
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Malitckaya, Maria; Komsa, Hannu Pekka; Havu, Ville; Puska, Martti J.

First-Principles Modeling of Point Defects and Complexes in Thin-Film Solar-Cell Absorber CuInSe₂

Published in:
Advanced Electronic Materials

DOI:
[10.1002/aelm.201600353](https://doi.org/10.1002/aelm.201600353)

Published: 01/06/2017

Document Version
Peer-reviewed accepted author manuscript, also known as Final accepted manuscript or Post-print

Please cite the original version:
Malitckaya, M., Komsa, H. P., Havu, V., & Puska, M. J. (2017). First-Principles Modeling of Point Defects and Complexes in Thin-Film Solar-Cell Absorber CuInSe₂. *Advanced Electronic Materials*, 3(6), 1-9. Article 1600353. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aelm.201600353>

This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

1
2
3
4 **First-principles modelling of point defects and complexes in thin-film solar-cell absorber**
5 **CuInSe₂**
6

7
8
9 *Maria Malitckaya, Hannu-Pekka Komsa, Ville Havu, Martti J. Puska**

10 Maria Fedina 1, Dr. Hannu-Pekka Komsa 1, Dr. Ville Havu 1, Prof. Martti J. Puska 1

11 Department of Applied Physics, Aalto University, P.O. Box 11000, Espoo, Finland.

12
13
14 E-mail: martti.puska@aalto.fi

15
16
17 Keywords: CuInSe₂, solar cell, native point defects, density functional theory
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 12/8/2016

25 Point defects and complexes may affect significantly physical, optical, and electrical properties
26 of semiconductors. The Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ (CIGSe) alloy is an absorber material for low-cost thin-
27 film solar cells. Several recently published computational investigations show contradicting
28 results for important point defects such as copper antisite substituting indium (Cu_{In}), indium
29 vacancy (V_{In}), and complexes of point defects in CuInSe₂. In the present work we study effects
30 of the most important computational parameters especially on the formation energies of point
31 defects. Moreover, related to defect identification by the help of their calculated properties we
32 discuss possible explanations for the three acceptors, which occur in photoluminescence
33 measurements of Cu-rich samples. [S. Siebentritt *et al.*, Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and
34 Applications **2010**, 18, 390, S. Siebentritt *et al.*, physica status solidi (c) **2004**, 1, 2304.] Finally,
35 new insight into comparison between theoretical and experimental results is presented in the case
36 of varying chemical potentials and of formation of secondary phases.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and can thus also provide information about the defect level positions within the band gap. ^{[9, 10, 11,}
5
6 ^{12, 13]} The results of different calculations agree well with respect to general trends in formation
7
8 energies of the most important defects, such as the copper vacancy (V_{Cu}), indium antisite on copper
9
10 place (In_{Cu}), and copper interstitial (Cu_{int}). However, the results differ in some important cases. For
11
12 instance, there are clearly different values for the ionization levels within the band gap for the
13
14 copper antisite on the indium place (Cu_{In}) and indium vacancy (V_{In}). Based on the formation energy
15
16 calculations, V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} are abundant acceptors, and are most probably responsible for some of
17
18 the above-mentioned PL peaks, but it is unclear whether any native defect can be responsible for
19
20 the third acceptor level.
21
22
23
24

25
26 One important goal of the present work was to gain a perspective on the present unsatisfactory
27
28 situation in modelling point defects in CIGSe and to approach the ultimate accuracy by which DFT
29
30 is able to predict the properties of bulk crystalline materials. ^[14] First we carried out a detailed
31
32 benchmarking of the first-principles computational scheme used. We checked effects due to the
33
34 supercell size and shape, as well as those of the finite-size supercell correction scheme. We used
35
36 also two very different implementations of the first-principles DFT method, which differ in
37
38 describing valence-core electron interaction and electron wave functions (see below). After finding
39
40 the computational parameters yielding accurate results, we calculated formation energies and
41
42 charge transition levels for different acceptor candidates in CuInSe_2 . By carefully considering the
43
44 relevant chemical potential limits, we were able to draw conclusions about the abundances of
45
46 different defects. In addition to simple native defects, we have also considered a set of complexes
47
48 formed by them. Our paper is organized as follows. Computational parameters and methods are
49
50 described in Sec. II. In Sec. III we discuss the chemical potential limits and present a detailed
51
52 benchmarking related to the supercell size and shape. Our results for defect formation energies are
53
54 presented in Sec. IV. Finally, in Sec. V we discuss which defects could be abundant acceptors on
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

The chalcopyrite $\text{Cu}(\text{In,Ga})\text{Se}_2$ (CIGSe) alloy is a promising candidate for low-cost flexible thin-film photovoltaic solar cells. Efficiencies of solar cells using CIGSe as the light absorber are steadily increasing thanks to detailed investigation of device parameters. ^[1, 2, 3] The defect microstructure influences optical and electronic properties of the absorber material. Understanding its evolution during the manufacturing and during the solar cell operation is impossible without knowledge of the fundamental parameters of point defects in CIGSe or eventually in its parent materials CuInSe_2 and CuGaSe_2 .

Experimentally, valuable information on point defects in semiconductors can be obtained especially from photoluminescence (PL) measurements or Hall measurements. Composition-dependent PL measurements and Hall measurements have been performed on chalcopyrite CIGSe by Siebentritt *et al.* ^[4, 5] For example, close to the stoichiometric compound, PL measurements showed three acceptor levels with ionization energies of 40 meV, 60 meV, and 100 meV above the valence band maximum (VBM) and one donor level 10 meV below the conduction band minimum (CBM). ^[4] The intensities of these three peaks vary, as the composition of the sample changes from Cu-rich to Cu-poor, so that in the Cu-poor samples only one peak is detected. Although only the Cu-poor material is important for actual devices Cu-rich samples give indispensable information for defect identification.

