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ABSTRACT Among the various organic photovoltaic devices, the conjugated polymer/fullerene approach has drawn the most research interest. The performance of these types of solar cells is greatly determined by the nanoscale morphology of the two components (donor/acceptor) and the molecular orientation/crystallinity in the photoactive layer. A vertically bicontinuous and interdigitized heterojunction between donor and acceptor has been regarded as one of the ideal structures to enable both efficient charge separation and transport. Synergistic control of polymer orientation in the nanostructured heterojunction is also critical to improve the performance of polymer solar cells. Nanoimprint lithography has emerged as a new approach to simultaneously control both the heterojunction morphology and polymer chains in organic photovoltaics. Currently, in the area of nanoimprinted polymer solar cells, much progress has been achieved in the fabrication of nanostructured morphology, control of molecular orientation/crystallinity, deposition of acceptor materials, patterned electrodes, understanding of structure–property correlations, and device performance. This review article summarizes the recent studies on nanoimprinted polymer solar cells and discusses the outstanding challenges and opportunities for future work.
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In recent years, photovoltaic (PV) technology, which harvests energy directly from sunlight, is being increasingly recognized as an essential component for future global energy production. Among existing solar cells, organic photovoltaics (OPVs) have many favorable characteristics, such as the potential of being flexible, semitransparent, and applicable to low-cost manufacturing processes such as screen-printing, inkjet, and roll-to-roll.1,2 As an important member of the OPV family, polymer solar cells draw the most research interest, due to the relatively high power conversion efficiency (PCE) achieved when compared to other types of OPVs such as small-molecule solar cells.3–5 However, compared to the high efficiencies (>10%) of inorganic solar cells, the best polymer solar cells (6–7%) still show a lower efficiency.6,7 Two critical factors limiting the performance of OPVs are the short exciton diffusion length (∼10 nm) and low mobility of charge carriers, especially the hole mobility (μh ∼ 10–6–10–3 cm2·V−1·s−1) within the photoactive layer.8–14 The bulk heterojunction (BHJ) structure has greatly improved the efficiency of polymer solar cells due to the formation of a large donor/acceptor interface, allowing for more efficient exciton dissociation.15–17 However, the active layer morphology within this structure still remains disordered and far from ideal. The discrete and randomly distributed phases cause significant charge recombination, as well as a significant amount of disorder in the polymer chains resulting in low carrier mobility.18 Further improvements of OPV performance can be achieved through new techniques which result in a more favorable active layer morphology and an increase in exciton dissociation rates as well as charge carrier transport.19

Many of the above-mentioned problems can be addressed if a vertically bicontinuous and interdigitized heterojunction nanomorphology as shown in Figure 1 can be achieved. The simulation work from Verschoor et al. has suggested that a similar morphology enabled as much as 80% internal quantum efficiency, in comparison to 15% for most BHJ blends,18 indicating a possible 5-fold improvement in PCE. Forrest et al. have observed that the external quantum efficiency of OPVs obtained by this morphology was the highest compared to other counterparts, such as bilayer or blend structures.20 The nanoscale interdigitized morphology decouples absorption depth and charge transport channels from the diffusion length, allowing for highly efficient lateral exciton diffusion and vertical charge transport with reduced recombination rates.

Despite the previously mentioned advantages of a vertically bicontinuous and interdigitized heterojunction, finding a practical means of achieving this morphology remains a fundamental challenge. Many different
methods such as polymer nanowires, nanoparticles, block copolymers, layer-by-layer deposition, nanoimprint lithography (NIL), template methods, nano-electrodes, and porous inorganic materials have been studied and reviewed to make nanostructured organic solar cells. Among them, NIL is seen as an emerging technique which can define such morphologies due to its high patterning resolution, high-throughput, and good fidelity as proven in the literature. Besides the enhanced donor/acceptor interface and exciton dissociation, it has been found that charge carrier transport in conjugated polymers can be enhanced by NIL-induced polymer chain alignment. Better light trapping within the active layer by NIL has been reported by different groups and summarized elsewhere. Improved light absorption and charge collection have been observed in devices with inorganic and organic electrodes patterned by this technique, as well. With significant progress achieved in the field, NIL has become a new and promising technique to produce highly efficient OPVs.

It is worth noting that, in previous works of nanoimprinted OPVs, there were large variations of specific fabrication methods, materials used, and processing details. For example, various donor and acceptor materials were chosen and processed differently. Moreover, various nanostructure geometries of molds have been used to fabricate imprinted OPVs, resulting in different sizes and shapes of donor/acceptor junctions which in turn affected the device performance. Due to these experimental variations, it is difficult to compare one work with another to validate the methods and underlying science. Currently, the fundamental understanding of structure–performance correlations of nanoimprinted OPVs is still quite limited. For instance, contradicting observations of polymer chain orientation and mobility enhancement in nanoimprinted poly(3-hexylthiophene) (P3HT) nanostructures have been reported by different groups, indicating that a complete understanding of chain alignment and crystallinity by nanoimprint is not yet established.

To develop a comprehensive understanding of nanoimprinted OPVs, it is important to review recent work on this type of solar cell. In this paper, we first summarize what has been achieved in the field of nanoimprinted OPVs. We review and compare different nanoimprint lithographic techniques employed to fabricate nanoimprinted OPVs in literature. Then we discuss the geometric effects of imprinted nanostructures on device performance. The effects of nanoimprint on polymer chain alignment and its influence on charge transport are reviewed. The progress on electrode patterning for polymer solar cells is introduced, as well. Finally, the current challenges and future tasks for nanoimprinted OPVs are previewed. The goal of this review is to help develop a better understanding of nanoimprinted OPVs so as to unleash the full potential of this emerging technique toward significant improvements of OPV performance.

