Prediction of Co and Ru nanocluster morphology on 2D MoS₂ from interaction energies

Cara-Lena Nies¹ and Michael Nolan^{1,2}

¹Tyndall National Institute, University College Cork, Lee Maltings, Dyke Parade,
Cork, T12 R5CP, Ireland

²NIBEC, School of Engineering, University of Ulster at Jordanstown BT37 0QB,
United Kingdom

1 Abstract

Layered materials, such as MoS₂, have a wide range of potential applications due to the properties of a single layer which often differ from the bulk material. They are of particular interest as ultra-thin diffusion barriers in semi-conductor device interconnects and as supports for low dimensional metal catalysts. Understanding the interaction between metals and the MoS₂ monolayer is of great importance when selecting systems for specific applications. In previous studies the focus has been largely on the strength of the interaction between a single atom or a nanoparticle of a range of metals, which has created a significant knowledge gap in understanding thin film nucleation on 2D materials. In this paper, we present a density functional theory (DFT) study of the adsorption of small Co and Ru structures, with up to four atoms, on a monolayer of MoS₂. We explore how the metal-substrate and metal-metal interactions contribute to the stability of metal clusters on MoS₂, and how these interactions change in the presence of a sulphur vacancy, to develop insight to allow prediction of thin film morphology. The strength of interaction between the metals and MoS₂ is in the order Co > Ru. The competition between metal-substrate and metal-metal interaction allows us to conclude that 2D structures should be preferred for Co on MoS₂, while Ru prefers 3D structures on MoS₂. However, the presence of a sulphur vacancy decreases the metal-metal interaction, indicating that with controlled

surface modification 2D Ru structures could be achieved. Based on this understanding, we propose Co on MoS₂ as a suitable candidate for advanced interconnects, while Ru on MoS₂ is more suited to catalysis applications.

2 Introduction

Layered materials that can be exfoliated into 2D sheets continue to generate significant interest across various disciplines, including batteries [1, 2], catalysis [3, 4], electronics [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], photonics [11, 12] and sensors [13, 14, 15, 16]. This is due in part to the interesting properties of these 2D materials which often differ from their bulk equivalent, as well as the flexibility in fabrication afforded by an ultra-thin material. [17] The majority of applications are built on an interaction between a metal and the 2D material. There are multiple studies in this regard that involve the adsorption of or doping with transition metals [5, 18, 19, 20, 4, 21, 22], alkali and alkali earth metals [23, 24, 25] and non-metals [25] on MoS₂ and other 2D materials. While experimental studies can be used to probe the performance 2D material in a device or some of the interfacial interactions between metal and 2D materials [26, 10, 9, 21], first principles modelling is a powerful tool that permits the investigation of the detailed interactions of metals and 2D materials at the atomic scale. In particular, understanding the nucleation of metals on 2D materials will be valuable for design of catalysts or preventing islanding of conductive metals.

Typically, theoretical studies focus on the adsorption of either single atoms of a series of metals [23, 27, 24, 25, 21] or large nanoparticle-like structures [19, 20]. In our previous study we identified that while these studies do deliver useful insights, there is a knowledge gap in the understanding of metal thin film nucleation on 2D materials. [28] We showed that we can investigate the first stages of thin film nucleation on 2D materials with first principles simulations, using the example of small Cu_n structures on an MoS₂ monolayer (ML).

MoS₂ is a naturally occurring transition metal dichalcogenide (TMD) and one of the most frequently studied 2D materials. Unlike graphene, MoS₂ is a semi-conductor which gives it an increased number of possible applications. [29, 11]. Our previous first principles study [28] of the interaction of Cu species on MoS₂ showed how Cu can take different structures depending on the number of Cu atoms and whether the TMD is stoichiometric or defective.

In the present study, we will expand the knowledge gained from our previous work on Cu on MoS₂

and apply it to the adsorption of small Co_n and Ru_n clusters on an MoS_2 ML, where $n = 1 - 4$. Co and Ru are of great interest in conjunction with MoS_2 for application in advanced interconnects as alternatives to Cu [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35] and TaN. Applications in catalysis include Pt-free hydrogen evolution catalysts. [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, ?]

Interconnects require high quality, conformal thin films with low resistivity, to avoid many of the typical failure mechanisms such as electromigration. [41, 42] This means that 3D migration of atoms (agglomeration) should be inhibited, while 2D growth (wetting) should be promoted. In contrast, in catalysis applications the ratio of surface to bulk is of great importance in promoting catalytic activity. Therefore, 3D growth (agglomeration) is essential when creating a supported metal catalyst. [43, 44, 45, 46]

In this work we aim to determine the atomic scale interactions that control the stability of small Co_n and Ru_n clusters ($n = 1 - 4$) on a single ML of MoS_2 . Based on this understanding, alongside the magnitude of metal-substrate and metal-metal interactions we will be able to predict the morphology of Co and Ru thin films on 2D MoS_2 . We have previously studied 2D vs 3D Cu clusters on TaN, where we determined that there are two useful descriptors for 2D vs 3D growth: [47]

1. If the metal-substrate interaction is more favourable than the metal-metal interaction, 2D growth is preferred.
2. If the total binding energy is more favourable than the cohesive energy of the bulk metal, than 2D growth is preferred.

Predictions made using these descriptors can be used when deciding which metal-substrate combination will be suitable for a particular application where the shape of the metal is vital.

3 Methods

All calculations for this study were carried out with density functional theory (DFT) using the Vienna Ab initio Simulation Package (VASP) version 5.4.[48] Three dimensional boundary conditions were applied and the spin polarized general gradient approximation (GGA) along with the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) approximation to the exchange-correlation functional were used to describe the system.[49] Valence electrons were described explicitly using a plane wave basis set with an energy cut-off of 450 eV. The valence electron configurations are as follows: Co = $4s^2 3d^7$, Ru = $5s^1 4d^7$, Mo

= $5s^1 4d^5$, S = $3s^2 3p^4$. The core electrons were treated with the projector augmented wave potential (PAW). [50] All forces acting on the atoms were converged to within 0.02 eV/Å. A Methfessel-Paxton smearing of order 1 was used and no symmetry was applied.

The description of the pristine and defective MoS₂ monolayer (ML) was published in our previous work.[28] Bulk MoS₂ is made up of two layers. To create the pristine ML one of these was removed, which also creates the vacuum necessary to avoid interaction along the z-axis; the vacuum region is 8 Å. The defective ML has the same structure as the pristine ML, except that a single S atom has been removed to create a vacancy and the ions are relaxed with no symmetry constraints. Using H₂S as a reference, we have computed an exothermic vacancy formation energy of -6.16 eV. The bond lengths in bulk structures that are used for comparison are based on the crystal structures in references [51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56]. Only a theoretical crystal structure was available for RuMo, all other structures used are experimental.

To understand the binding of Co and Ru to the MoS₂ monolayer, four different energies are computed.

1. Binding Energy per metal atom:

$$E_{\text{bind/atom}} = \frac{(E_{\text{total}} - E_{\text{monolayer}} - nE_{\text{metal_atom}})}{n} \quad (1)$$

E_{total} is the total energy of the relaxed Co_n or Ru_n (n = 1,2,3,4) adsorbed on MoS₂. The energy of a single gas phase metal atom ($E_{\text{metal_atom}}$) is multiplied by n, the number of atoms in adsorbed Co_n or Ru_n.

