Voltage matching, étendue and ratchet steps in advanced concept solar cells
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Many advanced solar cell concepts propose surpassing the Shockley Queisser (SQ) limit by introducing multiple quasi-Fermi level separations that are arranged in series and/or in parallel. Exceeding the SQ limit with any parallel arrangement involves intermediate states that deliver additional charge carriers at, ideally, the same electro-chemical potential as the other elements in the parallel network. This can be thought of as voltage matching individual parallel components and in intermediate band materials is intricately linked to solar concentration and étendue mismatch between absorption and emission. Generally, to achieve voltage matching under sub-optimal conditions, an additional degree of freedom in the absorption thresholds of the material through a carrier relaxation or ratchet step is required. We explain why the ideal ratchet step decreases with solar concentration and how it depends on radiative efficiency and emission étendue of the individual transitions. For solar cell concepts that use Auger type carrier-carrier interactions or molecular triplet states for energetic up- or down-conversion, ideal bandgap combinations and achievable efficiencies also depend on interaction rates. We show that Auger assisted solar cells suffer more strongly from finite interaction rates than carrier multiplication devices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Solar cells that are bounded by the Shockley-Queisser (SQ) efficiency limit possess one carrier temperature and non-equilibrium carrier populations in the valence and conduction band only. To surpass the SQ efficiency limit additional non-equilibrium carrier populations must be established, either through gradients in temperature or establishing multiple quasi-Fermi level separations. These separate electron populations can be arranged in series or in parallel and mediated via luminescence or carrier interactions. The various permutations of series, parallel and luminescent coupling are shown in Figure 1.

The most familiar and successful concept is the multi-junction solar cell (MJ-2T) where two or more materials with different bandgaps are integrated in a single device and connected in series. A requirement for high efficiency is that the currents delivered at maximum power by each junction are equal [1]. A mild variation of this is to permit luminescent coupling between the sub-cells (MJ-2T-LC), where excess photogeneration in high-gap sub-cells can be transferred radiatively to lower-gap sub-cells. This effect does not improve the maximum efficiency attainable but serves as an example where an additional process can help recover power that would otherwise be lost, in this case decreasing the variability of the output under changeable illumination conditions [2] and the need for precise bandgap engineering [3, 4]. Prospective multi-junction solar cells that make use of this (MJ-2T-LC), require a high material quality and can be categorised as belonging to both the ‘series’ and ‘luminescence’ category. For the sake of completeness, we note the extreme case of a purely luminescent solar collector, the luminescent solar concentrator which in the case of a single fluorescent sheet, is bounded by the Shockley-Queisser limit but has potential merit for reducing the need for costly solar cell material [5]. It relies on luminescent redirection and frequency conversion of light impinging on luminophores to the edges of a waveguide where it is collected by a conventional solar cell.

In this paper we are concerned with all systems enclosed within the parallel ellipse. The key to efficient operation of any parallel connected network of cells is to ensure that the free energy of the carrier populations,
represented by quasi-Fermi levels. Any one of the schemes classified as parallel contains at least two well-separated absorption thresholds, each associated with a different quasi-Fermi level separation (QFLS). When these transitions are represented in an equivalent circuit, any separation of quasi-Fermi levels can be described as an internal voltage, hence the term voltage matching has been coined as a measure of the internal free energy of carriers.

An example of a material that can support multiple QFLS is the intermediate band solar cell, where a second energy gap is used to slow inter-band carrier equilibration [6]. In this paper, we will use the term intermediate band (IB) to describe both intermediate bands and intermediate states that do not form a band. The distinction is not important for the following discussion of voltage matching as long as quasi-thermal equilibrium has been established and the occupancy of the state/band can be described by a quasi-Fermi level.

The limiting efficiencies for the different concepts shown in the Venn diagram of Figure 1 have been calculated in a number of previous publications. The Intermediate Band Solar Cell (IBSC) concept, a device with increased photo-current due to sequential absorption of below bandgap photons in a single material was first formulated as an impurity photovoltaic device by Wolf [7] and later revised using intermediate bands by Luque et al [8]. Yoshida et al showed that a ratchet or relaxation step ($\Delta E$) can improve the efficiency of an IBSC under low concentration [9], despite introducing a thermalization loss into the sequential absorption mechanism. Two configurations for the band alignment of such a electronic ratchet are drawn in Figure 2 where the ratchet ($\Delta E$) is located in either the IB or CB and the carrier populations defined in the conduction, valence and intermediate bands described by quasi-Fermi levels $\mu_c$, $\mu_v$ and $\mu_I$ respectively. A positive ratchet step, corresponding to an exothermic process ensures that the energy of the absorption thresholds - and more importantly the recombination thresholds - of the below bandgap transitions add up to more than the absorption threshold of the valence band (VB) to conduction band (CB) transition, i.e., $E_1 + E_2 > E_g$.

