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Abstract:

Solar-energy plays an important role in solving serious environmental problems and meeting high-energy demand. However, the lack of suitable materials hinders further progress of this technology. Here, we present the largest inorganic solar-cell material search to date using density functional theory (DFT) and machine-learning approaches. We calculated the spectroscopy limited maximum efficiency (SLME) using Tran-Blaha modified Becke-Johnson potential for 5097 non-metallic materials, and identified 1993 candidates with a SLME higher than 10\%, including 934 candidates with a suitable convex-hull stability and effective carrier mass. Screening for 2D-layered cases, we found 58 potential materials and performed G\(_0\)W\(_0\) calculations on a subset to estimate the prediction-uncertainty. As the above DFT methods are still computationally expensive, we developed a high accuracy machine learning model to pre-screen efficient materials and applied it to over a million materials. Our results provide a general framework and universal strategy for the design of high-efficiency solar cell materials.
Introduction

Solar-cells\(^1\,^2\) are one of the most promising sustainable energy alternatives. Their success, however, is heavily dependent on finding suitable materials. Despite substantial progress in identifying solar-cell materials, the field is facing a formidable challenge due to a lack of high-quality and large-volume frequency dependent dielectric function data. Recently, systematic investigations for photovoltaic (PV) materials have gained increasing interest in the density functional theory (DFT) community\(^3\), leading to the identification of candidate materials like several chalcopyrites\(^4\,^5\), tetrahedrite\(^6\), Cu-In halide perovskites\(^7\) and layered perovskites (Ruddlesden–Popper and Dion–Jacobson phases)\(^8\). Most of these materials have been predicted to be suitable for photovoltaics using the spectroscopy limited maximum efficiency (SLME) approach\(^4\). However, the number of known inorganic materials (such as those in the ICSD database\(^9\)) is on the order of hundreds of thousands, whereas the frequency-dependent dielectric function required for the SLME is only reported for a couple hundred, computed for example at the computationally intensive \(G_0W_0\)-BSE level of theory. In other words, a large, systematic ‘database’ of potential efficient materials is still missing and highly desirable. Such a dataset is the first step towards the development of any data-analytics or machine learning model as well\(^10\,^11\).

Many-body perturbation theory approaches (such as \(GW\)^12 and \(GW\)-BSE\(^13\)) are generally considered to be necessary to obtain accurate efficiencies because they accurately predict band gaps and frequency dependent dielectric functions. However, meta-GGA based methods, such as the Tran-Blaha modified Becke-Johnson (TBmBJ) potential\(^14\), have been recently shown to achieve comparable accuracy in evaluating the same quantities at a significantly reduced computational cost, enabling the calculation of the frequency dependent dielectric function and bandgap for thousands of inorganic crystalline materials\(^15\). The next step is to investigate if this
data can be used to identify novel high solar-efficiency\textsuperscript{16} materials. One of the earliest selection-metrics for identifying solar cell materials was introduced by Shockley-Queisser (SQ)\textsuperscript{16}, which utilized the bandgap, blackbody radiation, and solar spectrum information. However, the SQ formalism did not consider the absorption coefficient and thickness of the absorber material in the calculation of the efficiency. Yu et al.\textsuperscript{4} introduced the spectroscopic limited maximum efficiency (SLME) approach and applied it to 260 materials. The SLME overcame the shortcomings of the SQ limit by incorporating the absorptivity and therefore essentially taking dipole matrix elements and thickness into account. Additional investigations are needed to examine various other factors that may impact the efficiency, such as effective carrier mass and lifetime of charge carriers\textsuperscript{17}, internal efficiency of the cell\textsuperscript{18}, cost of the materials, defect-tolerance\textsuperscript{19}, thermal degradation tolerance, and chemical inertness, which are also critically important aspects when designing a photovoltaic device. While meta-GGA methods allow the investigation of hundreds to thousands of materials, the computational cost is still too high for tackling \(10^{100}\) possible materials\textsuperscript{20}. Recently, machine learning for materials modeling has emerged as a promising new solution to this problem. Having a systematic dataset like JARVIS-DFT\textsuperscript{21-24} enables the application of machine learning techniques.

