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1. Introduction

2D materials have become attractive for overcoming the bottleneck that causes efficiency degradation in nanoscale electronic devices such as thin-film transistors,[1] supercapacitors,[2] and photodetectors[3,4] as a result of reducing the particle size of bulk materials to the nanoscale. Compared with conventional bulk semiconductors such as Si, 2D materials have relatively high stability, dangling-bond-free surfaces, and ultrathin atomic-scale thickness. Here, the interface of Au and monolayer MoS$_2$ was chosen for investigation. Au is broadly used for electrodes with high stability under ambient conditions, whereas MoS$_2$ is a 2D material in the transition metal dichalcogenide (TMD) family. Because of its abundance, nontoxicity, and excellent electrical properties,[1,5] MoS$_2$ has been widely studied. It can also be synthesized into large-area thin films. The high electrical contact resistance at the metal/2D material interface can be tuned through changes in the interfacial properties. Here, it is found that a) the thermal and electrical conductance of the Au/MoS$_2$ monolayer interface can be tuned by changing the interfacial chemical properties through N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) wet cleaning while preserving the MoS$_2$ structure; b) the effectiveness of the NMP cleaning process, which removes surface adsorbates, exhibits a temperature dependence; c) experimental results demonstrate that adequate oxygen adsorbates at the Au/MoS$_2$ interface significantly improve the thermal and electrical conductance, in agreement with the simulation results. The interfacial thermal conductance increases by 339.87% when oxygen adsorbates are partially removed and decreases by 74.37% as a sharp interface exists (oxygen adsorbates are removed) compared to the as-deposited interfaces. The electrical conductance shows up to 2 order increase after NMP cleaning. This finding can both enhance the heat dissipation in functional devices and provide new options for the interface design of thin films.
through phase or doping engineering.[6–8] An ultrahigh vacuum (10⁻⁷ Torr) metal deposition process is suggested to ensure high interface quality at the metal/2D material junction, which yields a threefold increase in the electrical contact conductance.[10]

Thermal management and heat transport at the metal/2D material interface have attracted less attention than electrical performance. Nevertheless, poor heat dissipation exacerbates the degradation of devices as their dimensionality is reduced. Interfacial heat transport is sensitive to the material structure and chemical bonding; therefore, vacancies, interstitial impurities, and adsorbrates on the MoS₂ surface will affect the thermal conductance. To ensure uniformity and cleanliness of large-area semiconductor devices, a wet chemical cleaning process is commonly used. N-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP), which is used for cleaning and transferring 2D materials or layered materials via liquid-phase exfoliation, is a good hydrophilic solvent for enhancing the interfacial quality of metal/MoS₂.[11–13] Lan and co-workers have reported that NMP cleaning can improve the electrical performance of monolayer MoS₂ field-effect transistors.[14] However, whether NMP modifies the thermal properties of the metal/2D material interface is unclear.

MoS₂ is a promising thermoelectric material because of its unique density of states (DOS), which can enhance the Seebeck coefficient and result in a power factor as large as 8.5 mW m⁻¹ K⁻² for a bilayer MoS₂ variant at room temperature.[15] Thermoelectric properties can be improved through phonon engineering,[16] engineering of the strain effect,[17] and introducing various dopants for p- and n-type materials.[18,19] We previously proposed an interface design of inorganic composite thin films via machine learning and nanostructure optimization to achieve ultralow thermal conductivity for thermally insulating thin films or thermoelectric materials.[20,21] The machine learning techniques can accelerate the material exploration for development[22–24] and efficiency management of long-term control.[25,26] This strategy holds promise for reducing the total thermal conductivity along the cross-plane direction via nanoengineering for metal/MoS₂ interfaces, which exhibit low thermal conductance. The metal can preserve the electrical conductance, and the metal/MoS₂ interfaces can impede heat transfer to ensure a low thermal conductivity.

Here, we demonstrate a tunable interfacial thermal and electrical conductance effect across a metal/MoS₂ monolayer using the NMP cleaning method. We used density functional theory (DFT) calculations to show that the amounts of oxygen adsorbates at the Au/MoS₂ interface affect the thermoelectric properties of the material: medium oxygen adsorbate contents (25–50%) correspond to materials with better thermal and electrical conductivities. Therefore, we used the NMP wet cleaning method to remove adsorbates at the Au/MoS₂ interfaces. We found that the cleaning efficiency of NMP is temperature dependent and that, remarkably, the experimental results agree with the simulation results. The atomic binding, structure, and tensile strain properties that affect the thermal and electrical conductance at the metal/MoS₂ monolayer interface were characterized by Raman spectroscopy, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS), and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The tunability of the thermal resistance was verified using frequency-domain thermoreflectance (FDTR).[27] and the device electrical resistance at the Au/MoS₂ interface was analyzed.

