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## Materials

The Compound 1 was synthesized according to the procedure reported in the literatures ${ }^{1}$. The polymer donor PBDB-T was purchased from Organtec Ltd. and the 2-((5)6-Bromo-3-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-inden-1-ylidene)malononitrile (compound 3) was purchased from Beijing Huawei Ruike Chemical Co.,Ltd.. The poly[(9,9-bis(3-
((N,N-dimethyl)-N-ethylammonium)-propyl)2,7-fluorene)-alt-2,7-(9,9-
dioctylfluorene)] (PFN-Br), perylene-diimide (PDIN) and zirconium acetylacetonate (ZrAcac) was purchased from Organtec Solar Materials Inc. The poly[(9,9-bis(3'-(N,N-dimethyl)ethylammoinium-propyl)-2,7-fluorene)-alt-2,7-(9,9-dioctylfluorene)] (PFN) and (N,N-dimethylamino)propyl naphthalene diimide (NDIN) was purchased from Derthon Optoelectronic Materials Science Technology Co., Ltd.. ZnO nanoparticles were synthesized by hydrolysis and condensation of zinc acetate dihydrate by potassium hydroxide in methanol using a $\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}: \mathrm{OH}^{-}$ratio of 1:1.7 accroding to Weller et al. ${ }^{2,3}$ The Other common materials and chemical reagents were purchased from commercial sources and used as received. The PG1 exhibits a number average molecular weight $\left(M_{n}\right)$ of 14.4 KDa with a polydispersity index (PDI) of 2.0, measured by high temperature gel permeation chromatography (GPC) with 1,2,4trichlorobenzene as eluent and polystyrene standard at $160^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The other chemicals and solvents were purchased from J\&K, Alfa Aesar and TCI Chemical Co. respectively. The monomer M1, and polymer PG1 were synthesized according to Scheme S1.
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Scheme S1. Synthetic routes for the polymer acceptor PG1.

## Synthesis of Compound 2

In a dry round-bottomed flask, compound $\mathbf{1}(640 \mathrm{mg}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in DMF ( 50 mL ) and placed under a nitrogen atmosphere. The solution was cooled to 0 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stirred while phosphorus oxychloride in dichloroethane ( $0.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred for one hour at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and then stirred for five hours at $105{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the reaction, the mixture was cooled to room temperature and poured into ice water. 1 M NaOH solution was added and extracted with dichloromethane, The resulting crude compound was purified by silica gel column using a mixture of hexane/dichloromethane as the eluent to give a yellow solid compound 2 ( $595 \mathrm{mg}, 88 \%$ ).

Compound 2: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 10.13(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $3.19(\mathrm{t}, J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.89-1.91(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.36-1.44(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 34 \mathrm{H})$, $0.81(\mathrm{dd}, J=17.4,10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 0.49-0.61(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $100 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 181.79, 147.49, 146.86, 143.18, 137.04, 136.82, 136.80, 132.95, 129.67, 128.81, $127.43,127.40,112.40,55.28,31.83,31.50,30.34,30.20,30.03,29.64,29.34,29.31$, $29.18,28.16,27.91,22.73,22.68,22.64,22.43,22.41,14.09,13.94$, 13.92,13.70,13.67.13.67. Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization Time of Flight Spectrometry (MALDI-TOF) MS: calculated. For $\mathrm{C}_{60} \mathrm{H}_{86} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O} 2 \mathrm{~S} 5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}=1055.54$; found, 1055.63.

## Synthesis of M1

Compound 2 ( $0.158 \mathrm{~g}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-((5)6-Bromo-3-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-inden-1ylidene)malononitrile (compound $30.25 \mathrm{~g}, 0.91 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), pyridine ( 0.5 mL ) and chloroform ( 20 mL ) were dissolved in a round bottom flask under nitrogen. The mixture was stirred at $65{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. After cooling to room temperature, the mixture was poured into methanol and filtered. The residue was purified with column chromatography on silica gel using dichloromethane/petroleum ether $(1 / 1, v / v)$ as the eluent to give a dark blue solid M1 $(0.120 \mathrm{~g}, 51 \%$ yield $)$.

