Towards an optimized all lattice-matched InAlAs/InGaAsP/InGaAs multijunction solar cell with efficiency >50%
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An approach for an all lattice-matched multijunction solar cell optimized design is presented with 5.807 Å lattice constant, together with a detailed analysis of its performance by means of full device modeling. The simulations show that a (1.93 eV)In0.37Al0.63As/(1.39 eV)In0.33Ga0.62As0.57P0.43/(0.94 eV)In0.38Ga0.62As 3-junction solar cell can achieve efficiencies >51% under 100-suns illumination (with $V_{oc}=3.34$ V). As a key proof of concept, an equivalent 3-junction solar cell lattice-matched to InP was fabricated and tested. The independently connected single junction solar cells were also tested in a spectrum splitting configuration, showing similar performance to a monolithic tandem device, with $V_{oc}=1.8$ V. © 2013 American Institute of Physics. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4758300]
Here, we report on an optimized band gap combination for a monolithic 3-junction III-V semiconductor solar cell, formed by (1.93 eV) $\text{In}_{0.37}\text{Al}_{0.63}\text{As}/(1.39 \text{eV}) \text{In}_{0.38}\text{Ga}_{0.62}\text{As}/0.53\text{P}_{0.47}/(0.94 \text{eV}) \text{In}_{0.38}\text{Ga}_{0.62}\text{As}$ with lattice constant equal to 5.807 Å. We compare the theoretical performance of the proposed device with the conventional GaAs-based design and to an alternative InP-based design. According to full device simulations, this proposed approach for MJSCs can achieve theoretical efficiencies $> 51\%$ under merely 100-suns illumination. As a key proof of concept on the band gap and material combination, we have fabricated each independent subcell lattice-matched to $\text{InP}/(1.47 \text{eV}) \text{In}_{0.52}\text{Al}_{0.48}\text{As}/(1.06 \text{eV}) \text{In}_{0.63}\text{Ga}_{0.47}\text{As}/0.58\text{P}_{0.42}/(0.74 \text{eV}) \text{In}_{0.63}\text{Ga}_{0.47}\text{As}$. The maximum external quantum efficiency (EQE) of each subcell is around 80%. A monolithic 3J was fabricated and tested under direct illumination and showed an open circuit voltage ($V_{oc}$) equal to 1.8 V, demonstrating the tandem activity of the device and the high performance of the tunnel junctions. The results presented here indicate that the monolithic 3-junction solar cells can be implemented as an alternative for ultra-high efficiency MJSCs.

Figure 1(a) shows the band gap energy diagram as a function of lattice constant for various III-V compound semiconductor materials. Historically, alloys lattice-matched to GaAs/Ge (blue dashed line) were originally used to fabricate high efficiency multijunction solar cells.$^{10,11}$ In particular, the (1.90 eV) InGaP/(1.42 eV) GaAs/(0.67 eV) Ge combination—represented by blue solid squares—has received considerable attention in the past decades, due to the well-known optical properties of the alloys, as well as the capability of growing high crystalline InGaP on GaAs. However, the poor current-matching between the subcells (total current density $J_{tot}$ in tandem configuration) is equal to 20.5, 10.4, and 29.8 mA/cm², from top to bottom, for the terrestrial spectrum limits the overall performance of the device.

In order to identify the best III-V direct band gap semiconductor materials combination for a monolithic all lattice-matched 3-junction solar cell, detailed balance calculations were performed for all possible band gap arrangements with lattice spacing between GaAs (5.653 Å) and InP (5.868 Å), using AM1.5 direct illumination. The detailed balance model used here assumes: 300 K for all calculations, no reflection losses, no series-resistance losses, no reabsorption of emitted photons between different subcells, transparent zero-resistance tunnel junction interconnects, an enforced current-match between the subcells (total current concentration $J_{con}$ in tandem configuration) is equal to 20.5, 10.4, and 29.8 mA/cm², from top to bottom, for the terrestrial spectrum limits the overall performance of the device.
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doping concentration of shallow acceptors and donors, the thermal velocity of electrons and holes, the alloy density, Auger recombination for electrons and holes, and direct band-to-band recombination. Additionally, we also took into account how many photons with a specific wavelength are absorbed and reflected by each layer based on its dielectric properties (n, k), which were used to calculate the corresponding spectral absorption coefficient. These values were calculated based on an ellipsometer database and by using Vegard’s law for the layers at 5.807 Å. For the multijunction device modeling, we assumed transparent and zero-resistance tunnel junction interconnects, and again enforced current-matching between individually modeled subcells.