2. Results and Discussion

2.1. Simulation Results

The effect of different amounts of oxygen adsorbates or contaminants on the thermal and electrical conductance at the Au/MoS₂ interface were first analyzed via DFT calculations. The constructed unit cell of the Au/MoS₂ has a thickness of ≈1.9 nm; the unit cells with various oxygen percentages are shown in Figure 1a. Because the simulation is based on a periodic structure, which behaves more like a Au/MoS₂ composite, a direct comparison of the simulation and experimental values is not possible. However, the simulation results can be used to analyze the effect of various oxygen amounts on the thermal and electrical properties in the Au/MoS₂ systems. In order to easily analyze the simulated results, here, the relaxation time (τ) of all structures is assumed to be constant. We compared the tendency of thermal conductivity/relaxation time (κ/τ) and electrical conductivity/relaxation time (σ/τ), and the units are W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ s⁻¹ and Ω⁻¹ m⁻¹ s⁻¹, respectively. The simulated κ/τ, σ/τ, and Seebeck coefficient versus temperature in the range from 100 to 500 K are shown in Figure 1b–d. The percentages of oxygen adsorbates (surface coverage) at the Au/MoS₂ interfaces are 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%.

The κ/τ of all of the samples increases with increasing temperature, and the order of them is 25% O > 50% O > 75% O = 100% O > 0% O at temperatures greater than 300 K, as shown in Figure 1b. The residual oxygen adsorbates after the 50 °C NMP cleaning play an important role in modifying the interface region, resulting in better phonon transport. The σ/τ in all samples with different O percentages decreases with increasing temperature, as shown in Figure 1c. All of the energy bandgaps of the MoS₂ monolayers with O adsorbates on their surface decrease compared with the energy bandgap of the as-deposited MoS₂. In addition, the overlap of DOS between MoS₂ and Au decreases with increasing oxygen percentage. The detailed electron DOS of the MoS₂ monolayer and the Au/MoS₂ interfaces can be found in Figure S2 (Supporting Information). The order of σ/τ at temperatures greater than 300 K is 25% O > 50% O > 100% O > 75% O > 0% O. These results indicate that adequate oxygen would improve the thermal and electrical conductance but might also increase the interfacial vacancies or roughness in a real experimental procedure, both of which need to be carefully controlled.

The simulated Seebeck coefficient does not exhibit strong temperature dependence at temperatures greater than 300 K in Figure 1d. The samples with adsorbate contents of 0% O and 50% O exhibit p-type characteristics, whereas those with adsorbate contents of 75% O and 100% O exhibit n-type characteristics; the samples with 25% O undergo a conversion from p- to n-type at temperatures greater than 300 K. We had performed some experiments related to the conversion from n- to p-type in MoS₂ and other TMDs, and the conversion could be controlled by oxide layers.[28] the doping via implantation technique,[29] and electron-beam irradiation.[30] The oxygen doping
is one of commonly used methods to achieve the conversion. According to our experiences, we simulated the oxygen content at Au/MoS 2 interfaces and predicted the Seebeck coefficient at different temperatures, as can be seen in Figure 1d. The Seebeck coefficient of the p-type samples is slightly greater than that of the n-type samples. The order of Seebeck coefficients at temperatures less than 200 K is 25% O > 50% O > 0% O > 75% O = 100% O, whereas the 0% O samples exhibit the highest Seebeck coefficient at temperatures greater than 300 K. Thus, higher Seebeck coefficients were achieved with oxygen adsorbates at temperatures less than 200 K. These simulation results suggest that residual (adequate) oxygen adsorbates at the interface would provide better thermal and electrical conductivities. Next, we will analyze the experimentally determined thermal and electrical conductivity results.

2.2. Characterization

We assessed the quality of our large-area monolayer MoS 2 films using Raman spectroscopy. Figure 2a shows the Raman spectra of the MoS 2 monolayer before (dotted line) and after (solid line) the NMP chemical treatment at different temperatures. To exclude the position effect, the Raman spectra were recorded at the same location on each sample before and after the NMP cleaning. The two characteristic peaks at 381 cm⁻¹ and 403 cm⁻¹ correspond to the in-plane vibration (E 2g ) of the Mo and S atoms and to the out-of-plane vibration (A 1g ) of the S atoms, as displayed in Figure 2a, respectively. The A 1g peak of the sapphire substrate, which was used to align the data, also appears at 414 cm⁻¹ in the spectra of all of the samples. The frequency difference (Δω) between the E 2g and A 1g modes of MoS 2 is ≈21–22 cm⁻¹, which is slightly greater than previously reported values of 18–20 cm⁻¹ for MoS 2 monolayers. However, the characteristic peaks and Δω not only depend on the layer number but also on the applied laser wavelength, position, and synthesis method (e.g., chemical vapor deposition (CVD) or exfoliation). The precise estimation of the MoS 2 thickness was further confirmed by TEM images presented later in this section. In all samples shown in Figure 2a, the characteristic peaks do not exhibit a substantial change in frequency or intensity after the NMP cleaning at temperatures ranging from 25 to 110 °C, indicating that the MoS 2 structure remained intact after the NMP cleaning.

