


Journal of Materials Chemistry A

Accepted Manuscript



This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: D. Krasikov and I. Sankin, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2017, DOI: 10.1039/C6TA09155E.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [author guidelines](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the ethical guidelines, outlined in our [author and reviewer resource centre](#), still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



Journal Name

ARTICLE

Defect interactions and the role of complexes in CdTe solar cell absorber

Dmitry Krasikov,^a Igor Sankin^bReceived 00th January 20xx,
Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

While the electrical and optical properties of the most crystalline materials are determined by the point defects, association of these defects into complexes may further alter material properties introducing new important phenomena. The properties of isolated point defects in CdTe have attracted significant research efforts; yet, understanding of the complex defects in this material remains insufficient. This paper investigates thermodynamic aspects of defect association in chlorinated copper-doped CdTe absorbers from the first principles using a supercell approach with the range-separated hybrid exchange-correlation functional. Based on the complex association energies calculated for 76 defect reactions, we propose the most favorable pair complexes formed in Cl- and Cu-doped CdTe absorbers. Most of the complexes studied in this work appear to be harmful for the *p*-doping and may be responsible for performance instabilities observed in CdTe devices. We also discuss a plausible passivation mechanisms that mitigates Te_{Cd} recombination centers during Cl treatment as well as formation of larger defect clusters and segregation of the point defects on extended defects.

1. Introduction

The efficiency of CdTe-based solar cells depends to a large degree on the electric properties of CdTe absorber layer that, in turn, heavily depend on the amount and properties of the electrically active centres (crystalline defects) in it. The record efficiency of CdTe-based thin-film solar cells has recently reached 22.1%.¹ This impressive result, however, is still far from the theoretical maximum (~30%), leaving enough room for improvements. In particular, formation of a stronger *p*-type absorber doping and mitigation of absorber recombination centres to achieve longer carrier lifetime could further improve the open-circuit voltage.² As an additional and important requirement, the concentration and distribution of crystalline defects in absorber should remain constant under field stress conditions to ensure the stable device performance.

The typical fabrication process of a CdTe PV device includes a high-temperature annealing step at 400-450°C in the presence of chlorine and a *p*-type doping formation step at 200-300°C to introduce and activate Cu acceptors. Chlorine and copper introduced in CdTe at concentrations³⁻⁶ of 10^{17} - 10^{19} cm^{-3} form point defects that strongly affect electrical performance of the absorber. Recently, the properties of Cu- and Cl-related point defects in CdTe absorber became a subject of the intensive research.⁷⁻¹² At the same time, the defect complexes consisting of more than one point defect have attracted much less attention and their role in the formation of doping and recombination centres remains unclear. In this work, we

analyse the interactions of major point defects causing the formation of defects complexes and discuss the impact of resulting complexes on the doping, recombination properties, and stability of CdTe absorbers.

We base our work on the series of preceding studies⁹⁻²⁵ that systematically analyse the structure and the electric properties of intrinsic and Cu- and Cl-related point defects in CdTe. The electric character of the point defects derived using the first principles calculations is in agreement with the experimental data (Grill *et al.*¹⁸⁻¹⁹) and can be summarized as follows. The cadmium vacancy V_{Cd} is a non-shallow double acceptor. The cadmium antisite Cd_{Te} , the tellurium vacancy V_{Te} and the interstitial cadmium Cd_{i} are shallow double donors. The interstitial tellurium Te_{i} and tellurium antisite Te_{Cd} are deep double donors. The substitutional copper Cu_{Cd} is a non-shallow acceptor, while the interstitial copper Cu_{i} and the chlorine on tellurium site Cl_{Te} are shallow donors. The interstitial chlorine Cl_{i} may act as a donor or an acceptor depending on its position in the CdTe lattice.^{10,21} Although no study on the recombination activity of Cl- and Cu-related defects in CdTe is reported to date, certain attempts were made to analyse theoretically the recombination properties of intrinsic defects. According to the analysis of multiphonon carrier capture rates, Te_{Cd} is the most active recombination centre among the intrinsic defects in CdTe.^{24,25}

As compared to the point defects, there were only scattered efforts to investigate the complex defects in CdTe.^{10,11,17,20,26} Below, we summarize the major findings of these studies. ($\text{Cu}_{\text{i}}\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}}$) is a deep donor complex that can diffuse, ($\text{Cl}_{\text{Te}}\text{-V}_{\text{Cd}}$) is an acceptor complex with ionization level at 0.1 eV – 0.22 eV from the valence band maximum (VBM). ($\text{V}_{\text{Cd}}\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}}$) is a deep double acceptor complex with (0/-2) ionization level located at ~1.0 eV from VBM, ($\text{Te}_{\text{i}}\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}}$) complex has binding energy of -1.2 eV,

^a First Solar Inc, 28101 Cedar Park Blvd, Perrysburg, OH 43551 USA. E-mail: dmitry.krasikov@firstsolar.com

^b First Solar Inc, 28101 Cedar Park Blvd, Perrysburg, OH 43551 USA. E-mail: iaor.sankin@firstsolar.com

ARTICLE

Journal Name

(Te_i-Te_i) complex is weakly bound. The cadmium vacancy, V_{Cd}, does not form complexes with other cation and anion vacancies.

Multiple studies investigated the impact caused by complex defects on the macroscopic properties in different materials. Examples include doping compensation by the association of dopants with intrinsic defects (see e.g. refs. 27, 28) and aging of ferroelectrics due to the reorientation of dipoles formed by complex defects.²⁹ Other examples include appearance of the yellow luminescence in GaN,³⁰ high rate of non-radiative recombination in InGaN alloys,³¹ light-induced metastabilities in Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ solar cells.^{32–34} Passivation of impurities in Si by hydrogen³⁵ and retention of the hydrogen in metals,^{35,36} provide another set of examples. Together with a general assumption of the detrimental role of complexes in semiconductor devices,³⁷ this list emphasizes the need to improve the understanding of defect complexes in CdTe absorbers and their effect on the electronic properties and stability.

The instability of electronic properties of CdTe-based PV devices is another long-standing issue³⁸ that attracted considerable research interest.^{39–47} Several studies have attributed metastabilities to the Cu redistribution in the device.^{8,48–50} At the same time, Gretener *et al.*⁴² reported the instabilities in CdTe solar cells observed even without noticeable Cu redistribution. Guillemoles *et al.* proposed so-called short-range effects not involving long-range diffusion of species to explain metastabilities observed in CIGS PV cells.⁵¹ Such effects include relatively fast transition of a defect or a complex into the metastable state and defect reactions. To our knowledge, the role of short-range effects in CdTe solar cells is still unclear.

Section 2 of this work lists the assumptions and provides details on the methods used in this study. In section 3, we report the energies of pair interactions between the major point defects in Cl- and Cu-treated CdTe absorbers obtained from the calculated enthalpies of defect reaction and ionization levels of defects and complexes. In sub-section 4.1, we derive a quantitative association criterion used to evaluate association probability of the defects during Cl and Cu treatments and determine the most favourable pair complexes. In the following sub-section 4.2, we discuss the impact of defects association on the *p*-type doping in CdTe absorber. Sub-section 4.3 discusses the possibility of passivation of Te_{Cd} recombination centre by Cl, and sub-section 4.4 discusses the potential mechanisms of instabilities induced by pair complexes in Cl- and Cu-treated CdTe absorbers. Finally, in sub-section 4.5, we discuss the processes that may potentially limit the applicability of the model of pair complex formation, i.e. the association of point defects into larger defect clusters and the segregation on extended defects.

