## **Supporting Information**

Lead (Pb) Management in the Entire Life Cycle of Highly Efficient and

Stable Perovskite Solar Cells

Kai Liu<sup>a</sup>, Tianxiang Hu<sup>a</sup>, Zenghua Cai<sup>b</sup>, Fengcai Liu<sup>a</sup>, Saqib Rafique<sup>c</sup>, Xiaoguo Li<sup>a</sup>, Liangliang Deng<sup>a</sup>, Chongyuan Li<sup>a</sup>, Yanyan Wang<sup>a</sup>, Qiang Guo<sup>a</sup>, Xiaofei Yue<sup>a</sup>, Jiao Wang<sup>a</sup>, Yingguo Yang<sup>d</sup>, Chunxiao Cong<sup>a</sup>, Shiyou Chen<sup>e</sup>, Jia Zhangf, Anran Yu<sup>\*a</sup>, Yiqiang Zhan\*a,f

a. Center for Micro Nano Systems, School of Information Science and Technology

(SIST), Fudan University, 200433 Shanghai, P. R. China

Email: [aryu@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:aryu@fudan.edu.cn); [yqzhan@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:yqzhan@fudan.edu.cn)

b. Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Micro and Nano Heat Fluid Flow Technology and Energy Application, School of Physical Science and Technology, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, Suzhou, 215009, China

c. Oxide and chalcogenide MOCVD Centre Room 220, CSIM Building, Swansea University, Bay Campus, Fabian Way, Crymlyn Burrows, Skewen, Swansea, SA18EN

d. School of Microelectronics, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200433, P. R. China

e. Key Laboratory of Computational Physical Sciences (MOE), and State Key Laboratory of ASIC and System, School of Microelectronics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China

f. State Key Laboratory of Photovoltaic Science and Technology, Institute of Optoelectronics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200438, China

\* Corresponding author

## Control perovskite films:



**Figure S1.** 2D-GIWAXS images of perovskite films at various incident angel ranging from  $0.1^\circ$  to  $0.6^\circ$ .



**Figure S2.** Theoretical simulation of FA perovskites with BP molecules. (a-b) The process of constructing the stable surface structure of  $FAPbI<sub>3</sub>$  with BP molecules. (c) DFT calculation results about the total energy difference w/wo BP-5 at the surface of  $FAPbI<sub>3</sub>$ .



**Figure S3.** The UPS results and the energy band illustration of control and target perovskite films.



**Figure S4.** The photovoltaic parameters statistics of the control and target devices with different concentration of BP-5 molecules.



**Figure S5.** The certified performance of the target device measured at SIMIT.



**Figure S6.** PL mapping images of control and target perovskite films.



**Figure S7.** The dark current of the control and target device.



**Figure S8.** The EIS spectra of control and target devices. The fitted results are presented in the inset-table.



**Figure S9.** The mechanism of the UV absorption of BP-5 additives.



Figure S10. The digital photos of PbI<sub>2</sub> films with different concentration of BP-5 additives before and after UV aging test.



**Figure S11.** XPS analysis of control and target perovskite films. XPS spectra of control (a) and target films (b) before and after the UV aging period.



**Figure S12.** The pictures of different kinds of aqueous solutions. The clear black line indicates that there is no insoluble complex formed between BP-5 and lead iodide.



**Figure S13.** The TRPL results of control and target perovskite films (BP-9).



**Figure S14.** In-situ UV absorption spectra of control and target films during the initial annealing process at 150 °C

By using in-situ absorption spectra, we monitor the influence of BP-9 on crystallization process of perovskite. Figure S14 illustrates that the absorption edge of the control film shifts from 500 nm to 790 nm during the annealing process lasting from 4 s to 12 s, marking the transition from the intermediate phase to the perovskite phase. In contrast, the absorption edge of the target film extends to approximately 790 nm after 16 s of annealing, indicating a slower crystallization process in the target film. Moreover, the in-situ absorption spectra also revealed that after annealing for 16 s the control and target films both exhibit similar absorbance. This result suggests that the addition of BP additives cannot completely prevent the crystallization of perovskite, although it does slow down it through interaction.



**Figure S15.** The photovoltaic parameters statistics of the control and target devices with different concentration of BP-9 molecules.



**Figure S16**. The efficiency of target devices (incorporated additives: BP-5 & BP-9). The device incorporated mixed additives (BP-5 &BP-9) shows similar efficiency in comparison to that of the champion device (incorporated additives: BP-5, Figure 3c)



**Figure S17**. The operational stability of target devices. As shown in Figure S13, the target devices incorporated mixed additives (BP-5 and BP-9) also exhibits excellent operational stability.