Table I displays the composition, band gap energy, and thickness of each layer used in the simulations presented. P-type bases and n-type emitters form the mechanical stack. In all cases, window and back surface field layers were used to reduce surface recombination and the scattering of carriers towards the tunnel junction, respectively. These layers were carefully chosen to be transparent to wavelengths absorbed by the subsequent lower band gap p-n layer. The successful fabrication of the 1.93 eV InAlAs top subcell requires the growth of alloys with high Al content (0.63 in fraction for the p-n absorber layer and 0.70 in fraction for the 2.10 eV window and back surface field layers) with a tensile strain of +0.47%. We have previously demonstrated the growth of dislocation-free epitaxial In$_{0.25}$Al$_{0.62}$As/In$_{0.62}$Al$_{0.38}$As heterostructures with strain equal to +1.17%20 (2.5 times larger than what is required for the optimized top subcell). Therefore, a simple extension of the same metal-organic vapor phase epitaxy (MOVPE) growth conditions should provide us high quality materials. For both the middle and bottom subcells, lattice-matched window and back surface field layers with a band gap 0.5 eV higher than that of the p-n absorber layer are available, as shown in Table I. The assumption of zero-loss tunnel junctions is reasonable due to the fact that an InP-based fabricated tandem multijunction solar cell presented the same performance as the equivalent independently connected subcells, as will be presented later.

The performance of the monolithic two-terminal (1.93 eV) In$_{0.38}$Al$_{0.62}$As/(1.39 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As/(0.94 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As series-connected optimized design [(see schematic in Figure 2(a)] was analyzed by the 1-dimensional device modeling of each individual subcell, as well as the tandem 3J solar cell. Table I summarizes the performance characteristics of all individual subcells under AM 1.5 direct illumination. The proposed approach presents a very good current-match: the total current ($J_{tot}$) is equal to 15.3, 18.5, and 16.8 mA/cm$^2$, from top to bottom. As shown
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**FIG. 2.** (a) Schematic of a monolithic two-terminal series-connected (1.93 eV) In$_{0.37}$Al$_{0.63}$As/(1.39 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As/0.57P$_{0.43}$/(0.94 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As 3-junction solar cell with an optimized band gap energies combination, and lattice constant equal to 5.807 Å, as represented by red triangles in Figure 1(a). P- and n-type layers are base and emitter, respectively. The layers are out of scale to better represent the different alloys involved in the design, and the window layers are omitted here for simplicity. (b) Light J-V curve obtained from 1-dimensional full device modeling for the 3-junction solar cell shown in (a). Note that >51% in efficiency is achieved for concentration illumination. The simulation was performed using AM 1.5 direct 100-suns illumination, assuming zero-resistance tunnel junctions.

### Table I. Materials, band gaps and thicknesses of each subcell forming the (1.93 eV) InAlAs/(1.39 eV) InGaAsP/(0.94 eV) InGaAs monolithic lattice-matched 3-junction suggested device with optimized band gap combination. The tunnel junctions are omitted since the simulations assumed zero-loss resistance junctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Alloy</th>
<th>Eg (eV)</th>
<th>Thickness (μm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top subcell Window</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.38}$Al$</em>{0.62}$As</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emitter</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.37}$Al$</em>{0.63}$As</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.37}$Al$</em>{0.63}$As</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back surface field</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.36}$Al$</em>{0.70}$As</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle subcell Window</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.37}$Al$</em>{0.63}$As</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emitter</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.38}$Ga$</em>{0.62}$As$<em>{0.57}$P$</em>{0.43}$</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.38}$Ga$</em>{0.62}$As$<em>{0.57}$P$</em>{0.43}$</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back surface field</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.37}$Al$</em>{0.63}$As</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom subcell Window</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.43}$Ga$</em>{0.57}$P</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emitter</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.43}$Ga$</em>{0.57}$P</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.43}$Ga$</em>{0.57}$P</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back surface field</td>
<td>In$<em>{0.43}$Ga$</em>{0.57}$P</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Table II, the optimized lattice-matched 3-junction presents $V_{oc} = 3.01$ V and $\eta = 40.4\%$ under AM 1.5 direct illumination. This efficiency is lower than the detailed balance result (46.7%) due to the consideration of Auger and other recombination phenomena, indicating a realistic description for the device modeling. Since MJSCs are usually used in CPV systems, we also performed simulations under concentrated direct illumination. By re-optimizing the thickness of the top subcell the suggested design can achieve 51.8% efficiency under 100-suns, as shown in Figure 2(b). This result demonstrates the promising potential of our design as an achievable pathway for ultra-high efficiency solar cells.

The implementation of the suggested design requires a crystalline template with lattice constant $= 5.807 \text{ Å}$ [see red dashed line in Figure 1(a)] to initiate the epitaxial growth. The realization of such a template was achieved by the strain engineering of single crystalline layers, as recently demonstrated. Although the fabrication of this MJSC involves expensive materials, its cost can be significantly decreased by performing multiple templates’ growth using one bulk substrate combined with the epitaxial lift-off technique.

