

**High efficiency deep red to yellow photochemical
upconversion under solar irradiance**

Journal:	<i>Energy & Environmental Science</i>
Manuscript ID	EE-ART-07-2021-002197.R1
Article Type:	Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Gallaher, Joseph; The University of New South Wales, School of Chemistry Wright, Katherine; North Carolina State University, Department of Chemistry Frazer, Laszlo; Monash University, School of Chemistry; The University of New South Wales, School of Chemistry MacQueen, Rowan; Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin fur Materialien und Energie GmbH, Institute for Nanospectroscopy Crossley, Maxwell; The University of Sydney, School of Chemistry Castellano, Felix; North Carolina State University, Department of Chemistry Schmidt, Timothy; The University of New South Wales, School of Chemistry

Solar energy is abundant. Discovering ways to harvest solar energy efficiently are of particular interest. But, single-threshold solar cells, and emerging perovskite technologies in particular, do not harvest low energy photons. Photochemical upconversion by triplet fusion is a strategy to overcome this limitation by upconverting low energy photons from below to above the band gap of the solar cell. But, efficient upconversion in the relevant part of the spectrum at one-sun illumination has been elusive, in part due to a scarcity of high-performance triplet annihilators with low energy triplet states. In this paper we show that a perylene monoimide annihilator, when coupled to a far-red absorbing metalloporphyrin, can utilize up to 12% of generated triplet states in the upconversion process under one-sun illumination. The present composition is applicable to solar cells with band gaps above 1.85 eV, but with further sensitizer development could be pushed into the near infrared region of the spectrum.

PAPER

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/xxxxxxxxxx

High efficiency deep red to yellow photochemical up-conversion under solar irradiance †

Joseph K. Gallaher,^{*a} Katherine M. Wright,^b Laszlo Frazer,^{a,c} Rowan W. MacQueen,^{a,d} Maxwell J. Crossley,^e Felix N. Castellano,^b and Timothy W. Schmidt^a

Received Date

Accepted Date

DOI: 10.1039/xxxxxxxxxx

www.rsc.org/journalname

The performance of a perylene monoimide annihilator is evaluated in a photochemical upconversion composition. It is found to perform up to five times better than the commonly employed rubrene annihilator at low excitation intensity, but suffers from a low annihilation singlet yield which hinders its performance under strong excitation. Upconversion action spectroscopy under broadband bias reveals that under one sun illumination, an upconversion composition employing the perylene monoimide utilizes more than 12% of the generated triplet states to generate emissive, excited singlet states. In a suitable medium, this composition could enhance the energy conversion efficiency of high band gap solar cells.

Introduction

Solar energy is delivered to the Earth as a broadband spectrum, reaching the planet's surface with an intensity of about 1 kWm^{-2} . However, making efficient use of this energy presents certain challenges. A silicon solar cell does not make use of that part of the spectrum with wavelengths longer than 1100 nm, and at best can provide an open circuit voltage of about 750 mV.¹ These limitations cap the achievable energy conversion efficiency of a crystalline silicon solar cell to 29%,² and that of any single-junction semiconductor to 33.7% under the standard AM1.5G spectrum.^{3–5}

To move beyond the single-junction limit requires more efficient use of the solar spectrum. There are several strategies to achieve this. Multi-junction cells hold records for energy conversion efficiencies,^{1,6,7} using several band-gaps to sequentially harvest the solar spectrum from higher to lower photon energies. However, these devices are rather expensive, and are best suited to concentrator photovoltaic systems.⁸ Other strategies to overcome the single-junction limit include multiple exciton generation⁹ (including singlet fission^{4,10–15}), intermediate band solar cells,^{16–19} hot carrier solar cells,²⁰ and upconversion.^{21,22}




Fig. 1 Upconversion in action. Red light is absorbed by a bespoke porphyrin and the triplet energy is transferred to PMI or rubrene, which then undergoes triplet-triplet annihilation and emits higher energy, yellow light.

Upconversion (UC) is a process whereby two or more lower energy photons are combined by a material to produce higher energy photons (Figure 1). Detailed balance calculations show that a solar cell utilizing efficient UC is limited to about 43% energy conversion efficiency.⁴ Under solar concentration this figure is lifted to in excess of 50%.²³

Experimental demonstrations of UC fall into two categories: Rare-earth UC²⁴ and photochemical UC.^{25,26} While both photochemical and rare-earth upconversion is applicable to silicon photovoltaics,^{27,28} those cells which stand to gain the most from UC are those with higher band gaps,²³ which include many thin-film technologies as well as the emerging methylammonium lead halide perovskite solar cells.²⁹ These higher band gaps are best addressed with photochemical upconversion (PUC).^{22,26}

In PUC, photons are harvested by sensitizer molecules which undergo rapid intersystem crossing to generate molecular triplet states (Figure 2). In a well designed system, this triplet energy

^a ARC Centre of Excellence in Exciton Science, School of Chemistry, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.

^b Department of Chemistry, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA

^c ARC Centre of Excellence in Exciton Science, School of Chemistry, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia.

^d Department of Spins in Energy Conversion and Quantum Information Science, Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin für Materialien und Energie GmbH, Berlin, Germany

^e School of Chemistry, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

† Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: Full details of the materials and sample preparation and optical spectroscopy methods. Additional figures. See DOI: 10.1039/b000000x/




Fig. 2 The energy transfer scheme involved in photochemical upconversion. Large, solid arrows indicate photon absorption and emission events. Structures of molecules used in this study are shown at the bottom. ISC: intersystem crossing; TET: triplet energy transfer; TTA: triplet-triplet annihilation.

is rapidly transferred to annihilator molecules which can store the energy for hundreds of microseconds – long enough for two such triplet states to interact.³⁰ When two annihilator triplets “annihilate”, they ideally generate an excited singlet state which promptly results in a photon of higher energy than that originally absorbed. This process is also known as triplet fusion.³¹ PUC has been intensively studied over the past decade and a half,^{32–47} and has been applied to various photovoltaic and photocatalytic technologies.^{31,48–54}

The most widely used annihilator molecule in PUC studies is diphenylanthracene, coupled with a platinum or palladium octaethylporphyrin sensitizer.^{32,55–57} Such a combination can generate blue light from green light with a quantum yield of about 5% under one-sun conditions.⁵⁸ Other green-to-blue systems employing perylene were found to double this performance,^{59–61} and the perylene annihilator stands as the record holder for upconversion efficiency. However, thin film photovoltaics exhibit absorption thresholds in the red and near-infrared regions of the spectrum, requiring sensitizers and annihilators with lower energy triplet states. One parameter in the road map to optimising the efficiency of solar photon upconversion is expanding the library of possible triplet-acceptors to find more effective annihilator species.⁶²

In our demonstrations of upconversion applied to photovoltaics,^{49–54} we have nearly exclusively used rubrene as the annihilator, and a palladium porphyrin with extended conjugation as the sensitizer. Rubrene is an intrinsically efficient an-

nihilator, with two triplets generating a singlet with high probability,^{38,39} but it diffuses slowly. We previously estimated its second order triplet-triplet annihilation rate constant at just $1 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$,^{38,39,63} more than an order of magnitude below the diffusion limit in typical solvents. This limits its efficiency under one-sun pumping with available sensitizer materials. Nevertheless, we have achieved upconversion enhancements to current densities exceeding $4.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mAcm}^{-2}$ under one sun.⁵⁴ In order to increase this figure of merit,⁶⁴ we require an annihilator significantly more effective than rubrene.

