Analytical model for the open-circuit voltage and its associated resistance in organic planar heterojunction solar cells
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We derive an analytical formula for the open-circuit voltage ($V_{oc}$) of organic planar heterojunction solar cells under standard operating conditions. We find that the type of free carrier recombination at the interface between the donor and acceptor materials controls the slope of $V_{oc}$ vs incident light intensity. By using the same derivation, an equation for the resistance around $V_{oc}$ is obtained. From this, we investigate two parameters in more detail and compare them to experiments. The first is the work function of the cathode metal. We show that, within our model, $V_{oc}$ does not depend on this work function, while the cell resistance around $V_{oc}$ is strongly dependent on it. Second, we find that the asymptotic resistance around $V_{oc}$ is a third-order power function of the thickness of the organic layers (acceptor or donor). The model provides insights to achieve low-resistivity high open-circuit voltage organic solar cells.

II. MODEL

A. Analytical formulas for the open-circuit voltage

The schematic energy diagram of a planar heterojunction solar cell is shown in Fig. 1. Once an exciton reaches the interface between the donor and the acceptor, it will dissociate to a bound polaron pair with a certain probability. In order to generate free polarons (i.e., a free electron in the acceptor and a free hole in the donor), the Coulombic polaron pair binding energy has to be overcome. These carriers will then be mobile in their respective transport levels within the LUMO of the acceptor ($LUMO_A$) and the HOMO of the donor ($HOMO_D$). The maximum energy, which can be extracted, is given by the difference between these two levels, $|HOMO_D| - |LUMO_A|$. We note that, for the purpose of this model, any dipoles between the two organic layers are included in this difference. Carriers can gain or lose energy during their transport in the layers due to the band bending of the electrostatic potential (BB$_D$ and BB$_A$, as shown in Fig. 1). At the contacts, the carriers can be extracted, which leads to an additional energy loss originating from the difference of metal work function to the energy levels of the organic layers ($\Delta \phi_A$ and $\Delta \phi_D$). Again, all possible dipoles or pinning effects are included in these offsets.

If the device is working under open-circuit conditions, moving one electron and one hole from the donor-acceptor interface toward the electrodes will yield the voltage across the device. This corresponds to...
Einstein relation negligible compared to the free carrier concentration and the dimensional case. The vectors can be represented by their heterojunction. For symmetry reasons, we consider the one-BB\textsubscript{p} and Rec/H\textsubscript{2}0849 within the film. We assume the device to be in steady state and T. As the acceptor layer is an electron region, and the donor layer a hole densities and concentrations of holes and electrons, /H\textsubscript{9262}ing for the same sign. At the bottom, the coordinate system is drawn, with \(d_p\) and \(d_a\) as the thickness of the donor and acceptor layers, respectively.

\[ V_{\text{oc}} = |\text{HOMO}_D| - |\text{LUMO}_A| + BB_D + BB_A - \Delta \phi_A - \Delta \phi_D. \]  

We will see later that the effect of the band bending will compensate for the energy loss at the contacts, making \(V_{\text{oc}}\) independent of the work function of the electrodes.

In order to calculate the band bending of a bilayer of undoped semiconductors, we apply the Poisson equation,

\[ \nabla \cdot \vec{\mathbf{E}} = \frac{q \cdot (p - n)}{\varepsilon}, \]  

and the continuity equations of electrons and holes,

\[ \frac{dp}{dt} = -\nabla \cdot (p \mu_p \vec{\mathbf{E}} - D_p \nabla p) + G_p - \text{Rec}_p \]  

\[ \frac{dn}{dt} = -\nabla \cdot (n \mu_n \vec{\mathbf{E}} + D_n \nabla n) + G_n - \text{Rec}_n. \]

Here, \(q\) is the elementary charge, \(\varepsilon\) is the absolute permittivity that we assume the same for both layers, \(p\) and \(n\) are the concentrations of holes and electrons, \(\mu_p\) and \(\mu_n\) are the hole and electron mobilities, \(D_p\) and \(D_n\) are the hole and electron diffusion constants, \(G_p\) and \(G_n\) are carrier generation rates, and \(\text{Rec}_p\) and \(\text{Rec}_n\) are recombination rates, respectively. If solved self-consistently, the solutions yield the electron and hole densities \((n\) and \(p)\) as well as the electric field \((\vec{\mathbf{E}})\) within the film. We assume the device to be in steady state \((dp/dt \text{ and } dn/dt \text{ are } 0)\), the doping concentrations to be negligible compared to the free carrier concentration and the Einstein relation \((D/\mu = kT/q)\), where \(k\) is the Boltzmann constant and \(T\) is the absolute temperature) to hold.