The ratchet can be implemented using several different phenomena [10], typically using a forbidden transition. This can proceed via physical separation of optical transitions [11–13] to form a ‘spatial-ratchet’, using spin-forbidden transitions as might be achievable in dilute magnetic semiconductors [14] or molecular triplet states [15] as a ‘spin-ratchet’, or due to a separation of the carriers in momentum-space [16].

In contrast, sequential absorption Up-Conversion (UC) [17] and sequential emission Down-Conversion (DC) [18] enable luminescent transfer of excitations by applying an IB material in front of, or behind a single junction solar cell. The sequential absorption process is sometimes termed Excited State Absorption or ESA [19]. The importance of a relaxation step for UC to work efficiently at low to medium concentrations was recognised by Trupke et al. [17] and emphasized later in [20].

Coulomb mediated carrier-carrier interactions also enable a separate class of up and down conversion devices. In the case of up-conversion this process relies on two separate optical absorption events followed by an interaction between those excited states. Triplet-Triplet Annihilation (TTA) represents such a process in molecular materials [15] or Energy Transfer Up-Conversion (ETU) in ionic systems [19]. Down-conversion is simply the reverse process, corresponding to singlet fission in molecular materials [21] and cooperative energy transfer in ionic systems [22].

The final class of parallel device is represented by two coulomb mediated devices where the relevant bands are contacted directly, dispensing with the luminescent step altogether. Internal carrier multiplication (CM) [23, 24], multiple exciton generation [25] or direct singlet fission in molecular materials [26] correspond to systems where contacts are made to the lowest two energy bands in the system. The alternative is to contact the highest two energy bands, similar to the IBSC, but distinct in that carriers are excited via an Auger Assisted (AA) process [27, 28] or the molecular equivalent TTA [29], the latter having been demonstrated experimentally [30, 31]. In all these instances, an over-matching of the QFLS between IB and VB, and CB and VB is required to provide a free energy differential to drive the CM process, a requirement that has been articulated in the molecular singlet fission solar cell concept [21].

In this work, we show how the Ñetendue of absorption and emission, radiative efficiencies and interaction rates influence the size of the ratchet step that is necessary for parallel connected solar cells to attain their highest efficiency. We start with a thermodynamic description of an IB material in general and then consider the luminescent approaches, the purely parallel approach, especially under the consideration of finite Auger interaction rates, and finally the IBSC approach.
II. OPEN CIRCUIT QUASI-FERMI-LEVEL SEPARATIONS FOR BANDWIDTH-LIMITED TRANSITIONS

The concept of current matching in series connected tandem solar cells stems from the intuitive concept of conservation of charge and current continuity. However in parallel connected cells the concept of voltage matching is more subtle. Driving each of the transitions with an incoming light field induces a QFLS between the two states involved in the transition. This QFLS is equivalent to a Gibbs free energy between the electron and hole populations; in a single junction cell it corresponds to the potential for electrical work the system can perform and corresponds to the internal voltage of the device. With multiple transitions in a device, such as in the IBSC these free energies need to be matched for optimal operation which, in the context of an equivalent circuit, corresponds to matching the internal voltages of the device.

In order to achieve voltage matching in the parallel class of solar cell concepts, it is necessary to have a degree of freedom to choose the absorption thresholds. As we explain in detail below, the Gibbs free energy of an electron hole pair in a transition driven by sunlight is a result of étendue mismatch and radiative efficiency. At low concentration, all the parallel concepts reach maximum efficiency only if a ratchet or relaxation step is introduced such that the sum of the recombination threshold energies of the below bandgap transitions does not correspond to the energy of the recombination threshold for the VB to CB transition, i.e., $E_1 + E_2 \neq E_g$.

We now analyse the open circuit voltage of an intermediate band material with the aim of elucidating the relationship between étendue, radiative efficiency and the magnitude of the ratchet step. We make the Boltzmann approximation for both the illumination from the sun and the luminescence from the material in order to illustrate the fundamental thermodynamic considerations involved in parallel solar cells. In Boltzmann approximation the maximal Gibbs free energy of an electron hole pair in an absorber with sharp threshold $E_a$ at temperature $T_a$ under illumination from a blackbody of temperature $T_s$ can be written as [32, 33]

$$F = E_a \left(1 - \frac{T_a}{T_s}\right) + kT_s \ln \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \gamma(E_a, T_s)}{\Omega_{\text{emit}} \gamma(E_a, T_s) \eta_{\text{ext}}}\right).$$

(1)

$\Omega_{\text{abs}}$ is the étendue of the absorbed sunlight and $\Omega_{\text{emit}}$ the étendue of the luminescence emitted from the absorber. At full concentration the étendues are equal, while there is a factor of $\approx 46260$ between them at 1 Sun. The multiplier $\gamma(E_a, T)$ is given by

$$\gamma(E_a, T) = T \left(E_a^2 + 2TE_a + 2T^2\right).$$

(2)

To take into account a finite absorption bandwidth we can replace $\gamma(E_a, T)$ of a step absorber with a function $\gamma(E_1, E_2, T)$ that incorporates lower and upper absorption limits $E_1$ and $E_2$ in each band as

$$\gamma_1(E_1, E_2, T) = \gamma(E_1, T) - e^{\frac{E_1 - E_2}{kT_s}} \gamma(E_2, T).$$

(3)

Taking the Boltzmann approximation for the incoming sunlight becomes inaccurate at small bandgaps and should not be used in quantitative modelling of small bandgap absorbers. Nonetheless, as the free energy depends only logarithmically on the generation rate, these simple equations for the achievable free energy under sunlight illumination remain useful to illustrate the operation principles of parallel solar cells.