M1: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 9.15$ (br, 2H), 8.82 (br, 1.2H), 8.55 (br, 0.75H), 8.03 (br, 0.75H), 7.87-7.89 (br, 2H), 7.78-7.80 (br, 1.2H), 4.78 (m, 4H), 3.19-3.23 (t, $J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.89(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.47-1.51(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.33-1.37(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.33(\mathrm{~m}, 32 \mathrm{H}), 0.87-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 18 \mathrm{H}), 0.63-0.72(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 100 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 187.36,186.96,159.85,159.23,153.57,147.45,145.12,141.34$, $138.49,138.29,137.75,137.69,137.22,135.99,135.94,135.42,134.07,133.48$, 130.67, 130.13, 129.47, 128.14, 126.71, 126.34, 124.53, 120.17, 120.09, 115.29, $115.14,114.91,114.57,113.57,68.81,68.29,55.78,39.22,31.86,31.58,31.20,30.52$, 30.43, 29.85, 29.19, 22.66, 22.53, 22.50, 22.48, 14.11, 14.08, 13.81, 13.77. MatrixAssisted Laser Desorption/Ionization Time of Flight Spectrometry (MALDI-TOF) MS: calculated. For $\mathrm{C}_{84} \mathrm{H}_{92} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{5} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}=1565.82$; found, 1565.43.

Compound 3: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.76(\mathrm{~s}, 0.52 \mathrm{H}), 7.94-7.96(\mathrm{~d}, 0.44 \mathrm{H})$, $7.95(\mathrm{~s}, 0.43 \mathrm{H}), 7.81-7.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.81-7.82(\mathrm{~d}, 0.55 \mathrm{H}), 3.72-3.74(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(100 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 193.57,193.41,164.99,164.63,162.99,139.15,138.93,128.89$, $127.96,127.06,125.74,112.05,111.88,111.67,80.43,79.61,43.23,43.19$.

## Synthesis of PG1

In a 25 mL double-neck round-bottom flask, M1 $(156.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol})$ and ( $4,8-$ bis(4,5-didecylthiophen-2-yl)benzo[1,2-b:4,5-b']dithiophene-2,6-diyl)bis(trimethylstannane) (M2) (124.1 mg, 0.10 mmol$), \operatorname{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(10 \mathrm{mg})$, and dry toluene ( 10 mL ) were added. This double-neck round-bottom flask was then charged with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ cycle technique to 4-remove $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ for three times. The mixture solution was stirred for 5 h at $110{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under a $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ atmosphere. The highly viscous green solution was cooled down to room temperature. The reaction mixture was precipitated in 200 mL of methanol stirred for 2 h . The crude polymer was collected by filtration and then further purified by Soxhlet extraction with methanol, acetone, hexane, and chloroform, successively. A dark solid was obtained after removing chloroform ( $145 \mathrm{mg}, 62 \%, M_{n}$ $\left.=14.4 \mathrm{kDa}, M_{w}=26.7 \mathrm{kDa}, \mathrm{PDI}=2.0\right)$.

## Experimental Section

Measurements: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were measured in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ on Bruker AV 400 MHz FT-NMR spectrometer. UV-vis absorption spectrum was recorded on a UV-Vis-NIR Spectrophotometer of Agilent Technologies Cary Series. The electrochemical cyclic voltammetry (CV) was performed on a Zahner Ennium IM6 Electrochemical Workstation with glassy carbon disk, Pt wire, and $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{Ag}+$ electrode as working electrode, counter electrode, and reference electrode respectively, in a 0.1 M tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate $\left(\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NPF}_{6}\right)$ acetonitrile solution. The molecular weights of the polymers were measured by the GPC method with polystyrene as the standard and 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene as the solvent at $160^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using