The Raman spectra of MoS 2 coated with 5 nm thick Au are shown in Figure 2b. The Raman signal from the Au/MoS 2 interfaces is still visible in the spectra of the samples with a 5 nm Au layer but not in the spectra of the samples with 150 nm thick Au layer, which were used for the FDTR measurements. Compared with the spectrum of the as-deposited MoS 2 without Au (green curve in Figure 2b), that of the Au-coated sample shows a split of the characteristic peak of the E 2g mode into two peaks at 375.44 and 381.82 cm⁻¹ (Δω ≈ 6 cm⁻¹), whereas the A 1g mode shows no clear shift. A similar redshift (Δω) has been reported for separated peaks at 6.6 and 6.38 cm⁻¹ in the spectra of Au/Ti/ MoS 2 and Au/MoS 2 interfaces. The tensile strain induced by the lattice mismatch of Au and MoS 2 causes the redshift of the E 2g mode, whereas the interfacial bonding variation induced by Au deposition is negligible. Nevertheless, the peak intensity of the out-of-plane vibration (A 1g ) slightly decreases when the sample temperature during the NMP cleaning process is increased, as shown in Figure 2b, implying that the interfacial bonding of Au/MoS 2 might be weakened by NMP cleaning.

MoS 2 samples were analyzed by XPS after being transferred from sapphire to Au substrates to prevent interference from the oxygen atoms of the sapphire substrate. The XPS results in
Figure 2c reveal that the carbon and oxygen contents decrease by 35.5% and 44.65%, respectively, after the 110 °C NMP cleaning. At the same time, the Mo3d, S2s, Mo3p, and S2p binding energies show no obvious variations (details are available in Figure S3 in the Supporting Information). These results imply that the NMP cleaning can effectively remove the undesirable adsorbates or contaminants from the surface while not affecting the physical properties of the MoS2. The effect of the NMP residue or the adsorbates on the transfer the samples from the sapphire substrate to the Au substrate can be excluded; details are available elsewhere.[14]

The lattice structure of the Au/MoS2/sapphire interfaces was characterized by TEM, as shown in Figure 2e–g. A broad and mixed interfacial region at the Au/as-deposited MoS2 interface with a thickness of 1.43–1.79 nm of MoS2 is shown in Figure 2e. The interface of the Au/110 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2 in Figure 2g is smooth and clear and the thickness of MoS2 is 0.71–1.07 nm, which is exactly the monolayer thickness of MoS2. The Au/50 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2 in Figure 2f shows intermediate thickness (0.83–1.4 nm) and interfacial cleanliness compared with the interfaces in Figure 2e,g. This comparison shows that the NMP cleaning can eliminate the adsorbates from the MoS2 surface, consistent with the XPS results, and that the efficiency of cleaning increases with increasing temperature. In addition, the adsorbates or contaminants on the as-deposited MoS2 surface form a mixed region at the interface of Au and MoS2. The extra oxygen (or carbon) will likely form new bonds such as O=S and Au−O at the Au/MoS2 interface, corresponding to the intensity change of A 1g in Figure 2b. The change in the chemical characteristics at the Au/MoS2 interfaces will affect the thermal and electrical transport across the interfaces.

2.3. Thermal Properties

The total thermal conductance of Au/MoS2/sapphire is plotted in Figure 3a as a function of the NMP cleaning temperature. The thermal conductance shown in Figure 3a was evaluated on the basis of the reciprocal of the total thermal resistance in Figure S1 (Supporting Information). The Au surface was heated by a 405 nm pump laser, and the thermoreflectance was detected by a 635 nm probe laser, as shown in Figure 3b. The thermal conductance at different NMP temperatures are listed in Table 1. The oxygen percentage of the as-deposited interface is assumed as 100% and that of other interfaces decreases as NMP temperatures increase. According to the
positive correlation between cleaning efficiency and NMP temperature discussed above (Figure 2c–g), the simulated samples in Figure 1a with 75–100% O can be represented as the as-deposited MoS$_2$, those with 25–50% O as the 45–50 °C NMP-cleaned MoS$_2$, and those with 0% O as the 110 °C NMP-cleaned MoS$_2$.

