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Abstract We describe Simudo, a free Poisson/drift-diffusion steady state device model for semiconductor and intermediate band materials, including self-consistent optical absorption and generation. Simudo is the first freely available device model that can treat intermediate band materials. Simudo uses the finite element method (FEM) to solve the coupled nonlinear partial differential equations in two dimensions. We present the continuous equations that it solves, give a brief introduction to FEM, show the formulations we have developed, and demonstrate how they allow robust convergence with double-precision floating point arithmetic. We show that Simudo performs well in benchmark calculations of a standard semiconductor pn junction when compared to Synopsys Sentaurus. Simudo includes many semiconductor phenomena and parameters and is designed for extensibility by the user to include many physical processes.

Introduction

Device models are essential components of the development of semiconductor devices, from transistors to solar cells to lasers. Standard semiconductor device models, such as Synopsys Sentaurus, treat materials with 0, 1, or 2 bands (i.e., dielectrics, metals, and semiconductors, respectively) along with an electrostatic potential. At a given location in a given material, each band has its own carrier concentration, with particle motion given by diffusion and electric-field-induced drift. Since the electric field itself depends on particle motion, the resulting Poisson/drift-diffusion (PDD) equations are nonlinear and require numerical solution in the general case [1–5].

A new class of materials, called intermediate band (IB) materials, has been developed over the last 20 years with the goal of improving solar cell efficiency and producing effective infrared photodetectors [6–10]. These IB materials are like semiconductors except they have an extra band of allowed electronic energy levels above the valence band (VB) and below the conduction band (CB), as shown in Fig. 1. Such a band structure permits optical absorption from VB to IB and from IB to CB, which is the key to the increased solar cell efficiency [6]. It is also possible to consider multiple IBs, though such materials have not yet been realized in practice [11].

Where IB devices have been made, they have not generally been highly efficient, which is believed to be largely due to the fast nonradiative recombination processes [7–10,12–15]. It has not been possible, however, to perform standard device modeling to optimize these devices, to determine the ideal layer thicknesses, doping levels, etc., since standard semiconductor device models do not allow the possibility of treating a third band. Therefore, we do not know what efficiencies existing IB materials could permit, if they were optimized. Interpreting experiments on IB materials and designing the best devices require device modeling capabilities.

In order to describe the basic physics of IB devices, one must be able to describe

1. Optical processes between CB, VB, and IB, with rates dependent on IB filling fraction \( f \),
2. Nonradiative processes between CB, VB, and IB, with rates dependent on \( f \),
3. Carrier transport within the IB,
4. Junctions with standard semiconductors.

There is a large array of standard numerical semiconductor device models based on the coupled Poisson and carrier-continuity equations, including general purpose ones, such as Synopsys Sentaurus and Silvaco, as well as more specialized models such as Crosslight, which includes modeling of quantum well physics and a coupled treatment of carrier-density dependent optics for
The PDD models allow treatment of IB regions that are neither fully depleted nor fully quasi-neutral. A comparison of the features of the PDD models is also included in Table 1. To our knowledge, none has been released as open-source software.

Here we introduce Simudo, a free and open source steady-state PDD solver with self-consistent optics for arbitrary numbers of bands. Simudo uses the finite element method (FEM) to solve the coupled Poisson, drift-diffusion, and Beer-Lambert optical propagation equations self-consistently, when necessary including changing $f$ according to local generation and recombination, with associated changes in the optical absorption coefficient. Simudo has built-in radiative recombination, Shockley-Read trapping, and SRH recombination models in the non-degenerate limit and is straightforward to extend to include other models of generation or recombination. All of the band parameters, from energies to mobilities to cross sections, can vary in space or as functions of other parameters.

Simudo has a number of innovations in its formulation of the problem, described below, and allows high-accuracy simulation of benchmark semiconductor problems while working with 64-bit arithmetic, making it useful both for standard semiconductor simulations as well as for IB devices. It is written in the Python programming language, using the FEniCS platform to solve the FEM problem [36]. It exposes an easy-to-use API for defining problems and extracting results. It is designed for two-dimensional systems and is available for download at https://github.com/simudo/simudo.

In Section 2 we define the coupled partial differential equations (PDEs) Simudo solves. In Section 3, we give a basic introduction to FEM and how it can be used iteratively for nonlinear PDEs. Section 4 gives examples of setting up a simple problem using the API, including examples of its convenient topology definitions. Section 5.1 describes the heart of Simudo, giving in detail the conversion of the equations of Section 2 to the weak forms solved using FEM. This section describes the choices for dynamical variables, the weak forms used for FEM, and how these choices enable Simudo to achieve accuracy despite the problems of finite precision arithmetic. This section concludes with a comparison to Synopsys Sentaurus on a benchmark p-n diode, showing the high quality of Simudo’s results. Section 5.2 gives examples of setting up a simple problem using the API, including examples of its convenient topology definitions. Section 5.3 demonstrates the extensibility of Simudo to include new physical processes (in this case, Auger recombination), and Section 5.4 demonstrates the use of Simudo to analyze a system originally studied in Ref. 23, showing that its model works better than had been anticipated in the case with equal subgap optical absorption cross sections, but that unequal subgap absorption cross sections produce more complicated phenomena that require IB transport.

2 Statement of problem

In this section, we describe the mathematical model of the steady state PDD and optical problems we use in Simudo. Carriers both drift in response to electric fields and diffuse.

---

**Table 1** Comparison of selected device models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IB optics with photofilling</th>
<th>IB nonradiative processes</th>
<th>IB transport</th>
<th>Junctions 2D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentaurus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC1D [17]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAPS [20]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martí [23]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strandberg</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobias</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshida [26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simudo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carriers are generated optically and recombine using a variety of models. The local carrier concentration determines both the electric field and the optical absorption coefficients, so the transport, Poisson, and optical propagation equations are all coupled. Symbols used in this manuscript are summarized in Table 2.

### 2.1 Carrier transport and generation

We consider a CB, a VB, and some number of IBs under the assumption that the carrier population in each band is in local thermal equilibrium with a temperature $T$ and quasi-Fermi level $w_n$, where $u$ can be one of $\{C, V, I\}$ for the CB, VB, and IB, respectively. In the case of multiple IBs, $u$ can take values $I_1, I_2, \ldots$, indexing the various IBs, but we simplify the following discussion to consider the case of just one IB, indexed as $I$.

In the most common approximation of semiconductor device modeling, the carrier dynamics in each band can be described by the drift-diffusion equation and the continuity equation. We can write the carrier dynamics for both types of carriers by using $u$ to represent the carrier concentration, $u_V$, $u_C$ are the hole and electron concentrations, respectively, which we use interchangeably with their standard symbols, $p$, $n$. The top sign corresponds to $u = p$ and the bottom sign to $u = n$:

$$ j_u = q\mu_u u E \mp q D_u \nabla u $$  \hspace{1cm} (1a)$$

$$ \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \mp \frac{1}{q} \nabla \cdot j_u + g_u, $$  \hspace{1cm} (1b)$$

where $j_u$ is the current density of carriers in band $u$, $\mu_u$ is the carrier mobility, $D_u$ is the carrier diffusion constant, $E$ is the electric field, $q$ is the elementary charge, and $g_u$ contains all the generation, trapping, and recombination processes (see Section 2.2). For non-degenerate bands in which the quasi-Fermi level $w_n$ is sufficiently far from the band edge $E_u$, we can write

$$ u = N_u e^{\mp(w_u + q\phi - E_u)/kT}, $$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

where $N_u$ is the effective density of states of band $u$, $\phi$ is the electrostatic potential, $T$ is the temperature, and $k$ is Boltzmann’s constant.