The equations will be derived for a homogeneous planar heterojunction. For symmetry reasons, we consider the one-dimensional case. The vectors can be represented by their magnitude, and the gradients and divergences resolve into simple derivatives. In the following, the derivation will be outlined for the donor layer. The results for the acceptor layer are analogous.

The band bending due to the change in electrical potential is equal to

\[ BB_D = \int_0^{d_D} F(x)dx, \]  

where \(d_p\) is the thickness of the donor layer. We define the donor contact to be located at point \(x=0\) and the donor-acceptor interface at \(x=d_p\) (see the bottom of Fig. 1).

Starting from an expression for the current, the field \(F(x)\) is evaluated. As the equations will be derived for the hole-conducting donor material, we neglect the electron density. By doing so, we assume a metal contact that is not injecting any electrons. Therefore, the total current in the donor layer equals the hole current,

\[ j_p = q \mu_p \left( pF - \frac{kT dp}{q dx} \right), \]  

with \(j_p=0\) for the case under investigation \((V_{\text{oc}})\). Analytical solutions for the carrier density and electric field as a function of position can be derived, as shown in Appendix A.

By using Eqs. (5) and (6) with \(j_p=0\), the net band bending can be rewritten as

\[ BB_D = \frac{kT}{q} \ln \left( \frac{p_i}{p_e} \right). \]  

The carrier concentration at the interface \(p_i\) will be determined by the incident light intensity, whereas the carrier concentration at the contact \(p_e\) is a function of the barrier \(\Delta \phi_D\). The result of Appendix A can be used to calculate the carrier profile inside an organic solar cell. Figure 2 shows an example of simulations carried out for a 50 nm thick layer of organic material. The carrier density at the contact \(p_e\) is fixed to three different values, and for each value, a different \(p_i\) is used. The steady-state carrier density through the layer is plotted, depending on the boundary condition.

**B. Carrier concentration at the contact**

The physics at the interface between a metal and an organic semiconductor remains a matter of discussion. For an overview of the current state of understanding, see reviews by Scott\textsuperscript{19} and Arkhipov.\textsuperscript{20} While not going into detail here, the carrier density at the interface is given by an exponential dependence on the injection barrier \((\Delta \phi_D)\) and some dependence on field and temperature, depending on the model applied. The injection barrier can be calculated from the position of the HOMO or LUMO and the metal work function, taking into account any surface dipoles.\textsuperscript{21} Additionally, the metal work function itself depends on possible oxidation or surface contaminations.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, the \(\Delta \phi_D\) used here is an effective injection barrier, accounting for all such effects.

A general equation for the carrier density at the contact can be written as
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FIG. 2. Modeled carrier density versus position, where $x=0$ nm is equal to the contact and $x=50$ nm is the location of the heterojunction. The different graphs correspond to different carrier densities at the contact [(a) $10^{20}$, (b) $10^{22}$, and (c) $10^{24}$ carriers/m$^3$], while the different curves on each graph correspond to different carrier densities at the interface ranging from $10^{19}$ to $10^{26}$ carriers/m$^3$.

$$p_c = N_D f(F_c) \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta \phi_D}{kT/q}\right),$$

where $N_D$ is the effective density of states of the donor and $f(F_c)$ is a function to include the effect of the electric field at the contact. An example is the Richardson–Schockley equation for thermionic emission with field dependent barrier lowering,

$$p_c = N_D \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta \phi_D - \Delta_{\text{low}}(F)}{kT/q}\right),$$

with

$$\Delta_{\text{low}}(F) = \sqrt{\frac{q^2 F}{4 \pi \varepsilon}}.$$  

The effective reduction in the barrier is introduced to take the image charge into consideration. This effect occurs only if the field is aiding carrier injection, pointing away from the contact for electrons (acceptor layer) and pointing toward the contact for holes (donor layer). Otherwise, $\Delta_{\text{low}}(F)$ is zero.