**Fabrication. Nanoimprinted Polymer Solar Cells.** The general process flow for NIL is given in Figure 2a,b. Typically, a nanostructured mold treated with an anti-adhesion layer such as a 1H,1H,2H,2H-perfluorodecyltrichlorosilane (FDTS) monolayer is brought into contact with the polymer to be imprinted. Under a certain applied pressure and temperature, the polymer in the viscous state flows into the cavities of the mold and forms nanostructures. For nanoimprinted polymer solar cells, this temperature is important and usually set to be ~50 °C higher than the polymer’s glass transition temperature (T_g), which changes the polymer from a rigid solid state into a viscous state and helps its flowing during imprinting. Before demolding, the system is cooled down while maintaining the applied pressure in order to prevent polymer reflow. Finally, the mold is released from the sample, and polymer nanostructures with negative replication of the mold are formed. Figure 2c,d shows the scanning electron microscopic (SEM) images of a Si nanograting mold.
and imprinted P3HT nanogratings. It can be seen that the nanostructures on Si mold are transferred into P3HT film with excellent fidelity.

For the nanoimprinted solar cells to obtain high performance, the complete infiltration of acceptor materials into the nanostructured donor polymer layer is critical in order to form an intimate and large interfacial area junction for efficient exciton dissociation, charge separation, and collection. To date, three typical acceptor deposition methods are widely used in literature: (a) spin-coating,34,35 (b) physical vapor deposition,36,37 and (c) double nanoimprint or lamination.38,39 The choice of which method to use is primarily based on the properties of donor and acceptor materials within the device.

In order to use spin-coating to deposit acceptor materials onto imprinted donor nanostructures, two main requirements must be satisfied: (a) the solvent used for the acceptor solution needs to be orthogonal; that is, it only dissolves the acceptor material but not the donor, otherwise the nanostructure formed by NIL can be dissolved or damaged; (b) the solvent must wet the donor materials so that the acceptor material can spread uniformly over and into the nanostructures. With the efforts of many groups, some proper solvents have been developed to spin-coat specific acceptors onto the imprinted donor materials. For example, dichloromethane (DCM) has been demonstrated as a proper solvent for spin-coating [6,6]-phenyl-C61-butyric acid methyl ester (PCBM) onto the nanoimprinted P3HT structures to form P3HT/PCBM OPVs.34,40

As shown in Figure 3a1,a2, Aryal et al. have demonstrated that DCM was a suitable solvent to spin-coat PCBM while allowing for complete infiltration of PCBM into P3HT nanogratings.38 The complete filling of PCBM into P3HT nanostructures using DCM as a solvent has also been shown by Wiedemann et al., where they employed grazing-incidence small-angle X-ray scattering (GISAXS) to characterize the PCBM coverage into P3HT nanostructures.35 However, Avnon et al. have observed that DCM could slightly dissolve P3HT and decrease the height (∼10%) of imprinted P3HT nanostructures.41 To understand these contradicting observations, we studied the solubility of P3HT in DCM with different molecular weights (MW) and found that DCM dissolves low MW ($M_n \sim 13$K), partially dissolves medium MW ($M_n \sim 20$K), but does not dissolve high MW ($M_n \sim 25$K) P3HT. Therefore, high MW P3HT is desirable for spin-coating with DCM and can be obtained by extraction methods such as soxhlet extraction. Besides DCM for PCBM spin-coating, Sellinger et al. employed 2-butanone as solvent for 4,7-bis(2-(1-ethylhexyl-4,5-dicyanoimidazol-2-yl)vinyl)benzo[c]1,2,5-thiadiazole (EV-BT) to successfully fabricate nanoimprinted P3HT/EV-BT solar cells.42

Spin-coating has been proven as an effective, simple, and low-cost process to fill acceptor materials into imprinted donor materials. However, for some acceptors which have very low solubility in common solvents, or for which orthogonal solvents cannot be found, spin-coating is not feasible. In many cases, finding orthogonal solvents can be challenging because good donor and acceptor materials for organic solar cells are originally designed and synthesized to show similar solving behavior so that a bulk heterojunction structure can be realized. To overcome the drawbacks of spin-coating, physical vapor deposition (PVD) can be used as an alternative method to deposit acceptor materials in nanoimprinted solar cells. As the
most popular method in PVD, thermal evaporation is widely used in OPV fabrication. The challenge of complete filling of acceptors into donor nanostructures with this method arises from the poor step coverage (little coating on the sidewalls), especially when donor nanostructures have a high aspect ratio. An oblique angle deposition is employed to overcome this problem.43 In Figure 3b1,b2, it is shown that using oblique angle thermal evaporation of C60 into P3HT nanogratings from both sides separately can result in complete C60 filling into P3HT nanogratings.37 To improve acceptor coverage into imprinted nanostructures, instead of thermal evaporation, gas-transport-based organic vapor phase deposition was employed by Heremans et al.36 as a more isotropic deposition method to deposit N,N0-ditridecyl-3,4,9,10-perylenetetracarboxylic diimide (PTCDI-C13) into P3HT trenches.36 Complete coverage of PTCDI-C13 onto P3HT was achieved by this method. Despite these achievements mentioned above, some limitations exist for the fabrication of imprinted OPVs using this method. For example, typically a high vacuum is required for PVD, making this method more costly and slower. In addition, PVD is difficult to realize for materials which do not have the required vapor pressure for evaporation, such as conjugated polymer acceptors.

