Supplementary Information

From 20% Single-Junction Organic Photovoltaic to 26% Perovskite/Organic

Tandem Solar Cells: Self-Assembled Hole Transport Molecules Matters

- 4 Xiaokang Sun,‡^{ab} Fei Wang,‡^a Guo Yang,‡^a Xiaoman Ding,^a Jie Lv,^a Yonggui Sun,^a
- 5 Taomiao Wang,^a Chuanlin Gao,^c Guangye Zhang,^c Wenzhu Liu,^d Xiang Xu,^a
- 6 Soumitra Satapathi, Kiaoping Ouyang, Annie Ng, *f Long Ye,^g Mingjian Yuan,h
- Hongyu Zhang,*ⁱ Hanlin Hu*^a
-
- ^a Hoffmann Institute of Advanced Materials, Shenzhen Polytechnic University, 7098
- Liuxian Boulevard, Shenzhen 518055, China
- E-mail: hanlinhu@szpu.edu.cn
- ^b School of Materials Science and Engineering, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan

411105, China

- 14 ^c College of New Materials and New Energies, Shenzhen Technology University,
- Shenzhen, 518118, China
- 16 ^d Research Center for New Energy Technology, Shanghai Institute of Microsystem
- and Information Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai, China.
- 18 ^e Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Uttarakhand 247667, India
- ^f National Laboratory of Astana, Nazarbayev University, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

1. Device fabrication

OSCs device fabrication

 The OSC devices were fabricated with the conventional configuration of glass/ITO/SAMs/active layer/C60/BCP/Ag. The patterned ITO-coated glass substrate (15 Ω/sq) was cleaned with detergent and deionized water ultrasonic cleaning 20 min, then continuously cleaned three times with acetone, and isopropanol for 15 min of each step. After that the substrate was dried with a nitrogen gun and then placed in an ultraviolet-ozone cleaning machine for 20 min. This step can further remove the organic residue on the substrate surface and improve the hydrophilicity of the substrate surface. The 4PADCB or 4PADCB+TCB (weight ratio of 1:1) were dissolved in isopropanol (IPA) with a concentration of 0.5 mg/mL and placed into an 12 ultrasonic bath for 20 min. The SAM solution (65 µL for a 1.5×1.5 cm² substrate) was applied directly onto the ITO substrate for 40 s followed by a spin-coating step at 3000 rpm for 30 s. The ITO/SAM substrate was then placed onto a hotplate and annealed at 100 ℃ for 10 min. Finally, the ITO/SAM substrates were transferred inside a dry nitrogen glove box for solar cell fabrication. The PM6, BTP-eC9, Y6 and PC_{71} BM were purchased from organtec.ltd. For the PM6: BTP-eC9 system, the PM6:BTP-eC9 solution was prepared by dissolving blends with a weight ratio of 1:1.2 in chloroform (total concentration 15.4 mg/mL) and stirred at room temperature for 2 hours. The active layer was spin-coated on the ITO/SAM substrates at 3500 rpm and then annealed 5 min at 80 ℃. Finally, C60 (10 nm)/BCP (5 nm)/Ag (100 nm)

layers were deposited to complete the device fabrication.

Wide-bandgap perovskite single-junction device fabrication

3 The substrates were then spin-coated with NiO_X (10 mg/mL in deionized water) nanoparticle dispersion. Then, the films were transferred to a nitrogen-filled glovebox and the Me-4PACz (1 mg/mL in IPA) was spin-coated on the substrates at 4,000 rpm for 30 s and heated at 100℃ for 10 min. The 1 M perovskite 7 ($Cs_{0.25}FA_{0.75}Pb(Br_{0.5}I_{0.5})$) precursor solution used contains 129 mg FAI, 65 mg CsI, 275 mg PbBr2, and 115 mg PbI2, which were dissolved in 1 mL mixed solvent of 9 DMF:DMSO ($v/v = 4:1$). Then, the precursor solution was shaken overnight at 60°C. For the spin-coating process, the substrate was spun at 4,000 rpm for 45 s with an acceleration of 4,000 rpm/s, and 200 mL of MeAc was slowly dropped at 15 s before the spin-coating ended. The perovskite

films were then annealed at 100℃ for 15 min. Then, the C60 (10 nm)/BCP (5 nm)/Ag

(100 nm) layers were deposited to complete the device fabrication.

