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Abstract

Halide perovskites have generated considerable research interest due to their excellent optoelectronic properties in the past decade. To ensure the formation of high quality semiconductors, the deposition process for the perovskite film is a critical issue. Vacuum based processing is considered a promising method allowing, in principle, also for large areas. One of the benefits of vacuum processing is the control over the film composition through the use of quartz crystal microbalances (QCMs) that in-situ monitor the rates of the components. In metal halide perovskites, however, one frequently employed component or precursor, CH$_3$NH$_3$I, exhibits non-standard sublimation properties. Here, we study in detail the sublimation properties of CH$_3$NH$_3$I and demonstrate that by correcting for its complex adsorption properties and by modeling the film growth, accurate predictions about the stoichiometry of the final perovskite film can be obtained.
Metal halide perovskite have attracted tremendous attentions as an emerging material for energy harvesting due to their outstanding optoelectronic properties, featured as rapid increase in power conversion efficiency (PCE) of solar cells from 3.9% to 25.2% in last 10 years. In this field, growing a high-quality film has been one of the most challenging and important issues. This as the device performance is directly related to the quality (crystallization, morphology, density of defects in the bulk or the surface) of the perovskite film. The deposition method used to prepare the perovskite film has a large influence on its quality and therefore also on the device performance. Therefore, the fabrication process for the perovskite films have been extensively studied to improve the film and device properties. Perovskite thin film deposition started by using one-step spin coating, and was followed by a variety of alternative approaches such as sequential deposition, solvent engineering, and solvent assisted vapor process or hybrid process. Current thin film deposition efforts focus on the compatibility with large area and high throughputs. One widely accepted processing method in semiconductor industry is thermal vacuum deposition, or sublimation. This has been demonstrated successfully in the organic light-emitting diodes (OLEDs) industry. The vacuum process is particularly suited for manufacturing optoelectronic devices since high purity, uniform and large area films are readily achievable, resulting in high quality and reproducible thin-films. This fact has brought, therefore, many attempts to apply the vacuum process to the fabrication of perovskite films. After the first report on vacuum co-deposited halide perovskite for solar cell application by M. Liu et al., in 2013, numerous groups reported on vacuum-deposited perovskite solar cells. In spite of these achievements, the sublimation of the organic ammonium halide salts remains a critical factor in achieving reproducible results. This has
been most widely described for one of the archetype precursor, CH$_3$NH$_3$I, (methylammonium iodide, MAI). Numerous groups reporting vacuum processed perovskites have described the complications of controlling the sublimation of MAI $^{17-21, 27, 30, 31, 38-43}$.

One of the merits of vacuum processing is the control over the deposited film composition via in-situ monitoring the rate of the precursors using quartz crystal microbalances (QCMs). A QCM allows for very high accuracy in deposition as it provides a sensitivity of less than $\sim$1 Å·s$^{-1}$ in real time. Compared with other techniques that determine the perovskite film composition, this is the only one allowing for a direct control during film growth. In fact, most reports on perovskite thin films and their devices report the precursor ratios from the starting solution. It is than assumed that this precursor solution ratio is maintained in the final film. This, however, is unlikely due to the different solubilities of the precursors in the solvent used. When solvent engineering is used to prepare high quality perovskite films, the use of a second solvent further complicates the determination of the thin film composition. Post preparation methods to study the composition, are not readily available. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) give rather good information on the composition, but only at the surface of the film. Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) can provide bulk information but the quantification of the composition could be challenging due to the limiting factors such as complex matrix effects and beam induced damage under electron radiation $^{44-46}$. Optical analysis of the perovskite films, allows to determine the bandgap and from that estimations on the composition have been derived. When comparing reports from different groups on the bandgaps for identical compositions (inferred from the precursor solution composition) it is clear that differences in the final film composition exist $^{47-53}$, Fig. S1.

Therefore, making use of the QCMs in vacuum sublimed perovskites would be advantageous for the direct determination of the final film composition. However, this has so far not been achieved
quantitatively, due to complications arising from the sublimation of the organic ammonium halides. These complications range from uncontrolled working pressure\textsuperscript{18, 30, 31}, to fluctuating deposition rate when maintaining the source temperature constant\textsuperscript{17, 29, 38}. These effect might be alleviated by modifying the direction or position of QCM\textsuperscript{22, 54}, control on the chamber pressure rather than on the deposition rate\textsuperscript{18, 27, 31} and flash-evaporations from pre-formed perovskites from a single source\textsuperscript{55}. In addition, there have been attempts to investigate the reason why the organic ammonium halides are difficult to control during its sublimation in vacuum conditions. Thermal decomposition, uncontrollable impurities and also surface varied adsorption/electronic properties have been suggested as the origins of the unusual sublimation behavior of alkylammonium halides\textsuperscript{39, 56-58}. Despite these difficulties, perovskite based solar cells with high PCEs were obtained using vacuum-based deposition processing of the lead and alkylammonium salts. However, the level of compositional control is still much lower compared to typical vacuum processed organic films such those used in OLEDs and organic photovoltaics (OPVs).