Then, assuming $E_u$ is spatially constant,

$$ \nabla u = \mp N_u e^{\mp(w_u + q\phi - E_u)/kT} \frac{1}{kT} \nabla (w_u + q\phi) = \mp \frac{u}{kT} \nabla (w_u + q\phi), $$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

(4)$$

For such non-degenerate bands, the Einstein relation gives

$$ \mu_u = qD_u/kT, $$

from which Eq. (1a) gives

$$ j_u = q\mu_u u E \mp q D_u (\mp u \frac{1}{kT} \nabla (w_u + q\phi)) $$  \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

$$ j_u = q\mu_u u E \mp \mu_u u (\nabla w_u - qE) $$  \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

$$ j_u = \mu_u u \nabla w_u $$  \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

Equation (7) also applies to the case of degenerate bands, as shown in [37], even though the Einstein relation requires a modification. Moreover, Eq. (4) applies in the case of spatially-varying band structure (e.g., spatially-varying $N_c, E_c$) [39], so it is considerably more general than this derivation.

Since an intermediate band is often partially filled, we cannot model it using the non-degenerate approximation of Eq. (2). We write $D_I(E)$ for the density of states of the IB, such that $N_I = \int dE D_I(E)$ is the total density of IB states. If the IB has quasi-Fermi level $w_I$, the electron concentration is

$$ u_I = \int dE \frac{D_I(E)}{e^{(E-w_I-q\phi)/kT} + 1}. $$  \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

If the bandwidth of the IB is narrow relative to $kT$, we can approximate the IB density of states as a Dirac delta $D_I(E) = N_I \delta(E - E_I)$, and so

$$ u_I = N_I \int \frac{1}{e^{(E_I-w_I-q\phi)/kT} + 1} f_I $$

where $f_I$ is the filling fraction of the IB, and can be written as

$$ f_I = f(E_I-w_I-q\phi) $$

where $f(E)$ is the Fermi function. We work in this limit for the remainder of this manuscript. Extending beyond this sharp-IB case is not difficult but requires more cumbersome notation.

### Table 2 Common symbols used in this manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>Carrier density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_k$</td>
<td>Carrier density in band $k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_u$</td>
<td>Band edge energy of band $u$; central energy of IB $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_u$</td>
<td>Quasi-Fermi level of carriers in band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pm, \mp$</td>
<td>Top/bottom sign for positive/negative charge carriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$j_u$</td>
<td>Current density in band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_u$</td>
<td>Mobility of carriers in band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_u$</td>
<td>Diffusion coefficient of carriers in band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_u$</td>
<td>Surface recombination velocity of carriers in band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_u$</td>
<td>Integrated density of states for nondegenerate band $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_u$</td>
<td>Filling fraction $f_u = u/N_u$ of IB $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$j_{u,0}$</td>
<td>Charge neutral filling fraction of IB $u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_u$</td>
<td>Net generation in band $u$ due to all generation and recombination processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>Boltzmann constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>Elementary charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi, E, \rho$</td>
<td>Electrostatic potential, electric field, and charge density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{f_i, \lambda}$</td>
<td>Optical absorption coefficient from band $i$ to $f$ at vacuum wavelength $\lambda$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{f_i, I}^{\text{opt}}$</td>
<td>Optical cross section from band $i$ to $f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi_{\lambda, \hat{s}}$</td>
<td>Photon spectral flux density at wavelength lambda in direction $\hat{s}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi_{[\lambda_1, \lambda_2], \hat{s}}$</td>
<td>Photon flux in direction $\hat{s}$ from $\lambda_1$ to $\lambda_2$, i.e., $\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \Phi_{\lambda, \hat{s}} , d\lambda$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{n}$</td>
<td>Surface normal vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{s}$</td>
<td>Direction of light propagation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Carrier generation and recombination

Each band’s continuity equation (Eq. [12]) has a generation term $g_u$. This term is the sum of contributions from all generation and recombination processes to the band.

2.2.1 Optical carrier generation

Modeling optical carrier generation requires modeling the changing light intensity through the device. We use a simple Beer-Lambert model for optical propagation and absorption

$$\nabla \Phi_{\lambda,\hat{s}} \cdot \hat{s} = -\alpha_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,\hat{s}}$$

(10)

where $\Phi_{\lambda,\hat{s}}$ is the photon spectral flux at vacuum wavelength $\lambda$ and direction of propagation $\hat{s}$ and $\alpha_\lambda$ is the total absorption coefficient, which can be written as

$$\alpha_\lambda = \sum_{i,f} \alpha_{fi,\lambda},$$

where $\alpha_{fi,\lambda}$ is the absorption coefficient for the optical process at wavelength $\lambda$ that moves a carrier from band $i$ to band $f$. In the usual semiconductor case, $\alpha_{CV,\lambda}$ is finite for $\lambda$ corresponding to energies larger than the band gap while $\alpha_{VC,\lambda} = 0$. Free-carrier absorption is included in $\alpha_{ii,\lambda}$. The carrier generation rate in band $u$ is then

$$g_u = \mp \int \mathrm{d}\lambda \left( \sum_i \alpha_{ui,\lambda} - \sum_f \alpha_{fu,\lambda} \right) \Phi_{\lambda,\hat{s}}$$

(11)

where the top sign is used for bands that track holes. Further details of the optical propagation model are described in Section 2.3.

In nondegenerate bands, there are always enough carriers to excite in or out of a band. That is, the valence band always has electrons available, and the conduction band has empty states available to be filled, so the absorption coefficient $\alpha_{CV,\lambda}$ is insensitive to the free carrier density in the bands. In an IB, however, the VB$\rightarrow$IB process requires empty states in the IB while the IB$\rightarrow$CB process requires filled states in the IB. To capture this phenomenon, we write

$$\alpha_{CI,\lambda} = \sigma_{CI,\lambda}^{\text{opt}} n_I$$

(12)

$$\alpha_{IV,\lambda} = \sigma_{IV,\lambda}^{\text{opt}} (N_I - n_I)$$

(13)

where $\sigma_{fi,\lambda}^{\text{opt}}$ is the optical capture cross section from band $i$ to $f$ at wavelength $\lambda$, and $n_I$ is the concentration of electrons in the IB. Since $\alpha_{fi,\lambda}$ depends on the carrier concentrations, and the carrier concentrations depend on $\alpha_{fi,\lambda}$ (through the generation rate $g_u$), the transport and the optical models feed into each other, so they must be solved in a self-consistent manner.

2.2.2 Recombination and trapping

Simudo offers several built-in radiative and nonradiative recombination and trapping mechanisms in the non-degenerate limit, each including an equivalent thermal generation. An example is the SRH recombination model with a single trap level at energy $E_I$ [40], in which two trapping processes produce a recombination event, with recombination rate

$$r = \frac{pn - n^2}{(p + p_1)\tau_n + (n + n_1)\tau_p},$$

(14)

where $\tau_p, \tau_n$ are the carrier lifetimes and $p_1, n_1$ are the carrier concentrations of holes and electrons, respectively, if their quasi-Fermi levels were equal to $E_I$.

We can model traps as intermediate bands with $w_I$ tracked explicitly, in which case we implement standard Shockley-Read trapping [40], which can be expressed in terms of quasi-Fermi levels as

$$U_{Iu} = \left[ 1 - e^{s_u (w_u - w_I)/kT} \right] u_{I,-s_u} u / \tau_u,$$

(15)

where $s_u$ is the sign of the charge of carriers in band $u$, $u_{I,-s_u}$ is the density of carriers of sign $-s_u$ in the intermediate band, and $\tau_u$ is the Shockley-Read lifetime for band $u$, as in Eq. [14] [22].

