Review article Non-destructive Microcracks Detection Techniques in Silicon Solar Cell Mohd Israil*, Abdul Ghani Yousseph Kerm Department of physics, Aljouf University, Sakaka 2014, Aljouf, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia ABSTRACT A very high demand and limited stock of fossil fuels, renewable energy in very particular solar energy is the mainly focused area for research these days. This review paper presents the nondestructive optical testing techniques for the solar cells. The impacts of microcracks in solar cells as well as photovoltaic modules have been studied in this paper. Laser beam induced current, electron beam induced current, electroluminescence and photoluminescence are mainly discussed techniques in this paper. All the aforementioned methods will be reviewed, highlighting some of their salient characteristics including merits and demerits. For completion and thoroughness, some image processing techniques for the shape and size detection of micro-cracks will also be discussed

15 Keywords: LBIC, EBIC, Micro-crack, Solar Cell, Solar wafer

16

1

2

3

4

5

6 7 8

9

10 12 13

14

17 18

19 **1. INTRODUCTION**

20

21 Due to the high cost and limited stock of energy sources available on the earth, renewable 22 energy sources got high attention for research. In contrast, the many types of renewable energy resources such as wind and solar energy-are constantly replenished and will never 23 24 run out. Solar energy is the photonic energy which is converted into electrical energy by 25 solar cell. Solar cell can be categorized into inorganic solar cell and organic solar cell. In this study we are focusing on the inorganic silicon solar cell. It is important to recognize that the 26 27 silicon wafer is a large contributor, up to 75%, to the overall cost of the solar cell [1] and the 28 silicon raw material price increased exponentially due to a worldwide shortage of 29 polycrystalline silicon. To compensate for the feedstock shortage of silicon, solar wafer 30 manufacturers are slicing silicon thinner and thinner with thicknesses down to order of 31 100µm or less [2]. Figure 1 shows typical flow in the production of wafers from silicon. Wire 32 saw technology is being used by [2]; it is the technology for slicing thin wafer from a large diameter crystalline ingot of silicon. Wire saw must be balance precisely to achieve higher 33 34 productivity while minimizing the breakage problem in the wafer. In addition to the reduction

^{*}Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

35 of the thickness, wafer's manufacturers are also increasing the size of the wafer in order to

36 reduce the overall production cost. Solar wafers of size up to 210 mm × 210 mm square 37 shaped are now available in the current market.

38



39 40 41

Fig. 1. Typical process flow in the production of crystalline silicon wafers [2]

42 These technological trends in the production make wafer handling more challenging as the processes can potentially reduce the yield due to increased wafer and cell breakage. 43 Typically, the handling or mishandling may lead to some physical defects in the wafer like 44 cracks or scratches. These cracks may vary from macro level to micro level, generally, the 45 cracks of width of order less than 100 µm are considered as micro-cracks. Both 46 polycrystalline and mono crystalline solar wafer/cell occasionally contains micro-cracks. 47 48 Figure 2 illustrates example of the polycrystalline solar wafer with micro-crack. This figure 2 49 shows micro-crack which has been indicated by an arrow symbol. Low gray level and high 50 gradient magnitudes are two main features for the micro-cracks in solar wafers. Due to its 51 size, naturally this type of defect cannot be seen by naked eyes. Consequently, this may 52 result in the production of inferior quality solar panels if this defect in solar wafers or cells 53 goes undetected. In worst case the cell might even fail and this leads to the potentially malfunctioned photovoltaic (PV) modules [3-26]. Also, it can be seen from the figure 2, the 54 picture of the polycrystalline solar wafer shows multiple grains of different shapes and sizes, 55 therefore it is very hard to differentiate between micro-crack and grain boundary by simple 56 machine vision learning. So it is important to develop an inspection system for the detection 57 and evaluation of such a defect. Preferably, such a system should be non-contact in order to 58 59 ensure the surface and subsurface integrity of silicon wafers is preserved before and after

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

60 assessment, and from the start of the production process till completion [4]. The main objective of this paper is to review some of the well-known and emerging technologies for 61 micro-crack detection of solar wafers. Some of the salient features of these methods are 62 identified and critically discussed; aiming to provide useful guidance to new and existing 63 64 researchers wishing to venture into this very interesting research area.

