Atomic Structure of the (001) Surface of CuGaSe₂

Leandro Liborio* and Su Chuen Chew

TYC, The London Centre for Nanotechnology,

Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

Nicholas Harrison

TYC, The London Centre for Nanotechnology,

Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

and STFC, Daresbury Laboratory, Daresbury,

Warrington WA4 4AD, United Kingdom

Abstract

Hybrid exchange density functional theory is used to study the wide band gap chalcopyrite CuGaSe₂. The formation energies of the experimentally observed (4×1) and (1×1) atomic scale reconstructions on the CuGaSe₂(001) surface are calculated for different environmental conditions. The results suggest that a Se-rich (1×1) reconstruction, and a Cu-poor, Se-rich (4×1) reconstruction, are the only stable surfaces under all the studied environmental conditions. Two complementary mechanisms for the stabilisation of CuGaSe₂ surfaces are proposed, and it is suggested that the presence of Na stabilises the (4×1) reconstructions, making them the stable terminations under Na-rich conditions.

PACS numbers:

*Electronic address: l.liborio@imperial.ac.uk

I. INTRODUCTION

Ternary I-III-VI₂ chalcopyrite compounds (CuInSe₂, CuGaSe₂ and Cu(In/Ga)Se₂) are promising materials for photoelectronic devices such as solar cells [1, 2]. These devices are usually multilayered thin-film heterostructures in which the absorber layer is made of a chalcopyrite thin film that is epitaxially grown, in some cases using Molecular Organic Chemical Vapour Deposition (MOCVD). MOCVD is a reliable technique for the fabrication of high-efficiency solar cells [3], and solar cells with efficiencies between 10% and 19% can be obtained. More generally, efficiencies of the order of 20%, measured under the AM 1.5 global spectrum for 1000 W/m² irradiance, have been achieved in the lab for epitaxially grown CuIn_xGa_(1-x)Se₂-based solar cells[4, 5]. There are other methods to grow chalcopyrite thin films. For instance, single-crystal surfaces such as CuInSe₂(112) and (110) [6, 7] and surfaces of polycrystalline CuInSe₂ [?], have been prepared with the sputtering/annealing processing used by Denizou *et. al.* in the synthesis of the (001) surfaces of CuGaSe₂ that we have studied in this work. They grew single crystalline (001) CuGaSe₂ surfaces which were Ar⁺ sputtered and annealed[8, 9], and their atomic surface structures and compositions were analysed using low energy electron diffraction (LEED) and Auger electron spectroscopy (AES). Denizou *et. al.* observed clean, stable, unfacetted, non-stoichiometric (4×1) reconstructions on the (001) surface of CuGaSe₂, with a Se-rich, Cu-poor stoichiometry[8].

According to Tasker's classification[10], the stoichiometric, unreconstructed (001) CuGaSe₂ surface is a polar surface. But the (001) surfaces of CuGaSe₂ that we have studied here have been reconstructed, and are non-stoichiometric and non-polar. Experimental studies have been performed to characterise the (112) and (110) surfaces of CuInSe₂ single crystals[11]. As regards the experimental evidence on the CuGaSe₂ surfaces, Meeder and coworkers grew crystalline CuGaSe₂ samples and showed that the surfaces tend to be Cu-depleted and, if grown on soda-lime type of substrates, Na-rich[12].

Non-polar, non-stoichiometric (001) surfaces of CuGaSe₂ are relevant in the field of photovoltaic applications. For instance, surface-faceting is stronger on CuInSe₂(001) surfaces as com-

pared to CuGaSe_2 (001) surfaces, which implies that the CuGaSe_2 (001) surfaces are more stable than the CuGaSe_2 (112) surfaces. Non-stoichiometry is a stabilising factor in the CuGaSe_2 (001) surfaces when compared to the CuInSe_2 (001) surfaces [13]. Moreover, non-stoichiometric (001) surfaces of CuGaSe_2 play an important role in the study of the grain boundaries of CuGaSe_2 [1].

However, when the absorber layer is only composed of a CuGaSe_2 thin film, the devices show efficiencies of, at most, 9.5% [14]. $\text{CuIn}_x\text{Ga}_{(1-x)}\text{Se}_2$ is made from substituting Ga atoms with In atoms in CuGaSe_2 , and it is well-known that, to improve the efficiencies of chalcopyrite-based solar cells, the surface and interface properties of the chalcopyrites forming the different layers need to be understood [13].

In this work, we use *ab initio* thermodynamics to study the stability, under different environmental conditions, of several (4×1) surface reconstructions. The atomic structure of these reconstructions is proposed on the basis of the experimental evidence and the computed relaxation of the surface layers. The role of Na in the surface's stability is also studied.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Computational Details

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations were performed using CRYSTAL [15] and the Becke, three-parameter, Lee-Yang-Parr hybrid exchange functional (B3LYP). This functional has been shown to provide a reliable description of the electronic structure, geometry and energetics in a wide range of materials [16, 17]. In particular, hybrid exchange functionals such as B3LYP provide a much better prediction of the band gap of semiconductors than the local density approximation (LDA) or generalised gradient approximation (GGA) DFT functionals, and are therefore likely to be more accurate in estimating the valence band offset of semiconductor heterojunctions [18].

Polarised triple valence Gaussian basis sets [15] for copper (Cu), gallium (Ga), sodium (Na) and selenium (Se) were used throughout. For the Se, the outer diffuse Gaussian has been removed

and valence functions reoptimized for the solid. In CRYSTAL, real space summations of the Coulomb and exchange contributions to the Hamiltonian matrix are controlled by five overlap criteria. In these calculations, four of these overlap criteria have values of 10^{-6} and the last one has a value of 10^{-12} . The control of these approximations is described in detail elsewhere [19]. A Monkhorst-Pack shrinking factor of eight was used to sample the first Brillouin zone, and a Gilat net of eight points was used in the evaluation of the Fermi energy and density matrix [19]. The bulk CuGaSe₂ is optimised for lattice parameters and atomic positions, whereas the relaxation of the atomic coordinates is performed for the surface reconstructions only.

