

# Low-temperature, solution-processed, layered $V_2O_5$ hydrate as the hole-transport layer for stable organic solar cells†

Cite this: *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, **6**, 3088

Gerardo Terán-Escobar, Jonas Pampel, José M. Caicedo and Mónica Lira-Cantú\*

Layered  $V_2O_5$  hydrate has been applied as the hole transport layer (HTL) in organic solar cells (OSCs).  $V_2O_5$  is obtained from a sodium metavanadate solution in water under ambient conditions, resulting in a final thin film of formula  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$ . The 0.5 water molecules are not removed from the  $V_2O_5$  layered structure unless the sample is heated above 250 °C, which makes the thin film highly stable under real working conditions. The HTL was used in OSCs in the normal and the inverted configurations, applying metallic Ag as the back-metal electrode in both cases. Fabrication of both OSC configurations completely by solution-processing printing methods in air is possible, since the Al electrode needed for the normal-configuration OSC is not required. The work function (WF) and band gap energy (BG) of the  $V_2O_5$  thin films were assessed by XPS, UPS and optical analyses. Different WF values were observed for  $V_2O_5$  prepared from a fresh  $V_2O_5$ -isopropanol (IPA) solution (5.15 eV) and that prepared from a 24 h-old solution (5.5 eV). This difference is due to the gradual reduction of vanadium (from  $V^{5+}$  to  $V^{4+}$ ) in IPA. The OSCs made with the  $V_2O_5$  thin film obtained from the 24 h-old  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution required photo-activation, whereas those made with the freshly obtained  $V_2O_5$  did not. Outdoor stability analyses of sealed OSCs containing a  $V_2O_5$  HTL in either configuration revealed high stability for both devices: the photovoltaic response at  $T_{80}$  was retained for more than 1000 h.

Received 1st July 2013

Accepted 29th July 2013

DOI: 10.1039/c3ee42204f

[www.rsc.org/ees](http://www.rsc.org/ees)

## Broader context

Organic Solar Cells (OSCs) have achieved an impressive increase in power conversion efficiency in the past few years, with values above the 12% range. Yet, in order to be competitive with existing energy sources from fossil fuels and modern inorganic photovoltaic technologies, OSCs must reduce fabrication costs and improve its energy payback time (EPBT). To achieve the latter, the fabrication of OSCs by large scale, solution processing methods applying inexpensive, low temperature techniques is required. An important aim is the exclusion of toxic organic solvents, being water-based or alcohol-based solutions is highly desired. In this work, a layered  $V_2O_5$  hydrate has been applied as the hole transport layer in stable OSCs.  $V_2O_5$  is obtained from the dissolution of sodium metavanadate in water under ambient atmospheric conditions, resulting in a final thin film with the  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  formula. OSCs with normal and inverted configuration applying metallic Ag as the back metal electrode in both cases have been fabricated. The use of a Ag electrode eliminates the need for a highly reactive work function metal electrodes (Al, Ca) for the normal configuration OSC, and permits the fabrication of both OSC configurations completely by solution processing printing methods in air. Outdoor stability analyses of sealed devices showed high stability, maintaining the photovoltaic response at  $T_{80}$  for more than 1000 h.

## 1 Introduction

The predicted maximum power conversion efficiency (PCE) of organic solar cells (OSCs) has been empirically estimated to be 10 to 12%, but theoretical calculations suggest that values of 20 to 24% could be achieved, which are comparable to those of crystalline Si solar cells.<sup>1</sup> However, OSCs must also be cost-competitive and show long lifetimes. The former requires

inexpensive methods for large-scale fabrication, including solution-processing techniques such as roll-to-roll compatible printing techniques.<sup>2–8</sup> Ideally, a single printing method would be used to continuously and rapidly process all layers; unfortunately, no such process exists yet and therefore, multiple techniques must be employed. Additionally, the envisaged mass-production of OSCs indicates that toxic organic solvents will have to be replaced with non-toxic, alcohol or water-based solutions and inks. Interestingly, a few cases of partial or complete roll-to-roll fabrication methods of OSCs with water-based inks have very recently been reported.<sup>5,9–11</sup>

Transition metal oxides (TMOs) have been employed in organic solar cells, especially  $TiO_2$  and ZnO. Their most attractive feature is the possibility to be deposited by low temperature solution processing methods. Among them are

Catalan Institute of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology (ICN2), Campus UAB, Building ICN2, Bellaterra, Barcelona, E-0193, Spain, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Campus UAB, Building ICN2, Bellaterra, Barcelona, E-0193, Spain. E-mail: monica.lira@cin2.es; Fax: +34 937373606; Tel: +34 937374615

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/c3ee42204f



also  $V_2O_5$ ,<sup>12–21</sup>  $NiO$ ,<sup>22–30</sup>  $MoO_3$ ,<sup>31–35</sup>  $WO_3$ <sup>36–39</sup> or  $Sb_2O_3$ .<sup>40</sup> These TMOs exhibit a wide range of energy level alignments,<sup>41–44</sup> good transparency as thin films, are easy to manipulate, and confer low-resistance ohmic contacts to the OSC.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, TMOs can enhance the adhesion to the active layer<sup>8,16</sup> and show higher stability to ambient atmosphere relative to PEDOT:PSS, which has been shown to be detrimental for OSCs due to its high hygroscopicity and its acidic pH.<sup>46–50</sup> Additionally, the high power conversion efficiency requirement for future OSCs rely on small-molecule OSCs (SmOSCs)<sup>39,40,51,52</sup> and multi-junction or tandem solar cell (TmOSC) structures, whose PCE values presently range from 10–12%.<sup>5,10,53–56</sup> One interesting TMO is  $V_2O_5$ , which has been reported to be a good candidate for the HTL in OSCs. To date,  $V_2O_5$  HTLs have been synthesised chiefly by multistep techniques. Examples include the suspension of  $V_2O_5$  nanoparticulates obtained from the hydrolysis of vanadium(III) acetyl acetate<sup>19</sup> or the fabrication of a bronze  $V_2O_5$  HTL from a suspension of the metal oxide obtained after the reaction between the metal powder and  $H_2O_2$ .<sup>21</sup> Among the most widespread fabrication methods is the application of sol-gels made from vanadium(V) oxytriisopropoxide (ViPr),<sup>5,14,15,57,58</sup> which is a compound known for its high toxicity, reactivity and cost.

Herein we present the synthesis, optimisation and application of water-based, solution processable  $V_2O_5$  as the HTL in OSCs. The HTL was fabricated at low temperature in air without the need for any high temperature post-deposition treatments or multistep reactions. The water-based layered  $V_2O_5$  hydrate is highly compatible with the fabrication of OSCs by large-area, low-cost, fast processing and high-throughput printing,<sup>5,15</sup> and also enables the preparation of  $ZnO/V_2O_5$  recombination layers required for TmOSCs.<sup>59</sup> We demonstrate here that the application of the low-temperature water-based  $V_2O_5$  solution can be tuned in order to fabricate OSCs in either the inverted or the normal configurations, on either glass or flexible substrates. Moreover, we have fabricated OSCs with both configurations applying only Ag as the back metal electrode. Thus, our OSCs can be made completely by solution-processing methods, as they do not require an Al electrode for the normal-configuration OSCs<sup>10</sup> and the Ag metal electrode can be deposited by established solution-processing printing techniques.<sup>11</sup> A careful optimisation of the  $V_2O_5$  hydrate solution permitted to obviate the requirement for photo-activation of the solar cell in air.<sup>19</sup> Finally, the OSC devices also show good outdoor stability maintaining  $T_{80}$  for more than 1000 h.

