

## Supplementary Materials

# Reduced bipolar conduction in bandgap-engineered *n*-type $\text{Cu}_{0.008}\text{Bi}_2(\text{Te},\text{Se})_3$ by sulfur doping

Weon Ho Shin, Hyun-Sik Kim, Seyun Kim, Sung-sil Choo, Seok-won Hong, Yeseong Oh, Yerim Yang, Yoona Kim, and Sang-il Kim

### S1. Single-parabolic-band model

In the single-parabolic-band model, the thermoelectric parameters of the VB and CB computed by using the Boltzmann transport equations [S1] can be substituted into the following equations (S1)–(S4),

$$\sigma_{tot} = \sum_i \sigma_i, \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$S_{tot} = \frac{\sum_i S_i \sigma_i}{\sum_i \sigma_i}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

$$R_{Htotal} = \frac{\sum_i R_{Hi} \sigma_i^2}{(\sum_i \sigma_i)^2}, \quad (\text{S3})$$

$$\kappa_{bp} = (\sum_i S_i^2 \sigma_i - S_{total}^2 \sigma_{total})T. \quad (\text{S4})$$

The calculated  $\sigma_{tot}$  and  $S_{tot}$  of the samples were fitted to the experimental  $\sigma$  and  $S$  by adjusting the  $E_g$ ,  $E_{def}$ , and  $m^*$  values for the VB and CB to estimate  $\kappa_{bp}$  (Table 1) [S1]. In the fitting,  $E_g$  estimated by using the Goldsmid–Sharp formula was employed [S2]. Owing to the symmetry of the  $\text{Bi}_2(\text{Sb},\text{Te})_3$  crystal, more than one Fermi pocket contributes to  $m^*$  as  $m^* = N_V^{2/3} m_b^*$ , where  $N_V$  and  $m_b^*$  denote the valley degeneracy and band mass of a single valley, respectively.  $N_V$  for the VB and CB is 6. The Fermi level of an individual band calculated by using the experimental  $R_{Htot}$  was used to validate the values calculated by using  $S_p$  and  $S_n$ . The calculated  $R_{Hp}$  and  $R_H$  were used to estimate the hole and electron concentrations, shown in Table 1.  $\kappa_{bp}$  calculated by Equation (S4) with the parameters in Table 1 is shown in Figure 5(b).

## S2. Debye–Callaway model

The effect of the S doping on  $\kappa_{latt}$  was analyzed by using the Debye–Callaway model [S3]. In substitutes are considered as additional point defects in the native cation disorder of  $\text{Te}_{2.8}\text{S}_{0.2}$  in  $\text{Bi}_2(\text{Te}_{2.8}\text{S}_{0.2})$ . The thermal conductivity  $\kappa$  can be expressed by using the kinetic gas model,

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{3} C_V v l = \frac{1}{3} C_V v^2 \tau, \quad (\text{S5})$$

where  $C_V$ ,  $v$ ,  $l$ , and  $\tau$  denote the heat capacity, velocity, distance, and relaxation time between collisions, respectively. Equation (S5) can be used for phonons in solids as opposed to gas particles. The Callaway equation for  $\kappa_{latt}$  (Equation (S6)) is [S3]

$$\kappa_{latt} = \frac{1}{3} \int_0^{\omega_{max}} C_V(\omega) v_g(\omega)^2 \tau(\omega) d\omega, \quad (\text{S6})$$

where  $v_g$  denotes the phonon group velocity ( $v_g = d\omega/dk$ ), equivalent to the speed of sound,  $v$  (Debye model). Thus, Equation (S6) can be expressed as Equation (S7), which corresponds to the Debye–Callaway model,

$$\kappa_{latt} = \frac{k_B}{2\pi^2 v} \left( \frac{k_B T}{\hbar} \right)^3 \int_0^{\theta_a/T} \frac{\tau_{total}(z) z^4 e^z}{(e^z - 1)^2} dz, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where  $k_B$ ,  $\hbar$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $z$  denote the Boltzmann constant, reduced Planck constant, Debye temperature  $\theta_a$ , and  $\hbar\omega/k_B T$ , respectively. The Debye temperature  $\theta_a$  (94 K) and average phonon velocity (2147 m s<sup>-1</sup>) were obtained from the literature [S4,S5].  $\kappa_{latt}$  was estimated by using Equation (S7), where the total relaxation time  $\tau_{total}(z)$  is calculated by using the individual relaxation times ( $\tau_i$ ) of various scattering mechanisms based on the following relationship,

$$\tau_{total}(z)^{-1} = \sum_i \tau_i(z)^{-1} = \tau_U(z)^{-1} + \tau_B(z)^{-1} + \tau_{PD}(z)^{-1}, \quad (\text{S8})$$

where  $\tau_U$ ,  $\tau_B$ , and  $\tau_{PD}$  are the relaxation times of the Umklapp scattering, boundary scattering, and point-defect scattering, respectively. The point-defect scattering can be described by the scattering parameter