All the surface structures were represented by periodically repeated symmetric slabs consisting of seven layers of Se atoms and CuGa atoms in the (001) direction. Test calculations with (1×1) Se and CuGa terminated slabs, with a number of layers ranging from 5 up to 17, showed variations of the surface energy smaller than 0.015 J/m^2 . All the surface reconstructions studied in this work were simulated using symmetric slabs of 13 layers. These slabs have a centre of inversion: the simulated (001) surfaces are non-polar and non-stoichiometric

B. Surface Energies

Total energy electronic structure calculations can be combined with thermodynamics in order to deduce the stable structures of complex surfaces over a range of environmental conditions. The equilibrium surface stoichiometry and free energy is actually a statistical average over all elementary adsorption and desorption processes from and to a particle reservoir. When the total number of adsorption processes equals the total number of desorption processes, the average surface composition and structure remains constant and the surface has achieved thermodynamic equilibrium with the environment. Our approach is based in the methodology developed by A. Zunger and coworkers for calculating the surface energies of chalcopyrites[20–22].

At thermodynamic equilibrium, the energy of different surface reconstructions in the ternary compound CuGaSe₂ is given by:

$$\gamma(T, p) = \frac{1}{2A} \left[(G^{\text{slab}}(T, p, n_{\text{Cu}}, n_{\text{Ga}}, n_{\text{Se}}) - n_{\text{Cu}}\mu_{\text{Cu}}(T, p) - n_{\text{Ga}}\mu_{\text{Ga}}(T, p) - n_{\text{Se}}\mu_{\text{Se}}(T, p)) \right] \quad (1)$$

Since it is assumed that CuGaSe_2 is in equilibrium with its elemental components:

$$G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{bulk}}(T, p) = \mu_{\text{Cu}}(T, p) + \mu_{\text{Ga}}(T, p) + 2\mu_{\text{Se}}(T, p) \quad (2)$$

equations 2 and 1 can be combined to express the energy of a surface reconstruction in CuGaSe_2 as:

$$\gamma(T, p) = \frac{1}{2A} \left[G^{\text{slab}}(T, p, n_{\text{Cu}}, n_{\text{Ga}}, n_{\text{Se}}) - \left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{bulk}}(T, p) + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Cu}} \right) \mu_{\text{Cu}}(T, p) + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Ga}} \right) \mu_{\text{Ga}}(T, p) \right] \quad (3)$$

Defining $\Delta\mu_i = \mu_i(T, p) - \mu_i^\circ$, where μ_i° is the chemical potential at standard conditions ($T = 298\text{K}$, $p = 1\text{atm}$), the surface energy can be re-written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(T, p) = \frac{1}{2A} & \left[G^{\text{slab}}(T, p, n_{\text{Cu}}, n_{\text{Ga}}, n_{\text{Se}}) - \left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{bulk}}(T, p) \right. \\ & + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Cu}} \right) \mu_{\text{Cu}}^\circ + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Ga}} \right) \mu_{\text{Ga}}^\circ \\ & \left. + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Cu}} \right) \Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}} + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Ga}} \right) \Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

As it is assumed that the solid bulk CuGaSe_2 is in equilibrium, the upper bound of μ_i is the chemical potential of the corresponding element in its standard state, as to avoid precipitation of the element, that is:

$$\Delta\mu_i \leq 0 \quad (5)$$

We would like to know the region in the phase space where CuGaSe_2 is stable. In this region,

Equation 2 must hold true and, considering equation 5, it can be re-written as:

$$\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2} = \Delta \mu_{\text{Cu}} + \Delta \mu_{\text{Ga}} + 2\Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}$ is the Gibbs free energy of formation of CuGaSe_2 . The chemical potentials are further restricted by other competing phases. In this work, the competing phases being considered are CuGa_5Se_8 , Cu_3Se_2 and GaSe . Therefore:

$$3\Delta \mu_{\text{Cu}} + 3\Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \leq \Delta G_{\text{Cu}_3\text{Se}_2} \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta \mu_{\text{Ga}} + \Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \leq \Delta G_{\text{GaSe}} \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta \mu_{\text{Cu}} + 5\Delta \mu_{\text{Ga}} + \Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \leq \Delta G_{\text{CuGa}_5\text{Se}_8} \quad (9)$$

If the surface is doped with an extrinsic dopant such as Na, the Gibbs formation energy of Na-competing phases such as Na_2Se need to be considered as well. This phase adds an additional constraint to the system.

$$2\Delta \mu_{\text{Na}} + \Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \leq \Delta G_{\text{Na}_2\text{Se}} \quad (10)$$

The values of the chemicals potentials of Cu, Ga and Se for which CuGaSe_2 is stable have been determined by combining equations (6) and (7), and are represented by the white region in Figure 3. Within this region, the limiting values of $\Delta \mu_{\text{Se}}$ are given by:

$$\frac{\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}}{2} \leq \Delta \mu_{\text{Se}} \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

These values for $\Delta \mu_{\text{Se}}$ are then used in equation (10) to calculate the limiting values of $\Delta \mu_{\text{Na}}$, which is then used in the calculation of the surfaces energies of Na-doped surfaces.

