Performance Enhancement of an a-Si:H/μc-Si:H Heterojunction p-i-n Solar Cell by Tuning the Device Parameters
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Abstract

In this work, the solar cell design parameters like layer thickness, bandgap, donor and acceptor concentrations are varied to find optimum structure of a hydrogenated amorphous silicon (a-Si:H) and hydrogenated microcrystalline silicon (μc-Si:H) heterojunction p-i-n solar cell. A thin a-Si:H p-layer of 1 to 5 nm followed by a thick a-Si:H i-layer of thickness 1400 to 1600 nm and then thin n-layer of thickness 1 to 5 nm with acceptor concentration of 102 cm⁻³ and donor concentration of 1020 cm⁻³ and the bandgaps of p-, i-, and n-layers with higher bandgaps closer to 2.2 eV for a-Si:H p-layer, 1.85 eV for a-Si:H i-layer, and 1.2 eV for μc-Si:H n-layer have showed better performances. The optimum cell has a $J_{SC}$ of 18.93 mA/cm², $V_{OC}$ of 1095 mV, Fill factor of 0.7124, and efficiency of 14.77%. The overall external quantum efficiency of the numerically designed cell also remained very high from 85-95 % for wavelengths of 300-650 nm range. This indicates that the device will perform its best under both high and low frequency i.e. ultra-violet, near visible and visible light wavelengths.
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I. Introduction

Amorphous silicon (a-Si) or its hydrogenated form (a-Si:H) has long range of disorder in the silicon network and momentum conservation law for electron excitation by photon absorption is relaxed and hence it does not need phonon for electronic transitions or behaves like a direct bandgap material (1.5-2.2 eV, depending on deposition conditions and percentage of hydrogen). Due to the direct bandgap properties, amorphous silicon has higher light absorption coefficient than that of crystalline silicon and thin (around 1-micrometre) film solar cells can be made by it. In the arena of a-Si:H based solar cell, microcrystalline silicon (μc-Si:H having indirect bandgap ~1.1eV) is also used which is characterized by its nanoscale crystal structures, in the range of 20-700 nm with different orientations and has favorable optical and electrical properties, like low optical absorption in the ultra-violet–visible–near-infrared range and high conductivity and doping efficiency. These a-Si:H and/or μc-Si:H based thin film solar cells are getting popularity than that of self-supporting bulk wafer based silicon solar cells for their low material consumption, therefore reduce cost, low temperature processing, deposition facilities on glass or any other flexible plastic/metal foils and potential of multi-junction or tandem solar cells. Yunaz et al. found a potential efficiency over 20% for the Si-based multijunction thin film solar cell. Another groups have integrated a-Si:H and hydrogenated microcrystalline silicon (μc-Si:H) absorbers into tandem structure cells with a stabilized efficiency over 10%. Moreover, Yan et al. have reported an a-Si:H/a-SiGe:H/μc-Si:H triple-junction cell reached a recorded efficiency of 16.3%. Tandem and multijunction solar cells are a great solution to reach more than 30% efficiency. With their high power conversion efficiencies over 25%, silicon heterojunction solar cells (SHJ) are very promising candidates as bottom-cell for monolithic tandem solar cells. Ding et al. have optimized amorphous silicon oxide buffer layers for silicon heterojunction solar cells. Ge et al. have optimized intrinsic a-Si: H passivation layers in crystalline-amorphous silicon heterojunction solar cells. However, there is lack of studies of optimization of device parameters for efficiency improvement of a-Si:H/μc-Si:H hetero-junction solar cells.

In this work, the device parameters like layer thickness, bandgap, donor and acceptor concentrations are varied to find structure, optimum optical and electrical performance of a-Si:H/μc-Si:H heterojunction solar cell using numerical simulation software AFORS-HET.