## 2 Experimental section

### 2.1 Synthesis of TMOs

The  $TiO_2$  solution was fabricated and deposited as previously reported,<sup>60</sup> and the  $ZnO$  nanoparticles were synthesised following the Pacholski method<sup>61</sup> and deposited by spin coating at 1000 rpm. The  $V_2O_5$  hydrate solution was obtained using an adapted version of Livage's method.<sup>62</sup> Briefly, 4.5 g of sodium metavanadate ( $NaVO_3$ ) are dissolved in 100 mL of deionised water by heating the mixture at 90 °C with stirring. The resulting transparent solution is passed through a cation-exchange resin (DOWEX 2x-100, Aldrich) to obtain metavanadic acid ( $HVO_3$ ) as

a yellow solution, which is stored in a closed glass flask under an ambient atmosphere. As the solution ages, it becomes yellowish-orange, indicating the presence of condensed species such as decavanadates ( $[V_{10}O_{28}]^{6-}$ ). Finally, the orange solution changes to dark red, which is characteristic of the  $V_2O_5$  hydrate (gel). The condensation and aging of the solution occurs over ~20 days, after which, the viscous hydrate solution stabilises and is ready to use. A bright red vanadium pentoxide  $V_2O_5 \cdot nH_2O$  gel is obtained. For the inverted OSC a 1 : 1 mixture of  $V_2O_5$  hydrate (9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>) in isopropanol (IPA) was spin-coated at 1000 rpm, and then annealed at 120 °C for 5 min. For the normal configuration OSCs the  $V_2O_5$  solution was spin coated at 1000 rpm directly from the solution without the aid of the IPA.

### 2.2 Solar cell fabrication

The response of the solar cells was independent of the used substrate (ITO or FTO). All the flexible substrates were made on a PET/ITO transparent film. Substrates of FTO on glass were supplied by SOLEMS (resistance: 70 to 100 ohms). PET/ITO substrates were brought from Aldrich (resistance: 35 ohms). The substrates were cleaned with a water-soap solution, rinsed with deionised water, ultrasonicated in ethanol (99%), dried under  $N_2$  flux and finally, ozone treated in a UV-surface decontamination system (Novascan, PSD-UV) connected to an  $O_2$  supply. The OSCs were fabricated in either the *normal configuration* (FTO/ $V_2O_5$ /P3HT:PCBM/ $TiO_2$ /Ag) or the *inverted configuration* (FTO/ $TiO_2$ /P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag).  $TiO_2$  was used on glass/FTO substrates and was replaced by  $ZnO$  in order to fabricate flexible OSCs on ITO/PET (Aldrich). The bulk heterojunction blend comprised a 1 : 0.8 mixture of regioregular P3HT (Merck, 98%) and PCBM (Solenne, 99.5%) that was dissolved in dichlorobenzene (Sigma-Aldrich). The blend was spin coated at 1000 rpm, affording a 200 to 250 nm-thick P3HT:PCBM film. The devices were subsequently annealed at 120 °C for 5 min in air. A 100 nm-thick Ag back metal electrode was deposited by thermal evaporation in an evaporation system (Auto 306, Broc Edwards) with a base pressure of  $10^{-7}$  torr at a deposition rate of 1 Å s<sup>-1</sup>. The final active area was 0.2 cm<sup>2</sup>. The solar cells were sealed by applying a two-component adhesive (ThreeBond, 30Y-727 and 31x-167-2), which was mixed in a 1 : 1 ratio and cured under UV light for 10 min.

### 2.3 Characterisation

The thicknesses of the polymer layers were measured using a Nanopics-2100 from Nanopics profilometer and by SEM (Quanta FEI 200 FEG-ESEM). Optical measurements were performed using a UV-vis spectrophotometer (UV 1800, Shimadzu). Grazing incidence X-ray analyses were done using a Rigaku unit and measured between 5° and 80°. TGA analyses were done using an STA 449 F1 Jupiter (Netzsch). Contact angles were analysed using a DSA 100 (KRÜSS). XPS was done with the Al  $\kappa\alpha$  (1486.6 eV). All spectra were adjusted according to the value of the C 1s peak at  $284.4 \pm 0.1$  eV. The UPS were obtained using a He lamp (He I 21.2 eV) at an experimental resolution of 0.15 eV. The samples were biased at -5 V.



## 2.4 Photovoltaic characterisation

The solar simulation was performed on a KHS1200 (Steuernagel Solarkonstant) equipped with an AM1.5 filter for all characterisations ( $100 \text{ mW cm}^{-2}$ , AM1.5G,  $72^\circ \text{C}$ ). The equipment was calibrated according to the ASTM G173. *IV*-curves were measured using a Keithley 2601 multimeter. Light intensity was  $100 \text{ mW}$  calibrated with a Zipp & Konen CM-4 pyranometer, which was used constantly during measurements to set light intensity, and a calibrated S1227-1010BQ photodiode from Hamamatsu was also applied for calibration before each measurement. IPCE analyses were done with a QE/IPCE measurement System from Oriel (from 300 to 700 nm; at 10 nm intervals). The results were not corrected for any intensity losses due to light absorption or reflection by the glass support.

## 2.5 Outdoor stability analyses

The outdoor stability analyses were done following the ISOS-1 procedures<sup>63</sup> at the Laboratory of Nanostructured Materials for Photovoltaic Energy of the Catalan Institute of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology (ICN2-CSIC), located in Barcelona, Spain ( $41.30^\circ \text{N}$   $2.09^\circ \text{W}$ ), using a solar tracking positioning system. The system comprises a large dual axis-controlled platform with fully automated motors, which enables turning of the tracker hour angle up to  $100^\circ$  (which translates to nearly 7 hours of perpendicular solar tracking) and turning of the tracker elevation angle from  $15^\circ$  to  $90^\circ$  (which enables full tracking of solar elevation). We developed in-house software to control the photovoltaic response of sixteen solar cells at the same time and to continuously monitor light irradiation, temperature and


relative humidity over time. *IV*-curves were measured using a 2602A dual-channel SMU multimeter and a 3700 series switch/multimeter (both from Keithley). PCE values were calculated using the maximum daily irradiance level. The light irradiation was measured with a Zipp&Konen CM-4 pyranometer. The temperature and relative humidity were monitored with a combined sensor (Theodor Friedrichs).