Gibbs free energies are computationally very expensive to calculate from first principles and, there-

fore, they are usually approximated[23–25]. In this case, the approximations are applied when defining the variational limits of $\Delta\mu_i$ ($i = \text{Cu, Ga, Se}$), which is done through the formation energies of CuGaSe_2 and its competing phases. In the following, the methodology is exemplified using the Gibbs formation energy of CuGaSe_2 , which is defined in equation (6). This equation can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2} &= G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2} - G_{\text{Ga}} - G_{\text{Cu}} - 2G_{\text{Se}} \\
&= E_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{DFT}} - E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}} - E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}} - 2E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}} \\
&\quad + F_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{vib.}} - F_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{vib.}} - F_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{vib.}} - 2F_{\text{Se}}^{\text{vib.}} \\
&\quad + p(V_{\text{CuGaSe}_2} - V_{\text{Cu}} - V_{\text{Ga}} - 2V_{\text{Se}})
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

In this equation, the Gibbs free energy, $G = E - TS + pV$, is written as

$$G = E^{\text{DFT}} + F^{\text{vib.}} + pV. \tag{13}$$

E^{DFT} is the *ab initio* total energy of the material, $F^{\text{vib.}} = E^{\text{vib.}} - TS^{\text{vib.}}$ is the *Helmholtz* vibrational energy [23], which depends on the phonons and is a function of temperature, and pV is the pressure-volume term.

The pV and $F^{\text{vib.}}$ terms are small for crystalline incompressible materials such as CuGaSe_2 , and equation (12) uses *differences* between these quantities to define the $\Delta\mu_i$ variational limits. Consequently, the pV and $F^{\text{vib.}}$ contributions for these type of materials are of the order of 0.02 J/m^2 [23, 25, 26], and can be considered negligible. Therefore, $\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}$ can be written as:

$$\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2} = E_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{DFT}} - E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}} - E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}} - 2E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}} \tag{14}$$

where $E_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{DFT}}$, $E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}}$, $E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}}$ and $E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}}$ are the *ab initio* total energies of these materials in their solid standard states. $E_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{DFT}}$ is the total energy of bulk CuGaSe_2 in its tetragonal phase and $E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}}$ is calculated in its pure orthorhombic α phase[27]. As regards Cu and Al, the B3LYP approximation

does not provide accurate energies for metals and, therefore, $E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}}$ and $E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}}$ are calculated using the experimental standard formation enthalpies, ΔG^0 , of GaSe and Cu_3Se_2 as,

$$E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}} = [E_{\text{GaSe}}^{\text{DFT}} - E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}} - \Delta G_{\text{GaSe}}^{\circ}] \quad (15)$$

$$E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}} = \frac{1}{3} [E_{\text{Cu}_3\text{Se}_2}^{\text{DFT}} - 2E_{\text{Se}}^{\text{DFT}} - \Delta G_{\text{Cu}_3\text{Se}_2}^{\circ}] \quad (16)$$

Since the values of $\Delta G_{\text{CuGa}_5\text{Se}_8}^{\circ}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\circ}$ eV are not available from experiments, $E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}}$ and $E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}}$ are used to estimate, the values of $\Delta G_{\text{CuGa}_5\text{Se}_8}^{\circ} = -11.57\text{eV}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\circ} = -3.02\text{eV}$. $\Delta G_{\text{GaSe}}^{\circ} = -1.43\text{eV}$ was measured using combustion calorimetry[28], while $\Delta G_{\text{Cu}_3\text{Se}_2}^{\circ} = -1.67\text{eV}$ [29] and $\Delta G_{\text{Na}_2\text{Se}}^{\circ} = -3.55\text{eV}$ [30] were estimated using differential thermal analysis. Taking all these into consideration the expression for the surface energy -Equation 4- can be approximated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(T, p) = \frac{1}{2A} & \left[E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{DFT}} - \left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) E_{\text{CuGaSe}_2}^{\text{DFT}} \right. \\ & + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Cu}} \right) E_{\text{Cu}}^{\text{DFT}} + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Ga}} \right) E_{\text{Ga}}^{\text{DFT}} \\ & \left. + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Cu}} \right) \Delta \mu_{\text{Cu}} + \left(\left(\frac{n_{\text{Se}}}{2} \right) - n_{\text{Ga}} \right) \Delta \mu_{\text{Ga}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which is the expression we will use for calculating the surface energies.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. CuGaSe₂ Bulk

Figure 2 shows the CuGaSe₂ crystalline unit cell, and table I compares theoretical and experimental lattice parameters and band gaps. The first two lines show the theoretical lattice parameters calculated by us using the B3LYP [16, 17] and PBE [31] functionals. The lattice constants predicted using the B3LYP are overestimated by 2% and are in somewhat worse agreement with experiment than those predicted from the PBE GGA functional. This can be understood from the

FIG. 1: (Color online) Band structure and atom-projected density of states (DOS) of bulk CuGaSe₂. The inset at the top-right part of the DOS shows an amplified picture of the band-gap region.

20% proportion of Fock exchange retained in the B3LYP functional. Increasing the proportion of exchange tends to decrease the lattice constant and open a larger band gap while compensating for electronic self interaction. On the other hand, the Heyd-Scuseria-Ernzerhof (HSE) [32] functional overestimates the values of the lattice parameters by a smaller amount, but gives a bandgap of 1.40 eV, which is significantly smaller than that observed.[60]

The points chosen for the BZ path for the band structure in Figure 1 are the high symmetry points T(0, 0, π/a), Γ (0, 0, 0), N(π/a , π/a , 0) and P(π/a , π/a , $\pi/2a$). Our B3LYP calculations give a direct band gap of 1.73 eV, which is the theoretical value that best compares to the two experimental values reported in table I. These values were measured at room temperature using electroluminescence techniques [34] and a combination of ultraviolet photoelectron—and inverse-photoelectron—spectroscopy [36].