By combining Eqs. (1), (7), and (9), we obtain the following expression for $V_{oc}$:

$$V_{oc} = |\text{HOMO}_D| - |\text{LUMO}_A| + \frac{kT}{q} \ln\left(\frac{p_c}{N_D}\right) + \frac{kT}{q} \ln\left(\frac{n_A}{N_A}\right) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,D}) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,A}).$$  

FIG. 3. Effect of field dependent barrier lowering ($\Delta_{\text{low}}$). Simulations are carried out by using an injection barrier $\Delta \phi_D = 0.42$ eV, giving a contact carrier density ($p_c$) of $1 \times 20$ m$^{-3}$ without barrier lowering. The lower graph plots the field at the contact ($F_c$) needed to reach a certain carrier density at the interface. When a positive field is present, barrier lowering occurs and $p_c$ increases (upper panel). Note that it only increases by a factor of 2 for an increase in $p_c$ of 6 orders of magnitude.

contact for holes (donor layer). Otherwise, $\Delta_{\text{low}}(F)$ is zero.

By combining Eqs. (1), (7), and (9), we obtain the following expression for $V_{oc}$:

$$V_{oc} = |\text{HOMO}_D| - |\text{LUMO}_A| + \frac{kT}{q} \ln\left(\frac{p_c}{N_D}\right) + \frac{kT}{q} \ln\left(\frac{n_A}{N_A}\right) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,D}) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,A}).$$  

The terms that determine $V_{oc}$ are mainly HOMO$_D$, LUMO$_A$ and the carrier concentration achievable at the interface. The concentration of photogenerated carriers at the interface can never exceed the density of states. As a consequence, the open-circuit voltage will be limited by the effective energy offset between the HOMO of the donor and the LUMO of the acceptor, in practice, $V_{oc}$ will always be lower. The influence of the barrier lowering by the field at the contact is expected to be less than 20 meV, as can be seen in Fig. 3.

Furthermore, it appears that $V_{oc}$ is not dependent on the work function of the contact materials. Figure 4 plots the schematic energy diagram and the carrier profile inside the organic layers for two different contact materials, leading to two different injection barriers. The carrier density at the donor-acceptor interface is the same for both plots. When the work function of the contact material leads to a low injection barrier, the carrier profile generates a diffusion current toward the interface [Fig. 4(a)]. As the net current is zero at $V_{oc}$, a countering drift current pointing away from the interface should cancel this diffusion current. The resulting band bendings ($\Delta_{\text{BB}_A}$ and $\Delta_{\text{BB}_D}$) are negative terms in Eq. (1). In contrast, when the chosen contact leads to a high injection barrier, the diffusion current due to the carrier profile points toward the contacts [Fig. 4(b)]. In this case, the opposite drift current generates a band bending that has a positive contribution to $V_{oc}$. In the end, the obtained $V_{oc}$ is the same for
FIG. 4. Schematic energy diagrams (upper graphs) and corresponding carrier profile in the organic layers (lower graphs) when using (a) low and (b) high injection barriers at the contacts, $\Delta \phi_L$ and $\Delta \phi_A$. The same incident light intensity is used for the two situations, creating the same density of carriers at the donor-acceptor interface $(y)$. The values for the band benders, $BB_L$ and $BB_A$, are negative for (a) and positive for (b). The resulting open-circuit voltage $V_{oc}$ is the same.

both situations. The results of our analytical model are in agreement with the numerical calculations in the previous work.\textsuperscript{13,24}

C. Carrier density at the interface

The conversion of light into free charge carriers at the interface is a three-step process:

1. The absorbed light creates excitons.
2. The excitons diffuse toward the interface where dissociation into polaron-pairs occurs.
3. These polaron pairs need to further dissociate to create free charge carriers.

At the interface, three continuity equations are needed for the three particles involved, namely, for excitons [Eq. (12)], polaron pairs [X, Eq. (14)], and free carriers [holes in this example, $P_{i,a}$, Eq. (15)]. The equations for polaron pairs and free carriers are written for surface densities (particles per area), while a conversion to bulk densities can be done assuming all surface reactions take place at a monolayer from the interface. The exciton continuity equation is

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = G_S - \text{Rec}_S - D_S \frac{d^2S}{dx^2},$$

where $D_S \frac{dS}{dx} \bigg|_i = G_X.$

Here, $G_S$ is the generation of excitons due to incident light, $\text{Rec}_S$ incorporates all possible exciton recombination mechanisms, $D_S$ is the diffusion constant for the excitons, and $G_X$ is the amount of dissociated excitons into polaron pairs.

For the polaron pairs, we obtain

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = G_X - k_{X,\text{rec}}X - k_{\text{diss}}X + \mathcal{L}n_{i,a}P_{i,a},$$

where $k_{X,\text{rec}}$ is the recombination rate, $k_{\text{diss}}$ is the rate of dissociation into free carriers, and $\mathcal{L}n_{i,a}P_{i,a}$ is the creation of excitons due to Langevin-type recombination of free carriers.