Simudo also implements radiative trapping from band $u$, which can be written in a similar form to the nonradiative terms [24].

$$U_{Iu} = \left[ 1 - e^{s_u (w_u - w_I)/kT} \right] u_{I,-s_u} u \sigma_{iu,\lambda}^{\text{opt}} I_{Iu} / u_{1u},$$

(16)

where $\sigma_{iu,\lambda}^{\text{opt}}$ is the optical absorption cross section of a trap, and

$$I_{fi} = \frac{8\pi n_r^2}{h^2 c^3} \int_0^{\infty} \alpha_{fi}(E) E^2 e^{-E/kT} \mathrm{d}E,$$

(17)

where $n_r$ is the index of refraction and $u_1$ is either $n_1$ or $p_1$. As with Eq. [2] Eqs. [15,17] are valid in the non-degenerate limit where $w_u$ does not approach $E_u$ but $w_I$ can take any value. Extensions to the degenerate limit can be added, if desired. Simudo also treats standard radiative recombination between conduction and valence bands [11].

We also treat surface recombination at external surfaces $\Gamma$ of the device, which imposes a boundary condition

$$\mathbf{j}_u \cdot \hat{n}|_{\Gamma} = S_u (u - u_0)|_{\Gamma},$$

(18)

where $S_u$ is the surface recombination velocity of carrier type $u$ at boundary $\Gamma$, $\hat{n}$ is the normal to $\Gamma$, and $u_0$ is the carrier concentration at equilibrium [42]. The current release of Simudo supports only $S_u = 0$ or $\infty$, which impose $\mathbf{j}_u \cdot \hat{n}|_{\Gamma} = 0$ or $(u - u_0)|_{\Gamma} = 0$, respectively.
2.3 Optical equations

For each wavelength, we need to solve the optical propagation according to Eq. 10. For the purpose of this explanation, we consider a fixed spectral photon flux $\Phi_0, \lambda$ at the left boundary, with the direction of propagation in the positive $x$ direction so that

$$\Phi|_{x=0} = \Phi_0.$$ (19)

For stability of the numerical solution, it is convenient to use a second-order equation so that we can apply boundary conditions on both the inlet and outlet boundaries [43]. We take the derivative of Eq. 10 with respect to the direction of propagation,

$$\frac{d^2\Phi_\lambda}{dx^2} + \frac{d}{dx}\alpha_\lambda\Phi_\lambda = 0.$$ (20)

The boundary conditions are then

$$\Phi_\lambda|_{x=0} = \Phi_0, \quad \frac{d\Phi_\lambda}{dx} + \alpha_\lambda\Phi_\lambda|_{x=L} = 0.$$ (21a, 21b)

Using the substitution $\frac{d}{dx} \to \hat{s} \cdot \nabla$ for arbitrary propagation direction $\hat{s}$, we obtain

$$\hat{s} \cdot \nabla(\hat{s} \cdot \nabla\Phi_\lambda) + \hat{s} \cdot \nabla(\alpha_\lambda\Phi_\lambda) = 0,$$ (22)

and the boundary conditions become

$$\Phi_\lambda = \Phi_0 \quad x \in \Gamma_1 \quad \text{(inlet)}$$ (23a)

$$\Delta\Phi_\lambda + \alpha_\lambda\Phi_\lambda = 0 \quad x \in \Gamma_0 \quad \text{(outlet)}$$ (23b)

In the case where $\alpha_\lambda$ is constant on the interval $\lambda_1 < \lambda < \lambda_2$, the optical flux at all wavelengths in that range obeys Eq. 22 and can thus be treated together. We can write

$$\Phi_{[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]} = \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \Phi_\lambda d\lambda,$$

where $\Phi_R$ with wavelength region $R$ is a photon flux (where $\Phi_\lambda$ is a spectral photon flux). When $\alpha_\lambda$ is constant for $\lambda \in R$, we have

$$\hat{s} \cdot \nabla(\hat{s} \cdot \nabla\Phi_I) + \hat{s} \cdot \nabla(\alpha_\lambda\Phi_I) = 0.$$ (24)

Simudo uses this form, which allows simple treatment of piecewise constant absorption coefficients with a small number of optical fields $\Phi_R$.

When optical fields with more than one propagation direction are considered, we write the spectral flux density $\Phi_{\lambda, \hat{s}}$ and the flux density $\Phi_{R, \hat{s}}$.

2.4 Poisson’s equation

In electrostatics, Poisson’s equation is a second-order linear differential equation that relates the charge density $\rho$, the electrostatic potential $\phi$, and the permittivity $\varepsilon$,

$$\nabla \cdot (\varepsilon \nabla \phi) = -\rho$$ (25)

It can also be split up into two equations

$$\nabla \phi = -E$$ (25a)

$$\nabla \cdot (\varepsilon E) = \rho$$ (25b)

where $E$ is the electric field.

The charge density $\rho$ is the sum of the static charge and the mobile charge in each band. In an IB material, $\rho$ is defined as

$$\rho = q[-n + p - N_I(f_I - f_{I,0}) + N_D - N_A]$$ (26)

where $N_A$, $N_D$ are the shallow acceptor and donor doping concentrations, respectively, the mobile charge in the IB is $qN_I(f_I - f_{I,0})$, with $f_{I,0}$ the IB filling fraction of the bulk IB material at $T = 0$ K. For a donor-type IB $f_{I,0} = 1$, and for an acceptor-type IB $f_{I,0} = 0$. Note that in writing the shallow dopant terms $N_D$ and $N_A$, we are assuming complete ionization of these impurities.

3 Finite element method primer

The finite element method (FEM) is a computational method for solving systems of PDEs. We introduce the basics of the method here and refer the reader to many deeper introductions [44–46]. Well-posed systems of PDEs have a domain $\Omega$ and boundary $\Gamma$. FEM divides $\Omega$ into cells, which are generally segments (1D), triangles (2D), or tetrahedra (3D). The solution to the PDEs is approximated by superpositions of local basis functions, which are each nonzero in only a small number of cells. The key difference between the FEM and finite difference methods is that FEM essentially averages over the cells to get the best approximation over a region rather than at individual points. We illustrate its key features by considering a solution of the Poisson equation.

3.1 Poisson equation

We wish to solve the equation

$$\nabla^2 u = f,$$ (27)

over a domain $\Omega$ with boundary $\Gamma$, where $u$ is the function we want to find and $f$ is a given function of space. In Section 4, $u$ is the generic function for which we wish to solve.

We consider standard Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions (BCs), which specify the value of $u$ and its gradient
\( \mathbf{u} \) at the boundary, respectively. Suppose that the BCs we wish to apply are

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u}&|_{\Gamma_D} = u_{BC} \\
\n\mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{n}|_{\Gamma_N} &= g
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \hat{n} \) is the \( \Gamma_N \) surface normal. The Dirichlet condition applies on \( \Gamma_D \), and the Neumann condition applies on \( \Gamma_N \). \( \Gamma_D \) and \( \Gamma_N \) cannot overlap.

The core idea of FEM is to take a weighted average of Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) using a family of spatially highly localized weight functions \( \{ \phi_i \} \) called test functions. This manipulation results in an equation called a weak form, imposing a weaker condition on the solution \( \mathbf{u} \) than the strong form Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \). To make a weak form, we take the spatial average of Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) with each test function \( \phi_i \) to give the conditions

\[
0 = \int (\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}) \phi_i \, d\mathbf{v} - \int f \phi_i \, d\mathbf{v} 
\]

where the integrals are taken over the domain \( \Omega \).

