

Photonic Crystal Waveguides for >90% Light Trapping Efficiency in Luminescent Solar Concentrators

Haley C Bauser, Colton R Bukowsky, Megan Phelan, William Weigand, David R. Needell, Zachary C Holman, and Harry A Atwater

ACS Photonics, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acsp Photonics.0c00593 • Publication Date (Web): 19 Jun 2020

Downloaded from pubs.acs.org on June 19, 2020

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.

Photonic Crystal Waveguides for >90% Light Trapping Efficiency in Luminescent Solar Concentrators

Haley C. Bauser^{†, †}, Colton R. Bukowsky^{†, ‡, †}, Megan Phelan[†], William Weigand[‡], David R. Needell[†], Zachary C. Holman[‡], and Harry A. Atwater^{†, *}

[†] Department of Applied Physics and Materials Science, California Institute of Technology, 1200 E California Blvd, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

[‡] Leia Inc, 2440 Sand Hill Rd. Suite 100, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA

[‡] School of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287, USA

ABSTRACT: Luminescent solar concentrators are currently limited in their potential concentration factor and solar conversion efficiency by the inherent escape cone losses present in conventional planar dielectric waveguides. We demonstrate that photonic crystal slab waveguides tailored for luminescent solar concentrator applications can exhibit >90% light trapping efficiency. This is achieved by use of quantum dot luminophores embedded within the waveguide that absorb light at photon energies corresponding to photonic crystal leaky modes that couple to incoming sunlight. The luminophores then emit at lower photon energies into photonic crystal bound modes that enable highly efficient light trapping in slab waveguides of wavelength-scale thickness. Photonic crystal waveguides thus nearly eliminate escape cone losses, and overcome the performance limitations of previously proposed wavelength-selective dielectric multilayer filters. We describe designs for hole-array and rod-array photonic crystals comprised of hydrogenated amorphous silicon carbide using CdSe/CdS quantum dots. Our analysis suggests that photonic crystal waveguide luminescent solar concentrators using these materials these can achieve light trapping efficiency above 92% and a concentration factor as high as 100.


KEYWORDS: *Photonic Crystals, Quantum Dots, Luminescent Solar Concentrators, Waveguide Coupling, Photovoltaics*

Luminescent solar concentrators (LSCs) are of considerable interest for various solar energy conversion applications, including utility-scale photovoltaics and building integrated photovoltaics, due to their ability to effectively concentrate both direct and diffuse sunlight,¹⁻⁷ and thus to concentrate the global solar spectrum using low cost materials⁸. LSCs consist of a waveguide medium with embedded luminophores (e.g., dyes, quantum dots, rare earth ions) that down-convert incident light and guide the down-converted light emission to a photovoltaic cell for solar energy conversion.¹⁻⁷


Previous LSC designs suffer from low optical efficiencies, in part due to luminophores with low efficiencies and/or small Stokes shifts⁷, as well as poor waveguide trapping efficiencies. The Stokes shift, which is the difference between the luminophore absorption and emission energy,^{9,10} is a key factor determining the concentration limit due to its exponential effect on the maximum achievable concentration factor.¹⁰ The concentration factor is defined as the ratio of the optical power density that

arrives at the photovoltaic cell within the LSC waveguide to the flux that arrives at the waveguide top surface.^{9,10} Recent developments in LSC design, as well as high efficiency quantum dot luminophores (QDs) with large Stokes shifts, have thus opened a path to potentially large increase in achievable LSC concentration factors.^{11,12}


However, to date the maximum achievable concentration factor has also been limited by the waveguide optics of luminescent solar concentrators. In polymer planar slab waveguides with embedded luminophores, a theoretical maximum of only 74% of the emitted light is trapped in the waveguide via total internal reflection (TIR) for a waveguide index of refraction of 1.44, which corresponds to poly(lauryl) methacrylate (PLMA) which serves as an effective dispersion medium for CdSe/CdS quantum dots.^{6,11-14} The remaining 26% of emission exits the slab through the escape cone, as shown in Fig. 1 a. In order to overcome this source of loss, recent LSC designs have used wavelength-selective Bragg reflectors^{6, 15-18}. Bragg reflectors are composed of periodic stacks



(a)




(b)




(c)

Figure 1. QD emission loss in several LSC configurations. In (a), isotropic QD emission is trapped only via TIR with significant escape cone losses. In (b), Bragg filters with the reflection band indicated in the inset can further trap QD emission. In (c), photonic crystal waveguide rod and hole arrays, respectively, trap emitted light in guided modes.

(typically 10s – 100s of layers) with alternating refractive indices. Fig. 1b shows an example of a Bragg reflector with a characteristically wide reflection band capable of trapping emission of a lumiphore in a polymer waveguide at near unity efficiency.⁶ However, Bragg reflectors block a portion of incident solar spectrum, and exhibit significant blue shifting under increasing angles of incidence.^{8,17-19} Blue shifting causes the reflection band to move to wavelengths of QD absorption, thereby limiting QD lumiphore performance by blocking sunlight which the QD would otherwise be able to convert thus decreasing LSC module efficiency.



(a)



(b)

Figure 2. At left, photonic crystal waveguide light trapping fraction; vertical dashed line shows the QD emission wavelength. In (a), a rod array with QDs located in the center of the pillar at the substrate interface traps over 90% of QD emission. In (b) the hole array traps over 90% of QD emission when the QD is placed in the center of the holes.