2. Binding Energy with reference to a free Co_n or Ru_n cluster:

$$E_{\text{metal-substrate}} = \frac{E_{\text{total}} - E_{\text{monolayer*}} - E_{\text{metal_cluster}}}{n} \quad (2)$$

where $E_{\text{metal_cluster}}$ is the single point energy of the Co_n or Ru_n nanocluster structure in vacuum. $E_{\text{monolayer*}}$ is the single point energy of the monolayer after relaxation. We chose to use this instead of the reference used in Eq. 1, as surface rearrangements occur in several of the various structures. This method of computing the binding energy isolates the metal-substrate interaction. Using these two methods of computing the binding energy also allows us to determine an approximate metal-metal interaction energy, by applying Eq. 3

3. Metal-Metal Interaction Energy:

$$E_{\text{interact}} = E_{\text{bind/atom}} - E_{\text{metal-substrate}} \quad (3)$$

4. Addition Energy:

$$E_{\text{add}} = E_{\text{total}} - E_{\text{monolayer}+(n-1)\text{metal}} - E_{\text{metal_atom}} \quad (4)$$

where n is the number of Co or Ru atoms. This models the addition of a metal atom to an existing adsorbed cluster with $(n-1)$ Co or Ru atoms.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Ru and Co on Pristine MoS₂

As in our previous work, [28], there are three metal atom adsorption sites labelled as **1**, **2** and **3** on the MoS₂ ML, which are highlighted in Figure 1A. Site 1 has a metal atom adsorbed directly atop an S atom. Site 2 has a metal atom binding to 3 S atoms directly above an Mo atom and site 3 has a metal atom binding to 3 S atoms, but with no Mo atom underneath.

To study how Ru and Co atoms begin to nucleate into a film on the MoS₂ ML and to compare with the behaviour of Cu on MoS₂, we adsorb Co _{n} and Ru _{n} species with 1, 2, 3, and 4 atoms on MoS₂. The binding energies for the set of adsorption structures calculated using Eq. 1 are shown in Table 1. Metal-substrate interaction energies calculated from Eq. 2 are shown in Table 2, metal-metal interaction energies calculated from Eq. 3 are shown in Table 3 and addition energies, calculated with Eq. 4 are shown in Table S1 in the Supporting Information. A structure is considered 2D when all metal atoms are bound directly to the MoS₂ ML. For 3D structures, at least one of the metal atoms is bound to other metal atoms, but not to MoS₂.

The relaxed geometries of the various Co _{n} species are shown in Figures 1, 3, 5, 7 while the geometries for Ru _{n} species are shown in Figures 2, 4, 6, 8. The energies shown in these figures are the binding energies computed using Eq. 1. Structures are referred to and labelled according to the initial cluster adsorption structure, to avoid confusion due to any geometry rearrangements that occur.

In the following sections we elaborate how factors influencing structure stability vary as the cluster size increases. Such factors include presence or absence of metal-metal bonds, symmetrical versus asymmetrical addition, incorporation of atoms into the ML, adsorption site and changes to stability

in the presence of an S vacancy. Our findings are supported through analysis of geometry variations, bond lengths, adsorption, addition and metal-metal interaction energies and Bader charges.

4.1.1 Single Atom Adsorption

Co and Ru atoms adsorb exothermically at all three adsorption sites. A single Co atom adsorbs most strongly at site **2**, with an energy gain of -5.82 eV, followed by site **3** and site **1**, with energy gains of -5.55 eV and -4.21 eV. A single Ru atom adsorbs preferentially at site **2** with an energy gain of -3.92 eV, followed by site **3** and site **1**, with energy gains of -3.40 eV and -2.47 eV.

Similarly to Cu, for both Co and Ru, site **2** is the most favourable adsorption site. This is likely due to the adatom position repeating the geometry of the MoS₂ ML. We find that for a single adatom, Co-S distances are the shortest of all the metals studied, lying between 1.99 and 2.16 Å depending on the adsorption site. These Co-S distances are shorter than the Co-S distance of 2.31 Å in bulk CoS₂ [52]. Similarly, the Ru-S distances are between 2.13 and 2.24 Å, compared to 2.37 Å in bulk RuS₂ [55]. The shortest metal-S bonds are measured at site **1**, compared to those measured for sites **2** and **3**. There are some Co-Mo bonds observed, with Co-Mo distances of 2.85 Å, but there are no Ru-Mo bonds or Cu-Mo bonds [28]; the presence of these could be one origin for the enhanced interaction between Co and the MoS₂ ML. The relaxed geometries for adsorption of Co₁ and Ru₁ are shown in Figures 1 and 2, respectively.

4.1.2 Two Atom Adsorption

For two adatom adsorption, there are three different M₂ geometries. All of these are 2D. They involve atoms adsorbed at nearest neighbour equivalent surface sites, at equivalent but separated sites and atoms at neighbouring but non-equivalent sites. Relaxed geometries for adsorption of Co₂ and Ru₂ are shown in Figures 3 and 4, respectively.

For Co, adsorbing two atoms at equivalent neighbour sites corresponding to adsorption site **2** (as described section 3.1.1) is the most favourable Co₂ configuration, with a computed adsorption energy of -6.05 eV/atom. Adatoms originally adsorbed as equivalent neighbours at site **1** migrate to site **2** instead. This adsorption mode is more favourable by 0.32 eV compared to equivalent neighbours at site **3**.

The adsorption of two Co atoms is preferred at equivalent, separated sites corresponding to adsorption mode **2**. We propose that this is due to the geometry match with the substrate as there are

Figure 1: Atomic structure and energies of Co_1 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

Figure 2: Atomic structure and energies of Ru_1 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

no Co-Co bonds to contribute to the binding energy, only the weaker adsorption has Co-Mo bonds and both adsorption sites have metal interaction energies within less than 0.1 eV of each other. Adsorption of separated atoms at site **1** is the least favourable configuration for Co₂

Starting from a configuration of Co₂ adsorbed at site **3**, during relaxation one Co atom migrated to site **1**, making this a non-equivalent adsorption at separated sites **1-3**, as shown in Figure 3F. This explains the less favourable binding energy of -4.92 eV compared to -5.73 eV at equivalent neighbouring sites **3** and -5.37 eV at non-equivalent, neighbouring sites **1-3**.

Adsorption of Co atoms at neighbouring, but non-equivalent sites is overall more favourable than adsorption of separated atoms, in particular where the Co atoms bind to site **2-3**. These structures also have the strongest metal-metal interaction energies, Table 3. This is due to Co-Co bonding, which are present exclusively for these Co₂ adsorption modes due to the decreased distance between atoms compared to equivalent sites. We also observe large addition energies for these structures, showing that addition of a second atom can stabilise any atoms that may be initially adsorbed at a less favourable site.

During the adsorption of Ru₂, several rearrangements were observed. While adsorption of two neighbouring equivalent Ru atoms at site **2** is most favourable, with $E_{bind} = -4.45$ eV, the initial adsorption at neighbouring equivalent sites **1** resulted in both atoms migrating to site **2**, similar to Co₂, indicating that this particular configuration is unstable for metal atoms adsorbed at site **1**. The adsorption of Ru at separated sites **1** is the least favourable configuration for Ru₂, as well, although no rearrangements or migrations occur here.

Similar to Co₂, adsorption of Ru at equivalent separated sites **2** is the second most favourable of the equivalent Ru₂ adsorptions. The large distortions of the MoS₂ ML for an initial configuration of neighbouring Ru at site **3**, are caused by the attempted incorporation of one Ru atom into the S layer during relaxation. This has also caused an S atom adjacent to Ru to move out of the surface and bond to both Ru atoms from above, forming a triangular Ru₂S structure, as is shown in Fig. 4C. With a binding energy of -3.99 eV, the combination of sites **1-2** is as favourable as separated atoms at site **2**. This indicates, that at this very early stage of film growth there is no preference yet between structures with separated atoms and those with Ru-Ru bonds.

Those configurations that underwent strong rearrangements during relaxation, i.e. neighbouring equivalent atoms at site **3** and neighbouring atoms at non-equivalent site **2** and **3**, have very weak metal-metal interaction energies, from Table 3. The neighbouring site **3** has a positive metal-metal

Figure 3: Atomic structure and energies of CO_2 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

interaction energy, while the non-equivalent site **2-3** has an interaction energy close to zero. The latter should mean that metal atoms do not agglomerate or separate, while a positive metal-metal interaction should be indicative of a separation of atoms. However, a zero or positive metal-metal energy can only be computed when $E_{\text{bind}*}$, calculated from Eq. 2, is larger than or almost equal to E_{bind} , calculated from Eq. 1. As $E_{\text{bind}*}$ is calculated using the structure of the MoS_2 ML after metal relaxation and the energy of the Ru cluster in vacuum as references, this indicates that for these structures E_{bind} reflects energy changes during rearrangement which in turn affects the magnitude of the metal-metal interaction energy.