The free carrier continuity equation is

$$\frac{dp_{i,a}}{dt} = k_{\text{diss}}X - \mathcal{L}n_{i,a}P_{i,a} - k_{\text{SRH}}n_{i,a}p_{i,a} - k_{\text{rec}}n_{i,a}p_{i,a},$$

with the last term reflecting Shockley–Read–Hall (SRH) recombination.

In order to calculate the generation of excitons [$G_S$ in Eq. (12)], one should take into account the optical interference.\textsuperscript{25,26} The generation has a linear dependence on the light intensity ($G_S \propto P_0$). At low to medium light intensities, the exciton recombination term $\text{Rec}_S$ is directly proportional to the exciton density. Only at very high light intensities, recombination mechanisms such as singlet-singlet or singlet-polaron quenching will become important. As long as these multiple-particle effects can be neglected, the number of dissociated excitons will have a linear dependence on incident light intensity ($G_S = \alpha P_0$).

Polaron pairs are created from the dissociation of excitons at the heterojunction. Coulombic attractive forces prevent these particles from dissociating into free carriers. The two rates (recombination $k_{X,\text{rec}}$ and dissociation $k_{\text{diss}}$) will determine the probability of dissociation into free carriers.\textsuperscript{27}

The free carriers obtained in this way can return to a polaron pair with a rate constant $\mathcal{L}$, which is the Langevin recombination rate. As such, polaron pairs can be dissociated and created multiple times before the carriers are collected to the contacts.\textsuperscript{13,28} The last recombination term in Eq. (15) reflects the recombination at the interface due to surface traps. This trap-assisted recombination process can be expressed with the SRH equation.\textsuperscript{29–32} The recombination rate $k_{\text{SRH}}$ takes the trap density and the capture coefficients of electrons and holes into account.

The assumption $n_{i,a} = \xi p_{i,a}$ is made to relate the opposite charge carriers; both will have the same light dependence as they are created and recombined. Combining Eqs. (12), (14), and (15) with the continuity equation for electrons, we obtain a quadratic equation for the carrier density at the interface,

$$\mathcal{L} \xi \cdot p_{i,a}^2 + k_{\text{SRH}} \xi \left(1 + \frac{k_{\text{diss}}}{k_{X,\text{rec}}}ight) p_{i,a} - k_{\text{diss}} \alpha P_0 = 0.$$

Depending on which recombination mechanism dominates at the interface, Eq. (16) can be simplified. If bimolecular Langevin-type recombination is the important limiting factor, the carrier density can be expressed as

$$p_{i,a} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{k_{\text{diss}}} \xi k_{X,\text{rec}} \alpha P_0}.$$

The solution in case of SRH recombination is

$$p_{i,a} = \frac{k_{\text{diss}}}{k_{\text{SRH}} \xi (k_{\text{diss}} + k_{X,\text{rec}}) \alpha P_0}.$$

The final equation relating the $V_{oc}$ and the incident light is obtained by combining Eqs. (11), (17), and (18). Simplified, the $V_{oc}$ can be expressed by
\[ V_{oc} = |\text{HOMO}_D| - |\text{LUMO}_A| + n_{\text{voc}} \frac{kT}{q} \ln \left( \frac{\kappa}{N_A N_D} \alpha \rho_0 \right) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,D}) + \Delta_{\text{low}}(F_{c,A}), \]

where \( n_{\text{voc}} \) and \( \kappa \) are the factors determined by the actual recombination processes for the electrons and holes at the interface.

According to Eq. (19), \( V_{oc} \) has a logarithmic dependence on light, with a slope per decade equal to 2.3\( n_{\text{voc}} kT/q \). If both carrier types are limited by bimolecular recombination, \( n_{\text{voc}} \) is equal to 1, while a value of 2 is obtained if SRH recombination determines the electron and hole densities. These values correspond to a slope of 60 or 120 mV/decade. Only one slope dominates at a given light intensity, but a transition from SRH recombination at low light intensities to bimolecular recombination at high light intensities is possible, and this will be reflected in two different slopes for \( V_{oc} \) as a function of \( \log(P_i) \).

The different parameters directing \( n_i \) and \( p_i \) are assumed to be electric field independent. In certain cases, this assumption can be violated, and this will have a direct impact on the slope of \( V_{oc} \). Also, the choice of metal contact can influence the electrical field at the interface, and as such, \( V_{oc} \).