2. Methodology

2.1 Assumptions

Primary defects. We consider 4 intrinsic point defects (Cd_i, V_{Cd}, Te_i, Te_{Cd}) and 4 point defects formed by the chlorine and copper (Cl_i, Cl_{Te}, Cu_i, Cu_{Cd}). Since formation of Cd_{Te} and V_{Te} requires a long equilibration in Te-poor ambient not found in standard processing, we exclude these defects from the consideration. **Even if formed in some amount, they convert into Cl_{Te} defect in the chlorinated CdTe as follows from the calculated formation energies.**^{10,14} As we consider the species in the different charge states, we deal with 12 different point defects: Cd_i⁺², V_{Cd}⁻², Te_i⁰, Te_i⁺², Te_{Cd}⁰, Te_{Cd}⁺², Cl_i⁺, Cl_i⁻, Cl_{Te}⁺, Cu_i⁺, Cu_{Cd}⁰, Cu_{Cd}⁻ participating in 78 reactions including the reaction with the same kind of defect.

Excluded reactions. We do not consider reactions between V_{Cd} and Cu_{Cd}. These species do not coexist because Cu_i and Cd_i fill all the residual V_{Cd}, while Cu annealing temperature is too low to form new cadmium vacancies or diffuse existing vacancies from the interfaces. This leaves 76 reactions in total.

Defects chemistry. Any defect reaction consist of a forward and backward reactions described by rate constants linked through equilibrium constant. The equilibrium constant defined by the reaction energy and temperature determines the direction of a reaction and the equilibrium concentrations of reactants and products. In this work, we primarily analyse the equilibrium constants of defect reactions.

Bimolecular defect reactions. We only consider bimolecular reactions where two well-separated non-interacting point defects merge into a product (single point defect or complex). In the following discussion, the reactions that proceed from the “left” to the “right” are called forward, and the reactions from the “right” to the “left” are called backward. This description covers three types of possible defect reactions:

- The association/dissociation of a complex:



- The exchange reactions facilitated by kick out:



In the forward exchange reaction, a self-interstitial defect A_i kicks out a substitutional defect B_A formed by an element B on the lattice site belonging to an element A in a regular lattice. This exchange reaction forms a regular lattice site A_A and an interstitial defect B_i . In the backward reaction, B_i replaces A on its regular site, forming B_A and a mobile interstitial A_i that diffuses away from the reaction site.

- The formation/recombination of a vacancy and an interstitial defect:



In the recombination reaction (forward direction) an interstitial defect comes close to a vacancy and falls into it, which is usually energetically favourable. The backward reaction is the jump-out of an atom from a substitution lattice site into an interstitial site and the separation of thus formed interstitial defect and a

vacancy. If a regular lattice atom jumps out, then a Frenkel pair forms in such backward reaction.

Theoretical energy of reaction. We estimate the energy change in the above-mentioned reactions as a difference between formation enthalpies of products and reactants obtained from the first principles calculations using large supercells and the range-separated hybrid functional.

2.2 Reaction energies and ionization levels

We can express all three types of reactions discussed in Section 2.1 in a more general form



where R_1 and R_2 are reactants and P is a product that could be a complex, an interstitial, a substitutional defect or a regular lattice site for the reactions described by eqns (1), (2), and (3), respectively. The enthalpy change in the forward reaction is

$$\Delta H = H_f(P) - H_f(R_1) - H_f(R_2) \quad (5)$$

In eqn (5), $H_f(S)$ represents for the formation enthalpy of a corresponding specie. Since all the considered reactions conserve both the mass and the charge, the final expression for the reaction enthalpy does not contain the enthalpies of species in their reference states. In the supercell approximation the reaction enthalpy reads

$$\Delta H = E(P) + E(\text{Bulk}) - E(R_1) - E(R_2) + (q_1 + q_2)\Delta V(P) - q_1\Delta V(R_1) - q_2\Delta V(R_2) \quad (6)$$

The total energy of the ideal defect-free supercell is given by $E(\text{Bulk})$, while $E(S)$ is the total energy of a supercell containing a corresponding species that carries a charge q . Here, we count the valence band minimum (VBM) correction ΔV based on the average potential far from a defect.⁵² To calculate the total energies, we need to know the most favourable atomic structure of defects and complexes in each charge state. While getting such structures for point defects from previous works, we still need to calculate them for the complex defects. To do this, we build different atomic configurations of a complex by placing two point defects on the possible adjacent lattice sites known from the studies of point defects, and then we optimize these configurations under GGA-PBE approximation by minimizing the energy down to 0.02 eV/Å. After optimization, we calculate the total energies of relaxed structures using HSE06 hybrid functional and choose the structures with the lowest energies. In all calculations, we use the large 216-atoms cubic GGA-PBE-optimized CdTe supercells with the size of 19.83 Å. Although this supercell size does not fully resembles the physical problem with the well separated point defects, it provides enough space to recover the macroscopic bulk behaviour for electrostatic screening and elasticity between the defects or complexes in the neighbouring images and to minimize the overlap of defect wave functions.

To calculate thermodynamic ionization levels of the complex defects we use the formula:

$$\varepsilon_{th}(q/q') = \frac{E_q(Q_q) - E_{q'}(Q_{q'})}{q' - q} - \varepsilon_{VBM}^{Bulk} + \frac{q\Delta V - q'\Delta V'}{q' - q} \quad (7)$$

where q and q' are the charges carried by a complex in corresponding charge states, $E_q(Q_q)$ is the total energy of a supercell with charge q in the most stable atomic configuration Q_q for this charge state, ε_{VBM}^{Bulk} is the VBM energy of CdTe bulk, and ΔV is the VBM correction for defective supercell in a corresponding charge state.

In some cases, charge of the product in its most favourable state differs from the sum of the charges carried by reactants, meaning that the product traps or releases a free carrier after its formation. We obtain the total energy of such an "extended" reaction as a sum of the reaction enthalpy (eqn (6)) and the energy of carrier transition from the corresponding reservoir into the unoccupied defect levels. For example, the energy required to move an electron from the reservoir described by the Fermi level μ_F into an unoccupied defect level is $\varepsilon_{th}(q/q') - \mu_F$.⁵³ Therefore, the overall energy of the reaction with the change of the charge state is

$$\Delta E = \Delta H + (q_1 + q_2 - q_P) \cdot (\varepsilon_{th}((q_1 + q_2)/q_P) - \mu_F) \quad (8)$$

In eqn (8), $\varepsilon_{th}((q_1 + q_2)/q_P)$ represents the ionization level of a product species determined using eqn (7), and q_P is the most favourable charge state of a product for a given Fermi level.