In this paper, we study in detail the deposition of MAI and PbI\textsubscript{2} as well as the resulting MAPbI\textsubscript{3} perovskite using vacuum sublimation. Using various QCMs we suggest a simple method to estimate and control the molar composition of vacuum deposited MAPbI\textsubscript{3}. The MAI adsorption can be characterized as a surface dependent and diffusion driven process. We established the kinetic equations for the growth rate of MAI in vacuum, extracted from the QCM. Furthermore, considering the surface dependent adsorption of MAI and taking into account geometric factors, we show it is straightforward to estimate the composition of MAPbI\textsubscript{3} films from the experimental QCM data. Using this method of control, we demonstrate all-vacuum-processed perovskite solar cells with average PCE exceeding 18\%. We believe that this work will foster the general
application of vacuum processes to the deposition of perovskite films, promoting their adoption in industrial manufacturing.

**Figure 1.** (a) Schematics of the experimental set-up used in the deposition study. (b) Deposition rates and rate-ratios from different sensors when only PbI$_2$ is evaporated (c) and when only MAI is evaporated. (In the time $x$-axis, the zero is defined as the moment when the deposition rates becomes positive, after pre-heating.)

Fig. 1a shows the experimental set-up used for the deposition study. It includes two temperature controlled evaporation sources, used for MAI and PbI$_2$, respectively, with their corresponding QCM thickness sensors: MAI sensor ($S$-$MAI$), PbI$_2$ sensor ($S$-$PbI_2$). These are positioned such that the third sensor close to the substrate ($S$-$Sub$) detects both MAI and PbI$_2$, whereas the two QCMs close to the MAI and PbI$_2$ sources primarily detect sublimed material from either one of them ($S$-$MAI$ only detects MAI, whereas $S$-$PbI_2$ only detects PbI$_2$). As the geometrical arrangement of the QCM sensors is different, their respective tooling factors were determined. When only PbI$_2$ is evaporated, the deposition rates from $S$-$Sub$ and $S$-$PbI_2$ display identical values as demonstrated in Fig. 1b and Fig. S2. During the evaporation of PbI$_2$, as shown in Fig. 1b, there is no cross-reading on the $S$-$MAI$. Fig. 1c displays the deposition rates when only MAI is evaporated. As described above, the MAI evaporation is challenging in part due to the cross-reading at unintended sensors. To alleviate this problem, we used a small shield around the QCM, as indicated in Fig. 1a
(Fig. S3), which resulted in negligible cross-reading during the sublimation of MAI on $S$-$PbI_2$ (see red curve in Fig. 1c). Upon heating the MAI source, the monitored deposition rates from both $S$-$MAI$ and $S$-$Sub$ simultaneously increase and after a short time, the MAI rates become constant on both $S$-$MAI$ and $S$-$Sub$. This behavior, an initial transient region with fluctuating rates followed by a stabilized region is observed repeatedly for different batches of MAI (see Fig. S4). The deposition rate fluctuations in the transient region are slightly differed from batch to batch, however, for all batches of MAI the rates become constant. Here, the tooling factor determined for $S$-$Sub$ is maintained same from Fig. 1b, to display identical value with $S$-$PbI_2$ from PbI$_2$ source, hence the rates at $S$-$Sub$ and $S$-$MAI$ are different.

Figure 2. (a) Monitored deposition rates from the sensors with increased PbI$_2$ rates under constant MAI rate (left) and magnified image (right). (b) Adsorption of MAI and PbI$_2$ converted to the unit of $\text{mol} \cdot s^{-1} \cdot cm^{-2}$ from in Fig. 2a.