### D. Resistivity around \( V_{oc} \)

The resistivity at \( V_{oc} \) is a measure for the quality of the solar cell, as it influences the FF. It can be calculated starting from Eq. (6),

\[ F = \frac{kT}{q} \frac{\partial \ln(p)}{\partial \chi} + \frac{j}{pq \mu_p}. \]

By using this relationship together with Eqs. (1) and (5) (which are equations valid for any voltage applied over the contacts, not only for \( V_{oc} \)), we obtain a formula that is valid for the whole \( I-V \) curve,

\[ V(j) = |\text{HOMO}_D| - |\text{LUMO}_A| + \frac{kT}{q} \ln \left( \frac{n_i}{N_D} \right) + \frac{kT}{q} \ln \left( \frac{p_i}{N_A} \right) + jR(j), \]

with \( R(j) \) as an extra resistance, which gives the slope of the \( I-V \) curve for a certain current. When the bias reached is close to \( V_{oc} \), we can assume the carrier concentration at the interface and the contact to be constant. The voltage across the device is equal to \( V_{oc} \), with the addition of the term \( jR_{\text{voc}} \).

The resistance is given by

\[ R_{\text{voc}} = \frac{1}{q} \left( \int_0^{d_D} \frac{dx}{\mu_p n} + \int_{d_D}^{d_{\text{grd}}_A} \frac{dx}{\mu_n n} \right). \]

This integral can be solved and an analytic formula is obtained. The results are shown in Appendix B.

Equation (22) expresses the importance of reasonable mobilities for low resistance devices. However, another important parameter is the carrier concentration profile inside the organic layer. Low carrier densities, whether at the contacts, at the interface or in the bulk, will lead to high resistance, as shown by Eq. (22). By changing the metal contacts, the carrier concentration profile may drastically change, and accordingly, the resistance will change. Another important parameter is the thickness of the layer. It directly influences the resistance by both increasing the carrier transport path length and by altering the carrier concentration profile. Simulations and experiments will be carried out to illustrate these points.

### III. EXPERIMENT

In order to verify the model derived in Sec. II, we performed various experiments with organic solar cells based on copper phthalocyanine (CuPc) as the donor material and \( \text{N},\text{N'}-\text{di-tridecyl-3,4,9,10-perylene tetracarboxylic diimide (PTCDI-C}_{13}\text{H}_{27} \) as the electron acceptor. On some samples, a thin layer of bathocuprine (BCP) is added prior to metal deposition. The substrates consist of 100 nm thick indium tin oxide layer (ITO, Merck) on glass, with a sheet resistance of <20 \( \Omega/\square \). They are cleaned with soap, de-ionized water, acetone, and isopropanol. A 15 min UV-ozone treatment is carried out prior to the deposition of the organic layers. All organic molecules are purchased from Aldrich and are purified once by gradient sublimation. All layers are deposited under ultrahigh vacuum conditions (base pressure below 1 \( \times 10^{-8} \) Torr). The layers are subsequently deposited without breaking vacuum except for mounting the shadow masks for electrode deposition inside a nitrogen atmosphere.

Illumination is with a 1000 W xenon arc lamp equipped with filters to simulate the AM1.5D spectrum (L.O.T. oriel solar simulator). The lamp is calibrated by using a bandpass filter (KG5, L.O.T. oriel) and a silicon detector. The incident light power is varied with neutral density filters.

### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Simulation

The results of Sec. II can now be applied to calculate the carrier and electric field profiles in the different layers as a function of the incident light intensity. Initially, we choose a certain electric field at the contact \( F_c \). Depending on the injection model, the carrier density at the contact \( (p_i) \) is calculated. From these two values, we calculate the field and carrier profile in the layer. By changing the value of \( F_c \), a range of values for the carrier density \( (p_i) \) and field \( (F_{i,p}) \) at the interface is obtained. These steps are then repeated for the acceptor layer, giving a range of \( n_i \) and \( F_{i,A} \) values. As the electric field should be continuous at the interface \( (F_{i,p} = F_{i,A}) \), if the permittivities of the materials are the same), the profiles for the different layers can be linked to each other. Finally, by using Eq. (17) or (18), the incident light required to obtain a certain \( n_i-p_i \) couple can be calculated.