Consider a band arrangement with sequential absorbers. In Boltzmann approximation for both the illumination from the sun and multiple transitions in a device, such as in the IBSC these free energies need to be matched for optimal operation which, in the context of an equivalent circuit, corresponds to matching the internal voltages of the device.

$$\mu_{IV} + \mu_{CI} = \mu_{CV}.$$  

(4)

Using the QFLSs of the individual transitions

$$\mu_{IV} = E_1 \left(1 - \frac{T_c}{T_s}\right) + kT_c \ln \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \gamma(E_1, E_2, T_s)}{\Omega_{\text{emit}} \gamma(E_1, E_2, T_c) \eta_{\text{ext}}}\right),$$

(5)

$$\mu_{CI} = E_2 \left(1 - \frac{T_c}{T_s}\right) + kT_c \ln \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \gamma(E_2, E_3, T_s)}{\Omega_{\text{emit}} \gamma(E_2, E_3, T_c) \eta_{\text{ext}}}\right),$$

(6)

and

$$\mu_{CV} = E_g \left(1 - \frac{T_c}{T_s}\right) + kT_c \ln \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \gamma(E_g, T_s)}{\Omega_{\text{emit}} \gamma(E_g, T_c) \eta_{\text{ext}}}\right).$$

(7)

$\mu_{CV}$ is the QFLS of an absorber with external luminescence extraction efficiency $\eta_{\text{ext}}$ in the absence of intermediate states.

The ratchet step $\Delta E_{\text{match}}$ that leads to a matching of the free energies between the two low-bandgap absorbers in series and the high-bandgap absorber, is given by the condition

$$W_{oc}(E_g) = W_{oc}(E_g + \Delta E_{\text{match}} - E_1) + W_{oc}(E_1),$$

(8)

where $W_{oc}(E) = E - qV_{oc}$ is the difference between the absorption threshold and the open circuit voltage of a solar cell. In order to understand the dependencies of the ratchet step we can rewrite this as

$$\Delta E_{\text{match}} \approx kT_c T_s \ln \left(\frac{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \eta_{\text{ext}}^{CV}}{\Omega_{\text{abs}} \eta_{\text{ext}}^{IV}}\right) \gamma_1(E_1, E_2, T_c) \gamma_1(E_2, E_3, T_c) \gamma(E_g, T_s).$$

(9)

To analyze the voltage matched ratchet step it is instructive to look first at the ratios of $\gamma_1(E_1, E_2, T_c)$ to $\gamma_1(E_i, E_j, T_c)$. For the absorption thresholds relevant for solar cells, this ratio is on the order of $T_s/T_c \approx 20$ and
thus results in a negative contribution to the ratchet step of around $3kT_c$ or $\approx 75\text{meV}$. The contribution of the ratio between emission and absorption étendues $\Omega_{\text{em}}/\Omega_{\text{abs}}$ depends on the concentration of the incoming sunlight but is usually much greater than this. For uncentered sunlight and a solar cell with back reflector, it is $\approx 11kT_c$ or $\approx 278\text{meV}$. The ideal ratchet step for the ideal IBSC derived numerically from the current-voltage characteristics of the device [9] can thus be estimated from basic thermodynamic considerations. Note that this is an estimate based on matching the open circuit voltage, while the relevant voltage in the IBSC is the maximum power point voltage, a point that we will return to in the section discussing IBSCs. Finally, the contribution of the external luminescence extraction efficiencies $\eta_{\text{ext}}$ depends on material quality and optical geometry, i.e. light trapping. It can easily reach a magnitude similar to the étendue mismatch.

III. APPLICATION TO PARALLEL CLASS OF SOLAR CELLS

We approximate the incoming sunlight as blackbody radiation with a temperature of 6000K to simplify the calculations while retaining the important physics of the problem. Intermediate band materials operate at open circuit in photonic UC and DC (discussed in subsection III A), while current is extracted from different bands for the CM and AA solar cells (discussed in subsection III B). In the sequential absorption based IBSC, two transitions are operating in series and in parallel with a third transition (subsection III C).

A. Photonic up-conversion and down-conversion

In a photonic up-conversion (UC) solar cell, a material with intermediate states that act as stepping stone for the up-conversion process is added at the front or back of a conventional single junction solar cell. Adding it at the back is usually more efficient. The down-converter must be placed in front of a conventional solar cell and ideally converts one high energy photon into two low-energy photons with energy just above the bandgap of the conventional solar cell. It is therefore advantageous if both low-energy transitions occur at the same energy.