Fig. 2a shows the deposition rate change from $S$-$Sub$ with increasing the PbI$_2$ rate during the constant MAI rate regime. We recall that the contribution of the PbI$_2$ deposition rates read by $S$-$Sub$ and $S$-$PbI_2$ are equivalent, whereas the rate measured by $S$-$Sub$ corresponds to the sum of both MAI and PbI$_2$. Before the PbI$_2$ evaporation, the MAI rate was maintained at ~0.3 Å$\cdot$s$^{-1}$ at $S$-$Sub$, and upon the evaporation of PbI$_2$ the $S$-sub reading increased progressively with increasing PbI$_2$ rates. As we established that the PbI$_2$ rate on $S$-$Sub$ and $S$-$PbI_2$ have a linear correlation, we can
deduce the effective MAI rate on S-Sub by subtracting the PbI₂ rate from the total. Interestingly, we find that the effective MAI deposition rate increases with increasing PbI₂ rate and reaches a maximum S-Sub reading around 0.8 Å·s⁻¹, at a PbI₂ rate of ~1.6 Å·s⁻¹. Therefore, in the presence of PbI₂ the adhesion of MAI is increased to a maximum of 2.7 times compared to MAI alone. Further increase of the PbI₂ rate, up to 13 Å·s⁻¹ as shown in Fig. S5, resulted in the decrease of the MAI rate at S-Sub to ~0.4 Å·s⁻¹. When, after the PbI₂ deposition at such high rates, we suddenly reduce this to zero by closing the shutter above the PbI₂ crucible, the MAI rate increases again to its former maximum value of ~ 0.8 Å·s⁻¹. With longer sublimation of MAI only, its corresponding rate from S-Sub gradually decreased to a value of 0.3 Å·s⁻¹, which is the same deposition rate as before the PbI₂ evaporation. This rather slow decrease of the MAI rate upon ceasing to evaporate PbI₂ is due to the fast diffusion of MAI into the PbI₂. In order to allow for a quantitative analysis, the adsorption rates of MAI (r_{MAI}) and PbI₂ (r_{PbI₂}) are expressed in the unit of mol·s⁻¹·cm⁻². The adsorbed mass is related to the frequency change of the QCM (Δf) according to the Sauerbrey equation⁵⁹,

\[ Δf = -c \cdot Δm \quad (1) \]

The monitored thickness can be readily converted to the frequency change of the QCM, using the data provided by the manufacturer of the crystal sensors: in our case 1 Å corresponds to Δf = -0.842 Hz. Where c is the sensitivity factor for the crystal (0.081 Hz·ng⁻¹·cm⁻² for 6 Mhz crystal) and Δm the adsorbed mass change. Therefore, dividing Δm by the molar mass will give the number of adsorbed molecules per time unit, which is the same as the rate of the adsorbed molecules. As displayed in Fig. 2b, r_{MAI} is maximum when it is similar to r_{PbI₂}. Upon a further increase of r_{PbI₂}, r_{MAI} decreases. This implies that the adsorption of MAI is highest on the
stoichiometric perovskite surface, and with increasing $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ the surface on the crystal is converted into a PbI$_2$ rich perovskite phase on which the MAI adsorption rate is decreased.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.** (a) Schematic illustration of the main processes governing the co-deposition of MAI and PbI$_2$ in vacuum deposition and (b) the resultant thickness of the grown perovskite film as a function of $x$ and $t$.

To facilitate a more in depth discussion of the co-deposition process as monitored in Fig. 2, it is useful to assume that the MAI and PbI$_2$ alternatively come into contact with the surface. This simplification allows us to describe the different steps involved in the adsorption of the MAI and PbI$_2$ and its subsequent conversion into the perovskite. As we have shown that the adsorption of MAI on the bare QCM is not favored, we can reasonably assume that the first step is the deposition of PbI$_2$ (depicted as the yellow blocks in Fig. 3a). As in our approximation the two materials hit the substrate in an alternating manner, the subsequent step is the adsorption of MAI. The MAI primarily adheres on the PbI$_2$ covered areas (as the adsorption on PbI$_2$ is much more efficient than on the bare QCM surface), however, the deposition of MAI on PbI$_2$ leads to the formation of the perovskite which depends on the diffusion of MAI into the PbI$_2$ and/or partially formed MAPbI$_3$ perovskite (schematically shown in Fig. 3a as the brown line around the yellow and blue PbI$_2$ and...
MAI blocks). In this assumption, during the co-deposition of MAI and PbI$_2$ there are 3 different surfaces, PbI$_2$, MAI and the resulting MAPbI$_3$ perovskite. To establish the growth kinetics, we can start from the general equation for the adsorption rate as follows.

$$r_{\text{ads.}} = \varphi S \quad (2)$$

where $\varphi$ is the impingement rate which is the number of molecules striking the surface per unit time and area, and $S$ is the sticking probability, $S = \sigma \exp\left\{-\frac{E_{\text{act}}}{k_B T}\right\} f(\theta)$. ($\sigma$: condensation coefficient, $E_{\text{act}}$: activation energy for adsorption, $k_B$: Boltzman constant, $T$: temperature, $f(\theta)$: surface coverage function for probability of finding an adsorption site)\(^{60}\). In the case of the sticking of MAI on PbI$_2$, the perovskite is formed by the chemical reaction. Hence, this sticking can be characterized as the chemisorption, where the $E_{\text{act}}$ would also related to the activation energy for the chemical reaction. Regarding the surfaces, as mentioned earlier, the MAI adsorption rates is surface dependent, thus it can be expressed considering the 3 different surfaces separately.

