Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Journal of Materials Chemistry A. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019

Electronic Supplementary Information

Chemically tuned, bi-functional polar interlayer for TiO₂ photoanodes in fibre-shaped dye-sensitized solar cells

Ryanda Enggar Anugrah Ardhi,^{a,b} Minh Xuan Tran,^{a,b} Manxiang Wang,^c Guicheng Liu, ^{*,a,c} Joong Kee Lee^{*,a,b}

- ^a Center for Energy Storage Research, Clean Energy Institute, Korea Institute of Science and Technology (KIST), Hwarang-ro 14-gil 5, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 02792, Republic of Korea
- ^b Division of Energy and Environment Technology, KIST-School, Korea University of Science and Technology (UST), Hwarang-ro 14-gil 5, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 02792, Republic of Korea
- ^c Department of Physics, Dongguk University, 30 Pildong-ro 1-gil, Jung-gu, Seoul, 04620, Republic of Korea

* Corresponding authors:
log67@163.com, liuguicheng@dongguk.edu (G. Liu); leejk@kist.re.kr (J. K. Lee).
Tel.: +82 2 958 5252; Fax: +82 2 958 5229.

Supporting Figures



Fig. S1. Schematic of the TiO₂@PEOx-based FDSSC preparation process.



Fig. S2. Anodizing apparatus to prepare the TiO_2 nanotube photoanodes used in this work.



(b)

PEOx interlayer material $\xrightarrow{\oplus}$



Fig. S3. Chemical structures of the (a) N719 dye and (b) PEOx interlayer materials.



Fig. S4. 3D molecular model of the PEOx interlayer material, binding at the $TiO_2/N719$ dye interface, with monomer, dimer, and trimer configurations.



Fig. S5. Full-range UPS spectra of blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx samples.



Fig. S6. (**a**, **c**, **e**, **g**) Cross-sectional and (**b**, **d**, **f**, **h**) surface SEM images of (**a**–**d**) blank-TiO₂ and (**e**–**h**) TiO₂@PEOx samples



Fig. S7. Spectra for blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx samples without dye immersion obtained by (\mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b}) EDS, (\mathbf{c}) C 1s and (\mathbf{d}) O 1s XPS.



Fig. S8. Spectra for blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx samples with dye immersion for 24 h obtained by (**a**, **b**) EDS, (**c**) C 1s and (**d**) O 1s XPS.



Fig. S9. (a) UV-vis spectra of 0.5 mM N719 dye-ethanol solutions, where Solution 1 has not undergone any photoanode immersion, Solution 2 has undergone blank-TiO₂ sample immersion for 24 h, and Solution 3 has undergone TiO₂@PEOx sample immersion for 24 h. (b) UV-vis spectra of N719 dye, at varied concentrations, in 0.1 M aqueous NaOH solutions. (c) The enlarged UV-Vis spectra from panel (b). (d) Calibration curve obtained from the UV-vis spectra depicted in panels (b) and (c). (e) UV-vis spectra of the desorbed N719 dye on blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx surfaces. The N719 dye was desorbed by 0.1 M aqueous NaOH solution. The inset shows enlarged spectra from panel (e). (f) N719 dye loading adsorbed on blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx samples calculated from the data in panels (d) and (e).



Fig. S10. *J*–*V* characteristics, under the 1 sun (1.5G) illumination condition, of blank-TiO₂-based and the TiO₂@PEOx-based FDSSCs with PEOx concentrations varied between 4-20 mg ml⁻¹.

Supporting Tables

Table S1. Summary of the full-range XPS spectra shown in **Fig. 2a, e**.

Photoanodo		Atom								
	C 1s	0 1s	Ti 2p	N 1s	Ru 3d	S 2p	Total			
Before the N719 dye immersion										
blank-TiO ₂	25.62	51.43	22.95	_	_	_	100.00			
TiO ₂ @PEOx	28.94	47.06	21.38	2.62	_	—	100.00			
After the N719 dye immersion										
blank-TiO ₂	39.50	34.47	13.37	9.52	2.75	0.38	100.00			
TiO ₂ @PEOx	52.13	22.41	7.03	12.93	4.54	0.96	100.00			

Table S2. Summary of de-convoluted XPS results for blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx photoanode samples without dye immersion, corresponding to **Fig. 2b, 2c, S7c,** and **S7d**.