65



- 66
- 67
- 68 69

Fig. 2. Example of polycrystalline solar wafer with micro-crack

70 2. MICRO-CRACK INSPECTION IN SOLAR WAFERS/CELLS

71 To-date various researchers have experimented various methods and techniques for the 72 detection of micro-crack in solar wafers and solar cells. The most common methods that 73 have been investigated include the laser beam induced current (LBIC) [5-8], the electron 74 beam induced current (EBIC) [9-11], the optical testing such as the photoluminescence [12-14] the electroluminescence imaging [15]. In this paper, all the aforementioned methods will 75 76 be reviewed, highlighting some of their salient characteristics including merits and demerits. For completion and thoroughness, some image processing techniques for the shape and 77 size detection of micro-cracks will also be discussed. 78

79 2.1 Laser Beam Induced Current (LBIC)

80

81 LBIC is a non-destructive optical testing for the characterization of semiconductors [16-17]. The basic LBIC system setup is shown in figure 3. As shown in this figure, the light source is 82 83 selected from laser diodes of different wavelengths between 638 and 850 nm, and an 84 electrical current to the laser diode is electronically modulated to produce an AC laser beam, 85 and the modulation also provides the reference signal for a lock-in amplifier. When a light

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

86 beam is scanned over the surface of a photosensitive device, it creates electron-hole pairs 87 in the semiconductor causing a the dc current to flow which in turn measured using suitable 88 devices [5-8]. Such measurements are repeated for different position of the laser beam to 89 obtain LBIC image of the sample. The variations in the current are recorded and converted 90 into variation in contrast forming the LBIC image. More variation in the current indicates that 91 the cell will be more defected. In a typical set-up, the LBIC technique consists of a calibrated 92 measurement of current and reflection coefficient. This information allows the internal 93 quantum efficiency (IQE) of the solar cell is assessed [18]. The IQE is defined as the fraction 94 of incident photons transmitted into the solar cell that contribute in the generation of electron-95 hole pairs. Mathematically it is given by [19]:

96
$$IQE = \frac{1}{1-R} \left[\frac{h \ c \ I_{sc}}{e \ \lambda \ I_{L}} \right]$$
(1)

97 where R is reflection coefficient, h is Planck's constant, c is velocity of light, e is electron 98 charge, λ is wavelength of the illuminating light, I_{SC} is measured short circuit current and I_{L} is 99 intensity of the illuminated light. The quantum efficiency is the photon to electron conversion efficiency of the solar cell. Hence, lesser the efficiency of the cell indicates that the cell is 100 more defective. 101

- 102
- 103
- 104



105 106

- 107
- 108

Fig. 3. LBIC Measurement Setup

109

110 Figure 4 shows the current distribution map of the cell obtained through LBIC imaging. In this 111 figure, the dark irregular lines correspond to the active performance degrading grain 112 boundaries. Figure 5(a) shows the LBIC reflection map corresponding to the darker areas of 113 Figure 4. It is evident that the current distribution, as expected for multi-crystalline material, 114 is not uniform as illustrated in regions marked A-C. The uniformity is compromised by the reflection and absorption of different grains at the surface of the polycrystalline silicon solar 115 cell. Light is reflected more in region C than the neighboring regions A and B. In Figure 5(b), 116 117 reflective line scan is depicted, which further indicates the high current response in region C. 118 This region is expected to decrease the efficiency of the solar cell when it is in operation. The feature indicated by X corresponds to the grain boundary which clearly reflects more 119 120 incident light as do the contact fingers.

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432. *E-mail address: israilsaifi@gmail.com.



Fig. 4. LBIC map of Polycrystalline silicon solar cell [18]



125

Laser beam induced current (LBIC) methods have been investigated both for fast line scan techniques and for detailed surface mapping [20]. The major drawback of this method lies in

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432. *E-mail address: israilsaifi@gmail.com.

the necessity for electrical contacts, making this technique nearly impossible to apply for wafer inspection and technically difficult for non-tabbed solar cells. Furthermore, the scanning needs to be performed for the entire wafer area and this process is prohibitedly time consuming even though the accuracy of the LBIC is acceptable.