2.3 Computational tools

We perform all calculations using the ab-initio total-energy and molecular-dynamics package VASP (Vienna ab-initio simulation package) developed at the Institut für Materialphysik of the Universität Wien⁵⁴ and integrated into MedeA® software environment⁵⁵. In all calculations, we use plane wave basis set with 300 eV energy cut-off together with the projector augmented wave (PAW) potentials,^{56,57} describing the interactions of valence electrons with core states. We use the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) to the density functional theory parametrized by Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) to optimize the structures.⁵⁸ For the total energy calculations, we use HSE06⁵⁹ range-separated exchange-correlation hybrid functional with default parameters. Most of the calculations are performed using computational resources of Ohio Supercomputer Centre (Columbus, OH, USA).

3. Results

To calculate the enthalpies of the reactions, we identify the most stable products considering different reaction pathways. By comparing results, we find that the interstitial-vacancy complexes, e.g. $(\text{Cu}_i\text{-V}_{\text{Cd}})^{\cdot}$, are not stable and tend to convert into substitution defects. Similarly, the complex of self-interstitial with substitution defect are not stable and convert




Figure 1. Atomic structure of the most favourable complex defects in chlorinated Cu-doped CdTe absorbers.

Table 1. The calculated enthalpies of the reactions between all point defects under consideration. Integer numbers depict the type of each reaction: 1 - complex formation, 2 - exchange reaction facilitated by kick out, 3 - vacancy-interstitial pair annihilation.

	Cl _i ⁻	Cl _i ⁺	Cl _{Te} ⁺	Te _i ⁰	Te _i ⁺²	Te _{Cd} ⁰	Te _{Cd} ⁺²	Cu _i ⁺	Cu _{Cd} ⁰	Cu _{Cd} ⁻	Cd _i ⁺²	V _{Cd} ⁻²
Cl _i ⁻	-0.04	1										
Cl _i ⁺	-0.82	1	-0.72	1								
Cl _{Te} ⁺	-1.02	1	+0.37	1	+0.02	1						
Te _i ⁰	-0.58	1	+1.07	1	-0.65	2						
Te _i ⁺²	+0.49	1	-0.46	1	+0.32	1	-1.42	1	-0.85	1		
Te _{Cd} ⁰	-0.24	1	-1.46	1	-0.44	1	-1.45	1	-1.49	1	0.54	1
Te _{Cd} ⁺²	-1.88	1	-0.88	1	+0.16	1	-1.23	1	-0.68	1	-0.79	1
Cu _i ⁺	-0.04	1	-0.33	1	+0.01	1	-0.47	1	-0.11	1	-0.57	1
Cu _{Cd} ⁰	-0.58	1	-0.48	1	-0.41	1	-0.65	1	-1.09	1	-0.72	1
Cu _{Cd} ⁻	+0.62	1	-0.65	1	-0.52	1	-0.20	1	-1.31	1	-0.04	1
Cd _i ⁺²	+1.08	1	-0.14	1	+0.04	1	-0.54	1	+0.12	1	-0.48	2
V _{Cd} ⁻²	+0.56	3	-0.63	3	-0.74	1	-0.26	3	-2.12	3	0.33	1

into an interstitial defect by kick-out reaction. For example, reaction $\text{Cd}_i^{+2} + \text{Cu}_{\text{Cd}}^-$ tends to produce interstitial copper Cu_i^+ rather than $(\text{Cd}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})^+$ complex. Of total 76 reactions, there are 66 reactions of complex formation, while only three exchange reactions and six reactions of vacancy-interstitial recombination.

Table 1 summarizes the enthalpies of reactions resulting in the most energetically favourable products. All the exchange reactions and the majority of the vacancy-interstitial recombination and complex formation reactions have the negative reaction enthalpy. Despite the common perception that only donor-acceptor association is possible, we find that some of the donor-donor association reactions have negative binding enthalpy (e.g. Cl_i^+ with Cl_i^+ , Cl_i^+ with $\text{Te}_{\text{Cd}}^{+2}$ etc.).

We further use the calculated association enthalpies to derive the energies of association reactions with the change of charge state using eqn (8). By comparing different possible association reactions for each point defect, we have chosen nine most favourable complexes with the lowest association energies in the whole range of the Fermi levels.

Figure 1 presents the most favourable atomic structures of these primary complexes. We find that for some complexes, such as $(\text{Cu}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})^+$ and $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)^{-2}$, the atomic structure resembles the structure of constituting defects placed nearby, while for

the other complexes it is not the case. We also find that different complexes behave differently upon the change of the charge state. For most of the complexes, we do not observe any significant change of the atomic structure after recharge except some variation of bond lengths. For three complexes, namely, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)$, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$, $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$, we find different local energy minima for different charge states and strong lattice relaxation (change of the atomic configuration) resulting from the change of the charge state. This may cause additional effects, as we will discuss further.

Figure 2 summarises the ionization levels of all the primary complexes. All these levels are either of the donor character or of the deep acceptor character. Therefore, we conclude that in p-type CdTe, all complexes behave as donors or neutral defects. The energies of the association reactions for the primary complexes are plotted in Figure 3. These energies are grouped by defects: there are three groups that include the association of Cl_i , the association of Te_i and the association of the residual Cu_{Cd} remaining after association with Cl_i or Te_i . Most of the primary complexes have Fermi level-dependent association energies in a certain range of Fermi levels, which indicate the association with the change of the charge state.




Figure 2. The ionization levels of the most favourable complexes with respect to VBM. The double lines indicate the amphoteric (donor-acceptor) levels. The complexes having strong atomic configuration change are marked bold with the dashed rectangles indicating the corresponding ionization levels.

4. Discussion

4.1 The association criterion

Given the defect formation energy E_f as well as concentration of available lattice sites N_{sites} and the number of possible configurations N_{config} for an arbitrary defect species, its equilibrium concentration could be calculated using Boltzmann approximation for diluted concentrations as⁶⁰

$$c = N_{sites} N_{config} \exp\left(-\frac{E_f}{kT}\right) \quad (9)$$

Let us define the density of its available microstates as $N_{states} = N_{sites} N_{config}$. Then assuming approximately equal concentrations of available microstates N_{states} for the reactants and the product, we can use the law of mass action to estimate equilibrium concentration of a complex product as

$$C_{AB} = \frac{C_A C_B}{N_{states}} \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta E}{kT}\right) \quad (10)$$

In eqn (10), C_A and C_B are the concentrations of isolated point defects A and B , respectively, C_{AB} is the concentration of complex defect AB , and the association energy ΔE is obtained from Figure 3. Note that such formulation is applicable to a general case of association accompanied by the change of charge state. If the energy ΔE depends on the Fermi level and changes during the association, then finding equilibrium concentration C_{AB} would require a self-consistent solution of defect chemistry problem.

To assess the probability of defects association at different stages of solar cell preparation, we introduce a qualitative criterion of association degree. Let us select A and B such that $C_B \gg C_A$, where C_A and C_B could be either equilibrium or kinetically constrained concentrations of defects. Then, we can define the association degree as a concentration ratio between the complex and the minority defect C_{AB} / C_A . In the case of high association degree when $C_{AB} \geq C_A$, the association energy should satisfy the condition




Figure 3. The association energies of the most favourable complexes in the intrinsic and p-type CdTe. The horizontal lines indicate defect association without the change of charge state; the inclined lines indicate association with the change of charge state.

$$\Delta E \leq -kT \log\left(\frac{N_{states}}{C_B}\right) \quad (11)$$

Note that in approximation of diluted concentrations when $C_B \ll N_{states}$, condition (11) requires negative ΔE . We introduce the critical association energy $\Delta E_{crit} = kT \log(N_{states}/C_B)$ so that

$$|\Delta E| \leq \Delta E_{crit} \quad (12)$$

When the absolute value of the association energy exceeds ΔE_{crit} , more than a half of minority defects are associated into complexes. In the estimates shown in Figure 4, we use N_{states} equals to the density of lattice sites in CdTe.