( $\Gamma$ ), which is related to the mass difference ( $\Delta M$ ) and lattice constant difference ( $\Delta a$ ) between the two different constituents,

$$\tau_{PD}^{-1} = Pf(1-f)\omega^4 = \frac{V\omega^4}{4\pi v^3} \Gamma, \quad (S9)$$

$$\Gamma = f(1-f) \left[ \left( \frac{\Delta M}{M} \right)^2 + \frac{2}{9} \left\{ (G + 6.4\gamma) \frac{1+r}{1-r} \right\}^2 \left( \frac{\Delta a}{a} \right)^2 \right], \quad (S10)$$

where  $P$  is a fitting parameter,  $f$  represents the fractional concentration of the substitutes,  $G$  is the ratio of the fractional change in bulk modulus to the local bond length, and  $\gamma$  and  $r$  are the Grüneisen parameter and Poisson's ratio, respectively. The same parameters used to calculate the individual relaxation times  $\tau_U$  and  $\tau_B$  were used for the fitting for the undoped sample.

To estimate  $\tau_{PD}$  for the S-doped sample, we considered  $P$  in Equation (S9) as an adjusting parameter, where  $f$  is a fixed parameter, the determined factional concentration. For  $x = 0.05$  and  $0.15$ , the  $f$  values were  $0.017$  and  $0.05$ , respectively.  $P$  was  $83.1 \times 10^{-41} \text{ s}^3$ , fitted by using the experimental  $\kappa_{latt}$  values of the two doped samples. Thus, the  $P_S f(1-f)$  values were  $1.63$  and  $3.95 \times 10^{-41} \text{ s}^3$  for  $x = 0.05$  and  $0.15$ , respectively. The fitted parameters are shown in Table S1. The lines in Figure 4(c) show the  $\kappa_{latt}$  values of the S-doped samples calculated with the fitted parameters.

**Table S1.** Point defect contributions to the total relaxation rates ( $\tau_{\text{total}}^{-1}$ ) used to model the  $\kappa_{latt}$  values of the samples.

| $\text{Cu}_{0.008}\text{Bi}_2\text{Te}_{2.8-x}\text{Se}_{0.2}\text{S}_x$ | Fitting parameter, $P_S$<br>( $10^{-41}\text{s}^3$ ) | $f(1-f)*P_S$<br>( $10^{-41}\text{s}^3$ ) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| $x=0$<br>$f=0$                                                           | -                                                    | -                                        |
| $x=0.05$<br>$f=0.017$                                                    | 83.1                                                 | 1.63                                     |
| $x=0.15$<br>$f=0.05$                                                     | 83.1                                                 | 3.95                                     |

## References

[S1] May, A.F.; Snyder, G.J. *Materials, Preparation, and Characterization in Thermoelectric* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2012) pp. 1–18.

[S2] Goldsmid, H.J.; Sharp, J.W. Estimation of the thermal band gap of a semiconductor from seebeck measurements. *Journal of Electronic Materials*, **1999**, 28, 869–872

DOI: 10.1063/1.4905922

[S3] Callaway, J. Model for lattice thermal conductivity at low temperatures, *Phys. Rev.* **1959**, 113, 1046–1051.

DOI : 10.1103/PhysRev.113.1046

[S4] Bessas, D.; Sergueev, I.; Wille, H.C.; Perßon, J.; Ebling, D.; Hermann, R.P., Lattice dynamics in  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Te}_3$  and  $\text{Sb}_2\text{Te}_3$ : Te and Sb density of phonon states, *Phys. Rev. B* **2012**, 86, 224301.

[S5] Yang, F.; Ikeda, T.; Snyder, G.J.; Dames C., Effective thermal conductivity of polycrystalline materials with randomly oriented superlattice grains. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2010**, 108, 034310.