

$$j_{sc} = \frac{q A G_0}{h\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{q(V_{oc} - V)}{kT}\right)} - 1 \right)^{-1}$$

Stephan Lany and Alex Zunger^a
National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado 80401

(

exhibit meta stable behavior that can lead to persistent photoconductivity. In Ref. 20, we discussed in detail the general defect physics that lead to metastability and PPC

indicating that meta table beha io of CIGS ola cell i ac-
companied b a potentiall det imental ecombination cente .

is needed to correct for the band-tilting effect (Mortimer and B. Steinhardt) resulting from the high defect density of the actual calculation. Due to the small effective electron mass in CIS and CGS, $m_e^*/m_e=0.09$ (Ref. 36), the electron band-tilting effect is a motivation proposed for donors. Thus, the effective correction for H of the intrinsic In_C^0 double donor in CIS is a large ~ 1.5 eV. Due to the large effective hole mass, $m_h^*/m_e=0.8$ (Ref. 37 and 38) in CIS, the band-tilting correction for the single-acceptor state of V_C^0 and of the $(V_{Se}-V_C)^0$ complex (in the acceptor configuration) is only about 0.1 eV. Note that the electron band-tilting effect originates from the use of finite-size supercell and not from deficiencies of the LDA.

(iv) *Potential alignment correction for charged impurities.* The supercell formalism describes a periodic, infinite

band minimum,⁴² the range of possible Fermi level in Fig. 2(a) (left) is extended above the CBM of pure CIS, up to $E_F = E_V + 1.25$ eV, approximately corresponding to the CBM of $\text{C}_{1-x}\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_x\text{Se}_2$ alloy with composition up to $x = 0.4$, aimed for high efficiency CIGS solar cell. We see in Fig. 2(a) (left) that in CIS, the *isolated* V_{Se} has a deep, negative- U -like, double donor transition $(2+/0) = E_V + 0.05$ eV close to the VBM, and deep acceptor transition high in the gap, i.e., $(0/-) = E_V + 0.85$ eV and $(-/2) = E_V + 1.14$ eV.³⁹ The deep acceptor level results from the occupation of the antibonding b level (Fig. 1), leading to the formation of $V_{\text{Se}}(a^2b^1)$ and $V_{\text{Se}}^2(a^2b^2)$. Thus, the isolated V_{Se} exhibits amphoteric behavior having both deep donor and deep acceptor levels, hence the existence of the donor and acceptor levels in extended, i.e., the acceptor transition occurs high in the

the accepto nality of V_C , hq_e e e, the co e ponding
cha ge rate of the $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ complex, a e hified b 1
elati e to the i olated V_{Se}

[Fig. 2(a)] compared to the respective $(0/)$ and $(1/2)$ levels of the isolated V_{Se} . The position of the deep acceptor level around 1 eV above the VBM indicates that in a CIGS solar cell, the level can only be occupied close to the CdS/CIGS heterojunction, where the Fe mid-level can interfere with high energy. Even though the occupation of the deep level is accompanied by considerable atomic relaxation, no energy barrier is involved. Consequently, the deep acceptor level is a free-liberated ion. Note, however, that the deep level is present only in the acceptor configuration (hot III-III distance), where the b level is located inside the band gap [Fig. 3(a)]. In contrast, no such deep transition level exists along the complex, remain in the donor configuration (large III-III distance), because the b level is outside the band gap, i.e., above the CBM, in this configuration [Fig. 3(a)].

In the acceptor configuration of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$, the essential optical transition caused by the b level in the gap: The optical absorption energy due to photoexcitation of electron from the VBM into the b level ($a^2b^0 \rightarrow a^2b^1+h$), and the photoluminescence energy due to recombination of electron in the b level with hole at the VBM ($a^2b^1+h \rightarrow a^2b^0$), are given in Table II. Later in Sec. V, we compare the optical energy to experimentally observed absorption and PL energy. Unlike the $(1/2)$ and $(2/3)$ acceptor transition which are caused by occupation of a gap state, i.e., the b level, the activated $(+/-)$ transition inside the gap at the demand of the Fe mid-level at which the modulation of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ change from the donor to the acceptor configuration. The single-particle state being occupied during this transition, i.e., the a level, is outside the band gap before and after the transition [Fig. 3(a)] and, therefore, does not cause an optical transition level within the gap.