## 3 Results and discussion

### 3.1 Optimisation of the $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$ layer: concentration and layer thickness

$\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  hydrate is obtained from an aqueous solution of sodium metavanadate ( $\text{NaVO}_3$ ). During synthesis, the  $\text{NaVO}_3$  dissolved in water is converted into metavanadic acid ( $\text{HVO}_3$ ) *via* cation-exchange. A condensation process over time results in the formation of decavanadates ( $[\text{V}_{10}\text{O}_{28}]^{6-}$ ), and finally, a dark red solution is obtained, corresponding to vanadium pentoxide hydrate ( $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , where  $n$  varies). The variable water molecules in  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  hydrate are partially eliminated when the  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  thin film is formed on the glass/FTO substrate. The number of water molecules ( $n$ ) in the formula  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  ranges from 0 to 2.2, depending on the annealing temperature: below  $120^\circ \text{C}$ ,  $n = 1.6$ ; from 120 to  $250^\circ \text{C}$ ,  $n = 0.5$ ; from 250 to  $320^\circ \text{C}$ ,  $n = 0.1$ ; and annealing above  $320^\circ \text{C}$  promotes the total elimination of water ( $n = 0$ ) and the crystallisation of  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  into its rhombic crystalline phase.<sup>64,65</sup>

The  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  film used in this work was prepared by spin coating and the substrate was then treated at  $120^\circ \text{C}$  for several minutes before being applied to the OSCs. The final formula of the thin



**Fig. 1** Optimisation of the concentration of the  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  hydrate solution used to create the hole transport layer in an inverted organic solar cell (glass/FTO/ $\text{TiO}_2$ /P3HT:PCBM/ $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$ /Ag). (a) PCE (%) and (b)  $J_{\text{sc}}$  ( $\text{mA cm}^{-2}$ ). Measurements made at  $100 \text{ W cm}^{-2}$  AM1.5G. (c)  $V_{\text{oc}}$  and (d) FF (%), (e) layer thickness vs.  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  concentration and (f) AFM analyses of the  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  thin film made with a concentration of  $9 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$ .



film is  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  (the number of water molecules was calculated from the TGA analyses performed in air). Once the films have been prepared, the water molecules can only be removed if the film is heated above 250 °C. However, under real working conditions the OSCs will never reach those temperatures and therefore, the water in the  $V_2O_5$  interlayer can be considered stable.

Fig. 1 shows the photovoltaic response of inverted organic solar cells with the glass/FTO/TiO<sub>2</sub>/PCM:P3HT/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag configuration, depending on the  $V_2O_5$  concentration. For the fabrication of inverted devices, the deposition of  $V_2O_5$  on top of the active P3HT:PCBM layer requires mixing of  $V_2O_5$  hydrate with isopropanol (IPA) to improve adherence. The optimum ratio of  $V_2O_5$  to IPA was found to be 1 : 1 (as determined by contact angle measurements; see ESI Fig. S1†). The solution obtained was then spin-coated at 1000 rpm in an ambient atmosphere, and finally, heated at 120 °C for 5 min. There is a clear improvement on the photovoltaic response of the device (*ca.* in FF,  $J_{sc}$  and PCE) when the concentration of the oxide is increased from 2 mg mL<sup>-1</sup> to 9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>, as observed in Fig. 1. The PCE and FF increase and ultimately stabilise at 3% and 50%, respectively. As the FF increased, the  $J_{sc}$  also stabilised at a  $V_2O_5$  concentration of 9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>. Increasing the photovoltaic response by increasing the concentration of  $V_2O_5$  above these values was not achievable due its limited solubility. Thus, the optimal value chosen for fabrication of the inverted OSCs was 9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>. An increase in the thin film layer thickness was also observed when raising the concentration of the oxide from 2 mg mL<sup>-1</sup> to 9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>, with values ranging from 60 nm to 125 nm (as measured by SEM and profilometry, Fig. 1e). The possibility to fabricate thick film layers without compromising the photovoltaic performance of the device (*i.e.* by increasing series resistance) has also been observed by Brabec *et al.*<sup>19</sup> In our case, we attributed this response to the mixed ionic-electronic conductivity that characterises the  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  thin film. Finally, Fig. 1f shows the atomic force microscopy (AFM) image, at a 2 mm × 2 mm scan size, of the thin film  $V_2O_5$  made with a solution concentration of 9 mg mL<sup>-1</sup>. A nanostructured surface with high surface roughness is observed for the thin film.

To compare the performance of our  $V_2O_5$  HTLs with that of the most widely used HTL, PEDOT:PSS, we fabricated and assessed OSCs of both configurations. The devices were prepared on glass/FTO substrates (the fabrication of flexible OSCs applying the  $V_2O_5$  HTL is also possible, see ESI Fig. S2†). Fig. 2 shows the *IV* curves and the IPCE spectra obtained for the devices. In all cases the ETL was ZnO. Table 1 shows the photovoltaic parameters obtained for the different OSCs; for comparison purposes, we have also included solar cells containing a TiO<sub>2</sub> ETL. The reported values are mean values from six samples. The best photovoltaic performance (PCE: 3%) was generally observed for the OSC fabricated on glass/FTO substrates, with TiO<sub>2</sub> as the ETL and  $V_2O_5$  hydrate as the HTL. In this case, the OSCs employing the  $V_2O_5$  hydrate resulted in better performance when compared to PEDOT:PSS. The OSCs with ZnO and  $V_2O_5$  showed a very similar response with photovoltaic PCEs of *ca.* 2.5 to 2.6%. Our results indicate that a similar response can be achieved for OSCs with layered  $V_2O_5$  hydrate when compared to the PEDOT:PPS HTL.




Fig. 2 *IV* curves (a) and the corresponding IPCE spectra (b) for the inverted configuration organic solar cell in glass/FTO/ZnO/P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag and, for comparison purposes, similar cells containing PEDOT:PSS instead of  $V_2O_5$ . Measurements were taken at 100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup> AM1.5G.

### 3.2 S-shape curve and photo-annealing of the inverted OSC in air


Fig. 3 shows the *IV*-curves and IPCE spectra obtained for our OSCs fabricated with fresh (1) and 24 hour-old (2)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solutions. As observed, the OSC made with the fresh solution exhibited maximum photovoltaic performance directly after fabrication (Fig. 3a-(1)). In contrast, the OSC made with the 24 h-old solution (Fig. 3a-(2)) gradually improved with *IV*-cycles, ultimately reaching maximum performance (Fig. 3a-(3)). The corresponding IPCE analyses (see Fig. 3b) are in close agreement with the PCE values obtained for the OSCs. Besides the difference in IPCE intensity values, the most significant variations between the IPCE applying freshly prepared (1) and 24 h-old (2)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solutions are observed in the wavelength region below 450 nm, corresponding to the adsorption of the semiconductor oxides (TiO<sub>2</sub>, ZnO,  $V_2O_5$ , *etc.*).

Since the only difference in the fabrication of the two OSCs was the  $V_2O_5$  HTL, we attributed the need for photo-annealing to the  $V_2O_5$  thin film properties that are probably affected by the interaction between  $V_2O_5$  with IPA.<sup>62,66,67</sup> Layered vanadium(v) oxides in their hydrated state tend to accommodate foreign molecules in their interlayer region,<sup>64,66-68</sup> including organic compounds such as alcohols.<sup>69</sup> Alcohols intercalate, *via* their -OH group, at the polar site of  $V_2O_5$ . In this partially reversible



**Table 1** Photovoltaic parameters of inverted OSCs fabricated with hole transport layers of either  $V_2O_5$  or PEDOT:PSS. The values are the mean from six samples. Measurements were taken at  $100 \text{ mW cm}^{-2}$  AM1.5G

Inverted configuration	$V_{oc}$ (V)	$J_{sc}$ ( $\text{mA cm}^{-2}$ )	FF (%)	PCE (%)
Glass/FTO/TiO <sub>2</sub> /P3HT:PCBM/PEDOT:PSS/Ag	$0.557 \pm 0.015$	$9.84 \pm 0.43$	$45.43 \pm 2.74$	$2.53 \pm 0.17$
Glass/FTO/TiO <sub>2</sub> /P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag	$0.563 \pm 0.015$	$10.69 \pm 0.38$	$50.49 \pm 1.90$	$3.09 \pm 0.18$
Glass/FTO/ZnO/P3HT:PCBM/PEDOT:PSS/Ag	$0.543 \pm 0.013$	$10.07 \pm 0.37$	$45.06 \pm 1.16$	$2.64 \pm 0.12$
Glass/FTO/ZnO/P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag	$0.540 \pm 0.016$	$9.54 \pm 1.10$	$47.20 \pm 1.90$	$2.58 \pm 0.22$



