Why does pyrite have a low photovoltage?
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Hypothesis I: metallic phase impurities

Pyrite always contains metallic FeS-type phase impurities, which somehow reduce the photovoltage.

Evidence for it:

- large bulk defect formation energies (DFT) suggest pyrite is FeS$_{2.00}$
- some calculations show sulfur-deficient phases form spontaneously
- TEM of pyrite films with S:Fe = 1.6 show amorphous regions

Evidence against it:

- pyrite solar cells show large photocurrents (high EQEs)
- TEM studies of single crystals show no phase or line defects
- the best pyrite films show S:Fe = 2.00 and no detectable impurities by XRD or magnetic susceptibility
- authors cherry pick the worst film preps (sol gel, sputter, spray pyro)

Conclusions?

Above a critical $S$ pressure, LPCVD films are stoichiometric (2.0), phase pure (by XRD), and free of pyrrhotite (magnetism).

Hypothesis II: intrinsic surface states

Intrinsic surface states (square pyramidal Fe) pin the Fermi level at the valence band edge, which somehow reduces the photovoltage.

Evidence for it:

- Inversion layer on $n$-type cleaved single crystal

\[ V_{bb} = 650 \text{ mV} \]

Nature of the alleged intrinsic states

d_{z2} and d_{xy} orbitals of 5-coordinate surface iron ions

- Semi-quantitative ligand field theory puts the states near the VBM. Some DFT studies (including ours) agree.
- Recent MIT results (PRB 83, 235311) show no states in gap
What is Fermi level pinning?

Fermi level pinning: When surface states of a semiconductor cause a fixed amount of band bending, independent of any metal or other contacting phase.

Schottky junction w/o pinning:

\[
W = \frac{2e_s}{qN_A} \left( V_{bi} - V - \frac{kT}{q} \right)
\]

\[
V_{bi} = V_{bb} = \phi_m - \phi_s
\]

*can maximize \( V_{bb} \) by using a metal with \( E_F \) close to VBM

What is Fermi level pinning?

Schottky junction with pinning:

\[ V_{bb} = E_{s.s.} - \phi_s \]

*\( V_{bb} \) doesn't depend on metal because surface states act like a metal (reservoir of carriers)

What is Fermi level pinning?

Schottky junction with pinning:

\[ E_{s.s.} = V_{bb} = E_{s.s.} - \phi_s \]

* \( V_{bb} \) doesn't depend on metal because surface states act like a metal

Consequences of Fermi level pinning

FL pinning controls the band bending and can be good or bad, depending on the energy of surface states and doping of SC.

Scheme II. Interface Energetics for an Ideal n-Type Semiconductor (Top) Contacting a Solution of A+/A or B+/B Showing Band Bending, $E_V$. Dependent on Position of $E_{\text{redox}}$ While $E_{VB}$ and $E_{CB}$ Are Fixed. Interface Energetics for an n-Type Semiconductor Exhibiting Fermi Level Pinning (Bottom), Where $E_V$ Is Independent of $E_{\text{redox}}$ While $E_{VB}$ and $E_{CB}$ Shift Relative to Solution Levels

Table I. Semiconductor/Metal Interface Barrier Heights: “Fermi Level Pinning” at Solid-State Junctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semiconductor</th>
<th>metal</th>
<th>$T$, K</th>
<th>barrier height, V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n-GaAs</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.95 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.94 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.87 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.88 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-GaAs</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.48 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.63 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-CdTe</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-InP</td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Au</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequences of Fermi level pinning

FL pinning controls the band bending and can be good or bad, depending on the energy of surface states and doping of SC.

Scheme II. Interface Energetics for an Ideal n-Type Semiconductor (Top) Contacting a Solution of A+/A or B+/B Showing Band Bending, $E_V$, Dependent on Position of $E_{\text{redox}}$ While $E_{VB}$ and $E_{CB}$ Are Fixed. Interface Energetics for an n-Type Semiconductor Exhibiting Fermi Level Pinning (Bottom), Where $E_V$ Is Independent of $E_{\text{redox}}$ While $E_{VB}$ and $E_{CB}$ Shift Relative to Solution Levels.