TABLE I: Comparison of Theoretical and Experimental Results

	$a(\text{\AA})$	$c(\text{\AA})$	$\eta = c/2a$	$E_g(\text{eV})$	Ref.
Theory, B3LYP	5.739	11.311	0.985	1.73	Our calc.
Theory, PBE	5.692	11.302	0.993	0.38	Our calc.
Theory, PBE	5.685	11.220	0.987	0.03	[33]
Theory, HSE	5.637	11.120	0.986	1.40	[33]
Experiment	5.616	11.018	0.981	1.7	[34]
Experiment	5.614	11.022	0.982	1.65	[35, 36]

FIG. 2: (Color online) The (16 atom) conventional unit cell of CuGaSe_2 is shown.

The calculated atom-projected density of states of CuGaSe_2 is shown in Figure 1. Our results indicate that the valence band maximum is mainly composed Cu 3d and Se 4p states, which is in agreement with the composition deduced from electroreflectance measurements[37] and with previous electronic structure calculations[38]. As regards the conduction band minimum, our results indicate that it is mainly formed by Ga 4s, Cu 4s and Se 4p states, again in agreement with previous electronic calculations[39]. Moreover, the Mulliken bond population of tetrahedrally coordinated Ga and Cu in CuGaSe_2 is 0.183|e| for the Cu-Se bond and 0.268|e| for the Ga-Se bond, indicating that Ga-Se bonds are more covalent in nature than Cu-Se bonds. These values can be compared to previous calculations of bond populations performed using Gaussian basis sets of a similar structure and quality. Previous CRYSTAL values of Mulliken populations for the (Mg, Al, Si)-O bond in MgO , Al_2O_3 and SiO_2 oxides are of the order of 0.01, 0.148 and 0.290[40]. This suggests a semi-ionic character for both the Cu-Se and Ga-Se, which is in agreement with previous theoretical results [41–43].

B. Phase Stability

Figure 3 is the computed phase diagram as a function of the gallium and copper chemical potentials. It was calculated using the formalism described in section II B and highlights the stability region for CuGaSe_2 . This figure is a phase diagram projected in the $(\Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}}, \Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}})$ plane. Within this plane, the value of $\Delta\mu_{\text{Se}}$ is constrained by equations (6) and (7), and the diagonal line which links the $\Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}}$ and $\Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}}$ axes represents $\Delta\mu_{\text{Se}} = 0 \text{ eV}$. Points 1-2-3-4-5 indicate the corners of the stability region.

FIG. 3: (Color online) Calculated phase diagram for the Cu-Ga-Se system indicating the stable phases in the vicinity of CuGaSe_2 . $\Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}}=0$ and $\Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}}=0$ indicate Cu-rich, Ga-rich regions, respectively. Since $\Delta\mu_{\text{Se}}$ is defined through equations (6) and (7), the $\Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}} = \Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}} = 0$ also indicates a Se-poor region. The diagonal line which links the $\Delta\mu_{\text{Cu}}$ and $\Delta\mu_{\text{Ga}}$ axes represents a selenium rich region with $\Delta\mu_{\text{Se}} = 0$

The CuGaSe_2 phase diagram shown in Figure 3 can be compared to the one calculated by A. Zunger and coworkers [20]. The main general difference between Zunger's phase diagram and ours is the number of CuGaSe_2 's competing phases considered. Zunger's diagram includes Ga_2Se_3 (tetragonal), CuGa_5Se_8 , GaSe , Cu_3Se_2 , CuSe and Cu_2Se as competing phases, while the phase diagram in Figure 3 includes GaSe , CuGa_5Se_8 and Cu_3Se_2 : We did not include Ga_2Se_3 (tetragonal), CuSe and Cu_2Se . CuSe and Cu_2Se were not included because they do not contribute to define the border of the stability region for CuGaSe_2 , but Ga_2Se_3 (tetragonal) could not be included.

In Zunger's methodology, the formation energies of the competing phases were calculated ab ini-

tio, using the LDA functional. On the contrary, our methodology uses experimental formation energies. We could not find an experimental value for Ga_2Se_3 (tetragonal)'s formation energy. The ternary phase diagram of CuGaSe_2 shows a Ga_xSe_3 competing phase with a small equilibrium region. Ga_2Se_3 as a bulk only exists as a Ga-defective material, with a zincblende structure in which a third of the Ga sites are vacant. Ga_2Se_3 crystallizes into two forms: α and β . In the α -form, vacancies are disordered throughout the crystal, whereas in the β -form the vacancies form an ordered arrangement. There are two phases of the vacancy-ordered β - Ga_2Se_3 : monoclinic and orthorhombic. The phase observed in the CuGaSe_2 the ternary phase diagram was the monoclinic one.

C. Surface Energies

Figures 4 (a) and (b) show the relaxed, bulk-cut, Se-terminated and CuGa-terminated, fully-relaxed (1×1) (001) surfaces of CuGaSe_2 . Figure 7 shows that the Se-terminated surface has lower energy than the CuGa-terminated surface for all environmental conditions. Figure 4 (a) shows that surface Se dimerise: This removes dangling bonds, lowering the surface energy. For the CuGa-terminated slabs, there is electrostatic repulsion between the Cu and Ga atoms and the surface ‘rumples’. The Cu atoms are displaced deeper into the Se layer below by about $1.186\text{\AA}$ when compared to a Cu position in the bulk. Ga atoms are pushed out by approximately $0.582\text{\AA}$ and as a result, the Ga-Se bond lengthens to $2.730\text{\AA}$.

FIG. 4: (Color online) Top and lateral views of the relaxed: (a) Se-terminated and (b) CuGa-terminated (1×1) (001) surfaces of CuGaSe_2 .

FIG. 5: (Color online) Unrelaxed Se-terminated (1×1) (001) surface. The black rectangle represents the (4×1) unit cell and the Se inside this cell are labeled 1-8.