First-principles calculations based on the density functional theory (DFT) can be used to obtain important, complementary information about point defects such as formation energies and charge transition levels. ^[6] A plethora of studies concerning defects in CuInSe_2 and CuGaSe_2 has been published over the last two decades. ^[7-13] The most recent DFT investigations have employed hybrid functionals, which can overcome the energy band gap problem plaguing the older studies

1
2
3
4 the basis of our first-principles results and compare our findings with the above-mentioned PL
5
6 spectra.
7
8
9

10 **2. Computational methods**

11
12
13 Most of the calculations of this work were carried out in the framework of DFT with the
14 VASP program package ^[15, 16] based on the projector-augmented wave (PAW) method ^[17] and the
15 use of the plane-wave basis set. In our calculations the plane-wave cutoff energy was 455 eV which
16 was determined by a convergence test for the total energy of pristine CuInSe₂. In order to improve
17 electronic and atomic structures and to get a realistic energy band gap necessary for formation
18 energy calculations, we used the hybrid exchange-correlation functional HSE06 (Heyd-Scuseria-
19 Ernzerhof). ^[18] We used the default parameters for the portion of the Hartree-Fock exchange
20 ($\alpha=0.25$) and for the inverse screening length $\omega=0.20 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, in order to have an unbiased comparison
21 with previously published results obtained by different tunings of the α and ω parameters for
22 reproducing the experimental CuInSe₂ band gap. Relaxation of ionic positions were continued until
23 forces on each atom fell below 0.01 eV/Å. The ensuing structural parameters for the bulk CuInSe₂
24 show good agreement with the experimental results and the band gap is in line with previous
25 theoretical results; see Table 1 for comparison.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We modeled point defects by using a large number of different supercell sizes and shapes (see
47 Results section). The defect formation energy E_f is defined as ^[6,21]
48
49
50

$$51 \quad E_f = E_{tot}^{defect} - E_{tot}^{bulk} - \sum_i n_i \mu_i + q E_F + E_{corr}, \quad (1)$$

52 where E_{tot}^{defect} is the total energy of the supercell containing the defect, E_{tot}^{bulk} the total energy of
53 the bulk supercell, μ_i the chemical potential of the atom of type i , n_i the number of added atoms
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 when creating the defect in the supercell, q the charge state of the defect, and E_F is the Fermi level
5
6 measured from the VBM.
7

8
9 E_{corr} is an energy correction term accounting for the errors due to the finite size of the supercell.
10
11 These errors arise mainly from the electrostatic interaction of a charged defect with its periodic
12 images and with the neutralizing background charge. ^[22] Other sources of errors are the elastic
13 interactions between the defect and its periodic images. Various correction schemes have been
14 proposed for the electrostatic finite-size error correction for charged defects, e.g., those by Makov
15 and Payne (MP), ^[23] Lany and Zunger (LZ), ^[24] and by Freysoldt, Neugebauer, and Van de Walle
16 (FNV). ^[25] The MP method is not suitable if the defect state is not well localized. ^[23] In contrast,
17 the FNV scheme is general so that it can be easily applied to systems with any supercell shapes
18 and even when the dielectric tensor is anisotropic, which is the case for CuInSe₂. To this end, the
19 FNV scheme was mainly used in the present article, but we also compare its results to those of the
20 LZ scheme in the case of the tetragonal supercell.
21
22

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 In all of these correction schemes, dielectric constants of the host materials are required to
37 evaluate, how the interactions between charges are screened. Our values, calculated using the
38 HSE06 functional, are presented in Table 2. Since CuInSe₂ is tetragonal, the dielectric constants
39 along the a and c directions differ slightly. Our values are in a good agreement with experimental
40 values of 11.3^[26] and 13.6. ^[27] The potential alignment term of the FNV correction is determined
41 along the c -direction and thus a static dielectric constant of 11.15 is used.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Finally, when considering complexes of point defects the binding energy E_b of a defect complex
53
54 AB is defined as

$$E_b^{AB} = E_f^{AB} - (E_f^A + E_f^B), \quad (2)$$

1
2
3
4 where E_f^A , E_f^B , and E_f^{AB} are the formation energies of the defects A and B and that of the complex
5
6 AB, respectively, and they have to be calculated for the same values of the Fermi-level and the
7
8 chemical potentials.
9

10 11 12 **3. Point defects**

13 14 15 16 **3.1 Chemical potential stability diagram**

17
18 From the thermodynamic point of view, the phase stability diagram determines the regions of the
19
20 chemical potentials, where a particular compound will be stable. In case of CuInSe_2 , the chemical
21
22 potential diagram is based on the formation enthalpies $\Delta H_f(\text{X})$ of different binary and ternary
23
24 compounds (X). Their values, based on the PBE and HSE06 calculations for all of the considered
25
26 phases, are presented in Table 3 together with the respective experimental values. Further
27
28 computational details are given in Appendix A.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Using the formation enthalpies, the stability diagram for CuInSe_2 can be constructed by
37
38 determining the lowest energy phase at the given chemical potential values. The resulting stability
39
40 diagram for the copper-indium-selenium system is shown in Figure 1. The chemical potentials are
41
42 given in the form $\mu_i = \mu_i^0 + \Delta\mu_i$, where $\Delta\mu_i$ is the deviation from the chemical potential in the stable
43
44 elemental phase (μ_i^0). When using this definition it is required, in order to avoid precipitation of
45
46 elemental phases, that $\Delta\mu_i \leq 0$. Within the diagram region where CuInSe_2 is the most stable phase,
47
48 the chemical potentials satisfy
49
50
51

$$52 \mu_{\text{Cu}} + \mu_{\text{In}} + 2\mu_{\text{Se}} = \Delta H_f(\text{CuInSe}_2). \quad (3)$$