In this work, we introduce a workflow for identifying potential solar absorber materials by performing a high-throughput DFT screening based on the SLME, effective mass of charge carriers and the convex-hull stability for non-metallic systems and machine learning. The JARVIS-DFT database contains about 30000 bulk and 800 low-dimensional materials with their DFT-computed structural, energetics\textsuperscript{21}, elastic\textsuperscript{22}, optoelectronic\textsuperscript{23} and topological material\textsuperscript{24} properties. Out of 30000 materials available in JARVIS-DFT, we have Tran-Blaha modified Becke-Johnson potential (TBmBJ)\textsuperscript{14} data for 12881 materials only. Ignoring metallic systems, we calculated the
TBmBJ SLME for 5097 materials. Out of these 5097 materials, 1993 candidates have a SLME above the threshold of 10%. We further narrowed the search by screening for effective carrier mass less than 1.0 \( m_0 \), where \( m_0 \) is the mass of a free electron, and convex hull stability (<0.1 eV/atom), leading to 934 candidates. Our screening methodology is then applied to the search for solar-cell materials with 2D character, as this could combine the technological applicability of both classes of materials. We found 58 such materials and performed \( G_0W_0 \) with and without spin-orbit coupling (SOC) calculations on a subset of them to evaluate the uncertainty related to the neglection of many-body effects. Lastly, we developed a high accuracy machine learning tool based on the classification method to pre-screen materials in terms of high-SLME and we applied it to over a million materials available through large crystallographic and DFT databases such as AFLOW\textsuperscript{25}, Materials-project\textsuperscript{26}, Open Quantum Materials Database (OQMD)\textsuperscript{27}, Crystallography Open Database (COD)\textsuperscript{28} and JARVIS-DFT\textsuperscript{29}. We made all the predicted materials publicly available through the website: https://jarvis.nist.gov/.

**Results and discussion**

The SLME can be considered as the theoretical maximum of the photo-conversion efficiency of a single p-n junction solar cell\textsuperscript{30}. We calculate the SLME (\( \eta \)) for an absorber layer with thickness 500 nm and at 300 K for all the materials in our database for which the frequency dependent dielectric function is available. Out of 30000 materials in JARVIS-DFT, 12881 materials have TBmBJ bandgap and frequency-dependent dielectric function data and the database is still growing. Considering only non-metallic systems leads to 5097 materials for the calculation of the SLME values. Using 10 % as a threshold, 1997 solar cell material candidates remain, which significantly expands the list of known solar materials. The list of candidates includes several already known materials\textsuperscript{31} such as CdTe, GaAs, CuInSe\textsubscript{2}, CuGaSe\textsubscript{2}, ZnSnP\textsubscript{2}, CdSnP\textsubscript{2} and
CH$_3$NH$_3$PbI$_3$ as well as many new ones. To validate the screening workflow, we compare our SLME for 10 compounds to the SLME obtained with the G$_0$W$_0$ method$^{31}$. The calculated mean absolute deviation (MAD) between TBmBJ and G$_0$W$_0$ is 5.21 % (see Supplementary Information), which is reasonable considering the number of materials investigated. The individual data for the comparison can be found in the supplementary information.