For convenience, we introduce the notation \( \int_{\Omega} \equiv \int d\mathbf{v} \), and write

\[
0 = \int_{\Omega} \phi_i (\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}) - \int_{\Omega} \phi_i f. 
\]

(FEM) seeks a solution that satisfies the weak form and can be written as \( \mathbf{u} = \sum_i a_i \psi_j \) for a set of basis functions \( \{ \psi_j \} \), such that \( \mathbf{u} = u_{BC} \) on \( \Gamma_D \). There are many choices of families of basis functions \( \{ \psi_j \} \), with various mathematical properties. An important property of basis functions is that they are highly localized, i.e., take nonzero values inside only one cell or a small number of adjacent cells. For this example, we will use continuous piecewise polynomials, named “Lagrange” or “Continuous Galerkin” (CG) basis functions, as shown in Fig. 2. In most cases (including this example), the family of test functions \( \phi_i \) in Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) is precisely the family of basis functions \( \psi_j \) (without the ones that are nonzero on the \( \Gamma_D \) boundary).

We revisit the first term in Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) As \( \nabla \mathbf{u} \) is discontinuous across cells, \( \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} \) is made meaningful by integrating by parts, using

\[
\int_{\Omega} \sigma \cdot \nabla a + \int_{\Omega} a (\nabla \cdot \sigma) = \int_{\Gamma} \sigma a \cdot \hat{n}.
\]

Then with \( \sigma = \nabla \mathbf{u} \) and \( a = \phi_i \) in the first term, the condition becomes

\[
0 = \int_{\Gamma} \phi_i (\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{n}) - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi_i \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \int_{\Omega} \phi_i f
\]

Noting that the boundary is made up of Neumann and Dirichlet parts and recalling Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \), the first term of Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) becomes

\[
\int_{\Gamma} \phi_i (\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{n}) = \int_{\Gamma_N} \phi_i \left( \frac{\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{n}}{g} \right) + \int_{\Gamma_D} \phi_i (\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{n})
\]

\[
= \int_{\Gamma_N} \phi_i g,
\]

where we eliminated the Dirichlet boundary term by ensuring that the test functions \( \phi_i \) are zero on the \( \Gamma_D \) boundary. This process yields our final weak form,

\[
0 = \int_{\Gamma_N} \phi_i g - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi_i \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \int_{\Omega} \phi_i f.
\]

As the Neumann boundary condition \( g \) enters “naturally” through the weak form, it is called a natural boundary condition. On the other hand, the Dirichlet boundary condition must be imposed upon the solution space of \( \mathbf{u} \) directly, and it is called an essential boundary condition.

Remark 1 Dirichlet/Neumann BCs aren’t always matched up in this way with essential/natural BC application. For the mixed method in Section \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) the opposite occurs; the Dirichlet BC enters as a natural BC, and the Neumann BC enters as an essential BC.

Plugging \( \phi_i \rightarrow \psi_i \) and \( u \rightarrow \sum_j a_j \psi_j \) into Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) we obtain

\[
0 = \int_{\Gamma_N} \psi_i g - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \psi_i \cdot \nabla \left( \sum_j a_j \psi_j \right) - \int_{\Omega} \psi_i f
\]

\[
0 = \sum_j a_j \left[ \int_{\Omega} \nabla \psi_i \cdot \nabla \psi_j \right] - \left[ \int_{\Gamma_N} \psi_i g + \int_{\Omega} \psi_i f \right]
\]

which forms a sparse linear system for the \( a_j \)’s, which could be written as \( \mathbf{Ma} = \mathbf{b} \). Both \( \mathbf{M} \) and \( \mathbf{b} \) are evaluated numerically, and the resulting linear system is solved for \( \mathbf{a} \). The essential (Dirichlet) boundary condition Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \) is applied by manually forcing the appropriate \( a_j \)’s to satisfy the boundary values \( u_{BC} \), and removing the corresponding columns \( j \) from the matrix, as well as the corresponding rows from \( \mathbf{M} \), \( \mathbf{a} \), and \( \mathbf{b} \). Note that the rows removed from the \( \mathbf{b} \) vector are precisely those corresponding to test functions that would have been nonzero on the \( \Gamma_D \) boundary, which ensures the condition used in Eq. \( \cdot \cdot \cdot \).

Remark 2 Families of basis functions \( \{ \psi_j \} \) are typically “nodal.” That is, each basis function \( \psi_j \) is associated to a point in space \( p_k \) called a node, such that \( \psi_j(p_k) = \delta_{jk} \). This representation simplifies the application of essential boundary conditions— if the boundary condition dictates that \( u_{|\Gamma_D} = c_k \), then the coefficient \( a_k \) is equal to \( c_k \), and imposes no further restrictions on other coefficients \( a_j \).

3.2 Nonlinear Poisson equation

In the previous section we considered the linear problem \( \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} = f \), which reduced to a set of linear equations for the \( a_j \). If

1 Since the basis functions \( \{ \psi_j \} \) and \( \{ \phi_i \} \) and their derivatives are highly localized.

2 In the FEM literature, \( \mathbf{M} \) is named stiffness matrix, and \( \mathbf{b} \) is named mass vector.
Figure 2 Examples of 1-dimensional basis functions, focusing on those that are nonzero in the central cell. Faint lines show basis functions in nearby cells. (a) Continuous Galerkin basis functions of order 1 (CG1), i.e., piecewise linear functions. Note that each basis function is nonzero in two cells. (b) Discontinuous Galerkin basis functions of order 1 (DG1), i.e., piecewise linear functions with no continuity requirement at cell boundaries. Note that each basis function is nonzero only in one cell. (c) Example of reproducing a function as a sum of CG1 basis functions.

the RHS were to depend nonlinearly on \( u \), the resulting set of equations would also be nonlinear. Consider the modified equation

\[
\nabla^2 u = (1 + u^2)f,
\]

and assume the same boundary conditions. Following the procedure as for the standard Poisson equation yields the weak form

\[
0 = \int_{\Gamma_N} \varphi_i g - \int_{\Gamma} \nabla \varphi_i \cdot \nabla u - \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i (1 + u^2)f.
\]

Plugging \( u \mapsto \sum_j a_j \psi_j \) into Eq. 38 yields

\[- \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i \left( \sum_j a_j \psi_j \right) \left( \sum_j a_j \psi_j \right) f \]

for the last term, which is nonlinear as it contains a product of \( a_j \)'s.

There are multiple methods to linearize Eq. 38. We sketch the Newton iterative method used in Simudo. The idea is to first replace \( u \) by \( u_- + \delta u \) in the weak form Eq. 38 where \( u_- \) is the previous solution and \( \delta u \) is the new dynamical variable being solved for. Then, we pretend that \( \delta u \) is infinitesimal and drop all higher order terms such as \( (\delta u)^2 \), yielding a linear system in \( \delta u \). Applying this procedure to the weak form above, we obtain

\[
0 = \int_{\Gamma_N} \varphi_i g - \int_{\Gamma} \nabla \varphi_i \cdot \nabla (u_- + \delta u) - \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i (1 + (u_- + \delta u)^2) f
\]

\[\approx \int_{\Gamma_N} \varphi_i g - \int_{\Gamma} \nabla \varphi_i \cdot \nabla u_- - \int_{\Omega} \nabla \varphi_i \cdot \nabla (\delta u)
\]

\[- \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i (1 + u_-^2) f - \int_{\Omega} \varphi_i 2(\delta u) u_- f\]

which we solve for \( \delta u \) the standard way. We then update \( u_- \leftarrow u_- + \delta u \) and iterate to convergence. Note that inside Simudo, the linearized form Eq. 39 is derived automatically using FEniCS symbolic tools.

4 Numerical method

Simudo uses the finite element method to solve the coupled Poisson/drift-diffusion and optics problems, given by Eqs. 1b, 7, 22, and 25. In this section, we detail the weak forms used for these coupled equations and the solution method for the resulting nonlinear system. We benchmark Simudo against the industry standard Synopsys Sentaurus commercial simulator on a standard semiconductor problem to show the quality of our results.