Because it is difficult to correlate carrier density with incident light intensity, most of the plots used in this paper give the carrier density at the interface on the \( x \) axis, and not the incident light intensity. In all the simulations, the mobility of the organic layers is fixed to 1 \( \times 10^{-7} \) m\(^2\)/Vs, while the effective density of states is kept at 1 \( \times 10^{27} \) states/m\(^3\).
calculated for a clean surface. For some small molecules, with the work function of the metal, which is measured or injected barrier is not known, the injection barrier will scale and cathode metal work function. Although the effective in- vealed a clear relationship between efficiency of the OLED cathodes with different work functions. Their results re- side, but to the model, we modify the injection barrier at the donor side can be seen in Fig. 5, where the resis- tance at the interface, corresponding to \( \Delta \phi_D \), and this for a 50 nm thick layer with a mobility of \( 1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2/\text{V s} \).

**B. Change in work function of the contact**

A commonly recurring question when working with organic devices is the effect of the chosen metal contact on the performance of the device. Most contacts induce an injection barrier to the organic layer because of the difficulty in achieving Ohmic contacts. Different contact materials will change the carrier injection and as such the characteristics of the device. Stüssel et al. evaluated the performance of organic light-emitting diodes (OLEDs) by using a range of cathodes with different work functions. Their results revealed a clear relationship between efficiency of the OLED and cathode metal work function. Although the effective injection barrier is not known, the injection barrier will scale with the work function of the metal, which is measured or calculated for a clean surface. For some small molecules, such as \( C_{60} \), the interaction between organic and the metal contact is large enough that the injection barrier is pinned to a certain value, regardless of which metal is used. To avoid these problems, PTCDI-C\(_{13}\)H\(_{27}\) is used as an acceptor material as it is known that for this acceptor, different contact metals change the injection behavior. For the comparison model, we modify the injection barrier at the donor side, but \textit{mutatis mutandis}, this is equivalent to the experimental situation of modifying the barrier at the acceptor side.

The results of a simulation with different injection barriers at the donor side can be seen in Fig. 5, where the resistance at \( V_{oc} \) is plotted versus the carrier density at the interface for a 50 nm thick layer. With increasing injection barrier, the carrier density at the contact drops out the layer. As expected from Eq. (22), the resistance drops with increasing carrier density at the interface until the point where the increase has only an effect on the carrier profile close to the interface. The lower carrier density elsewhere in the layer will dominate and the resistance will remain constant. The point where the resistance exponentially stops decreasing is shifted depending on the metal work function. Higher injection barriers shift this point to lower light intensities and, consequently, the saturated resistance is higher.

**FIG. 5.** Calculated resistance at \( V_{oc} \) as a function of the carrier density at the interface \( p_i \) by using different injection barriers \( \Delta \phi_D \), and this for a 50 nm thick layer with a mobility of \( 1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2/\text{V s} \).

Experimentally, two different metals [ytterbium (Yb) and aluminum (Al), with reported work functions of 2.63 and 4.30 eV, respec- tively] are deposited as cathode on a planar heterojunction solar cells, consisting of 50 nm CuPc, 50 nm PTCDI-C\(_{13}\)H\(_{27}\), and a metal contact. The top contact is Yb or Al.

**FIG. 6.** Extracted light dependent parameters from planar heterojunction solar cells, consisting of 50 nm CuPc, 50 nm PTCDI-C\(_{13}\)H\(_{27}\), and a metal contact. The top contact is Yb or Al.
where $n$ is the diode ideality factor, $J_S$ is the reverse saturation current, and $R_s$ and $R_p$ are the series and parallel resistances, respectively. The extracted fit parameters (Table I) are comparable for both solar cells, with the exception of $R_s$. At high voltages or high $P_0$, $R_s$ dominates. In that sense, $R_s$ is a good value for $R_{Voc}$ for high $P_0$, provided that $R_s$ is independent of the incident light intensity $P_0$.

The resistance at $V_{oc}$ vs $P_0$ is plotted in Fig. 7. The trends of the simulated data (Fig. 5) are apparent. The resistance exponentially decreases until it satiates toward the series resistance. The fill factor follows this trend: lower FF for the case with Al are visible at high light intensities. A more detailed look at the effects of resistance on FF can be found elsewhere in the literature.18

### C. Thickness dependence

As mentioned in Sec. II D, a second parameter that influences $R_{Voc}$ is the thickness of the organic layers. Simulations show two different regimes, depending on the boundary carrier concentrations at the contact and at the interface. If both are low, $R_{Voc}$ will linearly increase with increasing thickness because the change in carrier density profile is negligible in comparison to the change in thickness. However, if the boundary concentrations are high, a third-order power-law dependence on the thickness will be visible. Figure 8 shows the reason of this power law. The carrier density forms a $U$ shape, where the minimum carrier density is situated in the middle of the layer, and not at the boundaries. For thicker layers, the minimum carrier density is smaller. This effect adds up to the normal increase in resistance due to a longer travel distance.