From the Figure 4, we see that as the temperature decreases, the association degree increases for a given value of ΔE_{crit} . A practical take-away from this observation is that interstitial defects not bound in complexes at high-temperature processing would tend to form complexes on cool down. The calculated diffusivities^{11,12,17,61,62} of Cu_i^{+} , Cd_i^{+2} , Te_i^{+2} and Cl_i^{+} interstitial defects in CdTe are in the range 10^{-14} - $7 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ at room temperature, which is sufficient to pass the mean distance between defects with concentration 10^{16} - 10^{17} cm^{-3} within minutes or faster. Therefore, during or after cooling down to room temperature most of the remaining interstitial defects in p-type CdTe will tend to react with other defects. Depending on conditions and parameters of reactions this will




Figure 4. Dependence of $-\Delta E_{crit}$ on the temperature and the concentration of majority defect C_B calculated for $N_{states} = 1.48 \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Solid lines of different thickness show ΔE_{crit} for 4 different C_B concentrations.

ARTICLE

Journal Name

lead to formation of complexes, kicking out foreign atoms from their native lattice sites (e.g. Te_i will knock out Cl_{Te} , Cd_i will kick out Cu_{Cd} , etc.), or to recombination with the vacancies.

Figure 4 also shows that at a fixed temperature, the association degree increases at higher concentrations of a majority defect C_B . Given as an example of $T = 400^\circ\text{C}$ and $\Delta E = -0.7\text{eV}$, the association degree would be very low (<11%) in the case of $\text{C}_B = 10^{16}\text{cm}^{-3}$, while becoming very significant (>92%) in the case of $\text{C}_B = 10^{19}\text{cm}^{-3}$.

4.2 The doping

In this section, we discuss the impact of complexes on p-type doping in CdTe absorbers. After a general discussion of the impact of defect association on the doping level, we consider specific cases linked to Cl treatment and Cu doping stages. In the following discussion, we assume that free charge carriers are in thermal equilibrium and therefore, omit possible effects of photo-generated carriers on the defect formation energies discussed by K. Alberi and M. A. Scarpulla.⁶³

As the doping depends on the balance between the charged acceptors and donors, our goal is to reveal how the formation of complexes may affect this balance. Here, we consider two cases when the complex formation occurs with and without change in the charge state.

The association without the change of the charge state. In a closed system, association of the compensating defect into a complex with charge-conservation does not influence the net doping. However, if there is an external reservoir that can re-supply compensating defect species to the system, association of such a defect into a complex will lead to doping reduction. This consumption-refilling process effectively increases the solubility of compensating point defects. One may consider this as a local reduction of the formation energy of a compensating defect at the site of a complex defect. Because of the increased solubility, the system either may come to the donor-acceptor compensation regime or, being already in this regime, may further reduce the uncompensated charged dopant density, which eventually results in the lower doping after cool down.⁶⁴ Well-known example of such association is the association of dopants with intrinsic defects.²⁷ As discussed earlier, the association degree increases on the cool down; however, the doping does not change if point defects do not form.

The association with the change of the charge state. This association directly changes the concentration of free carriers because the complex captures or releases free carriers upon the association. All the inclined lines in Figure 3 denote the association with the change of charge state; however, such association may influence the doping in different ways. If the association energy decreases with the reduction of Fermi level as, for example happens to $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ complex (Figure 3), it means that the complex becomes more stable by trapping holes from VBM. Therefore, the formation of such complex in significant quantities may reduce the net p-type doping concentration and vice versa. The complexes that have higher association energy at low Fermi level, such as $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$, influence the doping in the opposite way – the association is beneficial for

p-type doping, while the dissociation is detrimental. Since the association energy is determined by the Fermi level and, therefore, is changing during the association, the association-compensation process becomes self-balancing.

Now that we have summarized two distinct effects of defects association on doping, we analyse the doping formation during Cl- and Cu-treatment stages.

The doping in CdTe during the Cl-treatment stage. At this stage, the chlorine penetrates into CdTe film and mostly segregates at grain boundaries, while only small percentage of it ($\sim 5 \cdot 10^{16} - 4 \cdot 10^{17}\text{cm}^{-3}$) penetrates the grain interior.^{6,65} Inside the grain, chlorine may form not only Cl_i interstitial defects, but also Cl_{Te} and Te_i defects by kicking-out Te atoms from their lattice sites. Both the interstitial Cl_i and Te_i would bind to neutral Te_{Cd}^0 antisite defects formed during non-equilibrium initial CdTe deposition stage. Created $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$ and $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$ complexes are the most stable ones in CdTe before the introduction of Cu doping, which implies that all available Te_{Cd}^0 defects will be associated into complexes. In fact, Te_{Cd}^0 will be mostly bound to Cl_i because it is more energetically efficient than producing Te_i defect. Since this association occurs without change of the charge state, it does not influence the doping.

Cl treatment usually happens in undoped CdTe absorbers before Cu introduction, so a significant percentage of interstitial Cl_i defects exists in the acceptor state. Negatively charged Cl interstitials Cl_i^- associate readily with the Cl_{Te}^+ or Cl_i^+ donors forming neutral $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$ and $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)$ complexes with no change in doping concentration. Therefore, the amphoteric nature of the chlorine interstitials^{10,21} and the formation of neutral Cl complex explain why chlorine treatment does not introduce any doping in CdTe absorber. During the cool down after Cl treatment stage all the available Cl_i defects will be bound into the $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$ or $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)$ complexes.

The doping in CdTe during the Cu-doping stage. During the copper doping stage, Cu penetrates into CdTe and forms the Cu_{Cd}^- defects producing p-type doping. Strong compensation of Cu doping observed in most cases happens due to a variety of donor defects that include the remaining Cu_i^+ reactants and the Cd_i^{+2} products as well as defect complexes.

Let us consider the complexes that can form on this stage. The complex with the lowest association energy in Figure 3 is $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$. However its formation depends on the availability of Te_i , which production would cost an additional 0.67eV (Table 1). At the same time, a sufficient supply of Cl_i exists due to dissociation of $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)$ and $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$ that are less stable as compared to $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$. This means it is more energetically favourable to form $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ instead of kicking-out Te_i and forming $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$. Upon its formation in p-type CdTe, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ traps two holes becoming $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})^{2+}$, resulting in the most stable Cu complex in CdTe. Due to its double-donor character, this complex causes a strong compensating effect, leading to the observed reduction of Cu doping efficiency in chlorinated CdTe.⁶⁶

As discussed earlier, we do not expect $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ to exist in significant amounts; yet it is another donor affecting efficiency of Cu doping.

