Communications

Quantum Dot Solar Cells Prepared Using Electrophoretic Deposition

Hye Mi Choi, In Ae Ji, and Jin Ho Bang*

Department of Chemistry and Applied Chemistry, Hanyang University, Kyeonggi-do 426-791, Korea *E-mail: jbang@hanyang.ac.kr Received November 15, 2012, Accepted December 4, 2012

Key Words : Quantum dots, Solar cell, Electrophoretic deposition

Quantum dot solar cells (QDSCs) have attracted great interest as a next-generation solar energy conversion system.¹ While the conversion efficiency of QDSCs has recently exceeded 5%, they still lag behind their dye-sensitized solar cell analogues. The performance of QDSCs is governed by many factors such as their light harvesting capacity, interfacial charge recombination, the characteristics of the electrolytes, and the electrocatalytic activity of the counter electrode.² Among them, the anode characteristics (*i.e.*, light absorption and charge recombination) are intimately associated with the deposition method of the QD sensitizer. Therefore, the development of an effective deposition method is of great importance for highly efficient solar cell fabrication. Commonly used deposition methods include chemical bath deposition (CBD), successive ionic layer adsorption and reaction (SILAR), a molecular-linker based approach (MBA), and direct adsorption (DA).³ CBD and SILAR are based on in situ growth of QDs and feature simplicity and high QD coverage. However, they cannot control the QD size and size distribution. MBA and DA, on the other hand, are ex situ deposition techniques where pre-synthesized QDs are deposited onto nanoporous oxide substrates. While these methods are superior to CBD and SILAR from the viewpoint of the deposition of monodisperse, highly crystalline QDs, they typically suffer from low coverage and long deposition times. Electrophoretic deposition (EPD) has been demonstrated as a QD deposition method which has advantages of fast deposition with a high loading of monodisperse QDs. To date, most studies have focused on the deposition of QD/carbon composites or QDs on flat oxide substrates, but their performances are not sufficient to meet the requirements of efficient photoelectrodes.^{4,5} In this work, we performed EPD of QDs onto nanoporous oxide substrates to result in improved performance and investigated the effects of several factors on the performance of photoelectrodes prepared by EPD.

CdS QDs prepared by a hot injection method (Figure S1) were deposited onto a nanoporous TiO_2 electrode by EPD (see experimental details in Supporting Information). The scanning electron microscope (SEM) images in Figure 1(a) show that the porous nature of the TiO_2 films disappeared

after EPD, revealing that CdS QDs penetrated nanopores into the inner TiO₂ layer during the EPD process. Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) confirmed that CdS QDs were distributed over the entire TiO₂ layer while a larger amount of QDs were deposited near the top layer of the TiO₂ (Figure 1(b)). Figure 1(c) shows that the CdS/TiO₂ electrode outperformed CdS/OTE, indicating that significantly improved charge separation occurs when the QDs were integrated within the TiO₂ layer. Compared to MBA, which has been widely utilized for the deposition of highquality QDs, EPD is more effective for constructing efficient photoanodes (Figure S2). To investigate the influence of the TiO₂ thickness, the photocurrent of the electrodes was measured as a function of the TiO2 thickness. While the photocurrent linearly increased up to a TiO₂ thickness of 1.5 μ m, it began to level off as the TiO₂ layer became thicker (Figure 1(d)). This may be attributed to the limited penetration of CdS QDs through the nanopores. With a thicker



Figure 1. (a) SEM images of TiO₂ and CdS/TiO₂, (b) SEM-EDS line analysis along the blue line in SEM image, (c) *I-V* curves of solar cells with CdS/TiO₂ and CdS/OTE anodes (100 mW/cm², 0.1 M Na₂S electrolyte, Au counter electrode), and (d) photocurrent under illumination (50 mW/cm²) as a function of TiO₂ thickness.



Figure 2. (a) *I-V* curves of solar cells with CdS/TiO₂, CdS/ZnO, and CdS/SnO₂ anodes and (b) *I-V* curves of CdS/TiO₂ solar cells before and after EDT treatment.

 TiO_2 layer, most of the QDs tended to be stacked over its top, which hinders the formation of QD/TiO₂ interfaces for effective charge separation (Figure S3).

