

# Improved empirical method for calculating short circuit current density images of silicon solar cells from saturation current density images and vice versa

O. Breitenstein<sup>a,\*</sup>, F. Frühauf<sup>a</sup>, M. Turek<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Max Planck Institute of Microstructure Physics, Halle, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Fraunhofer Center of Silicon Photovoltaics (CSP), Halle, Germany

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 23 December 2015

Received in revised form

26 April 2016

Accepted 27 April 2016

Available online 10 May 2016

### Keywords:

Quantitative evaluation

Photocurrent imaging

Lock-in thermography

Photoluminescence imaging

Local analysis

## ABSTRACT

An empirical dependence of the short circuit current density  $J_{sc}$  as a function of the dark saturation current density  $J_{01}$  is proposed, which describes this dependence down to a bulk lifetime of 1 ns. This method avoids artifacts, which appear when applying the previously proposed quadratic dependence. The parameters of the new dependence are fitted to PC1D simulations and to experimental LBIC results for various wavelengths and AM 1.5 for a typical industrial BSF-type solar cell and a PERC cell. This dependence can also be used to calculate  $J_{01}$  images from LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  images. It turns out that this method is more reliable in BSF than in PERC cells.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

The local short circuit current density  $J_{sc}(x,y)$  of a solar cell, which is an important local efficiency parameter in particular for multicrystalline silicon solar cells, is usually imaged by LBIC mapping at a certain wavelength, see e.g. [1]. If the mapping is performed with different wavelengths, an image of  $J_{sc}$  under AM 1.5 illumination may be obtained, see [2]. Recently, both illuminated lock-in thermography (ILIT) [3] and dark lock-in thermography (DLIT) [4] based methods for imaging  $J_{sc}$  were proposed. The basic idea of the DLIT based method is that the local dark saturation current density  $J_{01}$  is a measure of the local bulk recombination probability. Therefore this parameter should also govern bulk recombination under short-circuit condition, which governs the local value of  $J_{sc}$ . An advantage of this method is that it can be applied to  $J_{01}$  images obtained by any imaging method, even to images that have been captured in the past. In particular this method is a good extension of the “Local I-V 2” method for evaluating DLIT images, which is currently the most reliable method to image  $J_{01}$  and perform a local efficiency analysis of given inhomogeneous solar cells, see [5–7].

In the previous empirical method for imaging  $J_{sc}$  [4] it was found that and explained why the reduction of  $J_{sc}$  with increasing


$J_{01}$  is linear in  $J_{01}$  only for small values of  $J_{01}$  and gradually saturates for higher values, corresponding to lower bulk lifetimes. In this work [4] the fit of PC1D-based (see [8])  $J_{01}$ -dependent  $J_{sc}$  values was performed up to a maximum of  $J_{01} = 5 \cdot 10^{-12}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>. In this range, the dependence  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$  could be well approximated by a quadratic function, hence by a 2nd order polynomial. However, when this method was later applied in practice and  $J_{01}$  values above  $5 \cdot 10^{-12}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup> appeared, this lead again to an apparent increase of  $J_{sc}$  with increasing  $J_{01}$ , which is clearly physically wrong. Therefore the goal of this contribution is to find a physically more reliable description of the  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$  dependence, which does not show this non-monotonic behavior and can be used up to very high values of  $J_{01}$ . This new dependence will first be fitted to PC1D simulations of a standard industrial BSF-type and a PERC-type multicrystalline silicon solar cell. Then, on typical cells of both types, LBIC images taken at AM 1.5 and various discrete wavelengths are compared with DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  images, leading to more realistic sets of fitting parameters.

## 2. The method

First we simulate  $J_{sc}$  and  $J_{01}$  by PC1D [8] for a typical industrial BSF-type cell of first generation with full-area Al back contact and for a PERC cell, in both cases for widely varying values of the bulk lifetime  $\tau_{bulk}$ . The used simulation parameters are the same as in [4], namely 200  $\mu$ m cell thickness,  $p_0 = 1.5 \cdot 10^{16}$  cm<sup>-3</sup>, and  $T = 25$  °C

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [breiten@mpi-halle.mpg.de](mailto:breiten@mpi-halle.mpg.de) (O. Breitenstein).