Fig. 1 shows the SLME and property distribution of the investigated materials. In Fig. 1a we observe that our criterion on the SLME eliminates more than 50 % of the materials. For the candidate materials, we analyze their characteristics to further identify interesting trends. In Fig. 1b we plot the SLME versus the bandgap and observe that, although a material could be deemed suitable as a solar cell material using traditional approaches like SQ, the SLME shows efficiency values over a wide range for materials with similar bandgaps. This indicates that the SLME is a stricter selection metric than the SQ limit, which is based solely on the band gap. This was previously demonstrated by Yu et al.$^{4}$, but for a smaller set of materials. To further elucidate the SLME and bandgap relationship, Fig. 1c shows a colormap of the SLME values versus the direct and indirect bandgap. Clearly, direct-bandgap materials close to 1.1 eV have a high SLME, which can be explained by the SLME’s origin from the SQ-formalism. Note that the SLME tends to underestimate the efficiency of materials with a large difference between the fundamental an optical band gap. Next, the calculated electron effective mass ($m^*$) is included in the screening process, by eliminating materials which have an electron effective mass values close or higher than 1.0 $m_0$ where $m_0$ is the mass of a free electron. The effective masses at 300 K were determined using an approach based on the Boltzmann-transport equation as implemented in the BoltzTrap$^{32}$ code, and are plotted in Fig. 1d. The effective mass plays an important role in designing solar-cells even if the material is highly absorbing because heavy charge-carriers are an indication of low
efficiency. Note that as we are not aware of a metric combining absorption coefficient and effective mass, we simply perform a secondary screening solely based on the effective mass values. Due to the recent explosion in low-dimensional materials research$^{33}$, it is interesting to see how many of the candidate materials belong to this class. Fig. 1e demonstrates that while most of the predicted materials are 3D, there are significant contributions from low dimensional materials as well. The number of low dimensional materials are determined by using the combined lattice-constant and data-mining approaches$^{22}$. Note that the dimensionality is considered to be reduced if there exists vdW bonding in one/two/three directions. Finding low dimensional materials can be of great interest because they allow for a high carrier mobility and easy thin-film fabrication. As there are several initiatives to build solar panels around curved shapes/architectures using flexible low-dimensional materials, the low dimensional materials predicted here could be of significant technological interest. In Fig. 1f, we see that most of the high-efficiency materials are ternary, which is consistent with known thin-film materials$^{31}$ such as chalcopyrite CuInSe$_2$ and AgCuSe. However, multicomponent systems can be difficult to fabricate experimentally, and in those cases, the list of less complicated compositions could be of interest to experimentalists. From Fig. 1g to Fig. 1i, it is clear that the efficiency of a material is only weakly correlated with the crystal system, compositional prototypes or space-groups, indicating that a simple structural screening is not sufficient, and detailed electronic structure calculations are essential for accurately predicting the efficiency of absorber materials. Although solar cell materials can belong to a wide variety of crystalline systems, there are some large fractions of suitable materials for space groups which correspond to those of well-known solar cell materials such as chalcopyrites (space group 122) and perovskites (space group 221). Apart from 122 and 221, other space groups with a large fraction of high potential materials are 225, 166, 12, 216, 62 and 194. From a technological
synthesis perspective, a particular crystal system could be favorable to experimentalists such as the case of perovskite solar cells.  

Fig. 1 Summary of SLME data. a) SLME-distribution of all the materials in the database, b) SLME ($\eta$) vs TBmBJ fundamental bandgap for high-SLME materials, c) colormap of SLME values with the direct versus indirect bandgaps for high-SLME materials, d) SLME vs average effective mass of electrons, e) dimensionality distribution in terms of 3D-bulk, 2D-bulk, 1D-bulk and 0D-bulk.
materials in the database, f) number of species distribution for high SLME materials, g) space-group distributions (1-230) for high-SLME materials, h) and i) compositional-prototype and crystal-system distributions for high-SLME materials.

Fig. 2 Periodic table trends of high SLME materials. The elements in a material are weighed 1 or 0 if the material has high or low-SLME. Then the probability of finding the element in a high-SLME material is calculated.

While it is interesting to compare the SLME with the crystallographic information in the previous figure, it would also be beneficial to see which elements from the periodic table contribute most to the high-efficiency materials. Generally, there is no established way of identifying high-efficiency solar cell materials based on just elements, but such periodic table trends can be used as an initial guideline for material design. In order to understand the elemental contributions, we weigh an element in a material one or zero depending on whether the material has a SLME above
10% or not. After such weighing for all the materials in our database, we calculate the probability that an element is part of a high-efficient SLME material. The results in Fig. 2 indicate that transition metals and chalcogenides such as Cu-Ag-Au, Mo-W, Rh-Ni-Pt, Ga-In, Tl, P, As, B, and K are the main constituent elements of high SLME materials. This is again in agreement with widely known efficient chalcopyrite materials\textsuperscript{31} such as Copper Indium Gallium Selenide (CIGS). Remarkably, the combination of transition metals and chalcogenides led to commonly known transition metal chalcogenide (TMD) materials which are great interest for 2D material applications. Note that although the TBmBJ formalism can be safely used to calculate the properties of low-dimensional materials in their bulk form, the inclusion of excitonic effects is critically important for calculating accurate absorption coefficients of monolayer materials. Hence, the focus of this work is on bulk periodic materials. However, having the predicted dimensionality is important to know whether it is possible to exfoliate the material in one/two/three directions.