4.1.3 Three Atom Adsorption

Three atom adsorption involved the study of three different geometries, two of which are 2D and one of which is 3D. These are shown in Figures 5 and 6. For the first configuration, the three adatoms are adsorbed in a line along neighbouring, equivalent sites. In the other two configurations the adatoms are arranged in a triangle, one 2D on the surface and the other in a 3D triangle; in the latter, the third adatom sits atop the two other adatoms.

The most favourable configuration for Co_3 is the 2D triangle at site **2** with a computed adsorption energy of -6.13 eV/atom. The line and 3D triangle configuration are however competitive in energy, with the line configuration the more favourable by between 0.01 and 0.32 eV depending on the initial site at which the Co atoms bind. The 2D triangle with Co atoms at site **1** has the least favourable adsorption energy at -4.22 eV/atom. This configuration also has the weakest metal-metal interaction energy of -0.98 eV, as the Co atoms move away from each other; the Co-Co distances are 2.08 Å between the adjacent Co atoms and 4.89 Å to 4.98 Å to the separated atom.

The largest metal-metal interaction energies, all of which are greater than 4 eV in magnitude, can be observed for all 3D triangle configurations as well as the line configuration at site **1**. This is due to the presence of Co-Co bonds in all of these configurations, as there is no metal-metal bonding observed in the other structures. The Co-Co distances are between 2.20 and 2.25 Å, with some few longer bonds of approx. 2.6 Å compared to 2.48 Å in bulk Co[51].

For Ru_3 , a different trend is seen. Here, the most favourable adsorption occurs for the 3D triangle configuration with the Ru atoms at site **2**; however, all Ru_3 configurations, with the exception of the 2D triangle configuration at site **1**, with an adsorption energy of -2.57 eV/atom, differ by no more than 0.7 eV/atom from this. This least favourable adsorption structure displays Ru atoms that migrate

Figure 4: Atomic structure and energies of Ru_2 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

Figure 5: Atomic structure and energies of Co_3 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

significantly from their original adsorption sites. While one atom remains at site **1**, the second atom bridges between two S atoms between site **2** and site **3**. The third atom has migrated to bind at site **2**. Even though there are Ru-Ru bonds, this structure is distorted, compared to the more stable structures, leading to a less favourable adsorption energy.

Compared to Co_3 , the metal-metal interactions are not as strong for Ru_3 . Similarly to Co_3 , the strongest metal-metal interactions are found for those structures where Ru-Ru bonding is present. Similar to Ru_2 , adsorption in a linear configuration, at site **3**, yields a positive interaction energy. The reason for this is the significant distortions to the ML, in which S atoms migrate out of the surface. Similar rearrangements can be observed for all Ru_3 structures at site **3** as well as for the 2D Co_3 structures. Compared to copper, where we did not observe this distortion, the smaller size of Co and Ru compared to Cu may promote these distortions when the metal atoms are adsorbed above the hollow site **3**. In response the S atoms begin can migrate and rearrange to accommodate the additional metal atom.

4.1.4 Four Atom Adsorption

For four atom adsorption, four different cluster geometries were explored; there are two 2D cluster and two 3D clusters. The relaxed geometries are shown in Figures 7 and 8. The 2D structures are 4 atoms are adsorbed in a line along equivalent sites and in a rhombus shape with metal atoms binding to adjacent, equivalent sites. For the 3D structures, two atoms are adsorbed at equivalent sites, with two atoms atop these to create a 3D rectangle. Similarly, for the tetrahedral geometry, three atoms are adsorbed to the ML, with a fourth atom atop these to create a tetrahedron.

Adsorption of Co at site **2** in the 3D tetrahedral configuration is the most favourable geometry with a binding energy of -6.32 eV/atom, with a linear adsorption mode at site **2** and a 3D tetrahedral configuration at site **3** showing binding energies of -6.10 eV and -6.05 eV, respectively. Generally, 3D rectangle structure is not as favourable, so that the 3D tetrahedral motifs predominate for 4 atom clusters, with the 2D linear configurations also favourable.

Of the twelve initial binding configurations, upon relaxation five structures show atoms migrating from their original positions. Three of these are the 3D rectangle configuration, which shows that this geometry is not favourable for Co_4 . At sites **1** and **2**, this configuration rearranges to the most favourable tetrahedral geometry with the base atoms adsorbed at site **2**. At site **3**, one of the atop atoms moves to the surface to adsorb at a site **1**, while the second atop atom migrates to rest between

Figure 6: Atomic structure and energies of Ru_3 adsorption modes on perfect MoS_2

the two base atoms, which remain at site **3**, forming a 3D rhombus structure shown in Figure 7I. The remaining rearrangements are discussed in Section S1.1.1 of the Supporting Information.

Rearrangements of the MoS₂ ML can also be observed. In the 2D configurations we can clearly see the Co atoms integrating into the S layer of the ML; see, for example, Figures 7C, F and L. Co atoms from the line configuration at site **3** incorporate into the S layer with little movement away from the original lattice, which could be one of the origins for the relative stability of this structure.

For Ru₄ adsorption, we find that similar to Co₄, a 3D tetrahedral configuration at site **2** is the most favourable geometry with an adsorption energy of -5.14 eV. Similarly to Co₄ and Ru₃, five of the twelve Ru₄ configurations atom migration to different sites or cause the ML to rearrange, or in some cases both.

However, in contrast to Co₄, the tetrahedral configuration is not favoured in these rearrangements. Instead, we observe more structural distortions to the Ru₄ geometries and the MoS₂ lattice. In the case of the 3D rectangle at site **1** these distortions cause a transition from a 3D structure to a 2D structure, as shown in Figure 8G. As for adsorptions at site **3** discussed previously, the most dramatic distortions to the MoS₂ ML occur at this site. The line and tetrahedral configurations, in particular, caused strong lattice distortions. While the Ru atoms have remained at their original adsorption sites, several S atoms migrated out of the surface to accommodate their incorporation into the S layer and have formed bonds with the Ru adatoms, creating a Ru₄S₃ cluster. More details on the various geometries are given in Section S1.1.2 in the Supporting Information.

4.1.5 Discussion

Comparing the contributions of metal-metal and metal-substrate interaction energies to the total binding energy is an important way of determining a preference towards 2D or 3D growth. With this particular system it is also important to consider that the metal-substrate interaction and the total binding energy reflect any energy changes associated with rearrangements in the MoS₂ ML. With this in mind there are three different factors that can influence the metal-substrate interaction. These are (a) a lack of metal-metal bonds, (b) ML rearrangements including incorporation of metal atoms into the S layer and (c) formation of metal-S clusters. Incorporation of adatoms into the surface layer is known to increase the metal-substrate interaction, as is the lack of metal-metal bonds [47]. A gain in the metal-substrate interaction energy from formation of a metal-S cluster is due to Eq. 2 not accounting for this, meaning that energy contributions from the formation of metal-S clusters are

Figure 7: Atomic structure and energies of Co₄ adsorption modes on perfect MoS₂

included in the metal-substrate interaction energy and thus it cannot be used in a straightforward manner as an indicator of 2D vs 3D growth for these geometries.

We find that there are five Co_n geometries where the metal-substrate interaction is more favourable than the metal-metal interaction. These are the separated Co_2 atoms at site **2** along with all of the linear site **3** adsorptions for Co_3 and Co_4 clusters. For these structures the increase in the metal-substrate interaction is caused by the lack of metal-metal bonds, and for the site **3** structures the incorporation of Co into the S layer as well as the limited metal-metal interactions in a linear structure.

There are ten Ru_n structures where the metal-substrate interaction is more favourable than the metal-metal interactions. However, we observe significant ML distortions for Ru_n adsorption, this should not be used as the only indicator for potential 2D vs 3D growth. In these cases, both the metal-substrate and the metal-metal interactions were positive.

Similar to Co_n , the majority of the structures that have a more favourable metal-substrate interaction are those that do not involve any metal-metal bonds or those where the Ru adatoms were incorporated into the S layer. Several of these structures involved the formation of metal-S structures, which can account in part for the larger number of structures with a more favourable metal-substrate interaction.