Photoanode	Bonding species Peak position (eV) Peak Area		Bond content (%)	Peak FWHM (eV)						
XPS peak region = N 1s										
	—	—	—	—	-					
blank-TiO ₂	-	—	_	_	-					
	 	_								
		200 52	470.40	-						
	N=C N C=O (Amida)	398.53	172.49	27.80	1.29					
	N-C-O (Amide)	400.05	74 49	12 03	1.30					
	Total	401.00	619.32	100 00	-					
	Total	XPS peak regio	n = Ti 2p	100.00						
	Ti ³⁺	457 10	662 44	3 51	1.39					
	ті ті ⁴⁺	458.85	11628 25	61 63	1.00					
blank-TiO ₂	ті ³⁺	463 35	1014 07	10.15	5.00					
	11 〒:4+	403.33	1914.97	24.70	1.04					
	Total	404.00	4000.92	4.70	1.34					
	TOLAI	450.05	10000.30	100.00	0.75					
	11 ⁵ 	400.85	125.25	1.15	0.75					
TiO ₂ @PEOx		458.60	7551.93	69.42	1.36					
10	Ti³⁺	463.05	118.00	1.08	1.39					
	Ti ⁴⁺	464.23	3084.07	28.35	1.99					
	Total		10879.25	100.00	-					
XPS peak region = C 1s										
	C-C (sp ²)	284.40	0.10	0.00	0.50					
	C-H	285.03	1802.49	87.41	1.94					
blank-TiO ₂	C-O, C-N	286.50	40.01	1.94	1.00					
-	C=0, C=N	287.42	96.19	4.00	1.23					
		288.78	123.23	5.00	1.00					
	Total	200.70	2062 12	100.00	-					
	$C-C(sp^2)$	284 40	173.84	5 17	2 18					
	С-Н	285.03	2401.87	71.37	1.60					
	C-O, C-N	286.50	332.24	9.87	0.78					
	C=O, C=N	287.42	201.45	5.99	0.89					
	O=C-N (Amide)	288.40 182.00		5.41	0.87					
	0-C=0	288.78	74.21	2.20	0.75					
	Total		3365.61	100.00	—					
		XPS peak regio	on = O 1s							
	O-Ti	530.08	13620.71	87.22	1.52					
	O=C	530.60	174.82	1.12	0.50					
blank-TiO ₂	0-C	531.63	187.29	1.20	0.65					
2	O ² (oxygen vacancy)	532.09	709.85	4.55	1.28					
	0-0=0	532.50	644.72	4.13	1.20					
	<u></u>	554.00	2/0.00	1./ŏ	1.22					
		F OC 22	15615.89	100.00	-					
TiO₂@PEOx	0-11	530.08	10892.82	83.64	1.38					
		530.60	1/4.08	1.34	0.57					
	0-0 0 ²⁻	531.03 522.00	10.00	9.90	1.04					
		002.09 520.50	10.92	0.00	U. 10 1 04					
	0-0=0 0-H	332.3U 533.00	200.24 87.65	4.30 0.67	I.∠I 1.27					
	Total	000.00	13022.86	100.00						

Table S3. Summary of de-convoluted XPS results of blank-TiO₂ and TiO₂@PEOx photoanode samples with dye immersion for 24 h corresponding to **Fig. 2f, S8c,** and **S8d**.

Photoanode Bonding species		Peak position (eV)	Peak area	Bond content (%)	Peak FWHM (eV)			
XPS peak region = N 1s								
	N=C=S (NCS)	397.85	19.30	6.26	1.60			
	N=C	398.62	73.88	23.95	2.22			
	Pyridine ring	399.87	196.86	63.81	1.70			
blank-TiO ₂	N-C=O (Amide)	400.36	0.00	0.00	0.00			
	N-O	400.94	0.00	0.00	0.00			
	N-C	401.62	12.36	4.06	1.16			
	ТВА	402.67	5.92	1.92	1.56			
	Total		308.32	100.00				
	N=C=S (NCS)	397.85	108.58	6.72	1.19			
	N=C	398.62	501.57	31.03	1.68			
	Pyridine ring	399.87	676.44	41.85	1.16			
TIO ₂ @PEOx	N-C=O (Amide)	400.36	35.90	2.22	1.15			
	N-O	400.94	187.28	11.59	1.53			
	N-C	401.62	37.60	2.33	1.31			
	ТВА	402.67	68.88	4.26	1.36			
	Total		1616.25	100.00	-			
		XPS peak regio	on = C 1s					
	C-C (sp ²)	284.40	0.00	0.00	0.00			
	C-H	285.03	3372.21	72.37	2.05			
	C=C (sp ³)	285.40	582.78	12.51	1.85			
blank-TiO ₂	C-O, C-N	286.50	190.43	4.09	1.63			
	C=O, C=N	287.42	282.25	6.06	1.42			
	N-C=O (Amide)	288.39	0.00	0.00	0.00			
	O-C=O	288.78	231.74	4.97	1.92			
	Total		4659.41	100.00	_			
	C-C (sp ²)	284.40	93.58	1.08	0.57			
	C-H	285.03	4645.82	53.49	2.13			
	C=C (sp ³)	285.40	977.59	11.26	1.40			
TIO ₂ @PEOx	C-O, C-N	286.50	586.88	6.76	1.89			
	C=O, C=N	287.42	714.93	8.23	1.80			
	N-C=O (Amide)	288.39	84.58	0.97	1.01			
	0-C=0	288.78	1581.61	18.21	3.13			
	Total		8684.99	100.00	_			
		XPS peak regio	on = 0 1s					
	O-Ti	530.08	10187.39	78.93	1.50			
	O=C	530.60	370.16	2.87	0.79			
	0-0	531.63	555.55	4.30	0.61			
blank-TiO ₂	O ²⁻ (oxygen vacancy) 532.09	504.14	3.91	0.72			
	0-C=0	532.50	823.04	6.38	1.29			
	O-N	533.00	0.10	0.00	0.10			
	O-H	534.00	467.17	3.62	1.87			
	Total		12907.55	100.00	_			
	O-Ti	530.08	7022.60	60.79	1.33			
	U=C	530.60	721.76	6.25	1.07			
	O-C	531.63	1852.75	16.04	1.17			
TiO ₂ @PEOx	O ²⁻ (oxygen vacancy) 532.09	1.52	0.01	0.67			
	O-C=O	532.50	1090.19	9.44	1.30			
	O-N	533.00	325.65	2.82	1.00			
	O-H	534.00	537.73	4.65	1.39			
	Total		11552.20	100.00	_			