**Fig. 3** Organic solar cells with  $V_2O_5$  hydrate as the hole transport layer in the inverted configuration (glass/FTO/TiO<sub>2</sub>/P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag). Photovoltaic response of the cells fabricated from a freshly prepared (1) or a 24 h-old (2)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution. Using the fresh solution obviates the need for photo-activation of the device in air, as shown in the  $I$ - $V$ -curves and IPCE spectra from (2) to (3). Measurements were taken at  $100 \text{ mW cm}^{-2}$  AM1.5G.

reaction the  $H_2O$  molecules of  $V_2O_5$  hydrate are exchanged with alcohol molecules, leading to the reduction of  $V_2O_5$  from  $V^{5+}$  to  $V^{4+}$ .  $V_2O_5$  reduces relatively quickly when in solution with organic molecules, as indicated by a gradual change in the colour of the solution from red (indicative of  $V^{5+}$ ) to green (indicative of the reduction of  $V^{5+}$  to  $V^{4+}$ ). Thus, the thin film obtained from the 24 h-old  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution could be partially reduced and therefore photo-annealing is required in order to eliminate the undesirable shunts and inflection points (S-shape  $I$ - $V$  curve) and to achieve maximum power conversion efficiency.<sup>4,70,71,80</sup>

To understand the changes that we observed in the OSCs as a function of the freshness of the  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution, we

**Table 2** Binding energy values (in eV) of the main peaks in the XPS spectra of  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  thin films obtained from fresh or 24 h-old solutions of  $V_2O_5$ -IPA<sup>21,72-74</sup>


Peak	Fresh (red)	24 h-old (green)	Assignment
$V2p_{3/2}$	516.20	516.20	$V^{4+}$
$V2p_{3/2}$	517.20	517.20	$V^{5+}$
$V2p_{1/2}$	524.75	524.70	$V^{5+}$
O 1s	529.95	529.90	$O_2^-$
O 1s	533.20	—	$H_2O$

characterised the  $V_2O_5$  thin films by XPS, UPS and optical analyses.<sup>76-78</sup> Fig. 4a shows the XPS spectra of the  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  thin films fabricated from the fresh (red) and 24 h-old (green) solutions. The binding energy (BE) values of the main peaks and their assignment are detailed in Table 2.

XPS analyses revealed only slight differences in the intensity of the spectra between the two films (see ESI Fig. S3<sup>†</sup>). Despite these small differences, the two thin films gave very similar XPS results: the main peaks of  $V2p_{3/2}$  and  $V2p_{1/2}$  were almost identical. The characteristic peaks of  $V_2O_5$  are observed at 517 eV and 524 eV (corresponding to  $V^{5+}$ ), and at 529.9 eV (the O 1s from the  $O_2^-$  ions). The XPS plot was subject to a Lorentzian-Gaussian fitting; the region of the  $V^{5+}$  peak at 517 eV reveals a shoulder at *ca.* 516 eV. This peak is attributed to the presence of  $V^{4+}$ , which is commonly observed in the hydrated form of  $V_2O_5$ <sup>72</sup> as well as in reduced films.<sup>73</sup> But, it is not present in a crystalline  $V_2O_5$  film that has been subjected to thermal evaporation or annealed at high temperatures, as these procedures eliminate all water.<sup>72</sup> This shoulder at 516 eV has also been observed by Ziberberg *et al.*, in the XPS analyses of a  $V_2O_5$  thin film (10 nm) obtained from vanadium(v)-oxytriisopropoxide (ViPr). However, they attributed the presence of the  $V^{4+}$  peak to air exposure and not to any possible organic residues from the ViPr (despite having observed residual carbon by XPS).

The calculated composition analyses of the films show that  $V^{4+}$  accounts for a very small amount (less than 10% of total V), indicating that both thin films are partially reduced if compared to the stoichiometric  $V_2O_5$ . Taking into account the atomic ratio of V and O (expected V : O ratio of 1 : 2.46 for  $V_2O_5$ ), we can be aware of the content of oxygen vacancies in the films. A deviation from the stoichiometric V : O ratio, of 1 : 2.46, was observed for both films, an indication of the presence of oxygen vacancies that arise from the reduction of  $V_2O_5$ , as expected.<sup>72</sup> Moreover, the peak at 533.2 eV of the O 1s is slightly higher in intensity for the film made from the freshly prepared solution, and almost disappears in the thin film made from the aged






**Fig. 4** XPS (a), band gap (b) and UPS (c) spectra of the  $V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$  thin film obtained from freshly prepared (red) or 24 h-old (green)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution.

$V_2O_5$ -IAP solution (as can be seen in Fig. 4a and S3†). This is in good agreement with the replacement of the water molecules intercalated in  $V_2O_5$  by the IAP molecules in solution. Once prepared as a thin film, the IAP evaporates from the  $V_2O_5$  layer leaving behind a thin film without (or at least less amount) of water molecules.

We can infer from these results that both thin films are partially reduced: the film prepared with fresh solution, by water, and the film prepared with the 24 h-old solution, by IPA.

The optical band gap (BG), calculated from Tauc's formula, plot of  $\alpha^2 E^2$  against photo energy,<sup>75</sup> is shown in Fig. 4b. It reveals a slight difference in BGs between the thin films fabricated from either fresh (red) or 24 h-old (green)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution, with values of 2.7 eV and 2.8 eV, respectively. The full He I scan of the ultraviolet photoelectron spectroscopy (UPS) analyses of the films is shown in Fig. 4c. The work function (WF) values obtained were 5.15 eV (fresh) and 5.5 eV (24 h-old), respectively, as reflected in the photoemission offset around 16 eV. These values are in good agreement with WF values of thin films of  $V_2O_5$  fabricated in air.<sup>15</sup> Finally, the values for the ionisation potential (IP), defined as the energy difference between the valence band (VB) edge and the vacuum level ( $E_v$ ), are 7.66 eV (fresh) and 8.0 eV (24 h-old).

These results permitted the construction of the band energy diagram for both thin films as shown in Fig. 5. To calculate the voltage of the OSC, we used the LUMO level of ZnO at 4.4 eV<sup>57</sup> and the HOMO level obtained experimentally for  $V_2O_5$  at 5.0 to 5.16 eV. The latter yields a  $V_{oc}$  value of 0.56 V to 0.6 V, which is in good agreement with the experimental  $V_{oc}$  values obtained for the OSCs shown in Fig. 3 (and very similar to the  $V_{oc}$  values between 0.56 and 0.58 V observed in Fig. 1). However, we were unable to arrive at a clear conclusion regarding the  $V_{oc}$  value of the solar cell that contained the  $V_2O_5$  thin film made from the 24 h-old (green)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solution (experimentally 0.38 V) since there is a wide range of possible reduction stages for  $V_2O_5$  that can be detected in IPA over time. Thus, based on the



**Fig. 5** Band diagrams for  $V_2O_5$  thin films obtained from freshly prepared (a) or 24 h-old and (b)  $V_2O_5$ -IPA solutions.  $E_v$ : vacuum level; CB: conduction band;  $E_f$ : Fermi level; and VB: valence band.


experimental and calculated values of  $V_{oc}$ , we reasoned that the fabrication steps followed to obtain the  $V_2O_5$  thin film affect the final photovoltaic response of the OSC. Moreover, the final  $V_{oc}$  of the device is probably chiefly dictated by the semiconductor oxide layers and by the HOMO/LUMO levels of the donor and acceptor materials of the active P3HT:PCBM layer.