**Fig. 1.** Dependence of  $J_{sc}$  on  $J_{01}$  for a standard cell, (a) linear drawing up to  $J_{01} = 5 \times 10^{-12} \text{ A/cm}^2$ , (b) linear over  $\log(J_{01})$  in the whole range. Symbols: PC1D simulations, lines: Fits.

for both cells,  $J_{01}^e = 550 \text{ fA/cm}^2$  and  $S_{\text{rear}} = 600 \text{ cm/s}$  for the standard cell, and  $J_{01}^e = 90 \text{ fA/cm}^2$  and  $S_{\text{rear}} = 10 \text{ cm/s}$  for the PERC cell. Whereas in [4] the simulations have been performed for  $\tau_{\text{bulk}}$  from 1 ms down to 1  $\mu\text{s}$ , corresponding to  $J_{01}$  up to  $5 \times 10^{-12} \text{ A/cm}^2$ , the simulations are performed here for  $\tau_{\text{bulk}}$  from 10 ms down to 1 ns, corresponding to  $J_{01}$  up to  $10^{-8} \text{ A/cm}^2$ . As in [4] the values of  $J_{01}^e$  and  $S_{\text{rear}}$  are assumed to be independent of  $\tau_{\text{bulk}}$ , which is only an approximation. All PC1D simulations were made for monochromatic illumination at 780, 850, and 940 nm and for AM 1.5 G (1 sun). The intensity for the monochromatic illumination was chosen so that, at a bulk lifetime of 100  $\mu\text{s}$ , the monochromatic  $J_{sc}$  is equal to that at AM 1.5. In the PC1D simulations we calculate  $J_{01}$  from simulated values of  $J_{sc}$  and  $V_{oc}$  by applying a simple one-diode model with an ideality factor of unity. This is certainly not correct for very low lifetimes, where recombination in the depletion region becomes important, but is accurate in the region up to  $J_{01} = 1.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ A/cm}^2$ , where the experimental LBIC data will be fitted.

Fig. 1 shows PC1D simulations of  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$  for the standard BSF-type cell as symbols (a) with a linear scale up to  $J_{01} = 5 \times 10^{-12} \text{ A/cm}^2$  and (b) over the logarithm of  $J_{01}$  in the full simulation range. The results for the PERC cell look qualitatively similar, except that here the  $J_{01}$  values already start in the low  $10^{-13} \text{ A/cm}^2$  range. In Fig. 1(a) and (b) the result of a quadratic fit of  $J_{\text{rec},sc}(J_{01})$  for the 940 nm data in the range below  $J_{01} = 5 \times 10^{-12} \text{ A/cm}^2$  is also shown. We see in (a) that this fit is quite good in this fitting range, but (b) shows that for higher  $J_{01}$  the values of  $J_{sc}$  drastically increase again. The goal of this paper is to find a better empirical description of  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$ , which holds over the whole definition range of  $J_{01}$  and shows a monotonic dependence on  $J_{01}$ .

The short circuit current represents the quantum efficiency of a solar cell, where the diffusion length  $L_d$  of the minority carriers, depending on the bulk lifetime  $\tau$ , enters as a crucial parameter. Similarly, the dark saturation current density is directly related to the diffusion length. Let us first look for the two limiting cases of the bulk thickness being much larger and much smaller than  $L_d$  and  $L_{\alpha}$ , respectively. These two limiting cases should also be met by our empirical formula for  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$ . In a first simplified approach for bulk thickness larger than  $L_d$  and  $L_{\alpha}$  we find  $J_{sc} \sim \text{IQE} = 1/(1 + L_{\alpha}/L_d)$  (see [9]) and  $J_{01} = (eDn_i^2)/(N_A L_d)$  (see [10]), leading to:

$$J_{sc}(J_{01}) \sim \frac{1}{1 + \frac{J_{01} L_{\alpha} N_A}{eDn_i^2}} \quad (1)$$

Here  $L_{\alpha}$  is the absorption length,  $D$  the diffusion constant,  $n_i$  is the intrinsic carrier concentration, and  $N_A$  the bulk doping concentration. This dependence is constant for low values of  $J_{01}$  and approaches zero for large  $J_{01}$ . However, it has to be considered that (1) only covers the bulk contribution of  $J_{sc}$ . There is also an emitter

and depletion region contribution of  $J_{sc}$ , which does not depend on the bulk lifetime. Hence in reality even for very large  $J_{01}$  (low bulk lifetime),  $J_{sc}$  is expected to drop to a finite value, which should depend on the excitation wavelength governing  $L_{\alpha}$ . In the second limiting case, where bulk thickness  $d$  smaller than  $L_d$  and  $L_{\alpha}$  we find  $J_{sc} \sim 1 - c_1/\tau$  (here  $c_1$  is a constant) and  $J_{01} = (en_i^2 d)/(N_A \tau)$  (see [11]), leading to:

$$J_{sc}(J_{01}) \sim 1 - c_2 J_{01} \quad (2)$$

Here  $c_2$  is another constant. This dependence drops linearly for low values of  $J_{01}$ , where it should be valid. The derivation of a strict analytical relationship between  $J_{sc}$  and  $J_{01}$ , which is applicable to real solar cells and includes the spectrum of the light, the inhomogeneity of the cell, its optical properties and contributions from emitter and space charge regions, would be very complex. Thus, our proposal is a phenomenological expression, which contains only four free parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $n$ , but nevertheless yields a very good representation of the numerical and experimental data. We have found that the  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$  dependence can be well fitted by:

$$J_{sc}(J_{01}) = C - \frac{A J_{01}}{\left[1 + \left(\frac{A J_{01}}{B}\right)^n\right]^{\frac{1}{n}}} \quad (3)$$

For low values of  $J_{01}$  this dependence drops linearly with  $J_{01}$  as in (2), whilst for very large values it approaches a finite value as in (1), regarding its discussion. The parameter  $A$  (dimensionless) in (3) describes, as in [4], the slope of the dependence in the linear part for low  $J_{01}$  values. This parameter describes the limiting case of small  $J_{01}$  after Eq. (2), where it corresponds to the parameter  $c_2$ . The parameter  $B$  (in units of  $\text{A/cm}^2$ ) describes the saturation value of the reduction (drop) of  $J_{sc}$  for large  $J_{01}$ . According to Eqs. (1) and (3),  $B \sim eDn_i^2/(L_{\alpha} N_A)$  holds, assuming  $n=1$  (the factor  $A$  in the nominator and the denominator cancel for large  $J_{01}$ ). The parameter  $n$  (dimensionless) describes how fast the dependence saturates (large  $n$  means fast saturation and small  $n$  means slow saturation), and the offset parameter  $C$  (in units of  $\text{A/cm}^2$ ) describes the  $J_{sc}$  value for an assumed  $J_{01}$  of zero. These parameters hold globally for certain types of cells (e.g. standard or PERC) and certain illumination conditions. Note that, for varying light intensity or reflection properties, the parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  scale linearly with the light intensity, but parameter  $n$  does not. This becomes clear by considering the limiting cases for low and high  $J_{01}$ , leading after (3) to  $J_{sc}^{\text{low}} = C$  and  $J_{sc}^{\text{high}} = C - B$ , which both must be proportional to the illumination intensity, and also the slope factor  $A$  should be proportional to the drop amount  $B$ . As a good approximation it can be assumed that these parameters scale with the global mean value of the short circuit current density of the cell. The lines in Fig. 1 show the fitting results for all illumination

conditions and Table 1 shows the obtained fitting parameters, also for the PERC case. We see that now the fit is possible over 4 orders of  $J_{01}$  up to  $10^{-8}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>.

As in [4] the offset parameter  $C$  may now be expressed by the global mean value of  $\langle J_{sc} \rangle$  of the cell, if this is known. For the mean value of the short circuit density we obtain from (3):

$$\langle J_{sc} \rangle = C - \sum_i \frac{A J_{01,i}}{N \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{A J_{01,i}}{B} \right)^n \right]^{\frac{1}{n}}} \quad (4)$$

where ( $N$  = number of pixels). This leads, using (3), to the final result:

$$J_{sc,i} = \langle J_{sc} \rangle - \frac{A J_{01,i}}{\left[ 1 + \left( \frac{A J_{01,i}}{B} \right)^n \right]^{\frac{1}{n}}} + \sum_i \frac{A J_{01,i}}{N \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{A J_{01,i}}{B} \right)^n \right]^{\frac{1}{n}}} \quad (5)$$

**Table 1**

Fitting parameters for various fitting types, cell types, and illumination conditions.


Fitting + cell type, illumination condition	A	B [A/cm <sup>2</sup> ]	C [A/cm <sup>2</sup> ]	n
PC1D, BSF-type, AM 1.5	$2 \cdot 10^{10}$	$2.7 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.87 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.42
780 nm	$1.8 \cdot 10^9$	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.55 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.65
850 nm	$3 \cdot 10^9$	$3.2 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.66 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.8
940 nm	$9 \cdot 10^9$	$3.9 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.13 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.95
LBIC, BSF-Type, AM 1.5	$1 \cdot 10^9$	$1 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.74 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
780 nm	$8 \cdot 10^8$	$7 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.69 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
960 nm	$3.9 \cdot 10^9$	$2.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.99 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
PC1D, PERC, AM 1.5	$2.7 \cdot 10^9$	$2.1 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.5 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.7
780 nm	$1.2 \cdot 10^9$	$2.7 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.55 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.9
850 nm	$2.5 \cdot 10^9$	$3 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.58 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0.9
940 nm	$6.5 \cdot 10^9$	$3.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.66 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
LBIC, PERC, AM 1.5	$1 \cdot 10^{10}$	$5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
780 nm	$5 \cdot 10^9$	$2.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1
960 nm	$1.5 \cdot 10^{10}$	$6.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.91 \cdot 10^{-2}$	1

This result contains only the parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $n$ . It will be shown below that, in the most interesting  $J_{01}$  range up to several  $10^{-11}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>, parameter  $n$  is uncritical and may be chosen as unity. Therefore this improved method also needs only two parameters  $A$  and  $B$ , whereby parameter  $B$  now has a different meaning than in [4].

Note that all these simulation results are made for a homogeneous solar cell. In a real multicrystalline solar cell  $J_{01}$  is dominated by recombination-active grain boundaries, see e.g. [12], which have an active spatial extension in the micron range or below. If one image pixel contains such a grain boundary, both  $J_{01}$  and  $J_{sc}$  are averaged over a region with significantly different values of  $J_{01}$ . This averaging would be allowed only if  $J_{sc}$  would depend linearly on  $J_{01}$ . As Fig. 1 shows,  $J_{sc}$  depends linearly on  $J_{01}$  only in the low- $J_{01}$  region below  $3 \cdot 10^{-12}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>. However, for higher  $J_{01}$ , which holds in the grain boundary positions (see [12]), the dependence becomes strongly sub-linear, namely nearly logarithmic up to  $10^{-10}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>, and then eventually saturates, see Fig. 1(b). Therefore, as has already been discussed in [4], for such an extremely inhomogeneous  $J_{01}$  distribution,  $J_{sc}$  and  $J_{01}$  must be averaged differently in one image pixel. This is the reason why it cannot be expected that the parameters obtained from these homogeneous PC1D simulations also hold for inhomogeneous multicrystalline solar cells. Therefore in the following we will fit LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  data to DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  data, which will lead to more realistic fitting parameters for practical applications.


### 3. Results

LBIC images of a typical multicrystalline BSF-type cell ( $J_{sc} = 34$  mA/cm<sup>2</sup>) and a p-type multicrystalline PERC cell ( $J_{sc} = 35.5$  mA/cm<sup>2</sup>) were made at wavelengths of 405, 532, 658, 780, 960, and 980 nm by using a LOANA setup, see [13]. From these monochromatic EQE images,  $J_{sc}$  images at AM 1.5 were derived by using the method of Padilla et al. [2]. These two cells were also imaged by DLIT using an InfraTec [14]



**Fig. 2.** Fitting results for the BSF-type cell: (a) LBIC-based AM 1.5  $J_{sc}$  image, (b) artificially blurred LBIC-based AM 1.5  $J_{sc}$  image, (c) DLIT- $J_{01}$ , (d) scatter plot, (e) DLIT-simulated  $J_{sc}$ , (f) LBIC-simulated  $J_{01}$ . All scaling ranges are indicated.





**Fig. 3.** Fitting results for the PERC-type cell: (a) LBIC-based AM 1.5  $J_{sc}$  image, (b) artificially blurred LBIC-based AM 1.5  $J_{sc}$  image, (c) DLIT- $J_{01}$ , (d) scatter plot, (e) DLIT-simulated  $J_{sc}$ , (f) LBIC-simulated  $J_{01}$ . All scaling ranges are indicated.

PV-LIT system at its highest possible lock-in frequency of 50 Hz. These DLIT images were evaluated using the “Local I-V 2” method [5,15] leading to images of  $J_{01}$  with a spatial resolution in the order of 1 mm. By applying the scatter plot method described in [4] to Eq. (3), the DLIT-simulated  $J_{sc}$  images were fitted to the blurred LBIC- $J_{sc}$  images by using the DLIT- $J_{01}$  images, leading to the fitting parameters also shown in Table 1. The dashed rectangles in Fig. 2(c) mark the regions used for the scatter plot. In these fits, only the image data in the free area between the grid lines and outside of the busbars were used. Therefore, to ensure that the  $J_{sc}(J_{01})$  data simulated by (4) match these data, the assumed global  $J_{sc}$  has to be increased by a few % to the measured one, as already been mentioned in [4]. For our example we had to increase the global  $J_{sc}$  by 3.8%.

In these fittings to experimental data the highest  $J_{01}$  values appeared at  $1.5 \cdot 10^{-11}$  A/cm<sup>2</sup>. The parameter  $n$  did not influence the fitting results measurably up to this  $J_{01}$  range, instead the non-linear behavior was only governed by parameter  $B$ . Therefore the parameter  $n$  was assumed to be unity for all these fittings to LBIC data. Thus, the new method also contains only the two parameters  $A$  and  $B$ , whereby  $B$  now has another meaning than in the old method [4]. Table 1 also contains the monochromatic fitting parameters for 780 nm and 960 nm wavelength. Fig. 2 shows the results of the fitting procedure for AM 1.5 for the BSF-type cell and Fig. 3 for the PERC cell. Here (a) shows the LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  images, (b) the same images artificially blurred to match the DLIT resolution, (c) the DLIT- $J_{01}$  images, (d) the scatter plots, which were used for fitting the parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ , and (e) shows, as the main result of this work, the  $J_{sc}$  images simulated from the DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  images (c) after Eq. (5) using only the parameters  $A$  and  $B$  and the slightly increased  $\langle J_{sc} \rangle$ .

If we know the dependence of  $J_{sc}$  on  $J_{01}$ , we may also calculate  $J_{01}$  from  $J_{sc}$ , hence from an LBIC image. The inverse function of (3),

assuming  $n=1$ , is:

$$J_{01,i} = \frac{BC - BJ_{sc,i}}{AJ_{sc,i} + AB - AC} \quad (6)$$

Figs. 2 and 3(f) show the results of this procedure applied to the AM 1.5  $J_{sc}$  images in (a) by using the LBIC-based fitting parameters in Table 1. We see that, at least in Fig. 2, the agreement with the DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  images in (c) is quite good, but the spatial resolution of LBIC- $J_{01}$  is much better than that of DLIT- $J_{01}$ . Of course, in the regions shadowed by the gridlines and busbars, artifacts appear. Note that the fitting parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  in (6) depend on the device type and on the illumination conditions including the intensity. Note also that these parameters were obtained here by averaging over relatively large pixels containing an inhomogeneous  $J_{01}$  and  $J_{sc}$  distribution. It is possible that these fitting parameters are not optimum anymore for the high resolution case. Astonishingly, the average value of LBIC- $J_{01}$  in the left indicated region of Fig. 2(f) over the regions outside of the gridlines is only 9% higher than the average of DLIT- $J_{01}$  in this region of Fig. 2(c).

The correlations shown in Fig. 3 for the PERC cell are not as good as those in Fig. 2 for the BSF cell. Since the dark currents are generally smaller in the PERC cell than in BSF cells, we have used a lower lock-in frequency for the DLIT measurement (10 instead of 50 Hz) in order to obtain a higher signal. Therefore the thermal blurring is larger in this case, and also the LBIC image in Fig. 3 (b) had to be artificially blurred more strongly. Since in this cell the LBIC contrasts were generally lower, the shadowing action of the gridlines visible in Fig. 3(a) was relatively stronger than in Fig. 2. Therefore the upper scaling limits of (a) and (b) are slightly different here. Though in Fig. 3 the qualitative correlation between the DLIT- and the LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  is also given, the quantitative correlation is not as good as that in Fig. 2. We believe that this is caused by the injection intensity dependence of the lifetime, which is known to be much stronger in PERC than in BSF cells

(see [16]). Note that LBIC is measured under  $J_{sc}$  condition, where the excess carrier concentration in the bulk is low, but DLIT is measured close to  $V_{oc}$  condition. If different types of defects show different injection dependencies of their recombination activity, they will lead to a different contrast in DLIT- $J_{sc}$  than in LBIC- $J_{sc}$ .

#### 4. Discussion and conclusions

In this contribution a new empirical procedure to convert  $J_{01}$  images into  $J_{sc}$  images and vice versa is introduced. The parameters of this method are fitted to PC1D simulations and to DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  and LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  images of a standard BSF-type and a PERC solar cell. For deriving  $J_{sc}$  from  $J_{01}$ , if the average value of  $J_{sc}$  is known, the method needs only two fitting parameters  $A$  and  $B$ . If  $J_{01}$  is to be derived from a  $J_{sc}$  image, three fitting parameters  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  are necessary. All these parameters scale linearly with the illumination intensity and thus with the global value of  $J_{sc}$ .

As the scatter plots in Figs. 2 and 3(d) show, the method proposed here shows a distinct scatter and seems to work more accurately for standard than for PERC cells. A general problem of this method, besides the injection intensity dependence of the lifetime mentioned above, is the very different spatial resolution of DLIT and LBIC imaging, which complicates the cross-correlation of these two methods when determining the fitting parameters. Here we have blurred the high-resolution LBIC images to compare them more reliably to the low-resolution DLIT-based  $J_{01}$  images. It was already discussed in [4] and again here above that this binning is problematic, since the local effective lifetime (which governs the LBIC signal) and  $J_{01}$  actually have to be averaged in a different way. While in low lifetime regions the LBIC signal can only be zero in extreme cases,  $J_{01}$  may increase unlimitedly. Another argument for the limited accuracy of this method is that the LBIC signal (in particular the AM 1.5 LBIC signal, which contains contributions from various wavelengths) reacts differently than  $J_{01}$  to defects lying in different depths of the cell. The inverse method to calculate  $J_{01}$  from LBIC-based  $J_{sc}$  is especially prone to artefacts. Whenever a  $J_{sc}$  value larger than parameter  $C$  appears (since the fitting procedure was performed in another region of the cell), Eq. (6) leads to negative values of  $J_{01}$ . Therefore the quantitative accuracy of the method proposed here should not be overestimated.

Nevertheless, the method provides a significant improvement to the assumption of a homogeneously distributed  $J_{sc}$ , which is often made in local efficiency analysis (see [6,17]), and also an improvement to the simple quadratic approach used before in [4]. It will be implemented in future versions of the “Local I-V 2” software for performing DLIT-based local efficiency analysis of solar cells [6,15]. In contrast to a previously proposed PL method for predicting  $J_{sc}$  [18], which has recently been shown to be inaccurate since it relied on the model of independent diodes [17];

note the different scaling ranges of Fig. 2(a) and (c) in [18]], the method proposed here can be expected to be more accurate.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to InfraTec GmbH Dresden [14] for providing and further developing the PV-LIT system used for the DLIT investigation. The authors acknowledge the financial support by the German Federal Ministry for Commerce and Energy and by industry partners within the research cluster “SolarLIFE” (Grant number 325763 D). The content is in the responsibility of the authors.

#### References

- [1] J. Marek, Light beam-induced current characterization of grain boundaries, *J. Appl. Phys.* 55 (1984) 318–326.
- [2] M. Padilla, B. Michl, B. Thaidigsmann, W. Warta, M.C. Schubert, Short-circuit current density mapping for solar cells, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 120 (2014) 282–288.
- [3] F. Fertig, J. Greulich, S. Rein, Spatially resolved determination of the short-circuit current density of silicon solar cells via lock-in thermography, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 104 (2014) 201111.
- [4] O. Breitenstein, F. Fertig, J. Bauer, An empirical method for imaging the short circuit current density in silicon solar cells based on dark lock-in thermography, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 143 (2015) 406–410.
- [5] O. Breitenstein, Nondestructive local analysis of current-voltage characteristics of solar cells by lock-in thermography, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 95 (2011) 2933–2936.
- [6] O. Breitenstein, Local efficiency analysis of solar cells based on lock-in thermography, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 107 (2012) 381–389.
- [7] O. Breitenstein, J. Bauer, D. Hinken, K. Bothe, The reliability of thermography- and luminescence-based series resistance and saturation current density imaging, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 137 (2015) 50–60.
- [8] PC1D, Version 5.9, (<http://www.engineering.unsw.edu.au/energy-engineering/pc1d-software-for-modelling-a-solar-cell/>).
- [9] P.A. Basore, Extended spectral analysis of internal quantum efficiency, in: *Proceedings of the 23rd IEEE Photovoltaic Specialists Conference*, Louisville, 1993, pp. 147–152.
- [10] J.H. Werner, S. Kolodinski, U. Rau, J.K. Arch, E. Bauser, Silicon solar cell of 16.8  $\mu\text{m}$  thickness and 14.7% efficiency, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 62 (1993) 2998–3000.
- [11] O. Breitenstein, The physics of industrial crystalline silicon solar cells, in: Gerhard P. Willeke, Eicke R. Weber (Eds.), *Advances in Photovoltaics*, Volume 2, Elsevier/AP, Burlington, 2013, pp. 1–75.
- [12] S. Rißland, O. Breitenstein, High resolution saturation current density imaging at grain boundaries by lock-in thermography, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 104 (2012) 121–124.
- [13] (<http://www.pv-tools.de/products/loana-system/loana-start.html>).
- [14] (<http://www.infratec-infrared.com/>).
- [15] (<http://www.maxplanckinnovation.de/en/>).
- [16] D. Chen, W. Deng, J. Dong, F. Ye, H. Zhu, H. Li, Y. Jiang, B. Gao, M. Zhong, Y. Cui, Y. Chen, Y. Yang, Z. Feng, P.P. Altermatt, P.J. Vanderlinden, 21.40% efficient large area screen printed industrial PERC solar cell, in: *Proceedings of the 31st EU PVSEC*, Hamburg, 2015, pp. 334–340.
- [17] C. Shen, H. Kampwerth, M. Green, T. Trupke, J. Carstensen, A. Schütt, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 109 (2013) 77–81.
- [18] O. Breitenstein, H. Höffler, J. Haunschild, Photoluminescence image evaluation of solar cells based on implied voltage distribution, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells* 128 (2014) 296–299.