Perovskite-organic tandem device fabrication

16 After completing the deposition of the BCP layer, Ag $(1 \text{ nm})/\text{MoO}_X$ (15 nm)was thermally evaporated on top of BCP and the film was brought back to the nitrogen- filled glovebox, then completed the deposition of the SAM layer. For the narrow band-gap PM6:BTP-eC9 system, the solution was prepared by dissolving blends with a weight ratio of 1:1:0.2 in chloroform (total concentration 15.4 mg/mL) and stirred at room temperature for 2 hours. The active layer was spin-coated on the ITO/SAM substrates at 3500 rpm and then annealed 5 min at 80 ℃. Finally, C60 (10 nm)/BCP

(5 nm)/Ag (100 nm) layers were deposited to complete the device fabrication.

2. Device performance characterization

4 The *J-V* characteristics were performed in N_2 -filled glovebox under AM 1.5G (100) mW/cm²) by using a Keithley 2400 source meter unit and an AAA solar simulator (SS-F5-3A, Enli Technology CO., Ltd.) calibrated by a standard Si photovoltaic cell. The external quantum efficiency (EQE) was measured by a certified incident photon to electron conversion (IPCE) equipment (QE-R) from Enli Technology Co., Lt. The light intensity at each wavelength was calibrated using a standard monocrystalline Si photovoltaic cell. The bias illumination obtained by applying a 500 nm short-pass filter, and an 800 nm long-pass filter was used for the measurements of the bottom subcell and the front subcell of perovskite-OPV TSC, respectively.

The analysis of *Jph vs Veff* **relationships**

14 The definition of J_{ph} is the current density under illumination (J_L) minus the dark 15 current density (J_D) , and V_0 refers to the voltage value when $J_{ph} = 0$. Accordingly, V_{eff} 16 = V_0 - V_{apply} , where V_{apply} represents applied voltage, has a clear meaning. Importantly, 17 when V_{eff} reaches a high value ($> 2V$) it is normally believed that generated excitons 18 are fully collected, in which J_{ph} is equal to saturated current density (J_{sat}) . Then, we 19 can calculate J_{SC}/J_{sat} and J_{max}/J_{sat} to describe exciton dissociation (η_{diss}) and charge 20 collection (η_{coll}) efficiency. J_{max} is the J_{ph} at the maximal output point.

Transient photovoltage (TPV) and transient photocurrent (TPC)

 For TPV, the measurement was conducted under 1 sun conditions by illuminating the device with a white light-emitting diode, and the champion device is set to the open- circuit condition. For TPC, the champion device is set to the short-circuit condition in dark. The output signal was collected by key sight oscilloscope.

Electrochemical analysis

 Mott-Schottky characteristics and Nyquist plots were conducted using a PARSTAT 4000A electrochemical workstation, employing a three-electrode setup. For the curve fitting of Mott-Schottky plots, the data were extracted by linear fitting the drop region of Mott-Schottky plots, and *Vbi* was obtained via the intercept of the straight line with the X axis.

Hole Mobility Measurements

 The mobilities were measured by using a space charge limited current (SCLC) model with the hole-only device of glass/ITO/SAMs/PM6: BTP-eC9/MoO3/Ag. Hole mobility was obtained by fitting the current density-voltage curves and calculated by 15 the equation¹:

$$
J(V) = \frac{9}{8} \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r \mu \frac{V^2}{L^2} \#(1)
$$

17 Where *I* is current density, ϵ_0 is the permittivity of free space (8.85 \times 10⁻¹⁴ F/cm), ϵ_r is 18 the relative permittivity of the material (assumed to 3), μ is hole mobility or electron 19 mobility, V is applied voltage and L is the thickness of film (~110 nm).

