Supplementary information: Elucidation of photovoltage origin and charge transport in Cu$_2$O heterojunctions for solar energy conversion
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1 Theory

Drift-diffusion equations we used for description of charge transport in the photocathode

\[ \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} = - \frac{q(N_D - n(x) + p(x) - N_A)}{\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r}, \]

\[ 0 = \frac{1}{q} \frac{\partial j_e}{\partial x} + G(x) - R(x), \]

\[ 0 = -\frac{1}{q} \frac{\partial j_h}{\partial x} + G(x) - R(x), \]

where \( q = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-19} \) C is elementary electron charge, \( \phi, n, p \) denote electrostatic potential, electron and hole concentration and \( x \) spatial coordinate. Donor(acceptor) concentration is denoted \( N_D(N_A) \), permittivity of vacuum \( \varepsilon_0 \), relative dielectric constant \( \varepsilon_r \), generation rate \( G(x) \) and recombination rate \( R(x) \).

The electron and hole flux \( j_e, j_h \) consists of two terms (diffusion and drift)

\[ j_e = +qD_e \frac{\partial n}{\partial x} - q \mu_e n \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}, \]

\[ j_h = -qD_h \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - q \mu_h p \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}, \]

where the electrostatic potential is \( \phi \), electron mobility is \( \mu_e \) and hole mobility \( \mu_h \).

Illumination source AM1.5G with intensity 100 mW/cm$^2$ was applied from the electrolyte side,[20] and for simplicity light absorption in TiO$_2$, AZO and Ga$_2$O$_3$ layers was neglected due to their wide bandgaps in comparison to that of Cu$_2$O. Optical reflections at all interfaces are also neglected. The generation rate of charge carriers from the simple Lambert-Beer law was assumed with wavelength-dependent absorption coefficient of Cu$_2$O.[15] Shockley-Read-Hall recombination through a midgap state is assumed in all layers and the corresponding carrier lifetimes are computed from the mobility and diffusion length values in Table S1.
The model equations were numerically solved in Comsol Multiphysics software. The baseline material parameters are summarized in Table S1. We remark that our baseline parameters assume perfect CB alignment of Cu$_2$O and Ga$_2$O$_3$ (equal value of $\chi$), although various small offsets (positive or negative) have been reported in the literature. We always refer applied voltage with respect to dark equilibrium (for HER taking place at photocathode, this translates to voltage versus the reversible hydrogen electrode, RHE). The total cathodic current density in photocurrent-voltage (IV) plots is reported negative as usual for photocathodes. Different to this sign convention for total current in our IV plots, positive electron current density indicates flow of electrons from right (Cu$_2$O) to the left (electrolyte) in our figures, whereas positive hole current density is in the opposite direction. Thus, positive (negative) partial current density means flow of that carrier in the desired (undesired) direction for forward operation of HER on the photocathode. As a replacement of the quantity $V_{oc}$ used in photovoltaics, we use the broadly used term of photocurrent onset (turn-on) voltage $V_{on}$ for photoelectrodes, defined as voltage for which photoelectrode starts to sustain measurable photocurrent (here we chose 0.1 mA/cm$^2$ threshold).

Stable numerical convergence of the model requires better mesh quality close to the internal interfaces. Therefore, the Cu$_2$O was meshed by 500 elements of symmetric arithmetic distribution, whereas TiO$_2$ and Ga$_2$O$_3$ were meshed with 500 elements (element ratio 10) with geometric distribution refined to the left of TiO$_2$ and Ga$_2$O$_3$, respectively. Where convergence was not obtained from the predefined initial values in Comsol, we used solution at thermal equilibrium as initial value for the solution away from thermal equilibrium.
Table S1: Baseline material parameters of semiconductors used in the calculations. The donor traps with density $5 \cdot 10^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$ in IRL are assumed to have 0.1 V wide Gaussian distribution around midgap with capture electron (hole) capture cross-section of $5 \cdot 10^{-13}$ cm$^2$ ($10^{-15}$ cm$^2$), respectively.
2 Estimations of built-in voltage

We will calculate built-in voltage $V_{bi}$ of heterojunction of two semiconductors numbered 1 and 2 in thermal equilibrium by the difference of their Fermi levels before contact \[5\]

$$V_{bi} = \frac{E_{F1} - E_{F2}}{q},$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$$E_F(n\text{-type}) = -\chi - \zeta_n,$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

$$E_F(p\text{-type}) = -\chi - E_g + \zeta_p,$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$\zeta_n = k_B T \log \left( \frac{N_C}{N_D} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$\zeta_p = k_B T \log \left( \frac{N_V}{N_A} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$V_{bi,n} = V_{bi} \frac{\varepsilon_p N_A}{\varepsilon_p N_A + \varepsilon_n N_D},$$ \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$V_{bi,p} = V_{bi} \frac{\varepsilon_n N_D}{\varepsilon_p N_A + \varepsilon_n N_D}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (12)

Built-in voltage is positive if Fermi level of semiconductor 1 is above the Fermi level of semiconductor 2. For AZO/Cu$_2$O (Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O) heterojunction, this calculation gives $V_{bi}$ of 0.99 V (1.93 V), respectively.