Bond length analysis shows that the length of Co-Co and Ru-Ru bonds is directly influenced by the geometry of the adsorbed structure. This means that the majority of metal-metal bonds are shorter than the bulk metal-metal distances of 2.48 Å [51] for Co and 2.67 Å [54] for Ru, with some configurations showing longer distances depending on the arrangement of Co and Ru atoms. Co-S and Ru-S bonds change in length depending on the adsorption site, with the shortest bonds measured for site **1** adsorptions. Bonds can also be longer due to structural distortions. Mo-S bonds are generally unaffected or slightly shorter than their equivalent on the bare ML. However, the local distortions described above can cause Mo-S distances to change by between -0.17 Å and +0.28 Å for Co adsorption and between -0.26 Å and +0.23 Å for Ru adsorption. Section S1.5 of the Supporting Information presents a more detailed analysis of the bonding.

Calculating addition energies allows us to study the energy gain as more atoms are added to a structure. Due to the many rearrangements of configurations observed, the energy gain computed from Eq. 4 also contains the energy gained from the local atomic rearrangements previously described.

We observe particularly large addition energies for structures such as the Co_4 line and 3D rectangle configurations, when rearrangements occur to realise a particularly favourable structure. Smaller

addition energies are observed for rearrangements to a structure that is less favourable. Where no rearrangement occurs, the addition energies are of similar magnitude for different configurations, indicating that the variation arises only from the structure. Further details on addition energy are given in Section S1.2 of the Supporting Information.

We now discuss the electronic properties of Co and Ru clusters adsorbed on MoS₂. From the computed Bader charges, a metallic Co atom has 9.0 valence electrons, while a Co atom is considered oxidised when it has a Bader charge of less than 9.0 electrons. Similarly, metallic Ru has 8.0 valence electrons, and oxidised Ru will have a Bader charge of less than 8.0 electrons.

Analysis of the Bader charges for Co adsorption shows that in general atoms bound to the MoS₂ ML are oxidised. Adatoms that are only bound to other Co atoms remain metallic. Overall oxidation of Co atoms varies with atom coordination.

For Ru we find that atoms are partially oxidised when adsorbing to the MoS₂ ML, with a computed Bader charge in the range of 7.6 to 7.8 electrons, compared to metallic Ru with 8.0 electrons. As the number of metal adatoms increases, atoms tend to be less oxidised and show more metallic character. Any Ru atom in a 3D configuration that is only adsorbed to other Ru atoms remains metallic with Bader charges of 7.9 to 8.0 electrons. The tetrahedral configuration at site **3**, which has formed a Ru₄S₃ cluster has a Bader charge of 7.6 electrons for the atop Ru atom that forms new Ru-S bonds. Further details of the Bader charge analysis are given in Section S1.3 of the Supporting Information.

The changes in charge density are localised around the adatoms and the Mo and S atoms in the immediate neighbourhood of the adatoms. Atoms that were found to be near metallic during the Bader analysis are also found to have somewhat less charge density compared to atoms that were oxidised. There is no distinct difference in how Co and Ru affect the charge density with adsorption to MoS₂. Examples of the charge density differences are shown in Figures S1 and S2 of the Supporting Information, with some additional discussion in Section S1.4.

Analysis of DOS plots shows that the Mo d-orbital or the S p-orbital contributions are largely unaffected by adatom adsorption. The metal d-orbital contribution increases for both Co and Ru as more adatoms are added, causing the total DOS to become increasingly more metallic compared to bare MoS₂, which is a semi-conductor. Metal d-orbital states appear in the band gap for as little as a single adatom. These increase in magnitude as the overall metal contribution increases with added adatoms. Some mid-gap states for Mo d-orbitals and S p-orbitals also begin to appear as more adatoms are added, contributing to the increasingly metallic nature of the system. DOS plots for all

No. metal atoms	Configuration	E _{bind} /Co-atom [eV]			E _{bind} /Ru-atom [eV]		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
1	-	-4.21	-5.82	-5.55	-2.47	-3.92	-3.40
2	neighbouring	-6.05	-6.05	-5.73	-4.45	-4.45	-3.75
	separated	-4.20	-5.81	-4.92	-2.45	-3.92	-3.19
	non-equivalent	-5.56	-5.37	-5.85	-3.99	-3.71	-3.87
3	line	-5.61	-6.08	-5.88	-4.07	-4.47	-4.41
	triangle	-5.43	-6.13	-5.89	-2.57	-4.65	-4.46
	3D triangle	-5.53	-6.05	-5.56	-4.22	-4.72	-4.36
4	line	-6.11	-6.10	-5.95	-4.28	-4.55	-4.76
	rhombus	-5.86	-5.93	-5.87	-4.61	-4.28	-4.37
	3D rectangle	-6.28	-6.33	-5.93	-3.29	-4.93	-4.62
	tetrahedral	-5.85	-6.32	-6.05	-4.70	-5.14	-4.74

Table 1: Computed binding Energies for Co₁, Co₂, Co₃, Co₄, Ru₁, Ru₂, Ru₃ and Ru₄ on MoS₂ ML for various atom configurations using Eq. 1. For the "non-equivalent" configurations for 2 metal atom adsorption, the column "site 1" has atoms at sites 1 and 2, "site 2" has atoms at 1 and 3 and "site 3" has atoms at 2 and 3.

configurations are shown in Section S3 in the Supporting Information.

4.2 Adsorption of Co and Ru clusters on Defective MoS₂

It is well known from both theoretical and experimental studies, that the MoS₂ ML easily forms S vacancies. To get a first insight into how the presence of such a vacancy might change the interaction between the metal and the ML, we repeat adsorption of single metal atoms and M₄ structures on a defective MoS₂ ML with a single S vacancy. This was carried out in our previous work with Cu adsorption. Using formation of H₂S from H₂, we computed a vacancy formation energy of -6.16 eV which confirms that defects are easily formed. Furthermore, our results showed that the presence of an S vacancy (giving a concentration of 2% vacancies per supercell) improved Cu adhesion and promoted formation of 3D clusters.[\[28\]](#)

The binding energies, the metal-substrate interaction energies and the metal-metal interaction energies for all structures on defective MoS₂ are shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6, respectively. Discussion on bond lengths can be found in Section S2.1 of the Supporting Information.

For single atom adsorption, we find that the metal-ML interaction is stronger at site **1**, where, similarly to Cu [\[28\]](#), Co and Ru fill the vacancy site. This leads to a stronger binding energy by ~ 2

Figure 8: Atomic structure and energies of Ru₄ adsorption modes on perfect MoS₂

No. metal atoms	Configuration	$E_{\text{metal-substrate}}/\text{Co-atom [eV]}$			$E_{\text{metal-substrate}}/\text{Ru-atom [eV]}$		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
2	neighbouring	-2.71	-2.64	-2.97	-2.71	-2.67	-4.55
	separated	-1.47	-3.00	-2.05	0.58	-1.21	-0.60
	non-equivalent	-1.44	-1.54	-2.02	-1.61	-1.36	-3.96
3	line	-1.17	-2.78	-4.78	-0.79	-3.17	-5.14
	triangle	-1.66	-2.31	-2.29	0.12	-2.07	-2.61
	3D triangle	-0.77	-1.42	-0.92	-0.66	-1.32	-1.88
4	line	-1.79	-2.46	-3.77	-0.16	-14.10	-4.65
	rhombus	-0.69	-0.98	-3.42	0.62	1.01	-0.86
	3D rectangle	-1.69	-1.55	-1.50	-0.24	-1.24	-1.49
	tetrahedral	-0.85	-1.69	-2.40	-0.79	-1.67	-5.19

Table 2: Computed metal-substrate interaction energies for Co_2 , Co_3 , Co_4 , Ru_2 , Ru_3 and Ru_4 on MoS_2 ML for various atom configurations using Eq. 2. For the "non-equivalent" configurations for 2 metal atom adsorption, the column "site 1" has atoms at sites 1 and 2, "site 2" has atoms at 1 and 3 and "site 3" has atoms at 2 and 3.

