International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2278-6252
Impact Factor: 7.358

Quantum Well Solar Cells (QWSCs) vs Quantum Dot Solar Cells (QDSCs) - A comparative study

Atul Kumar Agarwal
SGSG Government College, Nasirabad (Ajmer) India
agarwalatul75@gmail.com

Abstract

Quantum-structured solar cells represent the next frontier in photovoltaic (PV) innovation, aiming to surpass the efficiency limits of conventional single-junction devices. Among these, Quantum Well Solar Cells (QWSCs) and Quantum Dot Solar Cells (QDSCs) are two prominent designs leveraging nanoscale confinement to enhance photon absorption and carrier dynamics. This paper presents a comparative study of QWSCs and QDSCs based on research published up to 2016, focusing on device structure, operational mechanisms, efficiency performance, fabrication complexity, and material considerations. QWSCs, based on two-dimensional potential wells, extend absorption through multi-quantum well stacks but are limited by strain accumulation and interface recombination. QDSCs, using three-dimensionally confined nanocrystals, exhibit discrete energy states and tunable bandgaps offering greater theoretical efficiency potential through intermediate-band (IB) formation and multi-exciton generation (MEG). However, synthesis control and surface passivation remain major challenges. The study concludes that while both technologies hold promise beyond Shockley–Queisser limits, QDSCs offer higher ultimate potential but require substantial advances in nanomaterial engineering and stability before commercialization.

Keywords: *Quantum well solar cell, Quantum dot solar cell, nanostructured photovoltaics, intermediate band, efficiency, quantum confinement.*

1. Introduction

Conventional single-junction photovoltaic cells are fundamentally limited by the Shockley–Queisser (SQ) efficiency limit (~33% for ideal conditions under one sun, 1.1 eV bandgap). To overcome this barrier, researchers have explored nanostructured devices capable of manipulating electronic and optical properties beyond bulk semiconductor limits. Two such promising concepts are **Quantum Well Solar Cells (QWSCs)** and **Quantum Dot Solar Cells (QDSCs)** — both exploiting quantum confinement effects to tailor absorption spectra and carrier collection.

QWSCs utilize multiple thin layers (typically GaAs/AlGaAs or InGaAs/GaAs) forming potential wells that trap carriers and extend absorption toward lower photon energies (Barnham et al., 1990). QDSCs, meanwhile, incorporate nanoscale semiconductor dots (e.g., InAs, PbS, CdSe) with discrete energy states that enable multi-exciton generation and potentially intermediate-band absorption.[1]

By 2016, both device types had reached important milestones — QWSCs with efficiencies > 28% (as part of multi-junction stacks), and QDSCs demonstrating quantum yield > 100% in laboratory settings. Yet, their comparative advantages and limitations remain debated, making a focused comparative analysis timely.

2. Objectives

1. To compare the structural and operational principles of QWSCs and QDSCs.
2. To analyze efficiency mechanisms, performance records, and physical limitations.
3. To evaluate fabrication complexity, material sustainability, and scalability.
4. To synthesize insights on future research directions for quantum-structured photovoltaics.

3. Methodology

This research employs a **comparative literature review** based on peer-reviewed studies, conference proceedings, and review articles published **before or during 2016**. Data on efficiency, material systems, and device performance were extracted from sources such as:

- Nozik (2002, 2008) – conceptual framework for QDSCs and intermediate-band solar cells.[1]
- Green (2013, 2015) – review of emerging photovoltaic efficiencies.[6]
- Luque & Martí (2010) – intermediate-band and quantum structure models.[2]

The comparative framework evaluates five aspects:

- physical principles
- material systems
- fabrication and design
- efficiency and performance
- environmental and scalability considerations.

4. Results and Discussion

1) 4.1 Operating Principles

Quantum Well Solar Cells (QWSCs): QWSCs introduce nanometer-scale potential wells between barrier layers (e.g., GaAs wells in AlGaAs barriers). These wells confine carriers in one dimension, resulting in quantized energy states that extend absorption to slightly longer wavelengths. Carriers photo-generated in wells are thermally or field-assisted excited to the conduction band of the host semiconductor, contributing to current [2]. QWSCs effectively increase photocurrent with minimal voltage loss but are constrained by carrier escape efficiency and recombination at interfaces.

Quantum Dot Solar Cells (QDSCs): QDSCs use three-dimensionally confined nanocrystals (quantum dots, typically 2–10 nm) embedded in a host matrix. The discrete energy levels and tunable bandgap via dot size/composition allow broader spectral utilization. Mechanisms like *multi-exciton generation* (MEG) — generation of multiple electron–hole pairs from one high-energy photon — and *intermediate-band absorption* enable potential efficiencies beyond SQ limits[2][6]

2) 4.2 Material Systems

Device Type	Common Materials (≤ 2016)	Bandgap Tunability	Key Issues
QWSCs	GaAs/AlGaAs, InGaAs/GaAs, InGaAsP/InP	~1.1–1.4 eV effective tuning	Strain accumulation, lattice mismatch, interface recombination
QDSCs	InAs/GaAs, PbS, CdSe, Si nanocrystals	Broad (0.8–2.4 eV via size control)	Surface traps, size distribution, toxicity (Cd, Pb)

QWSC fabrication relies on **molecular beam epitaxy (MBE)** or **metal–organic chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD)** to control layer thickness on the order of nanometers. These epitaxial methods produce high crystal quality but are costly and substrate-limited.

QDSCs, conversely, use **colloidal synthesis** or **self-assembly** allowing potentially low-cost solution processing, though achieving uniform size and electronic coupling remains challenging (Nozik et al., 2008).