Configuration coordinate model for the conversion between the donor and acceptor configurations. Figure 3(b) shows the calculated configuration coordinate diagram for the $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ complex in CIS. Here, the distance $d_{In,In}$ between the In atoms is the reaction coordinate. As shown in Fig. 2(a), the $(V_{Se}-V_C)^+$ state in the donor configuration with large $d_{In,In}$ [1 in Fig. 3(b)] has the lowest energy in p -type CIGS, where the Fe mid-level is close to the VBM. 3.5 /F8 1 Tf

shown in Fig. 4 (Ref. 44) for the acceptor configuration with the hot In-In distance, along with the electronic orbital (interface plot of the wave function) of the a and b defect levels, which, in this configuration, lie below the VBM and in the band gap, respectively (Table I). The bonding and the antibonding character of the a and the b levels, respectively, are clearly visible in Fig. 4.

The deep $(1/2)$ and $(2/3)$ acceptor transition of the complex (Table II), which result from the occupation of the antibonding b level, occur at somewhat higher energy

t on $(a^1 \rightarrow a^2 + h)$, leading to a hole in the halo_v accepto
le el $(E_a$ in Fig. 3

ordinate diagram for CGS [Fig. 5(b)]. Consequently, the n -conductivity meta-table donor state that exists in CIS for E_F (+/-) [dashed green line in Fig. 2(a), CIS] does not exist in CGS [cf. Fig. 2(a), CGS]. In CGS, once E_F is above the (+/-) transition level, the potential charged complex will convert via E . (2) into the $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ acceptor configuration, even at low temperature. Thus, the donor configuration with large Ga-Ga distance exists in CGS only as a compensating donor for E_F (+/-). In contrast, the meta-table hallo acceptor state [dashed red line in Fig. 2(a)] exists in CGS similar like in low-gap CIS (cf. E_a in Table II). The only difference is the light low energy band is associated with the hole capture process of E . (3) and the one with large energy band for hole emission by transition E . (3) in the backward direction, i.e., $E_2=0.28$ eV and $E_3=0.92$ eV in CGS [cf. Fig. 5(b)].

$$(V_p - V)$$

Distribution between the donor/acceptor configurations of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$, determined from the Fermi level in thermodynamic equilibrium. In order to analyze the change in the net acceptor density upon illumination of the device, we need to determine the distribution between the donor and acceptor configuration of the $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ complex before the treatment, i.e., in the relaxed state at equilibrium. Since the equilibrium state of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ depends on the local Fermi level [cf. Fig. 2(a)], it will change as a function of distance d from the CdS/CIGS heterojunction in a solar

Dynamics of donor/acceptor conversion. The equilibrium distribution between the donor and the acceptor configurations should be regarded as a steady state situation with respect to the forward and backward directions of the transition E . (2) and (3). We now add the transition dynamics, i.e., the transition rates of E . (2) and (3), with which a new equilibrium between the donor and acceptor configurations of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ is established, once an external perturbation is applied, e.g., illumination of a bias. If the external perturbation creates an excess of free electrons, the complex will react to this perturbation by the electron capture, E . (2) in the forward direction, and the conversion into the acceptor state, the electron emitting the electron excess according to Le Chatelier's principle. Similarly, if the external perturbation

respond to the donor-to-acceptor transition of $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ due to the capture, Eq. (2), of photoexcited electrons. This process is described by the sequence $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4$ in the CCD of Fig. 3(b) and 5(b), and can take place only when the complex is excited, at least partially, to $(V_{Se}-V_C)^+$.

mediate distance from the junction due to the electron capture, E_c (2), in the forward direction. Taking $n=10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$,⁴⁸ and from E_c (4) a time constant $\tau_{ec}=10^2$ at $T=300 \text{ K}$. Second, due to hole depletion, the forward direction of the hole capture, E_h (3), is suppressed, which due to E_c (3) in the backward direction, i.e., hole emission, for which τ_{hc} and the time constant $\tau_{hc}=10^3$ at $T=300 \text{ K}$. Thus, both electron capture and hole emission are expected to lead to an increased acceptor density at intermediate distance from the junction, at the time scale of the reverse-bias experiment. The electrostatic potential profile by their different energy barrier E_1 and E_3 (Table II), which hold, to a large extent, determine the apparent activation energy of the bias-induced change. Note, however, that the transition, E_c (2) and (3), depend on the local electron and hole concentration, which, in turn, depend on temperature due to a temperature dependent depletion width. This may lead to a contribution to the apparent thermal activation energy, in addition to the barrier height.