The Cu_{Cd} acceptors remaining after the association with Cl_i can be further associated with Cu_i or Cl_{Te} ; the latter requires kicking-out the neighbouring Te atoms by Cl during Cu doping stage. However, taking into account the typical concentrations of Cu and Cl and the critical association energies from Figure 4, we conclude that the association will be very weak for these defects during high temperature Cu doping stage. However, after the cool down, most of the available Cu_i^+ will be associated with the remaining Cu_{Cd} acceptors forming the neutral ($\text{Cu}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}}$) complex. Since such association does not cause additional trapping or release of free carriers, it does not influence the doping.

To visualize the predicted evolution of the defects and complexes during the Cl treatment and the Cu doping stages we propose a flow chart shown in Figure 5. Although not intended to quantify concentrations of species at any particular conditions, it qualitatively shows the flows of Cl and Cu and their possible redistribution between the defects and complexes.

4.3 The recombination

The non-radiative recombination of the free carriers in CdTe absorbers is one of the most important factors limiting the resulting device performance. In this section, we discuss how the association of defects into complexes may influence non-radiative recombination of the charge carriers in CdTe absorbers and form non-uniform conditions-dependent recombination profiles.

The recombination activity of a defect depends on the carrier capture rates: if capture rates are high for both electrons and holes, the recombination rate is high. Since the capture rates are determined by the electron-phonon coupling,⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹ recombination activity of a defect could change as its electronic and phonon states change upon the association. Thus, the association and the dissociation of complexes may influence the overall carrier recombination rate.

Recent research has provided sufficient theoretical proof of high recombination activity of the isolated Te_{Cd} defects.^{24,25} However, after Cl treatment stage known to improve the carrier lifetime in CdTe absorbers,⁷⁰⁻⁷² no isolated Te_{Cd} defects remain because of the association with Cl_i^- defects (Figure 3). Since this association changes the energies of ionization and the atomic structure of Te_{Cd} , the recombination activity of Te_{Cd} changes

upon the association as well. A thorough theoretical analysis of the carrier capture rates of ($\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}}$) and ($\text{Te}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}}$) complexes can further clarify the role of Cl in experimentally observed lifetime improvement.

According to our calculations, some pair complexes experience strong configurational changes upon the change of the charge state. It may be the case that high recombination activity is inherent only to some particular atomic configuration of a complex. Stability of different configurations depends on the concentrations of free charge carriers³² and, therefore may change after changing the external conditions (electrical bias, illumination, temperature). In addition, this means that the stability of different configurations may be spatially varying because of the non-uniform distribution of free carriers within the absorber. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect not only a non-uniform, but also unstable (conditions-dependent) distribution of the recombination centres within CdTe absorber. Again, a thorough theoretical analysis of different configurations of complexes found on the right-hand-side of Figure 5 is required to understand the challenges related to free carrier recombination in CdTe PV devices.

4.4 The instabilities

We define instability as a performance change on the observable time-scale after changing the ambient conditions. We also define “fast transients” as changes observable on timescales up to 1 hour and “slow transients” as changes observable on multi-hours-timescale.^{44,45} In the following, we discuss the possible relation of defects association to these two types of performance transients.

Based on the available publications regarding performance transients, properties of the complexes, and instability mechanisms, we propose the following three mechanisms of instabilities caused by the defects association in CdTe:

- change of atomic configuration
- dissociation/association of point defects
- diffusion mechanisms caused by the defects association

The first mechanism belongs to a class of short-range instabilities⁵¹ not involving long-range diffusion of any defects. The second mechanism is also of a short-range character, but may be involved in more complex instability mechanisms along with the long-range transfer of point defects. The third mechanism is purely long-range effect.⁵¹

The slow change of the atomic configuration is due to the overcoming a potential energy barrier between the atomic configurations during the change of charge state. The rate of the transition between the configurations depends on the potential barrier height and the capture rates of charge carriers. For example, the estimations made by Lany and Zunger for double-vacancy complex defects in CIGS and CIS have shown that after turning off the light, the complex may return into its equilibrium configuration with time delay in the range of 100 – 2500 sec.³²

Therefore, slow change of atomic configuration may cause the corresponding slow changes of the doping and the recombination profiles in CdTe absorber. These effects may be




Figure 5. Sankey diagram showing qualitatively the defects evolution during Cl treatment and Cu doping stages. Exact concentrations and flows of defects depend on experimental conditions. This particular diagram with arbitrary thicknesses of flows may or may not correspond to real conditions.

ARTICLE

Journal Name

responsible for some of the “fast transients” (up to one hour) after changing the conditions. The properties of $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_i)$, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$, and $(\text{Te}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ complexes that exhibit strong lattice relaxation are of a great interest in this respect.

The slow association/dissociation. Any change in a system conditions by changes in ambient temperature, illumination, or electrical bias may trigger phenomena that involve diffusion, association and dissociation of point defects and complexes. Such processes could be relatively time-consuming due to slow diffusion of point defects, slow detachment of defect from complex or extended defect or slow association process caused by the association energy barrier. Below, we discuss several slow mechanisms of association and dissociation of complexes in CdTe studied in this work.

The simplest case is the dissociation of weakly bound $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ complex with association energy of -0.40 eV caused by the solar cell heating during the daily operation cycle. Our estimations show that the association degree of Cu_i may reduce from 90% to 65% upon heating from 20 to 70°C in case of 10^{17} cm^{-3} total Cu concentration (Figure 6). This may cause variation of device characteristics if the complex and the isolated point defects have different properties, e.g., capture cross-sections.

More complicated example is the simultaneous change of the association degrees of several complexes after the change of conditions. For example, the binding of defects into $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ and $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$ complexes results from the association energies that change in the opposite way with the decrease of the Fermi level (Figure 3). Such change in the association energies, e.g. during cooling, drives the system toward new equilibrium. However, chlorine redistribution between the complexes may be slow because of the slow detachment from $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$ complex or due to the slow triple-barrier diffusion of Cl_i^+ reported by Yang *et al.*¹² Furthermore, the plot of association energies in Figure 3 suggests that $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$ complex becomes less stable than the $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ when the Fermi level is low in highly p-doped material. As a result, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$ may slowly dissociate in favour of its counterpart exposing Te_{Cd} recombination centre and, therefore, influencing the recombination rates in the absorber.

The situation becomes even more complicated if one takes into account the changes of spatially dependent carrier generation rates and the non-equilibrium electrostatic potential. Analysis of such problems in time-space domain would require use the comprehensive atomistic kinetic models.

The slow diffusion. At least two additional diffusion mechanisms appear when taking we take into account the




Figure 6. The dependence of Cu_i defect association degree on the temperature ($[\text{Cu}_i] = [\text{Cu}_{\text{Cd}}] = 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$).

association of defects. On one hand, the association may reduce the effective diffusivity of an interstitial species due to defect trapping.⁷³ On the other hand, being associated with an interstitial, almost immobile^{17,74} substitution defect may acquire capability to diffuse by means of the chain mechanism. Such mechanism consists of repeated kick-out of the substitution defect in course of chain-like process involving the interstitial-substitution pair complex and the neighbouring regular lattice atom. Predicted theoretically for $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ complex, this mechanism may explain the “slow” Cu diffusion component in CdTe crystal.¹¹ Similar pair diffusion mechanism was proposed to explain the boron diffusion in silicon.⁷⁵ Such mechanism may facilitate the diffusion of the major substitution defects such as Cu_{Cd} , Cl_{Te} , and Te_{Cd} on the intermediate timescales between the fast diffusion of interstitial defects and the very slow direct diffusion of substitutions. In this regards, the diffusivity of $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cl}_{\text{Te}})$, $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Te}_{\text{Cd}})$, and $(\text{Cl}_i\text{-Cu}_{\text{Cd}})$ complexes require more study.