**Figure S18.** The efficiency of the latest n-i-p type PSCs fabricated by our strategy (BP-5 and BP-9)



**Figure S19.** The EQE curve and the integrated  $J_{sc}$  of the target device.



**Table S1.** The photovoltaic parameters of champion control and target devices.

**Table S2.** The efficiency of devices made by different additives (control, BP-5, BP-9, BP-5&BP-9).

Condition	<b>PCE</b>	FF	Voc	<b>Jsc</b>
Control	23.43%	79.70%	1.1492V	$25.58 \text{ mA/cm}$
$BP-9$	24.73%	81.36%	1.1865V	$25.62 \text{ mA/cm2}$
$BP-5$	25.13%	82.25%	1.1913V	$25.64 \text{ mA/cm2}$
BP-5&BP-9	25.07%	82.17%	1.1935V	$25.56 \text{ mA/cm2}$
$(0.25\%: 0.12\%)$				
$BP-5\&BP-9$	25.47%	82.62%	1.1933V	$25.83 \text{ mA/cm}$
$(0.25\%: 0.12\%,$				
Champion device)				
BP-5&BP-9	24.82%	81.42%	1.1951V	$25.51 \text{ mA/cm2}$
$(0.25\%: 0.15\%)$				
$BP-5\&BP-9$	24.05%	79.12%	1.1915 V	$25.51 \text{ mA/cm2}$
$(0.25\%: 0.18\%)$				

Perovskite	<b>PCE</b> (%)	<b>UV Stability</b> (Time/retained initial efficiency)	Ref
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	24.08%	300h/83% (UV:	Adv. Mater. $1$
		$365$ nm, 60 mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )	
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	24.26%	60h/100% (UV:	Energy Environ. Sci. <sup>2</sup>
		$405$ nm, $/$	
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	24.50%	1200h/87% (UV:	Joule <sup>3</sup>
		$254nm, 50 mW/cm^2$	
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	24.58%	170h/86% (UV:	Adv. Energy Mater. <sup>4</sup>
		$365$ nm, 60 mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )	
<b>CsFAMA</b>	22.40%	70h/91% (UV:	Nano Energy <sup>5</sup>
		365nm, 50 mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )	
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	24.50%	47h/90% (UV:	Adv. Funct. Mater. <sup>6</sup>
		365nm, 119 mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )	
$FACSPb(I_xBr_{1-x})3$	21.54%	60h/85% (UV:	Small Methods <sup>7</sup>
		$365$ nm, 60 mW/cm <sup>2</sup> )	
CsFAMA	22.14%	72h/70% (UV:	$J.$ Mater. Chem. $8$
		$275nm, 10 mW/cm^2$	
$FA_xMA_{1-x}PbI_3$	25.47%	$620h/96\%$ (UV:	<b>This work</b>
		$365nm, 22 mW/cm^2$	

**Table S3.** Photovoltaic performance (PCE and UV stability) of our devices compared with PSCs which were reported in the last two years.

## References

- 1. W. Sheng, J. He, J. Yang, Q. Cai, S. Xiao, Y. Zhong, L. Tan and Y. Chen, *Adv. Mater.*, 2023, **35**, e2301852.
- 2. Y. Gao, F. Ren, D. Sun, S. Li, G. Zheng, J. Wang, H. Raza, R. Chen, H. Wang, S. Liu, P. Yu, X. Meng, J. He, J. Zhou, X. Hu, Z. Zhang, L. Qiu, W. Chen and Z. Liu, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2023, **16**, 2295-2303.
- 3. H. Huang, P. Cui, Y. Chen, L. Yan, X. Yue, S. Qu, X. Wang, S. Du, B. Liu, Q. Zhang, Z. Lan, Y. Yang, J. Ji, X. Zhao, Y. Li, X. Wang, X. Ding and M. Li, *Joule*, 2022, **6**, 2186-2202.
- 4. Y. Li, L. Liu, C. Zheng, Z. Liu, L. Chen, N. Yuan, J. Ding, D. Wang and S. Liu, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2023, **13**, 2203190.
- 5. X. Zhu, C. F. J. Lau, K. Mo, S. Cheng, Y. Xu, R. Li, C. Wang, Q. Zheng, Y. Liu, T. Wang, Q. Lin and Z. Wang, *Nano Energy*, 2022, **103**, 107849.
- 6. L. Deng, H. Wang, S. Rafique, Y. Wang, T. Hu, K. Liu, Y. Wang, X. Li, Z. Xie, J. Tang, Z. Liu, J. Li, W. Yuan, J. Wang, A. Yu and Y. Zhan, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2023, **33**, 2303742.
- 7. Y. Dai, X. Ge, B. Shi, P. Wang, Y. Zhao and X. Zhang, *Small Methods*, 2024, DOI: 10.1002/smtd.202301793, e2301793.
- 8. J. Zhu, X. Hu, Z. Liu, M. Guo, Y. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Li and M. Wei, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2023, **11**, 14959-14970.