53
54 We note that the stability diagram is strictly speaking valid only under the thermodynamic
55
56 equilibrium.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Chemical potential diagrams for CuInSe₂ have been presented in many previous articles. [24, 7, 9,
5
6 ^{11, 13]} Generally, they agree qualitatively, but in some cases the CuInSe₂ stability regions may differ
7
8 remarkably from the other results, even among those calculated using the HSE06 functional. Our
9
10 phase stability diagram is close to that calculated by Yee *et al.* [13] and also to those presented by
11
12 Pohl and Albe [9], Huang *et al.* [12] or Kim *et al.* [30] Due to a differing CuInSe₂ heat of formation,
13
14 the chemical potential diagram by Bekaert *et al.* [11] has a noticeably bigger stability region than
15
16 that in the present work.
17
18
19
20

21 3.2 Supercell shape and size

22
23
24 We first focus on describing the effect of the chalcopyrite supercell shape and size used in
25
26 the calculations. Supercells constructed both from the 16-atom tetragonal unit cell [lattice vectors
27
28 $(a,0,0)$, $(0,a,0)$, and $(0,0,c)$, $c \approx 2a$] [9,12,13] and from the 8-atom triclinic primitive cell [lattice vectors
29
30 $(a,0,0)$, $(0,a,0)$, and $d=(a/2,a/2,c)$, $c \approx a$, $|d| \approx 1.22a$] have been employed in the previous studies. [11,
31
32
33
34 ^{10]} Various possible supercells with their properties are listed in Table 4.
35
36
37

38 According to Oikkonen *et al.*, even the 32-atom supercell is sufficient for obtaining converged
39
40 formation energies for neutral defects. [10] On the other hand, in the case of charged defects,
41
42 spurious interactions between a defect and its images converge extremely slowly as a function of
43
44 the supercell size. However, these errors can be corrected by using finite-size correction schemes.
45
46 To illustrate the magnitude of these errors, the uncorrected and the FNV corrected formation
47
48 energies for the the unrelaxed $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}^{-2}$ defect are shown in Figure 2. Here, an unrelaxed defect was
49
50 considered in order to study only the effects of electrostatic interactions between the defect and its
51
52 periodic images and to avoid other interactions arising, e.g, from long-range strain fields. In order
53
54 to access also large supercell sizes, a smaller plane-wave cutoff energy of 300 eV was used. Both
55
56 tetragonal and triclinic supercells were adopted. Since the supercells are of different shape, we
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 cannot perform a straightforward extrapolation to the limit of the infinite supercell volume.
5
6 However, it is clear from the figure that the uncorrected formation energies undergo large
7
8 variations, whereas the corrected ones are nearly independent on the supercell size. Moreover, the
9
10 uncorrected energies approach the corrected ones from below, as expected for localized charges in
11
12 supercells reasonably close to the cubic shape. ^[22]
13
14
15

16
17 Next, as a more realistic test case we show in Figure 3 the formation energy diagram for the
18
19 relaxed Cu_{In} antisite calculated using different supercells and the FNV correction. Here, in order
20
21 to show the performance of even larger supercells, results for the 432-atom supercell are included.
22
23 They are calculated using the FHI-aims code^[31] and employing the HSE06 functional. FHI-aims is
24
25 an all-electron code in which electron wavefunctions are presented in the efficient basis of
26
27 numerical atomic orbitals and in which the accuracy can be systematically improved by extending
28
29 the basis set. ^[31] Thus, performing calculations by FHI-aims allows us also to verify whether the
30
31 results depend on the basis set or the description of the core states. According to Figure 3 the
32
33 absolute values of the formation energies and, consequently, also the charge transition levels, show
34
35 only minor variations for supercells larger than 64 atoms, irrespective on the electronic-structure
36
37 method used. It has been found that the 64-atom supercell cannot correctly accommodate localized
38
39 states in the band gap near the band edges. ^[9] This may be the main reason for the deviation of the
40
41 64-atom supercell results from the other, better-converged ones in Figure 3. In contrast, it is
42
43 gratifying to note that the 128-atom supercell performs well in spite of its highly rectangular shape
44
45 with 90 degree angles (See Table 4). The reason is that the defect charge - neutralizing background
46
47 charge interaction has decreased between the 64- and 128-atom supercells in addition to the
48
49 increase of the defect-defect distance along the c-direction of the lattice.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In previous investigations, the LZ scheme has often been adopted for the finite-size correction.
5
6 In Figure 4, different correction schemes are compared. Since the LZ scheme is difficult to use for
7
8 arbitrary supercell shapes, we carried out these calculations for the tetragonal 64-atom supercell.
9
10 As already found out in previous studies,^[22] the LZ scheme tends to yield smaller corrections than
11
12 the FNV scheme. However, in the present case, the corrected results are rather similar.
13
14

15
16 In conclusion, the FNV and LZ schemes give similar results when the defect charge is well-
17
18 localized within the supercell. The FNV scheme can be easily applied for arbitrary supercell shapes
19
20 allowing the use of the smallest supercells fulfilling this requirement. This may be crucial for
21
22 obtaining adequate results in the case of several charged defects.
23
24