In this contribution, we report a perylene monoimide (PMI) annihilator⁶⁵ which, when coupled to our bespoke porphyrin, generates excited singlet states with normalized state upconversion efficiency $\eta_{UC_s} > 12\%$ under broadband, one-sun pumping.⁶⁶ At just 0.1 suns, η_{UC_s} is $> 5\%$, five times that of rubrene. This significant improvement brings us a step closer to realising efficient photochemical upconversion for photovoltaics under low-intensity (sub)-solar conditions.

Methods

Sample Preparation

All samples for optical spectroscopy were prepared under nitrogen atmosphere inside a glovebox, with an internal environment maintained at $< 0.5 \text{ ppm O}_2$. Full details of the materials and sample preparation can be found in the Supplementary Information (SI). Briefly, upconversion blends of PMI:PdPQ₄, and rubrene:PdPQ₄ were prepared by first preparing individual stock solutions of each component in anhydrous toluene. To make the upconversion blends an aliquot of annihilator stock solution (i.e., PMI or rubrene) was added to an equal volume of PdPQ₄ stock solution, and stirred for 3 hours to ensure mixing of the final solutions. In action spectra experiments, the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend had concentrations of 2.5:1 mM. The rubrene:PdPQ₄ blend had concentrations of 10:1 mM. The lower concentration of PMI was due to its lower solubility in toluene compared to rubrene, which limited the stock solution concentration. For relative external quantum yield experiments, both compositions were made at concentrations of 1:0.1 mM. Before removal from the glovebox, all samples were sealed under inert atmosphere using a custom quartz cuvette with a 1 mm path length, fitted with a J-Young greaseless stopcock.

Optical spectroscopy

External quantum yield measurements were performed on a home-built setup. A 670 nm laser diode was used as the excitation source, and the laser output focused, providing an elliptical spot with dimensions of approximately $437 \times 210 \mu\text{m}$ (measured to $1/e^2$) incident on the upconversion sample. Sample photoluminescence was collected parallel to the excitation axis using parabolic mirrors, filtered using a 650 nm short-pass filter to remove any residual excitation, and fibre-coupled into a high-resolution USB-spectrometer (Ocean Optics HR4000). The excitation light was attenuated using neutral density filters and a series of spectra were collected for a range of excitation powers affording a measure of external photon yield, and subsequent com-

Table 1 Definitions of Important Terms in Photochemical Upconversion⁶⁶

Symbol	Meaning	Max.
$\#^1S^*$	# of excited singlet sensitizers	
$\#^3S^*$	# of excited triplet sensitizers	
$\#^1A^*$	# of excited singlet annihilators	
$\#^3A^*$	# of excited triplet annihilators	
$\#h\nu$	# of emitted photons	
$\#cp$	# of reactive contact pairs	
$\Phi_{ISC} = \#^3S^*/\#^1S^*$	Intersystem crossing QY	1
$\Phi_{TET} = \#^3A^*/\#^3S^*$	Triplet energy transfer QY	1
$\Phi_{TTA} = \#^1A^*/\#^3A^*$	Triplet-triplet annihilation QY	0.5
$\Phi_F = \#h\nu/\#^1A^*$	Fluorescence QY	1
$\Phi_{UC_s} = \Phi_{ISC}\Phi_{TET}\Phi_{TTA}$	Upconversion state QY	0.5
$\Phi_{cp} = \#cp/\#^3A^*$	Contact pair QY	0.5
$f = \#^1A^*/\#cp$	Annihilation singlet yield	1
$\eta_\alpha = 2\Phi_\alpha$	Normalized efficiency ^a	
k_1	$^3A^*$ 1st-order decay constant	
k_2	$^3A^*$ 2nd-order decay constant	

^a $\alpha = TTA, UC_s, cp$

parison of, rubrene:PdPQ₄ and PMI:PdPQ₄ blends over a range of excitation power densities.

Excitation-action spectra were collected according to our previously reported home built setup.^{58,67} In this study the broadband bias beam (Energetiq LDLS EQ-1500) was filtered using a 650 nm long-pass filter to give resonant excitation with the Q-band structure of PdPQ₄ absorption (the upconverting region).^{38,68}

Time-resolved photoluminescence spectroscopy was carried out using a 150 fs regeneratively amplified titanium-doped sapphire laser (Clark-MXR CPA 2210), operating at a repetition rate of 1 kHz and with a fundamental wavelength of 780 nm, and an optical parametric amplifier (Light Conversion TOPAS-C) to produce excitation pulses of either 532 or 670 nm. The luminescence spectra of samples were recorded as a function of time delay after laser excitation and collected with an intensified CCD camera (Princeton Instruments PI-MAX4) mounted to a spectrograph (Acton SP-2150i).

Results and Discussion

Terminology

Because this manuscript deals extensively with the concept of upconversion efficiency, it is important to clearly lay out the terminology used. Recently, we published a viewpoint in which we made recommendations for the terminologies to be used in upconversion studies.⁶⁶ In it, we recommended that the symbol Φ only be used for quantum yields, and where the figure is doubled so that the maximum is unity, the symbol η is used. As such, while the maximum Φ_{TTA} is 0.5, the corresponding η_{TTA} is unity. A summary of relevant terms is given in Table 1. A comprehensive list of terms including those not relevant to the present study can be found in Reference 66.

Relative TTA-UC performance

The structures of the sensitizer and annihilator chromophores used in this study are shown in Figure 2. The steady-




Fig. 3 Steady-state optical absorption (solid lines) and emission (dashed lines) spectra of PMI (7.7 mM), PdPQ₄ (2 mM), and a PMI:PdPQ₄ blend (2.5:1 molar ratio) in anhydrous toluene. The excitation wavelength for PMI was 505 nm, and 670 nm for the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend (within the absorption region of the porphyrin Q-band structure). The upconverted emission observed from the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend matches that of PMI emission, confirming TTA-UC.

state optical absorption and emission spectra of *N*-(2,5-di-tert-butylphenyl)perylene-3,4-dicarboximide (PMI) and porphyrin PdPQ₄ are shown in Figure 3. PMI has a large extinction coefficient ($\epsilon_{506\text{nm}} = 35800 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ cm}^{-1}$), consistent with other perylene-monoimide derivatives. Following photoexcitation, strong photoluminescence is observed over the range of 500 – 600 nm, with near unity fluorescence quantum yield. As can be seen in Figure 3, the wavelengths of PMI emission range between the absorption features of the porphyrin sensitizer (PdPQ₄); this is preferable in photon upconversion processes in order to minimise reabsorption of upconverted photons, which would obviously negatively influence the yield of photons able to escape the upconverter sample matrix.