4.1 Solution method

The PDD problem is a coupled nonlinear system of PDEs, which we solve iteratively using Newton’s method (described in Section 3.2), as outlined in Fig. 3. The goal is to find a solution \( y = (\phi, E, w_C, w_I, j_C, j_I, j_V) \) that satisfies Eqs. 1b, 7, 22 and associated \( \Phi_\lambda \) that obeys Eq. 22. The optical problem is solved alongside the PDD problem in a self-consistent manner. That is, the PDD subproblem produces the absorption coefficient \( \alpha(\lambda) \) (which, for processes involving the IB, depends on the filling fraction). The optical subproblem is then solved using these absorption coefficients, yielding a new photon flux \( \Phi_\lambda \), which is fed back into the PDD where it enters in the optical carrier generation process, and the cycle iterates until a self-consistent solution is found.

The convergence of Newton’s method depends on the quality of the initial guess. Steps 1-4 in Fig. 3 are the pre-solver, which is used once to make the initial guess for the main Newton solver, illustrated in step 5. The full procedure is:
1. Initialize \( \phi \leftarrow 0 \) V.

2. For each point in space, calculate the bulk equilibrium Fermi level assuming local charge neutrality. That is, if we had a slab of bulk material with the material properties at this point, what would its Fermi level be?

A physical interpretation of this step is to partition the space into bulk regions and electrically insulate them from each other.

3. Set \( \phi_0 \leftarrow (\text{bulk equilibrium Fermi level})/q \). As indicated in Eq. 2 the quasi-Fermi levels are measured from \( \phi \). Initialize all quasi-Fermi levels \( w_u \) to zero.

Note that this step leaves the carrier concentrations unchanged from step 2.

4. Solve Poisson-only system, Eq. 25, at thermal equilibrium using \( \phi_0 \) as the initial guess. That is, solve only for \( \phi \) while keeping all \( w_u = 0 \) and thus all \( j_u = 0 \). A physical interpretation of this step is to remove the electrical insulation placed in step 2, allowing the formation of depletion regions as the carriers move to achieve a zero-current configuration that satisfies Poisson’s equation. The carrier density inside bulk-like regions of space changes little from the bulk equilibrium value in steps 2 and 3, making \( \phi_0 \) from step 3 an excellent guess throughout large regions of space.

5. **Main solver loop** Adaptively ramp up light intensity and/or bias, starting with thermal equilibrium (dark, no bias). Each solution requires a loop of Newton iterations. Within each Newton iteration, do the following:

   (a) **Optical calculation** For each optical field \( \lambda \), solve for the photon flux \( \Phi_\lambda \) given the latest value of \( \alpha_\lambda \). Note that Eq. 22 is linear when \( \alpha_\lambda \) is fixed.

   (b) **PDD Newton step** Perform one Newton step of the PDD problem.

      i. Solve for \( \delta y = \delta(\phi, E, w_C, w_I, w_V, j_C, j_I, j_V) \). Use the value of \( \Phi_\lambda \) (and thus optical carrier generation) computed in the previous step.

      ii. Update \( y \leftarrow y + \delta y \).

As an option, logarithmic damping can be applied to \( \delta y \) to prevent Newton’s method from diverging, e.g., \( y \leftarrow y + \log(1 + \alpha|\delta y|) / \alpha \) for \( \alpha = 1.72 \) or other user-defined value [47].

We now describe the weak forms that we use for each of Eqs. 1, 7, 22 and 24. There is much flexibility in the choice of particular weak forms, all of which can be equivalent to the same strong form. In Section 4.3.1 we illustrate the use of quasi-Fermi levels vs carrier densities as dynamical variables, showing the superior convergence attainable with the former.

### 4.2 Poisson equation

Here we introduce the formulation we use to implement Eq. 25. In this formulation, we solve for both \( \phi \) and \( E \) explicitly, which makes this approach a mixed formulation [48][49].
The potential \( \phi \) is represented as a superposition of discontinuous Galerkin (DG) basis functions of order \( d_{\text{poisson}} - 1 \) (cell-wise discontinuous polynomials), as in Fig. 2b, and the electric field \( E \) is represented using Brezzi-Douglas-Marini basis functions of order \( d_{\text{poisson}} \) (cellwise discontinuous polynomials with continuous normal component on cell boundaries). \[ 48 \]

The BDM space is \( H(\text{div}) \) conforming, meaning the divergence is accurately calculated and fluxes between cells are preserved, which makes it a natural choice for conserved or almost conserved current densities. In the results below, \( d_{\text{poisson}} = 2 \).

We multiply Eq. 25a by test function \( \psi \in \text{BDM}(d_{\text{poisson}}) \) and Eq. 25b by test function \( v \in \text{DG}(d_{\text{poisson}} - 1) \), then integrate each spatially.

This derivation yields the weak form

\[
\int_\Omega \psi \cdot \hat{\n} \phi_{\text{BC}} - \int_\Omega (\nabla \cdot \psi) \phi + \int_\Omega \psi \cdot E = 0 \tag{40}
\]

\[
\int_\Omega v (\nabla \cdot (\varepsilon E)) - \int_\Omega v \rho = 0, \tag{41}
\]

which must hold for every test function \( \psi \) and \( v \). Note that Eq. 40 was obtained by taking the dot product of Eq. 25a and \( \psi \), integrating spatially, then integrating by parts.

Unlike in the vanilla Poisson formulation of Section 4.1, the electric field boundary condition is the essential BC, and the potential BC is the natural BC.

### 4.3 Transport equations

The drift-diffusion equations are often numerically challenging to solve in semiconductors. Catastrophic cancellation can occur in Eq. 1a, e.g., for the majority carrier in a quasi-neutral region of a semiconductor, when the drift and diffusion contributions are nearly equal in magnitude. The current is given by the difference and can be hard to evaluate with finite precision arithmetic. We address this issue by using a quasi-Fermi-level-based representation for carrier density, and a mixed FEM method that solves explicitly for both the quasi-Fermi level \( w_u \) and the carrier density \( j_u \). A form of catastrophic cancellation still occurs in the quasi-Fermi-level form Eq. 7 albeit more subtly, and requires a numerical workaround, which we describe in Section 4.3.2

#### 4.3.1 Quasi-Fermi level formulation

We use a mixed method as we did for Poisson’s equation in Section 4.2 where the current density \( j_u \) and the quasi-Fermi level \( w_u \) are dynamical variables. The quasi-Fermi level \( w_u \) is represented as a superposition of DG basis functions of order \( d_{\text{transport}} - 1 \), and the electric field \( E \) is represented using BDM basis functions of order \( d_{\text{transport}} \). Section 4.2 contains a discussion of these functions’ properties and of the mixed method. In the results below, \( d_{\text{transport}} = 2 \).

We derive weak forms of Eq. 1b and Eq. 7. That is, we multiply Eq. 1b by test function \( v \in \text{DG}(d_{\text{transport}} - 1) \), take the dot product of Eq. 7 with the test function \( \psi \in \text{BDM}(d_{\text{transport}}) \), then integrate each equation spatially, giving

\[
0 = \int_\Omega v \nabla \cdot j_u + \int_\Omega v qg \tag{42a}
\]

\[
0 = \int_\Omega \psi \cdot j_u/\mu u - \int_\Omega (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u,\text{BC}} + \int_\Omega (\nabla \cdot \psi) w_u \tag{42b}
\]

where the second equation was obtained by a further integration by parts.