25 26 **4. Defect formation energies** 27

28
29
30 On the basis of the benchmarks in the previous section, we adopted the 128-atom supercell and
31
32 the 2x2x1 k-point set for all further defect calculations. The high-efficiency Cu-poor CIGSe
33
34 absorbers are prepared under a selenium-rich atmosphere.^[32] The experimental conditions
35
36 correspond to the boundary between the CuInSe₂ and Se stability regions in the stability diagram
37
38 (Figure 1). Therefore, point M in Figure 1 was chosen for the chemical potentials when calculating
39
40 the defect formation energies. This corresponds to $\Delta\mu_{Cu} = -0.5$ eV and $\Delta\mu_m = -0.87$ eV. The resulting
41
42 formation energies are shown in Figure 5 for all the simple low-formation-energy point defects
43
44 considered in this work as a function of the Fermi level. The numerical data on the formation
45
46 energies at the same chemical potential conditions and the Fermi level at the VBM are listed in
47
48 Table 5 for all relevant charge states. Defects which have in the formation energy plots a negative
49
50 charge at the VBM are shallow acceptors and defects becoming negative slightly above the VBM
51
52 are deeper acceptors.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Our results for the formation energies, when evaluated at the same chemical potentials, are in
5
6 close agreement with those calculated by Yee *et al.*^[13] and Pohl and Albe.^[9] Especially, we also
7
8 found two charge transition levels within the band gap for Cu_{In} and two acceptor levels for V_{In}.
9
10 The small shifts in the transition levels between different works can be explained by different
11
12 supercell sizes and different finite-size correction schemes used. Furthermore, our calculated
13
14 energy band gap is about 0.1 eV smaller than the experimental one (1.04 eV, Table 1). In some
15
16 works, the parameters α and ω of the HSE06 functional have been tuned to yield a band gap closer
17
18 to the experiment. This will naturally result in small shifts in the transition level positions with
19
20 respect to the band edges, but the effect on the formation energies is very small.^[33] Oikkonen *et*
21
22 *al.*^[10] and Bekaert *et al.*^[11] did not report on transition levels for Cu_{In} and V_{In} at all, in contrast to
23
24 our results and to those by Yee *et al.*^[13], by Huang *et al.*^[12], as well as to those by Pohl and Albe
25
26 ^[9]. In comparison with other results, those by Huang *et al.*^[12] showed the strongest tendency toward
27
28 deep states inside the band gap, which may reflect the largest Hartree-Fock exchange fraction of
29
30 30% used in their HSE06 functional calculations. Increasing this fraction results in more localized
31
32 single-electron states. According to our defect formation energies, Cu-rich and Se-rich material
33
34 will be p-type with the the most important acceptors being V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} and the most important
35
36 donors being Cu_{int} and In_{Cu}. Cu_{In} is predicted to be a deeper acceptor than V_{Cu} because its transition
37
38 level from the neutral to the singly negative state is inside the band gap. However, we should bear
39
40 in mind that the accuracy of first-principles calculations for the transition levels is of the order of
41
42 0.1 eV. The conclusion about the most abundant acceptors and donors is in agreement with the
43
44 results by Lany *et al.*,^[24] by Pohl and Albe,^[9] by Huang *et al.*,^[12] and Yee *et al.*,^[13] as well as
45
46 with those by Oikkonen *et al.*^[10] Due to the above-mentioned larger CuInSe₂ stability
47
48 region, Bekaert *et al.*^[11] found also V_{In} as an abundant acceptor.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

5 Acceptor candidates

5.1 Point defects

The formation energies and hence the concentrations of the native defects depend strongly on the chemical potentials used in the calculations. Experimentally this is manifested by the different numbers of PL peaks seen in Cu-poor and Cu-rich samples. To find out which of the native defects are likely to form at sufficiently large concentrations to be visible in PL measurements, we calculated the formation energies at chemical potential values relevant to the experimental conditions.

The line in Figure 6 shows the chemical potential values considered. Point A corresponds to extremely Cu-rich material and point F to extremely Cu-poor material. Due to the Se excess in a typical CuInSe₂ growth, we consider conditions close to the Se phase boundary. When growing stoichiometric or Cu-rich CuInSe₂ one has to increase the copper concentration and then remove Cu₂Se precipitates from the alloy.^[34] This experimental condition can be associated with the Cu₂Se stability region in Figure 6. On the other hand, high-quality solar cell absorber material is often Cu-poor.^[35] Moreover, a larger Cu deficiency is observed at grain surfaces, where the material can start forming so-called ordered defect compounds (ODC). Point E is taken to model such conditions.

Formation energies, corresponding to the above-defined range of chemical potentials, are presented in Figure 7 for the most important point defects, as a function of the In chemical potential. The solid and dashed lines in the figure correspond to the acceptor and donor defects, respectively. Even throughout this extended range of chemical potentials V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} are the acceptors of the lowest formation energies, irrespective of the Fermi-level position. Especially, for

1
2
3
4 p-type material (E_F at the VBM) there are no other acceptors with competitive formation energies.
5
6 Accounting also for the donors, the Cu-rich region between points A and B is characterized by a
7
8 large concentration of Cu_{In} and Cu_{int} defects, and the Cu-poor region between points E and F by
9
10 that of V_{Cu} and In_{Cu} defects.
11