When paired together in a PMI:PdPQ₄ blend, PMI performs the role of the annihilator (triplet-acceptor), with PdPQ₄ as the sensitizer (triplet-donor). The optical absorption spectra of the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend is shown in the SI. Following photoexcitation of the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend at 670 nm (*i.e.*, within the absorption window of the porphyrin Q-band structure) an upconverted emission was detected between 500 – 650 nm, corresponding to fluorescence from PMI, confirming triplet-triplet annihilation upconversion (TTA-UC) of the pairing.

It is noted that the peaks corresponding to 0–0 and 0–1 transitions (529 and 563 nm, respectively) of PMI differ in relative peak intensity (*i.e.*, vibronic progression ratio) in neat PMI compared to the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend. This is likely a reabsorption effect due to the differing excitation depth profile brought about by direct excitation and sensitized triplet fusion.

Having confirmed TTA-UC occurs in the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend, the question at hand was how PMI performs as an annihilator, particularly, relative to other deep-red-to-yellow annihilator chromophores reported in the literature. In this regard, we turned to rubrene, a commonly used annihilator in upconversion blends,

to act as a relative benchmark of efficiency when paired with the PdPQ₄ porphyrin sensitizer. The absorption and emission wavelengths of PMI and rubrene are substantially similar (see SI), which supports the use of rubrene as a relative comparison for upconversion efficiency.

To gain insight into the performance of PMI *versus* rubrene as annihilator species we probed the TTA-UC dynamics using time-resolved photoluminescence spectroscopy of each blend (see SI). Each sample was excited at 670 nm and the phosphorescence from PdPQ₄ triplets (800–900 nm), and the delayed-fluorescence resulting from TTA-UC of each annihilator species was measured. Both upconverter blends were at concentrations of 1:0.1 mM (annihilator:sensitizer) in anhydrous toluene.

Figure 4A shows the wavelength-integrated photoluminescence (kinetics) of PdPQ₄ triplet phosphorescence when PdPQ₄ is paired with PMI and rubrene annihilators, integrated around 850 nm. For the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend, the phosphorescence has a lifetime of 780 (± 10) ns, which is a 150-fold decrease in phosphorescence lifetime compared to neat (pure) PdPQ₄ (125 ± 1 μs lifetime). Notably, the PdPQ₄ phosphorescence lifetime in the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend is significantly shorter than the rubrene:PdPQ₄ blend (2.9 ± 0.1 μs). The phosphorescence lifetime of PdPQ₄ triplets is indicative of the triplet-energy-transfer (TET) rate from sensitizer to annihilator. This implies that TET is more rapid from PdPQ₄ to PMI than to rubrene. However, in both cases the triplet energy transfer yield, Φ_{TET}, is essentially unity.

The time-resolved anti-Stokes delayed-fluorescence from each annihilator (integrated around 570 nm for PMI, and 580 nm for rubrene) are shown in Figure 4B. The signatures are consistent with TTA-UC processes, namely, an anti-Stokes photoluminescence from annihilator singlet states on a delayed timescale (*i.e.*, delayed-fluorescence).

The kinetics of triplet decay is given by³⁰

$$\frac{d[T]}{dt} = -k_1[T] - k_2[T]^2 \quad (1)$$

with the rate of generation of upconverted photons given by

$$\frac{d[h\nu]}{dt} = f \frac{k_2[T]^2}{2} \Phi_F \quad (2)$$

where f accounts for spin-statistical factors and Φ_F is the fluorescence quantum yield. Where $k_2[T] \ll k_1$, the decay of $[T]$ is dominated by first order kinetics and approaches exponential behaviour with rate constant k_1 . Because the upconverted light depends on the square of the triplet concentration, it decays with twice the rate constant,

$$\frac{d[h\nu]}{dt} \propto \exp(-2k_1t). \quad (3)$$

The kinetics of delayed-fluorescence of the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend are well represented by a monoexponential decay, with a fitted lifetime of 203 ± 10 μs. As seen in Figure 4B, the delayed-fluorescence lifetime of PMI (in the PMI:PdPQ₄ blend) is significantly longer than observed for rubrene in the rubrene:PdPQ₄ blend, which has a lifetime of 62 ± 4 μs. These measurements provide estimates of k_1 for each species, but should be considered




Fig. 4 Time-resolved photoluminescence (TRPL) of PMI:PdPQ₄ and rubrene:PdPQ₄ blends following photoexcitation at 670 nm, showing the kinetics at of (A) phosphorescence from PdPQ₄ (integrated around 850 nm) and (B) delayed-fluorescence which results from emission from PMI (integrated around 570 nm) or rubrene (integrated around 580 nm). The solid lines are mono-exponential fits to the experimental data. Both upconverter blends were at a concentration of 1:0.1 mM ratio (annihilator:sensitizer) in anhydrous toluene.




Fig. 5 Integrated steady-state upconversion intensity for PMI:PdPQ₄ and rubrene:PdPQ₄ blends as a function of excitation power, from external quantum yield measurements. Both upconverter blends were excited at 670 nm. The intensity axis has rescaled to allow for a relative comparison, as described in the text.

a lower bound where sensitizer concentrations are higher (Table 2).⁶⁹

The TTA-UC phosphorescence dynamics are consistent with a lower k_1 for PMI, which augurs well for upconversion efficiency. As will be discussed in further detail below, the comparison of PMI and rubrene is ideally poised to provide insight into what effect the annihilation rate constant (k_2) *vis-a-vis* a poorer annihilation singlet-yield (f) of an annihilator species may have on the overall TTA-UC process.

Exploiting TTA-UC in a device context relies on maximising the number of photons being emitted back into a solar cell it is. In this regard, when considering the efficiency of UC, it is pertinent to give attention to the number of upconverted photons which are able to escape at TTA-UC sample matrix. With this in mind, and as a first approximation of the relative performance (proxy of efficiency) of the upconverter blends, we performed simple relative external quantum yield measurements for a direct comparison of PMI and rubrene. A monochromatic excitation source (670 nm laser diode) was used to excite each TTA-UC blend and a portion of the delayed-PL from the sample was collected on a USB-spectrometer (see SI for further details and spectra).