EQEEL measurements

EQEEL measurements were done using a home-built setup using a Keithley 2400 to

1 inject current to the solar cells. Emission photon-flux from the solar cells was 2 recorded using a Si detector (Hamamatsu s1337-1010BQ) and a Keithley 6482 3 picoammeter.

4 **Urbach energy** (E_U)

5 E_U can be calculated from the slope of the straight line by plotting ln (α) against the 6 incident photon energy (E), which follows the straight-line equation below:

$$
\ln \alpha(E) = \ln \alpha_0 + \frac{E}{E_u} - \frac{E_g}{E_u} \#(2) \#
$$

8 **3. Characterization of SAM**

9 **Instruments and characterization**

10 **Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy**

11 1H NMR and 31P NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker (AVANCE III 400MHz).

12 X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was measured by Thermo Scientific K-

13 Alpha.

14 **Contact angle measurements**

15 The contact angles of water and formamide (FA) on SAMs coated ITO were

16 measured by a video optical contact angle meter (DSA-100 (KRUSS Germany)).

17 Then the surface free energy was calculated by Owens-Wendt method:^{2, 3}

18
$$
\gamma_L \times (1 + \cos \theta) = 2 \times (\gamma_L^d \cdot \gamma_{sv}^d)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \times (\gamma_L^p \cdot \gamma_{sv}^p)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (3)
$$

19 where γ_L and γ_{sv} are surface free energy of the probe liquid and sample, respectively.

20 The θ is the contact γ_L angle of the sample. The Flory-Huggins interaction parameter

 *χ*donor-acceptor for blends to show the binary miscibility was calculated from the equation:

$$
\chi_{door-acceptor} = K \left(\gamma \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{2} - \gamma \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{2} \right)^2 \#(4)
$$

4 where γ is the surface energy of the material, *K* is the proportionality constant.

GIWAXS and XRD Measurement

 GIWAXS measurements were performed at the Synchrotron & Printable Electronic Lab, Hoffmann Institute of Advanced Materials, Shenzhen Polytechnic University with SAXSFocus 3.0 (GKINST Co., LTD.) equipped with a Cu X-ray Source (8.05 keV, 1.54 Å) and an EIGER 2R 500K detector. The incident angle during the measurement was maintained at 0.5° and the distance between sample and detector was 132 mm.

 For the GIWAXS and XRD measurement of SAM layers, the films were prepared by spin-coating the control and TCB-treated SAM precursor solutions (2 mg/mL in IPA) at 500 rpm for 30 s, followed by annealing at 130 °C for 5 min, the thicker films are beneficial to obtain better signals.

Theoretical calculations

 All the calculations of the model compounds studied in this work were performed using the Gaussian 09 software package. Ground state geometry optimizations of 4PADCB, and TCB are calculated by DFT at the B3LYP/6-31G (d, p) (empirical dispersion = gd3bj) level. The visualization of the molecular orbitals and ESP distribution was performed using GaussView 6.0.16 and VMD software.⁴ The

reduced density gradient analysis was performed using MultiWfn3.8 software.5, ⁶

4. Characterization of the active layer

Film-depth-dependent light absorption and composition distribution

 Film-depth-dependent light absorption was carried out with an in-situ spectrometer (PU100, Shaanxi Puguang Weishi Co. Ltd.) equipped with a soft plasma-ion source. 6 A 100 W power with an input pressure of \sim 10 Pa (oxygen) was used to generate soft ionic source. The surface of the target film is gradually etched by the soft ion source, without damage to the materials underneath. The absorption for the film during etching was in-situ monitored by a spectrometer.

Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) measurements

 Topographic images of the films were obtained from a Bruker atomic force microscopy (AFM) with the type of dimension edge with Scan Asyst in the tapping 13 mode using an etched silicon cantilever at a nominal load of \sim 2 nN, the scanning rate 14 for a 1 μ m×1 μ m image size was 0.9 Hz and 5 μ m×5 μ m image size was 1.0 Hz.