12
13
14 Within the Cu-rich region between points A and B and for n-type doped samples, the formation
15
16 energy of the acceptor-type V_{In} is low and close to that of V_{Cu} . However, the other two abundant
17
18 defects, V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} , are also acceptors and thus n-type doping under these conditions is unlike.
19
20 Indeed, while highly Cu-poor samples were found to be n-type due to the formation of In_{Cu} defects,
21
22 stoichiometric and Cu-rich samples were p-type.^[36] It is remarkable that in the p-type material
23
24 (Figure 7 a) both of the correlated defects, Cu_{int} and V_{Cu} , are among those of the lowest formation
25
26 energies even in Cu-rich material. This reflects the weak Cu-Se bonds^[8] and the small ionic radius
27
28 of the Cu ion. Moreover, because Cu_{In} is neutral when the Fermi level is close to the VBM and the
29
30 formation energy of In_{Cu} is high in the In-poor material, Cu_{int} and V_{Cu} form a correlated pair also
31
32 due to charge neutralization. Naturally, the formation of the Cu_{In} and Cu_{int} defects in large
33
34 quantities will eventually lead to the precipitation of CuSe and Cu_2Se .
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In summary, based on our formation energy studies the native point defects considered so far
42
43 can undoubtedly account for only two acceptor defects, V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} . To extend our search, we
44
45 next investigate several defect complexes.
46
47

48 **5.2 Defect complexes**

49
50
51 Point defects in CuInSe_2 can form different complexes. Complexes comprising copper vacancies,
52
53 such as $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$, $\text{V}_{\text{Se}}-\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$, $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$, and the antisite-related defect $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-\text{Cu}_{\text{In}}$, have been
54
55 considered in the literature.^[9, 10, 37] The complex $\text{V}_{\text{Se}}-\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$ was suggested to explain an observed
56
57 metastability.^[8] The $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$ complex is important because it will be abundant in Cu-poor p-
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 type material and it is suggested to be the basic building block in the ODCs. [37] However, the
5
6 binding energies calculated by Pohl and Albe indicate fairly weak bonding. [9] Moreover, $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$
7
8 is neutral and $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}-\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$ singly positive for all the Fermi level positions in the band gap so that they
9
10 cannot act as acceptors. The formation energy of the neutral V_{Se} is relatively high (Figure 5) so that
11
12 $\text{V}_{\text{Se}}-\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$ is not expected to be abundant in Se-rich growth conditions.
13
14

15
16 The most stable complexes should be made up of both acceptors and donors feeling a strong
17
18 Coulomb attraction. Moreover, complexes that could behave as acceptors obviously require
19
20 acceptor(s) of a (total) charge negative enough so that it is not compensated by the positive charge
21
22 contributed by the donor(s). This is also the reason why we have not considered, in spite of the low
23
24 formation energy, $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}^{+2}$ as a part of a complex. $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}^{+2}$ would require several native point defect
25
26 acceptors in order to make a complex into an acceptor. Because defect complexes are formed by
27
28 aggregation of native defects the abundance of the constituent native defects is crucial for the
29
30 abundance of a defect complex. Thus, we chose to study the complexes $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$, $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-\text{V}_{\text{In}}$, and
31
32 $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-\text{Cu}_{\text{In}}$. Their binding energies are listed in Table 6.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 As discussed above, the concentrations of $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}^{+}$ and V_{Cu}^{-} are high in p-type Cu-rich material.
40
41 Thus, during the growth process their agglomeration to complexes is expected to be very probable.
42
43 For example, $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}^{+}$ can be coupled with two V_{Cu}^{-} vacancies to form the acceptor complex (Cu_{int}
44
45 -2V_{Cu}). Its binding energy is minimized when $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}^{+}$ locates between the two V_{Cu}^{-} vacancies
46
47 giving $E_b = -0.36$ eV for all the Fermi level positions in the band gap (the complex and its
48
49 constituents have only one charge state, Figures 5 and 8). This is not a strongly bound complex, but
50
51 taking into account the abundance of its constituents its existence is plausible.
52
53
54
55
56

57 We have also considered the complex $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-\text{V}_{\text{In}}$, because, although the formation energy of V_{In}
58
59 is relatively high, it is anyway lowered toward Cu-rich - In-poor material, especially if the material
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 becomes less p-type. Because the charge state of V_{In} varies from -1 to -3 when the Fermi level rises
5
6 in the band gap the complex may act as an acceptor, when V_{In} is in the -2 or -3 charge state. The
7
8 nearest-neighbor configuration is impossible for this complex, because the copper interstitial fills
9
10 easily the vacant indium place and produces an antisite. However, the second nearest-neighbor
11
12 configuration is rather strongly bound with $E_b = -0.65, -0.65, \text{ and } -0.91$ eV for the 0, -1, and -2
13
14 charge state, respectively, and for the Fermi level at the beginning of the stability region of each
15
16 charge state. The -1 charge state will become stable when the Fermi level rises 0.1 eV above the
17
18 VBM indicating a rather shallow acceptor character. As the point defect V_{In} has three possible
19
20 charge states in the band gap (Figure 5), complexes comprising V_{In} also have three charge states
21
22 (Figure 8). However, the positions of the corresponding transition levels are not the same. Due to
23
24 the high binding energy of the -1 charge state, the transition level (0/-1) has shifted toward the
25
26 VBM and the (-1/-2) transition level toward the CBM in comparison with the transition levels (-
27
28 1/-2) and (-2/-3) for V_{In} , respectively.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 A possible candidate for an abundant acceptor is also $Cu_{int}-Cu_{In}$. This complex will be stable in
37
38 Cu-rich conditions. Also its charge state varies as a function of the Fermi level in the band gap
39
40 (Figure 8). When the Fermi level is close to the VBM, this complex is stable in the +1 charge state
41
42 with a binding energy of -0.33 eV. The complex $(Cu_{int}-Cu_{In})$ has a binding energy of -0.33 eV and
43
44 it is stable for E_F in the middle of the band gap. In n-type materials, when E_F is close to the CBM,
45
46 the acceptor defect $(Cu_{int}-Cu_{In})^{-1}$ will be stable with the lowest binding energy of -0.70 eV. The
47
48 transition levels of $Cu_{int}-Cu_{In}$ are shifted relatively to those of Cu_{In} (Figure 8). Notice, that the shift
49
50 of the transition level is larger when the difference between the binding energies of the two charge
51
52 states is larger.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In summary, from all the defect complexes considered, $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-}2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$, $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-V}_{\text{In}}$, and $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-Cu}_{\text{In}}$
5
6 could act as acceptors. However, the predicted binding of $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-}2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}$ is relatively weak. The
7
8 relatively high formation energy of V_{In} lowers its abundance as well as that of $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-V}_{\text{In}}$. The
9
10 complex $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}\text{-Cu}_{\text{In}}$ could act as an acceptor only in n-type material. These notions shed some
11
12 doubts on the importance of only native defect complexes as acceptors in CuInSe_2 . Finally, the
13
14 thermal equilibrium concept and the use of defect formation energies are doubtful for determining
15
16 complex abundances. Therefore a conclusive study would also require the study of the kinetics of
17
18 the native point defects which is beyond the scope of the present study.
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 **6. Conclusions**