Agilent Technologies PL-GPC220. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was measured on $\mathrm{TGA} / \mathrm{DSC}^{3+}$ from METTLER TOLEDO at a heating rate of $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ under a nitrogen atmosphere. Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) was performed on a TA DSC Q-200 with the scan rate of $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$. Atomic force microscopy (AFM) measurements were performed on a Dimension 3100 (Veeco) Atomic Force Microscope in the tapping mode. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was performed using a TePNai G2 F20 S-TWIN instrument at 200 kV accelerating voltage, in which the blend films were prepared using a processing technique, as following: first, the PBDB-T:PG1 films were spin-cast on the ITO/PEDOT:PSS substrates, and then the resulting substrates with the PBDB-T:PG1 films were submerged in deionized water to make these PBDB-T:PG1 films float onto the water/air interface, and finally the floated PBDB-T:PG1 films were picked up on unsupported 200 mesh copper grids. The GIWAXS measurements were performed at beamline 7.3.3 at the Advanced Light Source (ALS). Samples were prepared on a Si substrate under the same conditions as those used for device fabrication. The 10 KeV X-ray beam was incident at a grazing angle of $0.11^{\circ}-0.15^{\circ}$, which maximized the scattering intensity from the samples. The scattered x-rays were detected using a Dectris Pilatus 2 M photon counting detector. The crystal coherence length (CCL) was defined as CCL $=$ $0.9 \times(2 \pi / \mathrm{FWHM})(\AA)$, where FWHM is the full width at half maximum of the corresponding diffraction peak.

Fabrication and characterization of all-polymer solar cells.

The all-PSC devices structure was ITO/PEDOT:PSS/active layer/ZnO/Al. In an
ultrasonic bath, the ITO-coated glass ( $15 \Omega / \mathrm{sq}$ ) was cleaned with deionized water, acetone and isopropanol. After UVO cleaning for 10 min , and then a 30 nm thick poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene):poly(styrenesulfonate) (PEDOT:PSS) (Bayer Baytron 4083) anode buffer layer was spin-cast onto the ITO substrate and then dried by baking in an oven at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min . In a nitrogen glove box, the active layers were then deposited atop the PEDOT:PSS layer by spin-coating a CF solution of PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w:w) with a blend concentration of $14 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$. The thickness of the active layers was about 100 nm and controlled by adjusting the spin speed during the spincoating process and measured by a KLA Tencor D-100 profilometer. The ZnO nanoparticle ( ZnO NPs ) was then deposited on top of the active layers. The PFN-Br was deposited on top of the active layers by spin-coating an methanol solution with a concentration of $0.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ under 3000 rpm for 30 s . The PDIN was soluble in methanol containing a small amount of acetic acid (about $0.1 \%$ in volume) solution with a concentration of $1.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ were then deposited atop the active layer at 3000 rpm for 30 s . The ZrAcac was deposited on top of the active layers by spincoating an ethanol solution with a concentration of $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ under 3000 rpm for 30 s. The PDINO was deposited on top of the active layers by spin-coating a methanol solution with a concentration of $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ under 3000 rpm for 30 s . The PFN was soluble in methanol containing a small amount of acetic acid (about $0.4 \%$ in volume) solution with a concentration of $1.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ were then deposited atop the active layer at 3000 rpm for 30 s . The NDIN was soluble in methanol containing a small amount of acetic acid (about $0.1 \%$ in volume) solution with a concentration of $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$
were then deposited atop the active layer at 3000 rpm for 30 s . Finally, 100 nm Al was evaporated under vacuum at a pressure of $c a .4 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~Pa}$, and through a shadow mask to determine the active area of the devices $\left(\sim 2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}\right)$. The PCE values of the PSCs were measured under an illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}\left(100 \mathrm{~mW} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$ using a SS-F5-3A solar simulator (AAA grade, $50 \times 50 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}$ photobeam size) of Enli Technology CO, Ltd. A $2 \times 2 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ monocrystalline silicon reference cell (SRC-00019) was purchased from Enli Technology CO., Ltd. PCE statistics were obtained using 10 individual devices fabricated under the same conditions. The EQE was measured by Solar Cell Spectral Response Measurement System QE-R3011 (Enli Technology CO., Ltd.). The light intensity at each wavelength was calibrated with a standard single crystal Si photovoltaic cell. Sensentive EQE measurements were done using a chopped monochromatic light source (chopping frequency 173 Hz ), a current preamplifier (Stanford Instrument, SR570), a lock-in amplifier (Stanford Instrument, SR830), a reference Si diode. EQE-EL measurements were done using a home built setup. In this measurment, electric current was injected into the solar cell by a forward voltage bias, using a Keithly 2400 source meter, and emission from the solar cell was recorded by a Si diode and a Keithly picoammeter. The light intensity at each wavelength was calibrated with a standard single-crystal Si photovoltaic cell.