No. metal atoms	Configuration	$E_{\text{interact}}/\text{Co-atom [eV]}$			$E_{\text{interact}}/\text{Ru-atom [eV]}$		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
2	neighbouring	-3.34	-3.42	-2.76	-1.74	-1.77	0.79
	separated	-2.73	-2.82	-2.88	-3.04	-2.71	-2.59
	non-equivalent	-4.11	-3.84	-3.84	-2.38	-2.34	-0.09
3	line	-4.43	-3.30	-1.09	-3.28	-1.30	0.73
	triangle	-0.98	-3.82	-3.60	-2.68	-2.58	-1.86
	3D triangle	-4.77	-4.63	-4.64	-3.56	-3.40	-2.48
4	line	-4.32	-3.64	-2.18	-4.12	9.56	-0.11
	rhombus	-5.17	-4.95	-2.45	-5.23	-5.29	-3.50
	3D rectangle	-4.59	-4.79	-4.43	-3.05	-3.69	-3.13
	tetrahedral	-5.00	-4.63	-3.66	-3.92	-3.48	-4.72

Table 3: Computed metal-metal interaction energies using Eq. 3. For the "non-equivalent" configurations for 2 metal atom adsorption, the column "site 1" has atoms at sites 1 and 2, "site 2" has atoms at 1 and 3 and "site 3" has atoms at 2 and 3.

No. metal atoms	Configuration	$E_{\text{bind}}/\text{Co-atom [eV]}$			$E_{\text{bind}}/\text{Ru-atom [eV]}$		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
1	-	-6.83	-5.22	-5.12	-5.59	-3.32	-2.91
4	line	-5.43	-6.22	-	-4.48	-4.91	-5.16
	rhombus	-	-6.25	-6.64	-	-4.83	-4.33
	3D rectangle	-	-5.78	-6.29	-	-4.89	-4.71
	tetrahedral	-	-6.22	-6.00	-	-4.95	-4.72

Table 4: Computed binding Energies for Co_1 , Co_4 , Ru_1 and Ru_4 on defective MoS_2 ML for various atom configurations using Eq. 1.

No. metal atoms	Configuration	$E_{\text{metal-substrate}}/\text{Co-atom [eV]}$			$E_{\text{metal-substrate}}/\text{Ru-atom [eV]}$		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
4	line	-1.79	-2.30	-	-0.16	-2.68	-4.52
	rhombus	-	-1.96	-4.15	-	-2.76	-2.88
	3D rectangle	-	-0.73	-1.58	-	-1.01	-0.70
	tetrahedral	-	-1.37	-1.17	-	-1.60	-1.06

Table 5: Computed metal-substrate interaction energies Co_4 and Ru_4 on defective MoS_2 ML for various atom configurations using Eq. 2.

No. metal atoms	Configuration	$E_{\text{interact}}/\text{Co-atom [eV]}$			$E_{\text{interact}}/\text{Ru-atom [eV]}$		
		Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
4	line	-4.05	-3.92	-	-2.35	-2.22	-0.64
	rhombus	-	-4.29	-2.49	-	-2.07	-1.45
	3D rectangle	-	-5.05	-4.71	-	-3.88	-4.00
	tetrahedral	-	-4.86	-4.83	-	-3.35	-3.67

Table 6: Computed metal-metal interaction energies using Eq. 3 for Co_4 and Ru_4 on defective MoS_2

eV for Co and ~ 3 eV for Ru, compared to the same initial adsorption site on the pristine ML. While for Cu we found that the metal-ML interaction was enhanced at all sites, for Co and Ru we find that the initial adsorption at sites **2** and **3** is not stable. For Co, a single atom at either site **2** or **3** migrates away from its original adsorption site and the vacancy to bridge between two S atoms between site **2** and **3**. The same occurs for a Ru atom at site **3**, while adsorption at site **2** led to the atom migrating to the nearest site **3**. These adsorption configurations are less favourable by approximately 0.5 eV, than adsorption at the corresponding sites **2** and **3** on the pristine ML, and more favourable than adsorptions at site **1** on the pristine ML. These geometries are shown in Fig.9.

For Co_4 , a decrease in the interaction strength is observed for the line configuration at site **1**, and the 3D rectangle at site **2**. For the line configuration at site **1**, this is due to the atoms remaining in a line, compared to the migration to a different site that was observed on the pristine surface. Despite the formation of a bond between two of the Co atoms and one of the Co atoms migrating into the vacancy, the binding energy of -5.43 eV is less favourable compared to -6.11 eV on the pristine surface. All geometries for Co_4 are shown in Figure 10.

An increase in the interaction strength is observed for the line and rhombus configurations at site **2** and the rhombus and 3D rectangle configurations at site **3**. Depending on the configuration this change can be attributed to bond formation, structural rearrangement compared to the same adsorption configuration on the pristine ML, or in the case of the rhombus at site **3**, surface distortion and Co_xS_y formation. The latter is facilitated by the presence of the vacancy and does not occur on the pristine ML.

The presence of the vacancy changes the charge distribution compared to the pristine surface. Atoms near the vacancy are less oxidised (with computed Bader charges of 8.7 to 8.8 electrons) and atoms further away from the vacancy site are more oxidised (Bader charges of 8.5 electrons). The apex atoms in 3D structures are metallic, even for structures where these were slightly oxidised on the pristine surface.

Even though the effects of the vacancy and the adsorption of Co remain localised, the charge density difference shows that the area over which significant changes in charge density take place is a larger than on the pristine surface. Visualisations of the charge density differences on the defective ML are included in Figures S1 and S2 of the Supporting Information. Metal-metal interaction energies for Co are found to be generally of the same magnitude as on the pristine surface. There is no clear correlation between the binding energy and the metal-metal interaction energy. There are no Co

Figure 9: Adsorption modes of single Co (pink) and Ru (purple) atoms on defective MoS₂.

geometries on the defective surface where the metal-substrate interaction is more favourable than the metal-metal interaction. The interaction energy is also not affected by the incorporation of S into the Co cluster as is observed for the rhombus configuration at site **3**. This structure has very favourable adhesion to the ML, but the metal-metal interaction energy is similar compared to the pristine surface.

Ru₄ structures remained largely unchanged compared to the pristine ML; all Ru₄ geometries are shown in Figure 11. The only decrease in stability is observed for the tetrahedron at site **2**, which distorts away from the vacancy. An increase in stability of between 0.1 and 0.4 eV is observed for the line configurations at sites **1** and **2**, the rhombus configuration at site **2** and the 3D rectangle configuration at site **3**.

The line configuration initially at site **1** relaxes to produce two separated Co₂ clusters. Of the two atoms near the vacancy, one has moved into the vacancy to replace S, while the other is adsorbed at a site **3**. The energy gain compared to the pristine surface can be attributed to the additional Ru-Ru bonds as well as the incorporation of Ru into the vacancy, which is always favourable. The line configuration at site **2** has the same geometry for Ru₄ as Co₄ and Cu₄[28], with two Ru atoms bridging over the vacancy, as shown in Fig.11B. Similarly, the rhombus configuration at site **2** has rearranged to the same 3D triangle over the vacancy with the fourth atom at the nearest site **2** that was observed for Co₄ and Cu₄ on the defective ML.

Even though the binding energy for the tetrahedron at site **3** is similar on the defective ML and the pristine ML, the presence of the vacancy prevents the incorporation of the basal Ru atoms into the S layer. This is the case for all the structures at site **3**, which cause less distortion on the defective ML compared to the pristine ML.

Ru atoms are similarly oxidised on both the pristine and the defective ML, although as for Co, atoms near the vacancy tend to be less oxidised with approx. 7.8 electrons. Once again, atop Ru atoms in 3D structures remain metallic, with computed Bader charges of 7.9 to 8.0 electrons. Interestingly, the atop atom in the rearranged rhombus structure at site **2** is reduced, with a computed Bader charge of 8.1 electrons, making it the only metal atom in any of the configurations to become reduced. Additional Bader Analysis is detailed in Section S2.2 of the Supporting Information.

The charge density difference for Ru on the defective ML is similar to the pristine ML, Figure S2G and H.