The photonic up- or down-converting materials are not electrically contacted, hence they operate at open circuit and transfer power radiatively, as illustrated in Figure 3.

From the condition (9) on the ratchet step $\Delta E$ we can see whether a particular system is going to act as up- or down-converter. If the sum of the QFLSs that can be sustained by the two low-energy transitions is smaller than the QFLS sustained by the high energy transition, down-conversion will predominantly occur. The recombination through the high-energy transition is suppressed compared to recombination through the low-energy transitions. If, however, the QFLS of the high energy transition is smaller, up-conversion will occur. An UC with below optimal ratchet step $\Delta E$, shows a quadratic dependence of the UC intensity on the intensity of the low-energy light, while it is going to operate in the linear regime if $\Delta E$ is larger than optimal.

We illustrate this for the case of a symmetric sequential absorption up-converter and a down-converter. In the symmetric case, there are only two absorption thresholds at $E_1$ and $E_g$ and light with energies between $E_1$ and $E_g$ is absorbed equally by the valence to intermediate band transition and the intermediate to conduction band transition. If the up-converter is placed behind an optically thick solar cell of bandgap $E'_g < E_g$, no sunlight is going to excite the valence to conduction band transition in the up-converter.

At open circuit, no current will flow in either of the bands, so we can write

$$G_{VC}+G_{IC} = R_{CV}+R_{CI} = R_{CV}^0 e^{\mu_{CV}/kT_c}+R_{CI}^0 e^{\mu_{CI}/kT_c}, \quad (10)$$

to balance the net generation in the conduction band and

$$G_{VI} - G_{IC} = R_{IV} - R_{CI} = R_{IV}^0 e^{\mu_{IV}/kT_c} - R_{CI}^0 e^{\mu_{CI}/kT_c}. \quad (11)$$

$G_{ij}$ and $R_{ij}$ denote the generation and recombination rates from band $i$ to band $j$ respectively. Since $\mu_{IV} + \mu_{CI} = \mu_{CV}$, we obtain the quasi-Fermi-level separation between valence and conduction band for the symmetric case, with equal absorption and recombination rates as

$$\mu_{CV} = 2\mu_{IV} = 2 \ln \left(\frac{(R_{IV}^0)^2 + 4R_{CV}^0 (G_{VC}+G_{VI}) - R_{IV}^0}{2R_{CV}^0}\right). \quad (12)$$

The étendue of emission $\Omega_{\text{em}}$ is contained in the equilibrium recombination rates $R_{ij}^0$ of the transitions. As an up- or down-converter radiates into a solar cell, the étendue of emission depends on the density of optical
states that couple solar cell and frequency converter. This is usually given by the square of the minimum of the refractive indices between solar cell and IB material, but if optical coupling is mediated by resonant processes or near field coupling, the density of optical states, and with it the étendue of a particular transition can be enhanced by orders of magnitude [34].

This also means that the voltage matching condition that enables UC or DC of the incoming photon flux depends not only on the concentration of the incoming sunlight but also the optical density of states at the emission frequencies. As an illustrative example of the considerations we made above, we show results for the concentration-dependent additional photo-current that can be achieved in a CdTe solar cell if a symmetric sequential absorption UC is placed between the single junction CdTe solar cell and a back mirror (see Figure 4(a)). The étendue of up-converted emission is enhanced by the square of the refractive index of the UC material (as long as it is below the refractive index $n_{CdTe} = 3$), while the étendue of the emission below the solar cell bandgap is given by the emission étendue of the front surface of the cell as this emission exits through the front surface between solar cell and air. With a higher refractive index the UC therefore reaches its peak efficiency at lower concentration than with a lower refractive index.

A larger ratchet step leads to a high UC efficiency at low solar concentrations. At high solar concentrations, the UC flux is proportional to the incoming photon flux, i.e. the UC becomes a process linear in intensity. The smaller ratchet step only allows for small UC efficiency at low concentration, yet the UC efficiency rises with concentration. Ultimately, a higher photon flux can be reached at high concentration, compared to the larger ratchet step, as more of the below bandgap spectrum is absorbed by the UC.

For a DC placed in front of a silicon solar cell, a high refractive index is beneficial for two reasons. Firstly, it increases the fraction of emission that is directed towards the solar cell compared to the emission directed to air. In Figure 4(b), showing exemplary results for a silicon solar cell, we see that a sequential emission DC with a refractive index of $n = 1.5$ increases the photon flux hitting the solar cell only minimally compared to the incoming photon flux from the sun as too much is emitted out of the front of the cell. When the refractive index is increased, the photon flux on the solar cell can be increased compared to the incoming photon flux and the DC is useful. Varying the ratchet step from negative values (the intermediate states have a finite bandwidth and carriers relax to the bottom before emitting light again) through to positive values (endothermic emission processes combined with forbidden transitions) we see how the DC efficiency increases slightly as more of the spectrum is multiplied. When the ratchet step becomes too large the DC stops down-converting, i.e. the open circuit voltage in the DC now starts to favour luminescence from the upper transition and the DC efficiency drops drastically.

