Overview

- 1) Simulating thin films
- 2) Electrical characterization of OPVs
- 3) Diffusion limited recombination in OPVs
- 4) The open circuit voltage
- 5) Conclusions

Diffusion limited recombination

- •Imagine you have a hole in the middle of a sea of electrons.
- •Recombination will depend upon the probability of an electron meeting a hole.
- •This probability will be proportional to the rate at which the electrons move around.
- •And the density of electrons.
- •A more formal expression for the rate at which carriers recombine is given by Langevin recombination.





Langevin Recombination

•Recombination happens when an electron and hole get closer than the recombination radius r.

•This radius is defined as when the electrical potential and the thermal energy are equal.

$$E_{Coulomb} = E_{thermal}$$

$$\frac{q^2}{4\pi\epsilon r_c} = k_B T \qquad \longrightarrow \quad r_c = \frac{q^2}{4\pi\epsilon k_B T}$$



Langevin recombination

The rate at which carriers drift across the boundary is given by.

 $j_{electron} = qn \mu E$

The electric field is the first derivative of the potential.

$$j_{electron} = qn\mu \frac{q^2}{4\pi\epsilon r^2}$$

 $I_{electron flux} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$

Multiply over the area of a sphere

$$I_{electron\,flux} = j_{electron} 4 \pi r^2 = \frac{q^2 \mu n}{\epsilon}$$
$$I_{electron\,flux} = \frac{q^2 \mu n}{\epsilon}$$

Roderick MacKenzie





Imperial College London Langevin recombination for electrons and holes



How good is Langevin recombination?

Langevin's theory predicts that the recombination prefactor is a constant:

$$k = \frac{q}{\epsilon} (\mu_n + \mu_p) \qquad \qquad R = k n p$$

However we observe a carrier density dependence of k.



Our simple picture of recombination is too simple. When we try to model devices using pure Langevin theory we **can't reproduce the JV curves, charge extraction curves or TPV data** – can we improve the situation.....

Roderick MacKenzie

Imperial College London What's going wrong with Langevin recombination?

Well we assumed that all the carriers are free and thus trapping is neglected. However, we know from our molecular level simulations that there are a lot of traps.



How will this affect the mobility?



Roderick MacKenzie

How will this affect the mobility?



Roderick MacKenzie

Comparison to experiment



MacKenzie et al. J. Phys. Chem. C, 10.1021/jp200234m

How realistic is this model?

It works very well for steady state simulation.

We assumed that all carriers have the same Fermi-level.

This means that all trapped and free electrons can interact instantaneously.

But should trapped carriers be able to interact with each other?

Would it not be more realistic to have only the free carriers interacting with the trapped carriers?



Roderick MacKenzie

Shockley-Read-Hall recombination



Process	Rate	Description
electron capture	r_1	$n \cdot v_{th} \sigma_n N_t (1-f)$
electron emission	<i>r</i> ₂	$e_n N_t f$

E_v - HOMO

$$e_n = v_{th} \sigma_n N_c \exp\left(\frac{E_t - E_c}{kT}\right)$$

 v_{th} = thermal velocity of carriers σ = capture radious N_t = trap density *f*=Fermi-Dirac function describing occupation of the trap.

Roderick MacKenzie

Shockley-Read-Hall recombination

E_c - LUMO Process Rate $r_3 \mid r_4$ $E_t - Trap$ hole capture $p v_{th} \sigma_p N_t f$ r_3 $e_p N_t (1-f)$ hole emission r_4 ____E, - HOMO $e_p = v_{th} \sigma_p N_v \exp\left(\frac{E_v - E_t}{kT}\right)$ v_{th} = thermal velocity of carriers σ = capture radious $N_{+} = trap density$ f = Fermi-Dirac function describing occupation of the trap.

Roderick MacKenzie

Shockley-Read-Hall recombination



Electron density the trap:

$$\frac{\partial n_t}{\partial t} = r_1 - r_2 + r_3 - r_4$$

Loss of free electrons

$$R_n = r_1^e - r_2^e$$

Loss of free holes

$$R_n = r_4^e - r_3^e$$

Detailed balance is maintained. i.e. at equilibrium $r_1 = r_2$ and $r_3 = r_4$ Recombination is thus implicitly described.

Roderick MacKenzie