The effect of vacancy on the metal-metal interaction energy of adsorbed Ru structures is significant. For most structures, the magnitude of the metal-metal interaction energies is approximately half that

Figure 10: Atomic structure and energies of Co_4 adsorption modes on defective MoS_2 .

of the pristine ML. This is best illustrated using the example of the rearranged rhombus configuration at site **2** as this same rearrangement also occurs for Co. While for Co the interaction energy weakens by approximately 0.7 eV due to the separated fourth atom, for Ru the interaction is weakened by over 3 eV from -5.29 eV on the pristine surface to -2.07 eV on the defective surface.

This change can be attributed to the effect of the vacancy on adsorbed Ru structures. There are some exceptions, where the metal-metal interaction is strengthened compared to the ML, however this is due to a difference in geometry compared to the pristine surface.

There are three geometries adsorbed on the defective ML that have a metal-substrate interaction more favourable than the metal-metal interaction. These are the linear configurations at site **2** and **3** and the rhombus at site **3**. All three of these structures have none or few metal-metal bonds and both the configurations at site **3** involve incorporation into the S layer which increases the strength of the metal-substrate interaction.

4.3 Comparison of Interactions between Cu, Co and Ru and Pristine and Defective MoS₂

The interaction of the metals Cu, Co and Ru with the pristine and defective MoS₂ ML is clearly dependent on the nature of the metal. This is most obvious from the magnitude of the binding energies of a single atom. A single Cu atom binds to pristine MoS₂ with energies ranging from -0.8 to -1.3 eV. The adsorption energy of a Co atom ranges between -4.2 and -5.8 eV, while the adsorption energy of a Ru atom ranges between -2.5 and -3.9 eV.

For metal atoms and dimers, the stability of Cu and Ru adsorption is governed by the adsorption site, with site **2** the most favourable site for both. Ru atoms at site **3** cause distortions in the ML. For Co, the adsorption site can also influence the stability, with site **2** the most favourable overall. Site **2** is favoured, as it follows the MoS₂ lattice structure. We find that this, as well as the symmetrical addition of atoms at the same site instead of non-equivalent sites is correlated with the strength of adhesion.

As n increases, Cu adsorption becomes independent of adsorption site. Instead, the stability of structures is governed by the number of Cu-Cu bonds. This means that for n=3-4, all geometries have very similar binding energies. Further, for n=4, site **1** is the most favourable. The distance between neighbouring sites **1** is shorter compared to sites **2** and **3** and the proximity of atoms adsorbed at site **1** facilitates Cu-Cu bond formation. [28]

A – Site 1 Line
B – Site 2 Line
C – Site 2 Rhombus
D – Site 2 3D Rectangle
E – Site 2 Tetrahedral
F – Site 3 Line
G – Site 3 Rhombus
H – Site 3 3D Rectangle
I – Site 3 Tetrahedral

Figure 11: Atomic structure and energies of Ru₄ adsorption modes on defective MoS₂

Co adsorption continues to be controlled by the adsorption site for $n=3$. Different geometries have very similar energies at the same site, with the most favourable adsorption configurations at site **2**. Co_4 prefers tetrahedral-type geometries on pristine MoS_2 , with the majority of adsorption geometries rearranging to this type of structure. Some of the 2D structures at site **3** result in strong distortions, involving metal migration into the S layer, which increases the strength of their interaction with the ML and makes these structures competitive in energy with the tetrahedral geometries.

Similarly to Co, Ru_3 adsorption is mainly influenced by the adsorption site, with some influences from the overall geometry which is particularly noticeable at site **1**, where the triangle configuration has a binding energy that is 1.5 eV weaker compared to the other two geometries. This is also clear evidence that Ru atoms prefer to be associated, as the lower binding energy for the triangle at site **1** arises from the separation of the atoms. In contrast, when $n=4$, Ru structures are more stable when there are minimal distortions to the geometry or the ML, or when Ru atoms incorporate into the S layer and Ru_xS_y structures are formed.

For Cu, Co and Ru, adsorption of a single atom on the defective ML is most favourable when the metal atom fills the vacancy. Cu adsorption at sites **2** and **3** is also enhanced, while these adsorption sites become unfavourable for Co and Ru as the adatoms migrate away from the vacancy during the relaxation. Adsorption at the bridge site for Co and at the bridge site and site **3** for Ru is less favourable than adsorption on the pristine ML.

The presence of the S vacancy also enhances the binding of Cu_4 , although only a limited number of geometries were stable, while others were repelled from the ML. The stable configurations showed a preference to be 3D. 2D and 3D Co_4 structures were competitive in energy, with a preference towards structures that incorporated into the S layer. Further, the vacancy facilitated the transfer of an S atom from the ML onto the Co structure to create a Co_4S cluster, which was also quite favourable. In contrast, the presence of the vacancy prevented the incorporation of Ru atoms into the S layer to some extent and was also found to weaken metal-metal interactions. However, a Ru_2S cluster with two adjacent Ru atoms was formed and is the most favourable structure.

It is difficult to predict whether a thin film will grow in a 2D or 3D structure, but a useful descriptor is how the metal-substrate interaction compares to the metal-metal interaction and how the total binding energy compares to the bulk metal cohesive energy. While the metal-substrate interaction exceeds the metal-metal interaction energy for several Co_n and Ru_n structures, only Co has a total binding energy that is more favourable than the cohesive energy. The most favourable

adsorptions for both Ru and Cu are 1 eV less favourable than their respective cohesive energies. Despite this, we have shown that Ru incorporation into the S layer on the pristine surface and the presence of a vacancy both enhance Ru-substrate interaction and weaken metal-metal interaction. It is therefore possible that the presence of more vacancies in the MoS₂ ML could promote 2D growth of Ru.

MoS₂ would be most suitable as a barrier+liner for a Co interconnect, although based on our results, there are some concerns how the transfer of S atoms from the ML to Co_n would affect the purity of the interconnect. Ru on MoS₂ might be better suited as a catalyst. However further studies involving larger Ru_n structures are needed to determine if the overall strength of the interaction between Ru and MoS₂ could be enough to prevent agglomeration. As Ru was less likely to incorporate into the ML on a defective ML, growth of Ru on defective MoS₂ ML could be suitable for Ru interconnect systems.

5 Conclusion

We have presented an extensive study of the interaction of Co_n and Ru_n species, with $n = 1 - 4$, at the perfect and defective MoS₂ monolayer; we have also compared these metals to Cu_n from our earlier work. MoS₂ is of great interest for the barrier layer in semiconductor devices and as a support in catalysis, while Ru and Co are potential replacements for Cu as the interconnect metal and are used in metal catalysis. Thus, understanding how the metals interact with MoS₂ is important.

We find that the stability of single atom adsorption follows the trend $\text{Co} > \text{Ru} > \text{Cu}$. Furthermore, this trend holds for the adsorption of all metal species, regardless of the number of adatoms. Co typically adsorbs more strongly than Ru to the MoS₂ ML by up to 2.0 eV, while adsorption is stronger by up to 5.0 eV compared to Cu.

For two and three atom nanoclusters on perfect MoS₂, we find that the preferred adsorption configuration is determined by the adsorption site at the monolayer. Ru_n adsorption is accompanied by notable surface distortions in the monolayer, in particular the migration of sulfur atoms off their original sites as Ru atoms incorporate into the S layer of MoS₂. Such rearrangements are not seen for Cu or Co. The binding of Cu and Co nanoclusters appears to be driven by the formation of metal-metal and metal-surface bonds, whereas for Ru, the adsorption configuration is the dominant factor.

The 4 atom nanoclusters are the first clusters where 2D and 3D configurations can be compared. Co_4 structures prefer to adsorb in tetrahedral-like 3D geometries, as is evident from the rearrangement of the atomic structure when Co atoms are close enough that Co-Co bonds can form. However, linear configurations without Co-Co bonds are competitive in energy with these tetrahedral geometries. This likely originates from the incorporation of Co atoms into the S layer in such structures. In turn, this indicates a strong interaction with the MoS_2 ML, while tetrahedral geometries have an energy gain originating from Co-Co interactions instead. If we compare with Cu, the Co-S bond enthalpy is much higher than the Cu-S bond enthalpy, at 331 kJ/mol and 274.5 kJ/mol respectively (we did not find data for Ru-S bonds) and the Co cohesive energy is larger at 4.39 eV, compared to 3.49 eV for Cu.