Figure 5 shows a double-logarithmic plot of integrated delayed-PL intensity for PMI:PdPQ₄ and rubrene:PdPQ₄ blends as a function of excitation power. In addition to detector and background corrections (see SI), the PL intensity has been normalised and rescaled onto a relative PL intensity scale in order to directly compare the PL output. For each spectrum, in both the PMI and rubrene series, the spectra have been area-normalised to that of the rubrene:PdPQ₄ delayed-PL at the highest excitation power. Subsequently, the PMI:PdPQ₄ series has been re-scaled by the ratio of the area of rubrene and PMI at highest power, allowing a relative comparison in collected upconverted photons of the two upconverter blends.

At first glance, it is clear that at low excitation powers (<10 W cm⁻²) the number of photons escaping the upconverter matrix (*i.e.*, the relative external PL yield) is greater for PMI than rubrene. However, at higher excitation powers the PL intensity

from PMI levels off, approaching a slope of 1 (see Figure S12), and the rubrene blend has a greater number of escaping external photons. As a result there is a cross-over in relative PL intensity at an excitation density threshold of approximately 10 W cm⁻², at this sensitizer concentration. Since the sensitizer and its concentration is the same in both blends, and the only difference is the annihilator, this result suggests a difference in TTA-UC efficiency (Φ_{UC}) which, as discussed in more detail below, can be ascribed to differences in first- and second-order rate constants (*i.e.*, k_1 and k_2 , respectively) and/or the annihilation singlet-yield of the annihilator species, f .^{23,66,68}

Modelling TTA-UC efficiency

Gauging the efficiency of an efficient upconverter under simulated solar pumping is a non-trivial task. Simple external quantum efficiency measurements, while useful, will tend to underestimate the intrinsic efficiency of the TTA process without accounting for reabsorption effects. In previous work, we reported a method to measure the efficiency with which triplet states generate excited singlet states in an optically dense composition,⁶⁷ a technique referred to herein as excitation-action spectroscopy. Briefly, annihilator fluorescence is measured at a particular wavelength as the linear response of the upconversion composition to a chopped, monochromated probe beam, using lock-in amplification. Since the linear response of a quadratic process is zero, the upconverter is placed under a continuous pump, exciting sensitizer molecules at a rate comparable to solar excitation.

Figure 6 shows the excitation-action spectra of the PMI:PdPQ₄ (Figure 6A) and rubrene:PdPQ₄ (Figure 6B) blends. The spectral features of the excitation spectra are characterised by absorption features from the sensitizer porphyrin (600 – 700 nm), and the 0 – 0 band of the corresponding annihilator (< 550 nm). The plots have been normalized, with the intensity of the annihilator excitation feature set to unity.

Roughly speaking, since the plots are a measure of the linear response of upconverted light to a weak probe, the state upconversion quantum yield Φ_{UC_s} can be gauged from the intensity of the sensitizer peak (with the annihilator peak set to unity). To arrive at a more accurate figure requires detailed modelling of the experiment.

In our previous work, we modelled upconversion action spectra using the assumption that at a depth z in the upconverter the concentration of annihilator triplet states is in steady-state, thereby yielding the rate equation of the following general form:

$$\frac{d[T]_z}{dt} = 0 = k_\phi(z)[S] - k_1[T]_z - k_2[T]_z^2. \quad (4)$$

where $[T]_z$ is the concentration of annihilator triplet states at depth z , $[S]$ is the concentration of sensitizers, $k_\phi(z)$ is the excitation rate of the sensitizer, and k_1 and k_2 are the first and second-order annihilator triplet decay constants, respectively.

This assumption allowed modelling of the upconversion excitation-action spectra to quantitatively determine TTA efficiency by taking into account the reabsorption of emitted light by both the sensitizer and the annihilator, but without requiring




Fig. 6 Excitation-action spectra (symbols) of PQ_4Pd sensitized upconverters with PMI (top) and rubrene (bottom) annihilator. The solid lines represent fits to the experimental data using the broadband bias model, as described in the text. The fits to 1.05-sun data are plotted as thick lines.

knowledge of the fluorescence quantum yield. The action spectrum includes the direct excitation of the annihilator, so the measurement is internally calibrated. However, in our previous work, it was assumed that the bias pump was monochromatic and that the upconverter remained, at all times, in the quadratic regime. In this work it was necessary to explicitly take account of broadband pumping. Thus, the excitation-action spectra were modelled using Equations 5-7.

$$\sigma(\lambda) = A \times \left(\frac{\alpha_p^e(\lambda)}{\alpha_p(\lambda) + \alpha_{PL}} + \int_0^\infty dz f \Phi_{cp}(z) \alpha_p^s(\lambda) e^{-(\alpha_p(\lambda) + \alpha_{PL})z} \right) \quad (5)$$

and

$$\Phi_{cp}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{k_2 [T]_z}{k_2 [T]_z + k_1} \quad (6)$$

$$[T]_z = \frac{-k_1 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + 4k_2 k_\phi(z) [S]}}{2k_2} \quad (7)$$

The parameter A is an experimental scale factor, and the α terms are the (natural) extinction coefficients (with inverse dimension of length) of the upconversion blend at the probe wavelength (p) and photoluminescence detection wavelength (PL) of the annihilator (e) and the sensitizer (s). Further, f is the annihilation singlet-yield which accounts for the probability that the annihilation event of a pair of triplets yields the desired singlet. The function $\Phi_{cp}(z)$ accounts for the effect of the change in triplet concentration ($[T]_z$) as a function of depth (z) on the probability of second-order decay events due to contact pair formation.

The rate constant for the excitation rate of the sensitizer, $k_\phi(z)$, as a function of depth, z , may be determined by

$$k_\phi(z) [S] = \int d\lambda \mathcal{E}_{bias}^\lambda(\lambda) \alpha_s(\lambda) \exp(-\alpha(\lambda)z) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{bias}^\lambda(\lambda)$ is the spectral photon flux of the bias source, with units of photons per cm^2 per nm per s, having a known spectrum and spot size for each excitation condition.

As shown in Figure 6 the shape of the excitation-action spectra are well reproduced by the above model (solid lines). Table 2 shows the parameters f and k_2 for each annihilator in the PdPQ_4 sensitised upconverter blends resulting from the optimised fits (k_1 values were taken from the fits in Figure 4). These derived values show that PMI has a lower f value, but a larger second order rate-constant than rubrene. This is notable as we have previously reported the potential impact that an increase in k_2 may have on the efficiency of an upconverter, calculating that 2-orders of magnitude increase in k_2 would provide a photon upconverter with efficiency 6-fold greater than a proposed threshold for device relevance.⁶²

The relative performance of PMI and rubrene as an annihilator species in TTA-UC can be gauged by plotting

$$\eta_{UC_s} = f \frac{k_2 [T]_0}{k_2 [T]_0 + k_1} \quad (9)$$

as a function of the bias intensity. This is a measure of the ef-

Table 2 Derived values from modelling excitation-action spectra

	k_1 (s^{-1})	k_2 ($\text{M}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$)	f
PMI	$2.46(12) \times 10^3$	3.0×10^9	0.23
Rubrene	$8.1(5) \times 10^3$	9.5×10^8	~ 1

efficiency with which excited state annihilators are generated by excitation of the sensitizer at the front of the cuvette. As the light is extinguished as it penetrates the cuvette, this quantity naturally declines.