Table III. Semiconductor/Liquid Interfaces Where “Fermi Level Pinning” Applies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semiconductor</th>
<th>redox couple ($E^\circ$, V vs. SCE)</th>
<th>photovoltage, V</th>
<th>ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n-GaAs (1.35)</td>
<td>TMPD$^{4+}$/TMPD (0.1) 0.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-1$^+/$/Ox-1 (-0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ/BQ$^-$ (-0.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ/AQ$^-$ (-0.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(TPTZ)$_{23}^{3+/2+}$ (-0.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(TPTZ)$_{22}^{2+/+}$ (-0.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(TPTZ)$_{2+}$ (-1.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(TPTZ)$_{20}^{0/-}$ (-1.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{2+}$ (-1.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{3+}$ (-1.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{0/-}$ (-1.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA/DPA$^-$ (-1.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A$^-$/A$^+$ (-1.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p-GaAs (1.35) | TMPD$^{4+}$/TMPD (0.1) 0.02 | 0.12 | 32 |
| Ox-1$^+/$/Ox-1 (-0.42) | | 0.29 | |
| AQ/AQ$^-$ (-0.94) | | 0.29 | |
| Ru(TPTZ)$_{23}^{3+/2+}$ (-0.81) | | 0.44 | |
| Ru(TPTZ)$_{22}^{2+/+}$ (-0.97) | | 0.44 | |
| Ru(TPTZ)$_{2+}$ (-1.63) | | 0.56 | |
| Ru(TPTZ)$_{20}^{0/-}$ (-1.88) | | 0.61 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{2+}$ (-1.30) | | 0.58 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{3+}$ (-1.49) | | 0.64 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{0/-}$ (-1.73) | | 0.65 | |
| DPA/DPA$^-$ (-1.84) | | 0.25 | |
| A$^-$/A$^+$ (-1.94) | | 0.34 | |

p-Si (1.1) | PQ$^{2+}$/PQ$^+$(-0.45) | 0.39 | 38 |
| PQ$^+$/$PQ^0$ (-0.85) | | 0.42 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{2+}$ (-1.30) | | 0.42 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{3+}$ (-1.49) | | 0.42 | |
| Ru(bpy)$_{2}^{0/-}$ (-1.73) | | 0.38 | |
Band bending dictates maximum $V_{OC}$

The maximum open circuit voltage is equal to the amount of band bending (barrier height).

$I_{illumination}$ causes the bands to flatten. Largest $V_{OC}$ achieved when bands are flat.

$$\left( V_{OC} \right)_{\text{max}} = \left| V_{fb} - V_{\text{redox}} \right|$$

Pinning near the VBM should be helpful, giving a max voltage of \( \sim 650 \, \text{mV} \). Actual voltage 0-200 mV. Why?

- junction recombination is high (tunneling via s.s.?)
- surface states are actually within VB or CB

\[ \Delta E = 950 \, \text{meV} \]

\[ E_{\text{Vak}} \]

\[ \Phi_{\text{FB}} = 4.3 \, \text{eV} \]

\[ \Phi = 5.0 \, \text{eV} \]

\[ 200 \, \text{meV} \]

\[ E_{\text{F}} \]

\[ E_{\text{C}} \]

\[ E_{\text{V}} \]

\[ eV_{bb} = 650 \, \text{meV} \]

Pinning cannot by itself explain pyrite’s low voltage.

- Both should result in large reverse saturation current, low \( V_{\text{OC}} \).
Pinning + tunneling $\rightarrow$ low voltage

- Fermi level is pinned at VBM
- Large density of mid-gap bulk states (sulfur vacancies) allows tunneling through steep triangular barrier at surface

Tunneled barrier is lost voltage. Note that “bulk” defects could instead be a high concentration of vacancies in surface region.