3 Cu$_2$O photoelectrode preparation and testing

Electrodeposited copper oxide devices were prepared by the methods described in Dias et al., \[7\] with the following specific differences. The sputtered gold layer at the substrate was 150 nm thick. The Cu$_2$O was deposited for 100 min, yielding polycrystalline films of approximately 500 nm thickness. Atomic layer deposition of AZO was as described in Ref. [7], while ALD of Ga$_2$O$_3$ was as described in Pan et al. \[21\]. Each was followed immediately by ALD of TiO$_2$. For the current-voltage data of Figure 2, the devices were first functionalized by RuOx catalyst by electrodeposition, then tested in pH 5 electrolyte, as described in Ref. \[7\]. For the photovoltage decay experiments, the capacitive nature of RuOx prevented unambiguous measurements of potential. Instead, electrodeposited Pt was used as catalyst, deposited as described in Ref. \[22\]. Devices of Pt/TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O and Pt/TiO$_2$/AZO/Cu$_2$O showed similar onset potentials as those using RuOx catalyst. In control experiments, the Pt/TiO$_2$ interface was shown to rapidly and stably equilibrate at 0.0 V vs RHE in the dark when in contact with H$_2$-saturated electrolyte solution. This condition therefore pinned the Pt/TiO$_2$ surface potential at 0, ideal for open circuit potential measurements without capacitive effects. Hydrogen gas (¿99.99%) was produced by a hydrogen generator and bubbled into the electrolyte at atmospheric pressure. The photocathodes were connected as working electrodes with an Ag/AgCl (3M) reference electrode and a Pt wire counter electrode, held at open circuit using a Bio-Logic SP-200 potentiostat/galvanostat, and illuminated with a "cold white" spectrum LED source (Thorlabs). The light intensity was calibrated to a value which produces the same photocurrent density on the photocathodes as is generated under a class ABB solar simulator (LCS-100, Newport) calibrated at one sun intensity. The open circuit was measured continuously, the device was illuminated for ca. 30 sec to determine the steady-state photopotential, then the LED was switched off by electronic switch to monitor the decay of potential versus time.
Figure S1: Electron (left column) and hole (right column) current densities and their components for TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O under illumination and a) 0.5 V and b) 0.9 V. For 0.5 V, electrons are carrying the current in TiO$_2$ and Ga$_2$O$_3$, while hole current is zero. In the 50 nm from Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O interface into Cu$_2$O, electron current flows in the correct direction to the left, while beyond 50 nm the electron current flows in undesired direction to the back contact (negative sign) and hole current compensates this. Looking closer at the diffusion and drift current components, we observe that electron drift current dominates electron current in Ga$_2$O$_3$ and electron diffusion current dominates in Cu$_2$O. Throughout Cu$_2$O, hole drift interestingly dominates over hole diffusion, although the SCR of Cu$_2$O does not extend more than 25 nm into Cu$_2$O. Between Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O interface and 80 nm into Cu$_2$O, hole diffusion current is actually in wrong direction, but it is compensated by hole drift current. For 0.9 V, the electron and hole currents in Ga$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ are close to zero, while their non-zero profile in Cu$_2$O balances out in that region. The electron current is dominated by electron diffusion throughout TiO$_2$, Ga$_2$O$_3$ and Cu$_2$O. For most of Cu$_2$O (apart from near interface 1), negative electron current is in the undesired direction, and it is opposed by the positive hole current in the desired direction, thus giving total current 0.1 mA/cm$^2$. Hole current through Cu$_2$O is dominated by the hole diffusion component, which is a notable difference to the situation at 0.5 V where hole current was dominated by hole drift. Hole drift current throughout Cu$_2$O is actually in undesired direction. The range of vertical axis for current density between -6 and +6 mA/cm$^2$ is chosen to facilitate readability - the peak values are cut off in the plot.
Figure S2: Carrier concentrations for TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O under illumination at 0.5 V (solid lines) and 0.9 V (dashed lines).

Figure S3: Electron current components for TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O and $N_{D,Ga2O3}=10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$. 
Figure S4: Contour plots of onset voltage for TiO$_2$/AZO/Cu$_2$O (top), TiO$_2$/AZO/IRL/Cu$_2$O (middle) and TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O (bottom) junctions as function of n-type layer parameters $\chi_2$ and $N_2$, calculated by SCAPS. The threshold current density 0.5 mA/cm$^2$ was used for TiO$_2$/AZO/IRL/Cu$_2$O junction since the IV curves approach zero more slowly then for TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O junction (where threshold 0.1 mA/cm$^2$ was used). Simulations were not converging in the blank regions of the contour plot.
Figure S5: Simulations of transport in TiO$_2$/AZO/Cu$_2$O for different values of $\chi_{AZO}$ with $V_{on}$ values marked by asterisk. a) Current-voltage curves. Logarithmic plot of electron thermionic current components across b) interface 2 (AZO/TiO$_2$) $j_{nl2}$ (solid) and $j_{nr2}$ (dashed) and c) interface 1 (Cu$_2$O/AZO) $j_{nl1}$ (solid) and $j_{nr1}$ (dashed). The intersection of $j_{nr}$ with the threshold current density 0.1 mA/cm$^2$ is marked by circle for interface 1 and by square for interface 2, with the color corresponding to the respective electron affinity. d) Comparison of extracted values of $V_{on}$ from a) shown as stars and extracted values from analysis in b) and c) shown with the same symbols. Thermionic emission over interface Cu$_2$O/AZO stops electron current flow for $\chi_{AZO}=4.0$, 4.4 eV, while for $\chi_{AZO}=3.6$ and 3.2 eV the electron thermionic emission over interface from AZO/TiO$_2$ (interface 2) becomes current limiting.
Figure S6: Simulated dark current-voltage curves for TiO$_2$/AZO/Cu$_2$O and TiO$_2$/Ga$_2$O$_3$/Cu$_2$O and forward bias.

Figure S7: Comparison band diagrams (solid blue/green lines for CB/VB, left axes) and partial current densities (dashed lines, right axes) of TiO$_2$/AZO/IRL/Cu$_2$O junction at a) 0 V vs RHE and b) 0.4 V vs RHE.