Figure 7 shows the determined TTA-UC efficiencies as a function of bias intensity, measured in sun equivalence, for each blend. Immediately observed is that PMI is the more efficient annihilator species at low bias intensity, but levels off and is overtaken in efficiency at higher bias intensity by rubrene. This is consistent with the trend observed in the external PL yield measurements (see above). Moreover, the modelled normalized state UC efficiency (η_{UCs}) for PMI, at just 0.1 suns, is 4.8%, which is five-times greater than that of rubrene. Further, at the literature benchmark value of one-sun equivalent excitation PMI achieves >12% normalized efficiency (> 6% upconversion state quantum yield). As noted above, as the bias intensity increases η_{UCs} levels off earlier for PMI owing to its low f . In contrast, there is only a small levelling off for rubrene observed over the bias intensities probed, showing once more the cross-over in performance metric between the PMI and rubrene.




Fig. 7 (Normalized, left axis) upconversion state efficiencies for the PQ_4Pd sensitized upconvertors as a function of the bias intensity (in sun equivalence). The dashed lines are to guide the eye.

As seen from Equation 9, it follows that differences in the observed TTA efficiency can be attributed to differences in f , k_1 , and k_2 . One first observation is that the higher ‘ceiling’ of TTA-UC efficiency for rubrene would imply that rubrene has a greater annihilation singlet yield (f) compared to PMI.⁶⁸ Previously, we reported an f value for rubrene of about 0.6.³⁹ This was based on estimated excited state yields and the proportion of second-order decay, as gauged from kinetic traces. The excited state

yields were determined from a front-face experiment comparing the yield of prompt and delayed fluorescence from rubrene in an upconversion composition.³⁸ The details of self-absorption were not considered. The discrepancy between the value obtained from modelling action spectra, and those from our previous published results warrants further investigation.

As will be discussed in further detail below, the present comparison of PMI and rubrene is ideally poised to provide insight into the effect of annihilation rate constant (k_2) versus a poorer annihilation singlet-yield (f) of an annihilator species on the TTA-UC efficiency.

TTA-UC efficiency battle: annihilator k_2 vs f

At low excitation rates, the second order decay of annihilator triplets may be ignored and the triplet concentration is given by $[T] = k_\phi[S]/k_1$. From Equation 2, we see that

$$\left. \frac{d[h\nu]}{dt} \right|_{\text{low}} = \frac{1}{2}fk_2 \left(\frac{k_\phi[S]}{k_1} \right)^2 \Phi_F \quad (10)$$

For high excitation rates, where the second order decay dominates, $[T] = \sqrt{k_\phi[S]/k_2}$, and

$$\left. \frac{d[h\nu]}{dt} \right|_{\text{high}} = \frac{1}{2}fk_\phi[S]\Phi_F \quad (11)$$

This change from quadratic to linear behaviour is often used to diagnose the upconversion threshold intensity, where the decay due to the first and second order processes are equal.^{70–72}

Given the same sensitizer concentration and low excitation intensity, the rate at which excited singlet annihilators are generated is governed by fk_2/k_1^2 . This quantity is fit to 114 s/M for PMI, but only 14 s/M for rubrene, and thus we can expect approximately 8 times as much upconverted light from a PMI composition than rubrene at low intensity (both $\Phi_F \sim 1$). The ratio of slopes at low intensity in Figure 7 is 6.6. But, in Figure 5, the ratio of upconverted light in the low intensity regime is a little more than double. Nevertheless, despite a lower f value, PMI performs better than rubrene at low intensities due in a large part to its lower first order rate of triplet decay, k_1 . Its higher apparent k_2 value also contributes. This may be rationalised by the larger molecular size and steric hindrance of rubrene, compared to PMI, negatively influencing k_2 . For example, size and steric-bulk could reduce the mobility of rubrene (annihilator) and molecular contact during possible TET collision events.⁷³

In the high intensity limit, only f matters. Since PMI has a rather low f value, it reaches its efficiency and rubrene overtakes at higher intensities. The question at hand is what effect this has on the realization of photon upconversion being applied to photovoltaic applications.

The champion annihilator is perylene itself. It was shown by Hoseinkhani et al. to exhibit an f of unity, and excellent sub-solar upconversion performance when coupled with palladium tetraphenyltetraabenzoporphyrin.⁵⁹ At one sun, an external upconversion quantum yield exceeding 10% was obtained, with about 3% being obtained at 0.1 suns. Although perylene-based annihilators have been used in some of the most efficient TTA-UC

systems,^{31,59,74} a potential drawback of perylene is a high inclination to aggregate and the formation of excimers (excited-state dimers), which commonly have a high rate of non-radiative decay.⁷⁵ The formation of dark-states such as excimers would, obviously, negatively impact the overall TTA-UC efficiency. However, we found no evidence of excimer formation in the present work.

The performance of PMI presented here shows that a higher annihilation rate constant, k_2 , and lower triplet decay rate, k_1 , of an annihilator can yield more efficient TTA-UC at low sun illumination, but a poor annihilation singlet yield, f , causes a reduced maximum efficiency achievable at high sun excitation. From benchmarking PMI against rubrene, we can outlay some important design considerations for the road map to realising efficient photochemical upconversion for photovoltaics.

It is proposed that the dominant inherent characteristic of the annihilator that should be the centre of attention depends on the excitation conditions. If the target is for the greatest maximum efficiency in high-intensity situations, then any losses in overall TTA-UC efficiency caused a poor second-order rate constant, k_2 , may be 'remedied' by having a relatively high annihilation singlet yield, f .

On the other hand, in the search for efficient TTA-UC systems for use in applications with low-intensity illumination the annihilation rate constant, k_2 , and the triplet decay rate (squared) appear to dominate the overall TTA-UC efficiency. Thus, at sub-solar intensities the design of an effective annihilator molecule should prioritize triplet lifetime, as well as factors contributing to maximising the diffusion of annihilators.

While the present study was undertaken exclusively in solutions, the principles outlaid here also apply to solid state upconvertors. Indeed, quasi-solid state materials may yet have a role to play in photovoltaics.^{56,76}

Conclusions

We have characterized a perylene monoimide (PMI) derivative as an upconverting annihilator, comparing it to the commonly used rubrene. Using a variety of spectroscopies, we have established that it performs very well under low photon flux, when coupled with the PdPQ₄ sensitizer, owing to a low triplet decay rate and a higher triplet-triplet annihilation rate than rubrene. Yet, it suffers from a poor annihilation singlet yield, f , with only 23% of excitonically reactive contact pairs generating the excited singlet state. Under solar irradiance, our composition achieved over 6% upconversion state quantum yield, Φ_{UC} , which is 12% of the maximum achievable, η_{UC} . The comparison between PMI and rubrene underlines that an annihilator that performs well at low excitation intensities, does not necessarily perform well at higher intensities, and *vice-versa*.