Schottky junction J-V curves

Forward bias (a)

Reverse bias (b)

Current dominated by electron flow from the metal to the semiconductor

Current dominated by electron flow from the semiconductor to the metal
Reverse saturation current and $V_{OC}$

**Dark:**

$$J = J_S \left[ \exp \left( \frac{eV}{nkT} \right) - 1 \right]$$

**Light:**

$$J = J_S \left[ \exp \left( \frac{eV}{nkT} \right) - 1 \right] - J_L \quad \rightarrow \quad V_{OC} = \frac{nkT}{e} \ln \left( \frac{J_L}{J_S} + 1 \right)$$

Larger $J_S \rightarrow$ smaller $V_{OC}$
STM evidence for gap states

UHV cleaved natural crystal

- 0.14 V

100 nm

1 nm

- 0.14 V

+ 0.14 V

• Fe is both HOMO and LUMO
• surface gap is < 40 meV wide
• surface DOS seems continuous
• STM was “extremely difficult” → question robustness of results

Could also be explained by metallic inversion layer

Surface states above the CBM or below the VBM can pin the Fermi level within a band, resulting in a metallic surface and small $V_{OC}$.

Results in large dark current and minimal $V_{OC}$.
Systems studied in the past

- $n$-type crystals cleaved in vacuum
- $n$-type crystals with Pt, Au, and Nb Schottky contacts (<300 mV)
- $n$-type crystals in contact with redox electrolytes (< 200 mV)

No photovoltages reported using $p$-type crystals!
Emerging picture

• Pyrite is a stoichiometric compound. Native defects \((V_S, V_{Fe}, \text{etc.})\) occur at less than 0.1-1% in the bulk.

• Native defects form more easily near the surface than in the bulk. Surface region may have a large defect density.

• Surface band gap is smaller than bulk band gap by at least 0.3 eV due to intrinsic and extrinsic surface states. Gap may even close for certain compositions. This is Hypothesis III: extrinsic defects

• Fermi level is pinned by surface states.
  o pinning in gap + tunneling through steep potential barrier can explain consistently low \(V_{OC}\)
  o pinning out of gap can be itself account for low \(V_{OC}\)
The way forward

If the pyrite surface is such a mess, just bury it.

Rapid thermal anneal:
- e.g., $\text{ZnS}$, $\text{CdS}$, $\text{ZnO}$, $\text{TiO}_2$
- interlayer (e.g., $\text{Zn}_x\text{Fe}_{1-x}\text{S}_2$)
  - eliminate defects and gap states
  - grade the band gap
  - form p-n junction
Pyrite-sensitized photoelectrochemical cells

Precedent for TiO₂/FeS₂

\[ 0.5M / 0.5M [\text{Fe(CN)}₆]^{3-/4-} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Energy (eV vs. vacuum)} & \quad \text{Potential (V vs. SCE)} \\
-4.5 & \quad -0.4 \\
-5 & \quad -0.2 \\
-5.5 & \quad 0.4 \\
3.2 \text{ eV} & \quad 0.6 \\
\text{E(O/R)} & \quad \text{Electrolyte}
\end{align*}

in acid: \( J_{SC} = 6 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}, V_{OC} = 350 \text{ mV}, 1\% \)
in base: \( J_{SC} = 0.09 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}, V_{OC} = 600 \text{ mV} \)

Otherwise, window layers have never been tried before

Focus of 2nd year effort: p-n junctions

- I-V measurements
- Chemical analysis (UPS, SIMS)
- DFT calculations
New collaborations:

• Wilson Ho (UCI): STM measurements on single crystals

• Sukgeun Choi (NREL): spectroscopic ellipsometry

• Craig Perkins (NREL): Auger microscopy, UPS, and SIMS

END