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In the paper titled "Expanding Thermal Plasma Chemical Vapour Deposition of ZnO:Al Layers for CIGS Solar Cells," in the third paragraph in Experimental, some errors have occurred and it should be corrected as follows: “The ZnO:Al deposition parameters of the two conditions used here are shown in Table 1. All parameters were kept constant except for the Ar flow rate, whether or not a He back flow (directed from the backside of the heater to the substrate) was used to increase the thermal contact between the substrate and the holder. For both conditions, preliminary growth runs were made to check the final temperature \((T_f)\) reached following 12 minutes of ZnO:Al deposition, using temperature-sensitive stickers mounted on the samples. Since a higher final temperature was recorded when using 1 slm Ar in the absence of He backflow \((T_f = 240^\circ C)\), this condition is denoted as the high thermal budget condition (HTB), whereas the use of 1.5 slm Ar combined with He backflow \((T_f = 175^\circ C)\) is denoted by the low thermal budget (LTB) condition. In both cases the temperature increased linearly with time from the set-point of 100°C. For longer deposition times, final temperature values were extrapolated assuming the linear increase in temperature with deposition time. Furthermore, the HTB condition yielded much slower growth rates \((0.35–0.38 \text{ nm/s})\) than the LTB condition \((0.9-1.0 \text{ nm/s})\), so longer deposition times (and therefore greater thermal budget) were necessary in the former case to accumulate comparable film thicknesses.”