Author Contributions

J.K.G., L.F. and R.W.M. performed the experiments. T.W.S. and F.N.C. conceived the study. J.K.G. and T.W.S. analysed the data and wrote the manuscript. M.J.C. designed and provided the sensitizer material. F.N.C. designed, and K.M.W. synthesised the PMI material.

Conflicts of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council (Centre of Excellence in Exciton Science CE170100026). T.W.S. also acknowledges the support of the Australian Research Council for a Future Fellowship (FT130100177). The work at NC State was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Award No. DE-SC0011979.

References

- Green, M. A.; Emery, K.; Hishikawa, Y.; Warta, W.; Dunlop, E. D. Solar cell efficiency tables (version 47). *Prog. Photovolt.* **2016**, *24*, 3–11, PIP-15-272.
- Kerr, M. J.; Campbell, P.; Cuevas, A. Lifetime and Efficiency Limits of Crystalline Silicon Solar Cells. *Proc. 29th IEEE PVSC* **2002**, 438–441.
- Shockley, W.; Queisser, H. J. Detailed Balance Limit of Efficiency of P-N Junction Solar Cells. *J. Appl. Phys.* **1961**, *32*, 510–519.
- Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; McCamey, D. R.; Schmidt, T. W. Beyond Shockley–Queisser: Molecular Approaches to High-Efficiency Photovoltaics. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2015**, *6*, 2367–2378.
- Ehrler, B.; Hutter, E. M.; Berry, J. J. The Complicated Morality of Named Inventions. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2021**, *6*, 565–567.
- Chiu, P. T.; Law, D. L.; Woo, R. L.; Singer, S.; Hong, W. D.; Zakaria, A.; Boisvert, J. C.; Mesropian, S.; King, R. R.; Karam, N. H. Continued progress on direct bonded 5J space and terrestrial cells. *Proc. 40th IEEE PVSC* **2014**,
- Steiner, M. A.; France, R. M.; Buencuerpo, J.; Geisz, J. F.; Nielsen, M. P.; Pusch, A.; Olavarria, W. J.; Young, M.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J. High Efficiency Inverted GaAs and GaInP/GaAs Solar Cells With Strain-Balanced GaInAs/GaAsP Quantum Wells. *Adv. Ener. Mat.* **2021**, *11*, 2002874.
- Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems ISE, New world record for solar cell efficiency at 46%. *Press Release 26* **2014**,
- Hanna, M. C.; Nozik, A. J. Solar Conversion Efficiency of Photovoltaic and Photoelectrolysis Cells With Carrier Multiplication Absorbers. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2006**, *100*, 074510.
- Congreve, D. N.; Lee, J.; Thompson, N. J.; Hontz, E.; Yost, S. R.; Reuswig, P. D.; Bahlke, M. E.; Reineke, S.; Van Voorhis, T.; Baldo, M. A. External Quantum Efficiency Above 100% in a Singlet-Exciton-Fission-Based Organic Photovoltaic Cell. *Science* **2013**, *340*, 334–337.
- Ehrler, B.; Musselman, K. P.; Bohm, M. L.; Friend, R. H.; Greenham, N. C. Hybrid Pentacene/a-Silicon Solar Cells Utilizing Multiple Carrier Generation via Singlet Exciton Fission. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2012**, *101*.
- Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Gray-Weale, A. A.; Schmidt, T. W. Thermodynamic Limit of Exciton Fission Solar Cell Efficiency. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2012**, *3*, 2749–2754.