II. Methodology

Numerical modeling

A set of equations govern the operation of semiconductor devices provides the ideal characteristics for solar cells, i.e., the current density equation, Poisson’s equation and the continuity equation. The total current density of electrons and holes in doped semiconductors includes both the drift and diffusion currents. One (x) dimensional equations are given below.

$$J_n = qn(x)\mu_n E(x) + qD_n \frac{dn}{dx} \quad (1a)$$

$$J_p = qp(x)\mu_p E(x) - qD_p \frac{dp}{dx} \quad (1b)$$

Where, $J_n$ and $J_p$ are the current densities due to mobile electrons and holes respectively; n and p are the concentration of mobile electrons and holes respectively; q is absolute charge of each electron and hole; $\mu_n$ and $\mu_p$ are mobility of electrons and holes respectively; E is the electric field intensity voltage/length; $D_n$ and $D_p$ are diffusion constants for electrons holes respectively.

Maxwell’s equations of electromagnetic field theory shows that free electric charges gives rise to an electric field in the semiconductor through Poisson’s equation (equation2).
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\[
\frac{d^2 \varphi}{dx^2} = -\frac{q}{\varepsilon} (p - n + N_d^+ - N_a^-) \tag{2}
\]

Where, \( \varphi \) is the electric potential; \( N_d^+ \) and \( N_a^- \) are the concentrations of ionized donors and acceptors; \( \varepsilon \) is the material’s permittivity (an intrinsic property measuring the resistance to the forming of an electric field).

This next set of equations is beneficial for keeping track of particles moving in and out of a given volume of the semiconductor to ensure that the particles passing through a given volume, are being generated and recombined appropriately in order to account for changes in flow rate within the volume. These equations are basically particle conservation equations.

\[
\frac{dn}{dt} = \frac{1}{q} \frac{d}{dx} (G_n - R_n) \tag{3a}
\]

\[
\frac{dp}{dt} = -\frac{1}{q} \frac{d}{dx} (G_p - R_p) \tag{3b}
\]

Where, \( t \) is the time; \( G \) and \( R \) represent carrier generation and recombination rates.

**Simulation**

Based on the basic and relevant semiconductor equations for defects and others in numerical modeling section, appropriate boundary and steady-state conditions with small sinusoidal perturbations are applied in Automat for simulation of heterostructures (Version 2.5, AFORS-HET\textsuperscript{21}, Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin für Materialien und Energie) to simulate one dimensional semiconductor structures by numerical methods.\textsuperscript{8} To do this, the coupled partial differential equations set is transformed into non-linear algebraic equations set by finite difference methods.

P type or n type amorphous silicon has high density of dangling bonds. Generated carriers are lost by recombination and hence amorphous silicon solar cells prefer p-i-n (or n-i-p) structures to prepare the electric field in the intrinsic region (i region) and drift carriers to the external contacts.\textsuperscript{22} In the proposed solar cell, glass is used as the substrate followed by a thin transparent conducting oxide (TCO), a thin a-Si:H p-, i-, and followed by \( \mu c \)-Si:H n-layer with metal contacts at the back side. Indian tin oxide (ITO) or ZnO can be used as TCO and Al as the back contact as shown in Figure 1.

In both a-Si:H and \( \mu c \)-Si:H material there are disordered regions and voids.\textsuperscript{23} To model these amorphous and microcrystalline structures the density of states has been assumed to be both acceptor like states (in the upper half of the gap) and donor like states (in the lower half of the gap). Both of these acceptor and donor like states consist of exponential band tail and Gaussian mid-gap states, shown in Figure 2.
Table 1. Input parameters of the baseline a-Si:H and μc-Si:H p-i-n heterostructure cell