Ru_4 does not have the same preference for tetrahedral motifs as Co_4 , despite the tetrahedral configuration at site **2** being the most favourable adsorption mode. Nevertheless, clustered geometries are preferred compared to linear adsorption, probably as a result of the larger Ru cohesive energy of 6.74 eV. Structures with minimal distortion are particularly favoured, as well as those where Ru incorporates into the S layer of MoS_2 and Ru_xS_y clusters are formed.

On the defective ML, adsorption is most favourable at the vacancy site, where single metal atoms fill the missing S site, causing a significant increase in the interaction energy compared to the pristine ML. Adsorption at other sites is less favourable or unstable compared to the pristine ML. 2D and 3D Co_4 structures are competitive in energy in the presence of a vacancy, with a preference towards those structures that have metal incorporation into the S layer. The vacancy also facilitates the transfer of S atoms onto the Co cluster.

The most favourable Ru_4 structure on the defective ML is the line configuration at site **3** where transfer of an S atom onto the Ru structure has occurred. Despite this, we find that Ru atoms are less likely to incorporate into the S layer on a defective surface and that the metal-metal interaction energy is weakened, indicating that in the presence of more vacancies 2D growth of Ru should be promoted.

Our overall findings indicate that for Co 2D and 3D cluster adsorption structures are competitive. However, the binding energy of Co on MoS_2 is significantly more favourable than the cohesive energy of Co. This strong binding energy, as well as favourable metal-substrate interaction should inhibit migration of atoms to form 3D structures during thin film deposition, resulting in a 2D film suitable for interconnect applications, without the need of an additional liner material to promote wetting. This is the subject of further work.

In contrast, Ru has a binding energy that is less favourable than its cohesive energy. This suggests that 3D growth Ru on MoS₂ will be promoted, making this system more suitable for catalysis applications where 3D structures with large surface to volume ratios are desired. However, with several structures where the metal-substrate interaction is more favourable than the metal-metal interaction and the overall weakening of the metal-metal interactions caused by an S vacancy, a 2D Ru thin film could be formed in the presence of S vacancies.

References

- [1] A. Samad, A. Shafique, and Y.-H. Shin, “Adsorption and diffusion of mono, di, and trivalent ions on two-dimensional TiS_2 ,” *Nanotechnology*, vol. 28, no. 17, p. 175401, 2017.
- [2] C. Ye, D. Chao, J. Shan, H. Li, K. Davey, and S.-Z. Qiao, “Unveiling the advances of 2d materials for li/na-s batteries experimentally and theoretically,” *Matter*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 323–344, 2020.
- [3] D. Le, T. B. Rawal, and T. S. Rahman, “Single-layer MoS_2 with sulfur vacancies: structure and catalytic application,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 118, no. 10, pp. 5346–5351, 2014.
- [4] A. Sharma, A. Srivastava, M. Husain, and M. S. Khan, “Computational investigations of Cu-embedded MoS_2 sheet for CO oxidation catalysis,” *Journal of Materials Science*, vol. 53, pp. 9578–9588, Jul 2018.
- [5] Y. Ding, Y. Wang, J. Ni, L. Shi, S. Shi, and W. Tang, “First principles study of structural, vibrational and electronic properties of graphene-like MX_2 ($\text{M} = \text{Mo, Nb, W, Ta}$; $\text{X} = \text{S, Se, Te}$) monolayers,” *Physica B: Condensed Matter*, vol. 406, no. 11, pp. 2254–2260, 2011.
- [6] F. Zahid, L. Liu, Y. Zhu, J. Wang, and H. Guo, “A generic tight-binding model for monolayer, bilayer and bulk MoS_2 ,” *Aip Advances*, vol. 3, no. 5, p. 052111, 2013.
- [7] C.-L. Lo, K. K. Smithe, R. Mehta, S. Chugh, E. Pop, and Z. Chen, “Atomically thin diffusion barriers for ultra-scaled Cu interconnects implemented by 2d materials,” in *2017 IEEE International Reliability Physics Symposium (IRPS)*, pp. MR-4, IEEE, 2017.
- [8] C.-L. Lo, M. Catalano, K. K. Smithe, L. Wang, S. Zhang, E. Pop, M. J. Kim, and Z. Chen, “Studies of two-dimensional h-BN and MoS_2 for potential diffusion barrier application in copper interconnect technology,” *npj 2D Materials and Applications*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 42, 2017.
- [9] C.-L. Lo, K. Zhang, R. S. Smith, K. Shah, J. A. Robinson, and Z. Chen, “Large-area, single-layer molybdenum disulfide synthesized at BeOL compatible temperature as Cu diffusion barrier,” *IEEE Electron Device Letters*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 873–876, 2018.
- [10] K. K. Smithe, Z. Zhu, C. S. Bailey, E. Pop, and A. Yoon, “Investigation of monolayer MX_2 as sub-nanometer copper diffusion barriers,” in *2018 IEEE International Reliability Physics Symposium (IRPS)*, pp. P-PI, IEEE, 2018.

- [11] Wonbong Choi and Nitin Choudhary and Gang Hee Han and Juhong Park and Deji Akinwande and Young Hee Lee, “Recent development of two-dimensional transition metal dichalcogenides and their applications,” *Materials Today*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 116 – 130, 2017.
- [12] C. O’Dwyer, L. A. Walsh, F. Gity, S. Bhattacharjee, and P. K. Hurley, “Two-dimensional materials and their role in emerging electronic and photonic devices,” *The Electrochemical Society Interface*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 53–58, 2018.
- [13] Y.-H. Zhang, J.-L. Chen, L.-J. Yue, H.-L. Zhang, and F. Li, “Tuning co sensing properties and magnetism of mos2 monolayer through anchoring transition metal dopants,” *Computational and Theoretical Chemistry*, vol. 1104, pp. 12–17, 2017.
- [14] C. Mackin, A. Fasoli, M. Xue, Y. Lin, A. Adebisi, L. Bozano, and T. Palacios, “Chemical sensor systems based on 2d and thin film materials,” *2D Materials*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 022002, 2020.
- [15] E. W. K. Koh, C. H. Chiu, Y. K. Lim, Y.-W. Zhang, and H. Pan, “Hydrogen adsorption on and diffusion through mos2 monolayer: First-principles study,” *International journal of hydrogen energy*, vol. 37, no. 19, pp. 14323–14328, 2012.
- [16] C. Zhang, Y. Jiao, F. Ma, S. K. Matta, S. Bottle, and A. Du, “Free-radical gases on two-dimensional transition-metal disulfides (xs_2 , $\text{x} = \text{mo/w}$): robust half-metallicity for efficient nitrogen oxide sensors,” *Beilstein journal of nanotechnology*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1641–1646, 2018.
- [17] C.-L. Lo, B. A. Helfrecht, Y. He, D. M. Guzman, N. Onofrio, S. Zhang, D. Weinstein, A. Strachan, and Z. Chen, “Opportunities and challenges of 2d materials in back-end-of-line interconnect scaling,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 128, no. 8, p. 080903, 2020.
- [18] D. Ma, W. Ju, T. Li, X. Zhang, C. He, B. Ma, Y. Tang, Z. Lu, and Z. Yang, “Modulating electronic, magnetic and chemical properties of mos2 monolayer sheets by substitutional doping with transition metals,” *Applied Surface Science*, vol. 364, pp. 181–189, 2016.
- [19] T. B. Rawal, D. Le, and T. S. Rahman, “Effect of single-layer mos2 on the geometry, electronic structure, and reactivity of transition metal nanoparticles,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 121, no. 13, pp. 7282–7293, 2017.
- [20] H. Salehi, M. Moaddeli, and P. Amiri, “Noble metal chain adsorption on graphene sheet,” *Surface Science*, vol. 647, pp. 96–102, 2016.

