Electronic Supplementary Information

Relationship between the intermediate phases of sputtered Zn(O, S) buffer

layer and the conduction band offset in Cd-free Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ solar cells

Qian Du^a, Boyan Li^b Sihan Shi, Kaizhi Zhang, Yunxiang Zhang, Shiqing Cheng, Zhiqiang Zhou, Fangfang Liu, Shulong Sun^c, Yun Sun, Wei Liu *

Qian Du and Boyan Li contributed equally.

a Institute of Photoelectronic Thin Film Devices and Technology of Nankai University, Key Laboratory of Photoelectronic Thin Film Devices and Technology of Tianjin, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China.

b Institute of Modern Optics, College of Electronic Information and Optical Engineering, Nankai University, Tianjin 300350, China

c Hanergy Heyuan Mobile Energy Intelligence Manufacture Base, Beijing, 102211, China



Figure S1. (a) The configurations of conventional CdS-based CIGS solar cells and (b) Zn(O,S)-based CIGS solar cells.



Figure S2. The configuration of cross-sectional SEM image of Zn(O,S)/CIGS heterojunction solar cells. The amplified part in the white circle is the Zn(O,S) buffer layer of 50 nm approximately.



Figure S3. The EDS results of S and Zn elements distribution in the Zn(O,S) thin films with different oxygen fluxes (from 0.1 sccm to 0.4 sccm).



Figure S4. The XPS result of Zn 2p spectra in Zn(O,S) thin films with the various oxygen flux. The peak centered at 1022.3 eV is Zn $2p_{3/2}$ and the peak positioned at 1044.9 eV is Zn $2p_{1/2}$.

 Table S1. The variation of S content in Zn(O,S) thin films with the different oxygen fluxes

 based on XRF results.

Oxygen flux (sccm)	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
S content based on XRF result	0.58	0.54	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.26

Oxygen flux	Crystal orientation 2θ (°)					
(sccm)	(100)	(002)	(101)			
0.1	30.33	N/A	N/A			
0.2	30.88	N/A	N/A			
0.3	31.17	33.36	35.47			
0.4	31.44	33.82	35.85			

Table S2. GIXRD Peak position of thin films under different oxygen fluxes based on XRD results.

Oxygen flux (sccm)	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
S content based on XRF result	0.58	0.54	0.28	0.27
S content based on XPS result	0.63	0.57	0.28	0.23

Table S3. The variation of S content in Zn(O,S) thin films with the different oxygen fluxes based on XRF and XPS results.

		,0		
Oxygen flux (sccm)	Peak area			
	O-A	O-B	O- C	
0.1	4268.1	14094.9	7866.0	
0.2	4235.9	14302.6	6960.1	
0.3	4762.0	19674.6	9624.4	
0.4	4591.2	19820.6	10789.9	

Table S4. Peak area of O1s under the different oxygen fluxes

	Al-ZnO	CdS	Zn(O,S)	CIGS
Thickness (nm)	350	50	50	~2000
Permittivity	9	10	13.6	13.6
Eg(eV)	3.3	2.4	variable	variable
Electron affinity	4.6	4.2	variable	variable
Nc (cm $^{-3}$)	2.2×10 ¹⁸	2.2×10 ¹⁸	2.2×10 ¹⁸	2.2×10 ¹⁸
Nv (cm $^{-3}$)	1.8×10 ¹⁹	1.8×10 ¹⁹	1.8×10 ¹⁹	1.8×10 ¹⁹
μ_e (cm ² /V*s)	100	100	75	40
μ_h (cm ² /V*s)	30	20	20	10
Nd (cm ⁻³)	1.0×10 ¹⁸	1.0×10 ¹⁸	1.0×10^{12}	~
Na (cm ⁻³)	~	~	~	2.0×10 ¹⁶