### 3.3 OSCs with normal and inverted configuration with an Ag back metal electrode

One of the limitations for the fabrication of normal-configuration OSCs by low-temperature solution processing techniques is the requirement of low work function back metal electrodes, such as Al.<sup>10,58</sup> While Ag electrodes can easily be printed from solution, there is currently no viable route for printing a stable Al electrode.<sup>10</sup> This is a drawback that also limits the manufacture, by printing techniques, of tandem or multi-junction OSCs in the normal-configuration. Thus, in this section, we want to demonstrate that the fabrication of OSCs applying an Ag metal electrode is possible for both configurations when the  $V_2O_5$  HTL is applied.

Fig. 6 shows the solar cells' energy band diagrams (a and b), the solar cell architectures in both configurations (c and d), and the corresponding  $IV$  curves and IPCE analyses for both types of devices (e and f). The photovoltaic parameters obtained are detailed in Table 3. The band energy diagrams in Fig. 6a and b are represented in relation to the relative energy levels of the acceptor (PCBM) and the donor (P3HT). The experimental values observed for the  $V_2O_5$  thin film (5.1 eV) are very close to the energy level of the P3HT, and in good agreement with the work function of the Ag and the FTO electrodes responsible for the hole and electron collection respectively. Comparison of the photovoltaic response indicates a very similar behaviour, with  $V_{oc}$  ranging between 0.54 V and 0.56 V and the FF between 47 and 48%. The main difference is observed on the  $J_{sc}$ , which is lower for the OSC in the normal configuration in comparison with the inverted configuration. The difference in  $J_{sc}$  also limits the PCEs, which is observed between 2.6% and 3% for the inverted configuration, and at around 2% for the normal configuration (see Table 3). This difference in PCE is further validated by the





**Fig. 6** Schematic representation of the band energy diagram for the inverted (a) and normal (b) configuration of organic solar cells containing ZnO as the electron transport layer and water-based, solution-processed  $V_2O_5$  as the hole transport layer. The architecture of the inverted (e) and the normal (d) configuration OSCs. *IV* curves (c) and IPCE spectra (f) of the OSCs in each configuration. In both cases, an Ag back metal electrode was used. Measurements were taken at  $100 \text{ mW cm}^{-2}$  AM1.5G.

**Table 3** Photovoltaic parameters of OSCs in the normal or the inverted configuration, with an Ag back metal electrode and water-based, solution-processed  $V_2O_5$  as the hole transport layer. Measurements were taken at  $100 \text{ mW cm}^{-2}$  AM1.5G<sup>a</sup>

Device structure	$V_{oc}$ (V)	$J_{sc}$ ( $\text{mA cm}^{-2}$ )	FF (%)	PCE (%)
<b>Inverted</b>				
Glass/FTO/ZnO/P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag	$0.540 \pm 0.01$	$9.54 \pm 1.1$	$47.20 \pm 1.9$	$2.58 \pm 0.2$
<b>Normal</b>				
Glass/FTO/ $V_2O_5$ /P3HT:PCBM/ZnO/Ag	$0.565 \pm 0.01$	$7.65 \pm 0.3$	$48.35 \pm 2.3$	$2.10 \pm 0.2$
<b>Reference cell</b>				
Glass/FTO/ $TiO_2$ /P3HT:PCBM/ $V_2O_5$ /Ag	$0.563 \pm 0.01$	$10.69 \pm 0.3$	$50.49 \pm 1.9$	$3.09 \pm 0.1$

<sup>a</sup> Average value from six samples.

corresponding IPCE responses: with 70% and 40% for inverted and the normal configuration, respectively. The dissimilarity in the performance between the two types of OSCs can be attributed to the greater light reflection and the UV-filter effect imposed by the  $V_2O_5$  layer on the device. In the case where the device is illuminated from the FTO/ $V_2O_5$  side (see Fig. 6d and e), the  $V_2O_5$

layer could be acting as a UV-filter, limiting the amount of light reaching the cell. Adsorption spectra of the ZnO and the  $V_2O_5$  layers are shown in Fig. 6f.  $V_2O_5$  adsorbs at wavelengths up to 450 nm while in the inverted configuration (Fig. 6c), light enters the device from the FTO/ZnO side, where the ZnO layer blocks only the UV wavelength region below 380 nm. An interesting aspect observed is the value of  $V_{oc}$  that is almost the same for both types of devices. This is an indication that the LUMO level of ZnO at 4.4 eV and the HOMO level of  $V_2O_5$  at 5.16 eV can be used to calculate the  $V_{oc}$  of the normal configuration OSC.<sup>57</sup> In the same way it was described before for the inverted OSC in Section 3.2. OSCs applying  $V_2O_5$  as the HTL<sup>5,10,13,14,16–20,81–83</sup> have been usually reported with an Ag metal electrode in the inverted configuration,<sup>5,10,15,57</sup> and an Al or Ca electrode in the normal configuration.<sup>14,19,21,58</sup> In our work, the photovoltaic response of both types of OSCs seems to be independent of the Ag back metal electrode employed. This makes the OSCs amenable to fabrication by printing methods as the Ag metal electrode can simply be printed from solution.<sup>5,10,44,79</sup> This also could be a step forward to the fabrication of more compatible recombination layers for TmOSCs.<sup>10</sup>

The selection of the adequate back metal electrode in OSCs has been the subject of extensive research work. The OSCs that have been studied to date contain only one oxide semiconductor used as the ETL (usually  $TiO_2$ ,  $TiO_x$  or ZnO), and PEDOT:PSS as the HTL.<sup>44,84</sup> Since the use of TMOs as both ETL and HTL is relatively new, we have not found any other work in which a high work-function metal electrode (e.g. Ag) is used for




the normal configuration OSC. Greiner *et al.* recently described the effect of metal electrodes on the work function and band structure of  $\text{MoO}_3$  at metal/metal oxide interfaces. The reduction of the oxide (from  $\text{Mo}^{6+}$  to  $\text{Mo}^{3+}$ ) in contact with the metal electrode results in a lower work function of the oxide, and the maximum value depends on the thickness of the oxide layer.<sup>85</sup> Hadipour *et al.* have employed an Ag metal electrode in different OSCs in the normal configuration, including the ones in which  $\text{MoO}_3$  is the HTL. However, a thin layer of Ca between the active layer of P3HT:PCBM and the Ag metal electrode was employed for the normal configuration OSCs.<sup>86</sup> Lidzey *et al.* have reported a study on different back metal electrodes in normal configuration OSCs in which  $\text{MoO}_3$  is also the HTL.<sup>87</sup> The authors fabricated OSCs of the type ITO/ $\text{MoO}_3$ /PCDTBT:PC<sub>70</sub>BM/metal electrode (note that no ETL was applied between the active layer and the metal electrode), using diverse, thermally evaporated metals (Ag, Al, Ca, Ca/Ag and Ca/Al). The final photovoltaic performance of the solar cells was very similar in all cases, showing only slight differences among the devices. The authors chose the Ca/Al back electrode as the best one, owing to its slightly better photovoltaic response. Although their work involved only one TMO as the HTL ( $\text{MoO}_3$ ) and did not entail the use of any ETL, it is the closest research work related to the one presented here by us (in terms of set-up and results). It also supports the idea that the photovoltaic performance of normal configuration OSCs containing metal oxides is probably independent of the back metal electrode used. Despite the advances made by Lidzey *et al.*, our group and others, substantial studies are needed to clarify the role of the back electrode in these TMO-based OSCs.