The total thermal conductance of the sample with the as-deposited MoS$_2$ was 19.89 MW m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$. The relatively low thermal conductance of metal/MoS$_2$ interfaces indicates that such interfaces present a bottleneck in heat dissipation.\(^{[36]}\) When the NMP cleaning temperature was increased to 45 °C, the thermal conductance increased by 3.39 times, to 87.49 MW m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$. This increase in thermal conductance is attributed to the removal of undesirable adsorbates on the MoS$_2$ surface by the NMP cleaning process. However, when the cleaning temperature was increased to greater than 50 °C, the thermal conductance became lower than that of the as-deposited sample, decreasing by 74.37% to 5.12 MW m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$ at an
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**Figure 3.** a) Total thermal conductance of the Au/MoS$_2$/sapphire interface versus NMP cleaning temperature from 25 to 110 °C. The thermal conductance increased by 339.87% after 45 °C NMP cleaning and conversely decreased by 74.37% after 110 °C NMP cleaning. The as-deposited sample is marked in green, whereas the green dashed line is used for comparing the thermal conductance with that of the as-deposited sample. b) Schematic of the thermal conductance measurement of Au/MoS$_2$ monolayer on the sapphire substrate (see the details of the 1D heat conduction equation in the Experimental Section (Experimental Methods)). c) I–V curves of the as-deposited MoS$_2$ and MoS$_2$ that was subjected to 50 and 110 °C NMP cleaning. The 50 °C NMP cleaning dramatically improves (decreases) the contact resistance. The bottom illustration shows the measured samples with patterned Au pads corresponding to the photo in (e). d) I–V curves of the as-deposited MoS$_2$ and the 50 °C NMP-cleaned MoS$_2$. Linear I–V curves are observed after the NMP cleaning. e) The patterned Au pad of the 50 °C NMP-cleaned sample (the scale bar represents 1 mm).

| O percentage [%] at the interface | 100 | 90 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 0 |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| NMP temperature [°C] As-deposited | 25  | 45 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 100| 105| 110|    |   |
| Thermal conductance [MW m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$] | 19.89 | 36.76 | 87.49 | 62.70 | 16.65 | 14.39 | 12.68 | 11.11 | 10.46 | 5.12 |   |

**Table 1.** The thermal conductance of the Au/MoS$_2$ monolayer under different NMP cleaning temperatures. The as-deposited interface is assumed to have the most oxygen adsorbates at the interface, and the oxygen percentage decreases with increasing the NMP temperatures corresponding to the TEM images in Figure 2e–g.
NMP cleaning temperature of 110 °C. As the TEM images in Figure 2g show, a smooth and clean Au/MoS2 interface can be achieved through NMP cleaning at 110 °C; however, the phonon density of states (PDOS) of Au and MoS2 have a large mismatch above 5 THz that remarkably hinders the heat transport and leads to low interfacial thermal conductance.\(^{[37]}\)

The high thermal conductance of the 50 °C NMP-cleaned sample, whose TEM image is presented in Figure 2f, implies that adsorbates such as oxygen may increase the overlap region of the PDOS between Au and MoS2. Zhan et al. have reported that the PDOS is modified in the interface regions, resulting in a better match than in the bulk region.\(^{[38]}\) Hahn et al. proposed a thermal conductance analysis of Si/Ge interfaces with mixed regions by molecular dynamics simulations; their results showed that, compared with the sharp interface, the 0.5 nm mixed region exhibited increased thermal conductance, whereas a larger mixed region (1 or 2 nm) exhibited lowered thermal conductance.\(^{[39]}\) Accordingly, there would be a trade-off to enhancing the thermal conductance across the Au/MoS2 interfaces: the broad mixed region (Figure 2e) and sharp interface (Figure 2g) both adversely affect thermal transport, and the intermediate interface (Figure 2f) has optimized thermal conductance. That is, the thermal conductivity of the Au/50 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2 is greater than that of the Au/110 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2, whereas the Au/as-deposited MoS2 exhibits the lowest thermal conductivity, in good agreement with the simulation results in Figure 1b.

### 2.4. Electrical Characterization

Figure 3c shows the current–voltage (I–V) curves of the as-deposited, 50 °C NMP-cleaned, and 110 °C NMP-cleaned samples. Multiple devices with the same channel length between two electrodes for each of the three cases were used to check the consistency and reproducibility of the results. A representative device is shown in Figure 3e. Note that the I–V curves change substantially from nonlinear to linear after the NMP cleaning, as shown in Figure 3d, indicating that ohmic-like behavior appears only after NMP cleaning. This result was reproducibly measured in different devices, demonstrating high consistency. Furthermore, the total electrical resistance was dramatically reduced by \(\approx 2\) orders of magnitude from 3910 to 50 MΩ by the 50 °C NMP cleaning, which is attributed to the improvement of contact resistance at the Au/MoS2 interface. Higher contents of adsorbates such as O and C on the as-deposited sample may cause impurity scattering, adversely affecting the electron transport. However, the residual adsorbates after 50 °C NMP cleaning (Figure 2f) enhance the electron transport at the Au/MoS2 interface compared with that at the sharp interface of the 110 °C NMP-cleaned sample (Figure 2g). Several authors have proposed improving contact through surface treatment or surface engineering via interfacial chemical conditioning. Houssa et al. reported a large discrepancy in contact resistance of the MoS2-based metal/semiconductor heterojunctions by considering the interaction of IT-MoS2 with various chemical species (hydrogen, oxygen). The atoms or molecules of these species lower the work function of the IT-MoS2 during the local transformation, leading to low contact resistances.\(^{[40]}\) Leong et al. reported that the presence of zigzag edges on nickel–graphene electrodes enhances electrical contact via a tunneling effect and lower work function.\(^{[41]}\) Bhatiacharjee et al. found that applying a sulfur-based (ammonium sulfide) treatment to MoS2 could reduce its contact resistance and variability with high-work-function metals.\(^{[42]}\) The similar chemical enhancement at interfaces of metal/graphene has been applied as well to increase the performance for sensitive surface detection and surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy.\(^{[43]}\) The charge transport can be tuned by the degree of interaction between the metal and TMD layer via interlayers, doping strategy, or defect engineering.\(^{[4,45,46]}\) The interlayer between the material and metal electrode (buffer layer) which plays as a role for carrier transport has also been used for thin film solar cells,\(^{[47]}\) and the bandgap alignment and the carrier concentration at donor or acceptor level are essential for the interfacial conductive characteristics.