26
27
28 Discrepancies in theoretical calculations can often be associated with the choice of computational
29
30 parameters. In the case of compound semiconductors, such as the ternary compound CuInSe_2 the
31
32 choice of the chemical potential sets is the most important problem, because it strongly affects the
33
34 values of the formation energies and hence the concentrations of point defects and defect
35
36 complexes. However, the chemical potentials do not influence the existence and positions of the
37
38 transition levels.
39
40
41

42
43 The finite-size problem for the electrostatic energy of charged defects in semiconductors and
44
45 insulators can be solved by different correction schemes. Our calculations for native point defects
46
47 in CuInSe_2 show that the most popular schemes give qualitatively and quantitatively comparable
48
49 results. However, defect formation energies can depend on the wave function overlap or elastic
50
51 interactions between defects in neighboring supercells. We have calculated formation energies for
52
53 supercells comprising up to 432-atoms. Our results show that the 128- and 144-atom supercells are
54
55 sufficient to resolve the properties of the most important defects in CuInSe_2 .
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The growth conditions for CuInSe_2 can vary from Cu-poor to Cu-rich. The actual growth
5 parameters affect the abundances of the different types of point defects. In the present study we
6 varied the chemical potentials to their extreme values to model different growth conditions. In a p-
7 type material the shallow acceptor V_{Cu} , the slightly less shallow acceptor Cu_{In} , and the shallow
8 donors Cu_{int} and In_{Cu} are predicted to coexist as abundant defects over a relatively wide range of
9 chemical potentials. The concentrations of V_{Cu} and In_{Cu} increase toward Cu-poor conditions and
10 those of Cu_{int} and Cu_{In} toward Cu-rich conditions.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Our results show that the native point defects V_{Cu} and Cu_{In} are clearly responsible for two of
22 the acceptors seen in PL measurements in Cu-rich conditions. Of these, V_{Cu} is abundant also in Cu-
23 poor conditions. The question about the third acceptor present in Cu-rich conditions is more subtle.
24 Among the possible candidates the relatively high formation energy of V_{In} even in In-poor
25 conditions makes it less abundant and the stability, abundance, or the deep-acceptor character of
26 the defect complexes, such as $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-2V_{\text{Cu}}$, $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-V_{\text{In}}$, and $\text{Cu}_{\text{int}}-\text{Cu}_{\text{In}}$, may question also their role as
27 the third acceptor.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Acknowledgment**