#### 4.3.2 Quasi-Fermi level offset partitioning

As written, Eq. 42b still suffers from a form of catastrophic cancellation in its last term, which corresponds to the gradient term in Eq. 7. Since \( \int_\Omega \nabla \cdot \psi = 0 \) for \( \psi \in \text{BDM}(d_{\text{transport}}) \), the last term is nonzero only if \( w_u \) varies within the domain where \( \psi \) is nonzero. \( w_u \) can be extremely flat, for example in quasineutral regions, which makes this integral hard to calculate with finite arithmetic precision. This difficulty is more apparent in Eq. 7 if \( j_u/\mu u = \nabla w_u \) is small \(^3\) a representation of \( w_u \) that stores its value on the nodes of the mesh (as described in Remark 2) cannot resolve such small changes in \( w_u \) across space.

We circumvent this issue by using an offset representation for \( w_u \). The idea is to partition the domain into cells, each having its own (spatially constant) base quasi-Fermi level value \( w_{u0} \) relative to which the new dynamical variable \( \delta w_u \) is expressed. That is, \( w_u = w_{u0} + \delta w_u \) where \( \delta w_u \) is the quantity we actually solve for instead of \( w_u \). Before every Newton iteration step, the \( w_{u0} \) of each cell is initialized to the cell average of \( w_u \) from the previous iteration. This representation allows small changes of \( \delta w_u \) to be accurately represented, enabling accurate determination of the current.

The last remaining question is how to adjoin regions with different base \( w_{u0} \) values. We accomplish this by adding a sur-

\(^3\) In the BDM space, the normal fluxes are shared by adjacent elements. The flux exiting the perimeter of a collection of cells exactly equals the sum of fluxes out of each of the cells.

\(^4\) relative to \( |w_u|/(\text{mesh size}) \)
face integral jump term to Eq. [42b] resulting in

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} \psi \cdot \mathbf{J}_u / (\mu u) - \oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) \delta w_{u,BC} + \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \psi) \delta w_u + \sum_{f \in \text{interior facets}} \int_{f} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) [w_{u0}].$$

(43)

where $[w_{u0}]$ is the jump operator, which takes the difference between the values of a discontinuous expression on either side of a facet. The rest of this section is dedicated to deriving that term and comparing the resulting offset representation to a naive carrier-density-based formulation based on $u$ instead of $w_u$.

We substitute $w_u = w_{u0} + \delta w_u$ into Eq. [42b] and we obtain

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} \psi \cdot \mathbf{J}_u / (\mu u) - \oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) \delta w_{u,BC} + \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \psi) \delta w_u - \oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0,BC} + \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \psi) w_{u0}.$$  

(44)

Our goal now is to rewrite the $(\ast)$ term. We begin by noting that since $w_{u0}$ is constant on each cell $K$, $\nabla w_{u0} = 0$ within each cell. We integrate by parts using Eq. [31] yielding

$$\int_{K} \psi \cdot \nabla w_{u0} = \oint_{\partial K} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0}.$$  

(45)

Summing over all cells $K$,

$$\sum_{K} \int_{K} (\nabla \cdot \psi) w_{u0} = \sum_{K} \oint_{\partial K} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0}$$

$$\oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0} = \oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0} + \sum_{f \in \text{interior facets}} \int_{f} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) [w_{u0}]$$

$$- \oint_{\Gamma} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) w_{u0} + \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \psi) w_{u0} = \sum_{f \in \text{interior facets}} \int_{f} (\psi \cdot \hat{n}) [w_{u0}]$$

(43)

which, plugged into Eq. [44] yields Eq. [43]

A comparison of a carrier-density-based method against the quasi-Fermi-level-based method we use in Simudo can be seen in Fig. 4. The carrier-density-based method is also a mixed method, using $\mathbf{j}_u$ and $u$ as dynamical variables. Fig. 4a shows that it converges poorly, with the majority current being both the dominant contributor to $\mathbf{j}_{\text{tot}}$ and the least well resolved. Note that $\mathbf{j}_{\text{tot}}$ should be uniform throughout this 1D device, as in the Simudo result. Figure 4b shows that the carrier-density based method is able to resolve the majority drift and diffusion currents when they are sufficiently large, but is not able to resolve them to sufficient accuracy to produce a resolved $\mathbf{j}_{\text{tot}}$ anywhere.

4.4 Optics

The optical problem is solved by self-consistently iterating through the optical flux variables $\Phi[\lambda_{\min},\lambda_{\max},\hat{s}]$ and independently solving Eq. [22] for each one. For convenience, we write $\Phi = \Phi[\lambda_{\min},\lambda_{\max},\hat{s}]$, $\hat{s} = \hat{s}_i$, and $\alpha = \alpha[\lambda_{\min},\lambda_{\max}]$ for the remainder of this section. We represent $\Phi$ using CG basis functions of order $d_{\text{optical}} = 2$.

We now derive the weak form used in Simudo to solve each optical propagation problem. We follow closely the development in [43] of the modified second order radiative transfer equation (MSORTE) method, without the scattering matrix. Integrate
Eq. 22 with a test function $v \in CG(d_{optical})$ to obtain
\begin{equation}
\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \zeta + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla (\alpha \Phi) = 0
\end{equation}
where $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \mathbf{s}$ and $\zeta = \mathbf{s} \cdot \nabla \Phi$. Using Eq. 31 we obtain
\begin{equation}
\int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \zeta_{IC} - \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \zeta + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla (\alpha \Phi) = 0
\end{equation}
Inserting the outlet boundary condition Eq. 23b into the first term, we obtain the final weak form
\begin{equation}
\int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) (-\alpha \Phi) - \int_{\Omega} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \zeta + \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla (\alpha \Phi) = 0
\end{equation}
The inlet boundary condition Eq. 23a is applied directly on $\Phi$ as an essential boundary condition.

4.5 Sentaurus benchmark comparison

To validate Simudo, we benchmark it against the industry standard Synopsys Sentaurus device simulator. Since Sentaurus does not support intermediate band materials, the benchmark is limited to standard semiconductors. Our test problem is a silicon pn-junction with symmetric doping ranging from $10^{15} - 10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ and SRH carrier lifetimes of 1 ns and 1 $\mu$s in the p- and n-type regions, respectively. Both regions have a length 83.35 nm for the doping concentrations cases $10^{15} - 10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$, and 8.335 nm for doping concentrations $10^{19} - 10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$. The bias applied across the diode’s contacts ranges from $-2$ V to 2 V. Although the problem is one-dimensional, we consider a 2D region with a height of 1 $\mu$m. The Simudo mesh is rectangular with greater density at the contacts than in the middle, with a total of 2181 mesh points in the x-direction and only 2 mesh points in the y-direction. Sentaurus uses a uniform rectangular mesh with 8193 and 1025 mesh points in the x-direction for the $10^{15} - 10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$ and $10^{19} - 10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ doping concentration cases, respectively, and 2 points in the y-direction.

Figure 5 shows the excellent agreement between Simudo and Sentaurus across all doping concentrations and applied biases, with the relative error in total current staying below 0.2%. Note that the boundary conditions at the contacts are not the same for the Sentaurus and Simudo simulations. The Simudo simulations are performed with a surface recombination velocity $S = \infty$ or 0 for the majority, minority carriers, respectively. The Sentaurus simulations are performed with $S = 0$ for the minority carriers and the default “Ohmic contact” boundary condition for the majority carriers, which imposes charge neutrality and equilibrium carrier concentration at the contact. Under small and reverse bias, these two sets of boundary conditions should be equivalent, but under large forward bias, the default Sentaurus boundary condition is expected to give incorrect results due to its imposition of charge neutrality [50]. Sentaurus provides a “Modified Ohmic” boundary condition, which should be closer to the Simudo boundary condition, but we were unable to attain convergence using it. As a result, at larger biases the Simudo and Sentaurus results diverge from each other, and we do not include them in Fig. 5. We cannot rule out the possibility that the deviations between Simudo and Sentaurus at lower bias are also caused by the slightly different treatment of the boundary conditions.