![FIG. 4. (a) The additional photon flux $F_{UC}$ onto a CdTe solar cell with $E_g = 1.55$ for a symmetric UC placed behind the cell with UC emission at $1.55eV$ and an absorption threshold of $E_1$. $F_{UC}$ is normalized to the incoming flux above $1.55eV$ $I_{sun}$. It therefore represents the potential for a relative increase in photocurrent. The inset shows the geometrical configuration. The étendue for the emission into the solar cell is given by the refractive index of the UC material, while the étendue for the emission below the bandgap of the solar cell is given by the étendue for emission out of the solar cell, where total internal reflection occurs for large angles. (b) The total photon flux $F_{DC}$ from a DC material onto a Si solar cell, normalized to the incoming photon flux from the sun above $1.12eV$ ($F_{Si}$) and plotted against the ratchet step $\Delta E$ in the DC ($E_{g} = 2E_1 - \Delta E$). The DC emission threshold $E_1$ is set to $1.2eV$ to match the onset of strong absorption in a typical Si solar cell and the emission bandwidth is set to a small energy interval of $kT$ to minimise the absorption by the DC. The inset shows the placement of the DC in front of the cell.](image-url)

These results also reveal the second reason why a higher refractive index can be beneficial for DC: the matching of the open circuit voltages is shifted towards higher concentration for a higher refractive index. This allows for a slightly larger ratchet step in the DC and therefore a higher current. It occurs, because in the DC, both the low-energy transitions and the high energy transitions emit into a higher étendue if the refractive index is increased, unlike in the UC, where only the above bandgap transitions emit into a higher étendue.

An additional consideration for photonic UC or DC
is the external luminescence extraction efficiency of the different transitions. For UC to be efficient, the CB to VB transition $\eta_{ext}$ has to be close to unity, else most of the carriers will be lost to non-radiative recombination. In contrast, some amount of non-radiative recombination in the IB can be balanced by an increased ratchet step without compromising the efficiency of the up-conversion process, although this will decrease the number of low energy photons that can be harnessed. In the DC case, the low-energy transitions must be radiatively efficient, else it is not possible to achieve the desired above unity external quantum efficiency for the high energy photons. A non-radiative high-energy transition can, however, be tolerated in a DC.

The considerations presented here also apply for molecular UC and DC via triplet-triplet annihilation or singlet fission in organic materials or UC and DC using Lanthanides. Specific consequences of exchanging sequential absorption for a Coulomb mediated interaction process are discussed in the following section with emphasis on direct injection instead of luminescent transport.

**B. Purely parallel solar cells**

The Carrier Multiplication (CM) solar cell and the Auger Assisted (AA) solar cell are distinguished in their principle of operation mainly by the placement of the contacts. In an AA cell, the contacts are placed at valence and conduction band, while the CM cell has to be contacted in the intermediate band and care has to be taken that the carriers in the CB can not simply reach the contacts without first relaxing to the IB via Coulomb mediated carrier multiplication. The AA cell is therefore a high voltage, low-current cell and the CM cell a low-voltage high-current cell. Figure 5 illustrates how a Coulomb mediated process enables carrier up-conversion and carrier multiplication and presents an equivalent circuit diagram that represents both devices. In the AA cell, the ratchet step represents carrier thermalization upon Auger recombination and a positive ratchet step results in an exothermic reaction of two carriers in the IB scattering into a carrier in the VB and CB, respectively, i.e. heat is supplied to the lattice upon Auger recombination. A positive ratchet step in the CM cell thus represents an endothermic reaction and the lattice has to provide heat to enable carrier multiplication [21].

One can switch from one cell type to the other by exchanging which transition is electrically contacted to and thus represented by the diode. The exact nature of the voltage dependent current source is discussed in the results that follow.

Both cells require strong Auger type carrier-carrier interactions in the intermediate band to function. Note that interactions that allow carriers to relax from the CB to the IB without Coulomb mediated multiplication lead to significantly less efficient carrier multiplication and can render the AA solar cell completely ineffective due to strongly enhanced non-radiative recombination.

The Auger process and its inverse, the impact ionization process, are depicted in Figure 5(c). The rate of the Auger process $r_A$ depends on the carrier carrier interaction matrix elements $M_{ijkl}$ between the initial intermediate states $i$ and $j$ and the final states $k$ and $l$ in valence and conduction band respectively, as well as their occupations $f_n$.

$$r_A = \sum_{ijkl} M_{ijkl} f_i f_j (1 - f_k)(1 - f_l).$$

Impact ionization, as the reverse process depends inversely on the occupation probabilities, resulting in

$$r_{II} = \sum_{ijkl} M_{ijkl} (1 - f_i)(1 - f_j) f_k f_l.$$

While the interaction matrix elements are given by Coulomb integrals over the electronic wavefunctions and are largely determined by the material itself, the occupations depend on external conditions like illumination and applied voltage. Therefore, we aggregate the sum over the matrix elements into an interaction strength.