40
41
42 The project has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation
43 program under the grant agreement No 641004. HPK also thanks the Academy of Finland for the
44 support under Project No. 286279, and through its Centres of Excellence Programme (2012-2017)
45 under Project No. 251748. We acknowledge the generous computational resources provided by
46 CSC supercomputer center of Finland and also by the Aalto Science-IT project. We also like to
47 thank Prof. S. Siebentritt of the University of Luxembourg for discussions of of the PL results.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- [1] P. Jackson, R. Wuerz, D. Hariskos, E. Lotter, W. Witte, and M. Powalla, *physica status solidi (RRL) - Rapid Research Letters* **2016**, *8*, 583.
- [2] P. Jackson, D. Hariskos, R. Wuerz, W. Wischmann, and M. Powalla, *physica status solidi (RRL) - Rapid Research Letters* **2014**, *8*, 219.
- [3] P. Jackson, D. Hariskos, R. Wuerz, O. Kiowski, A. Bauer, T. M. Friedlmeier, and M. Powalla, *physica status solidi (RRL) - Rapid Research Letters* **2015**, *9*, 28.
- [4] S. Siebentritt, M. Igalson, C. Persson, and S. Lany, *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, **2010**, *18*, 390.
- [5] S. Siebentritt, N. Rega, A. Zajogin, and M. C. Lux-Steiner, *physica status solidi (c)* **2004**, *1*, 2304.
- [6] C. Freysoldt, B. Grabowski, T. Hickel, J. Neugebauer, G. Kresse, A. Janotti, and C. G. Van de Walle, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **2014**, *86*, 253.
- [7] C. Persson, Y.-J. Zhao, S. Lany, and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* **2005**, *72*, 035211.
- [8] S. Lany and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* **2005**, *72*, 035215.
- [9] J. Pohl and K. Albe, *Phys. Rev. B* **2013**, *87*, 245203.
- [10] L. E. Oikkonen, M. G. Ganchenkova, A. P. Seitsonen, and R. M. Nieminen, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **2014**, *26*, 345501.
- [11] J. Bekaert, R. Saniz, B. Partoens, and D. Lamoen, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *16*, 22299.
- [12] B. Huang, S. Chen, H. X. Deng, L. W. Wang, M. A. Contreras, R. Noufi, and S. H. Wei, *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics* **2014**, *4*, 477.
- [13] Y. S. Yee, B. Magyari-Köpe, Y. Nishi, S. F. Bent, and B. M. Clemens, *Phys. Rev. B* **2015**, *92*, 195201.
- [14] K. Lejaeghere, G. Bihlmayer, and T. Björkman, *Science* **2016**, *351*, 6280.
- [15] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B* **1996**, *54*, 11169.
- [16] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Computational Materials Science* **1996**, *6*, 15.
- [17] P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* **1994**, *50*, 17953.
- [18] J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2003**, *118*, 8207.
- [19] H. W. Spiess, U. Haeberlen, G. Brandt, A. Ruber, and J. Schneider, *physica status solidi (b)* **1974**, *62*, 183.
- [20] W. Paszkowicz, R. Lewandowska, and R. Bacewicz, *Journal of Alloys and Compounds* **2004**, *362*, 241. Proceedings of the Sixth International School and Symposium on Synchrotron Radiation in Natural Science (ISSRNS).
- [21] C. G. Van de Walle, D. B. Laks, G. F. Neumark, and S. T. Pantelides, *Phys. Rev. B* **1993**, *47*, 9425.
- [22] H.-P. Komsa, T. T. Rantala, and A. Pasquarello, *Phys. Rev. B* **2012**, *86*, 045112.
- [23] G. Makov and M. C. Payne *Phys. Rev. B* **1995**, *51*, 4014.
- [24] S. Lany and A. Zunger, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* **2009**, *17*, 084002.
- [25] C. Freysoldt, J. Neugebauer, and C. G. Van de Walle, *physica status solidi (b)* **2011**, *248*, 1067.
- [26] M. V. Yakushev, F. Luckert, C. Faugeras, A. V. Karotki, A. V. Mudryi, and R. W. Martin, *Applied Physics Letters* **2010**, *97*, 152110 .
- [27] P.W. Li, R.A. Anderson, R.H. Plovnick, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* **1979**, *40*, 333.
- [28] D. Cahen and R. Noufi, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* **1992**, *53*, 991.
- [29] A. S. Verma, S. Sharma, and V. K. Jindal, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **2012**, *26*, 1250079.
- [30] N. Kim, P. P. n. Martin, A. A. Rockett, and E. Ertekin, *Phys. Rev. B* **2016**, *93*, 165202.
- [31] V. Blum, R. Gehrke, F. Hanke, P. Havu, V. Havu, X. Ren, K. Reuter, and M. Scheffler, *Computer Physics Communications* **2009**, *180*, 2175.
- [32] F. Pianezzi, P. Reinhard, A. Chirila, B. Bissig, S. Nishiwaki, S. Buecheler, and A. N. Tiwari, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *16*, 8843.
- [33] H.-P. Komsa, P. Broqvist, and A. Pasquarello, *Phys. Rev. B* **2010**, *81*, 205118.
- [34] R. Noufi, R. Axton, C. Herrington, and S. K. Deb, *Applied Physics Letters* **1984**, *45*, 668.
- [35] S. Siebentritt, L. Gtay, D. Regesch, Y. Aida, and V. Deprdurand, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* **2013**, *119*, 18.
- [36] C. Stephan, S. Schorr, M. Tovar, and H.-W. Schock, *Applied Physics Letters* **2011**, *98*, 091906.
- [37] S. B. Zhang, S.-H. Wei, and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1997**, *78*, 4059.

Table 1. Calculated and measured lattice constants a and c and energy band gap E_g for

CuInSe₂. The lattice parameters correspond to the tetragonal 16-atom unit cell.

| | a (Å) | c (Å) | E_g (eV) |
|---------------------|---------|---------|------------|
| Present work | 5.78 | 11.64 | 0.90 |
| Exp.1 ^{a)} | 5.81 | 11.63 | 1.04 |
| Exp.2 ^{b)} | 5.76 | 11.54 | 1.04 |

a) [19], b) [20]

Table 2. Calculated macroscopic dielectric tensor. ϵ_∞ and ϵ_{ion} are the electronic and ionic

contributions to the dielectric tensor. The static dielectric constant ϵ_0 is the sum of the two

contributions.

| Direction | ϵ_∞ | ϵ_{ion} | ϵ_0 |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| a,b | 7.86 | 2.53 | 10.40 |
| c | 7.86 | 3.29 | 11.15 |

Table 3. Formation enthalpies ΔH_f (eV) calculated using the PBE and HSE06 functionals as well as the corresponding experimental values.

| Compound | PBE | HSE06 | Experiment |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
| CuSe | -0.27 | -0.45 | -0.42 ^{a)} |
| In ₂ Se ₃ | -2.45 | -2.99 | -3.57 ^{a)} |
| CuInSe ₂ | -1.77 | -2.40 | -2.12, ^{a)} -2.77 ^{b)} |
| Cu ₂ Se | 0.01 | -0.65 | -0.42 ^{a)} |
| InSe | -1.05 | -1.28 | -1.22 ^{a)} |
| CuIn ₅ Se ₈ | -7.08 | -8.93 | — |

a) [28] b) [29]

