## Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI)

## Materials and Instruments

All the chemicals and reagents were purchased from commercial sources and used as received without further purification. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were measured on a Bruker AV 500 spectrometer in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ at room temperature. High resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a GCT premier CAB048 mass spectrometer operating in MALDI-TOF mode. Single crystals of CC6-DBP-PXZ were grown in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$-methanol mixtures and single crystal X-ray diffraction intensity data were collected at 173 K on a Bruker-Nonices Smart Apex CCD diffractometer with graphite monochromated $\mathrm{MoK} \alpha$ radiation. Processing of the intensity data was carried out using the SAINT and SADABS routines, and the structure and refinement were conducted using the SHELTL suite of X-ray programs (version 6.10). UV-vis absorption spectra were measured on a Shimadzu UV-2600 spectrophotometer. PL spectra were recorded on a Horiba Fluoromax-4 spectrofluorometer. PL quantum yields were measured using a Hamamatsu absolute PL quantum yield spectrometer C11347 Quantaurus_QY. The ground-state geometries were optimized using the density function theory (DFT) method with BMK hybrid functional at the basis set level of $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$, and then the $\Delta E_{\mathrm{ST}}$ values were calculated by timedependent DFT (TDDFT) method at the same level. All the calculations were performed using Gaussian09 package.

## Additional Spectra



Fig. S1 (A) TGA and (B) DSC thermograms of CC6-DBP-PXZ and CC6-DBP-DMAC, measured under nitrogen at a heating rate of 20 and $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$, respectively.


Fig. S2 Fluorescence and phosphorescence spectra of (A) CC6-DBP-PXZ neat film, (B) CC6-DBPDMAC neat film, (C) $30 \mathrm{wt} \%$ CC6-DBP-PXZ:CBP doped film and (D) $30 \mathrm{wt} \%$ CC6-DBP-DMAC:CBP doped film.

## Estimation of Basic Photophysical Data

The quantum efficiencies and rate constants were determined using the following equations according to the following equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Phi_{\text {prompt }}=\Phi_{\mathrm{F}} R_{\mathrm{prompt}}  \tag{1}\\
& \Phi_{\text {delayed }}=\Phi_{\mathrm{F}} R_{\text {delayed }}  \tag{2}\\
& k_{\mathrm{F}}=\Phi_{\mathrm{prompt}} / \tau_{\mathrm{prompt}}  \tag{3}\\
& \Phi_{\mathrm{F}}=k_{\mathrm{F}} /\left(k_{\mathrm{F}}+k_{\mathrm{IC}}\right)  \tag{4}\\
& \Phi_{\mathrm{prompt}}=k_{\mathrm{F}} /\left(k_{\mathrm{F}}+k_{\mathrm{IC}}+k_{\mathrm{ISC}}\right)  \tag{5}\\
& \Phi_{\mathrm{IC}}=k_{\mathrm{IC}} /\left(k_{\mathrm{F}}+k_{\mathrm{IC}}+k_{\mathrm{ISC}}\right)  \tag{6}\\
& \Phi_{\mathrm{ISC}}=k_{\mathrm{ISC}} /\left(k_{\mathrm{F}}+k_{\mathrm{IC}}+k_{\mathrm{ISC}}\right)=1-\Phi_{\mathrm{prompt}}-\Phi_{\mathrm{IC}}  \tag{7}\\
& \Phi_{\mathrm{RISC}}=\Phi_{\text {delayed }} / \Phi_{\mathrm{ISC}}  \tag{8}\\
& k_{\mathrm{RISC}}=\left(k_{\mathrm{p}} k_{\mathrm{d}} \Phi_{\text {delayed }}\right) /\left(k_{\mathrm{ISC}} \Phi_{\mathrm{prompt}}\right)  \tag{9}\\
& k_{\mathrm{p}}=1 / \tau_{\mathrm{prompt}} ; k_{\mathrm{d}}=1 / \tau_{\text {delayed }} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Table S1. Transient PL decay data of THF solutions and neat films of CC6-DBP-PXZ and CC6-DBP-
DMAC at 300 K under nitrogen. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| compound | state | $<\tau>(\mathrm{ns})$ | $\tau_{1}(\mathrm{~ns})$ | $\tau_{2}(\mathrm{~ns})$ | $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~A}_{2}$ | $R_{\text {prompt }}(\%)$ | $R_{\text {delayed }}(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THF solution | 2.0 | 1.9 | 28.6 | 61783 | 15.048 | $\sim 100$ | $\sim 0$ |
| PXZ | neat film | 244.9 | 22.9 | 1212.8 | 40350.8 | 175.0 | 81 | 19 |
| CC6-DBP- | THF solution | 60.7 | 19.7 | 217.2 | 6505.02 | 154.58 | 79 | 21 |
| DMAC | neat film | 1294.8 | 25.7 | 2882.1 | 31778 | 226.3 | 56 | 44 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The transient PL decay data were fitted by multiple-exponential function and the mean fluorescence lifetimes ( $\left\langle\tau>\right.$ ) were calculated by $\langle\tau\rangle=\Sigma \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{i}} \tau_{\mathrm{i}}^{2} / \Sigma \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{i}} \tau_{\mathrm{i}}$, where $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the pre-exponential for lifetime $\tau_{\mathrm{i}}$. $R_{\text {prompt }}$ and $R_{\text {delayed }}$ are individual component ratio for prompt and delayed fluorescence. $R_{\text {prompt }}=$ $\tau_{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1} /\left(\tau_{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}+\tau_{2} \mathrm{~A}_{2}+\tau_{3} \mathrm{~A}_{3}\right), R_{\text {delayed }}=1-R_{\text {prompt. }}$.