Under solar illumination it is usually safe to assume quasi-equilibrium between states without energy gaps, as intraband carrier-carrier interaction and carrier-phonon interaction are much faster than interband and radiative processes. This allows us to re-write the occupation...
probabilities as
\[ f^{VB}_n = \frac{1}{e^{\mu n/V_B} + 1} \quad (15) \]
\[ f^{IB}_n = \frac{1}{e^{\mu n/V_B} + 1} \]
\[ f^{CB}_n = \frac{1}{e^{-\mu n/V_B} + 1}. \]

For simplicity, we assume that the bandwidth of the intermediate states is small compared to the gaps between the bands. As a consequence the energy difference between the two states in VB and CB that are connected by a Coulomb mediated interaction event is given approximately by \(2E_1 = E_g + dE\). Without restricting the validity of our results we set the energy of the carrier in the valence band to 0. Finally, we use the Boltzmann approximation for VB and CB occupations, which is valid under sunlight illumination away from full concentration, to obtain
\[ (1 - f^{VB}) \approx e^{-\mu n/V_B} \quad (16) \]
\[ f^{CB} \approx e^{-\mu n/V_B}. \]

We then write the Auger up-conversion and impact ionization rates as
\[ r_A = M\left(e^{\mu n/V_B} + e^{\mu I/V_C}\right)^{-2} e^{2\mu n - \mu V} \quad (17) \]
\[ r_{II} = M\left(e^{\mu n/V_B} + e^{\mu I/V_C}\right)^{-2} e^{\mu n/V_B}. \]

Note that the rates are equal if the sum of the chemical potentials (or Gibbs free energies) of the electrons in the initial states \(2\mu_I\) equals the sum of the chemical potentials of the electrons in the final states \(\mu_V + \mu_C\) as demanded by detailed balance.

In order to obtain a current-voltage relation we consider the metallic intermediate band case [35] in which the equilibrium Fermi-level of the material is in the intermediate band. This means that \(\mu_I\) is approximately fixed at \(E_1\) under illumination, so that we can replace \(\mu_I\) with \(E_1\) in equation (17).

The current voltage characteristic is then given by
\[ I^{AA,m} = G_{CV} + G_A - R_{CV} - R_A \quad (18) \]
\[ = G_{CV} - e^{\mu n/V} P_{CV} + \frac{M - E_1}{4} \left(e^{\mu n/V} - e^{\mu n/V} - e^{-\mu n/V} - \mu n/V\right), \]
for the AA cell and by
\[ I^{CM,m} = G_{VI} - 2G_A - R_{CV} + 2R_A \quad (19) \]
\[ = G_{VI} - e^{\mu n/V} P_{CV} + \frac{M - E_1}{2} \left(e^{\mu n/V} - e^{\mu n/V} - \mu n/V\right). \]
for the CM cell.

The power extracted from the device can be written as
\[ P^{AA} = I^{AA}V^{AA} = qI^{AA}\mu_{CV}, \quad (20) \]
for the AA cell and
\[ P^{CM} = I^{CM}V^{CM} = qI^{CM}\mu_{IV}, \quad (21) \]
for the CM cell.

We need to solve for the QFLS of the transition not electrically contacted to, i.e. not fixed by the applied voltage, as function of the voltage applied at the other transition, the Auger interaction rate \(G_A^0\), carrier generation rates \(G_{VI}\) and \(G_{VC}\) and recombination rates \(I_{CV}^0\) and \(R_{CV}^0\). The maximum power point in dependence of the absorption thresholds \(E_1\) and \(E_g\) and the Auger rate \(G_A^0\) can then be found through a numerical root finding algorithm. \(G_A^0\) depends on the intermediate state offset as \(e^{-2E_1/T}\) for the intrinsic case and as \(e^{-E_1/T}\) for the metallic IB case.

The limiting efficiencies for the AA and CM cell are obtained by assuming infinitely fast Auger interaction rates, in addition to the usual SQ assumptions of sharp band edges \(E_1\) for VB to IB and \(E_g\) for VB to CB transitions, infinite carrier mobility, absence of non-radiative recombination and unity absorptivities. Here, we look at the maximal efficiencies as function of a finite Auger interaction strength, keeping the other idealisations. In order to provide an intuition for the order of magnitude of the Auger interaction strengths and to provide a realistic bandgap dependence of the Auger interaction, we assume a semiconductor material that follows the Kane rule for the dependence of the electron effective mass on the bandgap
\[ m_e(E_g) = \frac{m_0}{1 + 20eV/E_g}. \quad (22) \]

We take a typical bulk semiconductor Auger interaction strength of \(10^{-30}\text{cm}^6/\text{s}\). The maximum power point for specific bandgap combinations can be obtained numerically by taking the derivative of the power towards the applied voltage. We show the maximal efficiencies, the ideal bandgaps, the relaxation step and the QFLSs at the operating point as a function of Auger interaction strengths in Figure 6 for both CM and AA solar cell with a metallic IB. In these plots the Auger rates are parametrized through the effective thickness of a bulk semiconductor which would deliver this Auger rate if it follows equation (22) for the IB effective density of states. Note that the limiting efficiency is only reached for unrealistically thick devices, corresponding to unrealistically fast Auger interaction rates in bulk semiconductors.