Recently, there has been a third method to fabricate nanoimprinted OPVs using lamination reported by He et al.38,39 In their first work, with solvent vapor-assisted nanoimprint, P3HT was initially patterned by a Si mold under room temperature, and the patterned nanostructures were used as mold to imprint the acceptor poly((9,9-diocytfluorene)-2,7-diyl-alt-[4,7-bis(3-hexyl-thien-5-yl)-2,1,3-benzothiadiazole]-2,2'-diyl) (F8TBT).38 Therefore, one of the requirements for this lamination technique is that the first imprinted polymer be mechanically strong. Figure 3c1,c2 shows images of 25 nm nanodots in P3HT imprinted by Si mold and holes in F8TBT imprinted by P3HT nanodots. This solvent-assisted double imprinting technique provides a low-cost way to make nanoimprinted OPVs with donors and acceptors having an intimate contact with one another. Double nanoimprinted P3HT:PCBM and F8TBT/PCBM solar cells using this lamination technique have also been reported in their later work, demonstrating this technique's wide application.39

Nanoimprinted Blend Solar Cells. In literature, most nanoimprinted OPVs have architectures where fullerene acceptors were infiltrated into nanoimprinted polymer nanostructures. However, some studies have shown that NIL could also be used to pattern the blended active layer in polymer solar cells directly to improve the device performance. The improvement is attributed to increased active layer roughness by NIL, causing light scattering at the interface between active layer and metal electrode to be enhanced, and thus leading to increased light absorption and photocurrent.44,45 Device performance can also be improved because hydrostatic pressure during imprinting increases the crystallinity and mobility of organic semiconductors by decreasing the intermolecular spacing.46,47 In the work from Li et al., a ~50% increase in PCE was observed in nanoimprinted P3HT:PCBM BHJ solar cells.48 Figure 3d1,d2 shows the atomic force microscopic (AFM) images of blended P3HT:PCBM solar cells before and after patterning; a clear increase in roughness by NIL can be observed. The enhanced light-trapping ability was responsible for a higher short circuit current (Jsc). The largest improvement in device performance was an increase in fill factor (FF) attributed to nanoimprint-induced molecular ordering of the P3HT, which was qualitatively verified by their Raman study on the effects of pressure on the P3HT:PCBM active layer.
The positive effect of nanoimprint lithography on blended P3HT:PCBM solar cells was also reported by Lee et al. In their work, the P3HT:PCBM blended solar cells were imprinted by an anodic aluminum oxide (AAO) mold, which could be used as a cost-effective and simple method for mold fabrication. Patterned devices showed a 25% increase in PCE. The increase was mainly due to an improved $J_{sc}$ and attributed to increased utilization as a result of scattering as verified by their reflectance study and an improved crystalline ordering of the P3HT domain as confirmed by their grazing-incidence X-ray diffraction (GIXRD) study.

**Geometric Effect.** Increases in the donor/acceptor interfacial area by NIL can be quantified by the interface enhancement factor (IEF); its value is determined by the nanostructure’s specific geometries. For instance, for nanogratings with height $h$, width $w$, and spacing $p$, IEF can be expressed as eq 1, while for nanopillars with pitch $d$, radius $r$, and height $h$, IEF can be calculated approximately by eq 2:\[\text{IEF} = 1 + \frac{2h}{w + p}\] (1)
\[\text{IEF} = \frac{(2\pi rh + d^2)}{d^2}\] (2)

Theoretically, the donor/acceptor interfacial area increase in imprinted devices compared to a planar interface (i.e., IEF) is determined by the aspect ratio and density of nanostructures. Therefore, to improve the exciton dissociation, nanostructures with a higher IEF are desired. Through simulation, Wiedenmann et al. found that the $J_{sc}$ for nanoimprinted P3HT:PCBM solar cells were proportional to the interfacial area between P3HT and PCBM. Kim et al. found that, besides width/spacing, the thickness of imprinted nanostructures was also important and needed to be optimized according to the photon mean free path. They concluded that, in the optimum design, the nanostructure size and spacing must be 2–3 times smaller than the exciton mean diffusion length and the active layer thickness should be greater than 50% of the photon mean free path for sufficient light absorption. Besides these simulation studies, a great deal of experimental work has been carried out to study the geometric effect of nanostructures on OPV performance, as summarized in Table 1. The first experimental study on the geometric effects was reported from Kim et al. In their work, two different molds with the same height (200 nm) but different periods (510 and 700 nm) resulting in different IEFs were used to imprint the thermally deprotectable polythiophene derivative (TDPTD) donor layer to fabricate nanoimprinted TDPTD/PCBM solar cells. They found that, as the donor/acceptor interfacial area increased, the $J_{sc}$ increased. Also in the work from Cheyns et al., the positive effect of nanostructures with large IEFs was observed from nanoimprinted P3HT/PTCDI-C13 solar cell. Recently, He et al. systemically studied the geometric effect of nanostructures on imprinted P3HT/F8TBT solar cell performance by using molds of different sizes. Both external quantum efficiency (EQE) and $J_{sc}$ increased with $A/A_0$ ($A$, interfacial area of imprinted layer; $A_0$, interfacial area of initial nonimprinted layer). Also these parameters increased with the decrease of nanostructure width. The smallest feature they made (height $h$ was fixed at 75–80 nm, but width $w$ and spacing $p$ were decreased to 25 nm) yielded the best performance. In their later work, they found the same trends for F8TBT/PCBM and P3HT/PCBM solar cells made by this double imprint technique. Of particular interest is that the highest PCE achieved in P3HT/PCBM solar cells was up to 3.25% when the smallest feature was used, and this is the highest reported efficiency for imprinted P3HT/PCBM solar cells to date.