In this paper, we report on photonic crystal designs to improve LSC waveguides by more efficiently trapping light in the waveguide plane. In Fig. 1 c and d we show photonic crystal rod and hole arrays with coupled quantum dots. As opposed to trapping light in a ray optical regime as is shown in Fig. 1 a and b, we study trapping in the wave-optic regime and QD emission coupling into waveguide modes of photonic crystal slab structures. We report specific photonic crystal designs for both a rod array and a hole array. The arrays consist of CdSe/CdS QDs coupled to high index a-SiC:H. Fig. 2 demonstrates that both array designs are capable of trapping the CdSe/CS QD emission at an efficiency above 90%, substantially more than the theoretical maximum of 74% achieved by TIR modes of an index 1.44 polymer. In addition to the increased trapping efficiency, this approach increases the achievable concentration factor and also has potential for decreasing the module cost by eliminating the need for wavelength selective filters. For the purpose of the paper, we will consider highly efficient CdSe/CdS QD LSC lumiphores, as reported by Hanifi et al.^{6,20}. The absorption and luminescence emission spectra for these lumiphores are recreated in Fig. 3. The CdSe/CdS QDs are highly efficient with a photoluminescence quantum yield (PLQY) of $99.6\% \pm 0.3\%$, a Stokes shift of 0.52 eV, and a Stokes ratio above 100. The Stokes ratio is defined as the ratio of




Figure 3. Absorption and photoluminescence of CdSe/CdS quantum dots. The absorption cutoff is near 500nm and PL peak is at 635nm. The EQE indicates the InGaP cell band edge aligns with the QD PL peak. The AM 1.5G solar spectrum is shown for reference.

the absorption coefficient of the CdS shell to the absorption coefficient of the CdSe core.²⁰ Our LSC waveguides are thus designed to trap light emitted by the CdSe/CdS QDs.

PROPERTIES OF PHOTONIC CRYSTAL WAVEGUIDES

Guided modes in photonic crystal waveguides (PCWGs) have been extensively studied and experimentally realized for applications in magnetic mode control, non-linear optics, high quality resonators, on-chip photonic lasers, and LSCs.²¹⁻²⁸ PCWGs are capable of guiding emitted light into waveguide modes thus increase the optical efficiency of waveguides for LSCs. For the purposes of light




Figure 4: Enhancement of QD PLQY as a function of Purcell factor.

trapping in LSCs, we consider the 2-D PCWG that is periodic in the x and y plane with a defined thickness, t , in the z plane. PCWGs trap the transverse electric

(TE) and transverse magnetic (TM) modes of luminophore light by increasing the local density of optical states (LDOS) available to an emitter.^{29,30} In our design, the TM and/or TE guided modes of with large LDOS can be tailored to achieve the highest possible chance of light remaining trapped in the PCWG. We therefore analyze both hole and rod waveguides in parallel.

In our evaluation of PCWG performance, we also consider Purcell enhancement and resulting Purcell factor, F_p , generated in the photonic slab waveguide. The Purcell factor, given in Eq. 1, refers to the proportional increase in the spontaneous rate or emission of a dipole, as a function of the environment in which the emitter is placed where V is the mode volume within the crystal, and λ_{free}/n is the wavelength within the PCWG.

$$F_p = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \left(\frac{\lambda_{free}}{n} \right)^3 \left(\frac{Q}{V} \right)$$

(1)

Q is the quality factor which we more specifically define in Eq. 2 where f_0 is the frequency within the photonic crystal (PC), E is the energy within the PC, and P is the dissipated power within the PCWG.

$$Q = \frac{2\pi f_0 E}{P}$$

(2)

This result follows from Fermi's Golden Rule and predicts that placing a QD emitter in a nanostructured dielectric environment with a large LDOS enhances spontaneous emission into specific optical modes relative to emission into free space.³⁰⁻³⁶ Our simulation results use Eq.1 and the simulated dipole power emitted at various positions of a PC to determine F_p . Within the utilized Lumerical software, the Purcell factor calculation is simplified to be the ratio of the dipole within the PCWG to the dipole power in free space.³²⁻³⁵ Due to detailed balance between photon absorption and emission, the converse is also true: emission into lossy modes and/or excited carrier thermalization losses can be reduced.^{31, 36-38}

$$PLQY_{enhanced} = \frac{F_p * PLQY_0}{F_p * PLQY_0 + (1 - PLQY_0)}$$

(3)

Non-radiative losses are thus reduced, increasing the PLQY of the QDs, as indicated in Eq. 3. By placing the QD in a photonic crystal with a modest Purcell factor (3-5), highly efficient QDs (PLQY > 90%), such as the CdSe/CdS dots, can exhibit a PLQY closer to unity.³⁹ Likewise, if we can achieve higher Purcell factors (>8), less efficient QDs

(PLQY < 70%) can increase their PLQY to above 90%, illustrated in Fig. 4. The phenomenon of Purcell enhancement via PCWGs holds great potential for the LSC community as many QDs that absorb a greater portion of the solar spectrum and emit at longer wavelengths suffer from decreased PLQY.^{11,40-41} The Purcell Enhancement provided by a PCWG can thus be applied to systems with near infrared emitting QDs tuned to photovoltaic material such as GaAs or Si which could in turn increase the overall device efficiency.⁴² The design parameters of the PCWG can be rescaled in order to accommodate different emission wavelengths. We therefore analyze both the trapping potential and Purcell enhancement of photonic crystals with coupled QDs.

PHOTONIC CRYSTAL DESIGN




Figure 5: In (a), index of refraction and extinction coefficient of a-SiC:H, measured via spectroscopic ellipsometry. In (b), reflection, absorption, and transmission of a hexagonal array PCWG of a-SiC:H pillars at sufficient trapping thickness. QD absorption is also shown to indicate overlap in absorption of the QDs and the photonic crystal material.