## Mobility measurement

Hole and electron mobility were measured using the space-charge limited current (SCLC) method. Device structures are ITO/PEDOT:PSS/Active layer/ $\mathrm{MoO}_{3} / \mathrm{Al}$ for
hole-only devices and ITO/ZnO-gel /Active layer/ZnO-NPs/A1 for electron-only devices. The SCLC is described by:

$$
J=9 \varepsilon_{0} \varepsilon_{\mathrm{r}} \mu\left(V_{\mathrm{appl}}-V_{\mathrm{bi}}-V_{\mathrm{s}}\right)^{2} / 8 L^{3}
$$

Where $J$ is the current density, $\varepsilon_{0}$ is the permittivity of free space $\left(8.85 \times 10^{-12} \mathrm{~F}\right.$ $\mathrm{m}^{-1}$ ), $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{r}}$ is the relative permittivity of the material (assumed to be 3 ), $\mu$ is the mobility of hole or electron, $V_{\text {appl }}$ is the applied voltage, $V_{\mathrm{bi}}$ is the built-in voltage, $V_{\mathrm{s}}$ is the voltage drop from the substrate's series resistance ( $V_{\mathrm{s}}=\mathrm{IR}$ ) and $L$ is the thickness of the active layer.


Fig. S1 The TGA curve of PG1 at a scan rate of $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ under nitrogen.


Fig. S2 DSC curves of PG1 at a scan rate of $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{min}{ }^{-1}$ under nitrogen.


Fig. S3 The UV-vis absorption spectra of PG1 in thin solid films.


Fig. S4 Cyclic voltammetry of PG1 and PBDB-T films on a glassy carbon electrode measured in a $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L} \mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{NPF}_{6}$ acetonitrile solution at a scan rate of $20 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$.
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Fig. S5 The $J-V$ and (b) EQE characteristics of the all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w) with different contents of CN under the illumination of AM 1.5G, 100 $\mathrm{mW} \mathrm{cm}{ }^{-2}$.

Table S1. Photovoltaic parameters of all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w) with different concentration of CN additive.

| Conditions | Speeds (rpm) | $V_{\text {oc }}$ <br> (V) | $\begin{gathered} J_{\mathrm{sc}}{ }^{\mathrm{a}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | FF | PCE <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As-cast | 3000 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.87 \\ (0.86 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 16.8 (16.4) | $\begin{gathered} 0.51 \\ (0.50 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.5 \\ (7.3 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3\% CN | 3300 | $\begin{gathered} 0.92 \\ (0.90 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 16.9 (16.5) | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \\ (0.65 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.4 \\ (10.2 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4\% CN | 3000 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.8 (17.5) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.68 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.5 \\ (11.3 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 5\% CN | 3500 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.1 (16.8) | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \\ (0.66 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.8 \\ (10.5 \pm 0.3) \end{gathered}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The integral $J_{\text {sc }}$ in parentheses from the EQE curves. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ The average PCE in parentheses from more than 10 devices.


Fig. S6 The $J-V$ and (b) EQE characteristics of the all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w) with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ at different annealing temperature for 5 min under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$.