Neither the broad interfacial region of the as-deposited sample nor the sharp interface of the 110 °C NMP-cleaned sample were optimized interfaces for electrical contacts from our electrical measurement, although the 110 °C NMP cleaning process provided MoS2 with ohmic-like contact (linear I–V characteristics). That is, the Au/50 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2 interface exhibited better electrical conductivity than the Au/110 °C NMP-cleaned MoS2 and the Au/as-deposited MoS2, which is consistent with the simulated electrical conductivity results in Figure 1c. The intermediate interfaces of the 45–50 °C NMP-cleaned samples, which exhibit high thermal conductance and low electrical contact resistance, have strong potential for use in high-performance transistors on MoS2 or other TMD materials. On the other hand, the 110 °C NMP-cleaned Au/MoS2 interface, which exhibits low thermal conductance and good electrical contact, can be a good candidate for thermolectric composites via interface nanoengineering.

### 3. Conclusion

We proposed an effective and simple NMP cleaning method for tuning the thermal and electrical conductance at the Au/MoS2 interface. The thermal conductance can be increased by 3.39 times by increasing the wet cleaning temperature by \(\approx 45–50 \) °C; on the other hand, it decreases by 74.37% when the cleaning temperature is increased to 110 °C. The total electrical resistance can be reduced by 2 orders of magnitude when the NMP cleaning is performed at 50 °C. We found that the ability of the NMP cleaning procedure to remove undesirable adsorbates from the MoS2 surface while preserving the physical properties of the material is temperature dependent. The Au/MoS2 interface changed from a broad and mixed interfacial region to a cleaner and thinner region when the cleaning was conducted at 50 °C and changed gradually to a sharp interface as the NMP cleaning temperature was increased at 110 °C. The intermediate interfacial region at the Au/MoS2 interface (45–50 °C NMP-cleaned) exhibited excellent interfacial thermal conductance and the lowest electrical contact resistance among the investigated samples. The experimental results are in good agreement with the simulated results, indicating that adequate oxygen adsorbates at the Au/MoS2 interface enhance the thermal and
electrical conductance. We have shown that the interfacial thermal and electrical conductance of Au/MoS₂ can be tuned by changing the interfacial chemical properties via NMP wet cleaning, which is promising for both enhancing the heat dissipation of functional ultrasilic electronics and for interface design of thermal insulating thin films.

4. Experimental Section

**Experimental Methods**: The continuous monolayer MoS₂ films were grown on sapphire substrates via CVD in a hot-wall furnace by sulfuring MoO₃ powders at 750 °C. The sulfur stream was generated by heating sulfur powder at 190 °C under an Ar carrier gas. The sapphire substrate was placed downstream at the center of the furnace. The sample was immersed into NMP solution for 20 min at various temperatures from 25 to 110 °C. All samples were rinsed with isopropyl alcohol (IPA) to remove any residual chemical species from their surface, and they were subsequently dried under blown nitrogen gas. The samples were placed in a vacuum chamber for Au deposition followed by NMP cleaning within 30 min via sputtering (CFS-4EP-LL, 5 × 10⁻⁴ Pa). Samples with 5 and 150 nm thick Au layers were used for the Raman spectroscopy and thermal property measurements, respectively. Meanwhile, a metal mask pads using an electron beam evaporator (EIKO, 5 × 10⁻⁴ Pa) were used for the Raman spectroscopy and electrical measurement purposes. The detailed flow of the NMP wet cleaning process for MoS₂ samples is shown in Figure 4.

