IQE mapping revealed n- and p-type domains within single nanoflakes. Average IQE values from single domains exceeded 60%, indicating that the individual n- and p-type domains were efficient for iodide oxidation and tri-iodide reduction, respectively. Single domain i-E curves showed diode-like responses that do not appear in the ensemble-level photoelectrochemical measurement. We propose that the sum of the n- and p-type diode currents cause the low ensemble-average PEC current response. XPS measurements indicate that the origin of the n- and p-type domains is likely nonideal stoichiometry within the parent crystal. Our findings contribute to the understanding of the origin of the performance gap between bulk and nanoflake TMD photoelectrodes. Furthermore, our work suggests that it may be possible to synthesize nanoflakes with lateral p-n junctions to enhance charge separation in TMD photocatalysts.
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