Usually, it is assumed that the CM solar cell can double the current only upwards from an energy above twice the fundamental bandgap. We need to thus explain how it is possible to have a positive ratchet step for the CM cell which leads to \(E_g < 2E_1\). Because it is indeed correct that individual carriers can only undergo impact ionization if they have twice the energy of the states in the IB,
it seems natural to assume that $E_g \geq E_1$. Nonetheless, this is not a necessary condition. Consider an Auger interaction rate that is infinitely fast, which is the assumption made to obtain the limiting efficiency. In that case any finite thermal carrier occupation at above bandgap states with $E = 2E_1$ is enough to obtain efficient carrier multiplication as the carriers in the above bandgap states can multiply by drawing thermal energy from the lattice. This is the semiconductor equivalent to an endothermic chemical reaction and it is preferable for high efficiency if the interaction rate is not the limiting factor since it leads to a higher current overall. The endothermic energy step is reduced when finite Auger interaction rates are considered and for slow Auger interaction, an exothermic process becomes necessary to efficiently drive carrier multiplication, as shown in 6(c). Experiments that find appreciable carrier multiplication only at excitation energies far above $2E_g$ [36, 37] probably suffer from a combination of slow Auger interaction rates and competing relaxation pathways.

We can clearly see from Figure 6(a) that the CM cell is more robust to slow Auger interaction, making it the more realistic to achieve compared to the semiconductor implementation of an AA cell, provided selective contacts that only allow the carriers in the IB states to flow to the contacts, not carriers in the CB. The best ratchet steps shown in Figure 6(c) show a logarithmic decrease of the ratchet step with the interaction rate for the CM device. This occurs because the driving force for the CM process, which is proportional to the quasi-Fermi-level of the conduction band states (see equation (17), gets stronger with decreasing ratchet step, which can compensate for the slower interaction rate. By symmetry, one could expect that the ideal ratchet step for the Auger device would increase to compensate for slower interaction rates, yet, this is not the case. A close look at equation 17 reveals that a larger ratchet step does not increase the net Auger up-conversion rate, and it is therefore not helpful to increase the ratchet step beyond the voltage matching requirement.

The QFLSs (see Figure 6(d)) at the operating point conform to the requirement that the Gibbs free energy created in the process of Auger up-conversion or carrier multiplication has to be positive in the respective schemes. The stronger the Auger interaction, the smaller the free energy differential that is necessary to drive the transitions efficiently.

Finally, in Figure 7 we present the typical IV curves of the two devices, together with the quasi-Fermi-level separations of the bands that are not contacted to. Clearly, the CM cell has a substantial quasi-Fermi-level separation between VB and CB $\mu_{CV}$, even at short circuit, which enables a doubling of the current obtained from photons with energy above the VB to CB bandgap $E_g$. This is necessary to efficiently drive the impact ionization process. The QFLS $\mu_{CV}$ of the device increases towards the operating point, where it meets the point of twice the applied voltage. Here, Auger recombination

![Figure 6](https://example.com/figure6.png)

**FIG. 6.** (a) Maximally achievable efficiencies, (b) best bandgaps, (c) best ratchet steps of AA (solid lines) and CM solar cells (dashed lines) as function of the effective Auger interaction thickness of the device. (d) The QFLSs of the individual transitions at the operating point. The lower of the transitions is multiplied by 2 to illustrate the loss in free energy upon carrier multiplication for the CM solar cell and upon Auger mediated up-conversion for the AA solar cell.
starts to dominate over carrier multiplication and carrier multiplication ceases to function. Increasing the ratchet step \( \Delta E \) from the ideal value moves this critical meeting point to lower voltages and therefore decreases the obtainable voltage. Decreasing the ratchet step, on the other hand, decreases the available current because the onset of carrier multiplication is moved upwards, reducing the amount of carriers that are multiplied.

Interpreting carrier multiplication as the voltage dependent current source in the equivalent circuit picture, we can conclude that this current source delivers a current that corresponds to approximately twice the photon flux above the higher bandgap. Yet, if the applied voltage becomes too high and the free energy balance of the impact ionization becomes negative and Auger recombination dominates instead, decreasing the output current.

The I-V curve of the AA solar cell Figure 8 shows a similar behaviour. Now the voltage dependent current source represents the low energy transition and it delivers a current that corresponds to half the incoming photon flux in its absorption range. At external short circuit condition, a QFLS is sustained between IB and VB. The Auger process works to increase the overall current, with no change in QFLS until the applied voltage becomes large enough to enable strong impact ionization. This impact ionization process maintains the QFLS between IB and VB at more than twice the voltage applied across the diode (VB to CB transition) as it counteracts the Coulomb mediated up-conversion of carriers.