For the XPS measurements, the MoS₂ monolayer was transferred onto a Au substrate from the sapphire substrate to avoid interference from the oxygen signals of the oxide substrate. Raman spectra were collected with a micro-Raman spectrometer (HORIBA-JOBIN-YVON, model T64000) with low-frequency (<200 cm⁻¹) capability; the spectrometer was equipped with a single-mode laser with a wavelength of 785 nm. The thermal resistances of the Au/MoS₂ monolayer/sapphire structures were measured under vacuum (<0.02 Pa) at room temperature using the FDTR method. The Au film layer functioned as a thermal insulating thin film. The composites were separated with a vacuum spacing of 15 Å to ensure no interactions occurred between them. In addition, oxygen adsorption (surface coverage) of 25–100% was carried out on the MoS₂ sheet to represent various oxygen concentrations in the experiment. Each oxygen

**Figure 4.** The workflow of the NMP cleaning process on MoS₂ samples. The thickness and pattern of the deposited Au layers were varied depending on the measurement technique for which the sample was prepared (Raman, FDTR, or electrical measurement).

**Temperature at the Au surface, T(0), was obtained using the 1D heat conduction equation:**

\[
\frac{T(0)}{q} = \frac{e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}}}{2\alpha dC_2} + R_0 + R_1 + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0 d_0}{\alpha_1 d_1} \right) d_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0 d_0}{\alpha_1 d_1} \right) d_1
\]

where \( q \) is the heat flux, \( d \) is the film thickness, \( \omega \) is the frequency, \( \lambda \) is the thermal conductivity, \( C \) is the volumetric heat capacity, and the subscripts 0, 1, and 2 refer to the Au, MoS₂ monolayer, and the sapphire substrate, respectively; \( R_0 \) and \( R_1 \) are the interfacial thermal resistance of the Au/MoS₂ and the MoS₂/sapphire, respectively, as shown in Figure 3b. The fourth and fifth terms in Equation (1) represented the thermal resistance of the Au and MoS₂ monolayer, respectively. The total thermal resistance could be evaluated by the sum of the second to fifth terms in Equation (1), which was the intercept of the linear plot of \( T(0)/q \) versus \( \omega\lambda \) obtained from the measurement. In this work, the total thermal conductance in various samples was calculated by the reciprocal of the total thermal resistance. The measured thermal resistance with experimental standard deviation is provided in Figure S1 (Supporting Information).

**Simulation Procedure**: All DFT calculations were performed using the Vienna Ab-initio Simulation Package (VASP).[52–55] The projector-augmented-wave method[56,57] was used in conjunction with the generalized gradient approximation and Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof[58] exchange-correlation functional. The Kohn–Sham orbitals were expanded in a plane-wave basis set with a kinetic energy cutoff of 500 eV. The convergence threshold was set to 10⁻⁵ eV for the total electronic energy in the self-consistent loop. The atomic positions were relaxed using the quasi-Newton algorithm until the x-, y-, and z-components of the unconstrained atomic force were smaller than 1 × 10⁻² eV Å⁻¹.

The calculated lattice constants for the bulk Au and MoS₂ unit cells were 4.15 and 3.18 Å, respectively, in good agreement with the experimental values.[59,60] In the Au/MoS₂ composites, the Au{111} surface was adopted, which was modeled by a six-layer slab within a (2 × 2) lateral supercell, where the lowest three layers were fixed; the MoS₂ sheet was also modeled in a (2 × 2) lateral supercell. The lattice mismatch of the Au/MoS₂ composites was controlled to be smaller than 3%. For the summation in the Brillouin zone, the Monkhorst–Pack mesh [k-point] was set to (8 × 8 × 8), (8 × 8 × 1), and (4 × 4 × 1) for the Au{111} surface, MoS₂ unit cell, and Au/MoS₂ composites, respectively. The composites were separated with a vacuum spacing of 15 Å to ensure no interactions occurred between them. In addition, oxygen adsorption (surface coverage) of 25–100% was carried out on the MoS₂ sheet to represent various oxygen concentrations in the experiment. Each oxygen
atom was adsorbed onto each top site of the sulfur atoms, resulting in the most stable structures, as shown in Figure 1a. The thermoelectric properties were calculated using the BoltzTraP code,[62] which adopted the constant relaxation time and rigid band approximations via the semiclassical Boltzmann transport theory.

Supporting Information
Supporting Information is available from the Wiley Online Library or from the author.

Acknowledgements
This work was supported by the “Materials Research by Information Integration” Initiative (MI2I) project of the Support Program for Starting Up Innovation Hub from Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST). The National Center of High-Performance Computing (NCHC) contributed to this project by allowing access to their computer facilities and donating computer time.