### 3.4 Outdoor stability analyses: normal vs. inverted OSCs, effects of UV filter

The lifetime stability of the OSCs was analyzed under outdoor conditions for 1000 h. Fig. 7 shows the normalized PCE response observed with time for the inverted and normal configuration OSCs applying  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  as the HTL. Initial results revealed that the light irradiation dose affects drastically the OSCs' response as can be observed in Fig. 7. A peak on PCE can be observed almost every time the light irradiation drops below 1 sun ( $100 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ ), especially for irradiance between 0.6 and 0.8 suns (see also ESI, Fig. S4 and S5<sup>†</sup>). Moreover, the lifetime analyses revealed better stability and longer lifetimes for OSCs with normal-configuration, staying at  $T_{80}$  even after 1000 h of analysis. The inverted-configuration OSCs revealed strong degradation reaching  $T_{80}$  after only 320 h of analysis. This response was unexpected since the OSCs with inverted-configuration are well-known to display higher stability (even under ambient conditions) than the normal configuration OSCs.<sup>47–50,88</sup> In our solar cells, we consider that the greater stability of the normal configuration OSC is partly due to the UV-filter effect that the  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  layer can impose on the device when illuminated from the FTO/ $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  side, as already described.

In order to demonstrate that the OSCs would be more stable in the absence of UV light, we applied a UV filter to the inverted-configuration OSC. Two samples, one with the UV filter and the



**Fig. 7** Outdoor stability analysis of sealed OSCs containing water-based, solution-processed  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  as the hole transport layer. Comparison of normalised PCE response: (a) normal configuration vs. inverted configuration (both without the UV filter); and (b) with the UV filter vs. without the UV filter (both in inverted configuration). The cells were analysed outdoors in Barcelona, Spain ( $41.30^{\circ} \text{ N}$ ,  $2.09^{\circ} \text{ W}$ ). The PCE values were calculated using the maximum irradiance level per day. Average temperatures: 10 to 15  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  (day) and 5 to 7  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  (night). Average RH: 70%. Normal configuration: glass/FTO/ $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$ /P3HT:PCBM/ZnO/Ag. Inverted configuration: glass/FTO/ZnO/P3HT:PCBM/ $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$ /Ag.

other without, were analysed outdoors under the same conditions. The filter (an adhesive UV filter film that cuts UV light below 400 nm) was applied on top of the test cell. Fig. 7b shows the observed response for the first 1000 h of analysis. The control sample performed just like the inverted OSC analysed in Fig. 7a, reaching  $T_{60}$  at  $\sim 500$  h and  $T_{40}$  at  $\sim 1000$  h. However, the sample with the UV filter remained at  $T_{80}$  for many hours and was still stable after  $\sim 1000$  h of testing. Thus we can demonstrate that elimination of UV light can improve the lifetime of the inverted-configuration OSC by several orders of magnitude.

In this work, we have demonstrated the high stability of OSCs containing  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5 \cdot 0.5\text{H}_2\text{O}$  as the HTL despite the presence of water molecules in the layer. The degradation of the OSC lacking the UV filter indicates that  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  is photoactive under UV light, and that the active P3HT:PCBM layer or the Ag electrode can interact with the  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  HTL. Nevertheless, a UV filter is beneficial and improves the OSC's stability.

## 4 Conclusions

In summary, we have demonstrated the first example of stable organic solar cells (OSCs) containing a layered  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  hydrate as the hole transport layer (HTL).  $\text{V}_2\text{O}_5$  is processed from a water-based solution in air, resulting in a final thin film of formula



$V_2O_5 \cdot 0.5H_2O$ . The water molecules remain in the  $V_2O_5$  layered structure at temperatures below 250 °C, which makes the thin film highly stable under real working conditions. The HTL was employed in OSCs in either the normal or the inverted configuration, in which Ag was used for the back metal electrode. These types of OSCs can be fabricated totally by solution-processing printing in air, as they do not require the Al electrode found in normal-configuration OSCs. XPS, UPS and optical characterisation of the  $V_2O_5$  thin films revealed differences based on the age of the  $V_2O_5$ -isopropanol (IPA) solution used for film deposition. In films made with a 24 h-old solution, reduction of the oxide (from  $V^{5+}$  to  $V^{4+}$ ) by IPA meant that subsequent re-oxidation (by photo-annealing) was required to achieve optimal photovoltaic performance. In contrast, the films made with fresh  $V_2O_5$ -isopropanol solution directly exhibited peak performance and therefore did not require any photo-annealing. The normal-configuration OSCs do not require any photo-annealing because the  $V_2O_5$  thin film is formed from an aqueous solution. Outdoor stability analyses of sealed OSCs containing  $V_2O_5$  as the HTL, in either the inverted or the normal configuration, revealed that the normal-configuration was highly stable. It remained at  $T_{80}$  even after 1000 h, probably due to the fact that it is illuminated from the FTO/ $V_2O_5$  side and to the UV-filtering effect of the  $V_2O_5$  layer. In contrast, the inverted-configuration OSC, which is illuminated from the FTO/ZnO side, was far less stable. Our hypothesis on the effects of the  $V_2O_5$  layer was corroborated by a subsequent test in which an inverted-configuration OSC, equipped with an external UV-filter, achieved comparable levels of stability to that of the normal-configuration OSC.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Aurelie Vanwaelscappel for the AFM image. We thank Guillaume Sauthier for his advice on the XPS and UPS analyses, and Prof. Frederik C. Krebs from the Technical University of Denmark (DTU) for providing the sample of the adhesive UV-filter employed for the stability/lifetime testing. We thank CONACYT (Mexico) for the PhD scholarship for G. T. E., the Erasmus fellowship programme for financial support for J. P., the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitively (MINECO) for the Consolider grant NANOSELECT CSD2007-00041, and the Xarxa de Referència en Materials Avançats per a l'Energia, XaRMAE (Reference Centre for Advanced Materials for Energy) of the Catalan government.