Modifying eqn (2) then,

$$r_{\text{MAI}} = \varphi_{\text{MAI}} \left\{ \sum_i S_i f(\theta_i) \right\} = \varphi_{\text{MAI}} \left\{ S_{\text{MAI}} f(\theta_{\text{MAI}}) + S_{\text{PbI}} f(\theta_{\text{PbI}}) + S_{\text{perov}} f(\theta_{\text{perov}}) \right\} \quad (3)$$

Where $S_i$ refers to the intrinsic sticking coefficient (or $\sigma \exp\left\{-\frac{E_{\text{act}}}{k_B T}\right\}$) of MAI on a surface of the different materials $i$ (e.g., $i =$ MAI, PbI$_2$ and MAPbI$_3$), and $f(\theta_i)$ is defined as the fractional ratio of coverage by the species $i$. For example, $\theta_{\text{MAI}}$ is the surface area covered by MAI/total surface area ($\sum_i \theta_i = 1$). The surface area for the different compounds can be assumed to be proportional to their respective adsorption rate and their molar mass divided by their density, as described below,
Area covered by $i$ under deposition, $\theta_i \propto \frac{M_i}{\rho_i} r_i$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Where $M_i$ and $\rho_i$ are the molar mass and density of $i$, respectively. During co-sublimation of both MAI and PbI$_2$, the diffusion flux of MAI, $J$, should also be taken into account to correctly determine the coverage. This is needed as upon the diffusion of MAI into PbI$_2$ the perovskite is formed, eliminating MAI and PbI$_2$ from the surface (Fig. 3a), where the $J$ can be represented as a function of $x$ and $t$ as shown in Fig. 3b, with respect to the concentration gradient of MAI from surface. When taking all these factors into account we can consider two regimes during the sublimation: either $r_{\text{PbI}_2} < r_{\text{MAI}}$ or $r_{\text{MAI}} < r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ and for both cases we can derive a dependency on each other as depicted in Fig. 4 (The derivation is described in detail in the Supporting information).

**Figure 4.** PbI$_2$ rate vs MAI rate extracted from Fig. 2b with simulated lines using the derived growth equations for the either the $r_{\text{MAI}}$ or $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ dominant rate regimes. (The equations are described in the Supporting information.)

The experimental data points are in good agreement with the fitting curves from the derived equations. The values of $\varphi_{\text{MAI}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-12}$ mol$\cdot$s$^{-1}\cdot$cm$^{-2}$, $S_{\text{PbI}_2} = 0.50$ and $S_{\text{MAI}} = 0.23$ used for the
numerical fitting are physically meaningful. The impingement rate $\varphi_{\text{MAI}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$, is always higher than $r_{\text{MAI}}$. The sticking probability is also similar to the value extracted by another simple definition of the probability which is,

$$\text{Sticking probability} = \frac{\# \text{ of adsorbed molecule}}{\# \text{ of striking molecule}} = \frac{r_{\text{MAI}}}{\varphi_{\text{MAI}}}$$

(5)

For example, when $r_{\text{PbI}_2} = 0$, the surface of the film will be full of MAI under the constant $\varphi_{\text{MAI}}$, hence we can estimate the $S_{\text{MAI}}$ using eqn (5), with corresponding values of $\varphi_{\text{MAI}}$ and $r_{\text{MAI}}$. As shown in Fig. 4, the $r_{\text{MAI}} = 0.38 \times 10^{-12} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$ results in $S_{\text{MAI}} = 0.27$, which is close to the result, $S_{\text{MAI}} = 0.23$, previously calculated by the proposed solutions. $S_{\text{PbI}_2}$ can be estimated in the same manner assuming that adsorption of MAI on PbI$_2$ would be dominant in the region where the $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ is much faster than $r_{\text{MAI}}$. As shown in Fig. 4, when $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ reaches the highest value, over $4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$, $r_{\text{MAI}}$ approaches $\sim 0.8 \times 10^{-12} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$, resulting in the $S_{\text{PbI}_2} = 0.57$ from the definition in eqn (5), which is also similar to the calculated result from the solutions, 0.50. Therefore, our suggested growth model accurately describes the vacuum deposition process for MAPbI$_3$ perovskites.