HAADF-TEM measurements

 The films were floated off the substrates in deionized water and collected on lacey carbon coated TEM grids (Electron Microscopy Sciences). HAADF-TEM were performed on a Thermo Fischer Talos-200S TEM equipped with an electron monochromator and a Gatan Imaging Filter (GIF) Quantum 966.

GIWAXS and GISAXS Measurement

The samples were fabricated by spin-coating the active layer precursor solutions onto

 Si substrates. The incidence angles are 0.12° and the distances between sample and detector are 132 mm (GIWAXS) and 1000 mm (GISAXS) respectively. One dimensional experimental data were obtained with the SGTools software package programmed by Zhao et al.⁷

5 **Data analysis.**

6 The ordering degree of SAMs was quantified by using the Herman's orientation factor

7 (*f*), which is defined as follows:

$$
8 \quad f = \frac{1}{2} (3 \langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle - 1) \# (5)
$$

11

9 where the $\langle cos^2{\theta} \rangle$ is the average value of the square of the cosine of the azimuthal 10 angle for the scattering peak, which is calculated as follows:

$$
\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle = \frac{\int_{\min}^{\pi/2} I(\theta) \cos^2(\theta) \sin(\theta) d\theta}{\int_{\min}^{\pi/2} I(\theta) \sin(\theta) d\theta} \tag{6}
$$

12 where $I(\theta)$ is the intensity at an azimuthal angle of θ .

 The structural information of blend films such as the period of arrangement and lamellar stacking spacing is obtained via the Bragg equation, as well as the crystal coherence length (*CCL*) can be obtained from the Scherrer formula,⁸ and the specific expressions of the Bragg equation and Scherrer formula are as follows:

$$
17 \quad d = \frac{\lambda}{2\sin(\theta)} = \frac{2\pi}{q} \text{H}(7)
$$

$$
18 \quad CCL = \frac{K\lambda}{FWHM \cdot \cos(\theta)} \#(8)
$$

1 where *d* is the lamellar stacking spacing, and *CCL* is the crystal domain along the 2 specified direction called crystal coherence length, which is generally considered to 3 be equivalent to the grain size. λ is the value of X-ray wavelength; *K* is a 4 dimensionless shape factor,⁹ generally taken as $K = 0.89$; FWHM is the half-peak 5 width of the scattering peak; θ is the scattering angle.

6 **GISAXS fitting model**

7 To quantify and compare the phase separation, the IP (in plane) scattering profiles are 8 fitted with a model that describes the scattering contribution of each phase, the fitting 9 equation is shown in Eq. (1):

$$
I(q) = \frac{A_1}{\left[1 + (q\xi)^2\right]^2} + A_2 \langle P(q, R) \rangle S(q, R, \eta, D) + B \# (9)
$$

11 where the first term was the so-called Debye-Anderson-Brumberger (DAB) term¹⁰, 12 modeling the scattering from the amorphous intermixing domains, and *ξ* is the 13 average correlation length of the amorphous domain.

14 The second term is the scattering intensity contribution from the small molecule 15 pure domains in the co-monomer, where $P(q, R)$ is the shape factor of the pure 16 domains. $S(q, R, \eta, D)$ is the structure factor of pure domains, and the fractal-like 17 network model is generally used to describe the cluster domains in the films 18 expressed as follows:

$$
S(q) = 1 + \frac{\sin [(D - 1)\tan^{-1}(q\eta)]}{(qR)^D} \cdot \frac{D\Gamma(D - 1)}{\left[1 + \frac{1}{(q\eta)^2}\right]^{\frac{(D - 1)}{2}}} \tag{10}
$$

11 20 where R is the mean radius, *η* is the coherence length of the fractal network, and *D* is 21 the fractal dimension of the structure. The average domain size can be estimated by the Guinier radius of the fractal-like network *Rg* expressed as follows:

Fig. S1 TGA plots of TCB at a scan rate of 10°C min-1 under inert atmosphere.

⁴

5 **Table S1** The the overall average ESP values of DCB core and TCB, respectively.