**Effects on Chain Alignment and Charge Transport.** For organic solar cells, it is fundamentally important to achieve control of favorable molecular orientation and crystallinity for efficient charge transport. Not only is the overall crystallinity of the conjugated polymers important, but the conductivity in each direction is equally critical in determining charge transport. For example, the charge carrier mobility in P3HT is inversely proportional to the charge carrier’s hopping distance. Therefore, the hole mobility is higher ($\sim 0.1 \text{cm}^2 \cdot \text{V}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) along the $\pi-\pi$ stacking and backbone directions, with relatively short hopping distance $b$ ($\sim 0.38$ nm) and $c$ ($\sim 0.38$ nm), than along the hexyl side chain direction ($10^{-10} \text{cm}^2 \cdot \text{V}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$), with long hopping distance $a$ ($\sim 1.69$ nm), as shown in Figure 4a.

In most P3HT-based OPVs, where the active layer is vertically sandwiched between anode and cathode, it is preferable for P3HT chain alignment to be perpendicular to the substrate, that is, in face-on or vertical orientations. Annealing the device at temperatures higher than the $T_g$ of P3HT has been shown to allow the polymer chains to reorient in a more thermodynamically favorable way and increase its crystallinity. However, it is evident that, under annealing, P3HT thin films tend to be aligned parallel to the substrate, that is, in edge-on orientation, and thus limit the vertical conductivity.

Recently, NIL has proven to be an effective way to crystallize polymers such as polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) and poly(9,9-diocetylfluorene-co-benzothiadiazole) (F8BT) with controlled orientations. For P3HT, this NIL-induced polymer chain ordering has been confirmed by different groups. For example, Cui et al. used polarizing microscopy to characterize P3HT thin films and found that there were obvious differences in optical birefringence in imprinted P3HT grating images, as compared to nonimprinted areas that underwent the same thermal treatment. This indicated a preferred chain orientation in patterned P3HT thin...
films, which was confirmed by X-ray diffraction (XRD) study.\textsuperscript{27} To further study this chain alignment by nanoimprint confinement, we performed both out-of-plane and in-plane grazing-incidence XRD (GIXRD) on imprinted P3HT nanogratings and nanopillars.\textsuperscript{32} It was shown that a vertical chain alignment in P3HT can be achieved in imprinted P3HT nanostructures compared to the edge-on orientation in nonimprinted films. It was believed that this chain alignment was due to thermal dynamical vertical flow of polymers in the nanocavities and the interaction between the hydrophobic side chains of P3HT and the hydrophobic surface of the mold (treated with hydrophobic FDTS).\textsuperscript{62} Recently, the NIL-induced chain alignment in P3HT nanostructures was also studied by Hlaing et al.\textsuperscript{33} However, instead of observing vertical alignment, their work found a face-on orientation in P3HT nanogratings. To understand these contradicting studies and also general molecular orientation of nanoimprinted nanostructures, it is important to understand how polymers flow into the mold cavities during NIL. Many studies have shown that the polymer flow during NIL can be strongly affected by the geometries of the mold cavity such as widths, heights, and residual layer thicknesses, which may result in different polymer chain orientations. For instance, the effect of nanostructure width on P3HT chain alignment has been systematically studied by McGehee et al.\textsuperscript{67} In their study, P3HT nanopillars with the same height (\(\sim 300 \text{ nm}\)) but different widths (20–120 nm) were made by filling the polymer into anodic alumina film with different pore diameters. They found that the ratio of out-of-plane (\(\alpha_i\)) to in-plane (\(\alpha_{ij}\)) absorption coefficients, \(\alpha_i/\alpha_{ij}\), increased with a decrease of P3HT nanopillar width, indicating that the polymer chains were more oriented in the vertical direction within narrow P3HT nanopillars.

### TABLE 1. Performance Summary of Photovoltaic Devices with Different Geometries (width w, spacing p and height h) in Literature\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reference</th>
<th>donor/acceptor</th>
<th>structure</th>
<th>feature size width (nm)</th>
<th>dimension notes</th>
<th>(V_{oc} (V))</th>
<th>(J_{sc} (mA/cm^2))</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>PCE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52 TDPTD/PCBM</td>
<td>planar</td>
<td>520/180 w/p, h=200 nm</td>
<td>0.78 0.58 0.34 0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36 P3HT/PC6D-C13</td>
<td>planar</td>
<td>70/70 w/p/h</td>
<td>0.50 0.45 0.53 0.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38 P3HT/F8TBT</td>
<td>planar</td>
<td>N/A 1.06 0.94 0.39 0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 F8TBT/PCBM</td>
<td>planar</td>
<td>50/50 w/p, h=80 nm</td>
<td>0.62 0.53 1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PC6B</td>
<td>planar</td>
<td>N/A 0.62 0.49 1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>blend</td>
<td>N/A 0.65 0.59 3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>blend (air)</td>
<td>N/A 0.63 0.59 3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>nanograting</td>
<td>520/180 w/p, h=200 nm</td>
<td>0.78 0.47 0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>2D dot array</td>
<td>200 w=p, h=80 nm</td>
<td>0.94 0.39 1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>2D dot array</td>
<td>200 w=p, h=80 nm</td>
<td>0.94 0.39 1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 P3HT/PCBM</td>
<td>2D dot array</td>
<td>200 w=p, h=80 nm</td>
<td>0.94 0.39 1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Table reprinted with permission from the references as indicated. Copyright 2008 IOPscience (ref 36). Copyright 2010 American Chemical Society (ref 38). Copyright 2011 John Wiley and Sons (ref 39). Copyright 2007 American Institute of Physics (ref 52).
Figure 4. (a) Schematic of edge-on, face-on, and vertical orientation of P3HT chains on substrate. (b) Cross-sectional SEM image of SU-8 gratings with “rippling” patterns formed by partially curing SU-8 with UV light on purpose before the nanoimprint. (c) SEM images of imprinted P3HT nanostructures with different geometries and schematic of their effects on chain alignment/orientations: (c1) dominant vertical chain alignment in 200 nm height and 20 nm residual layer and (c2) the dominant parallel chain alignment in 50 nm height and 75 nm residual layer P3HT nanograting. (Height and residual layer thickness are calculated from ref 33.) Images (a, c1) reprinted from ref 32. Copyright 2009 American Chemical Society. Image (b) reprinted with permission from ref 68. Copyright 2007 American Institute of Physics. Image (c2) reprinted from ref 33. Copyright 2011 American Chemical Society.