Table S2. Photovoltaic parameters of all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w) with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ at different annealing temperature for 5 min under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$.

| Conditions | Speeds | $V_{\text {oc }}$ | $J_{\mathrm{sc}^{\mathrm{a}}}$ | FF | PCE $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | (rpm) | (V) | $\left(\mathrm{mA} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\right)$ |  | (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Without TA | 3000 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.8 (17.5) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.68 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.5 \\ (11.3 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 3200 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.7 (17.2) | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0.66 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.3 \\ (11.1 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 3400 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.92 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 17.7 (17.2) | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0.65 \pm 0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.3 \\ (11.1 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| $120{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 3500 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.92 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 17.5(17.1) | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0.65 \pm 0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.2 \\ (11.0 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The integral $J_{\mathrm{sc}}$ in parentheses from the EQE curves. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The average PCE in parentheses from more than 10 devices.
(a)

(b)


Fig. S7 The $J-V$ and (b) EQE characteristics of the all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 at different $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{A}$ weight ratios with contents of $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$.

Table S3. Photovoltaic parameters of the all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1 at different

D/A weight ratios with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$.

| D/A (w/w) | Speeds (rpm) | $V_{\text {oc }}$ <br> (V) | $\begin{gathered} J_{\mathrm{sc}}{ }^{\mathrm{a}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | FF | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{PCE}^{\mathrm{b}} \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2:1 | 3200 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.7 (17.5) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.66 \\ (0.64 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.0 \\ (10.7 \pm 0.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1.5:1 | 3000 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.8 (17.5) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.68 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.5 \\ (11.3 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1:1 | 3500 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.3(17.1) | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0.67 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.1 \\ (10.9 \pm 0.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The integral $J_{\mathrm{sc}}$ in parentheses from the EQE curves. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ The average PCE in parentheses from more than 15 devices.


Fig. S8. The $J-V$ curves of the PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w)-based all-PSCs with $4 \%$ CN at different electron transporting layers (ETLs) under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$. Various electron transporting layers (ETLs) were used, including ZnO-NPs, PDIN, ZrAcac, NDIN, PFN, PFN-Br, and PDINO.

Table S4. Photovoltaic parameters of the PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w)-based all-PSCs with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ at different electron transporting layers (ETLs) under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$. Various electron transporting layers (ETLs) were used, including ZnO-NPs, PDIN, ZrAcac, NDIN, PFN, PFN-Br, and PDINO.

| Interface <br> layer | Speeds <br> $(\mathrm{rpm})$ | $V_{\text {oc }}$ <br> $(\mathrm{V})$ | $J_{\mathrm{sc}^{\mathrm{a}}}$ <br> $\left(\mathrm{mA} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}\right)$ | FF | $\mathrm{PCE}^{\mathrm{b}}$ <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZnO-NPs | 3000 | 0.94 | $17.6(17.5)$ | 0.69 | 11.5 |
|  |  | $(0.93 \pm 0.01)$ |  | $(0.68 \pm 0.01)$ | $(11.3 \pm 0.2)$ |
| PDIN | 3300 | 0.93 | $17.8(17.3)$ | 0.68 | 11.3 |
|  |  | $(0.92 \pm 0.01)$ |  | $(0.66 \pm 0.02)$ | $(11.1 \pm 0.2)$ |
| ZrAcac | 3200 | 0.94 | $17.7(17.3)$ | 0.68 | 11.3 |
|  |  | $(0.92 \pm 0.02)$ |  | $(0.65 \pm 0.03)$ | $(11.1 \pm 0.2)$ |
| NDIN | 3600 | 0.94 | $17.1(16.8)$ | 0.67 | 10.7 |
|  |  | $(0.93 \pm 0.01)$ |  | $(0.65 \pm 0.02)$ | $(10.5 \pm 0.2)$ |
| PFN | 3800 | 0.93 | $17.7(17.2)$ | 0.67 | 11.1 |
|  |  | $(0.92 \pm 0.01)$ |  | $(0.64 \pm 0.03)$ | $(10.8 \pm 0.3)$ |
| PFN-Br | 4200 | 0.93 | $17.9(17.4)$ | 0.68 | 11.4 |
|  |  | $(0.92 \pm 0.01)$ |  | $(0.65 \pm 0.03)$ | $(11.1 \pm 0.3)$ |
| PDINO | 3500 | 0.94 | $16.9(16.4)$ | 0.67 | 10.6 |
|  |  | $(0.92 \pm 0.02)$ |  | $(0.65 \pm 0.02)$ | $(10.4 \pm 0.2)$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The integral $J_{\mathrm{sc}}$ in parentheses from the EQE curves. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ The average PCE in parentheses from more than 15 devices.