- 135
- 136

137 2.2 Electron Beam Induced Current (EBIC)

138 EBIC analysis, as the name implies, is a semiconductor analysis technique that employs an 139 electron beam to induce a current within a sample which may be used as a signal for 140 generating images that depict characteristics of the sample, among others showing the 141 locations of p-n junctions in the sample, highlighting the presence of local defects, and 142 mapping doping non-homogeneities [21]. Since a scanning electron microscope (SEM) is a 143 convenient source of electron beam for this purpose, most EBIC techniques are performed 144 using a SEM. A typical EBIC imaging system consisting, SEM, low noise current amplifier 145 and display unit is shown in figure 6. When an electron beam from SEM strikes the surface 146 of the solar cell, it generates the electron-hole pairs within the volume of beam interaction 147 over the cell. 148



149 150

Fig. 6. EBIC Imaging Systems

- 151 152
- 153

154 With proper electrical contact with the sample, the movement of the holes and electrons 155 generated by the SEM's electron beam can be collected, amplified, and analyzed, such that 156 variations in the generation, drift, or recombination of these carriers can be displayed as 157 variations of contrast as in LBIC image discussed previously. EBIC imaging is very sensitive 158 to electron-hole recombination. This is the reason, why EBIC analysis is very useful for 159 finding defects that act as recombination centers in semiconductor materials. The EBIC current (I_{EBIC}) collected is many times larger than the primary beam current absorbed by the 160 161 sample (I_{ab}) , and is given by the equation

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

$$I_{EBIC} = I_{ab} \times \left(\frac{E_b}{E_h}\right) \times n \tag{2}$$

163 164

165 where E_b is the primary beam energy or the SEM's accelerating voltage, E_h is the energy 166 needed to create an electron-hole pair (about 3.6 eV for Silicon), and n is the collection 167 efficiency. The accelerating voltage belongs to the extremely high Tension (EHT) category, 168 ranging from tens to hundreds of keV. Thus, assuming a collection efficiency of 100%, and an EHT of 20 keV, the collected EBIC current would be about 5556 times larger than I_{ab} . 169 170 EBIC currents are usually in the nanoampere to microampere range while I_{ab} is in the 171 picoampere range. In areas around the p-n junction where physical defects exist, electron-172 hole recombination is enhanced, thus reducing the collected current in those defected 173 areas. Hence, if the current through the junction is used to produce the EBIC image, the 174 areas with physical defects will appear to be darker in the EBIC image than areas with no 175 physical defects. EBIC imaging is therefore a convenient tool for finding sub-surface and 176 other difficult-to-see damage sites.

177

178 Referring to figure 6, the wire that carries the current away from the top contact can be seen 179 in the lower left. The solar cell is slowly scanned and the EBIC current given by Equation (2) 180 is then measured. This current is displayed in color. The measured EBIC current was small 181 when the beam fell on the metal contact but was larger when it fell on the active region of the 182 solar cell. Figure 7 shows a secondary electron image of a polycrystalline silicon solar cell. 183 Within the active region of the solar cell there are large variations in the current. This is due 184 to a variation in the density of defects which causes the electron-hole pairs to recombine 185 before they are separated by the built-in electric field. Figure 8 illustrates a typical EBIC 186 image when the electron beam energy is 20 keV [11]. The crack can be clearly seen in the image. Therefore this technique is useful to detect the presence or absence of micro-crack in 187 188 solar cell or solar wafer.

189 EBIC and LBIC are powerful tools for mapping distribution of recombination active defects 190 and impurities in solar cells. The operation of both EBIC and LBIC is based on local injection 191 of minority carriers and their subsequent collection by a p-n junction or a Schottky diode 192 fabricated on the sample surface, the measurement closely mimics the actual operation of a 193 solar cell. LBIC, which has somewhat lower resolution than EBIC, is usually used to map the 194 whole cell, whereas EBIC is better suited for high resolution imaging of small areas of the 195 wafer. The analysis of temperature dependence of EBIC contrast enables one to distinguish 196 shallow and deep recombination centers, but no further parameters of the traps can be 197 determined. Additionally, the depth of the analyzed layer is shallow, typically several microns 198 from the surface in EBIC, and several tens or hundreds of microns in LBIC, depending on 199 the wavelength of the illuminator. Therefore, only a small fraction of the sample volume in 200 which electron-hole pairs are generated can be analyzed.

201

^{*}Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.