5 Examples and results

In this section, we give examples of using Simudo. Section 5.1 shows how to set up a simple 1-dimensional pn-junction device and demonstrates the helpful tools that Simudo provides for defining regions and boundaries. Section 5.2 shows the extensibility of Simudo by illustrating the code required to add a new Auger recombination process. Section 5.3 illustrates the use of Simudo to study a system first considered in Ref. 23.

5.1 PN junction and topology definitions

We give here an example describing a simple pn-junction device in Simudo, with the required code shown in Fig. 6. This example constructs the device and implements steps 1-4 of the pre-solver shown in Fig. 3. We also illustrate the useful topology construction operations built in to Simudo.

In this 1-dimensional example, the object $1s$ contains information about the layers, including their sizes, positions, and mesh. The object $pdd$ sets up the Poisson/drift-diffusion solver and has information about the bands in each material, including recombination processes and boundary conditions. In this example, there are only two bands (VB, CB); for a problem including an IB, $pdd$ would have a third band, too.

Simudo is designed for 2-dimensional simulations, and it has sophisticated tools to define the arrangement of materials, dopings, contacts, meshing regions, or other user-defined spatial properties. In many FEM solvers, interfaces must be tracked manually, including their orientation, to ensure that
U = make_unit_registry(('mesh_unit = 1 micrometer',))
setup_dolfin_parameters()
doping = 1e18 * U('cm^-3') # doping level for both sides

####
# Define geometry of layers, including names for easy referencing
####
mesh_points = 400 ; L = 0.2 # device length in um
layers = [dict(name='emitter', material='Si', thickness=L/2),
         dict(name='base', material='Si', thickness=L/2)]

# For non-uniform meshing, define regions to receive extra mesh points
# "/+layer" indicates relative to right/left endpoint of layer
overmesh_regions = [
    dict(x0=('emitter', -L/20), x1=('emitter', +L/20), edge_length=L*1e-4),
    dict(x0=('base', -L/20), x1=('base', +L/20), edge_length=L*1e-4)]

ls = ConstructionHelperLayeredStructure() # Helper for constructing 1D models
ls.params = dict(edge_length=L/mesh_points, # default edge_length
                 layers=layers, simple_overmesh_regions=overmesh_regions, mesh_unit=U.mesh_unit)
ls.run()

mesh_data = ls.mesh_data

# topology: define names for certain external facets of the domain
R, F = CellRegions(), FacetRegions()
F.exterior = (R.domain).boundary(R.exterior)
F.left_contact = (R.exterior_left).boundary(R.domain)
F.right_contact = (R.domain).boundary(R.exterior_right)
F.contacts = F.left_contact | F.right_contact
F.nonconductive = F.exterior - F.left_contact - F.right_contact.flip()

####
# Define PDD problem, including bands, BC's, and recombination
####
def create_problemdata(goal, phi_charge_neutrality=None):
    root = ProblemData(goal=goal, mesh_data=mesh_data, unit_registry=U)
    pdd = root.pdd
    pdd.easy_add_band(name='CB', band_type=None)
    pdd.easy_add_band(name='VB', band_type=None)
    pdd.spatial.add_rule('temperature', R.domain, U('300 K'))
    pdd.spatial.add_rule('poisson/static_rho', R.emitter, -doping * U('elementary_charge'))
    pdd.spatial.add_rule('SRH/CB/tau', R.domain, U('1e-9 s'))
    pdd.spatial.add_rule('SRH/VB/tau', R.domain, U('1e-6 s'))
    pdd.spatial.add_rule('SRH/energy_level', R.domain, U('0.553 eV'))
    SimpleSiliconMaterial(problem_data=root).register()

    if goal == 'thermal equilibrium':
        pdd.spatial.add_BC('poisson/phi', F.contacts, phi_charge_neutrality)
        pdd.spatial.add_BC('poisson/E', F.nonconductive, U('V/m') * pdd.mesh_util.zerovec)
        return root

####
# Run pre-solver
####
p0 = create_problemdata(goal='local charge neutrality')
p0.pdd.easy_auto_pre_solve() # Step 2
p1 = create_problemdata(goal='thermal equilibrium', phi_charge_neutrality=p0.pdd.poisson.phi) # Step 3
p1.pdd.easy_auto_pre_solve() # Step 4

Figure 6  Example Simudo code to construct a symmetrically doped pn junction of length 200 nm with $N_D = N_A = 10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$, impose boundary conditions, and find the thermal equilibrium solution, which is the output of step 4 of the pre-solver, shown in Fig. 3. We do not show the import statements at the top of the script.
Simudo introduces a set of topology tools that instead allow users to define the regions and interfaces in which they are interested, and Simudo then takes care of all the bookkeeping. The user defines regions as desired (e.g., emitter, base, defective-region), which can then be given properties, whether they be doping levels, recombination parameters, or other desired properties. These regions are initially defined abstractly, without having any coordinates in the device, using CellRegions and FacetRegions, and are later connected to geometry and materials by the mesh generator.

Full details are given in the documentation accompanying Simudo, but we give a further illustration of these methods in Figs. 7 and 8. That example illustrates the creation of arbitrary CellRegion objects, including unions and intersections, and edges that connect them. When R is a CellRegions container, accessing a nonexistent attribute (such as R.domain) causes its creation. The user can define new CellRegion objects by applying Boolean operations on previous ones and new FacetRegion objects by using the boundary method. For example, consider the region R.region1. Then R.region1.boundary(R.region2) creates a signed boundary from region1 to region2, as illustrated in Fig. 7. All of these custom regions are kept as symbolic expressions and evaluated by Simudo only when needed (e.g., when asked to apply a boundary condition or when asked to compute a volume or surface integral). This layer of abstraction allows the user not to worry about the details of mesh markers, entity indices, and facet orientations [51], and is described more fully in the documentation that accompanies Simudo.

The examples in Figs. 7 and 8 illustrate another useful concept. The mesh generation interprets the external region as being outside the simulation domain, allowing convenient definitions for boundary conditions and current flow. The FacetRegions are used in the example of Fig. 8 to define the boundary conditions, which – in step 4 – are conductive at the left and right contacts and nonconductive at the top and bottom surfaces. The example also shows how the mesh can be refined by adding extra mesh points near the contacts.

### 5.2 Extensibility: Adding Auger recombination

The initial release of Simudo contains radiative and Shockley-Read trapping and recombination processes in the non-degenerate limits for VB, CB. The user can easily add modified physics to their problems, which we demonstrate here with an example of adding an Auger recombination process to Simudo, with the form

$$ U_A = C_n(n^2p - n_0^2p_0) + C_p(p^2n - p_0^2n_0) \quad (49) $$

where $C_n, C_p$ are the Auger coefficients, and $p_0$ and $n_0$ are the hole and electron concentrations at thermal equilibrium, respectively [41]. The code is listed in Fig. 9. The function $\text{get\_generation\_user}(\text{band})$ adds a negative local generation rate in the CB and VB and returns 0 for all other bands. This recombination process moves particles between two bands, the src_band and dst_band. In this case, where the electrons and holes have opposite charge, the Auger process destroys both particles simultaneously; if both carrier types involved in the process had the same charge, the process would represent a transfer from the src_band to the dst_band, with the appro-
from simudo.mesh import CellRegions, FacetRegions
R = CellRegions() ; F = FacetRegions()

# R.region1 is created automatically when referenced
print(R)
print(R.region1, type(R.region1))
print(R)
### CellRegionByName('region1') <class
### 'simudo.mesh.topology.CellRegionByName'>
### 'region1': CellRegionByName('region1'))

# define new region as set difference of region2 and region1
R.region3 = R.region2 - R.region1
The method (R.region1).boundary(R.region2) creates the signed
boundary from region1 into region2, e.g., for calculating flux.
# R.region2 is created when referenced.
F.b1 = (R.region2).boundary(R.exterior_right)
F.b2 = (R.region1).boundary(R.region3)
F.b3 = (F.b2).flip()

Figure 8 Example of using CellRegions and FacetRegions to construct
regions corresponding to those shown in Fig. 7. The R and F objects are
containers for cell and facet regions respectively. They are both initialized
empty, and regions in each one are created when referenced. The boundary
method in (R.region1).boundary(R.region3) creates the signed boundary
from region1 to region3. The flip() method gives the boundary with the
opposite sign. The actual mapping of these regions into the domain
occurs in the mesh generation.

private sign for the recombination process determined by the
get_band_generation_sign method.