**Figure 5.** Schematic figure for calibration of the geometric factor, Thickness at substrate, for MAI and PbI$_2$. 
Considering the enhanced adsorption of MAI with PbI$_2$, it is possible to estimate and control the composition of the perovskite film in vacuum co-deposition using the evaporation system described in Fig. 1a, as well as in Fig. 5. Since the S-Sub reads both MAI and PbI$_2$, therefore, the enhanced adsorption of MAI on PbI$_2$ is already taken into account at the S-Sub. In addition, the adsorbed thickness ratio on the S-Sub will be directly proportional to the adsorbed mass ratio, which can be simply calculated by dividing their molar mass even without considering the Sauerbrey equation. However, one should be aware that S-Sub is off-centered to prevent the shadows on the substrate by evaporated materials from the crucible sources. This results in different amount of molecules reaching the S-Sub and the substrate, depending on the location of the crucibles. To calibrate this difference caused by the geometrical factor, we positioned two glass substrates; one is at the normal substrate holder and another is at the sensor by attaching it to the sensor head as illustrated in Fig. 5. Afterwards, MAI and PbI$_2$ are separately evaporated and the thickness of the evaporated films on the glass substrates is measured as demonstrated in Fig. 5. In our case, the ratio of $\frac{\text{Thickness at substrate}}{\text{Thickness at sub.sensor}}$ is 2.0 and 2.3 for the MAI and PbI$_2$ sources respectively. In this correction, we assumed that during the perovskite co-deposition, the different sub-layers (e.g. glass, Au-coated QCM, and organic charge transporting layer) have a negligible effect on the overall adsorption rate of the perovskite. The different sub-layers will affect the initial growth rate for the perovskite, however, once the surface is fully covered by the deposited perovskite, the surface dependent growth property can be excluded. From the work of Olthof and Meerholz it is known that after approximately 10 nm of deposition the surface is completely covered with a perovskite film$^{58}$. In view of the final perovskite film thickness we deposit, (usually over 500 nm for active layer), we can assume that the surface effect is negligible for the growth rate of the thick perovskite.
It is important to note that the consideration of the geometric factor enables us to directly control the composition of the perovskite by monitoring the actually adsorbed precursor amount. This is an important advantage of vacuum deposition as other processes use indirect methods to estimate the composition. These range from XPS, EDX or even by assuming complete deposition of the precursors from solution. In that method the composition of the film is usually estimated by weighing the precursors, which may result in large errors due to the different solubility and coating yields of the precursors.

Table 1. Monitored thicknesses and calculated molar ratios of co-evaporated perovskite film under 4 different conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Film 1</th>
<th>Film 2</th>
<th>Film 3</th>
<th>Film 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitored thickness at substrate sensor [PbI$_2$/MAI] (nm)</td>
<td>430 / 104</td>
<td>441 / 145</td>
<td>440 / 183</td>
<td>410 / 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight ratio of [PbI$_2$:MAI] at substrate sensor</td>
<td>1 : 0.24</td>
<td>1 : 0.34</td>
<td>1 : 0.42</td>
<td>1 : 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated molar ratio of PbI$_2$:MAI at substrate</td>
<td>1 : 0.61</td>
<td>1 : 0.85</td>
<td>1 : 0.95</td>
<td>1 : 1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* The thickness of MAI is nominal value, where the same tooling factor was used with PbI$_2$. *The molar ratio at substrate calculated from weight ratio divided by molar masses and multiplied by geometric factor, defined as $\frac{\text{Thickness at substrate}}{\text{Thickness at substrate sensor}}$.)

Based on this method, we fabricated four different perovskite films with a fixed PbI$_2$ rate of 1 Å·s$^{-1}$, and varying MAI rates as monitored by S-Sub. Again, since the PbI$_2$ rate on S-Sub and S-PbI$_2$ have a linear correlation, it is able to monitor and control the adsorbed MAI rate on S-Sub by subtracting the PbI$_2$ rate from the total on S-Sub. The resulting final thicknesses as deduced from S-Sub for PbI$_2$ and MAI are shown in Table 1. Using the previously-described methodology, the composition of the co-evaporated films at the substrate was calculated. Film 3 is close to the 1:1 stoichiometry for PbI$_2$:MAI. The measured thickness and absorbance of the films are in Fig. S6.
We used these films to prepare thin film solar cells in the \textit{p-i-n} configuration according to the schematic drawing depicted in Fig. 6a. We used an all vacuum process as reported previously$^{63}$.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6.png}
\caption{(a) Structure of the fabricated device (b-e) Statistics of the photovoltaic parameters}
\end{figure}