Fig. 7. EBIC current map of a polycrystalline silicon solar cell





204



- 208 209
- 210

211 **2.3 Electroluminescence (EL) imaging technique**

Luminescence imaging is very attractive idea for the micro-crack detection for the solar cells and wafers [22, 27-29]. Luminescence in the semiconductor is the result of the electron-hole recombination by electron excitation. Electroluminescence (EL) is the form of luminescence in which electrons are excited into the conduction band through the use of electrical current by connecting cell in forward bias mode. This technique could be applied not only to the

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

finished cell but also to the module and solar panels. The typical set-up for electroluminescence based inspection system is shown in Figure 9. It shows the solar cell sample connected to a power supply, a Silicon-CCD camera used to capture the picture which is then processed by the work station.

222 223



224 225 226

227

Fig. 9. A typical set up for Electroluminescence [15]

EL method requires the solar cells to be in the forward bias condition in order for it to emit infrared radiations. The luminescence ranges from 950 nm to 1250 nm with the peak occurring at approximately 1150 nm. Emission intensity is dependent on the density of defects in the silicon, with fewer defects resulting in more emitted photons. The EL system should be placed in the dark room as the image of the cells is being taken by cooled charge couple devices (CCD) camera.

234 Figure 10 (a) shows the sample of optical image of the defected monocrystalline silicon solar 235 cell, whereas Figure 10(b) shows the EL image of the same cell. The presence of horizontal 236 line can easily be seen in the bottom part of the Figure 10(b). This horizontal line is a crack 237 present in the cell which cannot be seen in the Figure 10(a). Meanwhile Figure 10(d) shows 238 an EL image of the polycrystalline silicon cell in which the grain boundaries became visible; 239 those are not visible in the optical image as shown in Figure 10(c). The beauty of this system is that it can be applied for the wafer, cell as well as photovoltaic module. Figure 11 shows 240 241 EL image of the monocrystalline photovoltaic (PV) module reported by [22]. The CCD image 242 of the monocrystalline photovoltaic module acquired at delivery is shown in Figure 11(a),

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

243 while Figure 11(b) shows the corresponding EL image. The presence of manufacturing 244 defects like crack in the module is not clearly visible in Figure 11(a).

245 From the results given above, it is clear that the EL imaging is a good technique to inspect the defects in the solar cell. But this method also requires electrical contacts between the 246 247 cell and the leads supplying currents from an external power supply. Therefore, this method 248 works well for cells and modules, but not for wafers. However, with wafers the radiation can 249 also be induced by illuminating it with source of a smaller wavelength: the so called photo-250 luminescence (PL). The details are explained in the following section.





Fig. 10. (a) Optical image of a defected monocrystalline silicon solar cell, (b) 255 the corresponding EL image of (a), (c) optical image of defected 256 polycrystalline silicon solar cell, (d) the corresponding EL image of (c) [15] 257

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432. *E-mail address: israilsaifi@gmail.com.





260

Fig. 11. EL images of a PV module (a) at delivery status (b) after exposed to temperature change

265 266

267 2.4 Photoluminescence (PL) imaging technique

As explained in previous section, the EL is very efficient technique to locate the defects in the solar cell but it can be applied for finished cell or module only. This method cannot be applied in the case of solar wafer. Photoluminescence (PL) is a versatile non-destructive tool to inspect silicon wafers and solar cells. More importantly, this method eradicates the needs for an electrical contact with the device under test. Moreover it can be applied not only at the end of the cells production, but it can be slotted in during the processes of producing solar cells [23, 30].

Photoluminescence is the result of the electron-hole recombination in which the electron excited to the conduction band after absorption of photon. The imaging setup is very similar to the EL. The only difference is the electrons are excited by means of laser source as shown in figure 12 [12]. The PL image is detected using a cooled CCD camera with a 1000nm long pass filter to remove the reflected and scattered laser light.

Physics behind the PL imaging is that most of the photon generated electrons give up their energy as heat, but a small fraction of the electrons recombine with a hole, emitting a photon (radiative recombination). The photoluminescence intensity depends on the rate of recombination of electron-hole pairs, which depends on the excess carrier density and the doping concentration in the semiconductor. If we consider the case of p-type solar wafer with

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

doping concentration N_A and Δn is the excess minority carrier density then the intensity of the PL current is given as follows [24]:

287

$$I_{PL} \alpha R \approx B \Delta n \left(\Delta n + N_A \right) \tag{3}$$

288 289

where *R* and *B* are radiative recombination rate and radiative recombination coefficient respectively. Photoluminescence intensity is proportional to the carrier concentration. Therefore, bright areas in general indicate higher minority-carrier lifetime regions, whereas dark areas indicate higher defect concentration.