- 13 Einzinger, M.; Wu, T.; Kompalla, J. F.; Smith, H. L.; Perkinson, C. F.; Nienhaus, L.; Wieghold, S.; Congreve, D. N.; Kahn, A.; Bawendi, M. G.; Baldo, M. A. Sensitization of silicon by singlet exciton fission in tetracene. *Nature* **2019**, *571*, 90–94.
- 14 MacQueen, R. W.; Liebhaber, M.; Niederhausen, J.; Mews, M.; Gersmann, C.; Jäckle, S.; Jäger, K.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Schmidt, T. W.; Rech, B.; Lips, K. Crystalline silicon solar cells with tetracene interlayers: the path to silicon-singlet fission heterojunction devices. *Mater. Horiz.* **2018**, *5*, 1065–1075.
- 15 Rao, A.; Friend, R. H. Harnessing singlet exciton fission to break the Shockley–Queisser limit. *Nature Rev. Mater.* **2017**, *2*, 17063.
- 16 Luque, A.; Martí, A. Increasing the Efficiency of Ideal Solar Cells by Photon Induced Transitions at Intermediate Levels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1997**, *78*, 5014.
- 17 Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Schmidt, T. W. A Molecular Approach to the Intermediate Band Solar Cell: The Symmetric Case. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2008**, *93*, 063507.
- 18 Simpson, C.; Clarke, T. M.; MacQueen, R. W.; Cheng, Y. Y.; Trevitt, A. J.; Mozer, A. J.; Wagner, P.; Schmidt, T. W.; Nattestad, A. An intermediate band dye-sensitized solar cell using triplet-triplet annihilation. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *17*, 24826–24830.
- 19 Hill, S. P.; Dilbeck, T.; Baduelli, E.; Hanson, K. Integrated Photon Upconversion Solar Cell via Molecular Self-Assembled Bilayers. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2016**, *1*, 3–8.
- 20 Ross, R. T.; Nozik, A. J. Efficiency of hot-carrier solar energy converters. *J. Appl. Phys.* **1982**, *53*, 3813–3818.
- 21 Trupke, T.; Green, M. A.; Würfel, P. Improving Solar Cell Efficiencies by up-conversion of Sub-Band-Gap Light. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2002**, *92*, 4117–4122.
- 22 Schulze, T. F.; Schmidt, T. W. Photochemical Upconversion: Present Status and Prospects for its Application to Solar Energy Conversion. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2015**, *8*, 103–125.
- 23 Schmidt, T. W.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y. In *Comprehensive Renewable Energy*; Sayigh, A., Ed.; Elsevier: Oxford, 2012; pp 533–548.
- 24 Auzel, F. Upconversion and anti-stokes processes with f and d ions in solids. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 139–173.
- 25 Parker, C. A.; Hatchard, C. G. Sensitized Anti-Stokes Delayed Fluorescence. *Proc. Chem. Soc.* **1962**, 386–387.
- 26 Singh-Rachford, T. N.; Castellano, F. N. Photon upconversion based on sensitized triplet-triplet annihilation. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *254*, 2560–2573.
- 27 Goldschmidt, J.; Fischer, S.; Herter, B.; Fröhlich, B.; Krämer, K.; Richards, B.; Ivaturi, A.; MacDougall, S.; Hueso, J. M.; Favilla, E.; Tonelli, M. Record efficient upconverter solar cell devices. Proc. EU PVSEC. 2014; p 1AP.1.2.
- 28 Gholizadeh, E. M.; Prasad, S. K. K.; Teh, Z. L.; Ishwara, T.; Norman, S.; Petty II, A. J.; Cole, J. H.; Cheong, S.; Tilley, R. D.; Anthony, J. E.; Huang, S.; Schmidt, T. W. Photochemical upconversion of near-infrared light from below the silicon bandgap. *Nature Photonics* **2020**, *14*, 585–590.
- 29 Green, M. A.; Ho-Baillie, A.; Snaith, H. J. The Emergence of Perovskite Solar Cells. *Nat. Photonics* **2014**, *8*, 506–514.
- 30 Schmidt, T. W.; Castellano, F. N. Photochemical Upconversion: The Primacy of Kinetics. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2014**, *5*, 4062–4072.
- 31 Ravetz, B. D.; Pun, A. B.; Churchill, E. M.; Congreve, D. N.; Rovis, T.; Campos, L. M. Photoredox catalysis using infrared light via triplet fusion upconversion. *Nature* **2019**, *565*, 343–346.
- 32 Islangulov, R. R.; Kozlov, D. V.; Castellano, F. N. Low power upconversion using MLCT sensitizers. *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 3776–3778.
- 33 Balushev, S.; Keivanidis, P.; Wegner, G.; Jacob, J.; Grimsdale, A.; Müllen, K.; Miteva, T.; Yasuda, A.; Nelles, G. Upconversion photoluminescence in poly (ladder-type-pentaphenylene) doped with metal (II)-octaethyl porphyrins. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2005**, *86*, 061904.
- 34 Singh-Rachford, T. N.; Castellano, F. N. Pd(II) Phthalocyanine-Sensitized Triplet-Triplet Annihilation from Rubrene. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 3550–3556.
- 35 Singh-Rachford, T. N.; Haefele, A.; Ziessel, R.; Castellano, F. N. Boron Dipyrromethene Chromophores: Next Generation Triplet Acceptors/Annihilators for Low Power Upconversion Schemes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 16164.
- 36 Monguzzi, A.; Tubino, R.; Meinardi, F. Multicomponent polymeric film for red to green low power sensitized upconversion. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 1171–1174.
- 37 Cheng, Y. Y.; Fückel, B.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. Entropically driven photochemical upconversion. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2011**, *115*, 1047–1053.
- 38 Cheng, Y.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. On the efficiency limit of triplet-triplet annihilation for photochemical upconversion. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *12*, 66–71.
- 39 Cheng, Y.; Fückel, B.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. Kinetic Analysis of Photochemical Upconversion by Triplet-Triplet Annihilation: Beyond Any Spin Statistical Limit. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2010**, *1*, 1795–1799.
- 40 Murakami, Y. Photochemical photon upconverters with ionic liquids. *Chem. Phys. Letters* **2011**, *516*, 56–61.
- 41 Jankus, V.; Snedden, E. W.; Bright, D. W.; Whittle, V. L.; Williams, J. A. G.; Monkman, A. Energy Upconversion via Triplet Fusion in Super Yellow PPV Films Doped with Palladium Tetraphenyltetrabenzoporphyrin: a Comprehensive Investigation of Exciton Dynamics. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2013**, *23*, 384–393.
- 42 Gray, V.; Dzebo, D.; Abrahamsson, M.; Albinsson, B.; Moth-Poulsen, K. Triplet-triplet annihilation photon-upconversion: towards solar energy applications. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2014**, *16*, 10345–10352.
- 43 Huang, Z.; Li, X.; Mahboub, M.; Hanson, K. M.; Nichols, V. M.; Le, H.; Tang, M. L.; Bardeen, C. J. Hybrid Molecule–Nanocrystal Photon Upconversion Across the Visi-