Auger electron spectroscopy experiments suggest that the (4×1) surface reconstructions observed with LEED are Cu-poor and Se-rich [9]. This suggests a model of the (4×1) reconstruction in which Se and Cu defects are introduced in the surface layers of a Se-terminated slab. Passivation with Sodium (Na) is important to the performance of the chalcopyrite absorber: Na is known to accumulate at the surface and grain boundaries [44] and, therefore, we have explored the stability of Na_{Cu} defects. Figure 5 shows the top view of the unrelaxed Se-terminated (001) surface as a reference. The black rectangle indicates a (4×1) surface unit cell, the atomic positions of Se in the top layer are numbered from 1 to 8. In Figure 6 top and side views of the reconstructions studied in this work are displayed.

Reconstruction 6(a) is a (001) CuSe-terminated surface that is generated by the removal of the top layer of Ga atoms from the CuGa-terminated surface shown in figure 4(b). Reconstruction 6(d) is nearly stoichiometric ($\text{Cu}_{0.917}\text{GaSe}_2$): It is made by removing four Se atoms at locations 2, 4, 6 and 8, and then the Cu atom below Se 2 and 6. In reconstruction 6(c) the Cu atom below Se 2 and Se 6 is replaced by Na: The reconstructions 6(d) and (c) do not display dimerisation of surface Se. On the contrary, reconstruction 6(b), which is made by removing two Se atoms at positions 2 and 6 and the Cu atom below, has a Se-rich stoichiometry of $\text{Cu}_{0.917}\text{GaSe}_{2.167}$ and presents dimerisation of the surface Se.

Figure (7) shows the surface energies of the ideal Se-terminated, CuGa-terminated and CuSe-terminated (1×1) surfaces, plus the (4×1) (b), (c) and (d) reconstructions. These surface energies are plotted as a function of the chemical potentials of Se, Cu and Ga, which are represented by the variables $\Delta\mu_i$. These variables have been constrained to vary along the border of the stability

FIG. 6: (Color online) Studied surface reconstructions on the (001) surface of CuGaSe_2 . (a) is a (1×1) CuSe-terminated surface generated by removing Ga atoms from the (1×1) CuGa-terminated surface. (b) is made by removing the Se atoms 2 and 6, and the Cu atom below them, from the unreconstructed Se-terminated surface shown in figure 5 and has a $\text{Cu}_{0.917}\text{GaSe}_{2.167}$ stoichiometry. In reconstruction (c) Se atoms 2 and 6 are removed and the Cu atom below them is replaced by Na. Finally, (d) has a $\text{Cu}_{0.917}\text{GaSe}_2$ stoichiometry and it is made by removing four Se atoms at locations 2, 4, 6 and 8, and then the Cu atom below Se 2 and 6.

region set up in figure 3. In this figure, segments 1-5 and 1-2 represents the Cu and Ga rich regions, and segment 3-4 represents the Se rich region. Segment 2-3 ranges from intermediate conditions to the Se rich condition, and segment 4-5 encompasses both intermediate and extreme conditions.

The ideal (1×1) CuGa-terminated surface is unstable under all environmental conditions and has the highest surface energy amongst the surfaces modelled. The (1×1) Se-terminated surface is stable under most of the studied environmental conditions and at Se-rich conditions -along segment 3-4- it has the lowest surface energy of all reconstructions. The (1×1) CuSe-termination (a) has the same energy as the (1×1) CuGa-termination along the 5-1 segment, but otherwise is of lower energy than the CuGa-termination. Reconstruction (4×1) (d) is nearly stoichiometric and, as a result, its energy is relatively insensitive to the environmental conditions. The atomic structure of reconstruction (4×1) (c) is similar to reconstruction (4×1) (d), except that a Na atom is replacing a Cu atom in the surface layer. The surface energy of reconstruction (4×1) (c) is

FIG. 7: (Color online) Surface energies of the ideal Se-terminated, CuGa-terminated and CuSe-terminated (1×1) surfaces, plus the (4×1) (b), (c) and (d) reconstructions. These energies are plotted as a function of the chemical potentials of Se, Cu and Ga, which are constrained to vary along the border of the stability region set up in figure 3.

plotted along the border of the stability region for the two limiting values of $\Delta\mu_{\text{Na}}$ as defined in Section II B. Na has a stabilising effect on the reconstructions in the upper limits of $\Delta\mu_{\text{Na}}$. As a result, in a Na-rich environment and under Cu-rich, Ga-rich and Se-poor conditions (point 1 Figure (7)), reconstruction (4×1) (c) has the lowest surface energy.

We propose two complementary mechanisms for surface stabilisation. The first one is the ability of a surface reconstruction to coordinate Ga and Cu atoms at the surface, and the second one is the ability of the surface Se to eliminate dangling bonds. It is clear from figure (4) and figures (6) that Cu and Ga coordination is achieved with Se-terminated surfaces. The surface Se then eliminate dangling bonds through dimerisation. It is for this reason that the unreconstructed Se-terminated surface is stable for most environmental conditions. Except from the Se-poor environmental conditions described by region 5-1 in figure 3, it is the Cu and Ga coordination to Se which dominates the surface energy, and this helps explain the low surface energies of reconstructions (4×1) (b) and Se-terminated (1×1) , and the large surface energies of reconstructions (4×1) (d), (4×1) (c) and (1×1) (a).

FIG. 8: (Color online) Projected densities of states (PDOS) of different surface reconstructions on the (001) surface of CuGaSe_2 . Figure (a) shows the PDOS of the (1×1) Se-terminated surface. Figures (b) (c) and (d) show the PDOS of the (4×1) reconstructions shown in figures 6(b), (c) and (d).