In order to design an experimentally realizable LSC system, the photonic crystal design should consider realistic materials properties and fabrication limitations related to the slab thickness and QD location within the waveguide. It has previously been shown that an z mirror symmetric 2D photonic crystal slab in air maximizes mode confinement, and in turn achieves minimal light leakage^{29, 30}. Here we must include a substrate on which the photonic crystal material can be deposited. By including a substrate layer, the z symmetry of the photonic crystal is broken, introducing newly accessible leaky modes to the photonic crystal as TE and TM modes couple to each other and are no longer trapped within the photonic crystal plane.²⁹ Instead, light can escape the photonic leaky modes and couple into waveguide modes of the underlying $n > 1$ index substrate.²⁹⁻³⁰ This provides a mechanism for collection within the LSC system of the light leaking to the substrate. Thus, our design creates a preference for emission into PC slab guided modes and the TIR guided modes of the substrate. Since light emitted outside the angle of the substrate escape cone




Figure 6: Schematic of the rod array (left) and hole array (right) a-SiC:H PCWGs. The rod array has a thickness of 1.21 microns, a rod radius of 61 nm, and a pitch of 242 nm. The hole array has a thickness of 694 nm, a hole radius of 58 nm, and a pitch of 231 nm.

stays trapped within the substrate TIR modes, we consider that light to also be trapped, in addition to light that is trapped within the plane of the photonic crystal material. There are multiple photovoltaic cell configurations that can utilize the light trapped in both the photonic crystal and the substrate plane, so light travelling laterally in either layer effectively stays within the LSC system. Thus, the total trapping efficiency is the percentage of emitted light trapped either in the PCWG or the substrate, whereas photons lost to the ambient environment are considered lost from our PCWG system.

The second parameter we consider is the absorption wavelengths of the QDs in relation to that of the photonic crystal material. In order to achieve a high Purcell enhancement, it is advantageous for the photonic crystal to be created from a high index material which also has low absorption, so as to avoid parasitic absorption of light emitted from the QDs into the photonic crystal slab.³¹⁻³⁷ Our high index PCWGs are based on plasma enhanced chemical vapor deposited a-SiC:H that has negligible absorption beyond 610 nm, while maintaining an index of refraction greater than 3 across the PL spectrum.⁴³ The disadvantage to using this material is its high absorption in the short wavelength region; as previously described, CdSe/CdS QDs absorb light with wavelengths up to 500 nm. The slab material and the QDs both absorb short wavelength light, as shown in Fig. 5. Previous work has explored directly embedding luminophores in visibly transparent, lower index materials like TiO₂ or ZnS, however the low index leads to lower trapping efficiencies and lower Purcell enhancement.³⁹ Furthermore, even though the absorption length is decreased for the lower index materials, there is still some absorption, so less light is absorbed and converted by the QDs, which in turn results in a less efficient module. Therefore, we choose to work with the higher index a-SiC:H but change the QD placement accordingly in the rod array to mitigate

parasitic absorption. We cannot locate QDs inside the pillars of the rod array. In order to ensure as much light as possible reaches the QDs to be successfully down-converted, we thus opt to locate the QD layer at the bottom of the photonic crystal rod array waveguide at the substrate interface. With the QDs at the substrate interface, the rod array orientation is inverted, with the substrate becoming a superstrate. With this inversion, incoming light will first travel through the superstrate before reaching the QDs as opposed to travelling through the a-SiC:H. This will allow the vast majority of incoming short wavelength light to be absorbed and re-emitted by the QDs before having the chance to be parasitically absorbed by the a-SiC:H. Once the QD re-emits, the emission will travel via the PCWG, which is lossless in the emission region, and the TIR modes of the substrate. We thus opt for this inverted configuration, in contrast with placing the QDs at the top of the pillars at the air interface, in order to guide modes into the TIR of the glass substrate rather than emission to air. We thus opt for for this inverted configuration, in contrast with placing the QDs at the top of the pillars at the air interface, in order to guide modes into the TIR of the glass substrate as opposed to air. This will inevitably lead to lower trapping and Purcell enhancement than would be achievable if QDs could be located at the center of each rod, because the symmetry of the photonic crystal is broken, which furthermore decreases the mode volume and mode density within the crystal. However, this trade-off is necessary in order to build a feasible and optically efficient photovoltaic module. Such a system can potentially be fabricated by first applying a layer of dispersed QDs to the substrate, and then depositing the PCWG material.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ The use of a superstrate configuration is thus preferred to configurations in which the high energy photons are at greater risk of parasitic absorption by a-SiC:H.

In addition to the rod array, we evaluate a hole array 2D PCWG, in which the QDs are placed within holes etched into a thin film of a-SiC:H. The hole array 2D PCWG does not have the same QD placement constraints as for the rod array, due to the QD placement outside the absorbing medium. The QDs can be located throughout the volume of the holes, as opposed to an effectively single layer of QDs at a specific location as is required for the rod array. Another advantage of the hole array is the greater effective index of refraction. Instead of setting the holes to an index of 1 to simulate air, we set it to 1.44 to simulate poly(laurel) methacrylate, a common polymer material used as a matrix for suspending CdSe/CdS QDs⁶. The higher index of refraction increases the effective index of the photonic crystal,




Figure 7: In (a), band structures for the optimized hexagonal rod array of a-SiC:H. The Stokes shifted QD emission couples to the TE and TM modes of the photonic crystal. In (b), band structures for the optimized hexagonal hole array PCWG composed of a-SiC:H. The Stokes shift demonstrates that the QDs emission lies within the TE and TM bands of the photonic crystal. The top right insets in both a and b show the unit cell and structure, color coded by the index of refraction of the PCWG and the surrounding material.

thereby allowing for a higher potential Purcell enhancement and trapping.³¹⁻³²

As detailed in the Methods section, the parameters for the radius, pitch, and height of both the hole array and the rod array are set in units normalized to the wavelength. For both array types, we choose a hexagonal array in order to have a higher fill fraction than a square array provides. Both the hexagonal rod array and hole array are set with radii roughly as a quarter of the periodicity.²⁹ We found upon exploring the hole radius parameter space that varying the hole radius did not result in drastically different trapping potentials, so therefore kept them as a quarter of the period for both arrays. While the ratios of the periodicity and radius are the same for the rod and hole array, the respective array designs deviate with respect to thickness. Since the QDs have to be placed at the substrate interface in the rod array, the photonic crystal must be thicker than in the hole array in order to maximize the light trapped in the PCWG and substrate TIR modes. This corresponds to a height five times the periodicity. The hole array does not have the same