The solar cells based on film 1 and 2 did not lead to very high power conversion efficiencies (PCEs) (Fig. 6b). Those based on film 3 and 4 performed much better, although the devices using film 4 showed a larger spreading in particular of the short circuit current density ($I_{SC}$). The best performance in absolute PCE and spreading were obtained for the solar cells employing film 3. That is, the perovskite film with an almost stoichiometric composition. Since it is known that the best performance is obtained for perovskite films that are close to the ideal stoichiometry, this finding further corroborates that the method we developed indeed allows to determine the perovskite composition. The origin of wide distribution in $I_{SC}$ and $FF$ in MAI deficient and in particular the PbI$_2$ deficient films is not clear but it is speculated that it can be caused by unstable perovskite active layer originating from non-stoichiometry.

In conclusion, we established the growth kinetics of MAPbI$_3$ in a vacuum based sublimation process. For this, we positioned the source QCMs in such a way that they selective monitor only
one precursor sublimation rate. To monitor the co-deposition of both precursors, a third sensor
close to the substrate is used. By careful studying the rates on each of these QCMs in different
sublimation conditions, we have developed a simple model describing the growth kinetics. Using
this model we are able to control the molar composition of the MAPbI$_3$ in vacuum co-deposition
process. This is an important step forward as now direct control over the final film composition is
available whereas previously this had to be obtained off line after film deposition. As mentioned,
in-situ composition control is extensively used in other vacuum-based processing methods, such
as OLEDs and we believe this will provide meaningful insights for general application of the
vacuum process for the fabrication of perovskites films.

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from European Union’s Horizon 2020
research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 763977 of the PERTPV project,
the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (MINECO), MAT2017-88821-R,
Valenciana IDIFEDER/2018/061. M.S. acknowledges the MINECO for his RyC.

References

[1] Kojima, A.; Teshima, K.; Shirai, Y.; Miyasaka, T. Organometal Halide Perovskites as Visible-
[2] J. H. Im, C. R. Lee, J. W. Lee, S. W. Park, N. G. Park, 6.5% Efficient Perovskite Quantum-


Deposition Kinetics and Compositional Control of Vacuum Processed CH$_3$NH$_3$PbI$_3$ Perovskite

Beom-Soo Kim*, Lidón Gil-Escrig, Michele Sessolo and Henk J. Bolink*.

Instituto de Ciencia Molecular, Universidad de Valencia, Calle Catedrático José Beltrán 2, Paterna, 46980, Spain.

Email: beom.kim@uv.es, henk.bolink@uv.es

Experimental

Deposition study using QCM

For every deposition study, a new QCM (Fil-Tech, 6 Mhz) was used. The deposition rates were controlled and monitored by stored program (VAKSIS) of the evaporator. The precursor materials, MAI (Lumtec) and PbI$_2$ (Lumtec) were introduced in the temperature controlled evaporation sources (Creaphys) through an inert atmosphere glove box. Before evaporation MAI, the source was heated at 90 °C at ambient pressure for ~20 minutes for out-gassing.

Device fabrication

ITO pre-patterned substrates were cleaned following a standard procedure in which they are sequentially cleaned with soap, water, deionized water, and isopropanol in a sonication bath, followed by UV treatment for 20 min. All the solar cell layers were prepared by thermal vacuum deposition
performed in vacuum chambers evacuated to a pressure of \( \sim 10^{-6} \) mbar, which were integrated into a nitrogen-filled glove box (\( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) and \( \text{O}_2 < 0.1 \) ppm). TaTm, \( \text{C}_{60} \) and BCP were sublimed in the same vacuum chamber at temperatures ranging from 100 to \( >300 \) °C, depending on the material, and the precise evaporation rate and deposited film thickness were controlled by the QCM sensors. In general, the deposition rate for TaTm and \( \text{C}_{60} \) was 0.5 Å/s while the thinner BCP layer was evaporated at 0.2–0.3 Å/s. For the perovskite deposition, MAI and PbI\(_2\) were co-evaporated at the same time. The MAI rate was controlled by the substrate sensor, which reads both MAI and PbI\(_2\) rates while the PbI\(_2\) rate is maintained constant which is monitored by the QCM sensor close to the PbI\(_2\) source. The MoO\(_3\) and Ag were evaporated in another vacuum chamber using aluminum boats as sources by applying currents ranging from 2.0 to 4.5 A. After TaTm deposition, the substrate was heated at 140 °C for 10 minutes, according to previous report, *Chem. Mater.* 2019, 31, 17, 6945-6949.