The recovery of the equilibrium state after reverse-bias treatment was investigated in Ref. 15 in a thermal stimulated capacitance experiment, by analyzing the (negative) capacitance step after which the increased capacitance of the metastable state relaxed back to the capacitance of the equilibrium state before reverse-bias treatment. In our $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ model, this step is caused by the back transition from the acceptor into the donor conduction band by the hole capture, E_h (3). The activation energy of 0.32 eV measured in Ref. 15 for this transition compares well with our calculated energy barrier in Table II. Also, the measured field-effect factor of $\gamma_0=4 \cdot 10^4$ (Ref. 15) supports the $(V_{Se}-V_C)$ model, and from E_h (5) a similar value $P_{hc}^2=10^3$ appears.

Can the amphoteric ($V_{Se}-V_{Cu}$) defect explain unusual capacitance transients? Even though the dynamics of the activated (+/-) transition corresponding to the donor/acceptor concentration of ($V_{Se}-V_C$) is different from conventional transition (cf. Sec. IV), this concentration may be in both directions, observed directly in capacitance experiment, proposed temperature, and frequency, ω , $\ln \omega$, are appropriate. [Note that in the experiment cited above, the evidence for the (+/-) transition of ($V_{Se}-V_C$) is only indirect and manifested by a change of the $h\nu$ acceptor concentration due to illumination of bias. The $h\nu$ acceptor density is all determined at $\ln \omega$ temperature, hence the (+/-) transition itself is not activated.] Recently, Yonng *et al.*¹⁶ and Yonng and Chandall¹⁷

imila it κ ith o. calc. lated ab o ption le el of (

an order estimated overlap and, hence, interaction between defect and host orbital, the exact choice of the experimental (non-relativistic) lattice constant implies the presence of some hydrostatic pressure acting on the lattice in the calculation. Fortunately, the exact value is only a minor difference in the defect formation and transition energies. Since the large lattice expansion of the anion vacancy in II-VI compounds is particularly sensitive to the lattice constant (Ref. 20) the difference can be more pronounced, in the case of anion vacancy, however. For CIS and CGS, we conducted additional calculation that H change by not more than 0.2 eV when using the LDA lattice constant.

²⁹S. Lan, Y. J. Zhao, C. Peon, and A. Zunger, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **86**, 042109 (2005).

³⁰Y. J. Zhao, C. Peon, S. Lan, and A. Zunger, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **85**, 5860 (2004).

³¹S. B. Zhang, S. H. Wei, A. Zunger, and H. Katayama-Yoshida, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 9642 (1998).

³²C. Peon, Y. J. Zhao, S. Lan, and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 035211 (2005).

³³V. I. Anisimov, I. V. Solov'ev, M. A. Korotin, M. T. Chulkov, and G. A. Sawatzky, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 16929 (1993); A. I. Liechtenstein, V. I. Anisimov, and J. Zaanen, *ibid.* **52**, R5467 (1995).

³⁴M. Ueda, N. Hamada, T. Kotani, and M. van Schilfegaarde, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 125101 (2002).

³⁵L. Hedin and S. Lundqvist, in *Solid State Physics*, edited by F. Seitz, D. T. N. B. and H. Ehrenreich (Academic, New York, 1969), Vol. 23, p. 1.

³⁶H. Weine, H. Neumann, H. J. H. H. G. K. K. and N. Van Nam, *Phys. Stat. Solidi B* **81**, K59 (1977).

³⁷T. Irie, S. Endo, and S. Kimura, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* **18**, 1303 (1979).

³⁸We determined $m_h^*/m_e=0.8$ from fitting an effective-mass-like density of states (degeneracy factor of 2) to the numerical density of states, calculated in LDA including spin-orbit coupling. The obtained effective $m_h^*/m_e=0.73$ determined experimentally in Ref. 37.

³⁹In Ref. 20, we determined V from the difference of the single-particle energies of the In- d (Ga- d) orbital in the defect calculation relative to In- d (Ga- d) energy in the perfect host. The present method appears to yield more consistent results and less controlled state compared to the former method. Accordingly, the potential alignment V for the

$(V_{Sc}-V_C)$ complex determined here differs by up to 0.2 eV from that determined in Ref. 20. The most significant change is that we now find a hallo state of the acceptor conduction of $(V_{Sc}-V_C)$, similar to the hallo state of the isolated V_C .