thickness requirement in part due to improved trapping from the increase in waveguide effective index. The trapping potential remains stable for a range of thicknesses. However, the thickness is set to 3 times the periodicity in order to explore a wider set of QD placements throughout the volume of the hole. To summarize, we find the optimal geometry for the rod array is a radius of 61 nm, a pitch of 242 nm, and a height of 1.21 microns. For the hole array, we set the radius to 58 nm, the pitch to 231 nm, and the height to 694 nm, as illustrated in Fig. 6. Given the index of refraction of the PCWG, the index of the substrate, and the physical designs demonstrated in Fig 6., the band diagrams in Fig. 7 were generated. For both the rod and hole array there is one or many flat TE and TM bands at the QD emission frequency. The strong coupling of luminescence to the PCWG seen in FDTD simulations is supported by the location of these bands at the PL frequency. The flat quality of the band(s) indicate a high LDOS of modes with large, in plane wave-vectors, which agrees with the large percentages of light detected to travel laterally in FDTD simulations. Even though the field profiles of Figures 8 and 9 include all mode, the order and periodic quality of these photonic crystal modes is clearly recognizable.

TRAPPING EFFICIENCY

For both the rod and hole array PCWGs, we start by finding the trapping efficiency and Purcell factor for QDs located in the center for maximum symmetry. In the rod array, the highest symmetry point is the center in the x, y plane at the waveguide/substrate interface. For the hole array, the point of maximum symmetry is centered in a hole in the x - y plane, and at the height mid-point within the slab. To best simulate realistic QD arrays, we locate the QDs throughout the x - y symmetry plane for the rod and hole array. For the rod array, we assume the QDs will be spin-coated and




Figure 8: Magnitude of the electric field intensity of QD emission in an optimized hexagonal array of a-SiC:H rods with the QDs located at the glass interface. In order to simulate the entire area of the rod/glass interface, the QD was located in the center (a) then translated toward the edge (b) in order to optimize average trapping over the entire substrate interface containing QD emitters.




Figure 9: Magnitude of the electric field intensity for the optimized a-SiC hexagonal hole array. QD locations are translated to different $x, y,$ and z locations to characterize QD emission trapping in the array. In (a), QD at the air interface; in (b), QD in the center of the hole array; in (c), QD emission located at the substrate interface. The left column shows the electric field intensity with the QD located in the x, y center, and the right columns shows the electric field intensity with the QD located at the edge of the hole radius for each respective z location.

therefore will cover the x, y plane of each pillar at the waveguide/substrate interface. We locate QD at the edge of the pillar in the x and y directions, then along the arc between the x and y edges in order to get a robust data set of QD behavior through the area of the crystal/substrate interface. As show in in Fig 8., locating the QD in the center of the rod at the crystal/substrate interface results in the the majority of the electric field intensity to be contained within the plane of the PCWG, with much of the light in the substrate region emitting outside the escape cone of the substrate. While locating the QD at the edge of the rod radius further breaks symmetry and does not result in as high of a trapping efficiency as the aforementioned location, the majority of the emission of the QD remains trapped within the PCWG and substrate TIR. We find that the average trapping efficiency for the rod array with QDs dispersed across the rod array area at the PCWG substrate interface is 92.56% with a Purcell factor of 2.2.

To analyze QD trapping in the hole array, we must consider the $x, y,$ and z directions and therefore performed a sensitivity study over a volume of potential QD locations. Fig 9. demonstrates that the

hole array maintains a similar pattern to the rod array shown in Fig 8. In all cases, the majority of the electric field intensity of the QD emission remains in the plane of the PC material with more emission loss, particularly outside the TIR modes of the substrate, introduced upon moving the QD across the x, y plane by breaking the symmetry of the PCWG. Moving the emitter position throughout the range of z values yielded interesting results. Moving the QD location towards the substrate or air interface of the photonic crystal caused the light trapping efficiency to fluctuate in proportion to the fraction of light emitted in the escape cone of the substrate. The trapping efficiency assuming a disk-like monolayer of QDs located in the center of the a-SiC:H hole array is 95.36%. As stated in the previous section, the total height of each pillar in the hole array is 694 nm. When moving the QD 232 nm from the center in the positive or negative direction, the trapping efficiency drops from 95.36% in the center to around 91.5% at z coordinates of 579 nm and 115 nm respectively from the substrate interface. However, when moving to 636 nm or 58 nm, the trapping efficiency increases to 93.82% for both heights. This results from successful trapping in either PC modes or TIR modes of the substrate. When QDS are located closer to the top or bottom of the photonic crystal, at the air or substrate interfaces, light trapping in the photonic crystal plane remains nearly constant, however the fraction of light in TIR modes of the substrate increases. Moreover, when QDs are located at a height 115nm above the substrate interface approximately 85% of the emitted light stays within the photonic crystal. We observe similar behavior when we move the QD downwards to 58nm above the substrate interface. Likewise, for both QD placements, about 11% of the light travels out of the photonic crystal into the substrate. However, when the QD is located at a height 115 nm above the substrate, 44% of that light is lost via the substrate escape cone whereas only 22% the light in the substrate is lost via the substrate escape cone for the QD placed 58 nm above the substrate.

When QDs are located near the crystal/substrate and crystal to air interface of the hole array, there is a significant reduction in light trapping efficiency. Light trapping for QDs at the air interface decreases to 82.5% and the light trapping efficiency decreases to 84.16% for QDs located at the substrate interface. Given how robust the trapping efficiency remains from 58 nm to 636 nm, we explored where this drop-off occurs and found that the trapping efficiency only drops below 90% within 25 nm of either interface. When accounting for a random distribution of QDs throughout the entire volume of the hole, the trapping efficiency is 92.3%

with a Purcell factor of 2.9. If we assume that the polymer layer near the top and bottom interfaces is devoid of QDs, so that QDs are located only at heights from from 58 to 636 nm, the trapping efficiency increases to 93.3% with a Purcell factor of 3.2. If we lower the optical density of the QDs, allowing a lower volumetric QD concentration, we can concentrate the QDS in a thin disk located in the center of the holes with the majority of the volume infilled with polymer. This gives a trapping efficiency of 95.4% with a Purcell factor of 3.26.