Conflict of Interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Keywords
electrical conductance, interfacial thermal resistances, molybdenum disulfide, monolayers, wet cleaning

Received: February 28, 2020
Revised: April 11, 2020
Published online: May 27, 2020

References
[1] J. Pu, Y. Yomogida, K. K. Liu, L. J. Li, Y. Iwasa, T. Takenobu, Nano Lett. 2012, 12, 4013.
[2] K. Wang, L. Li, W. Xue, S. Zhou, Y. Lan, H. Zhang, Z. Sui, Int. J. Electrochem. Sci. 2017, 12, 8306.
[3] M. Tan, Y. Hao, X. Ren, J. Electron. Mater. 2014, 43, 3098.
[4] Q. Cheng, J. Pang, D. Sun, J. Wang, S. Zhang, F. Liu, Y. Chen, R. Yang, N. Liang, X. Lu, Y. Ji, J. Wang, C. Zhang, Y. Sang, H. Liu, W. Zhou, InfoMat 2020, 2, 656.
[5] K. F. Mak, C. Lee, J. Hone, J. Shan, T. F. Heinz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 2010, 105, 136805.
[6] L. Yang, K. Majumdar, H. Liu, Y. Du, H. Wu, M. Hatzistergos, P. Y. Hung, R. Tieckelmann, W. Tsai, C. Hobbs, P. D. Ye, Nano Lett. 2014, 14, 6275.
[7] R. Kappera, D. Voiry, S. E. Yalcin, B. Branch, G. Gupta, A. D. Mohite, M. Chhowalla, Nat. Mater. 2014, 13, 1128.
[8] K. A. Duerloo, Y. Li, E. J. Reed, Nat. Commun. 2015, 6, 4214.
[9] D. Jena, K. Banerjee, G. H. Xing, Nat. Mater. 2014, 13, 1076.
[10] C. D. English, C. Shine, V. E. Dorgan, K. C. Saraswat, E. Pop, Nano Lett. 2016, 16, 3824.
[11] V. Kaushik, S. H. Wu, H. Jang, J. Kang, K. Kim, J. W. Suk, Nanomaterials 2018, 8, 587.
[12] X. Cui, C. Z. Zhang, R. Hao, Y. L. Hou, Nanoscale 2011, 3, 2118.
[13] Y. Xu, H. Cao, Y. Xue, B. Li, W. Cai, Nanomaterials 2018, 8, 942.
[14] P.-C. Chen, C.-P. Lin, C.-J. Hong, C.-H. Yang, Y.-Y. Lin, M.-Y. Li, L.-J. Li, T.-Y. Yu, C.-J. Su, K.-S. Li, Y.-L. Zhong, T.-H. Hou, Y.-W. Lan, Nano Res. 2019, 12, 303.
[15] K. Hippalgaonkar, Y. Wang, Y. Ye, D. Y. Qiu, H. Zhu, Y. Wang, J. Moore, S. G. Louie, X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 2017, 95, 115407.
[16] Z. Jin, Q. Liao, H. Fang, Z. Liu, W. Liu, Z. Ding, T. Luo, N. Yang, Sci. Rep. 2015, 5, 18342.
[17] J. X. Xiang, R. N. Ali, Y. F. Yang, Z. Zheng, B. Xiang, X. D. Cui, Phys. E 2019, 109, 248.
[18] S. Kong, T. M. Wu, M. Yuan, Z. W. Huang, Q. L. Meng, K. F. Mak, W. Zhuang, P. Jiang, X. H. Bao, J. Mater. Chem. A 2017, 5, 2004.
[19] S. Kong, T. Wu, W. Zhuang, P. Jiang, X. Bao, J. Phys. Chem. B 2018, 122, 713.
[20] D. Wu, L. Xie, X. Chao, Z. Yang, J. He, ACS Appl. Energy Mater. 2019, 2, 1676.
[21] Y.-J. Wu, M. Sasaki, M. Goto, L. Fang, Y. Xu, ACS Appl. Nano Mater. 2018, 1, 3355.
[22] Y.-J. Wu, L. Fang, Y. Xu, npj Comput. Mater. 2019, 5, 56.
[23] T. Zhan, L. Fang, Y. Xu, Sci. Rep. 2017, 7, 7109.
[24] Y.-J. Wu, T. Zhan, Z. Hou, L. Fang, Y. Xu, Sci. Data 2020, 7, 36.
[25] Y. Y. Zhou, Y. Huang, J. Pang, K. Wang, J. Power Sources 2019, 440, 22749.
[26] Y. Zhou, Y. Wang, K. Kang, F. Peng, L. Wang, J. Pang, Appl. Energy 2020, 260, 114169.
[27] R. Kato, Y. Xu, M. Goto, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 2011, 50, 106602.
[28] C.-Y. Lin, K. B. Simbulan, C.-J. Hong, K.-S. Li, Y.-L. Zhong, Y.-K. Su, Y.-W. Lan, Nanoscale Horiz. 2020, 5, 163.
[29] Y.-W. Lan, P.-C. Chen, Y.-Y. Lin, M.-Y. Li, L.-J. Li, Y.-L. Tu, F.-L. Yang, M.-C. Chen, K.-S. Li, Nanoscale Horiz. 2019, 4, 683.
[30] C.-P. Lin, P.-C. Chen, J.-H. Huang, C.-T. Lin, D. Wang, W.-T. Lin, C.-C. Cheng, C.-J. Su, Y.-W. Lan, T. H. Hou, ACS Appl. Electron. Mater. 2019, 1, 684.
[31] D. Dumcenco, D. Ovchinnikov, K. Marinov, P. Lazic, M. Gibertini, N. Marzari, O. Lopez Sanchez, Y. C. Kung, D. Krasnozhon, M. W. Chen, S. Bertolazzi, P. Gillet, A. Fontcuberta i Morral, A. Radenovic, A. Kis, ACS Nano 2015, 9, 4611.
[32] B. M. Foley, S. C. Hernandez, J. C. Duda, J. T. Robinson, S. C. Walton, P. E. Hopkins, Nano Lett. 2015, 15, 4876.
[33] Y. Liu, H. Nan, X. Wu, W. Pan, W. Wang, J. Bai, W. Zhao, L. Sun, X. Wang, Z. Ni, ACS Nano 2013, 7, 4202.
[34] H. Yuan, G. Cheng, L. You, H. Li, H. Zhu, W. Li, J. J. Kopanski, Y. S. Obeng, A. R. Hight Walker, D. J. Gundlach, C. A. Richter, D. E. Loannou, Q. Li, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2015, 7, 1180.
[35] C. Gong, C. Huang, J. Miller, L. Cheng, Y. Hao, D. Cobden, J. Kim, R. S. Ruoff, R. M. Wallace, K. Cho, X. Xu, Y. J. Chabal, ACS Nano 2013, 7, 11350.
[36] E. Yalon, O. B. Aslan, K. K. H. Smithie, C. J. McClellan, S. V. Suryavanshi, F. Xiong, A. Sood, C. M. Neumann, X. Xu, K. E. Goodson, T. F. Heinz, E. Pop, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2017, 9, 43013.
[37] X. Liu, G. Zhang, Y.-W. Zhang, Nano Res. 2016, 9, 2372.
[38] T. Zhan, S. Minamoto, Y. Xu, Y. Tanaka, Y. Kagawa, AIP Adv. 2015, 5, 047102.
[39] K. R. Hahn, M. Puligheddu, L. Colombo, Phys. Rev. B 2015, 91, 195313.
[40] M. Houssa, K. Iordanidou, A. Dabral, A. Lu, G. Pourtois, V. Afanasev, A. Stesmans, ACS Appl. Nano Mater. 2019, 2, 760.
[41] W. S. Leong, X. Luo, Y. Li, K. H. Khoo, S. Y. Quek, J. T. Thong, ACS Nano 2015, 9, 869.
[42] S. Bhattacharjee, K. L. Ganapathi, D. N. Nath, N. Bhat, IEEE Trans. Electron Devices 2016, 63, 2556.
[43] Y. Yin, J. Pang, J. Wang, X. Lu, Q. Hao, E. Saei Ghareh Naz, X. Zhou, L. Ma, O. G. Schmidt, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2019, 11, 15891.
[44] Y. Han, H. Wang, L. Qiang, Y. Gao, Q. Li, J. Pang, H. Liu, L. Han, Y. Wu, Y. Zhang, J. Mater. Sci. 2020, 55, 591.