While the mechanism of slow configuration change plays a role mostly in the “fast transients”, the second and third instability mechanisms may play important role in the “slow” performance transients. It is hard to explain the slow transients by either extremely slow diffusion of the substitution defects or by very fast diffusion of the interstitial species. It was not clear how fast the diffusion of interstitials is until the recent work by Guo *et al.* have shown⁴⁸ that the diffusion of isolated Cl_i^+ donors is simply too fast to explain the experimentally observed slow transient effects in CdTe-based solar cell. Kinetic simulations performed in that work used 1D diffusion-reaction simulator equipped with defect parameters predicted from the first principles in order to study metastabilities of solar cell performance under illumination. In their simulation, the stabilization occurs within one minute as opposed to 10 hours in the corresponding experiment. This result implies that the diffusion of the interstitial defects alone cannot explain the slow transients on the multi-hour timescales. Therefore, we suggest that slow changes in defects association degree and slow diffusion of defects may be responsible for the experimentally observed “slow transients”.

4.5 Point defects vs other defects

We have established that the point defects in chlorinated and Cu-doped CdTe absorbers tend to form pair complexes, and the models describing electrical properties of CdTe devices should account for this phenomenon. The question, however, arises about the applicability limits caused by other competing processes that may come into play and influence the electric behaviours. Examples of such processes are the aggregation of point defects into clusters and the segregation on the extended defects. Thorough theoretical analysis of all these processes is out of scope of this paper, so we provide only some general comments and simple assessment of the role of different processes.

The large defect clusters. We assume that the formation of large defect clusters proceeds primarily via bimolecular reactions of the consecutive attachment of additional point

defects to the most stable pair complexes. Therefore, we can assess the probability of formation of large clusters by analysing the energies of point defects attachment to the primary pair complexes. We can treat such attachment similarly to the association of two defects. For example, in order to form a triple complex, the association energy has to overcome the configuration entropy contribution separating the defects. Moreover, the association into a cluster should be more stable as compared to the pair complexes to be competitive. To assess the association probability of Cl- and Cu-related defects into clusters, we analyse the association of Cl_i and Cu_i defects with the most stable pair complexes, such as (Cl_i-Cl_{Te}), (Cl_i-Cl_i), (Cl_i-Cu_{Cd}), (Cl_i-Te_{Cd}), and (Cu_i-Cu_{Cd}). We find that none of the analysed cluster associations can compete with the previously analysed pair complexes in terms of stability; therefore, we would disregard these mechanisms. At the same time, we find some stable structures of (3Te)_i and (4Te)_i defect clusters. This means that Te_i can potentially form larger clusters, for example at Te-rich conditions. While the properties of such clusters can be important in some cases, their formation does not influence our results on pair complexes formation and all our above conclusions hold true.

The segregation on extended defects. We discriminate two types of the extended defects in a polycrystalline CdTe absorber with columnar grains: (i) the external grain surfaces (grain boundaries, GB) that can be highly disordered and defective, (ii) the more ordered planar (e.g., twin boundaries) and line defects (e.g. dislocations) inside the grains. According to the available experimental data, the external GBs do not accumulate Cu,^{76,77} while do accumulate Cl.^{6,65,77,78} However, Cl still penetrates the grain interior in significant concentrations from $5 \cdot 10^{16}$ to $4 \cdot 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ estimated by ToF-SIMS measurements^{6,65} and may segregate on the extended defects of type (ii) inside the grain.

The most abundant extended defect of type (ii) in CdTe is Σ -3 coherent twin boundary that has the lowest energy.⁷⁹⁻⁸¹ However neither the intrinsic defects nor the Cu- or Cl-related defects do not segregate on such boundaries as was shown both theoretically^{12,82} and experimentally.⁶⁵ Other planar defects have much lower density than Σ -3 boundaries.

The dislocation density in CdTe usually does not exceed 10^5 - 10^6 cm^{-2} .^{79,83} Even if packed with the point defects very tightly, dislocations can accommodate only up to 10^{14} cm^{-3} point defects, i.e., 3-4 orders of magnitude less than overall density of Cu and Cl elements in the grain interior. Therefore, we conclude that, while some amount of Cl and Cu atoms can segregate on the extended defects of type (ii), most of the intra-grain Cu and Cl atoms reside in point defects and pair defect complexes.

5. Conclusions and outlook

We have analysed the thermodynamic aspects of defects interactions in Cl- and Cu-treated CdTe absorbers using first principles calculations. Below, we list the most important findings made in this work:

- There exists a number of pair complexes with the negative association enthalpy including some donor-donor complexes.
- The interstitial-vacancy complexes and the complexes formed by self-interstitial with substitution defect are unstable.
- There are several complexes with the strong lattice relaxation.
- Interstitial Cl defect (Cl_i) participates in the formation of the most favourable complexes.
- All the primary pair complexes in *p*-type CdTe exhibit either neutral or donor character.

We have identified several pair complexes that could be present in CdTe absorbers and may influence the device performance and stability. While only the detailed kinetic simulations of the cell preparation and field operation may reveal the actual role of defects association, we can still derive general conclusions about the role of the most important complexes in CdTe.

The most tightly bound complexes in chlorinated CdTe are those associating Te_{Cd} antisite defect: (Cl_i-Te_{Cd}) and (Te_i-Te_{Cd}). If association in stable complexes indeed passivates Te_{Cd} recombination centres, it would explain the role of Cl treatment in improvement of the free carrier lifetime in CdTe. The neutral (Cl_i-Cl_{Te}) complexes are presumably, the most abundant in chlorinated CdTe absorbers before the Cu treatment. After the Cu introduction and activation, (Cl_i-Cl_{Te}) complexes dissociate in favour of more stable (Cl_i-Cu_{Cd})²⁺ complexes that become the dominant compensating defects limiting the *p*-type doping. On the cool down, Cu_{Cd}⁻ acceptors formed during Cu anneal tend to bind available Cu_i⁺ interstitials to form neutral (Cu_i-Cu_{Cd}) complexes that do not influence the doping.

Association of the point defects into pair complexes may introduce several mechanisms of the instabilities including

- Slow change of the atomic configuration of the complexes with the large lattice relaxation,
- Slow dissociation/association of point defects, and
- Slow diffusion mechanisms caused by the defect association.

The latter two mechanisms may play an important role in the performance changes observed on the multi-hour timescales. To further clarify these effects, the kinetic parameters are needed for several complexes including (Cl_i-Cl_{Te}), (Cl_i-Te_{Cd}), (Cl_i-Cu_{Cd}), and (Cu_i-Cu_{Cd}) complexes. Required parameters include the carrier capture rates, diffusivities, and the barriers for changing atomic configuration and association/dissociation.

According to our calculations, large cluster complexes involving Cl and Cu in the bulk of CdTe grains are less favourable energetically as compared to pair complexes. At the same time, the large clusters of Te_i may form at some conditions and deserve further investigation.