More defects in the silicon will result in more energy lost as heat, and fewer emitted photons. In contrast fewer defects in the silicon will result in more radiative recombination, and more emitted photons. Example of the PL image of the polycrystalline silicon solar cell is given in figure 13 [25], showing the presence of micro-cracks and they are highlighted in a red square box. PL imaging is an efficient technique as it does not require any electrical contact and the image taken by this technique is free from series resistance. It can be applied to wafer, cell as well as module.

- 301
- 302



^{*}Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432. *E-mail address: israilsaifi@gmail.com.



Fig. 13. Example of PL image of a polycrystalline silicon solar cell with micro-crack in the red box

310

311

312 3. CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

313

314 In this paper the first laser beam induced current testing method is investigated, although it is very 315 good technique for the in line testing but the major drawback of this method is that it needs electrical contacts with the cell. Second technique discussed here is based on electron-hole recombination 316 which is the electron beam induced current. Like LBIC method EBIC method is also not applicable to 317 the solar wafer because it also needs electrical contacts. EBIC analysis is very useful for finding 318 319 defects that act as recombination centers in solar cells. Electroluminescence and photoluminescence is 320 also discussed in this article gave high quality results. But between these EL and PL techniques PL is better than EL as it can be applied for solar wafers as well as solar cells. 321

322

- Zimmermann CG. The impact of mechanical defects on the reliability of solar cells in aerospace applications. IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability. 2006; 6(3): 486-94.
- MEMC, Accessed 17 February 2014. <u>http://www.memc.com/index.php?view=Solar-</u>
 Manufacturing.
- Kontges M, Kunze I, Kajari-Schroder S, Breitenmoser X, Bjorneklett B. The risk of power
 loss in crystalline silicon based photovoltaic modules due to micro-cracks. Solar Energy
 Materials and Solar Cells. 2011; 95(4): 1131-37.
- Dunlop ED, Halton D. Radiometric pulse and thermal imaging methods for the detection
 of physical defects in solar cells and Si wafers in a production environment. Solar
 Energy Materials and Solar Cells. 2004; 82(3): 467-80.

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

³²³ 324

- Carstensen J, Popkirov G, Bahr J, Foll H. CELLO: an advanced LBIC measurement technique for solar cell local characterization. Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells.
 2003; 76(4): 599-11.
- Sites JR, Nagle TJ. LBIC analysis of thin-film polycrystalline solar cells. Proceedings of 31st PVSC Photovoltaic Specialists Conference. Fort Collins; 2005: 199-04.
- Vorster FJ, Dyk EEV. High saturation solar light beam induced current scanning of solar cells. Review of Scientific Instrument. 2007; 78(4) 013904-1-8.
- Zook JD. Effects of grain boundaries in polycrystalline solar cells. Applied Physics
 Letter. 1980: 37(2), 223-26.
- Breitenstein O, Bauer J, Kittler M, Arguirov T, Seifert W. EBIC and luminescence studies
 of defects in solar cells. Scanning. 2008; 30(4): 331- 38.
- 347 10. Kveder V, Kittler M, Schröter W. Recombination activity of contaminated dislocations in
 348 silicon: A model describing electron-beam-induced current contrast behavior. Physical
 349 Review B. 2001: 63(11): 115208.
- 11. Meng L, Nagalingam D, Bhatia CS, Street AG, Phang JCH. SEAM and EBIC studies of
 morphological and electrical defects in polycrystalline silicon solar cell. Proceedings of
 IEEE International Reliability Physics Symposium: Singapore; 2010.
- Israil M, Anwar SA, Abdullah MZ. Automatic detection of micro-crack in solar wafers and
 cells: a review. Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control. 2013; 35(5):
 606-18.
- 356 13. Giesecke JA., Michl B, Schindler F, Schubert MC, Warta W. Minority carrier lifetime of
 357 silicon solar cells from quasi-steady-state photoluminescence. Solar Energy and
 358 Materials. 2011; 95(7): 1979-82.
- Trupke T, Bardos RA, Schubert MC, Warta W. Photoluminescence imaging of silicon
 wafers. Applied Physics Letters. 2006; 89(4): 0441071-3.
- 361 15. Fuyuki T, Kitiyanan A. Photographic diagnosis of crystalline silicon solar cells utilizing
 362 electroluminescence. Applied Physics A: Materials Science & Processing. 2009; 96(1):
 363 189-96.
- Bajaj J, Tennant WE, Zucca R, Irvine SJC. Spatially resolved characterization of
 HgCdTe materials and devices by scanning laser microscopy. Semiconductor Science
 and Technology. 1993; 8(6S): 872.
- 367 17. Bajaj J, Tennant WE. Remote contact LBIC imaging of defects in semiconductors. Journal of Crystal Growth. 1990; 103(1): 170-178.
- Thantsha NM, Macabebe EQB, Vorster FJ, Van Dyk EE. Opto-electronic analysis of
 silicon solar cells by LBIC investigations and current–voltage characterization. Physica
 B: Condensed Matter. 2009; 404(22): 4445-4448.
- 372 19. Mazer JA. Solar Cell: An Introduction to Crystalline Photovoltaic Technology. Boston:
 373 Kluwer Academic; 1996.
- 20. Agostinelli G, Friesen G, Merli F, Dunlop ED, Acciarri M, Racz A, Hylton J, Einhaus R,
 Lauinger T. Large area fast LBIC as a tool for inline PV module string characterization.
 Proceedings of the 17th European Photovoltaic Solar Energy Conference. 2001; Munich:
 410-413.
- 21. Leamy HJ. Charge Collection Scanning Electron Microscopy. Journal of Applied
 Physics. 1982; 53(6), R51-R80.