| Parameters                                      | a-Si:H p-layer | a-Si:H i-layer | uc-Si:H n-layer |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Layer thickness, L(nm)                          | variable       | variable       | variable        |
| Dielectric constant                             | 11.9           | 11.9           | 11.9            |
| Bandgap, Eg (eV)                                | variable       | variable       | variable        |
| Electron mobility                               | 20             | 20             | 50              |
| Hole mobility                                   | 5              | 5              | 5               |
| Acceptor concentration, Na(cm$^{-3}$)            | variable       | 0              | 0               |
| Donator concentration, Nd(cm$^{-3}$)             | 0              | 1000           | variable        |
| Effective DOS CB, Nc (cm$^{-3}$)                 | 1.00E+20       | 1.00E+20       | 1.00E+19        |
| Effective DOS VB, Nv (cm$^{-3}$)                 | 1.00E+20       | 1.00E+20       | 1.00E+19        |
| Electron affinity (eV)                           | 3.9            | 3.9            | 3.9             |
| Valence Band tail states parameters              |                |                |                 |
| VB trap density (cm$^{-3}$)                      | 2.40E+20       | 9.40E+19       | 1.88E+20        |
| VB tail characteristic energy (meV)              | 120            | 50             | 94              |
| Electron capture cross section (cm$^2$)         | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16        |
| Hole capture cross section (cm$^2$)              | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16        |
| Conduction Band tail states parameters          |                |                |                 |
| CB trap density (cm$^{-3}$)                      | 1.60E+20       | 6.40E+19       | 1.36E+20        |
| CB tail characteristic energy (meV)              | 80.00          | 35.00          | 68.00           |
| Electron capture cross section (cm$^2$)         | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16        |
| Hole capture cross section (cm$^2$)              | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16       | 7.00E-16        |
| Gaussian defect states parameters (Acceptor)     |                |                |                 |
| Defect density (cm$^{-3}$)                       | 6.90E+19       | 5.00E+15       | 6.90E+19        |
| Standard deviation (Gaussian) (eV)               | 0.21           | 0.144          | 0.21            |
| Electron capture cross section (cm$^2$)         | 3.00E-15       | 3.00E-15       | 3.00E-15        |
| Hole capture cross section (cm$^2$)              | 3.00E-14       | 3.00E-14       | 3.00E-14        |
| Gaussian defect states parameters (Donor)        |                |                |                 |
| Defect density (cm$^{-3}$)                       | 6.90E+19       | 5.00E+15       | 6.90E+19        |
| Standard deviation (Gaussian) (eV)               | 0.21           | 0.144          | 0.21            |
| Electron capture cross section (cm$^2$)         | 3.00E-14       | 3.00E-15       | 3.00E-14        |
| Hole capture cross section (cm$^2$)              | 3.00E-15       | 3.00E-14       | 3.00E-14        |

Microcrystalline silicon shows somewhat lower effective conduction band density ($N_c$) and valence band density ($N_v$) for the presence of crystalline grains in the material. That is why values of $N_c$ and $N_v$ are kept one order lower than that of amorphous silicon. For the same reason electron mobility and hole mobility are also kept little higher.

The efficiency, short circuit current density, open circuit voltage, and fill factor of the hetero-structure p-i-n device depend on design parameters like window layer thickness, donor and acceptor concentrations, electron and hole mobility, band-gap, and band-tail states. However, both amorphous and microcrystalline silicon have low mobility and large number of localized gap states which reduces the efficiency significantly. In this work, the input parameters like layer thickness, bandgap, donor and acceptor concentrations are varied to find best performed cell structure. Later on, the performance of the optimized a-Si:H/μc-Si:H heterojunction solar cell is validated at a device temperature $T = 300\text{K}$. AM 1.5 spectrum with 100 mW/cm$^2$ illumination. Light is imposed from the top side of the cell as shown in Figure 1.

III. Results and Discussions

Optimization of layer thickness

Layer thickness plays an important role in the optimization of a thin film p-i-n device. As a-Si:H p-layer is actually the window layer, its thickness is varied from 1 nm - 100 nm. It is essential to have a thick intrinsic layer, which acts as a buffer layer for better absorption of photons. Therefore, a-Si:H i-layer is varied from several nanometers to 5 micrometers. The μc-Si:H n-layer is kept within the 1 to 200 nm range and varied to find the optimum thickness for better electron transport as in Figure 3.
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Figure 3 illustrates the effect of thickness variation on $J_{SC}$, $V_{OC}$, FF, and Efficiency. From Figure 3(a) and 3(b) it is evident that a thin a-Si:H p-layer of 1 to 5 nm would result in a better $J_{SC}$, and $V_{OC}$ and thus a higher efficiency. With increase in thickness of p-layer the amount of light reaching the absorber layer reduces and results in lower $J_{SC}$ values. It also becomes difficult for the built in field to separate the electron-hole pair if the thickness of p-layer is high.