- [21] Y. Wang, B. Wang, R. Huang, B. Gao, F. Kong, and Q. Zhang, “First-principles study of transition-metal atoms adsorption on mos2 monolayer,” *Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures*, vol. 63, pp. 276–282, 2014.
- [22] R. Zhao, C.-L. Lo, F. Zhang, R. K. Ghosh, T. Knobloch, M. Terrones, Z. Chen, and J. Robinson, “Incorporating niobium in mos2 at beol-compatible temperatures and its impact on copper diffusion barrier performance,” *Advanced Materials Interfaces*, p. 1901055, 2019.
- [23] F. Ersan, G. Gökoğlu, and E. Aktürk, “Adsorption and diffusion of lithium on monolayer transition metal dichalcogenides (mos2 (1-x) se2 x) alloys,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 119, no. 51, pp. 28648–28653, 2015.
- [24] X. Li, Y. Fang, S. Wu, and Z. Zhu, “Adsorption of alkali, alkaline-earth, simple and 3 d transition metal, and nonmetal atoms on monolayer mos2,” *AIP Advances*, vol. 5, no. 5, p. 057143, 2015.
- [25] M. Makaremi, B. Mortazavi, and C. V. Singh, “Adsorption of metallic, metalloidic, and non-metallic adatoms on two-dimensional c3n,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 121, no. 34, pp. 18575–18583, 2017.
- [26] C. M. Smyth, R. Addou, S. McDonnell, C. L. Hinkle, and R. M. Wallace, “Contact metal–mos2 interfacial reactions and potential implications on mos2-based device performance,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 120, no. 27, pp. 14719–14729, 2016.
- [27] J. Fan, J. Yang, A. Pham, and S. Li, “Origins of possible synergistic effects in the interactions between metal atoms and mos 2/graphene heterostructures for battery applications,” *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, vol. 20, no. 27, pp. 18671–18677, 2018.
- [28] C.-L. Nies and M. Nolan, “Dft calculations of the structure and stability of copper clusters on mos2,” *Beilstein Journal of Nanotechnology*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 391–406, 2020.
- [29] R. Addou, L. Colombo, and R. M. Wallace, “Surface defects on natural mos2,” *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, vol. 7, no. 22, pp. 11921–11929, 2015.
- [30] O. V. Pedreira, K. Croes, A. Leśniewska, C. Wu, M. Van Der Veen, J. De Messemacker, K. Vandersmissen, N. Jourdan, L. Wen, C. Adelmann, *et al.*, “Reliability study on cobalt and ruthenium as alternative metals for advanced interconnects,” in *2017 IEEE International Reliability Physics Symposium (IRPS)*, pp. 6B–2, IEEE, 2017.

- [31] N. Bekiaris, Z. Wu, H. Ren, M. Naik, J. H. Park, M. Lee, T. H. Ha, W. Hou, J. R. Bakke, M. Gage, *et al.*, “Cobalt fill for advanced interconnects,” in *2017 IEEE International Interconnect Technology Conference (IITC)*, pp. 1–3, IEEE, 2017.
- [32] K. Barmak, S. Ezzat, R. Gusley, A. Jog, S. Kerdsonpanya, A. Khaniya, E. Milosevic, W. Richardson, K. Sentosun, A. Zangiabadi, *et al.*, “Epitaxial metals for interconnects beyond cu,” *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A: Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films*, vol. 38, no. 3, p. 033406, 2020.
- [33] O. V. Pedreira, M. Stucchi, A. Gupta, V. V. Gonzalez, M. van der Veen, S. Lariviere, C. Wilson, Z. Tőkei, *et al.*, “Metal reliability mechanisms in ruthenium interconnects,” in *2020 IEEE International Reliability Physics Symposium (IRPS)*, pp. 1–7, IEEE, 2020.
- [34] T. M. Philip, N. A. Lanzillo, T. Gunst, T. Markussen, J. Cobb, S. Aboud, and R. R. Robison, “First-principles evaluation of fcc ruthenium for its use in advanced interconnects,” *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. 044045, 2020.
- [35] D. Zhang, A. Du, C. Zhao, J. Gao, S. Mao, J. Xu, S. Gu, Y. Liu, X. Luo, Y. Li, *et al.*, “Investigation of barrier property of amorphous co–ti layer as single barrier/liner in local co interconnects,” *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2076–2081, 2020.
- [36] J. Zhang, X. Xu, L. Yang, D. Cheng, and D. Cao, “Single-atom ru doping induced phase transition of mos2 and s vacancy for hydrogen evolution reaction,” *Small Methods*, vol. 3, no. 12, p. 1900653, 2019.
- [37] J. Liu, Y. Zheng, D. Zhu, A. Vasileff, T. Ling, and S.-Z. Qiao, “Identification of ph-dependent synergy on ru/mos 2 interface: a comparison of alkaline and acidic hydrogen evolution,” *Nanoscale*, vol. 9, no. 43, pp. 16616–16621, 2017.
- [38] I. S. Kwon, T. T. Debelá, I. H. Kwak, Y. C. Park, J. Seo, J. Y. Shim, S. J. Yoo, J.-G. Kim, J. Park, and H. S. Kang, “Ruthenium nanoparticles on cobalt-doped 1t’ phase mos2 nanosheets for overall water splitting,” *Small*, vol. 16, no. 13, p. 2000081, 2020.
- [39] B. T. Young, M. A. K. Pathan, T. Jiang, D. Le, N. Marrow, T. Nguyen, C. E. Jordan, T. S. Rahman, D. M. Popolan-Vaida, and M. E. Vaida, “Catalytic c2h2 synthesis via low temperature co hydrogenation on defect-rich 2d-mos2 and 2d-mos2 decorated with mo clusters,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, vol. 152, no. 7, p. 074706, 2020.

- [40] Z. Liang, R. Shen, Y. H. Ng, P. Zhang, Q. Xiang, and X. Li, “A review on 2d mos2 cocatalysts in photocatalytic h₂ production,” *Journal of Materials Science & Technology*, vol. 56, pp. 89–121, 2020.
- [41] B. Li, C. Christiansen, D. Badami, and C.-C. Yang, “Electromigration challenges for advanced on-chip cu interconnects,” *Microelectronics Reliability*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 712–724, 2014.
- [42] D. C. Edelstein, “20 years of cu beol in manufacturing, and its future prospects,” in *2017 IEEE International Electron Devices Meeting (IEDM)*, pp. 14–1, IEEE, 2017.
- [43] C. Dong, Y. Li, D. Cheng, M. Zhang, J. Liu, Y.-G. Wang, D. Xiao, and D. Ma, “Supported metal clusters: Fabrication and application in heterogeneous catalysis,” *ACS Catalysis*, vol. 10, no. 19, pp. 11011–11045, 2020.
- [44] H.-M. Benia, X. Lin, H.-J. Gao, N. Nilius, and H.-J. Freund, “Nucleation and growth of gold on mgo thin films: A combined stm and luminescence study,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, vol. 111, no. 28, pp. 10528–10533, 2007.
- [45] J. Engel, S. Francis, and A. Roldan, “The influence of support materials on the structural and electronic properties of gold nanoparticles—a dft study,” *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, vol. 21, no. 35, pp. 19011–19025, 2019.
- [46] Y. Han, R. Ferrando, and Z. Li, “Atomic details of interfacial interaction in gold nanoparticles supported on mgo (001),” *The journal of physical chemistry letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 131–137, 2014.
- [47] S. Kondati Natarajan, C.-L. Nies, and M. Nolan, “The role of ru passivation and doping on the barrier and seed layer properties of ru-modified tan for copper interconnects,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, vol. 152, no. 14, p. 144701, 2020.
- [48] G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, “Efficient iterative schemes for ab initio total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 54, p. 11169, 15 October 1996.
- [49] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, “Generalized gradient approximation made simple,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 77, p. 3865, 28 October 1996.
- [50] P. Blochl, “Projector augmented-wave method,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 50, p. 17953, 15 December 1994.

- [51] K. Persson, “Materials data on co (sg:194) by materials project,” 2 2016.
- [52] K. Persson, “Materials data on cos2 (sg:205) by materials project,” 2 2015.
- [53] K. Persson, “Materials data on co3mo (sg:194) by materials project,” 2 2015.
- [54] K. Persson, “Materials data on ru (sg:194) by materials project,” 2 2016.
- [55] K. Persson, “Materials data on rus2 (sg:205) by materials project,” 11 2014.
- [56] K. Persson, “Materials data on moru3 (sg:194) by materials project,” 2 2016.