Fig. S9 The $J-V$ and (b) EQE characteristics of the all-PSCs based on PBDB-T:PG1
(1.5:1, w/w) with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ at different active area under the illumination of AM 1.5 G , $100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}$.

Table S5. Photovoltaic parameters of the PBDB-T:PG1 (1.5:1, w/w)-based PSCs with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ at different active area under the illumination of AM $1.5 \mathrm{G}, 100 \mathrm{~mW} \mathrm{~cm}{ }^{-2}$.

| Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{2}\right)$ | Speeds (rpm) | $V_{\mathrm{oc}}$ <br> (V) | $\begin{gathered} J_{\mathrm{sc}^{\mathrm{a}}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | FF | PCE ${ }^{b}$ <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.04 | 3000 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.8 (17.5) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.68 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.5 \\ (11.3 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 0.20 | 3500 | $\begin{gathered} 0.94 \\ (0.93 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.4(17.3) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.67 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.3 \\ (11.0 \pm 0.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| 0.45 | 3800 | $\begin{gathered} 0.93 \\ (0.92 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 17.3(16.9) | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \\ (0.66 \pm 0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.8 \\ (10.6 \pm 0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 0.81 | 3500 | $\begin{gathered} 0.92 \\ (0.90 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 17.0(16.8) | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \\ (0.65 \pm 0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.6 \\ (10.3 \pm 0.3) \end{gathered}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The integral $J_{\mathrm{sc}}$ in parentheses from the EQE curves. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The average PCE in parentheses from more than 15 devices.


Fig. S10 Storage stability (in the $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-filled glovebox) of the PBDB-T:PG1device.
(a)

(b)


Fig. S11 Normalized absorption spectra and emission spectra of (a) the as cast PBDBT:PG1 and (b) the 4\% CN PBDB-T:PG1.
(b)

(c)


Fig. S12 $J^{1 / 2}-V$ plots of (a) the PG1 pure film, (b) hole-only and (c) the electron-only devices based on PBDB-T: PG1 blends without and with CN treatment.

Table S6. Summarized hole and electron mobilities ( $\mu_{\mathrm{h}}$ and $\mu_{\mathrm{e}}$ ) of the device active layers measured by SCLC method.

| Condition | $\mu_{\mathrm{h}}\left(10^{-4} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~V}^{-1 \cdot} \cdot \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{e}}\left(10^{-4} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~V}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{h}} / \mu_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pure PG1 |  | $8.93 \pm 0.13$ |  |
| As-cast | $1.90 \pm 0.17$ | $1.01 \pm 0.19$ | $1.88 \pm 0.18$ |
| $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ | $6.76 \pm 0.23$ | $6.49 \pm 0.22$ | $1.04 \pm 0.22$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Average values with standard deviations were obtained from 10 devices.

Table S7. Summarized lamellar distance, $\pi-\pi$ distance and crystal coherence length of PBDB-T and PG1-based neat and blended films from GIWAXS.

|  | In plane | Out of plane | Crystal coherence length |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $d$-spacing $(\AA)$ | $\pi-\pi(\AA)$ | $L_{\mathrm{c}-100, \mathrm{IP}}(\AA)$ | $L_{\mathrm{c}-010, \mathrm{OOP}}(\AA)$ |
| PBDB-T | 20.9 | 3.67 | 80.9 | 29.2 |
| PG1 | 19.6 | 3.85 | 82.9 | 17.8 |
| As-cast | 20.9 | 3.82 | 92.8 | 15.1 |
| $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ | 21.1 | 3.71 | 199.2 | 28.3 |



Fig. S13 Surface height histograms extracted from the AFM images in the blend without CN treatment and the blend with $4 \% \mathrm{CN}$ additive treatment.
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