		Photoanode current collector		N719 dye	PCE (%)	V _{oc} (V)	J _{sc} (mA cm ⁻²)	FF	Reference number	
Year	Photoanode		Counter electrode	concentration (mM)					Main article	Supporting information
2019	TiO₂@PEOx	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	11.21	0.80	17.04	0.82	This work	
2010	TiO₂ nanotube	Ti wire	CF@PANI@CoSe	0.50	10.28	0.73	17.65	0.80	38	(\$1)
		TI WILC	Pt wire	0.50	8.34	0.76	16.33	0.68		(31)
2019	TiO ₂ -rGO	Stainless steel wire	Pt wire	0.30	5.36	0.79	12.94	0.52	39	S2
2018	TiO ₂ microridge/nanorods	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	8.13	0.70	14.79	0.78	8	S3
2018	TiO ₂ nanowire	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	3.13	0.69	7.58	0.60	9	S4
2018 TiO ₂ nanotube		Ti wire	Pt-modified CS-CNT fibre	0.30	10.00	0.73	19.43	0.71	40	S5
			Pt wire	-	6.11	0.74	14.59	0.56	-	
2017	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	CF@TiO2@MoS2	0.30	9.50	0.74	16.95	0.75	41	S6
2016	TiO ₂ micron-cone- nanowire	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	4.75	0.67	10.44	0.68	6	S7
2016	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	Pt-coated carbon fibre	0.30	5.64	0.74	11.92	0.64	30	S8
2015	TiO ₂ micron-cone	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	8.07	0.70	16.04	0.72	42	S9
2015	TiO popotubo	Ti wiro	RACNTs fibre	0.50	6.80	0.70	14.50	0.67	- 43	S10
2015	HO ₂ hanolube	TI WIE	Pt wire	- 0.50	2.74	0.67	12.01	0.34		
2015	TiO, nanotube	Ti wire	Graphene fibre	0.30	3.25	0.58	14.10	0.40	11 01	S 11
2015			Pt wire	- 0.50	2.14	—	_	—		511
2014	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	MWCNT fibre	0.30	7.13	0.71	16.28	0.61	45	S12
2014	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	CNT/GNRPt Fibre	0.30	6.83	0.69	13.55	0.73	46	S13
2012	TiO ₂ NRs-coated CFs	CFs (carbon fibres)	Pt -cozated optical fibre	0.30	1.28	0.61	4.58	0.46	47	S14
2011	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.30	5.84	0.64	13.62	0.67	48	S15
2010	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	2.78	0.52	10.90	0.48	49	S16
2010	TiO ₂ nanotube	Ti wire	Pt wire	0.50	4.10	0.69	11.65	0.51	50	S17

Table S4. Comparison of the performance of TiO_2 @PEOx-based FDSSC and other FDSSC examples reported in the literature.

Table S5. EIS parameters of Fig. 6c, 6d, 0	6f and 6g, simulated by the equivalent circuit
depicted in Fig. 6a, 6b.	

