

CORRECTION

[View Article Online](#)
[View Journal](#) | [View Issue](#)Cite this: *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, 6, 10149

Correction: Balancing electrical and optical losses for efficient 4-terminal Si-perovskite solar cells with solution processed percolation electrodes

César Omar Ramírez Quiroz,^{*a} Yilei Shen,^a Michael Salvador,^{ab} Karen Forberich,^a Nadine Schrenker,^c George D. Spyropoulos,^a Thomas Heumüller,^a Benjamin Wilkinson,^d Thomas Kirchartz,^{ef} Erdmann Spiecker,^c Pierre J. Verlinden,^g Xueling Zhang,^g Martin A. Green,^d Anita Ho-Baillie^d and Christoph J. Brabec^{*ah}

DOI: 10.1039/c8ta90069h

www.rsc.org/MaterialsACorrection for 'Balancing electrical and optical losses for efficient 4-terminal Si-perovskite solar cells with solution processed percolation electrodes' by César Omar Ramírez Quiroz *et al.*, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, 6, 3583–3592.

The authors regret inconsistent labelling of the J_{sc} column in Table 1 of the original manuscript. The experimental conditions are now described correctly in the caption of the updated Table 1, shown below, as indicated by superscripts "b" and "c".

Table 1 Key metrics of best performing devices^a

HTL	ETL/electrode	J_{sc} (mA cm ⁻²)	V_{oc} (V)	FF (%)	PCEs
CuSCN	PC ₆₀ BM–ZnO:Al/Ag ^b	22.5	1.101	81.1	20.1
PEDOT:PSS	PC ₆₀ BM–ZnO:Al/Ag ^b	19.4	0.901	80.2	14.0
CuSCN	PC ₆₀ BM–ZnO:Al/AgNW ^b	21.0	1.098	74.1	17.1
PEDOT:PSS	PC ₆₀ BM–ZnO:Al/AgNW ^b	18.2	0.902	74.5	12.1
PERL (bare) ^c		41.5	0.680	79.5	22.4
PERL filtered w/CuSCN cell ^c		17.7	0.674	80.1	9.6
PERL filtered w/PEDOT:PSS cell ^c		16.0	0.673	80.1	8.6
4-Terminal tandem PERL; CuSCN-based					26.7/26.9 ^d
4-Terminal tandem PERL; PEDOT-based					20.9
IBC (bare) ^c		41.3	0.651	75.1	20.2
IBC filtered w/CuSCN cell ^c		17.0	0.633	75.2	8.1
IBC filtered w/PEDOT:PSS cell ^c		15.2	0.634	75.2	7.3
4-Terminal tandem IBC; CuSCN-based					25.2
4-Terminal tandem IBC; PEDOT-based					19.5

^a All values derived from J – V and EQE characterization represent the best performing devices from the same experimental run comprising 12 cells per experiment. ^b J_{sc} and PCE values determined under AM 1.5 irradiation at 0.1 W cm⁻² intensity. ^c J_{sc} (EQE corrected) and PCE values determined under AM 1.5 irradiation at 0.1 W cm⁻² intensity. ^d Measured efficiency when implementing 165 nm of MgF₂ as antireflective (see Fig. S13).

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

^aFriedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Institute of Materials for Electronics and Energy Technology (I-MEET), Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Erlangen, Germany. E-mail: omar.quiroz@fau.de

^bKaust Solar Center, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Saudi Arabia

^cCenter for Nanoanalysis and Electron Microscopy (CENEM), Department Werkstoffwissenschaften, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Cauerstraße 6, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

^dThe Australian Centre for Advanced Photovoltaics (ACAP), School of Photovoltaic and Renewable Energy Engineering, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia

^eIEK-5 Photovoltaik, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, 52428 Jülich, Germany

^fFaculty of Engineering, CENIDE, University of Duisburg-Essen, Carl-Benz-Straße 199, 47057 Duisburg, Germany

^gTrina Solar, No. 2 Trina Road, Trina PV Industrial Park, Xinbei District, Changzhou, Jiangsu 213031, China

^hFriedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Bavarian Center for Applied Energy Research (ZAE Bayern), Erlangen, Germany