While the photonic band gap is not included in our figure of merit, the difference between the TE and TM band structures in rod arrays compared to hole arrays resulted in distinctly different in trapping mechanisms. The difference in the Purcell factor is particularly notable. In the rod array, the Purcell factor of the x and y dipole emission profiles of the QD are low due in part to how the rod array favors a TM photonic bandgap. In the hole array, the x and y dipole emission profiles of the QDs exhibit higher Purcell factors, averaging over all possible dipole directions. Since the rod array favors the z -oriented dipole emissions, the trapping efficiency and Purcell factor could greatly be improved by the use of properly oriented quantum rods whose emission profile more closely resembles a z -oriented dipole.

Both the rod array and hole array PCWGs demonstrate that nanophotonic slab waveguides can increase the waveguide trapping efficiency for LSCs from 74% to beyond 92%. For the rod array, we find Purcell factors of 2 while hole arrays demonstrate Purcell factors of approximately 3.

Quantum Dot Location	η_{trap} (%)	F_p
TIR Only; in waveguide	74.13	1
RA; at Substrate Interface	92.56	2.2
HA; in PCWG center	95.36	3.26
HA; 58 nm above substrate	93.82	3.33
HA; 638 nm above substrate	93.82	3.34
HA; 579 nm above substrate	91.80	3.24
HA; at air interface	82.50	2.64
HA; at substrate interface	84.16	2.62
HA; infill full hole volume	92.30	3.2
HA: infill 58-638 nm	93.32	3.3

Table 1: Trapping efficiency and Purcell enhancement as a function of QD location in hole (HA) and rod array (RA) photonic crystal waveguides.




Figure 10: Concentration factor vs. geometric gain for an edge-lined LSC using CdSe/CdS QDs. We show the concentration factor performance in comparison to TIR for the proposed a) rod array, and b) hole configurations with varied ways of filling the QDs in the holes, assuming a realized Stokes ratio of 100. Figures c) and d) display the concentration factor performance for each the rods and holes, respectively, for an idealized CdSe/CdS quantum dot with a Stokes ratio of 1,000.

LSC CONCENTRATION FACTOR FOR PHOTONIC CRYSTAL WAVEGUIDES

We now analyze the concentration factor of LSC photonic crystal slab waveguides. Concentration factor represents the achievable enlargement factor of active PV area for an LSC⁴⁷. LSC designs aim to achieve high concentration factors in order to minimize the required PV active area within the LSC. We define concentration factor in Eq. 4 as a function of the LSC geometric gain (GG), device absorbance (η_{abs}), waveguide efficiency (η_{wg}), luminophore PLQY (η_{PL}), and trapping efficiency (η_{trap}), in accordance with an analytical analysis of concentration factor.⁴⁷ Here we define geometric gain as the ratio of LSC area to the area of the photovoltaic cell. Analysis of concentration factor as a function of geometric gain provides a more general figure of merit, and it is used and in order to compare across different photovoltaic cell location schemes. While the highly efficient CdSe/CdS QDs display a PLQY above 99% in solution, when dispersed in a waveguide medium, the PLQY

decreases to 95%.^{6,12,20, 48} In order to give a more experimentally relevant analysis, a PLQY of 95% is used in our concentration factor analysis. Device absorbance refers to the fraction of incident light that is absorbed by the luminophores, waveguide efficiency is the fraction of PL that reaches the PV material, and trapping efficiency is the fraction of PL trapped within waveguide modes and TIR. Hence, higher trapping efficiencies, as described in this paper, directly enable increased concentration factors.

$$\text{Concentration Factor} = \eta_{abs} \times \eta_{WG} \times \eta_{PL} \times \eta_{trap} \times GG$$

(4)

Here, we assume an LSC that uses InGaP cells with a band edge matched to the emission of the QDs^{6,9}, CdSe/CdS QDs with a measured Stokes ratio of 100^{12,20}, and an optical density at 450nm of 3.0. Here we define Stokes ratio as the ratio of the absorption coefficient (α_1) at the QD CdS shell to the absorption coefficient (α_2) at the QD CdSe core. We analyze the

concentration factor of the LSC system as a function of geometric gain. We find that increasing the trapping efficiency increases the potentially achievable concentration factors. Figure 10a shows that the concentration factor improves when employing a rod array PCWG, compared to designs in which luminophores that are dispersed in a polymer waveguide with only TIR light trapping. Figure 10b repeats this analysis for a hole array PCWG configuration. In Fig. 10b, we compare the performance of i) TIR alone, ii) a disk-like array of QDs in the hole centers, iii) filling 93% of the hole volumes with QDs, and iv) filling the entire hole with QDs. In each of these cases, the optical density is kept constant at 3.0. We can see that higher concentration factors are achieved with the highest trapping efficiency configurations. Since the trapping efficiencies of all of these designs are $> 92\%$, each of these configurations has the potential to improve on a traditional QD waveguide by nearly 30%, which agrees with the results of Rousseau and Wood.²⁷