They believed that the reason for the preferred vertical alignment in narrow nanostructures was that, when the polymer flowed into the nanopores, the rod-like polymer chains were too rigid to lie horizontally within the narrow pores. Our previous work on polymer flow characterization demonstrated the movement of SU-8 polymers into mold cavities during imprint, which was visualized by partially UV curing the SU-8 before imprint.68 As shown in Figure 4b, the rippling patterns of SU-8 that were formed during NIL indicate how a linear polymer would align in the imprinted structure: parallel within the residual layer of SU-8, tilted on the corner between nanostructures and residual layer, and vertical when flowing into the cavity. Here we apply these general polymer flow behaviors during NIL to analyze the previously reported chain alignment in imprinted P3HT nanostructures.32,33 It is reasonable to speculate that the ratio of each orientation (vertical and parallel) in the P3HT nanostructure is dependent on the height and/or aspect ratio of nanostructures, that is, more vertical alignment than parallel alignment in higher nanostructures. In addition, the XRD results also reveal the chain alignment within the residual layer, which is most likely parallel in the film (i.e., edge-on or face-on) if it is not negligible compared to the height of nanostructures. Therefore, the residual layer thickness can affect the XRD results and the conclusion of chain orientation. Huck et al. have shown that, for the conjugated polymer F8BT, the NIL-induced ordering started from the surface of the mold and progressively vanished as it goes further into the residual film.26,64 Hu et al. have shown that for polymers like PVDF a full chain alignment within the patterned nanostructures could only happen at full confinement, that is, no residual layer beneath the nanostructures.63,66

On the basis of the above-mentioned literature studies of NIL-induced chain alignment and the fundamental studies of polymer flow in NIL, it appears that the molecular orientation induced by NIL can be greatly affected by the geometry of nanostructures, including width, height, aspect ratio, residual layer thickness, and molecular weight of polymer.

To explain the contradiction between the results of our work and those of Ocko’s group, we provide two examples based on findings observed in literature. As shown in Figure 4c1, the first example consists of imprinted P3HT nanostructures having large height but small width or high aspect ratio, similar to our work (in which P3HT nanogratings having width \( w = 65 \text{ nm} \), height \( h = 200 \text{ nm} \), and residual layer thickness \( r = 20 \text{ nm} \) were characterized). The second example, as shown in Figure 4c2, is similar to that from Ocko et al., where they studied P3HT nanostructures with comparable width \( w = 60–70 \text{ nm} \) (measured from figure in literature), yet small height \( h = 50 \text{ nm} \) and large residual layer thickness \( r > 50 \text{ nm} \) (calculated from literature). It can be seen that the vertical orientation is likely dominant in our imprinted nanostructures because P3HT molecules fully flow into the deep mold cavity. Additionally, due to the thin residual layer in our work, the observed XRD signal is mainly from the imprinted nanostructure. Recently, we have reconfirmed these measurements, showing the presence of vertical alignment and absence of the face-on orientation (results not shown). In the work of Ocko et al., it is likely that P3HT molecules were only partially aligned due to the limited movement within the shallow mold cavity, making the face-on orientation
The thick residual layer might contribute to the total XRD signal, as well, resulting in a conclusion of face-on orientation. It is worth noting that all of these statements are based on results reported in literature and our speculation. To confirm our statements experimentally, we are currently investigating such effects by systematically studying chain orientations for P3HT nanostructures with varied widths, heights, residue thicknesses, and molecular weights.

The importance of understanding and controlling polymer orientation in nanostructures stems from the strong effects of molecular ordering on carrier mobility in the direction of photocurrent flow. The effect of this nanoimprint-induced chain alignment on $\mu_n$ in P3HT has been confirmed by previous work in nanoimprinted P3HT-based organic field effect transistors (OFETs)\textsuperscript{27,28}. Field effect transistors were fabricated using these nanogratings, and device measurements showed a 60-fold hole mobility enhancement, as compared to that of nonimprinted thin film transistors.\textsuperscript{28} Cui et al. also found a 12-fold increase in $\mu_n$ from P3HT nanogratings compared to thin films, indicating the positive effect of NIL on charge carrier transport in P3HT.\textsuperscript{27} It is worth noting that they used large period gratings and observed that the mobility in the direction perpendicular to the gratings was higher than that parallel to them, which was contradictory to our results.\textsuperscript{28} These different observations again indicate the potential geometric dependence of chain alignment and orientations. To further confirm this NIL-induced mobility increase in OPVs, it would be necessary to directly measure the vertical $\mu_n$.