The effects of surface Se dimerisation can be seen in the corresponding partial density of states (PDOS), and in the bond population of the Se forming the dimers. In bulk chalcopyrite-type CuGaSe_2 , Cu and Ga are tetrahedrally coordinated by four Se atoms. There are bond populations of $0.268|e|$ between Ga-Se and $0.183|e|$ between Cu-Se, but between Cu-Cu, Cu-Ga, Ga-Ga and Se-Se, the bond populations are of the order of at most $0.01|e|$. For the (1×1) Se-terminated

surface indicated in figure (4)(a), the bond population in the Se-dimers at the surface is 0.13|e|. As regards the (4×1) reconstructions, only the Se dimers on surface (6)(b) present a significant bond population of 0.128|e|: in all the other (4×1) reconstructions, the bond population for the surface Se-Se contacts is negligible. Figures (8) show the PDOS of the (1×1) and (4×1) surface reconstructions described in figures (4)(a) and (6)(b), (c) and (d). The total DOS is projected onto contributions for Ga, Cu and Se bulk atoms, and onto pairs of surface Se atoms which have the closest interatomic distances in all the slab, and which are likely to be forming surface dimers. The clearest signature of surface Se dimerisation is the anti-bonding states of the surface Se dimers, which are indicated by their PDOS. Figures (8)(a) and (b) show large peaks of surface Se PDOS above the Fermi energy. From a molecular orbital point of view, these peaks can be interpreted as empty antibonding orbitals of the surface Se dimers. These surface Se PDOS peaks disappear from the conduction band in figures (8)(c) and (d), which indicates occupation of all the bonding and antibonding orbitals of the surface Se dimers, decreasing the covalent nature of the Se bonding at the surface. Except from the Se-poor environmental conditions described by region 5-1 in figure 3, the surface energies of reconstructions (8)(a), (b), (c) and (d), under most environmental conditions, is correlated with the bond population of its surface Se dimers: low surface energies are strongly related to high Se-Se bond populations.

It is well known that in chalcopyrites such as CuAlS_2 [45], CuGaS_2 [46], CuInSe_2 and CuGaSe_2 [47] Cu vacancies have the lowest formation energies under most environmental conditions. When chalcopyrites are doped with Na, AES evidence shows that Na tends to accumulate at the surfaces and grain boundaries[48]. An example of this is CuInSe_2 : If available in large quantities, Na will replace Cu and form the more stable NaInSe_2 compound, which will precipitate to form a separate phase; when available in small quantities, Na will replace Cu and In atoms, forming Na_{Cu} and Na_{In} defects. The concentration of Na_{Cu} defects is higher than the concentration of In_{Cu} defects[49]. This results in the quenching of the In_{Cu} and V_{Cu} defects, which results in a decrease of the concentration of the $(2\text{V}_{\text{Cu}}^{-1} + \text{In}_{\text{Cu}}^{+2})$ complex defect. The presence of small quantities of Na then contributes to the synthesis of Cu-poor chalcopyrites, avoiding the formation of the so called ordered defective compounds[45], increasing the p-type

layer conductivity [50], and reducing the dependence on the compositional ratio of Cu/In [51].

Moreover, Na enhances key features of polycrystalline Cu(In/Ga)Se₂ (CIGS) thin-film solar cells, such as the fill factor (FF) and the open circuit voltage [52, 53]. Na is normally incorporated into CIGS films, during the deposition process, by thermal diffusion from a soda lime glass substrate. However, to improve performance of nonalkali-substrate-based CIGS solar cells, various methods for Na incorporation have been reported, including co-evaporation of Na compounds during CIGS deposition [51] and deposition of a SiO_x:Na layer prior to Mo deposition [54]. Among these methods of Na incorporation, evaporating NaF is one of the most effective ways: In this method, Na diffusion into CIGS differs from that of soda lime glass, and high-quality CIGS films could be obtained at low temperature [55]. Na also has the ability to retain Se at the surface. Experimental evidence[56–58] shows that, at Na-rich conditions, Na is likely to be forming Na₂Se which, in turn, will form Na polyselenides such as Na₂Se₂. The formation of Na₂Se₂ is an exothermic process and energy is needed to remove Se from the surface. The role of Na in chalcopyrites has been theoretically studied as well. Y. Yan and coworkers [59] used ab initio calculations to analyse the electronic structure of the CuInSe's grain boundaries, and they discussed the effect of Na in them. In particular, they defined a “segregation energy”, that estimates how expensive is for a Na atom to diffuse into a grain boundary. No thermodynamics was used in the definition of this energy: they only used ab initio total energies, which restricted the range of possible segregation energy values to only one.

Se-dimerisation helps to explain surface stability under most environmental conditions, but not under the conditions the which (4×1) reconstructions were observed. LEED measurements show that (4×1) reconstructions form on CuGaSe₂(001) after several cycles of Ar⁺ ion bombardment and subsequent annealing at UHV conditions. The observed surface reconstructions were clean, stable and unfaçetted, with a Se-rich and Cu-poor stoichiometry.[8] Since we assume Se is present in the gas phase, the experimental UHV conditions can be represented in our phase diagram by low values of the μ_{Se} . According to equations (7), region 5-1 in figure 3 has the lowest values of μ_{Se} that can be achieved in a Cu, Ga and Se system. Under these conditions, reconstruction (4×1)(b)