Figures 10c,d repeat the analyses for each the rod and hole configurations, respectively, by assuming an optimized CdSe/CdS QD with a Stokes ratio of 1,000. By assuming a higher Stokes ratio, we are able to achieve concentration factors beyond 100 for both the rod and hole arrays. Furthermore, the concentration factor enhancement remains robust for the hole array infilling options allowing for flexibility in fabrication and optical density of the QDs.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have demonstrated that high index dielectric rod and hole photonic waveguides composed of a-SiC:H coupled with CdSe/CdS QDs can be used to improve the concentration factor of an LSC to more than 100. We show that over 90% of light emitted from a QD can be trapped within the modes of both a photonic crystal rod and hole slab waveguide. Employing a PCWG rod array results in a total trapping efficiency of 92.6% and a Purcell factor of 2.2. A PCWG hole array exhibits a light trapping efficiency of 95.4% for a disk-like emitter array in the hole centers for a hole array PCWG. Furthermore, we explore infilling through the z-plane of the hole array crystal and find trapping efficiencies remain above 90% for all infilling possibilities. Finally, we performed a system level analysis to determine the concentration factor of an LSC is using PCWGS and found a significant increase in concentration factor as a function of geometric gain when employing nanophotonic waveguides, as compared to simply TIR mode waveguides. While high trapping and concentration factors are achieved in the proposed designs, we expect future designs and materials can be

explored to further improve Purcell enhancement. A higher index polymer would also help increase the potential Purcell enhancement in the photonic crystal hole array by increasing the effective index of the photonic crystal. We further expect that by exploring other materials and luminophores, this work can be improved upon and applied to a variety of LSC systems operating at different wavelengths that correspond to different photovoltaic materials, transmission profiles, and optical properties.

METHODS

To conduct a full analysis of both the behavior of emitted light and the module performance, we use two different analysis methods. First, we employ Lumerical FDTD simulations to calculate the trapping of light emitted from a QD. Given the QD capability to isotropically absorb light over all angles of incidence, this study does not analyze the incident absorbed light, but instead looks specifically at QD emission within the LSC.^{6,12,20} We utilize Perfectly Matched Layer (PML) boundary conditions over a periodicity of 8 unit cells to accurately calculate behavior when the field emission has adequate distance to spatially decay while limiting coherent interference with the boundaries in each plane. In order to isolate emitters from coherent electric field phase interference, a super-cell is required. Perfectly matched layer (PML) boundary conditions were used on all simulation boundaries in order to isolate the effects of coupling a single emitter to the PC optical environment. In order to approximate a QD we use a dipole source. We simulate the source emission in the x , y , and z orientations then perform an average of the results weighted by the Purcell factor corresponding to each orientation. This averaging modeled the behavior of a single incoherent and non-directional emitter. More than 20 positions for the rod array and more than 30 positions for the hole array were used to infer an ensemble average for a random dispersion of luminophores reported in Table 1.

The simulation consists of monitors surrounding the photonic crystal and the underlying substrate in order to record all light in every potential loss channel: the sides, the substrate, and the photonic crystal-to-air boundary. The monitors reported the percentage of emission that is lost to the ambient region above the photonic crystal, was trapped in the plane of the photonic crystal, and propagated through the substrate. Monitors were placed in the substrate to record the fields which moved away from the PC and free space. These fields were then analytically propagated to the far-field to determine the power distribution incident on the flat, opposite surface of the substrate. The light that was trapped in plane and within these TIR angles

of the substrate was considered trapped in the overall LSC system. Shape parameters such as the slab thickness, radius, etc. are all examined in normalized units, relative to the periodicity, as in Reference 29.

The reflection, transmission, and absorption analysis of the photonic rod slab array demonstrated in Fig 6. was also done via Lumerical FDTD. Unlike the trapping analysis where the light source was a dipole emitter, the light source was a plane wave in order to simulate incoming light from the sun and the boundary conditions were periodic with an assumption of symmetry throughout the hexagonal rod array. Monitors were located both at the top and bottom of the array to account for reflected and transmitted light. Absorption was determined as the sum of reflection and absorption subtracted from 1.

MIT Photonic Bands (MPB) was used to calculate the photonic crystal band diagrams of Fig. 7, using up to 32 k-points along each reciprocal space vector, with resolution and mesh of 24 and 8, respectively.⁴⁹ The slab nature of the structure and the inherent periodicity of the method was reconciled by including a large portion of free space above/below the structure in the simulation volume such that confined fields did not interact.⁵⁰

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

* haa@caltech.edu

Author Contributions

⊣ H.C.B. and C.R.B. contributed equally to this work

The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors.

Funding Sources

This work was supported by the DOE ‘Photonics at Thermodynamic Limits’ Energy Frontier Research Center under grant DE-SC0019140 (DRN and MEP), and also by the by the Caltech Space Solar Power project (HCB). Work by CRB, WW, and ZCH were supported in part by the Engineering Research Center Program of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy under NSF Cooperative Agreement No. EEC-1041895.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the DOE ‘Photonics at Thermodynamic Limits’ Energy Frontier Research Center under grant DE-SC0019140 (DRN and MEP), and also by the by the Caltech Space Solar Power project (HCB). Work by CRB, WW, and ZCH were supported in part by the Engineering Research Center Program of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy under NSF Cooperative Agreement No. EEC-1041895.

ABBREVIATIONS

LSC, Luminescent Solar Concentrator; QD, Quantum Dot; TIR, Total Internal Reflection; PLQY, Photoluminescence Quantum Yield; TE, Transverse Electric; TM, Transverse Magnetic; PCWG, Photonic Crystal Waveguide.

REFERENCES

- (1) Batchelder, J. S.; Zewail, A. H.; Cole, T. Luminescent Solar Concentrators. 1: Theory of Operation and Techniques for Performance Evaluation. *Appl. Opt.* **1979**, *18*, 3090–3110
- (2) Zhao, Y. and Lunt, R.R. Transparent Luminescent Solar Concentrators for Large-Area Solar Windows Enabled by Massive Stokes-Shift Nanocluster Phosphors. *Adv. Energy Mater.*, **2013** *3*: 1143-1148.
- (3) Debije, M.G. and Verbunt, P.P.C. Thirty Years of Luminescent Solar Concentrator Research: Solar Energy for the Built Environment. *Adv. Energy Mater.*, **2012** *2*, 12-35.
- (4) Sol, J. A. H. P., Timmermans, G. H., van Breugel, A. J., Schenning, A. P. H. J., Debije, M. G., Multi Luminescent Solar Concentrator “Smart” Windows *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2018**, *8*, 1702922.
- (5) Wu, K., Li, H. & Klimov, V.I. Tandem luminescent solar concentrators based on engineered quantum dots. *Nature Photon* **2012** *12*, 105–110
- (6) Needell D.R. et al Design Criteria for Micro-Optical Tandem Luminescent Solar Concentrators *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics*, **2018** *8* 1560-1567
- (7) Slooff, L.H., Bende, E.E., Burgers, A.R., Budel, T., Pravettoni, M., Kenny, R.P., Dunlop, E.D. and Büchtemann, A. A luminescent solar concentrator with 7.1% power conversion efficiency. *phys. stat. sol. RRL*, **2008** *2*: 257-259.
- (8) Horowitz, K. A. W.; Remo, T.; Smith, B.; and Ptak, A. Techno-Economic Analysis and Cost Reduction Roadmap for III-V Solar Cells. Golden, CO: National

Renewable Energy Laboratory. **2018** NREL/TP-6A20-72103.