The layer structure used in the experiments is 20 nm CuPc, followed by PTCDI-C$_{13}$H$_{27}$ to form the donor-acceptor interface, which is capped with 10 nm BCP and 80 nm Al to form the cathode. The layer thickness of PTCDI-C$_{13}$H$_{27}$ is varied from 78 to 228 nm. The dark $I$-$V$ curves are seen in Fig. 9. The fitted parameters from Eq. (23) can be found in Table I. As seen before, $R_{Voc}$ as a function of the incident light intensity has an asymptote toward the series resistance. The inset of Fig. 9 plots the series resistance versus the thickness. The trend is clearly superlinear.

### Table I. Parameters from dark IV-curves fitted with the generalized Shockley equation for the different samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$J_S$ (A/m$^2$)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$R_s$ (Ω m$^2$)</th>
<th>$R_p$ (Ω m$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work function experiments (50 nm PTCDI-C$<em>{13}$H$</em>{27}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yb cathode</td>
<td>1.0 × 10$^{-5}$</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.7 × 10$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al cathode</td>
<td>2.1 × 10$^{-5}$</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11 × 10$^{-3}$</td>
<td>4.7 × 10$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness experiments (BCP/Al cathode)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 nm PTCDI-C$<em>{13}$H$</em>{27}$</td>
<td>1.7 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>2.6 × 10$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 nm PTCDI-C$<em>{13}$H$</em>{27}$</td>
<td>1.2 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>2.3 × 10$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 nm PTCDI-C$<em>{13}$H$</em>{27}$</td>
<td>1.4 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>25.0 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.8 × 10$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![FIG. 7. The measured resistance at $V_{oc}$ versus incident light power ($P_0$) for planar solar cells with Yb and Al as contact. As a guide for the eye, the dotted and the dashed lines represent the fitted dark series resistance $R_S$ for cells with Al and Yb respectively.](image1.png)

![FIG. 8. Upper panel: calculated carrier profile inside layers with different thickness, from 25 nm to 500 nm, and with a mobility of 1 × 10$^{-7}$ m$^2$/V s. The carrier density at the contact and the interface is kept constant at 1 × 10$^{24}$ carriers/m$^3$. Lower panel: the resulting resistance at $V_{oc}$ for the different thicknesses.](image2.png)
As a side note, the resistance dependence at high light intensities is related to the classical space-charge limited current (SCLC). In the SCLC model, the current is limited by the bulk itself, and not by injection of carriers at the contact. In our case, one of the contacts of the classical space-charge limited current is replaced by the interface between donor and acceptor, and as a result, we observe the same thickness dependence.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Starting from basic continuity equations, we have presented an analytical model for the open-circuit voltage regime of planar heterojunction solar cells. This model indicates that $V_{oc}$ does not depend on the work function of the metal contacts. When the work function creates a low injection barrier, drift current will induce $V_{oc}$. If a high injection barrier is created, diffusion current of carriers away from the interface will make sure that the same barrier is created, diffusion current of carriers away from the interface will make sure that the same $V_{oc}$ is reached. The exact relationship between $V_{oc}$ and $P^0$ is determined by the actual recombination process of free carriers at the interface.

An extension of the model focuses on the resistance of the solar cell at $V_{oc}$. This resistance is determined by the carrier profile inside the organic layers; the higher the carrier density, the lower the resistance. The carrier profile at zero current is determined by the boundary values, namely, the carrier density at the interface and at the contact. In this view, a change in the work function of the contact metal, leading to a change in carrier density at the contact, will affect the resistance, and hence, the FF. The lowest resistance will be reached when the carrier density is high or when the injection barrier is low. Metals with work functions close to the HOMO of the donor material or the LUMO of the acceptor material will lead to low resistive organic solar cells.

The effect of the thickness on the resistance is twofold. Thicker layers will lead to a longer distance the carriers need to travel. A second effect is the change in steady-state carrier densities. The minimum carrier density in the layer will be reduced when increasing the thickness. This point of lowest carrier density is the point of highest resistivity, and any change in this density will be reflected in the overall resistance of the layer. At high light intensities, these two effects add up and the resistance follows a third-order power law of the incident light intensity.