	Overall average value (kcal/mol)
DCB Core	-1.11
TCB	2.33

9 (c)
$$
q_{xy} \approx 9.5 \text{nm}^{-1}
$$
.

ageing tests of thermal annealing

2 **Fig. S9** (a) *J-V* dark curves of the device with the structure of ITO/control and TCB-

TCB Concentration (mg/mL)	V_{OC} (V)	J_{SC} $(mA cm-2)$	FF	PCE (%)
0.1	0.860	28.38	79.63	19.44
0.3	0.862	28.57	79.41	19.54
0.5	0.863	28.83	80.64	20.06
0.8	0.863	28.57	79.74	19.67
1.0	0.863	28.45	79.69	19.57

5 **Table S2** Detailed device parameters with varied concentration of TCB.

³ treated SAM/Ag.

Temperature $(^{\circ}C)$	V_{OC} (V)	J_{SC} $(mA cm-2)$	FF	PCE $(\%)$
80	0.863	28.64	78.94	19.52
100	0.863	28.83	80.64	20.06
120	0.864	28.79	78.85	19.62

1 **Table S3** Detailed device parameters with varied TA temperatures of SAM layer.

 $\overline{6}$

 $\overline{7}$

 $\overline{8}$

 $\overline{9}$

 $\overline{5}$

 $\overline{1}$

 \overline{c}

 $\overline{3}$

 $\overline{4}$

10

- **Fig. S10** Certified Efficiency of PM6:BTP-eC9 binary OSCs device based on TCB-
- treated SAM.
-

- 1 **Table S4** Summary of the photovoltaic parameter of the device based on control and
- 2 TCB-treated SAM.

4

5

Fig. S11 Nyquist plots of devices based on control and TCB-treated SAM layer.

Fig. S13 FTPS-EQEs of the device based on control and TCB-treated SAM layer.

Fig. S14 Photographs of water and formamide droplets in contact with control and

Table S5 Surface energy (γs) of control and TCB-treated SAM layers.

Fig. S15 The time evolutions of absorption peak of blend films during spin-coating.

Fig. S16 (a) GISAXS patterns and (b) scattering profiles of Yoneda peaks.

Table S6 Fitting data obtained from GISAXS patterns.

2 **Fig. S17** GIWAXS patterns and scattering profiles of active layer based on (a) control

- 3 and (b) TCB-treated SAM layer.
- 4
- 5
- 6 **Table S7** Detailed (010) peak information in the OOP direction of active layer based

7 on control and TCB-treated SAM layer.

Conditions	peak position (nm^{-1})	FWHM (nm^{-1})	d -spacing (nm)	CCL (nm)
Control	17.38	2.057	0.362	5.47
TCB-treated	17.45	2.001	0.360	5.62

9

10

Fig. S18 AFM height images of active layer on (a) control and (b) TCB-treated SAM

- **Fig. S19** TEM images of active layer on on (a) control and (b) TCB-treated SAM
- layer.
-

Fig. S20 (a) Film-depth-dependent absorption spectra, (b) exciton generation rate and

- c) contours of active layer on control and TCB-treated SAM layers.
-

Band gap	V_{OC} (V)	J_{SC} $(mA cm-2)$	FF	PCE (%)
1.85eV PSCs	1.300	15.97	82.98	17.24
1.36eV OSCs	0.858	28.90	79.68	19.75
Tandem	2.131	14.95	81.90	26.09

2 **Table S8.** The photovaltaic patameters of single junction and tandem devices.

1

4

5

6

8 **Fig. S21** Statistical PCE versus FF of perovskite/organic solar cells in this work and

1 results reported in the literature.

- 2 **Table S9** Summary of photovoltaic performance of perovskite/organic solar cells in
- 3 the literature.