has a lower surface energy than Se-terminated (1×1) surface and, under Na-rich conditions, the stable surface reconstruction is reconstruction $(4 \times 1)(c)$. Both these surfaces have Cu-poor and Se-rich stoichiometries of $\text{Cu}_{0.97}\text{GaSe}_{2.167}$ and $\text{Cu}_{0.97}\text{GaSe}_2$ respectively. The distance between the surface Se in reconstruction $(4 \times 1)(c)$ lengthen by an average of $0.261 \text{ \AA}$ when compared to that of reconstruction $(4 \times 1)(b)$, and Se dimerisation at the surface has disappeared. The limiting values of $\Delta\mu_{\text{Na}}$ are calculated combining equations (10) and (11). Region 5-1 of figure 3 is a Na-rich region and, in it, reconstruction $(4 \times 1)(c)$ is predicted to be the stable one.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Ab initio thermodynamics has been used to study the stability of different surface reconstructions that were observed in $\text{CuGaSe}_2(001)$. It has been shown that, for most environmental conditions, the presence of Se at the surface, with its ability to dimerise and coordinate Cu and Ga ions at the surface, it is the main mechanism stabilising the surface. In particular, the atomic structure of the experimentally observed (4×1) surface reconstructions can be described by Cu-poor Se-rich reconstructions $(4 \times 1)(b)$ and (c) , and it was established that the presence of Na stabilises the (4×1) reconstruction.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The calculations performed for this work were carried out in part on the facilities of Imperial College High Performance Computing Service (URL: <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/ict/services/teachingandresearchservices/highperformancecomputing>), and in part on the national high-performance computing service of the UK, HECToR, where computer time has been provided via our membership of the HPC Materials Chemistry Consortium of the UK and funded by the EPSRC (portfolio Grant No EP/F067496).

This work was funded by the EPSRC under the "Nanostructured Functional Materials for Energy

Efficient Refrigeration, Energy Harvesting and Production of Hydrogen from Water" grant (EP/G060940/1).

- [1] U. Rau, K. Taretto and S. Siebentritt, *Applied Physics A: Materials Science & Processing*, 2009, **96**, 221–234.
- [2] P. Palacios, I. Aguilera, P. Wahnou and J. C. Conesa, *Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 2008, **112**, 9525–9529.
- [3] S. Irvine, V. Barrioz, D. Lamb, E. Jones and R. Rowlands-Jones, *Journal of Crystal Growth*, 2008, **310**, 5198 – 5203.
- [4] K. Ramanathan, M. A. Contreras, C. L. Perkins, S. Asher, F. S. Hasoon, J. Keane, D. Young, Romero, M., Metzger, W., R. Noufi, J. Ward and A. Duda, *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, 2003, **11**, 225–230.
- [5] I. Repins, M. A. Contreras, B. Egaas, C. DeHart, J. Scharf, C. L. Perkins, B. To and R. Noufi, *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, 2008, **16**, 235.
- [6] R. Hunger, C. Pettenkofer and R. Scheer, *Surface Science*, 2001, **477**, 76–93.
- [7] T. P. Massopoust, P. J. Ireland, L. L. Kazmerski and K. J. Bachmann, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A*, 1984, **2**, 1123.
- [8] T. Deniozou, N. Esser and S. Siebentritt, *Surf. Sci.*, 2005, **579**, 100 – 106.
- [9] T. Deniozou, N. Esser, S. Siebentritt, P. Vogt and R. Hunger, *Thin Solid Films*, 2005, **480-481**, 382 – 387.
- [10] P. Tasker, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.*, 1979, **12**, 4977.
- [11] P. Corvini, A. Kahn and S. Wagner, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **57**, 2967.
- [12] A. Meeder, L. Weinhardt, R. Stresing, D. F. Marrón, R. Würz, S. M. Babu, T. Schedel-Niedrig, M. C. Lux-Steiner, C. Heske and E. Umbach, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 2003, **64**, 1553 – 1557.
- [13] S. Siebentritt, N. Papathanasiou, J. Albert and M. C. Lux-Steiner, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2006, **88**, 151919.

- [14] J. A. AbuShama, S. Johnston, R. Ahrenkiel, R. Crandall, D. Young and R. Noufi, *Evolution of Electronic Properties of (Cu(In,Ga)Se₂ (CIGS)-Based Solar Cells During a 3-Stage Growth Process*, 2003.
- [15] R. Dovesi, V. R. Saunders, C. Roetti, R. Orlando, C. M. Zicovich-Wilson, F. Pascale, B. Civalleri, K. Doll, N. M. Harrison, I. J. Bush, P. D'Arco and M. Llunell, *CRYSTAL 2006 Users's Manual*, University of Torino, 2007.
- [16] S. Tomić, B. Montanari and N. Harrison, *Physica E*, 2008, **40**, 2125.
- [17] *Principles and Applications of Density Functional Theory in Inorganic Chemistry II*, ed. N. Kaltsoyannis and J. McGrady, Springer, 2004, ch. The Performance of Hybrid Density Functionals in Solid State Chemistry, pp. 171–232.
- [18] J. Muscat, A. Wander and N. M. Harrison, *Chem. Phys. Letts.*, 2001, **342**, 397.
- [19] R. Dovesi, V. R. Saunders, C. Roetti, R. Orlando, C. M. Zicovich-Wilson, F. Pascale, B. Civalleri, K. Doll, N. M. Harrison, I. J. Bush, P. D'Arco and M. Llunell, *CRYSTAL 2006 Users's Manual*, University of Torino, 2007.
- [20] C. Persson, Y.-J. Zhao, S. Lany and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2005, **72**, 035211.
- [21] S. B. Zhang and S.-H. Wei, *Physical Review Letters*, 2004, **92**, 086102.
- [22] S. B. Zhang and S.-H. Wei, *Physical Review B*, 2002, **65**, 081402.
- [23] K. Reuter and M. Scheffler, *Physical Review B*, 2001, **65**, 35406.
- [24] K. Reuter and M. Scheffler, *Physical Review B*, 2003, **68**, 45407.
- [25] K. Reuter and M. Scheffler, *Physical Review Letters*, 2003, **90**, 46103.
- [26] B. Korzun, R. Mianzelen, A. Sheleg, N. Tekhanovich, K. Bente and W. Schmitz, *Physica Status Solidi B*, 2005, **242**, 1990.
- [27] B. Eckert and R. Steudel, *Topics in Current Chemistry*, 2003, **231**, 31–98.
- [28] F. Zheng, J. Shen, Y. Liu, W. Kim, M. Chu, M. Ider, X. Bao and T. Anderson, *Calphad*, 2008, **32**, 432–438.
- [29] V. Glazov, A. Pashinkin and V. Fedorov, *Inorganic Materials*, 2000, **36**, 641–652.
- [30] F. Hergert, S. Jost, R. Hock, M. Purwins and J. Palm, *Thin Solid Films*, 2006, **511**, 147–152.
- [31] J. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. Lett.; Physical Review Letters*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- [32] J. Heyd, J. E. Peralta, G. E. Scuseria and R. L. Martin, *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2005, **123**,

174101.