A first critical step for the demonstration of the optimized 3-junction solar cell is the fabrication of high-quality In$_{1-x}$Al$_x$As, In$_{1-x}$Ga$_x$As$_{1-y}$P$_y$, and In$_{1-x}$Ga$_x$As subcells with specific compositions. Therefore, as a proof of principle for the potential implementation of the optimized monolithic, lattice-matched, 3-junction solar cell, we fabricated and tested equivalent subcells lattice-matched to InP, which involves the same class of compound semiconductors. This alternative design—(1.47 eV) In$_{0.52}$Al$_{0.48}$As/(1.06 eV) In$_{0.53}$Ga$_{0.47}$As$_{0.42}$P$_{0.58}$/ (0.74 eV) In$_{0.53}$Ga$_{0.47}$As—is displayed by solid green diamonds in Figure 1(a). The solar cells were grown on 50 nm, p-type InP (001) on-axis substrates using Veeco E400 MOVPE reactor operated at low pressure. The main precursors used in the layers are trimethylindium, trimethylaluminum, and arsine. Growth temperatures typically ranged from 600 to 750 °C depending on the layers.

To test the subcells, electrical measurements were performed using a solar simulator with AM1.5 global 1-sun illumination (1 kW/m$^2$). One of the major limiting factors of a high efficiency MJSC is the short circuit current ($J_{sc}$), which will determine how much current will flow once the device is connected to a circuit. Here, all subcells were engineered to current-match at 12.0 mA/cm$^2$, allowing each one to operate at its maximum power. The subcells were externally connected in a six terminal series configuration and tested under AM 1.5 global 1-sun illumination as a proof of principle of the InP-based multijunction design [Figure 3(a)]. The spectrum was optically split by using 850 and 1200 nm long-pass filters on top of the InGaAsP middle and InGaAs bottom subcells, respectively, in order to mimic the behavior of the 3-junction device. The tandem activity is demonstrated by the $V_{oc}$ equal to 1.8 V (modeled max $V_{oc}$ = 2.1 V). The $J_{sc}$ (10.3 mA/cm$^2$) of the externally series-connected solar cell slightly decreased, due to the resistance and possible leakage current within the electrical contacts between the subcells. The spectral response of the independent subcells was measured as a function of wavelength [Figure 3(b)]. All independent single junction solar cells were coated with appropriate anti-reflection coatings to minimize reflection and improve light absorption. All subcells showed maximum EQE around 80%, efficiently absorbing light from a wide range of the spectrum.

As a further step towards the realization of the optimized device, we fabricated an InP-based 3J solar cell and tested it under 1-sun direct illumination [see Figure 4(a)]. For the first test cell structure, features such as the transparent In$_{0.35}$Al$_{0.65}$As window layer and back surface field were omitted. Additionally, both the middle InGaAsP and bottom InGaAs subcells thicknesses were reduced to 1 μm from their optimal thicknesses. The monolithically grown 3J device shows similar performance compared to the independently connected subcells. This demonstrates the extremely low resistance of the fabricated tunnel junctions, validating our device modeling assumption for the lattice-matched optimized 3-junction solar cells presented earlier.

---

### Table II. Figures of merit for all individual subcells in a tandem configuration and for the optimized (1.93 eV) In$_{0.37}$Al$_{0.63}$As/(1.39 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As$_{0.57}$/P$_{0.43}$ (0.94 eV) In$_{0.38}$Ga$_{0.62}$As 3-junction device obtained from 1-dimensional device modeling, assuming Lambert-Beer absorption, normal incidence of light, constant temperature (300 K), and AM 1.5 direct 1-sun illumination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimized design</th>
<th>$V_{oc}$ (V)</th>
<th>$J_{sc}$ (mA/cm$^2$)</th>
<th>FF (%)</th>
<th>$\eta$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.93 eV InAlAs</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39 eV InGaAsP</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.94 eV InGaAs</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-junction</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Fig. 3](image-url) **Fig. 3.** (a) Light $J$-$V$ curve under 1-sun AM1.5 global illumination for the InAlAs, InGaAsP and InGaAs subcells lattice-matched to InP externally connected in series, in a six terminal configuration. 850 and 1200 nm long pass filters were used on top of the InGaAsP middle and InGaAs bottom subcells, respectively, in order to mimic the behavior of the 3-junction device. (b) External quantum efficiency measurements for each independent subcell.
The tandem 3J solar cell presented similar performance, with 
anti-reflection coating optimized for this particular band gap, one can expect efficiencies around 20% under 1-sun illumination. A maximum EQE of 80% was measured for each subcell. The demonstration of InP-based 3-junction solar cells is an important step towards the development of the multijunction device with optimized band gaps, which is a promising alternative for ultra-high efficiency CPV systems.
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18Here, the optimization refers to the best band gap combination corresponding to semiconductor compounds with lattice spacing between GaAs and InP, therefore the design is termed “optimized.”
22The crystal quality of the subcells was evaluated by high resolution x-ray diffraction measurements using a conventional Cu-Kx x-ray source. The x-ray beam size was 4 × 25 mm², giving an accurate and representative estimative of the crystal diffraction condition, and therefore its lattice constant. (004) symmetric ω-2θ scans were performed to confirm that the material grown was lattice-matched to the InP substrate.