3) 4.3 Efficiency and Photoconversion Performance

By 2016, record laboratory efficiencies for each class were approximately:

- **QWSCs:** ~28–30% (as subcells in multi-junction stacks) — Green (2015).[6][7]
- **QDSCs:** ~12% (single-junction colloidal PbS/CdSe type) — Semonin et al. (2011).[4]

The higher absolute performance of QWSCs stems from their maturity and integration into GaAs/Ge triple-junction designs (Barnham et al., 2000). In contrast, QDSCs promise higher *theoretical* limits (~44–60% with perfect MEG or IB operation), but practical devices remain below 15% due to nonradiative losses and incomplete carrier extraction.

4) 4.4 Mechanisms of Efficiency Enhancement

QWSCs:

- Enhanced absorption via multiple quantum wells (MQWs) extending sub-bandgap response.
- Photocurrent gain without significant voltage penalty when well design is optimized
- Enhanced carrier confinement at heterointerfaces can increase open-circuit voltage under appropriate strain control.

QDSCs:

- MEG allows conversion of high-energy photons into multiple excitons, potentially reducing thermalization losses. [3]
- Intermediate-band (IB) models permit absorption of sub-bandgap photons via transitions between discrete states.[1]
- Bandgap tunability through quantum confinement enables spectral matching to solar irradiance for multi-junction integration.

5) 4.5 Fabrication Complexity and Scalability

Parameter	QWSCs	QDSCs
Fabrication Technique	MBE/MOCVD (epitaxial)	Colloidal or epitaxial quantum dots
Process Temperature	600–700 °C	< 300 °C (solution processes possible)
Cost per cm^2 (approx., 2015)	High (~$50–100)	Potentially low (< $5 projected)
Scalability	Limited to III–V wafers	High (solution-processed films)
Maturity	Demonstrated in multi-junction cells	Mostly laboratory prototypes

QWSCs are technologically mature but costly; QDSCs offer scalability and flexibility but face stability and interface challenges. The use of heavy metals in common QDs (Cd, Pb) also raises environmental and regulatory concerns.

6) 4.6 Environmental and Material Considerations

- **Toxicity:** QDSCs using CdSe or PbS introduce hazardous heavy metals; alternatives such as $CuInS_2$, perovskite QDs, or Si nanocrystals were being explored by 2015 but lacked stability.
- **Material Scarcity:** QWSCs depend on III–V materials (Ga, In, As) that are expensive and limited in supply.
- **Energy Payback:** Both device types have short projected energy payback times (< 2 years for mature fabrication) compared to conventional Si PVs, but this is model-dependent. [5]
- **End-of-Life Recycling:** Not yet established for either technology; material recovery would be essential once commercialized.

7) 4.7 Comparative Summary

Feature	Quantum Well Solar Cell	Quantum Dot Solar Cell
Quantum confinement	2D wells	3D dots
Carrier confinement	In one dimension	In all three dimensions
Fabrication	High-precision epitaxy	Solution or epitaxial growth
Efficiency (2016)	Up to 28–30% (multi-junction)	10–12% (single-junction)
Potential Limit	~35–40%	> 45–60% (with MEG/IB)
Material constraints	Expensive III–V compounds	Toxic metals, stability issues
Scalability	Low	Potentially high
Maturity	Demonstrated	Experimental

5. Conclusion

Quantum Well and Quantum Dot solar cells represent parallel routes toward third-generation photovoltaics that transcend classical efficiency limits through quantum engineering.

- **QWSCs** offer a more mature and reliable approach, already integrated into high-performance multi-junction GaAs cells, but face cost, strain, and scalability barriers.
- **QDSCs**, though less efficient in 2016, promise higher ultimate potential through multi-exciton generation and spectral tunability, yet remain constrained by synthesis control, toxicity, and long-term stability.

In summary, **QWSCs are nearer to commercialization**, primarily for space or concentrator applications, while **QDSCs hold greater transformative promise** for cost-effective, next-generation solar energy — pending breakthroughs in material stability and eco-friendly synthesis. Future research must focus on non-toxic, earth-abundant nanomaterials, improved carrier extraction architectures, and scalable manufacturing to realize the theoretical advantages of quantum photovoltaics.

References

1. Nozik, A. J. (2008). Multiple exciton generation in quantum dots for solar photon conversion. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 457, 3–11.
2. Luque, A., & Martí, A. (2010). The intermediate band solar cell: progress toward the realization of an attractive concept. *Advanced Materials*, 22(2), 160–174.
3. Schaller, R. D., & Klimov, V. I. (2004). High efficiency carrier multiplication in PbSe nanocrystals. *Physical Review Letters*, 92(18), 186601.
4. Semonin, O. E., Luther, J. M., Choi, S., Chen, H.-Y., Gao, J., Nozik, A. J., & Beard, M. C. (2011). Peak external quantum efficiencies exceeding 100% in PbSe nanocrystal solar cells. *Science*, 334(6062), 1530–1533.
5. Razykov, T. M., Ferekides, C. S., Morel, D., Stefanakos, E., Ullal, H. S., & Upadhyaya, H. M. (2011). Solar photovoltaic electricity: Current status and future prospects. *Solar Energy*, 85(8), 1580–1608.
6. Green, M. A. (2013). Third generation photovoltaics: ultra-high conversion efficiency at low cost. *Progress in Photovoltaics*, 21(1), 12–20.
7. Green, M. A. (2015). Solar cell efficiency tables (Version 46). *Progress in Photovoltaics*, 23(7), 805–812.