Next, we present a few screening examples for solar cells. First, as mentioned above, most of the chalcopyrites have space group 122, so we screen materials with space-group 122 and SLME $\geq 10\%$, which results in 44 materials. Further screening based on reduced effective masses $< 1.0m_e$ and energy above the convex hull $< 0.1$ eV/atom leads to materials such as MgGeP$_2$ (JVASP-8813), ZnSiAs$_2$ (JVASP-2256), and AlCuS$_2$ (JVASP-2397). We are not aware of any previous literature which has reported these materials as potential photovoltaic materials. Similar searches for finding perovskites with SLME $\geq 10\%$ and space-group 221 results in materials such as TaTlO$_3$ (JVASP-41734) and TiSnO$_3$ (JVASP-35817).

Finally, we perform a screening of all the 2D-bulk materials with a high SLME, low reduced effective mass ($< 1.0m_0$), and energy above the convex hull $< 0.1$ eV/atom. In our previous work\textsuperscript{15}, we found that TBmBJ accurately predicted the dielectric function of 2D-bulk materials such as
MoS$_2$ and SnSe$_2$. The dimensionalities of the bulk materials were determined with lattice-parameter and data-mining approaches$^{35}$ as mentioned above. We identified at least 58 potential 2D-bulk materials based on our screening criteria (Table 1). In order to further analyze the TBmBJ accuracy for these materials, we performed $G_0W_0$ calculations for five of the 58 materials. The comparison of the TBmBJ and $G_0W_0$ results is shown in Table 2. We find that the MAD between the TBmBJ and $G_0W_0$ for band gaps and SLME are 0.22 and 3.23 % respectively. The MAD for SLME further drops by inclusion of spin-orbit coupling (SOC) in the $G_0W_0$ calculations. These low computationally-derived MAD values confirm the high-performance of the candidate materials. Note that SOC is not considered for the TBmBJ calculations.