(9) Yablanovich, E. Thermodynamics of the fluorescent planar concentrator *J. Opt. Soc. Am.*, **1980** Vol. 70, No. 11 1362-1363

(10) Smestad, G.; Ries, H.; Winston, R.; Yablonovitch, E. The thermodynamic limits of light concentrators *Sol. Energy Mater.* **1990** 21, 99-11

(11) Meinardi, F.; Ehrenberg, S; Dharmo, L.; Carulli, F.; Mauri, M.; Bruni, F.; Simonutti, R.; Kortshagen, U.; and Brovelli, S. Highly Efficient Luminescent Solar Concentrators based on Ultra-Earth-Abundant Indirect Band Gap Silicon Quantum Dots, *Nat. Photonics*, **2017** vol 11, no. 3, pp. 177–185

(12) Bronstein, N. D.; Yao, Y.; Xu, L.; O'Brien, E.; Powers, A. S.; Ferry, V. E.; Alivisatos, A. P.; and Nuzzo, R. G. Quantum Dot Luminescent Concentrator Cavity Exhibiting 30-fold Concentration *ACS Photonics*, **2015**, 2, 11, 1576-1583

(13) McDowall, S.; Butler, T.; Bain, E.; Scharnhorst, K. and Patrick, D. "Comprehensive analysis of escape-cone losses from luminescent waveguides," *Appl. Opt.* **2013** 52, 1230-1239

(14) Verbunt, P. P. C.; Sánchez-Somolinos, C.; Broer, D. J. and Debije, M. J. "Anisotropic light emissions in luminescent solar concentrators–isotropic systems," *Opt. Express* **2013** 21, 485-493

(15) van Sark, W.; Barnham, K. W. J.; Slooff, L. H.; Chatten, A. J.; Buchtemann, A.; Meyer, A.; McCormack, S. J.; Koole, R.; Farrell, D. J.; Bose, R.; Bende, E. E.; Burgers, A. R.; Budel, T.; Quilitz, J.; Kennedy, M.; Meyer, T.; Donega, C. D. M.; Meijerink, A.; Vanmaekelbergh, D. Luminescent Solar Concentrators: A review of recent results *Opt. Express* **2008**, 16 (26), 21773–21792.

(16) Debije, M. G.; Van, M.-P.; Verbunt, P. P. C.; Kastelijn, M. J.; van der Blom, R. H. L.; Broer, D. J. and Bastiaansen, C. W. M. "Effect on the output of a luminescent solar concentrator on application of organic wavelength-selective mirrors," *Appl. Opt.*, **2010** vol. 49, no. 4, 745–51

(17) Verbunt, P. P. C. ; Tsoi, S.; Debije, M.G.; Boer, D. J., Bastiaansen, C.W.M.; Lin, C. de Boer, D.K.G. "Increased efficiency of luminescent solar concentrators after application of organic wavelength selective mirrors," *Opt. Express* **2012** 20, 655-668

(18) Leem, J. W., Guan, X.-Y. & Yu, J. S. "Tunable distributed Bragg reflectors with wide-angle and broadband high-reflectivity using nanoporous/dense

titanium dioxide film stacks for visible wavelength applications" *Opt. Express* **2014** 22, 18519–18526 .

(19) Baumeister, P. "Optical Coating Technology". SPIE Press, Bellingham, Washington USA: 2004.

(20) Hanifi, D. A.; Bronstein, N. D.; Koscher, B. A.; Nett, Z.; Swabeck, J. K.; Takano, K.; Schwartzberg, A. M.; Maserati, L.; Vandewal, K.; van de Burgt, Y.; Salleo, A.; Alivisatos, A. P. Redefining Near-Unity Luminescence in Quantum Dots with Photothermal Threshold Quantum Yield *Science* **2019**, 363, 1199–1202.

(21) Yablonovitch, E. "Inhibited spontaneous emission in solid-state physics and electronics" *Physical Review Letters* **1987** 5, 8(20), 2059–2062

(22) Liu, J.; Xu, H.; Yang, Z. et al. A Research of Magnetic Control Ferrite Photonic Crystal Filter . *Plasmonics* **2017** 12, 971–976

(23) Dudley, J., Taylor, J. Ten years of nonlinear optics in photonic crystal fibre. *Nature Photon* **2009** 3, 85–90

(24) Akahane, Y., Asano, T., Song, B. et al. High-Q photonic nanocavity in a two-dimensional photonic crystal. *Nature* **2003** 425, 944–947

(25) Parisa Andalib and Nosrat Granpayeh, "All-optical ultracompact photonic crystal AND gate based on nonlinear ring resonators," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **2009** 26, 10-16

(26) Kurosaka, Y., Iwahashi, S., Liang, Y. et al. On-chip beam-steering photonic-crystal lasers. *Nature Photon* **2010** 4, 447–450

(27) Rousseau, I. and Wood, V. "Nanophotonic luminescent solar concentrators" *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2013** 103, 131113

(28) Peters, M.; Goldschmidt, J. C.; Löper, P.; Blasi, B.; Gombert, A. "The effect of photonic structures on the light guiding efficiency of fluorescent concentrators. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2009**, 105, 014909.