## Notes and references

- R. A. J. Janssen and J. Nelson, *Adv. Mater.*, 2013, **25**, 1847–1858.
- H. Hoppe and N. S. Sariciftci, *J. Mater. Res.*, 2004, **19**, 1924–1945.
- F. C. Krebs, S. A. Gevorgyan and J. Alstrup, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2009, **19**, 5442–5451.
- M. R. Lilliedal, A. J. Medford, M. V. Madsen, K. Norrman and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2010, **94**, 2018–2031.
- T. T. Larsen-Olsen, T. R. Andersen, B. Andreasen, A. P. L. Böttiger, E. Bundgaard, K. Norrman, J. W. Andreasen, M. Jørgensen and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **97**, 43–49.
- E. Lee, J. Kim and C. Kim, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **105**, 1–5.
- Z. Tan, L. Li, C. Cui, Y. Ding, Q. Xu, S. Li, D. Qian and Y. Li, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2012, **116**, 18626–18632.
- S. R. Dupont, E. Voroshazi, P. Heremans and R. H. Dauskardt, *Org. Electron.*, 2013, **14**, 1262–1270.
- O. Hagemann, M. Bjerring, N. C. Nielsen and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2008, **92**, 1327–1335.
- T. T. Larsen-Olsen, E. Bundgaard, K. O. Sylvester-Hvid and F. C. Krebs, *Org. Electron.*, 2011, **12**, 364–371.
- R. Søndergaard, M. Helgesen, M. Jørgensen and F. C. Krebs, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2011, **1**, 68–71.
- N. Espinosa, H. F. Dam, D. M. Tanenbaum, J. W. Andreasen, M. Jørgensen and F. C. Krebs, *Materials*, 2011, **4**, 169–182.
- W. T. Chiang, S. H. Su, Y. F. Lin and M. Yokoyama, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.*, 2010, **49**, 04DK14.
- K. Zilberberg, S. Trost, H. Schmidt and T. Riedl, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2011, **1**, 377–381.
- K. Zilberberg, S. Trost, J. Meyer, A. Kahn, A. Behrendt, D. Lützenkirchen-Hecht, R. Frahm and T. Riedl, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2011, **21**, 4776–4783.
- S. R. Dupont, M. Oliver, F. C. Krebs and R. H. Dauskardt, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **97**, 171–175.
- C. Gong, H. B. Yang, Q. L. Song and C. M. Li, *Org. Electron.*, 2012, **13**, 7–12.
- S. H. Su, W. K. Lin, W. T. Chiang, Y. F. Lin and M. Yokoyama, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.*, 2012, **51**, 02BK03.
- H. Q. Wang, N. Li, N. S. Guldal and C. J. Brabec, *Org. Electron.*, 2012, **13**, 3014–3021.
- M. Hajzeri, A. S. Vuk, L. S. Perse, M. Colovic, B. Herbig, U. Posset, M. Krzmann and B. Orel, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **99**, 67–72.
- F. Xie, W. C. H. Choy, C. Wang, X. Li, S. Zhang and J. Hou, *Adv. Mater.*, 2013, **25**, 2051–2055.
- J. C. Bernede, S. Houari, D. Nguyen, P. Y. Jouan, A. Khelil, A. Mokrani, L. Cattin and P. Predeep, *Phys. Status Solidi A*, 2012, **209**, 1291–1297.
- R. Betancur, M. Maymó, X. Elias, L. T. Vuong and J. Martorell, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2011, **95**, 735–739.
- Q. Chen, B. J. Worfolk, T. C. Hauger, U. Al-Atar, K. D. Harris and J. M. Buriak, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2011, **3**, 3962–3970.
- M. D. Irwin, B. Buchholz, A. W. Hains, R. P. H. Chang and T. J. Marks, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 2783–2787.
- M. D. Irwin, J. D. Servaites, D. B. Buchholz, B. J. Leever, J. Liu, J. D. Emery, M. Zhang, J. H. Song, M. F. Durstock, A. J. Freeman, M. J. Bedzyk, M. C. Hersam, R. P. H. Chang, M. A. Ratner and T. J. Marks, *Chem. Mater.*, 2011, **23**, 2218–2226.
- C. H. Poh, C. K. Poh, G. Bryant, W. Belcher and P. Dastoor, *Proc. SPIE*, 2011, **8204OW**.
- K. X. Steirer, J. P. Chesin, N. E. Widjonarko, J. J. Berry, A. Miedaner, D. S. Ginley and D. C. Olson, *Org. Electron.*, 2010, **11**, 1414–1418.



- 29 K. X. Steirer, P. F. Ndione, N. E. Widjonarko, M. T. Lloyd, J. Meyer, E. L. Ratcliff, A. Kahn, N. R. Armstrong, C. J. Curtis, D. S. Ginley, J. J. Berry and D. C. Olson, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2011, **1**, 813–820.
- 30 N. Sun, G. Fang, P. Qin, Q. Zheng, M. Wang, X. Fan, F. Cheng, J. Wan and X. Zhao, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2010, **94**, 2328–2331.
- 31 D. W. Zhao, P. Liu, X. W. Sun, S. T. Tan, L. Ke and A. K. K. Kyaw, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2009, **95**, 153304.
- 32 A. K. K. Kyaw, X. W. Sun, C. Y. Jiang, G. Q. Lo, D. W. Zhao and D. L. Kwong, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2008, **93**.
- 33 Y. Kinoshita, R. Takenaka and H. Murata, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2008, **92**, 243309.
- 34 C. Girotto, E. Voroshazi, D. Cheyins, P. Heremans and B. P. Rand, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2011, **3**, 3244–3247.
- 35 H. Schmidt, H. Flügge, T. Winkler, T. Bülow, T. Riedl and W. Kowalsky, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2009, **94**, 243302.
- 36 A. G. F. Janssen, T. Riedl, S. Hamwi, H. H. Johannes and W. Kowalsky, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2007, **91**, 073519.
- 37 C. Tao, S. Ruan, G. Xie, X. Kong, L. Shen, F. Meng, C. Liu, X. Zhang, W. Dong and W. Chen, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2009, **94**, 043311.
- 38 C. Tao, G. Xie, F. Meng, S. Ruan and W. Chen, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2011, **115**, 12611–12615.
- 39 M. G. Varnamkhandi, H. R. Fallah, M. Mostajaboddavati, R. Ghasemi and A. Hassanzadeh, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **98**, 379–384.
- 40 L. J. Zuo, X. X. Jiang, L. G. Yang, M. S. Xu, Y. X. Nan, Q. X. Yan and H. Z. Chen, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2011, **99**, 183306.
- 41 M. T. Greiner, M. G. Helander, W.-M. Tang, Z.-B. Wang, J. Qiu and Z.-H. Lu, *Nat. Mater.*, 2012, **11**, 76–81.
- 42 H. Ma, H. L. Yip, F. Huang and A. K. Y. Jen, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2010, **20**, 1371–1388.
- 43 W. J. Potscavage Jr, A. Sharma and B. Kippelen, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2009, **42**, 1758–1767.
- 44 R. Steim, F. R. Kogler and C. J. Brabec, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2010, **20**, 2499–2512.
- 45 Z. B. Wang, M. G. Helander, M. T. Greiner, J. Qiu and Z. H. Lu, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2009, **80**, 235325.
- 46 K. Norrman, M. V. Madsen, S. A. Gevorgyan and F. C. Krebs, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 16883–16892.
- 47 B. Andreasen, D. M. Tanenbaum, M. Hermenau, E. Voroshazi, M. T. Lloyd, Y. Galagan, B. Zimmermann, S. Kudret, W. Maes, L. Lutsen, D. Vanderzande, U. Wurfel, R. Andriessen, R. Rosch, H. Hoppe, G. Teran-Escobar, M. Lira-Cantu, A. Rivaton, G. Y. Uzunoglu, D. S. Germack, M. Hosel, H. F. Dam, M. Jorgensen, S. A. Gevorgyan, M. V. Madsen, E. Bundgaard, F. C. Krebs and K. Norrman, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **14**, 11780–11799.
- 48 R. Rosch, D. M. Tanenbaum, M. Jorgensen, M. Seeland, M. Barenklau, M. Hermenau, E. Voroshazi, M. T. Lloyd, Y. Galagan, B. Zimmermann, U. Wurfel, M. Hosel, H. F. Dam, S. A. Gevorgyan, S. Kudret, W. Maes, L. Lutsen, D. Vanderzande, R. Andriessen, G. Teran-Escobar, M. Lira-Cantu, A. Rivaton, G. Y. Uzunoglu, D. Germack, B. Andreasen, M. V. Madsen, K. Norrman, H. Hoppe and F. C. Krebs, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2012, **5**, 6521–6540.
- 49 D. M. Tanenbaum, M. Hermenau, E. Voroshazi, M. T. Lloyd, Y. Galagan, B. Zimmermann, M. Hosel, H. F. Dam, M. Jorgensen, S. A. Gevorgyan, S. Kudret, W. Maes, L. Lutsen, D. Vanderzande, U. Wurfel, R. Andriessen, R. Rosch, H. Hoppe, G. Teran-Escobar, M. Lira-Cantu, A. Rivaton, G. Y. Uzunoglu, D. Germack, B. Andreasen, M. V. Madsen, K. Norrman and F. C. Krebs, *RSC Adv.*, 2012, **2**, 882–893.
- 50 G. Teran-Escobar, D. M. Tanenbaum, E. Voroshazi, M. Hermenau, K. Norrman, M. T. Lloyd, Y. Galagan, B. Zimmermann, M. Hosel, H. F. Dam, M. Jorgensen, S. Gevorgyan, S. Kudret, W. Maes, L. Lutsen, D. Vanderzande, U. Wurfel, R. Andriessen, R. Rosch, H. Hoppe, A. Rivaton, G. Y. Uzunoglu, D. Germack, B. Andreasen, M. V. Madsen, E. Bundgaard, F. C. Krebs and M. Lira-Cantu, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **14**, 11824–11845.
- 51 F. J. Zhang, D. W. Zhao, Z. L. Zhuo, H. Wang, Z. Xu and Y. S. Wang, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2010, **94**, 2416–2421.
- 52 D. Y. Kim, G. Sarasqueta and F. So, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2009, **93**, 1452–1456.
- 53 J. Li, Q. Y. Bao, H. X. Wei, Z. Q. Xu, J. P. Yang, Y. Q. Li, S. T. Lee and J. X. Tang, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, **22**, 6285–6290.
- 54 S. Kouijzer, S. Esiner, C. H. Frijters, M. Turbiez, M. M. Wienk and R. A. J. Janssen, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2012, **2**, 945–949.
- 55 V. S. Gevaerts, A. Furlan, M. M. Wienk, M. Turbiez and R. A. J. Janssen, *Adv. Mater.*, 2012, **24**, 2130–2134.
- 56 Y. Yuan, J. Huang and G. Li, *Green*, 2011, **1**, 65–80.
- 57 C. P. Chen, Y. D. Chen and S. C. Chuang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2011, **23**, 3859–3863.
- 58 I. Hancox, L. A. Rochford, D. Clare, M. Walker, J. J. Mudd, P. Sullivan, S. Schumann, C. F. McConville and T. S. Jones, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2013, **117**, 49–57.
- 59 D. Gupta, M. M. Wienk and R. A. J. Janssen, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2013, **3**, 782–787.
- 60 M. Lira-Cantu and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2006, **90**, 2076–2086.
- 61 I. Gonzalez-Valls and M. Lira-Cantu, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2010, **3**, 789–795.
- 62 J. Livage, *Chem. Mater.*, 1991, **3**, 578–593.
- 63 M. O. Reese, S. A. Gevorgyan, M. Jørgensen, E. Bundgaard, S. R. Kurtz, D. S. Ginley, D. C. Olson, M. T. Lloyd, P. Morvillo, E. A. Katz, A. Elschner, O. Haillant, T. R. Currier, V. Shrotriya, M. Hermenau, M. Riede, K. R. Kirov, G. Trimmel, T. Rath, O. Inganäs, F. Zhang, M. Andersson, K. Tvingstedt, M. Lira-Cantu, D. Laird, C. McGuinness, S. Gowrisanker, M. Pannone, M. Xiao, J. Hauch, R. Steim, D. M. DeLongchamp, R. Rösch, H. Hoppe, N. Espinosa, A. Urbina, G. Yaman-Uzunoglu, J.-B. Bonekamp, A. J. J. M. van Breemen, C. Girotto, E. Voroshazi and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2011, **95**, 1253–1267.
- 64 J. Livage, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 1998, **178–180**, 999–1018.
- 65 M. Nabavi, C. Sanchez and J. Livage, *Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem.*, 1991, **28**, 1173–1192.
- 66 J. Livage, *Mater. Res. Bull.*, 1991, **26**, 1173–1180.
- 67 J. Livage, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 1999, **190–192**, 391–403.
- 68 J. Livage, F. Beteille, C. Roux, M. Chatry and P. Davidson, *Acta Mater.*, 1998, **46**, 743–750.