The effects of the oxide substrate were also investigated in this study. Three commonly employed oxides (TiO₂, ZnO, and SnO₂) with the same thickness of $\sim 1.5 \ \mu m$ were employed as EPD substrates. Figure 2(a) compares their solar cell performances, demonstrating that TiO₂ excelled among the three oxides and the solar cells constructed with ZnO and SnO₂ photoanodes suffered from a low open-circuit voltage (V_{oc}) and short-circuit current (I_{sc}) along with a poor fill factor (FF). This observation was supported by the incident photon-to-current efficiency (IPCE) measurements, in which the conversion efficiency of CdS/TiO₂ was superior to its counterparts over the entire visible light spectrum (Figure S4). This result is in good accordance with recent studies of photoelectrodes prepared by MBA,⁶ suggesting that oxide substrates have the same influence on the solar cell performance regardless of the deposition method. The CdS/TiO₂ anode was treated with 1,2-ethanedithiol (EDT) to remove the organic stabilizer around the CdS QDs, which results in stronger coupling between CdS and TiO2. Figure 2(b) shows that the Isc dramatically increased after the EDT treatment, which is ascribed to stronger electronic coupling by shortening their distance.⁷

To extend the visible light absorption capability of the photoanode, pre-synthesized CdSe QDs were deposited onto nanoporous TiO₂ films by EPD. Figure 3(a) shows the absorption spectrum of the CdSe/TiO₂ photoelectrode, in which most of the visible light photons were absorbed by the CdSe QD sensitizer. Figure 3(b) displays the *I-V* characteristics of the photoelectrode, where the V_{oc} (0.79 V), I_{sc} (2.16 mA/cm²), and *FF* (0.28) were obtained. The overall energy conversion efficiency was found to be 0.48%. It is noteworthy that the V_{oc} was substantially higher than those observed in reports where other QD deposition methods were employed, which may be attributed to reduced charge recombination. Further investigation is currently underway to elucidate this intriguing observation.



Communications to the Editor



(a)1

Figure 3. (a) Diffuse reflectance UV-Vis absorption spectrum of $CdSe/TiO_2$ photoelectrode (inset: a photo of the electrode) and (b) *I-V* curve of solar cell with CdSe/TiO₂ anode.

In conclusion, we successfully demonstrated that EPD results in the facile and effective deposition of various QDs. The performance of the photoelectrodes was found to be dictated by several factors such as the oxide thickness, type of oxide substrate, and post-treatment. While the EPD process presented in this work has not yet been fully optimized, it led to high V_{oc} unattainable from other deposition methods, which we believe could be of great benefit for the development of efficient solar cells. Further optimization is in progress to improve the solar cell performance.

Acknowledgments. We thank Prof. P. V. Kamat for helpful discussion. The experiments were partly carried out at Radiation Laboratory, University of Notre Dame, which is supported by the Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences. We acknowledge the research fund provided by Hanyang University (HY-2010-N).

Supporting Information. Experimental details; UV-Vis absorption and photoluminescence spectra of CdS and CdSe QDs; *I-V* curves of solar cells fabricated by EPD and MBA; SEM image of CdS QDs deposited on a thicker TiO₂ film; IPCE of solar cells with CdS/TiO₂, CdS/ZnO, and CdS/SnO₂ anodes.

References

- Kamat, P. V.; Tvrdy, K.; Baker, D. R.; Radich, J. G. Chem. Rev. 2010, 110, 6664.
- Mora-Seró, I.; Giménez, S.; Fabregat-Santiago, F.; Gómez, R.; Shen, Q.; Toyoda, T.; Bisquert, J. Acc. Chem. Res. 2009, 42, 1848.
- Salant, A.; Shalom, M.; Hod, I.; Faust, A.; Zaban, A.; Banin, U. ACS Nano 2010, 4, 5962.
- Parsi Benehkohal, N.; González-Pedro, V.; Boix, P. P.; Chavhan, S.; Tena-Zaera, R.; Demopoulos, G. P.; Mora-Seró, I. J. Phys. Chem. C 2012, 116, 16391.
- 5. Bang, J. H.; Kamat, P. V. ACS Nano 2011, 5, 9421.
- Tvrdy, K.; Frantsuzov, P. A.; Kamat, P. V. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 2011, 108, 29.
- Luther, J. M.; Law, M.; Beard, M. C.; Song, Q.; Reese, M. O.; Ellingson, R. J.; Nozik, A. J. *Nano Lett.* **2008**, *8*, 3488.