[45] D. Somvanshi, S. Kallatt, C. Venkatesh, S. Nair, G. Gupta, J. K. Anthony, D. Karmakar, K. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. B 2017, 96, 205423.

[46] H. Qiao, Z. Huang, X. Ren, S. Liu, Y. Zhang, X. Qi, H. Zhang, Adv. Opt. Mater. 2020, 8, 1900765.

[47] Y. Cao, X. Zhu, H. Chen, X. Zhang, J. Zhouc, Z. Hu, J. Pang, Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells 2020, 200, 109945.

[48] Y. B. Xu, H. T. Wang, Y. Tanaka, M. Shimono, M. Yamazaki, Mater. Trans. 2007, 48, 148.

[49] T. Zhan, Y. Xu, M. Goto, Y. Tanaka, R. Kato, M. Sasaki, RSC Adv. 2015, 5, 49703.

[50] Y. Xu, R. Kato, M. Goto, J. Appl. Phys. 2010, 108, 104317.

[51] Y. Xu, M. Goto, R. Kato, Y. Tanaka, Y. Kagawa, J. Appl. Phys. 2012, 111, 084320.

[52] G. Kresse, J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B 1993, 47, 558.

[53] G. F. Kresse, J. Furthmüller, Comput. Mater. Sci. 1996, 6, 15.

[54] G. F. Kresse, J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B 1996, 54, 11169.

[55] G. Kresse, J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B 1994, 49, 14251.

[56] P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B 1994, 49, 11169.

[57] G. Kresse, D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B 1999, 59, 1758.

[58] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. 1996, 77, 3865.

[59] E. Scalise, M. Houssa, G. Pourtois, V. Afanas’ev, A. Stesmans, Nano Res. 2012, 5, 43.

[60] E. R. Jette, F. Foote, J. Chem. Phys. 1935, 3, 605.

[61] H. J. Monkhorst, J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B 1976, 13, 5188.

[62] G. K. H. Madsen, D. J. Singh, Comput. Phys. Commun. 2006, 175, 67.