(29) Joannopoulos, J. D.; Johnson, S. G.; Winn, J. N.; Meade, R. D. Photonic Crystals: Molding the Flow of Light, 2nd ed.; Princeton University Press: Princeton, **2008**

(30). Ding, Y.; Magnusson, R. Band Gaps and Leaky-Wave Effects in Resonant Photonic-Crystal Waveguides. *Opt. Express* **2007**, 15, 680– 694

(31) Purcell, E. *Phys. Rev.* **1946**, 69 (11-12), 674

- (32) Novotny, L.; Hecht, B. Principles of Nano-Optics, Cambridge, U.K., 2006.
- (33) Kuttge, M.; Garcia de Abajo, F.; Polman, A. Ultrasmall Mode Volume Plasmonic Nanodisk Resonators *Nano Lett.* **2009** *10* (5) 1537-1541
- (34) Jiao, X.; Blair, S. Optical Antenna Design for Fluorescence Enhancement in the Ultraviolet *Opt. Express* **2012** *20* 29909-29922
- (35) Kristensen, P. T.; Hughes, S. Modes and Mode Volumes of Leaky Optical Cavities and Plasmonic Nanoresonators *ACS Photonics* **2014** *1* (1) 2-10
- (36) Englund, D.; Fattal, D.; Waks, E.; Solomon, G.; Zhang, B.; Nakaoka, T.; Arakawa, Y.; Yamamoto, Y.; Vuckovic, J. Controlling the Spontaneous Emission Rate of Single Quantum Dots in a Two-Dimensional Photonic Crystal. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2005**, *95*, 013904
- (37) Lodahl, P., Floris van Driel, A., Nikolaev, I. et al. Controlling the dynamics of spontaneous emission from quantum dots by photonic crystals. *Nature* **2004** *430*, 654–657
- (38) Einstein, A. “Strahlungs-Emission und -Absorption nach der Quantentheorie” *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft* **1916** *18* (13/14). 318–323.
- (39) Bukowsky, C. R., Scalable Nanophotonic Light Management Design for Solar Cells, Thesis, California Institute of Technology, **2019**
- (40) Zhou, Y., Benetti, D., Fan, Z., Zhao, H., Ma, D., Govorov, A. O., Vomiero, A., Rosei, F. “Near Infrared, Highly Efficient Luminescent Solar Concentrators”. *Adv. Energy Mater.*, **2016** *6*: 1501913.
- (41) Meinardi, F., Bruni, F. & Brovelli, S. “Luminescent solar concentrators for building-integrated photovoltaics”. *Nat Rev Mater* **2017** *2*, 17072.
- (42) Needell, D. R.; Bukowsky, C. R. ; Darbe, S.; Bauser, H.; Ilic, O and Atwater, H.A. “Spectrally Matched Quantum Dot Photoluminescence in GaAs-Si Tandem Luminescent Solar Concentrators,” *IEEE J. Photovoltaics* **2019** *9*, 2, 397– 401
- (43) Boccard, M.; Holman, Z. C. Amorphous silicon carbide passivating layers for crystalline-silicon-based heterojunction solar cells *J. Appl. Phys.* **2015**, *118* (6) 065704
- (44) Bae, W. K.; Park, Y. S.; Lim, J.; Lee, D.; Padilha, L. A.; McDaniel, H.; Robel, I.; Lee, C.; Pietryga, J. M.; Klimov, V. I. Controlling the Influence of Auger Recombination on the Performance of Quantum-Dot Light-Emitting Diodes *Nat. Commun.* **2013**, *4*, 2661
- (45) Likovich, E.M., Jaramillo, R., Russell, K.J., Ramanathan, S. and Narayanamurti, V., High-Current-Density Monolayer CdSe/ZnS Quantum Dot Light-Emitting Devices with Oxide Electrodes. *Adv. Mater.*, **2011** *23*: 4521-4525
- (46) Caruge, J., Halpert, J., Wood, V. et al. Colloidal quantum-dot light-emitting diodes with metal-oxide charge transport layers. *Nature Photon* **2008** *2*, 247–250
- (47) Klimov, V.I.; Baker, T. A.; Lim, J.; Velizhanin, K.A. and McDaniel, H. “Quality Factor of Luminescent Solar Concentrators and Practical Concentration Limits Attainable with Semiconductor Quantum Dots” *ACS Photonics* **2016** *3* (6), 1138-1148
- (48) Meinardi, F., Colombo, A., Velizhanin, K. et al. Large-area luminescent solar concentrators based on ‘Stokes-shift-engineered’ nanocrystals in a mass-polymerized PMMA matrix. *Nature Photon* **2014** *8* 392–399.
- (49) Johnson, S. G. and Joannopoulos, J. D. Block-iterative frequency-domain methods for Maxwell's equations in a planewave basis, *Optics Express* **2001** *8*, no. 3, 173-190
- (50) Johnson, S. G.; Fan, S.; Villeneuve, P.; Joannopoulos, J. D. and Kolodziejski, L. Guided Modes in Photonic Crystal Slabs. *Physical Review B* **1999** *60*, no. 8 5751–58

For Table of Contents Use Only

Photonic Crystal Waveguides for >90% Light Trapping Efficiency in Luminescent Solar Concentrators


Haley C. Bauser^{†, †}, Colton R. Bukowsky^{†, ‡, †}, Megan Phelan[†], William Weigand[‡], David R. Needell[†], Zachary C. Holman[‡], and Harry A. Atwater^{†, *}

[†] Department of Applied Physics and Materials Science, California Institute of Technology, 1200 E California Blvd, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

[‡] Leia Inc, 2440 Sand Hill Rd. Suite 100, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA

[‡] School of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287, USA

The below graphic demonstrates a rod and hole array photonic crystal with coupled quantum dots whose emission is guided to a photovoltaic cell.



Photonic Crystal Rod Waveguide

Photonic Crystal Hole Waveguide