Table 4. Supercells of different sizes for the chalcopyrite lattice. The 8-atom primitive unit cell is triclinic(tric) and the 16-atom unit cell tetragonal(tetr).

| Size | Unit cell | Supercell size | Lengths of supercell lattice vectors |
|------|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 32 | tric | 2x2x1 | 2a, 2a, 1.22a |
| 64 | tetr | 2x2x1 | 2a, 2a, 2a |
| 64 | tric | 2x2x2 | 2a, 2a, 2.44a |
| 128 | tetr | 2x2x2 | 2a, 2a, 4a |
| 144 | tric | 3x3x2 | 3a, 3a, 2.44a |
| 144 | tetr | 3x3x1 | 3a, 3a, 2a |
| 216 | tric | 3x3x3 | 3a, 3a, 3.67a |
| 288 | tric | 3x3x4 | 3a, 3a, 4.88a |
| 432 | tetr | 3x3x3 | 3a, 3a, 6a |
| 512 | tetr | 4x4x2 | 4a, 4a, 4a |
| 512 | tric | 4x4x4 | 4a, 4a, 4.88a |

Table 5. Defect formation energies in CuInSe₂ (eV). The chemical potentials correspond to the point M in Figure 1 and the Fermi level is at the VBM.

| Point defect | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| V _{Cu} | – | – | 0.84 | 0.88 | – | – | – |
| V _{In} | 3.37 | 2.63 | 2.32 | 2.23 | – | – | – |
| Cu _{In} | – | 1.66 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 1.24 | – |
| In _{Cu} | – | – | – | 2.94 | – | 0.72 | – |
| Cu _{int} | – | – | 4.02 | 1.98 | 0.77 | – | – |
| In _{int} | – | – | – | 5.21 | 8.03 | 3.52 | 2.93 |
| V _{Se} | – | – | – | 2.25 | – | – | – |

Table 6. Binding energies of defect complexes (eV) in the different charge states.(See Fig. 8)

| Point defect | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Cu _{int} -2V _{Cu} | – | -0.36 | – | – |
| Cu _{int} -V _{In} | -0.91 | -0.65 | -0.65 | – |
| Cu _{int} -Cu _{In} | – | -0.70 | -0.33 | -0.33 |

A Details on stability diagram calculation

The lattice structures and k-point sets used in the calculations are listed in Table 7. A cutoff energy of 500 eV was used. Optimized lattice constants for all compounds are presented in Table 8.

Table 7: Lattice structures of different materials and k-point sets used in the lattice optimization.

| Material | Lattice | k-points | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|
| | | PBE | HSE |
| Cu | fcc | 12x12x12 | 12x12x12 |
| In | fcc, tetragonal | 12x12x8 | 12x12x8 |
| Se | hexagonal | 12x12x12 | 8x8x8 |
| CuSe | Klockmannite | 12x12x4 | 12x12x4 |
| Cu ₂ Se | Fluorite, CaF ₂ | 12x12x12 | 12x12x12 |
| InSe | CuCrSe ₂ (R3m) | 8x8x8 | 8x8x8 |
| In ₂ Se ₃ | Bi ₂ Te ₃ | 8x8x8 | 8x8x8 |
| CuInSe ₂ | Chalcopyrite | 8x8x8 | 8x8x8 |

Table 8: Optimized lattice constants (Å).

| | PBE | HSE |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Cu | 3.634 | 3.637 |
| In | 3.287/5.111 | 3.225/5.087 |
| Se | 4.528/5.050 | 5.380/4.815 |
| CuSe | 4.029/17.542 | 4.009/17.424 |
| Cu ₂ Se | 5.840 | 5.831 |
| InSe | 4.094/31.267 | 4.049/26.430 |
| In ₂ Se ₃ | 4.018/30.230 | 3.962/29.868 |
| CuInSe ₂ | 5.831/11.838 | 5.826/11.737 |

Figure 1. Stability diagram for CuInSe₂ constructed using the heats of formation calculated with the HSE06 functional and presented in Table III. Point M correspond to point A in Figure 1 in the paper by Pohl and Albe ^[9] and it is used in comparisons below.




Figure 2. Formation energy of the $\text{In}_{\text{Cu}}^{+2}$ antisite for different supercell shapes and sizes. Values for the unrelaxed defects are compared. k-points sets used for the chosen supercell sizes are shown on the top of plot. The chemical potentials correspond to point M in Figure 1 and the Fermi level is at the VBM.






Figure 3. Formation energy of the Cu_{In} antisite as a function of the Fermi level obtained using the 64, 128, and 144 -atom supercells and the VASP code, as well as the 432-atom supercell and the FHI-aims code. The chemical potentials correspond to point M in Figure 1.



1
2
3
4 **Figure 4.** Formation energy of the Cu_{In} antisite as a function of the Fermi level. The
5
6 calculations are performed with the 64-atom supercell and with different correction schemes. The
7
8
9 chemical potentials correspond to point M in Figure 1.



10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 **Figure 5.** Defect formation energies in CuInSe_2 as a function of the Fermi level. The chemical
33
34 potentials correspond to point M in Figure 1.




Figure 6. Chemical potential diagram. The stars, connected by a straight line, correspond to the equilibrium states discussed in the text.





Figure 7. Point defect formation energies along the green line in stability diagram of Figure 6.

The energies are calculated for E_F at (a) VBM and (b) CBM. The dashed and solid lines correspond to the donor and acceptor defects, respectively.



1
2
3
4 **Figure 8.** Formation energies of defect complexes as a function of the Fermi level at point M on
5
6 the stability chemical potential diagram of Figure 1.
7
8
9