REFERENCES

- 1. J. Lv, Q. Yang, W. Deng, H. Chen, M. Kumar, F. Zhao, S. Lu, H. Hu and Z. Kan, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2023, **465**, 142822. 2. D. K. Owens and R. C. Wendt, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 1969, **13**, 1741. 3. J. Lv, X. K. Sun, H. Tang, F. Wang, G. Y. Zhang, L. X. Zhu, J. M. Huang, Q. G. Yang, S. R. Lu, G. Li, F. Laquai and H. L. Hu, *InfoMat*, 2024, **6**, e12530. 4. W. Humphrey, A. Dalke and K. Schulten, *J. Mol. Graphics*, 1996, **14**, 33. 5. T. Lu and S. Manzetti, *Struct. Chem.*, 2014, **25**, 1521. 6. T. Lu and F. Chen, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2012, **33**, 580. 7. N. Zhao, C. M. Yang, F. G. Bian, D. Y. Guo and X. P. Ouyang, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2022, **55**, 195. 8. A. Mahmood and J. L. Wang, *Sol. RRL*, 2020, **4**, 2000337. 9. D.-M. Smilgies, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2009, **42**, 1030. 10. H.-C. Liao, C.-S. Tsao, T.-H. Lin, C.-M. Chuang, C.-Y. Chen, U. S. Jeng, C.-H. Su, Y.-F. Chen and W.-F. Su, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2011, **133**, 13064. 11. P. Wang, W. Li, O. J. Sandberg, C. Guo, R. Sun, H. Wang, D. Li, H. Zhang, S. Cheng, D. Liu, J. Min, A. Armin and T. Wang, *Nano Letters*, 2021, **21**, 7845. 12. W. Chen, D. Li, X. Chen, H. Chen, S. Liu, H. Yang, X. Li, Y. Shen, X. Ou, Y. Yang, L. Jiang, Y. Li and Y. Li, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2021, **32**, 2109321. 13. S. Qin, C. Lu, Z. Jia, Y. Wang, S. Li, W. Lai, P. Shi, R. Wang, C. Zhu, J. Du, J. Zhang, L. Meng and Y. Li, *Adv. Mater.*, 2022, **34**, 2108829. 14. W. Chen, Y. Zhu, J. Xiu, G. Chen, H. Liang, S. Liu, H. Xue, E. Birgersson, J. W. Ho, X. Qin, J. Lin, R. Ma, T. Liu, Y. He, A. M.-C. Ng, X. Guo, Z. He, H. Yan, A. B. Djurišić and Y. Hou, *Nat. Energy*, 2022, **7**, 229. 15. Y. M. Xie, Q. Yao, Z. Zeng, Q. Xue, T. Niu, R. Xia, Y. Cheng, F. Lin, S. W. Tsang, A. K. Y. Jen, H. L. Yip and Y. Cao, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2022, **32**, 2112126. 16. K. O. Brinkmann, T. Becker, F. Zimmermann, C. Kreusel, T. Gahlmann, M. Theisen, T. Haeger, S. Olthof, C. Tückmantel, M. Günster, T. Maschwitz, F. Göbelsmann, C. Koch, D. Hertel, P. Caprioglio, F. Peña-Camargo, L. Perdigón-Toro, A. Al-Ashouri, L. Merten, A. Hinderhofer, L. Gomell, S. Zhang, F. Schreiber, S. Albrecht, K. Meerholz, D. Neher, M. Stolterfoht and T. Riedl, *Nature*, 2022, **604**, 280. 17. X. Gu, X. Lai, Y. Zhang, T. Wang, W. L. Tan, C. R. McNeill, Q. Liu, P. Sonar, F. He, W. Li, C. Shan and A. K. K. Kyaw, *Adv. Sci.*, 2022, **9**, 2200445. 18. Y. M. Xie, T. Q. Niu, Q. Yao, Q. F. Xue, Z. X. Zeng, Y. H. Cheng, H. L. Yip and Y. Cao, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2022, **71**, 12. 19. Y. Ding, Q. Guo, Y. Geng, Z. Dai, Z. Wang, Z. Chen, Q. Guo, Z. Zheng, Y. Li and E. Zhou, *Nano Today*, 2022, **46**, 101586. 20. C. Wang, W. L. Shao, J. W. Liang, C. Chen, X. Z. Hu, H. S. Cui, C. W. Liu, G. J.
- Fang and C. Tao, *Small*, 2022, **18**, 2204081.

and Z. Zhu, *Adv. Mater.*, 2024, **n/a**, 2410692.