**Characterization**

Absorption spectra were collected using a fiber optics based Avantes Avaspec2048 Spectrometer. Characterization of the solar cells was performed as follows, using two different methods for double check. For the first, the external quantum efficiency (EQE) was measured using the cell response at different wavelength (measured with a white light halogen lamp in combination with band-pass filters), where the solar spectrum mismatch is corrected using a calibrated Silicon reference cell (MiniSun simulator by ECN, the Netherlands). Solar cells were illuminated by the halogen lamp in combination with interference filters for the EQE and \( J-V \) measurements. An estimation of the short-circuit current density (\( J_{SC} \)) understand standard test conditions was calculated by convolving the EQE spectrum with the AM1.5G reference spectrum, using the premise of a linear dependence of \( J_{sc} \) on light intensity. \( J-V \) characteristics of the solar cells were recorded using a Keithley2400 SourceMeter, in a −0.2 and 1.2 V voltage range, with 0.01 V steps. Also, the \( J-V \) curves were measured again illuminated under a Wavelabs Sinus 70 LED solar simulator. The light intensity was calibrated before
every measurement using a calibrated Si reference diode equipped with an infrared cut-off filter (KG-3, Schott). Keithley 2612A SourceMeter was used to record in a −0.2 and 1.2 V voltage range, with 0.01 V steps and integrating the signal for 20 ms after a 10 ms delay, corresponding to a speed of about 0.3 V/s.

**Figure S1.** Extracted PL spectrum for (Cs$_{0.05}$MA$_{0.17}$FA$_{0.83}$)$_{0.95}$Pb(I$_{0.83}$Br$_{0.17}$)$_3$ and FAPbI$_3$(0.85)MAPbBr$_3$(0.15) perovskite by a digitizer from the references.

**Figure S2.** Rates from PbI$_2$ sensor vs Substrate sensor extracted from Fig. 1(b) and linear fitting.
Figure S3. Photography of the inside of the evaporator. The yellow dashed lines indicate the shield of the sensors.

Figure S4. MAI rates from MAI sensor, Substrate sensor and their ratio with different batches of MAI.
Figure S5. Deposition rates from the sensors with increased PbI₂ rates under constant MAI rate shown in Fig. 1d with full scale

Deriving the growth kinetics:

Taking into account for eqn (4) and the consideration of the surface that discussed in Fig. 3a, the \( f(\theta_i) \), fractional ratio of coverage for the surface area covered by the species \( i \), under the co-deposition of MAI and PbI₂ can be described as the function of the deposition rate and diffusion flux.

\[
\frac{M_{\text{MAI}}}{\rho_{\text{MAI}}} r_{\text{MAI}} - \frac{M_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\rho_{\text{PbI}_2}} f(\theta_{\text{MAI}}) = \frac{M_{\text{MAI}}}{\rho_{\text{MAI}}} r_{\text{MAI}} + \frac{M_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\rho_{\text{PbI}_2}} f(\theta_{\text{PbI}_2}) = \frac{2M_{\text{MAI}}}{\rho_{\text{MAI}}} + \frac{M_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\rho_{\text{PbI}_2}} f(\theta_{\text{MAI}})
\]

(S1)

According to Fick’s first law of diffusion, \( J \) equals to \(-D \frac{\partial c}{\partial x}\) where \( D \) is diffusivity, \( c \) is concentration and \( x \) is position. As shown in Fig. 3b, the thickness of the film can be represented as the distance from the substrate to the surface of the film, \( x \), with time. Since we are specifically interested in \( J \) at the surface to reflect the change of the surface, the concentration can be replaced by the adsorption rate of MAI multiplied by time and area. Therefore, if we substitute \( J \) by the adsorption rate, and \( f(\theta_i) \) into eqn (S1), then we obtain,

\[
r_{\text{det}} = \phi_{\text{det}} \left\{ \frac{M_{\text{MAI}}}{\rho_{\text{MAI}}} r_{\text{MAI}} D \frac{\partial \rho_{\text{MAI}}}{\partial x} / \chi_{\text{MAI}} \cdot A \cdot t + \frac{M_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\rho_{\text{PbI}_2}} r_{\text{PbI}_2} D \frac{\partial \rho_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\partial x} / \chi_{\text{PbI}_2} \cdot A \cdot t + \frac{2M_{\text{MAI}}}{\rho_{\text{MAI}}} + \frac{M_{\text{PbI}_2}}{\rho_{\text{PbI}_2}} \right\}
\]