**Nanoimprinted Electrode.** In addition to active layer patterning to improve exciton dissociation and charge transport, NIL can also be used to pattern electrodes for OPVs in order to improve light transmission and charge collection. Nanoimprinted polymeric electrodes such as poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene) (PEDOT) is of interest due to its high transparency, conductivity, and favorable work function. In the work from Pang et al., to overcome the nonthermoplastic property of PEDOT, plasticizer glycerol was used to assist with nanoimprint at low temperature and pressure.\textsuperscript{69,70} Guo et al. demonstrated a transfer imprint of PEDOT using a poly(dimethylsiloxane) (PDMS) mold followed by sequential inking and stamping steps.\textsuperscript{71} The driving currents of the pentacene organic thin film transistors (OTFTs) with the patterned PEDOT contacts were greatly increased due to the high channel width-to-length ratio. This technique was also extended to the fabrication of a poly[2-methoxy-5-(2-ethylhexyloxy)-1,4-phenylene vinylene] (MEH-PPV) polymer light-emitting diode (PLED) using a roll-to-roll PEDOT imprint process. Nanoimprinted poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene):poly(styrenesulfonate) (PEDOT:PSS), the water-soluble polymer mixture of PEDOT and PSS, is also of particular interest due to more convenient processing parameters for organic electronics. This work was first reported by Silva et al.\textsuperscript{72} Their work demonstrated the feasibility of PEDOT:PSS patterning using NIL, and a 30% relative increase in PCE could be achieved in blended P3HT:PCBM solar cells with imprinted PEDOT:PSS nanogratings when compared to nonimprinted devices. It is worth noting that PEDOT:PSS nanogratings with extremely low aspect ratio (AR) ($\sim 10^{-2}$) were made and used in their work. To further increase the device performance, PEDOT:PSS nanostructures with a higher AR are desired. However, this goal is difficult to achieve due to the low cohesion of PEDOT:PSS molecules, which makes imprinted nanostructures easy to destroy during demolding.\textsuperscript{73} To overcome this challenge, we developed a dehydration-assisted nanoimprint process to enhance the cohesion of PEDOT:PSS molecules and make high AR nanostructures.\textsuperscript{31} The result of dehydration-assisted NIL is shown in Figure 5a. It can be seen that, after dehydration, high patterning fidelity and high-quality PEDOT:PSS nanostructures were possible due to the enhanced cohesion. Large-scale PEDOT:PSS nanogratings (2 x 2 cm$^2$) with height $h$ = 60 nm, width $w$ = 70 nm, and spacing $p$ = 70 nm have been duplicated from a Si mold, resulting in an AR of 0.86 ($h/w = 0.86$).

Not only can the polymer electrode be patterned by NIL to improve solar cell performance, but many inorganic electrode materials can also be improved by this technique. Nanostructured metal oxide semiconductors for OPVs, such as ZnO and TiO$_2$, processed using NIL, have been reported in literature.\textsuperscript{74–78} As shown in Figure 5b, McGeehe et al. fabricated TiO$_2$ nanostructures by NIL and found that P3HT-TiO$_2$ solar cells with patterned TiO$_2$ showed a 2-fold increase in $J_{sc}$ and PCE over nonimprinted devices.\textsuperscript{75} The improved efficiency was attributed to the enhanced charge separation and collection caused by increasing the interfacial area between TiO$_2$ and P3HT. Kang et al. showed that inexpensive metal materials could demonstrate similar performance as an anode when compared with ITO for organic solar cells.\textsuperscript{30} In their work, they used NIL to fabricate metal-wire electrodes on Au, Cu, and Ag. Figure 5c shows the SEM image of a Cu wire electrode made using this technique. Similar optical transmission compared to conventional ITO electrodes was realized in the visible range while maintaining high electrical conductivity. With geometric optimization, blended P3HT:PCBM solar cells containing nanopatterned metal electrodes gave similar PCE to those with high-quality ITO electrodes. In their following work, they showed that a flexible transparent Cu nanowire mesh electrode could be fabricated by simple transfer printing from a PDMS mold, and an OPV using this flexible electrode gave comparable PCE to one using an ITO electrode.\textsuperscript{79} Their work also demonstrated that the PCE of OPVs can be increased by 35% using a transparent plasmonic Ag.
nanowire electrode, despite the polarization dependence of the nanowire electrode and its lower transmittance than that of commercially available ITO-coated glass. Very recently, they fabricated photonic color filters using periodic Au nanogratings. To harvest the light absorbed by these photonic color filters and avoid solar energy waste, P3HT:PCBM solar cells were built on these filters which also function as an anode. These dual-function devices might find applications in colored decorative OPVs. In addition to this work on nanoimprinted metal electrodes, Lee et al. have demonstrated that the light transmission of indium tin oxide (ITO) could be increased by forming periodic ITO dot patterns on the ITO glass, as shown in Figure 5d. In their work, a PDMS mold was used to pattern the ITO nanoparticle solution, directly forming periodic nano-dots. ITO glass with the patterned ITO layer showed a 5% increase in transmission at 485 nm compared to that of ordinary ITO glass.

Challenges and Future Tasks. To date, much progress has been achieved in nanoimprinted polymer solar cells. However, there are still many challenges existing in this field. To further widen the application of NIL in OPVs, three important factors, including the process window, cost and throughput, and efficiency, need to be considered.