For the ideal configuration, the operating point of the cell matches well with the point where the Gibbs free energy created in the Auger process becomes negligible. If the ratchet step is increased beyond the ideal value, the cell loses some of its current, while only marginally increasing voltage. If it is decreased, it loses voltage without increasing the current enough to compensate for the voltage loss.

These results illustrate the nature of AA and CM solar cells pertaining to the QFLSs in the device and the ratchet steps. One important aspect that we would like to emphasize is that any device with Auger type interaction to multiply or up-convert carriers must have a QFLS at short circuit. This should be observable in luminescence experiments, even at short circuit, with appreciable
luminescence from the high energy states in a CM solar cell and appreciable luminescence from the low energy states in a AA solar cell. At open circuit under solar illumination condition, luminescence should occur from both thresholds, if the material is applicable for parallel solar cells. Such measurements can be performed without contacting the device and can be used for efficient screening of potential materials.

C. Intermediate band solar cell

Despite considerable experimental efforts to realise the IBSC concept [38], the voltage losses of the IBSC compared to the corresponding single junction device, are usually very high and the concept of voltage recovery, with a voltage higher than the lowest absorption threshold has not yet been proven in experiment [39]. Furthermore, the three-color luminescence test proposed in [40] to prove the existence of two separate QFLSs has been passed only at low temperature [41].

The beneficial impact of a ratchet step in IBSCs has been discussed in a few previous publications [9, 42, 43]. In section II we have shown that a ratchet step is the consequence of étendue mismatch between absorption and emission and also possible non-radiative processes. Equation (9) does, however, match the open circuit voltages of the individual transitions. Yet, in an IBSC it is the operating voltage of the series connected IB transitions, connected in parallel to the VB to CB transitions, that needs to be optimised (see equivalent circuit diagram in Figure 9). The trade-off involved here leads to numerical values for the ratchet that differ from the value obtained from matching open circuit voltages.

We consider the asymmetric, sequential absorption IBSC, with three absorption thresholds, of which the two lower ones involve the IB. Due to the ratchet step the energies of the two lower absorption thresholds do not have to add up to the VB to CB bandgap, which allows for the freedom to match the internal voltages. Balancing generation and recombination rates for each band as shown in equations (10) and (11) we obtain the open circuit voltage as a function of generation rates, saturation currents and QFLSs

\[ V_{oc}^{Asym} = \frac{kT_e}{q} \left[ \ln(f) + \ln \left( \frac{G_{IC} - G_{V1} + R_0^0 f}{R_{CI}^0} \right) \right]. \]  

Here, \( f \) is the solution of a quadratic equation given by

\[ f = \frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4ac}}{2a} , \]  

with

\[ a = \frac{R_{CV}^0 R_{IV}^0}{R_{CI}^0} , \]

\[ b = \frac{G_{IC} - G_{V1}}{R_{CI}^0} R_{CV}^0 + R_{IV}^0 , \]

and

\[ c = G_{VC} + G_{VI} . \]

This equation for the open circuit voltage applies to any material system, where the recombination current of each transition can be approximated with ideality factor 1. In Figure 10 we nonetheless assume ideal transitions in order to compare the open circuit voltage of an ideal single junction solar cell with the open circuit voltage of an ideal IBSC with the same VB to CB bandgap. The ideal IBSC shows a higher open circuit voltage than the ideal single junction solar cell of the same voltage. Also, the ratchet step needed to recover the open circuit voltage of the single junction decreases considerably with concentration, as predicted in equation (9).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have categorized advanced concept solar cells into three categories: series, via luminescence and in parallel. Étendue mismatch and non-radiative recombination necessitate a degree of freedom in the combination of absorption thresholds that can be provided with a ratchet relaxation step. We quantify the ideal value for this ratchet step for photonic up- (UC) and down-conversion (DC) solar cells, Auger type solar cells with carrier multiplication (CM) or internal carrier up-conversion (AA) and sequential absorption intermediate band solar cells (IBSC).

For infinite Auger interaction rates, the two concepts yield the same limiting efficiency as they are completely symmetric to each other in this regime. Finite Auger interaction rates break the symmetry between the two concepts and we find that the CM solar cell is more robust to a slowdown of Auger interaction rates. The ideal ratchet step for the AA solar cell is largely unaffected by the Auger interaction rate, while it decreases sharply with slower interaction in the case of the CM solar cell. Plotting the QFLS of the non-contacted transition against
IBSCs require voltage matching through ratchets for their optimal functioning, especially in the presence of non-idealities. We showed that there is a difference between voltage matching at open circuit and voltage matching at the operating point of IBSCs. The latter being the important consideration.

Finally, the controlling QFLSs is important for efficient operation of any member of the parallel class of solar cell. The existence of multiple QFLSs in a candidate material should be confirmed with luminescence experiments.
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