(S2)
As we observed from Fig. 2, we determined that $S_{\text{MAI}} < S_{\text{PbI}_2} < S_{\text{Perov.}} \approx 2.7 S_{\text{MAI}}$. Therefore, taking into account these sticking probability, the molar mass (159, 461 and 620 g/mol) and the density (2.22, 6.16 and 4.16 g/cm³) for MAI, PbI₂ and perovskite respectively from the reported values 1-3, then eqn (S2) can be presented as below, with the substitution of $D \frac{\partial r_{\text{MAI}}}{\partial x} \cdot A \cdot t$ to $r_{\text{MAI}}'$ for simplicity.

$$r_{\text{MAI}} = \varphi_{\text{MAI}} \left( \frac{S_{\text{MAI}}(r_{\text{MAI}} + 9.11 r_{\text{MAI}}') + S_{\text{PbI}_2}(1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2} - 2.07 r_{\text{MAI}}')}{r_{\text{MAI}} + 1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2}} \right) \quad (S3)$$

We recall that $r_i$ and $S_i$ are adsorption rate and sticking probability of species $i$, and $\varphi_{\text{MAI}}$ is impingement rate of MAI, and $r_{\text{MAI}}'$ is the diffusion flux of MAI, $J$, on the surface. The diffusion of MAI is fast as deduced when discussing Fig. 2. As a result the diffusion flux $J$ will be limited by the slower components, either $r_{\text{MAI}}$ or $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ under the co-deposition. Therefore, there are two regimes during sublimation either $r_{\text{PbI}_2} < r_{\text{MAI}}$ or $r_{\text{MAI}} < r_{\text{PbI}_2}$. When $r_{\text{PbI}_2} < r_{\text{MAI}}$, $J$ will be limited by $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$, so we can assume that $J = r_{\text{PbI}_2}$, and substituting $J$ into eqn (S3) we obtain,

$$r_{\text{MAI}} = \varphi_{\text{MAI}} \left( \frac{S_{\text{MAI}}(r_{\text{MAI}} + 9.11 r_{\text{PbI}_2}) + S_{\text{PbI}_2}(1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2} - 2.07 r_{\text{MAI}})}{r_{\text{MAI}} + 1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2}} \right) \quad (S4)$$

The solution for $r_{\text{MAI}}$, as function of $r_{\text{PbI}_2}$, $\varphi_{\text{MAI}}$ and $S$ is as below.

$$r_{\text{MAI}} = \sqrt{0.27 r_{\text{PbI}_2}^2 - 1.03 r_{\text{PbI}_2} S_{\text{PbI}_2} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} + 8.59 r_{\text{PbI}_2} S_{\text{PbI}_2} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} + 0.25 \varphi_{\text{MAI}}^2 S_{\text{MAI}}^2 - 0.52 r_{\text{PbI}_2} + 0.50 \varphi_{\text{MAI}} S_{\text{MAI}}^2} \quad (S5)$$

For $r_{\text{MAI}} < r_{\text{PbI}_2}$ regime, where $J$ is limited by $r_{\text{MAI}}$ hence assuming $J = r_{\text{MAI}}$ then eqn (S3) becomes,
\[ r_{\text{MAI}} = \frac{S_{\text{MAI}} (r_{\text{MAI}} + 9.11 r_{\text{MAI}}) + S_{\text{PbI}_2} (1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2} - 2.07 r_{\text{MAI}})}{r_{\text{MAI}} + 1.04 r_{\text{PbI}_2}} \]  

(S6)

from which the solution is the following

\[ r_{\text{MAI}} = 0.005 \sqrt{104 r_{\text{PbI}_2} + 207 S_{\text{PbI}_2} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} + 1011 S_{\text{MAI}} \varphi_{\text{MAI}}} + 41600 r_{\text{PbI}_2} S_{\text{MAI}} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} - 0.52 r_{\text{PbI}_2} - 1.04 S_{\text{PbI}_2} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} + 5.06 S_{\text{MAI}} \varphi_{\text{MAI}} \]  

(S7)

The equations, S5 and S7 are used in Fig. 4 for the simulation.

**Figure S6.** Absorbance and thickness of the fabricated perovskite films

**Figure S7.** Recorded deposition rates changes during the MAI+PbI2 co-deposition from different sensors with varied estimated compositions.
Figure S8. Photovoltaic parameters of the fabricated device measured under halogen lamp with corrected $J_{sc}$ by convolving EQE with spectrum of AM1.5G.
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