On the other hand, from Figure 3(c) and 3(d) it can be seen that an a-Si:H absorber layer of 1400 to 1800 nm should be used to get better performance from the device. With increase of i-layer thickness $J_{SC}$ increases gradually up to 2 µm but starts decreasing after that. However, $V_{OC}$ increases abruptly just after 10 nm and reaches to its maximum value after 100 nm and remains almost constant for further increase in thickness.

For µc-Si:H n-layer the maximum efficiency can be achieved within 1 to 10 nm range where efficiency and FF are maximum as shown in Figure 3(e) and 3(f). Although $J_{SC}$ decreases with increase of thickness, $V_{OC}$ remains constant throughout the variation. This is because of the lower electron and hole mobility of the a-Si:H where thicker n-layers reduces the electron transport facility.

Optimization of doping concentrations

Variation of efficiency along with $J_{SC}$, $V_{OC}$ and FF are depicted in Figure 4 for the variation in acceptor and donor concentration. From Figure 4(a) it can be seen that $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both increases with increase in a-Si:H p-layer acceptor concentration, $N_a$. However, beyond the acceptor concentration of $10^{19}$ cm$^{-3}$, the $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both reached the maximum value and do not increase further. This is because of the fully crowded states in the cell, which saturates the performance. For this reason it is also seen from Figure 4(b) that efficiency and FF also reached to saturation after the $10^{19}$ cm$^{-3}$ limit.
In the case of μc-Si:H n-layer donor concentration, $N_d$ from Figure 4(c) and 4(d) it can be seen that $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both increase till $10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ but beyond that range $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both do not increase that much and the device saturates. Increasing donor concentration further does not increase the efficiency and FF.

**Optimization of Bandgaps**

Bandgaps of the a-Si:H p-, i-, and μc-Si:H n-layers are varied to find the optimum bandgaps for the heterojunction p-i-n device. For a-Si:H the bandgap can be varied from 1.5 to 2.2 eV and for μc-Si:H from 1.2 eV to 1.5 eV.\(^2,3,27\) The bandgaps of p-, i-, and n-layers were varied in the specified range for optimization. Effect of bandgap variation on $J_{SC}$ and $V_{OC}$, efficiency and FF are shown in Figure 5.

**Fig. 4.** Impact of Acceptor concentration ($N_a$) and Donor concentration ($N_d$) variation on $J_{SC}$, $V_{OC}$, Efficiency and FF

From Figure 4(a) it can be seen that $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both increases with increase in a-Si:H p-layer acceptor concentration, $N_a$. However, beyond the acceptor concentration of $10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, the $V_{OC}$ and $J_{SC}$ both reached the maximum value and do not increase further. This is because of the fully crowded states in the cell, which saturates the performance. For this reason it is also seen from Figure 4(b) that efficiency and FF also reached to saturation after the $10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ limit.
hand, $V_{OC}$ has an approximately linear increasing trend with increase in bandgap. This might be because of the lowering of band offset with increase in bandgap of i-layer. As bandgap of p-layer is kept at 2.1 eV, the low bandgap of i-layer would create a band offset which will eventually increase the recombination. Therefore, maximum efficiency is achieved within the 1.8 to 1.9 eV range.

From Figure 5(e) and 5(f) it can be seen that $J_{SC}$ decreases with increase of $\mu c$-Si:H n-layer bandgap and after 1.35 eV the device reaches saturation. However, $V_{OC}$ remains constant throughout the variation of n-layer. Therefore maximum efficiency is achieved close to the $\mu c$-Si:H n-layer bandgap of 1.2eV.

**Optimized cell performance**

By taking all the optimal values of the layer thicknesses, bandgap, and doping concentrations of both a-Si:H p- and i-layers and $\mu c$-Si:H n-layer and running the simulation using AFORS-HET the characteristics of the best performed heterojunction cell was found. Table 2 shows the optimum parameters found in the simulation and used to design the best-performed p-i-n cell. Here it is noticed that the top a-Si:H p-layer has acted as an window layer by picking its highest possible bandgap, 2.2 eV.

Illumination of 1000 W/m² at AM 1.5 was used to find the J-V and P-V curves shown in Figure 6. The calculated light J-V characteristics of the cell yield the following results.