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.

380	22.	Sander M, Henke B, Schweizer S, Ebert M, Bagdahn J. PV module defect detection by
381		combination of mechanical and electrical analysis methods. Proceedings of 35 th PVSC
382		Photovoltaic Specialists Conference Photovoltaic Specialists Conference (PVSC). 2010;
383		Hawaii: 1765-69.
384	23.	Abbott M D, Cotter JE, Trupke T, Fisher K, Bardos RA. Application of
385		Photoluminescence to High-Efficiency Silicon Solar Cell Fabrication. Proceedings of the
386		4 th World Conference on Photovoltaic Energy Conversion. 2006; Waikoloa: 1211-1214.
387	24.	Herlufsen S, Schmidt J, Hinken D, Bothe K, Brendel R. Photo conductance-calibrated
388		photoluminescence lifetime imaging of crystalline silicon, Physica Status Solidi (RRL).
389		2008; 2(6): 245-47.
390	25.	Kingdom-tech (KT), http://www.kingdom-
391		tech.com.cn/uploadfile/download/f/1/6_1306387325.pdf, last retrieved 18 February
392		2014.
393	<mark>26.</mark>	Paggi M, Corrado M, Rodriguez MA. A multiphysics and multiscale numerical approach
394		to microcracking and power loss in photovoltaic modules. Composite Structure. 2013;
395		<mark>95: 630-38.</mark>
396	<mark>27.</mark>	Tsai DM, Shih-Chieh W, Wei-Chen L. Defect detection of solar cells in
397		electroluminescence images using Fourier image reconstruction. Solar Energy Materials
398		and Solar Cells. 2012; 99: 250-262.
399	<mark>28.</mark>	Bothe K, Pohl P, Schmidt J, Weber T, Altermatt P, Fischer B, Brendel R.
400		Electroluminescence imaging as an in-line characterization tool for solar cell production.
401		In 21st European Photovoltaic Solar Energy Conference; 2006: Dresden.
402	<mark>29.</mark>	Potthoff T, Bothe K, Eitner U, Hinken D , Köntges M. Detection of the voltage
403		distribution in photovoltaic modules by electroluminescence imaging. Progress in
404		Photovoltaics: Research and Applications. 2010; 18(2): 100-06.
405	<mark>30</mark> .	Abbott MD, Cotter JE, Chen FW, Trupke T, Bardos RA, Fisher K C. Application of
406		photoluminescence characterization to the development and manufacturing of high-
407		efficiency silicon solar cells. Journal of applied physics. 2006; 100(11): 114514.
408		
409		

*Tel.: +966 046257869; fax: +966 046255432.