Acknowledgements

We thank Andrei Los and Marcus Gloeckler for the helpful discussions.

References

- Best Research-Cell Efficiencies, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (http://nrel.gov/ncpv/images/efficiency_chart.jpg)
- J. M. Burst, J. N. Duenow, D. S. Albin, E. Colegrove, M. O. Reese, J. A. Aguiar, C.-S. Jiang, M. K. Patel, M. M. Al-Jassim, D. Kuciauskas, S. Swain, T. Ablekim, K. G. Lynn, W. K. Metzger, *Nature Energy* 2016, **1**, 16015.
- S. G. Kumar, K. S. R. Koteswara Rao, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2014, **7**, 45.
- V. Evani, M. Khan, S. Collins, V. Palekis, P. Bane, D. Morel and C. Ferekides, Photovoltaic Specialist Conference (PVSC), IEEE 42nd, New Orleans, LA, June, 2015, DOI: 10.1109/PVSC.2015.7356098.
- T.A. Gessert, W.K. Metzger, P. Dippo, S.E. Asher, R.G. Dhere, M.R. Young, *Thin Solid Films* 2009, **517**, 2370–2373.
- S. P. Harvey, G. Teeter, H. Moutinho, M. M. Al-Jassim, *Progr. Photovolt: Res. Appl.* 2015, **23**, 838–846.
- J. Perrenoud, L. Kranz, C. Gretener, F. Pianezzi, S. Nishiwaki, S. Buecheler, A. N. Tiwari, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2013, **114**, 174505.
- N.E. Gorji, *Applied Physics A*, 2015, **119**, 275–284.
- J. Ma, S.-H. Wei, T. A. Gessert, K.K. Chin, *Phys. Rev. B* 2011, **83**, 245207.
- J.-H. Yang, W.-J. Yin, J.-S. Park, W. Metzger, S.-H. Wei, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2016, **119**, 045104.
- D. Krasikov, A. Knizhnik, and B. Potapkin, S. Selezneva, T. Sommerer, *Thin Solid Films* 2013, **535**, 322–325.
- J.-H. Yang, W.-J. Yin, J.-S. Park, J. Ma, S.-H. Wei, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* 2016, **31**, 083002.
- S.-H. Wei and S. B. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* 2002, **66**, 155211.
- J.-H. Yang, J.-S. Park, J. Kang, W. Metzger, T. Barnes, S.-H. Wei, *Phys. Rev. B* 2014, **90**, 245202.
- S. Lany, V. Ostheimer, H. Wolf, Th. Wichert, *Physica B* 2001, **308–310**, 958–962.
- M.-H. Du, H. Takenaka, D. J. Singh, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2008, **104**, 093521.
- V. Lordi, *J. Cryst. Growth* 2013, **379**, 84–92.
- R. Grill, A. Zappettini, *Progr. Cryst. Growth Charact. Mater.* 2004, **48/49**, 209–244.
- R. Grill, B. Nahlovskyy, E. Belas, M. Bugar, P. Moravec, P. Hoschl, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* 2010, **25**, 045019.
- K. Biswas and M.-H. Du, *New Journal of Physics* 2012, **14**, 063020.
- D. Krasikov, A. Knizhnik, B. Potapkin, T. Sommerer, *MRS Proceedings*, 2014, **1638**, mrsf13-1638-w08-02, doi:10.1557/opl.2014.148.
- A. Lindström, S. Mirbt, B. Sanyal, M. Klintonberg, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* 2016, **49**, 035101.
- A. Lindström, M. Klintonberg, B. Sanyal, and S. Mirbt, *AIP Advances* 2015, **5**, 087101.
- D. N. Krasikov, A. V. Scherbinin, A. A. Knizhnik, A. N. Vasiliev, B. V. Potapkin, T. J. Sommerer, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2016, **119**, 085706.
- J.-H. Yang, L. Shi, L.-W. Wang, S.-H. Wei, *Scientific Reports* 2016, **6**, 21712.
- A. Carvalho, S. Öberg, P. R. Briddon, *Thin Solid Films* 2011, **519**, 7468.
- A. Garcia, J. E. Northrup, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1995, **74**, 1131–1134.
- Y. Ke, S. Lany, J. J. Berry, J. D. Perkins, P. A. Parilla, A. Zakutayev, T. Ohno, R. O'Hayre, David S. Ginley, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 2014, **24**, 2875–2882.
- P. Erhart, P. Traskelin, K. Albe, *Phys. Rev. B* 2013, **88**, 024107.
- D. O. Demchenko, I. C. Diallo, and M. A. Reshchikov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2013, **110**, 087404.
- C. E. Dreyer, A. Alkauskas, J. L. Lyons, J. S. Speck, C. G. Van de Walle, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 2016, **108**, 141101.
- S. Lany, A. Zunger, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2006, **100**, 113725.
- K. Decock, P. Zabierowski, M. Burgelman, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2012, **111**, 043703.
- K. Macielak, M. Maciaszek, M. Igalson, P. Zabierowski, and N. Barreau, *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics* 2015, **5**, 1206–1211.
- S. M. Myers, M. I. Baskes, H. K. Birnbaum, J. W. Corbett, G. G. DeLeo, S. K. Estreicher, E. E. Haller, P. Jena, N. M. Johnson, R. Kirchheim, S. J. Pearton, M. J. Stavola, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64**, 559.
- T. Tanabe, *Phys. Scr.* 2014, **T159**, 014044.
- C. Freysoldt, B. Grabowski, T. Hickel, J. Neugebauer, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 2014, **86**, 253–305.
- K. D. Dobson, I. Visoly-Fisher, G. Hodes, D. Cahen, *Solar Energy Materials & Solar Cells* 2000, **62**, 295–325.
- S. Erra, C. Shivakumar, H. Zhao, K. Barri, D.L. Morel, C.S. Ferekides, *Thin Solid Films* 2007, **515**, 5833–5836.
- C. Deline, J. del Cueto, D. S. Albin, S. Rummel, *J. Photonics Energy* 2012, **2(1)**, 022001.
- S. B. Schujman, J. R. Mann, C. Hull, A. Conteh, G. Dufresne, L. M. LaQue, C. Rice, D. Taylor, J. Wax, D. J. Metacarpa, P. Haldar, Photovoltaic Specialist Conference (PVSC), IEEE 40th, Denver, CO, June, 2014, pp. 2626–2629.
- C. Gretener, J. Perrenoud, L. Kranz, E. Cheah, M. Dietrich, S. Buecheler, A.N. Tiwari, *Sol. Energy Mater. Solar Cells* 2016, **146**, 51–57.
- I. Rimmaudo, A. Salavei, B. L. Xu, S. Di Mare, A. Romeo, *Thin Solid Films* 2015, **582**, 105–109.
- C. Deline, J. del Cueto, D. S. Albin, C. Petersen, L. Tyler and G. Tamizhmani, Photovoltaic Specialists Conference (PVSC), 2011, IEEE 37th, Seattle, WA, June 2011, pp. 003113–003118.
- T. J. Silverman, M. G. Deceglie, B. Marion and S. R. Kurtz, Photovoltaic Specialist Conference (PVSC), 2014, IEEE 40th, Denver, CO, June 2014, pp. 3676–3681.
- M. Gostein and L. Dunn, Photovoltaic Specialists Conference (PVSC), 2011, IEEE 37th, Seattle, WA, June 2011, pp. 003126–003131.
- M. Nardone, D. Albin, *IEEE J. Photovoltaics* 2015, **8**, 962.
- D. Guo, R. Akis, D. Brinkman, A. Moore, T. Fang, I. Sankin, D. Vasileksa, C. Ringhofer, Photovoltaic Specialist Conference (PVSC), IEEE 42nd, New Orleans, LA, June, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- D. Guo and D. Vasileksa, 2016 International Conference on Numerical Simulation of Optoelectronic Devices (NUSOD), Sydney, NSW, 2016, pp. 181–182. doi: 10.1109/NUSOD.2016.7547094.
- N. Abdollahi, N. E. Gorji, *Superlattices and Microstructures* 2016, **100**, 9.
- J.-F. Guillemoles, L. Kronik, D. Cahen, U. Rau, A. Jasenek, H.-W. Schock, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2000, **104**, 4849.
- T. Mattila and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* 1998, **58**, 1367.
- P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* 2000, **62**, 6158.
- G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B* 1996, **54**, 11169.
- MedeA® version 2.19, Materials Design Inc., Angel Fire, New Mexico, USA, 2011.
- P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* 1994, **50**, 17953.
- G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev.* 1999, **59**, 1758.
- J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865.
- J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, *J. Chem. Phys.* 2006, **118**, 8207.
- C. G. Van de Walle, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 2004, **95**, 3851–3879.
- J.-H. Yang, J.-S. Park, J. Kang, S.-H. Wei, *Phys. Rev. B* 2015, **91**, 075202.
- J.L. Roehl, S.V. Khare, *Solar Energy* 2014, **101**, 245–253.
- K. Alberi, M. A. Scarpulla, *Scientific Reports* 2016, **6**, 27954.
- D. Krasikov, A. Knizhnik, B. Potapkin, T. Sommerer, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* 2013, **28**, 125019.
- D. Mao, C. E. Wickersham, Jr., M. Gloeckler, *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics*, 2014, **4**, 1655.
- S. A. Jensen, J. M. Burst, J. N. Duenow, H. L. Guthrey, J. Moseley, H. R. Moutinho, S. W. Johnston, A. Kanevce, M. M.