Table S5. The simulation parameters of the Zn(O,S)/CIGS solar cells

Cells	Cell number	V _{oc} [mV]	J _{sc} [mA cm ⁻²]	FF [%]	Eff [%]
	#1	478	27.13	41.32	5.4
	#2	430	27.79	35.71	4.3
	#3	490	26.70	38.45	5.04
0.1.000	#4	484	24.60	29.85	3.56
0.1 sccm	#5	482	27.32	39.87	5.25
	#6	476	27.45	41.18	5.38
	#7	473	27.21	41.10	5.29
	#8	489	27.03	40.25	5.32
	#1	538	34.04	59.43	10.89
	#2	508	28.8	66.95	9.8
	#3	466	28.5	55.74	7.39
0.2 soom	#4	562	26.18	61.09	8.9
0.2 Seem	#5	554	32.31	58.78	10.52
	#6	539	33.94	56.52	10.34
	#7	542	28.57	56.77	8.79
	#8	546	30.92	58.40	9.86
	#1	592	31.63	71.24	13.34
	#2	580	32.7	70.12	13.3
	#3	556	33.53	69.66	12.99
0.3 soom	#4	538	32.57	65.83	11.53
0.5 Seem	#5	584	32.32	70.20	13.25
	#6	581	32.69	69.03	13.11
	#7	569	33.41	67.72	12.87
	#8	552	31.55	65.98	11.49
	#1	574	25.11	66.11	9.54
0.4 sccm	#2	512	29.34	57.58	8.65
	#3	550	26.03	51.93	7.43

Table S6. Performance of Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ (CIGS) solar cells based on the samples with different oxygen fluxes and the samples with CdS buffer layer.

	#4	557	28.43	59.42	9.41
	#5	542	28.69	57.36	8.92
	#6	554	27.64	61.78	9.46
	#7	561	29.11	57.20	9.34
	#8	549	28.34	54.77	8.52
CdS/CIGS	#1	616	30.73	76.06	14.4
	#2	658	32.16	67.06	14.19
	#3	634	29.18	69.99	12.95
	#4	640	29.96	69.83	13.39
	#5	647	30.55	72.15	14.26
	#6	635	31.67	68.97	13.87
	#7	638	32.15	66.74	13.69
	#8	641	30.76	72.22	14.24

Cells	Cell number	Voc [mV]	Jsc [mA cm ⁻²]	FF [%]	Eff [%]
	#1	477	26.52	41.15	5.21
	#2	428	27.82	35.43	4.22
	#3	491	26.54	38.79	5.05
0.1	#4	480	24.48	29.39	3.42
0.1 sccm	#5	482	27.17	39.56	5.18
	#6	477	26.98	41.01	5.28
	#7	471	27.19	39.86	5.14
	#8	483	26.75	40.17	5.20
	#1	539	33.91	59.22	10.82
	#2	501	28.81	66.24	9.56
	#3	465	28.34	55.12	7.26
	#4	557	25.96	60.74	8.78
0.2 sccm	#5	546	31.99	57.32	10.01
	#6	528	33.67	56.66	10.07
	#7	543	27.74	54.57	8.22
	#8	546	30.12	58.23	9.58
	#1	590	31.52	70.83	13.17
	#2	572	32.25	69.34	12.79
	#3	554	33.29	69.47	12.81
0.2	#4	529	32.33	65.26	11.16
0.3 sccm	#5	585	32.24	70.03	13.21
	#6	580	32.42	68.69	12.92
	#7	562	32.89	67.36	12.45
	#8	548	30.74	65.21	10.98
	#1	573	25.12	66.08	9.51
0.4 sccm	#2	510	29.25	57.46	8.57
	#3	543	25.58	50.69	7.04

Table S7. Performance of $Cu(In,Ga)Se_2$ (CIGS) solar cells based on the samples with different oxygen fluxes and the samples with CdS buffer layer after a half year.

	#4	557	28.38	59.25	9.37
	#5	541	28.43	56.99	8.77
	#6	555	27.63	61.74	9.47
	#7	559	29.10	57.12	9.29
	#8	547	28.19	54.53	8.41
CdS/CIGS	#1	612	30.37	75.98	14.12
	#2	658	32.09	66.84	14.11
	#3	630	29.17	69.75	12.82
	#4	640	29.81	69.48	13.26
	#5	644	30.13	71.87	13.95
	#6	631	31.55	68.62	13.66
	#7	638	32.14	66.75	13.69
	#8	642	30.58	72.19	14.17