Photoanode	Applied Voltage (V)	R _{τi} (Ω cm)	R _{Pt} (Ω cm)	R _{ττ} (Ω cm)	С _π (F cm ⁻¹)	С _{<i>_{Pt}</i> (F ст⁻¹)}	С ₇₇ (F cm ⁻¹)	
	0.20	56.79	105.07	123.20	2.65 × 10 ⁻⁶	6.10 × 10 ⁻⁴	5.39 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	0.40	46.07	72.43	79.19	1.73 × 10 ⁻⁶	2.95 × 10 ⁻⁴	2.43 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
blank-TiO ₂	0.60	42.69	58.42	66.23	1.66×10^{-6}	2.62×10^{-4}	1.40 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	0.80	18.01	45.08	50.35	1.53 × 10 ⁻⁶	2.20×10^{-4}	1.24 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	1.00	17.66	31.24	35.34	1.24×10^{-6}	2.08×10^{-4}	1.14 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	0.20	56.48	102.40	122.50	2.63×10^{-6}	5.93 × 10 ⁻⁴	5.19 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	0.40	36.58	67.00	76.50	1.70×10^{-6}	2.92×10^{-4}	2.41×10^{-11}	
TiO ₂ @PEOx	0.60	34.81	55.70	65.30	1.64 × 10 ⁻⁶	2.54×10^{-4}	1.35 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	0.80	15.49	43.08	46.10	1.50×10^{-6}	2.13 × 10 ⁻⁴	1.16 × 10 ⁻¹¹	
	1.00	13.30	29.33	34.30	1.23×10^{-6}	1.97 × 10 ⁻⁴	1.08 × 10 ⁻¹¹	

Supporting Information References

- S1 J. Zhang, Z. Wang, X. Li, J. Yang, C. Song, Y. Li, J. Cheng, Q. Guan and B.
 Wang, ACS Appl. Energy Mater., 2019, 2, 2870–2877.
- S2 X. Y. Gu, E. Z. Chen, M. Y. Ma, Z. Y. Yang, J. L. Bai, L. L. Chen, G. Z. Sun, Z. X.
 Zhang, X. Jun Pan, J. Y. Zhou and E. Q. Xie, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.*, 2019, **52**, 095502.
- S3 G. Liu, M. Wang, H. Wang, R. E. A. Ardhi, H. Yu, D. Zou and J. K. Lee, *Nano Energy*, 2018, **49**, 95–102.
- S4 G. Liu, H Wang, M. Wang, W. Liu, R. E. A. Ardhi, D. Zou and J. K. Lee, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2018, **167**, 34–40.
- S5 X. Fu, H. Sun, S. Xie, J. Zhang, Z.g Pan, M. Liao, L. Xu, Z. Li, B. Wang, X. Sun and H. Peng, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, 6, 45–51.
- S6 J. Liang, G. Zhu, C. Wang, Y. Wang, H. Zhu, Y. Hu, H. Lv, R. Chen, L. Ma, T.
 Chen, Z. Jin and J. Liu, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2017, 7, 1601208.
- S7 G. Liu, X. Gao, H. Wang, A. Y. Kim, Z. Zhao, J. K. Lee and D. Zou, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2016, 4, 5925–5931.
- S8 Z. Wen, M. H. Yeh, H. Guo, J. Wang, Y. Zi, W. Xu, J. Deng, L. Zhu, X. Wang, C.
 Hu, L. Zhu, X. Sun and Z. L. Wang, *Sci. Adv.*, 2016, 2, e1600097.
- S9 G. Liu, M. Peng, W. Song, H. Wang and D. Zou, *Nano Energy*, 2015, **11**, 341–347.
- S10 Y. Xue, Y. Ding, J. Niu, Z. Xia, A. Roy, H. Chen, J. Qu, Z. L. Wang and L. Dai, *Sci. Adv.*, 2015, 1, 1400198.
- S11 T. Chen and L. Dai, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2015, 54, 14947.
- S12 Z. Yang, J. Deng, X. Sun, H. Li and H. Peng, *Adv. Mater.*, 2014, **26**, 2643–2647.

- S13 X. Fang, Z. Yang, L. Qiu, H. Sun, S. Pan, J. Deng, Y. Luo and H. Peng, *Adv. Mater.*, 2014, 26, 1694–1698.
- S14 W. Guo, C. Xu, X. Wang, S. Wang, C. Pan, C. Lin and Z. L. Wang, *J. Am. Chem.* Soc., 2012, **134**, 4437–4441.
- S15 S. Huang, X. Guo, X. Huang, Q. Zhang, H. Sun, D. Li, Y. Luo and Q. Meng, Nanotechnology, 2011, 22, 315402.
- S16 Z. Liu and M. Misra, ACS Nano, 2010, 4, 2196–2200.
- S17 Y. Liu, M. Li, H. Wang, J. Zheng, H. Xu, Q. Ye and H. Shen, J. Phys. *D: Appl. Phys.*, 2010, **43**, 205103.