Process Window for New Materials. The first challenge comes from the unknown process window, that is, the question of whether NIL can be applied to new conjugated materials which give higher efficiency than P3HT. To date, most work on nanoimprinted OPVs has been focused on P3HT, due to its convenience for nanoimprint patterning, high PCE when combined with PCBM in BHJ architecture (4–5%), and commercial availability. However, many groups have reported much higher efficiencies by using new conjugated polymers. For example, Heeger et al. showed that an efficiency up to 6.1% could be obtained by using poly[N′-900-heptadecanyl-2,7-carbazole-alt-5,5-(4′,7′-di-2-thienyl-2′,1′,3′-benzothiadiazole)] (PCDTBT) in bulk heterojunction composites with the fullerene derivative [6,6]-phenyl-C70-butyric acid methyl ester (PC70BM). Later, 7.4% PCE was announced by Yu et al. using a bulk heterojunction composed of a polymer of thieno[3,4-b]thiophene and benzodithiophene (PTB) family PTB7 and PC71BM. So far, no work has been reported showing the effect of NIL on these champion polymers. If NIL is to become a useful technique for the organic solar cell industry in the future, the feasibility of using NIL to improve the device performance of these new polymers needs to be addressed.

Cost and Throughput. For any nanofabrication process, maintaining both low-cost and high-throughput is always desired. Therefore, it is critical for nanoimprinted OPVs to simplify fabrication, lower costs, and increase throughput. Although many people have demonstrated that the PCE of polymer solar cells can be improved by NIL, the required fabrication procedures are more complicated and thus more costly than the most common blended BHJ solar cells. For example, e-beam lithography is the most widely used technique to fabricate molds with nanoscale sizes, but due to the complicated and long fabrication procedures, it is extremely expensive to make molds with large feature areas. Fabrication of molds with...
small feature sizes and large area, while keeping a low cost, will need to rely on other simpler techniques; much progress in this area has been reported.\textsuperscript{34,41,49,85–87} For example, we have developed a robust but low-cost method to make Si molds over 4 in. by inductively coupled plasma etching using freestanding anodic alumina membranes (AAMs) as an etch mask.\textsuperscript{34} Another example is large-area, high AR, sub-20 nm SiO\textsubscript{2} nanopillar and nanohole molds made by Guo et al., as shown in Figure 6a,b.\textsuperscript{86} In their work, SiO\textsubscript{2} molds were fabricated through the transfer of nanopatterns of the block copolymer poly(styrene)-block-poly(methyl methacrylate) (PS-b-PMMA) onto an SiO\textsubscript{2} layer. P3HT nanopillars and nanoholes with 15 nm diameters were realized using these molds; this size is, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, the smallest ever reported. Their work has demonstrated the possibility of achieving the ideal OPV structure, that is, precise phase separation at the scale of exciton diffusion length (\textasciitilde 10 nm). Besides the fabrication of molds at lower cost, nanoimprint at lower temperatures and pressures is also desired. Much progress on low temperature and pressure NIL has been reported from different groups.\textsuperscript{88–97} For example, as shown in Figure 7(a–d), Ahn et al. have demonstrated their work on R2R and roll-to-plate (R2P) NIL.\textsuperscript{94} In their work, large-area (4 in. wide) imprinted epoxysilicone nanogratings with 300 nm line width gratings on both hard substrate glass and flexible substrate PET have been realized by developing a apparatus capable of both R2R and R2P NIL processes. Polymer solar cells made by roller printing have also been realized by different groups.\textsuperscript{98–102} However, to date, no one has reported nanoimprinted polymer solar cells made using this roll-to-roll method. Multidisciplinary collaborations are required to realize this high-throughput fabrication.

**Efficiency.** The third challenge is how to further improve the performance of nanoimprinted polymer solar cells. In literature, people have shown that devices made by this technique give higher efficiencies than bilayer structures, but the highest efficiencies using the same donor and acceptor materials are still lower than the best reported performance using the BHJ structure. One important reason could be that the sizes of imprinted nanostructures in literature are still larger than the exciton diffusion length, and the thicknesses are shorter than the photon mean free path. However, technically fabricating a polymer nanostructure with high aspect ratio and small width can be challenging. For example, as shown in Figure 8a, Tao et al. demonstrated that, during demolding, the
Figure 7. Photograph of (a) R2R/R2P NIL apparatus, (b) 4 in. wide and 12 in. long 700 nm period epoxysilicone pattern on flexible PET substrate by R2R NIL process, and (c) 4 in. wide and 10.5 in. long 700 nm period grating pattern on glass substrate. (d) SEM images of the patterned grating structure. Images reprinted from ref 94. Copyright 2009 American Chemical Society.

Figure 8. Summary of polymer geometric effects: (a) cohesion energy of SU-8 pillars and their adhesion with the mold as a function of the aspect ratio of the nanopillars; (b) relation between defect yield of transfer imprinted P3HT nanostructures and their aspect ratios; (c) $T_g$ as a function of film thickness for polystyrene. Images reprinted with permission from the references as indicated: (a) ref 103. Copyright 2010 IOPscience; (b) ref 104. Copyright 2011 Japan Science and Technology Information Aggregator, Electronic; (c) ref 105. Copyright 1994 EDP Sciences.
imprinted polymer nanostructure, such as SU-8, could be destroyed more readily as the aspect ratio increases, making the adhesion between mold and polymer higher than the polymer cohesion.$^{103}$ By studying the relationship between the defect yield of transfer imprinted P3HT nanogratings and their aspect ratios, Hirai et al. found that the AR needed to be limited to below 3 if complete P3HT nanogratings were desired, and that nanostructures were narrowly transferred when the aspect ratio went to 8.5, as shown in Figure 8b.$^{104}$ In addition to the challenge of achieving high aspect ratios, it may also be difficult to maintain good mechanical strength when the imprinted conjugated polymer nanostructure’s size decreases close to the exciton diffusion lengths (i.e., below 10 nm). Keddie et al. have shown that the $T_g$ for polymers such as polystyrene could drop greatly, from 375 to 340 K, when its thickness decreased to $\sim$10 nm, as shown in Figure 8c.$^{105}$ Besides these technical limitations, note that the optimal height of imprinted polymer nanostructures is determined by light interference and charge mobility, as well.$^{106}$ As demonstrated in literature, the chain alignment in imprinted conjugated polymers can improve hole mobility, which allows for a higher nanostructure. However, it is noted that there is a size limit for NIL-induced chain alignment in conjugated polymers. For example, Hu et al. have found that the NIL-induced chain alignment in PVDF was nonuniform and more present close to the mold trench walls,$^{66}$ as shown in Figure 9a,b. Taking into account these findings, it is reasonable to conclude that there must be a practical maximum IEF and minimum nanostucture width for each conjugated polymer used for OPVs. Further studies are required with respect to these factors.