Table S2. Photophysical data of neat films and doped films in CBP ( $30 \mathrm{wt} \%$ ) of CC6-BP-PXZ and CC6-
BP-DMAC. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | CC6-DBP-PXZ |  | CC6-DBP-DMAC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | neat film | $30 \mathrm{wt} \%$ in CBP | neat film | $30 \mathrm{wt} \%$ in CBP |
| $\Phi_{\mathrm{F}}(\%)$ | 38.3 | 59.0 | 59.5 | 69.1 |
| $\tau_{\text {prompt }}(\mathrm{ns})$ | 22.9 | 24.5 | 25.7 | 29.4 |
| $\tau_{\text {delayed }}(\mu \mathrm{s})$ | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 6.4 |
| $R_{\text {delayed }}(\%)$ | 19.0 | 28.6 | 44.0 | 43.4 |
| $\Phi_{\text {prompt }}(\%)$ | 31.0 | 37.8 | 33.3 | 39.1 |
| $\Phi_{\text {delayed (\%) }}$ | 7.3 | 15.2 | 26.2 | 30.0 |
| $\Phi_{\text {ISC }}(\%)$ | 19.0 | 28.6 | 44.0 | 43.4 |
| $\Phi_{\text {RISC (\%) }}$ | 38.4 | 53.0 | 59.5 | 69.1 |
| $k_{\mathrm{F}}\left(\times 10^{6} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | 13.5 | 15.4 | 13.0 | 13.3 |
| $k_{\text {IC }}\left(\times 10^{6} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | 21.8 | 13.7 | 8.8 | 5.9 |
| $k_{\text {ISC }}\left(\times 10^{6} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | 8.3 | 11.7 | 17.1 | 14.7 |
| $k_{\text {RISC }}\left(\times 10^{6} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 1.1 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Abbreviations: $\Phi_{\mathrm{PL}}=$ absolute photoluminescence quantum yield; $\tau_{\text {prompt }}$ and $\tau_{\text {delayed }}=$ lifetimes calculated from the prompt and delayed fluorescence decay, respectively; $R_{\text {delayed }}=$ the ratio of delayed components; $\Phi_{\text {prompt }}$ and $\Phi_{\text {delayed }}=$ fluorescent and delayed components, respectively, determined from the total $\Phi_{\mathrm{PL}}$ and the proportion of the integrated area of each of the components in the transient spectra to the total integrated area; $\Phi_{\mathrm{ISC}}=$ the intersystem crossing quantum yield; $K_{\mathrm{F}}=$ fluorescence decay rate; $K_{\mathrm{IC}}=$ internal conversion decay rate from $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ to $\mathrm{S}_{0} ; K_{\mathrm{ISC}}=$ intersystem crossing decay rate from $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ to $\mathrm{T}_{1}$; $K_{\text {RISC }}=$ the rate constant of reverse intersystem crossing process.

Table S3. The theoretically calculated maximum $\eta_{\text {ext }}$ values for nondoped OLEDs of CC6-DBP-PXZ and CC6-DBP-
DMAC.

|  | $\Phi_{\text {prompt }}(\%)$ | $\Phi_{\text {ISC (\%) }}$ | $\Phi_{\text {RISC (\%) }}$ | $\eta_{\text {ext }}{ }^{\mathrm{a}}(\%)$ | $\eta_{\text {ext }}{ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CC6-DBP-PXZ | 31.0 | 19.0 | 38.4 | $7.7-11.5$ | 7.73 |
| CC6-DBP-DMAC | 33.3 | 44.0 | 59.5 | $12.8-19.2$ | 9.02 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Theoretical maximum $\eta_{\text {ext }}$ values, calculated according to the following equations (1) and (2):
$\eta_{\text {ext }}=\eta_{\text {int }} \times \eta_{\text {out }}$
$\eta_{\text {int }}=\gamma \times\left[\eta_{\mathrm{S}} \times \Phi_{\text {prompt }}+\left(\eta_{\mathrm{S}} \times \Phi_{\mathrm{ISC}}+\eta_{\mathrm{T}}\right) \times \Phi_{\mathrm{RISC}}\right]$
where $\eta_{\text {int }}$ denotes the internal quantum efficiency, $\eta_{\text {out }}$ is the optical out-coupling factor (typically $0.2 \sim 0.3$ ), $\gamma$ is the charge balance factor (ideally $\gamma=1.0$ ), and $\eta_{\mathrm{S}}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{T}}$ are the fractions of singlet and triplet excitons ( $25 \%$ and $75 \%$, respectively).
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Experimental maximum $\eta_{\text {ext }}$ values.