- ble and Near-Infrared. *Nano Letters* **2015**, *15*, 5552–5557.
- 44 Mongin, C.; Garakyaraghi, S.; Razgoniaeva, N.; Zamkov, M.; Castellano, F. N. Direct observation of triplet energy transfer from semiconductor nanocrystals. *Science* **2016**, *351*, 369–372.
- 45 Simon, Y. C.; Weder, C. Low-power photon upconversion through triplet–triplet annihilation in polymers. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2012**, *22*, 20817.
- 46 Okumura, K.; Mase, K.; Yanai, N.; Kimizuka, N. Employing Core-Shell Quantum Dots as Triplet Sensitizers for Photon Upconversion. *Chemistry – A European Journal* **2016**, *22*, 7721–7726.
- 47 Amemori, S.; Sasaki, Y.; Yanai, N.; Kimizuka, N. Near-Infrared-to-Visible Photon Upconversion Sensitized by a Metal Complex with Spin-Forbidden yet Strong S0–T1 Absorption. *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, in press.
- 48 Khnayzer, R. S.; Blumhoff, J.; Harrington, J. A.; Haeefe, A.; Deng, F.; Castellano, F. N. Upconversion-powered photoelectrochemistry. *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, *48*, 209–211.
- 49 Cheng, Y. Y.; Fückel, B.; MacQueen, R. W.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Schulze, T. F.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Stannowski, B.; Lips, K.; Schmidt, T. W. Improving the light-harvesting of amorphous silicon solar cells with photochemical upconversion. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2012**, *5*, 6953–6959.
- 50 Schulze, T. F.; Cheng, Y. Y.; Fückel, B.; MacQueen, R. W.; Danos, A.; Davis, N. J. L. K.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Stannowski, B.; Lips, K.; Schmidt, T. W. Photochemical Upconversion Enhanced Solar Cells: Effect of a Back Reflector. *Aust. J. Chem.* **2012**, *65*, 480–485.
- 51 Schulze, T. F.; Czolk, J.; Cheng, Y.-Y.; Fückel, B.; MacQueen, R. W.; Khoury, T.; Crossley, M. J.; Stannowski, B.; Lips, K.; Lemmer, U., et al. Efficiency enhancement of organic and thin-film silicon solar cells with photochemical upconversion. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2012**, *116*, 22794–22801.
- 52 Nattestad, A.; Cheng, Y. Y.; MacQueen, R. W.; Schulze, T. F.; Thompson, F. W.; Mozer, A. J.; Fückel, B.; Khoury, T.; Crossley, M. J.; Lips, K.; Wallace, G. G.; Schmidt, T. W. Dye-Sensitized Solar Cell with Integrated Triplet–Triplet Annihilation Upconversion System. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2013**, *4*, 2073–2078.
- 53 Schulze, T. F.; Cheng, Y. Y.; Khoury, T.; Crossley, M. J.; Stannowski, B.; Lips, K.; Schmidt, T. W. Micro-optical design of photochemical upconverters for thin-film solar cells. *J. Photon. Ener.* **2013**, *3*, 034598–034598.
- 54 Cheng, Y. Y.; Nattestad, A.; Schulze, T. F.; MacQueen, R. W.; Fückel, B.; Lips, K.; Wallace, G. G.; Khoury, T.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. Increased upconversion performance for thin film solar cells: a trimolecular composition. *Chem. Sci.* **2016**, *7*, 559–568.
- 55 Lee, S. H.; Ayer, M. A.; Vadrucci, R.; Weder, C.; Simon, Y. C. Light upconversion by triplet-triplet annihilation in diphenylanthracene-based copolymers. *Polym. Chem.* **2014**, *5*, 6898–6904.
- 56 Sripathy, K.; MacQueen, R. W.; Peterson, J. R.; Cheng, Y. Y.; Dvorak, M.; McCamey, D. R.; Treat, N. D.; Stingelin, N.; Schmidt, T. W. Highly efficient photochemical upconversion in a quasi-solid organogel. *J. Mater. Chem. C* **2015**, *3*, 616–622.
- 57 Ogawa, T.; Yanai, N.; Monguzzi, A.; Kimizuka, N. Highly Efficient Photon Upconversion in Self-Assembled Light-Harvesting Molecular Systems. *Scientific Reports* **2015**, *5*, 10882.
- 58 Pun, J. K. H.; Gallaher, J. K.; Frazer, L.; Prasad, S. K. K.; Dover, C. B.; MacQueen, R. W.; Schmidt, T. W. TIPS-anthracene: a singlet fission or triplet fusion material? *Journal of Photonics for Energy* **2018**, *8*, 1–9.
- 59 Hoseinkhani, S.; Tubino, R.; Meinardi, F.; Monguzzi, A. Achieving the photon up-conversion thermodynamic yield upper limit by sensitized triplet–triplet annihilation. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *17*, 4020–4024.
- 60 Monguzzi, A.; Borisov, S. M.; Pedrini, J.; Klimant, I.; Salvalaggio, M.; Biagini, P.; Melchiorre, F.; Lelii, C.; Meinardi, F. Efficient Broadband Triplet–Triplet Annihilation-Assisted Photon Upconversion at Subsolar Irradiance in Fully Organic Systems. *Adv. Func. Mat.* **2015**, *25*, 5617–5624.
- 61 Monguzzi, A.; Braga, D.; Gandini, M.; Holmberg, V. C.; Kim, D. K.; Sahu, A.; Norris, D. J.; Meinardi, F. Broadband Up-Conversion at Subsolar Irradiance: Triplet–Triplet Annihilation Boosted by Fluorescent Semiconductor Nanocrystals. *Nano Letters* **2014**, *14*, 6644–6650.
- 62 Frazer, L.; Gallaher, J. K.; Schmidt, T. W. Optimizing the Efficiency of Solar Photon Upconversion. *ACS Energy Letters* **2017**, *2*, 1346–1354.
- 63 Piper, R. B.; Yoshida, M.; Farrell, D. J.; Khoury, T.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W.; Haque, S. A.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J. Kinetic insight into bimolecular upconversion: experiment and simulation. *RSC Adv.* **2014**, *4*, 8059–8063.
- 64 Beery, D.; Schmidt, T. W.; Hanson, K. Harnessing Sunlight via Molecular Photon Upconversion. *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces* **2021**, in press.
- 65 Yarnell, J. E.; Chakraborty, A.; Myahkostupov, M.; Wright, K. M.; Castellano, F. N. Long-lived triplet excited state in a platinum(ii) perylene monoimide complex. *Dalton Trans.* **2018**, *47*, 15071–15081.
- 66 Zhou, Y.; Castellano, F. N.; Schmidt, T. W.; Hanson, K. On the Quantum Yield of Photon Upconversion via Triplet–Triplet Annihilation. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2020**, *5*, 2322–2326.
- 67 MacQueen, R. W.; Cheng, Y. Y.; Danos, A. N.; Lips, K.; Schmidt, T. W. Action spectrum experiment for the measurement of incoherent photon upconversion efficiency under sun-like excitation. *RSC Adv.* **2014**, *4*, 52749–52756.
- 68 Cheng, Y. Y.; Fückel, B.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Tayebjee, M. J. Y.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. Kinetic Analysis of Photochemical Upconversion by Triplet–Triplet Annihilation: Beyond Any Spin Statistical Limit. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2010**, *1*, 1795–1799.
- 69 Gholizadeh, E. M.; Frazer, L.; MacQueen, R. W.; Galla-

- her, J. K.; Schmidt, T. W. Photochemical upconversion is suppressed by high concentrations of molecular sensitizers. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *20*, 19500–19506.
- 70 Haefele, A.; Blumhoff, J.; Khnayzer, R. S.; Castellano, F. N. Getting to the (Square) Root of the Problem: How to Make Noncoherent Pumped Upconversion Linear. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2012**, *3*, 299–303.
- 71 Monguzzi, A.; Mezyk, J.; Scotognella, F.; Tubino, R.; Meinardi, F. Upconversion-induced fluorescence in multicomponent systems: Steady-state excitation power threshold. *Phys. Rev. B* **2008**, *78*, 5.
- 72 Auckett, J. E.; Chen, Y. Y.; Khoury, T.; Clady, R. G. C. R.; Ekins-Daukes, N. J.; Crossley, M. J.; Schmidt, T. W. Efficient upconversion by triplet-triplet annihilation. *J. of Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **2009**, *185*, 012002.
- 73 Kitazawa, M.; Yabe, T.; Hirata, Y.; Okada, T. Solvent viscosity dependence of bimolecular reaction rate constant of the excited 9-cyanoanthracene quenched by 1,3-cyclohexadiene. *Journal of Molecular Liquids* **1995**, *65-66*, 321 – 324.
- 74 Li, C.; Koenigsmann, C.; Deng, F.; Hagstrom, A.; Schmuttenmaer, C. A.; Kim, J.-H. Photocurrent Enhancement from Solid-State Triplet–Triplet Annihilation Upconversion of Low-Intensity, Low-Energy Photons. *ACS Photonics* **2016**, *3*, 784–790.
- 75 Musser, A. J.; Rajendran, S. K.; Georgiou, K.; Gai, L.; Grant, R. T.; Shen, Z.; Cavazzini, M.; Ruseckas, A.; Turnbull, G. A.; Samuel, I. D. W.; Clark, J.; Lidzey, D. G. Intermolecular states in organic dye dispersions: excimers vs. aggregates. *J. Mater. Chem. C* **2017**, *5*, 8380–8389.
- 76 Vadrucchi, R.; Weder, C.; Simon, Y. C. Organogels for low-power light upconversion. *Mater. Horiz.* **2015**, *2*, 120–124.