Like bilayer polymer solar cells, nanoimprinted polymer solar cells are typically made through the deposition of one material onto the second, making these two layers’ electrical properties relatively independent. It is thus reasonable to speculate that the challenges occurring at the donor/acceptor interface in bilayer structures exist in imprinted devices, as well. For example, a critical factor limiting the PCE of bilayer polymer solar cells is the mismatch between hole and electron mobilities. In BHJ structures, the charge carrier mobilities are more balanced due to the interaction between polymer and fullerenes.$^{60,107}$ However, in bilayer solar cells, where $\mu_h$ is typically 2 to 3 orders of magnitude lower than electron mobility ($\mu_e$), the hole accumulation at the anode results in space–charge limited current.$^{108}$ The photocurrent has a square-root dependence on bias, and thus a FF above 40% is difficult to achieve.$^{109}$ If $\mu_h$ and $\mu_e$ could be balanced, as demonstrated by Schwartz et al. in their bilayer P3HT/PCBM solar cells, FF and PCE up to 63 and 3.5%, respectively, could be achieved. This strongly demonstrates the effects of mobility balance on device performance.$^{40}$ One approach to balance the charge mobility for nanoimprinted OPVs is NIL-induced chain alignment as discussed previously. Zhou et al. have shown that the field effect $\mu_h$ in P3HT nanogratings could be increased to $\sim 3 \times 10^{-2}$ cm$^2$-V$^{-1}$-s$^{-1}$, which is comparable to $\mu_e$ reported in literature.$^{28}$

Besides the issue of mobility mismatch, the donor/acceptor interface of nanoimprinted polymer solar cells need to be studied carefully, as well. Theoretically, a sharp interface between the donor and acceptor is needed for efficient charge separation. However, people have found that there are a large number of grain boundaries, defects, and interface trap states at the pristine polymer and fullerene bilayer interface, which decrease the device performance.$^{110}$ In bilayer devices, postannealing can be applied to solve this problem, by causing the diffusion of the two materials into one another, forming a more intimate donor/acceptor interface.$^{110-114}$ When applied to nanoimprinted solar cells, one concern might be that the imprinted nanostructures can melt at high annealing temperature and decrease performance. However, it has been shown that postannealing did improve the PCE of nanoimprinted solar cells, similarly to the bilayer structure, even after high temperature treatment.$^{28,37}$ A possible
answer to this phenomenon might be that, in these studies, the widths of imprinted nanostructures were larger than the exciton diffusion length. Postannealing made the imprinted polymer nanostructure and fullerene diffuse into one another, forming even better phase separation at scales closer to the exciton diffusion length. Hlaing et al. have shown that the NIL-induced P3HT chain alignment could be maintained when the imprinted nanostructures were melted at a high annealing temperature.33 These findings prove that postannealing can be an effective way to improve the interface of imprinted polymer/fullerene solar cells without any changes in chain orientation. Despite these findings, it is worth noting that annealing can have an opposite effect, that is, decrease the PCE of bilayer polymer solar cells in some cases, depending on each material’s specific properties. For example, McNeill et al. have proven that annealing decreases the performance of polyfluorene copolymers poly(9,9-diocetylfluorene-co-bis(N,N′-(4,4-butyphenyl))bis(N,N′-phenyl-1,4-phenylene) diamine) (PFB) and F8BT solar cells because it decreased the hole and electron mobilities and increased disorder at the PFB/F8BT interface, resulting in low exciton dissociation.115 These findings suggest that alternative ways need to be developed to improve the donor/acceptor interface when annealing does not apply, and each material combination should be carefully studied.

CONCLUSIONS

Recent progress from nanoimprinted polymer solar cells has made NIL a new and promising technique by which the active layer morphology can be greatly controlled and optimized. Simultaneous control of both efficient exciton dissociation and charge transport, which are regarded as two important factors limiting the performance of organic solar cells, becomes realistic using this technique. Various fabrication methods have been developed to make nanoimprinted polymer solar cells. One approach to further improve the efficiency of nanoimprinted solar cells is to optimize the geometry of nanostructures formed by NIL to maximize the exciton dissociation rate; the feasibility of this method has been proven by several studies from different groups. In addition, it has been found that a more favorable chain alignment, which can assist hole transport in conjugated polymers, can be realized when polymer thin films are patterned using a hydrophobic Si mold. Some preliminary studies have observed that hole mobility can be enhanced in nanoimprinted P3HT. NIL-introduced electrode patterning also provides an alternative approach to improve the PCE of polymer solar cells. To integrate NIL into the future OPV industry, advancements in nanoimprinted OPVs need to include testing the process window of NIL on different conjugated polymers, increasing the throughput of this technique at low cost and further improving the PCE of this type of solar cell.
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