- Short circuit current density of $J_{SC}$ = 18.93 mA/cm²,
- Open circuit voltage $V_{OC}$ = 1095 mV,
- Fill-factor, FF = 0.7124,
- Efficiency = 14.77 %.

Figure 7 shows the band diagram of the optimum heterostructure p-i-n cell under equilibrium condition. The fermi level was found to be at -6.15 eV.

**Table 2. Optimum parameters found in simulation and used to design the best-performed cell**

| Layers | Thickness, L(nm) | $N_{a}$ (cm⁻³) | $N_d$ (cm⁻³) | Eg (eV) |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| a-Si:H p-layer | 1 | $1 \times 10^{21}$ | 0 | 2.2 |
| a-Si:H i-layer | 1600 | 0 | 1000 | 1.85 |
| $\mu c$-Si:H n-layer | 1 | 0 | $1 \times 10^{20}$ | 1.2 |

**Fig. 6.** J-V and P-V curve of the best performed p-i-n cell under AM 1.5 spectrum and 1000 W/m² illumination
The generation and recombination rate of the designed cell is illustrated in Figure 8. It can be seen that the recombination rate is much higher at the front and back surface of the cell. However, front and back surface recombination can be reduced by adding surface passivation to the layers.

Figure 9 shows the electron and hole current densities with the variation of thickness of the device. The total output current density remained at around -18.93 mA/cm$^2$, which is pretty high for a p-i-n cell. This indicates that a well-designed heterojunction cell can have a higher current density and better performance.

Figure 10 illustrates the internal and external quantum efficiencies of the cell. The external quantum efficiency reached a maximum of 96.29% at wavelength (λ) of around 630 nm. The overall external quantum efficiency remained very high from 85-95 % for wavelength of 300-650 nm range. This indicates that the device will perform its best under both high and low frequency i.e. ultra-violet, near visible, and visible light wavelengths. Figure 10 shows the spectral response of the cell which also indicates the similar scenario.

Finally, for μc-Si:H n-layer the maximum efficiency can be achieved within 1 to 10 nm range. Although $J_{SC}$ decreases

**IV. Conclusions**

The parameters like bandgap, layer thickness, and doping concentrations of aSi:H/μc-Si:H heterojunction p-i-n cell are varied with AFORS-HET simulation software. It is found that layer thicknesses have significant effects on efficiency improvement. With increase in thickness of p-layer the amount of light reaching the absorber layer reduces and results in lower $J_{SC}$ values. It also becomes difficult for the built in field to separate the electron-hole pair if the thickness of p-layer is high. Therefore, a thin a-Si:H p-layer of 1 to 5 nm would result in a better $J_{SC}$ and $V_{OC}$, and thus a higher efficiency. A thick a-Si:H absorber layer of 1400 to 1800 nm should be used to get better performance from the device. Finally, for μc-Si:H n-layer the maximum efficiency can be achieved within 1 to 10 nm range. Although $J_{SC}$ decreases
with increase of thickness of n-layer $V_{oc}$ remains constant throughout the variation. The doping concentrations of both a-Si:H $p$-, and $\mu$-c-Si:H n-layers are varied and maximum efficiency of around 14.77% is achieved with acceptor concentration of $1\times10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ and donor concentration of $1\times10^{20}$ cm$^{-3}$. The bandgap of $p$-, $i$-, and n-layers are also varied and optimum performance is found at higher bandgaps closer to 2.2 eV for a-Si:H $p$-layer, 1.85 eV for a-Si:H $i$-layer, and 1.2 eV for $\mu$-c-Si:H n-layer.

Finally, using these values an optimum cell is numerically designed and simulated. It is found that the best-performed cell has a short circuit current density of 18.93 mA/cm$^2$, open circuit voltage of 1.095 V, fill factor of 0.7124, and efficiency of 14.77%. The cell has higher front and back surface recombination speeds which can be reduced by surface passivation. Besides this, the cell has maximum external quantum efficiency of 96.29% at wavelength ($\lambda$) of around 630 nm. The overall external quantum efficiency remained very high from 85-95% for wavelength of 300-650 nm range. This indicates that the device will perform its best under both high and low frequency i.e. ultra-violet, near visible, and visible light wavelengths.
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