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Executive Summary

(Completed during MS9; 1-2 pages)

Replace this text with a paragraph answering the following questions:

* Who is the partner for this project?
* What is the larger task that our project partner needs us to complete? (Re-read the memo from nanoHUB and your answers to questions in M1.)
* What is the specific (immediate) task your team is trying to complete? When answering this question,
  + Identify your target audience and
  + State your goals for the simulation suite.
* What is your solution? When answering this question,
  + Briefly describe each mathematical model and
  + Describe how the target user can explore each model through a simulation

We are partnering in this endeavor with nanoHub. We are developing a simulation suite that helps our clients visualize certain aspects of the photovoltaic panel fabrication process, as it relates specifically to quantum dot nanoparticles. For the direct user (the PV fabrication team), our goal is to provide them with a way of easily testing different ‘recipes’ for mixtures of QD materials in order to achieve a given average band gap energy. (We haven’t gotten a solution yet). (We haven’t reached this level yet).

Replace this text with a paragraph answering the following questions:

* How do you define success? Provide a ***critical*** evaluation of the effectiveness of your simulation suite with respect to *each* of the **five** criteria for a success (see the memo from our project partners). ***For each criterion, provide strengths AND weaknesses***. ***Be specific by making reference to identifiable features of your solution*.** All solutions have weaknesses, so your team needs to think critically about what needs to be done to bring your solution up to a professional quality product that is ready for your target audience to use on nanoHUB.org.

Milestone 1 Summary

(1-2 paragraphs, 0.5-1 page)

The outcome of Milestone one was a collection of information relating to the development and implementation of PV Quantum Dot technology. Briefly, the information contained in the document is organized as follows. The initial section is a reflection on the problem at hand, what is needed? By what are we constrained? For whom are we making this product? The second section is a list of potential stakeholders in PV technology, as well as a description of each and whether or not that particular party would be in direct contact with our proposed product. We were then asked to evaluate our list of stakeholders and narrow it down to one particular primary direct user for whom we would be specializing our simulation suite. Once we had picked one and given our reasons for doing so, we then researched and brainstormed about what we would need to know in order to create a simulation suite that would actually be useful to our chosen user. The end goal of this milestone was to narrow down the end result of the project, to force us to think about and research our direct user, so that when it comes time to actually produce the suite, we will have the information necessary to develop a set of simulations that have a direct correlation to the needs of the user.

The main feedback that we received was directed at our oversight as far as citations and proper formatting.

We addressed these concerns by properly formatting our citations and including correct in-text attributions.

Milestone two was an assignment that was designed to elicit from our team a further distilled list of the concepts and ideas that had been generated in the previous Milestone. In short, Milestone two is organized according to the following description. The first section of Milestone two is devoted to a short recap of Milestone one, the feedback we had received from the peer team and how we planned to address it. The next portion is a table where we catalogued more than a score of concepts that we thought would be viable simulations, either freestanding or combined with one or more other concepts from the list. Within each idea, we also communicated the evidence we had found as to why this concept was useful. There were also associated boxes for the sources we had discovered in our research, the concept generation strategies we had implemented, as well as for the specific user criteria we deemed individual concept addressed. Following that segment was another table set aside for our full APA formatted citations (in alphabetical order), as well as a space for a few lines from each member describing their individual contributions to the Milestone.

We received very positive feedback on our work for Milestone two. The reviewer did not have any critiques concerning either our content or formatting. Pursuant to this favorable assessment we did not make any changes to M2 and attempted to apply our previous standards to the current Milestone.

Milestone 3 was again a continuation of the previous two milestones. This milestone, however, differed from those before. This milestone the documentation of our path to condensing our set of twenty ideas down to a suite of four graphical user interfaces that are related in some way to each other and all correlate to the desired goal of developing a simulation suite that assists our direct users (the fabrication team for a solar cell manufacturing company) visualize data that pertains to their mission. We did this in several ways. We initially voted on each of the twenty concepts, each member had one vote, and when we finished voting for the ideas we eliminated the lowest ten ideas and then discussed each of them. We used the supplied pro/con tables to evaluate each of the ten ideas, citing our sources and using documented and cited rationale for how we weighted each of the pros and cons. We then assigned each of the ideas a weighting between 1 and 5. When each idea had been weighted and summed the scores were compared and four best results were selected as our final simulation ideas. Then, for each idea, we each selected one that we were going to be responsible for coding in the end graphical user interface GUIs. When we had determined who would be coding what, we each wrote a paragraph describing how each GUI related to the main purpose and to the other GUIs (each was written with input from the other team members). We each then wrote our contribution statement at the end of the document.

We received good feedback on M3 for the most part. However, there was concern with our rationale for the pro and con table, we had carefully devised a system of rationale that could be extended to each of the ten ideas, the apparent desire for the grading team was that there should be distinct rationale for each idea, this was not communicated and we felt it to be unnecessary given the information that was made available to us when we generated these rationale.

We evaluated the feedback, but as we are not re-iterating M3 there is not a place to communicate our changes other than in this document. We do not feel that the rationale was inappropriate or that the tactic we used by employing the same rationale for all weighting was against course policy. We do however, wish to communicate our desire to conform to the desires of the grading team. We feel that there would be a better chance of success if the grading rubric were supplied for all assignments before the due date, so that those completing the assignments know exactly what the graders are looking at, so the students can achieve the best result possible given their abilities and their desire to complete the requirements in the most satisfactory manner possible.

After our presentation of M4 we received minimal feedback, most of it related to aesthetic/organizational elements. We were told that the basic premises of the GUI simulations were good, but perhaps a little cloudy on what their purpose was. We feel the presentation was a success, in preparing for it and discussing it afterwards we discovered a few things that we wanted to do differently.

From the feedback we were given, we decided to include a couple extra buttons in the GUIs that would allow the entry of new data, or the use of the original data set that we are now allowing to be entered via the main GUI window.

We have taken these things into account and have edited our slides/pseudo GUIs accordingly. We feel that our simulation is robust and will be useful to our direct user.

Milestone 5 was simply a resubmission of M4.

The feedback we received was mostly positive but there were a couple of concerns with our citation methods the requirements for which were unclear. There was also mention of a couple of our GUIs being too similar, that was an error in our description, the surfaces present information in a similar format, but have different outputs, while the layouts look the same the information is different.

We have looked over these concerns and will attempt to rectify them to the best of our abilities.

Include similar summary paragraphs for each Milestone 2-9