5.3 P[IB]N junction

In Ref. [52], the authors consider a quantum-dot-based IB solar
cell with a p-n-IB-p-n structure. They present a drift-diffusion
model for the IB region only, with the carrier density and cur-
crent density boundary conditions obtained from a depletion
approximation and law of the junction. This model assumes
that transport is diffusion-dominated in the IB region, and
drift can therefore be neglected. This early device model gave
important insights into the behavior of IB devices.

In testing the self-consistency of the model, the authors
estimate the IB mobility required to remain in the diffusion-
dominated regime, finding that an IB mobility greater than
62 cm²/V·s is required to make their model consistent. This
claim raises an immediate question: does something interest-
ing happen when the IB mobility goes below that threshold?
Since Simudo is a full drift-diffusion device model, we can di-
rectly answer that question. The code to set up this problem
occurs in the mesh generation.

We simulate this device with μI ranging from 0.001 to
300 cm²/V·s, with resulting J-V curves shown as solid lines
in Fig. 10, which is tightly zoomed and still shows only minor
effects of this over-10⁵ change in μI. In fact, the IB and drifts
currents contribute negligibly to the transport inside the IB re-
region and the current remains diffusion-dominated throughout,
as shown in Fig. 11.

The device behavior is approximately independent of μI
because the IV and CI generation rates are nearly identical
throughout the IB device.

We model a similar device with a simpler p-IB-n structure.
This device has the same band and absorption parameters as
the device described in [52], summarized in Table 3. The in-
cident light is a blackbody spectrum at 6000 K with a solar
concentration factor X = 1000. The device has equal subgap
optical cross sections and nearly current matched (within 10%)
dependence on shown in the dashed curves of Fig. 10, which show a stronger device thus relies on IB transport for the CI and IV generation at the back. Both the matched- and the high-mobility case, the overall current is slightly larger than in the mismatched case, showing the role of IB filling fraction.

In the high-mobility case, the overall current is slightly larger with the mismatched absorptions, due to the increased optical depth. Figure 10(a) shows how $J_{sc}$ varies with $\mu_I$ in both of these cases, where the greater dependence on $\mu_I$ in the mismatched case is apparent. Figure 11(b) shows that in the matched-$\sigma_{opt}$ case, $j_I$ is never particularly large, while it grows to be five times larger in the mismatched case, showing the role of IB currents in internally balancing the optical absorptions.

In the low-mobility limit, where $j_I$ is always small, when local CI and IV current generations are imbalanced, the filling fraction $f$ of the IB must shift to equalize generation and recombination at each point [53]. This effect is visible in Fig. 12 where at low mobility, the mismatched-$\sigma_{opt}$ case has photodepletion at the front side and photofilling at the back side, consistent with excess CI generation at the front and excess IV generation at the back. Both the matched-$\sigma_{opt}$ and the high-mobility mismatched-$\sigma_{opt}$ cases maintain an approximately uniform IB filling fraction.

These examples together show the utility of Simudo to explore the performance of IB devices and resolve an assertion made in earlier device models without the benefit of a coupled PDD/optics solver.

6 Conclusion

The availability of a device model for intermediate band materials should enable both understanding of this new class of materials and optimization of IB devices. Simudo’s methods for overcoming catastrophic cancellation may also prove useful in standard semiconductor device simulation. This self-consistent solution of the Poisson/drift-diffusion and optical propagation equations provides a platform for studying a wide range of optoelectronic materials and devices, including solar cells and photodetectors, with tools to enable extensibility to arbitrary generation and recombination models, thermal effects, and more. Simudo has been validated against Synopsys Sentaurus for standard semiconductor devices. The near-term roadmap for Simudo includes explicit heterojunction support and nonlocal tunneling, which will be available with future releases at github.com/simudo/simudo. We hope that the free and open source nature of this software will enable further development of IB materials and device simulation more broadly.
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Table 3 Parameters modeled on the device from [52] for Figs. 10–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_C = 1.67$ eV</td>
<td>Conduction band edge energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_I = 1.10$ eV</td>
<td>Intermediate band energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_V = 0$ eV</td>
<td>Valence band edge energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_C = N_V = 5 \times 10^{18}$ cm$^{-3}$</td>
<td>CB and VB effective density of states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_I = 10^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$</td>
<td>IB density of states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_C = \mu_V = 2000$ cm$^2$/N/s</td>
<td>CB and VB mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_I = 0.001 - 300$ cm$^2$/N/s</td>
<td>IB mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{opt} = (2 - 10) \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^2$</td>
<td>Absorption coefficient for CV process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{opt}^C = 2 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^2$</td>
<td>Optical cross section for CI process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{opt}^V = 2 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^2$</td>
<td>Optical cross section for IV process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon = 13$</td>
<td>Dielectric constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_s = 6000$ K</td>
<td>Sun temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_c = 300$ K</td>
<td>Cell temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X = 1000$</td>
<td>Solar concentration factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_{IB} = 1.3$ $\mu$m</td>
<td>IB region length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10  (a) $J(V)$ curves for devices with parameters of Table 3 under $X = 1000$ suns illumination, modeled on Ref. [23]. Solid lines show $\sigma_{opt} = \sigma_{opt}^C$, as in [23], while dotted lines show $\sigma_{opt}^C = 5\sigma_{opt}^V$, which causes the CI absorption to be preferentially at the top of the device. Note the small vertical scale. The mismatched-$\sigma_{opt}$ case is more strongly influenced by the IB mobility $\mu_I$, but the effects are relatively small throughout. (b) The short-circuit current $J_{sc}$ for devices with varying $\mu_I$ shows that the matched-$\sigma_{opt}$ case is independent of $\mu_I$ when $\mu_I$ is sufficiently large ($\gtrsim 0.1$ cm$^2$/Vs), while the mismatched-$\sigma_{opt}$ case again shows a stronger $\mu_I$-dependence, but note the small vertical scale.
Figure 11 (a) Drift (dashed) and diffusion (solid) currents for each band, at $\mu_I = 100 \text{ cm}^2/\text{V/s}$ and $\sigma_{ei} = \sigma_{iv}$, with other parameters as in Table 3. The IB current density attains its maximum at the marked point. (b) The maximum value of the IB current density is shown as a function of $\mu_I$ for the matched and unmatched absorption cross sections, showing the increased requirements for $j_I$ and thus $\mu_I$ in the case where local absorptions are mismatched.

Figure 12 IB filling fraction $f(x)$ at the maximum power point with the parameters as in Table 3. With mismatched $\sigma_{opt}$ and low $\mu_I$, the IB filling fraction changes drastically through the depth of the device, as the local generation and recombination rates must come into balance; this balancing increases the local recombination and decreases the total current generation, as seen in Fig. 10b. With matched $\sigma_{opt}$, internal IB currents balance the absorptions, and $f(x)$ remains nearly constant.
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