- Al-Jassim, and W. K. Metzger, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 2016, **108**, 263903
- 67 A. Alkauskas, Q. Yan, C. G. Van de Walle, *Phys. Rev. B* 2014, **90**, 075202.
- 68 L. Shi, K. Xu, L.-W. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B* 2015, **91**, 205315.
- 69 G. D. Barmparis, Y. S. Puzyrev, X.-G. Zhang, S. T. Pantelides, *Phys. Rev. B* 2015, **92**, 214111.
- 70 H. R. Moutinho, M. M. Al-Jassim, D. H. Levi, P. C. Dippo, and L. L. Kazmerski, *J. Vacuum Science & Technology A* 1998, **16**, 1251.
- 71 W. K. Metzger, D. Albin, M. J. Romero, P. Dippo, M. Young, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2006, **99**, 103703.
- 72 L. Kranz, C. Gretener, J. Perrenoud, D. Jaeger, S. S. A. Gerstl, R. Schmitt, S. Buecheler, A. N. Tiwari, *Adv. Energy Mater.* 2014, **4**, 1301400.
- 73 R.A. Oriani, *Acta Metallurgica*, 1970, **18**, 147-157.
- 74 E. Colegrove, S. P. Harvey, J.-H. Yang, J. M. Burst, D. S. Albin, S.-H. Wei, W. K. Metzger, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* 2016, **5**, 054014.
- 75 W. Windl, M. M. Bunea, R. Stumpf, S. T. Dunham, M. P. Masquelier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1999, **83**, 4345.
- 76 D. Mao, G. Blatz, C.E. Wickersham Jr., M. Gloeckler, *Sol. Energy Mater. Solar Cells* 2016, **157**, 65.
- 77 J. D. Major, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* 2016, **31**, 093001.
- 78 J. D. Poplawsky, C. Li, N. R. Paudel, W. Guo, Y. Yan, S. J. Pennycook, *Sol. Energy Mater. Solar Cells* 2016, **150**, 95-101.
- 79 K. Durose in *CdTe and Related Compounds; Physics, Defects, Hetero- and Nano-structures, Crystal Growth, Surfaces and Applications: Part II: Crystal Growth, Surfaces and Applications* edited by R. Triboulet and P. Siffert (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2010), p. 4–18.
- 80 J.-S. Park, J. Kang, J.-H. Yang, W. Metzger, S.-H. Wei, *New J. Phys.* 2015, **17**, 013027.
- 81 Y. Yan, M. M. Al-Jassim, T. Demuth, *J. Appl. Phys.* 2001, **90**, 3952.
- 82 C. Buurma, T. Paulauskas, Z. Guo, R. Klie, M.K.Y. Chan, *Microscopy and Microanalysis* 2014, **20(S3)**, 528.
- 83 K. N. Zaunbrecher, D. Kuciauskas, C. H. Swartz, P. Dippo, M. Edirisooriya, O. S. Ogedengbe, S. Sohal, B. L. Hancock, E. G. LeBlanc, P. A. R. D. Jayathilaka, T. M. Barnes, T. H. Myers, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 2016, **109**, 091904.

	Cl_i^-	Cl_i^+	Cl_{Te}^+	Te_i^0	Te_i^{+2}	Te_{Cd}^0	$\text{Te}_{\text{Cd}}^{+2}$	Cu_i^+	Cu_{Cd}^0	Cu_{Cd}^-	Cd_i^{+2}	$\text{V}_{\text{Cd}}^{-2}$
Cl_i^-	-0.04					Calculated enthalpies of reactions between the point defects						
Cl_i^+	-0.82	-0.72										
Cl_{Te}^+	-1.02	+0.37	+0.02									
Te_i^0	-0.58	+1.07	-0.65	+0.44								
Te_i^{+2}	+0.49	-0.46	+0.32	-1.42	-0.85							
Te_{Cd}^0	-0.24	-1.46	-0.44	-1.45	-1.49	0.54						
$\text{Te}_{\text{Cd}}^{+2}$	-1.88	-0.88	+0.16	-1.23	-0.68	-0.79	-0.03					
Cu_i^+	-0.04	-0.33	+0.01	-0.47	-0.11	-0.57	+0.05	+0.16				
Cu_{Cd}^0	-0.58	-0.48	-0.41	-0.65	-1.09	-0.72	-0.68	-0.40	-0.23			
Cu_{Cd}^-	+0.62	-0.65	-0.52	-0.20	-1.31	-0.04	-0.74	-0.37	-0.22	-0.07		
Cd_i^{+2}	+1.08	-0.14	+0.04	-0.54	+0.12	-0.48	+0.58	+0.02	-0.33	-1.00	+0.02	
$\text{V}_{\text{Cd}}^{-2}$	+0.56	-0.63	-0.74	-0.26	-2.12	0.33	-0.47	-1.50	N/A	N/A	-2.60	+0.55

40x20mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Association of crystalline point defects in chlorinated Cu-doped CdTe PV absorbers studied to assess its impact on performance and stability