- [33] J. Paier, R. Asahi, A. Nagoya and G. Kresse, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2009, **79**, 115126.
- [34] G. Boyd, H. Kasper, J. McFee and F. Storz, 1972, **8**, 900.
- [35] L. Mandel, R. D. Tomlinson and M. J. Hampshire, *Journal of Applied Crystallography*, 1977, **10**, 130 – 131.
- [36] A. Meeder, L. Weinhardt, R. Stresing, D. F. Marrón, R. Würz, S. M. Babu, T. Schedel-Niedrig, M. C. Lux-Steiner, C. Heske and E. Umbach, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids*, 2003, **64**, 1553 – 1557.
- [37] J. L. Shay, B. Tell, H. M. Kasper and L. M. Schiavone, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1972, **5**, 5003–5005.
- [38] S. Siebentritt, M. Igalson, C. Persson and S. Lany, *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications*, 2010, **18**, 390–410.
- [39] J. E. Jaffe and A. Zunger, *Physical Review B*, 1983, **28**, 5822–5847.
- [40] R. Dovesi, C. Roetti, C. Freyria-Fava, E. Apra, V. R. Saunders and N. M. Harrison, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 1992, **341**, 203.
- [41] M. V.-G. C. Rincon, *Materials Letters*, 1996, **28**, 297.
- [42] H. Neumann, *Crystal Research and Technology*, 1983, **18**, 1299.
- [43] J. M. Merino, R. Diaz and M. Leon, *Physical Review B*, 2000, **61**, 10211.
- [44] D. Rudmann, A. F. da Cunha, M. Kaelin, F. Kurdesau, H. Zogg, A. N. Tiwari, and G. Bilger, *Applied Physics Letters*, **84**, 1129–1131.
- [45] L. Liborio and N. Harrison, *Physical Review B*, 2008, **77**, 104104.
- [46] C. Bailey, L. Liborio, G. Mallia, S. Tomic and N. M. Harrison, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2010, **81**, year.
- [47] C. Persson, Y. Zhao, S. Lany and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B*, 2005, **72**, 035211.
- [48] D. W. Niles, M. Al-Jassim and K. Ramanathan, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A*, 1999, **17**, 291.
- [49] B. J. Stanberry, A. Davydov, C. H. Chang and T. j. Anderson, *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1996, p. 579.
- [50] M. Contreras, B. Egaas, P. Dippo, J. Webb, J. Granata, K. Ramanathan, S. Asher, A. Swartzlander and R. Noufi, *Photovoltaic Specialists Conference, 1997.*, *Conference Record of the Twenty-Sixth IEEE*, 1997, p. 359.
- [51] T. Nakada, D. Iga, H. Ohbo and A. Kunioka, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.*, 1997, **36**, 732.

- [52] L. Stolt, J. Hedstrom, J. Kessler, M. Ruckh, K. Velthaus and H. W. Schock, *Applied Physics Letters*, 1993, **62**, 597 –599.
- [53] M. Ruckh, D. Schmid, M. Kaiser, R. Schaffler, T. Walter and H. Schock, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells*, 1996, **41-42**, 335.
- [54] S. Ishizuka, A. Yamada, M. M. Islam, H. Shibata, P. Fons, T. Sakurai, K. Akimoto and S. Niki, *J. Appl. Phys.*, 2009, **106**, 034908.
- [55] D. Rudmann, A. F. da Cunha, M. Kaelin, F. Kurdesau, H. Zogg, A. N. Tiwari, and G. Bilger, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, 2004, **84**, 1129.
- [56] F. Hergert, S. Jost, R. Hock, M. Purwins and J. Palm, *Thin Solid Films*, 2006, **511-512**, 147 – 152.
- [57] F. Hergert, R. Hock, A. Weber, M. Purwins, J. Palm and V. Probst, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 2005, **66**, 1903 – 1907.
- [58] F. Hergert, S. Jost, R. Hock, M. Purwins and J. Palm, *Thin Solid Films*, 2007, **515**, 5843 – 5847.
- [59] Y. Yan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*; *Physical Review Letters*, 2007, **99**, year.
- [60] We do not have a satisfactory explanation for the discrepancy between the PBE results for the band gap. The paper by Paier et. al.[33] also presents PBE results for the CuGaS₂. We have recently published a paper on the defects in CuGaS₂[46]. The calculations in that paper were done using the B3LYP functional but, in order to document the performance of the PBE functional, we also performed PBE calculations on CuGaS₂. We obtained a band gap of 0.79 eV that compares very well with the 0.7 eV obtained by Paier and coworkers. The problem, then, is apparently not due to the difference in the implementation of PBE in the codes used. Moreover, B3LYP gives us a reasonable value of the band gap of CuGaSe₂, indicating that the discrepancy is unlikely to be due to inadequacies in the basis set or numerical conditions adopted in the current calculations. We had an exchange of emails with Paier and coworkers, and we believe that the remaining difference in the approaches is perhaps the Fermi surface smearing used by Paier et. al., which may have resulted in convergence to a near metallic state.