- 69 S. Kittaka, H. Yamamoto, S. Higuma and T. Sasaki, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.*, 1992, **88**, 715–718.
- 70 M. Jørgensen, K. Norrman, S. A. Gevorgyan, T. Tromholt, B. Andreasen and F. C. Krebs, *Adv. Mater.*, 2012, **24**, 580–612.
- 71 A. Manor, E. A. Katz, T. Tromholt and F. C. Krebs, *Sol. Energy Mater. Sol. Cells*, 2012, **98**, 491–493.
- 72 V. Bondarenka, S. Kaciulis, Z. Martunas, A. Reza, G. J. Babonas and A. Pasiskevicius, *Lith. J. Phys.*, 2008, **48**, 341–348.
- 73 J. Światowska-Mrowiecka, F. Martin, V. Maurice, S. Zanna, L. Klein, J. Castle and P. Marcus, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2008, **53**, 4257–4266.
- 74 D. Liu, Y. Liu, B. B. Garcia, Q. Zhang, A. Pan, Y. H. Jeong and G. Cao, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2009, **19**, 8789–8795.
- 75 M. Benmoussa, A. Outzourhit, R. Jourdani, A. Bennouna and E. L. Ameziane, *Act. Passive Electron. Compon.*, 2003, **26**, 245–256.
- 76 J. Meyer, K. Zilberberg, T. Riedl and A. Kahn, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 2011, **110**, 033710.
- 77 Z. Y. Li and Q. H. Wu, *J. Mater. Sci.: Mater. Electron.*, 2008, **19**, S366–S370.
- 78 A. L. Pergament, E. L. Kazakova and G. B. Stefanovich, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.*, 2002, **35**, 2187–2197.
- 79 H. L. Yip and A. K. Y. Jen, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2012, **5**, 5994–6011.
- 80 I. Gonzalez-Valls, D. Angmo, S. A. Gevorgyan, J. Sebastián Reparaz, F. C. Krebs and M. Lira-Cantu, *J. Polym. Sci., Part B: Polym. Phys.*, 2013, **51**, 272–280.
- 81 P. Lutsyk and Y. Vertsimakha, *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.*, 2005, **426**, 265–276.
- 82 G. Li, C. W. Chu, V. Shrotriya, J. Huang and Y. Yang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2006, **88**, 253503.
- 83 A. Ojala, H. Burckstummer, J. Hwang, K. Graf, B. von Vacano, K. Meerholz, P. Erk and F. Wurthner, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, **22**, 4473–4482.
- 84 E. D. Gomez and Y. L. Loo, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2010, **20**, 6604–6611.
- 85 M. T. Greiner, L. Chai, M. G. Helander, W. M. Tang and Z. H. Lu, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2013, **23**, 215–226.
- 86 A. Hadipour, D. Cheyons, P. Heremans and B. P. Rand, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2011, **1**, 930–935.
- 87 D. C. Watters, J. Kingsley, H. Yi, T. Wang, A. Iraqi and D. Lidzey, *Org. Electron.*, 2012, **13**, 1401–1408.
- 88 E. Voroshazi, B. Verreet, A. Buri, R. Müller, D. Di Nuzzo and P. Heremans, *Org. Electron.*, 2011, **12**, 736–744.