Table 1: The JARVIS-ID (JVASP), chemical formula, crystallographic space-group, SLME, TBmBJ fundamental gap ($E_g$), average electron effective mass ($m^*/m_0$) of all the 2D-bulk layered materials with high SLME (>10 %), low effective mass (<1.0$m_0$) and energy-above the convex hull (0.1 eV/atom) are shown as an example of screening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JID</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Spg.</th>
<th>$E_g$</th>
<th>SLME</th>
<th>$m^*/m_0$</th>
<th>JID</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Spg.</th>
<th>$E_g$</th>
<th>SLME</th>
<th>$m^*/m_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8781</td>
<td>BiTeBr</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13064</td>
<td>Tl$_2$Au$_4$S$_3$</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26802</td>
<td>AgBiSCl$_2$</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14351</td>
<td>Rb$_2$TeI$_6$</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>GeI$_2$</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>SnS$_2$</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>MoS$_2$</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MoS$_2$</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5644</td>
<td>GeAsSe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4358</td>
<td>GaSe</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>MoTe$_2$</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>MoSe$_2$</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>SnSe$_2$</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>SiAs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>SnS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>GaSe</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>MoSe$_2$</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5053</td>
<td>InAg(PSe$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4630</td>
<td>TiPt$_2$S$_3$</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5146</td>
<td>InAg(PS$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29420</td>
<td>AgBiSCl$_2$</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5176</td>
<td>CuBr</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29475</td>
<td>SnS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5215</td>
<td>Bi$_2$Se$_3$</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Bandgap and SLME properties of a selection of materials from Table 1 with TBmBJ and $G_0W_0$ methods in DFT to evaluate uncertainty in predictions. Here $E_g$ denotes the bandgap in eV and $\eta$ the calculated SLME in percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>JID</th>
<th>$E_g$ (TBmBJ)</th>
<th>$E_g$ (GoW0)</th>
<th>$E_g$ (GoW0+SOC)</th>
<th>$\eta$ (TBmBJ)</th>
<th>$\eta$ (GoW0)</th>
<th>$\eta$ (GoW0+SOC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CuBr</td>
<td>5176</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>21.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AuI</td>
<td>3849</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiAs</td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiTeBr</td>
<td>8781</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TlPtS₃</td>
<td>4630</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAD</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recently Walsh et al.\textsuperscript{20} argued that the size of the design space of possible materials can be on the order of $10^{100}$. Carrying out high-level DFT calculations for materials on this scale is an impossible task due to the associated computational cost. Hence, we train a machine learning model\textsuperscript{36} which can help in the screening process. Based on the SLME data, we classify materials in two classes: high (SLME$\geq$10%) and low (SLME$<$10%) efficiency materials. In order to convert all the crystallographic information to computational fingerprints, we use the classical force-field inspired descriptors (CFID)\textsuperscript{10}. The CFID descriptors consist of a universal set of chemical, structural and charge details for a material. For an arbitrary material, CFID generates 1557 descriptors. So, it is not just structural spacegroup screening example discussed above. We train a classification machine learning model using the gradient boosting decision trees algorithm\textsuperscript{37}, which is known for its high accuracy and interpretability, and use a 90%-10% train-test split for assessing the performance of the model. The performance of the classification model is determined from the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The ROC curve for the classification model is shown in Fig. 3. For the high SLME classification, the area under the curve is 0.90. Random guessing has a ROC area of 0.5, whereas a perfect model has a ROC area of 1.0. Therefore, a ROC area of 0.90 suggests a highly accurate model. The model is publicly available at JARVIS-ML (https://www.ctcms.nist.gov/jarvisml/) to quickly predict whether or not material will have a high SLME. To obtain possible materials, we use the large crystallographic databases such as AFLOW\textsuperscript{25}, Materials-project (MP)\textsuperscript{26}, OQMD\textsuperscript{27} and COD\textsuperscript{28}. We convert the crystal structure into CFID descriptors for 639262 materials from AFLOW, 82125 materials from MP, 360802 materials from OQMD, and 111783 materials from the COD database. After applying the trained classification model on these materials, we pre-screen materials to narrow down and prioritize future DFT calculations. The properties of these materials will be determined using
OptB88vdW and TBmBJ calculations within the JARVIS-DFT workflow. Hence, based on the ML model, we can optimize the DFT screening process. As this feedback loop keeps learning new data, we expect the ML model to continuously improve its accuracy in a controlled and systematic way.

![Classification receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) curve for high-SLME materials. The dotted line shows the random guessing line with an area under curve 0.5.](image)

In summary, we have presented the results of a combined density functional theory high-throughput screening and machine learning approach for identifying promising solar cell materials based on the spectroscopy limited maximum efficiency. Using frequency dependent dielectric function data obtained with the meta-GGA TBmBJ formalism drastically increases the volume of
materials data which can be investigated with high accuracy. Additionally, we use the effective carrier mass and energy above the convex hull to further screen candidate materials. Our analysis reveals several trends for high-efficiency solar materials starting from crystallographic information to chemical constituents and identifies 58 potential 2D-bulk solar cell materials with a high potential as thin film solar-cell materials. Finally, we have trained a machine learning classification model with the SLME data which can quickly predict whether a material will have a SLME above 10%. We believe the data, tools and the methodology for identifying solar cell materials provide a complete suite to accelerate the discovery of photovoltaic materials and can have a significant impact on the next-generation of materials design.