The results of these simulations can be applied to optimize organic planar heterojunction solar cells. For example, novel promising organic materials sometimes result in high resistive solar cells. Often, this high resistance is explained by a low mobility of the material; however, a better choice of contacts along with an optimized layer thickness could also reduce the resistance.
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APPENDIX A: SOLUTION OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION FOR $p(x)$ AND $F(x)$

By using the Poisson equation [Eq. (2)] for holes only with zero net current ($j_p=0$), Eq. (6) can be reformulated as

$$F \frac{dF}{dx} - \frac{kT}{q} \frac{d^2F}{dx^2} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

A double substitution ($x=-u2kT/q$ and $F=y'/y$) is carried out, yielding the following differential equation:

$$y'' = C_1 y.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

The differential equation can be solved depending on the value of the integration constant $C_1$. This latter parameter is determined by the boundary conditions: the electric field ($F_c$) and the carrier density ($p_c$) at the contact,

$$C_1 = F_c^2 - \frac{2kT}{e} p_c.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

Case 1: $C_1 < 0$. The solution can be expressed as

$$y = A \cos(\sqrt{C_1} u + C_2),$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

where $A$ and $C_2$ are the two more integration constants. As $F$ is equal to $y'/y$, the integration constant $A$ disappears. The field and the carrier density can be rewritten as

$$F(x) = \mp \sqrt{-C_1} \tan \left( \mp \sqrt{-C_1} \frac{q}{2kT} x + C_2 \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (A5)

$$p(x) = \frac{e}{2kT \cos^2 \left( \mp \sqrt{-C_2} \frac{q}{2kT} x + C_2 \right)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A6)

with the integration parameter $C_2$ that can be expressed in terms of $F_c$ and $p_c$,

$$C_2 = \arctan \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{-2kT p_c/ \left( e F_c^2 \right) - 1}} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A7)

Case 2: $C_1 = 0$. This case can be seen as a boundary case. The solution is
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\[ y = A(u + C_2). \]  
(A8)

The field and the carrier density can be written as

\[ F(x) = \frac{-1}{2kTx - C_2}, \]  
(A9)

\[ p(x) = \frac{e}{2kT} \cdot \frac{1}{\left( \frac{2kT}{x} - C_2 \right)^2}, \]  
(A10)

with

\[ C_2 = \frac{1}{F_c}. \]  
(A11)

Case 3: \( C_1 > 0 \). Two solutions are possible,

\[ y = A \sinh(\pm \sqrt{C_1}u + C_2), \]  
(A12)

or

\[ y = A \cosh(\pm \sqrt{C_1}u + C_2), \]  
(A13)

but the solution with the \( \cosh \) is nonphysical as it leads to negative charge densities. Again, equations for field and carrier density can be calculated as

\[ F(x) = \pm \sqrt{C_1} \coth \left( \mp \sqrt{C_1} \frac{q}{2kT} x + C_2 \right), \]  
(A14)

\[ p(x) = \frac{e}{2kT \sinh^2 \left( \mp \sqrt{C_1} \frac{q}{2kT} x + C_2 \right)}, \]  
(A15)

with

\[ C_2 = \sec \left( \pm \sqrt{\frac{1 - \frac{2kT}{x} \frac{p_c}{F_c}}{1 - \frac{2kT}{x} \frac{p_c}{F_c}}} \right). \]  
(A16)

APPENDIX B: SOLUTION OF INTEGRAL EQUATION FOR \( R_{\text{voc}} \)

The sign of the integration constant \( C_1 \) [Eq. (A3)] will determine the solution of Eq. (22). To simplify the equations, two parameters (\( \beta \) and \( \gamma \)) are defined as

\[ \beta = 1 - \frac{C_1}{F_c^2}, \]  
(B1)

\[ \gamma = 2dp_c \frac{\sqrt{C_1}}{kT q}. \]  
(B2)

The solutions of the integral are as follows:

For \( C_1 > 0 \) or \( \beta < 1 \),

\[ R_{\text{voc}} = \frac{\frac{d_p^3}{\varepsilon \mu_p kTq}}{e} \left[ \sinh \left( \gamma (2 - \beta) \cos \gamma - 2\sqrt{1 - \beta \sin \gamma} - \gamma \beta \right) \right] \frac{1}{\gamma^3 \beta}. \]  
(B3)

For \( C_1 < 0 \) or \( \beta > 1 \),

\[ R_{\text{voc}} = \frac{\frac{d_p^3}{\varepsilon \mu_p kTq}}{e} \left[ \sin \left( \gamma (\beta - 2) \cos \gamma - 2\sqrt{\beta - 1 \sin \gamma} - \gamma \beta \right) \right] \frac{1}{\gamma^3 \beta}. \]  
(B4)