Methods

All DFT calculations were carried out with Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP)\textsuperscript{38,39} using projected augmented wave (PAW) formalism. Please note commercial software is identified to specify procedures. Such identification does not imply recommendation by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The k-point and plane-wave cut-off convergence for each material is obtained using the workflow detailed in Ref.\textsuperscript{40}

The SLME ($\eta$) is defined as:

$$\eta = \frac{P_{\text{max}}}{P_{\text{in}}} = \max \left\{ \left( \frac{J_{sc} - \int_0^\infty (e^{V/E_T - 1}) \nu}{\int_0^\infty E_{\text{sun}}(E) dE} \right) V \right\}$$

(1)

$$J_{sc} = e \int_0^\infty a(E) I_{\text{sun}}(E) dE$$

(2)

$$J_0 = \frac{\hbar c}{f_r} = \frac{e \pi}{f_r} \int_0^\infty a(E) I_{bb}(E, T) dE$$

(3)
\[ f_r = e^{\left( \frac{E_g - E_d a}{kT} \right)}, \]

where \( J_{sc} \) and \( J_0 \) are the short-circuit and reverse saturation current density, \( \alpha(E) = 1 - e^{-2\alpha(E)L} \) is the absorptivity of the material, \( V \) the potential over the absorber layer, \( k \) Boltzmann’s constant, \( T \) the temperature of the device, \( e \) the elementary charge, \( I_{sun} \) is the AM1.5G solar spectrum\(^{41} \), \( I_{bb} \) is the black-body spectrum at temperature \( T \), both expressed in terms of the photon flux. \( P_{max} \) is the maximum power density of the material and \( P_{in} \) is the total incident power density based on the solar spectrum. The SLME is calculated using the crystallographic average of the dielectric function, obtained by diagonalizing the dielectric tensor for each energy and averaging the diagonal elements. VASP uses a complex shift (CSHIFT) in the Kramers-Kronig relation to calculate the real part of the dielectric tensor, and also determines the corresponding imaginary part for consistency. This introduces a smoothening for both the real and imaginary part of the dielectric tensor, which translates to an earlier onset for the absorption spectrum. As this earlier onset can have a significant and unphysical influence on the calculated efficiency, we set the absorption to zero below the band gap. Even with this correction, the SLME is still pushed slightly towards the SQ limit because of the increased onset produced by smoothening and cutting off the absorptivity. As this increase in efficiency does not lead to the elimination of potentially good photovoltaic materials, it is acceptable for our screening purposes. Note that the SLME uses an exponential function to model the fraction of radiative recombination as given in Eq. 4. As a consequence, the SLME quickly goes to zero as the difference between the direct allowed and fundamental band becomes larger. This issue has been recently brought up by Bercx et al.\(^{5} \) and Blank et al.\(^{42} \) However, we consider the SLME as an appropriate metric for the initial screening of efficient materials for a thin film photovoltaic, which are generally direct bandgap in nature. Also note that for some materials, the SLME slightly exceeds the SQ limit of the corresponding band
gap, which is related to the fact that by using a step function for the absorptivity \( \alpha(E) \), the SQ limit maximizes the reverse saturation current \( J_0 \). This is discussed in more detail in our previous work\(^5,43\). For a selected set of materials, we performed \( G_0W_0 \) calculations\(^{12,44} \) with an ENCUrGW parameter (energy cutoff for response function) = 333.3 eV, 200 empty bands, and both with and without the inclusion of spin-orbit coupling (SOC). Details of the code used for running the high-throughput workflow, calculating the SLME, and training the machine learning model is available at: https://github.com/usnistgov/jarvis.
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Table S1: Comparison of SLME using TBmBJ and GW methods for a few materials used in Yu et al’s work. There is an overall decreasing trend in SLME for GoW₀ data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>ICSD</th>
<th>GoW₀-SLME</th>
<th>TBmBJ-SLME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CuInS₂</td>
<td>656271</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuInTe₂</td>
<td>658015</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuGaSe₂</td>
<td>627528</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgInTe₂</td>
<td>605485</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgIn₅Te₈</td>
<td>151871</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>32.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuGaTe₂</td>
<td>656165</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>32.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuInSe₂</td>
<td>602951</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuBSe₂</td>
<td>613591</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgInS₂</td>
<td>656317</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgIn₅Se₈</td>
<td>35597</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: