Electronic Supplementary Information

Over 25% Efficiency and Stable Bromine-free RbCsFAMA-based Quadruple Cation Perovskite Solar Cells Enabled by an Aromatic Zwitterion

Qi Wang^a, Weijian Tang^a, Yuting Chen^a, Wuke Qiu^a, Yihui Wu^{*ab}, and Qiang Peng^{*ab}

^a School of Chemical Engineering and State Key Laboratory of Polymer Materials Engineering, Sichuan University,

Chengdu 610065, China. E-mails: yihuiwu@scu.edu.cn; qiangpeng@scu.edu.cn

^b Engineering Research Center of Alternative Energy Materials & Devices, Ministry of Education, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

Materials: All the chemicals were used as received. Lead iodide (\geq 98%) was purchased from TCI. SnCl₂·2H₂O (>99.99%), 1-(3-sulfopropyl)pyridinium hydroxide inner salt (SPHI, 98%), and anisole were purchased from Aladdin. RbI (99.9%), thioglycolic acid (TGA, 98%), urea, lithium Bis(trifluoromethanesulfonyl)imide salt (Li-TFSI), and 4-tertbutylpyridine (*t*BP) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. CsCl (99.999%) was purchased from Alfa-aesar. Cobalt(III) Tris(bis(trifluoromethylsulfonyl)imide)) salt (Co(III) TFSI, FK209) were purchased from Greatcell solar. Formamidinium iodide (FAI), methylammonium iodide (MAI), and spiro-OMeTAD were purchased from Xi'an p-oled. HCl aqueous (37 wt%) was purchased from CHRON Chemicals. Distilled water was purchased from Watsons. Dimethylformamide (DMF), dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), chlorobenzene (CB), isopropyl alcohol (IPA), and acetonitrile were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used without purification.

Device fabrication: All devices were prepared on the cleaned and patterned FTO substrates (AGC22-8A, Advanced Election Technology Co. Ltd.). The compact SnO₂ layer was fabricated using a chemical bath deposition (CBD) method. Briefly, 625 mg of urea and 137.5 mg of SnCl₂·2H₂O were dissolved in 50 mL of ultrapure water. Then, 625 μ L of HCl and 12.5 μ L of TGA were added into this solution. The obtained CBD solution was loaded onto a glass reaction vessel (size: 65 mm * 61 mm * 92 mm, volume: ~140 mL, purchased from Taobao). The cleaned FTO substrate were vertically placed into the vessel and the reaction was kept at 90 °C for 5.5 h. After the reaction is complete, the FTO/SnO₂ substrate was removed from the reaction vessel and cleaned via sonication with deionized water and IPA for 5 min each. The FTO/SnO₂ substrate was then annealed in an ambient environment at 170 °C for 60 min, followed by spin-coating 10 mM KCl in deionized water at 3000 rpm for 30 s and annealing at 100 °C for 10 min. Before perovskite deposition, the FTO/SnO₂ substrate was treated by a UV-Ozone for 15 min.

The Br-free RbCsFAMA perovskite solution was prepared by mixing 645.4 mg of PbI₂, 216.7 mg of FAI, 11.1 mg of MAI, 11.8 mg of CsCl, and 8.9 mg of RbI in a mixed solvent (DMF:DMSO = 4:1, v/v). The solution was stirred for 12 h before use. After that, the perovskite ink was deposited on the above mentioned FTO/SnO₂ substrate via spin coating at 1000 rpm for 10 sec with a ramp of 200, and 4000 rpm for 30 sec (2000 rpm ramp). 20 seconds into the second step, 110 μ L of anisole was deposited onto the substrate. For the SPHI containing samples, different concentrations of SPHI (0.01 wt%, 0.05 wt%, 0.1 wt%, 0.5 wt%, and 1 wt%) were added directly into the perovskite precursor ink. And then the wet film was annealed at 110 °C for 60 min. After the perovskite film was cooled down to room temperature, a 5 mg/mL of PEAI/IPA solution was spin-coated at 5000 rpm for 30 s and no annealing is required. After that, a solution of spiro-OMeTAD/CB (100 mg mL⁻¹) was spin coated onto perovskite films at 4000 rpm for 30 s in glove box, where 40 μ L 4-tert-butylpyridine, 24.5 μ L Li-TFSI/acetonitrile (520 mg mL⁻¹), and 49 μ L Co-TFSI/acetonitrile (300 mg mL⁻¹) were used as the additive. Finally, 8 nm of MoO₃ and 120 nm of Ag electrode were deposited by thermal evaporation. After that, all devices were stored in a desiccator overnight and then the *J-V* curves were measured.

For the FAMA-based device, the perovskite solution was prepared by mixing 1.53 M PbI₂, 1.4 M FAI, 0.5 M MACl, and 0.0122 M MAPbBr₃ in DMF:DMSO (8:1, v/v). The perovskite solution deposited *via* spin coating at 1000 rpm for 10 s (200 rpm ramp) and 5000 rpm for 30 s (2000 rpm ramp). During 10 seconds into the second step, 110 μ L of anisole was deposited onto the substrate. For the SPHI containing samples, 0.1 wt% of SPHI was added directly into the perovskite precursor ink. And then, the wet film was annealed at 110 °C for 60 min. The fabrication procedures of PEAI, HTL and metal electrode are the same with that of the RbCsFAMA-based PSCs.

Characterization: The top-view and the cross-sectional SEM images were obtained by using a Titachi S4800 fieldemission scanning electron microscopy (Hitachi High Technologies Corporation).

AFM was recorded from Bruker Innova atomic microscopy.

The UV-visible absorption spectra of the solution and thin films were measured from the absorbance model (without integrating sphere) using PerkinElmer Lambda 950 UV-vis spectrophotometer with a scanning rate of 600 nm/min in the range of 900-300 nm at a step bandwidth of 1 nm. The type of baseline calibration was the 100% transmittance baseline.

The XRD patterns of the perovskite films were recorded on Bruker D8 advance with a Cu K α radiation (40 kV, 40 mA) and a scanning rate of 5°/ min in the 2 θ range of 5-50° at a step size of 0.02 s.

The steady PL spectra and time-resolved PL decay measurements were performed using an FLS980 Series of Fluorescence Spectrometers. For the PL measurement, the excitation source was a monochromatized Xe lamp (peak wavelength at 500 nm with a line width of 2 nm). For TRPL, the excitation source was a supercontinuum pulsed laser sources (YSL SC-PRO) with an excitation wavelength at 800 nm and a repetition rate of 0.1 MHz.

Monochromatic external quantum efficiency (EQE) spectra were recorded as functions of wavelength with a monochromatic incident light of 1×10^{16} photons cm⁻² in alternating current mode with a bias voltage of 0 V (QE-R3011). The light intensity of the solar simulator was calibrated by a standard silicon solar cell provided by PV Measurements.

Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) was obtained by using a potentiometer (CHI604E, CH instrument) under dark conditions in the frequency range from 1 MHz to 10 mHz with an AC amplitude of 5 mV.

Mott-Schottky analysis were conducted by using a potentiometer (CHI604E, CH instrument) at the frequency of 1000 Hz in the applied voltage range from 0 V to 1.5 V with an AC amplitude of 5 mV.

A Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR, Thermo Fisher Nicolet Is5) was used to collect the FT-IR spectral data for the samples without and with SPHI.

The liquid state ¹H nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements were recorded on JNM-ECZ400S/L1 spectrometer (TMS as an internal standard ($\delta = 0$)).

UPS and XPS spectra were recorded by a Thermo-Fisher ESCALAB Xi+ system. For XPS measurement, radiation was produced by a monochromatic 75 W Al Kα excitation centred at 1486.7 eV. For UPS measurement, He I ultraviolet radiation source of 21.22 eV was used.

The current-voltage characteristics were measured by Keithley 2400 source and the solar simulator with standard AM $1.5G (100 \text{ mW/cm}^2, \text{SAN EI: Japan})$ under ambient conditions. The *J-V* curves were measured by forward (-0.1 V to 1.5 V forward bias) or reverse (1.5 V to -0.1 V) scans with a delay time of 100 ms for each point. The *J-V* curves for all devices were obtained by masking the cells with a metal mask of 0.09 cm² or 1 cm² in area.

The devices for long-term stability measurement were stored in a N_2 -filled glovebox. After various periods of time, the *J-V* measurements were performed.

The dynamic MPP tracking was carried out in a custom-made N₂-filled box under 1 sun continuous illumination (white light LED array) with temperature of \sim 30 °C (the equipment was purchased from Ezhou Zhongneng Optoelectronic Co., Ltd.). The MPP was automatically recalculated every 2 h by tracking the *J-V* curve.



Fig. S1. UV-vis absorption spectra of SPHI, FAI, and SPHI-FAI mixed samples (DMSO was used as the solvent).



Fig. S2. XPS spectra of the control and SPHI treated perovskite films: (a) survey, high resolution spectra of C 1s (b), N 1s (c), Cs 3d (d), and Rb 3d (e).



Fig. S3. SEM images and the corresponding grain size distributions of the control (a, c) and SPHI treated perovskite films (b, d).



Fig. S4. AFM images and the corresponding amplitude of the control (a,c) and SPHI treated perovskite films (b,d).



Fig. S5 (a) The UV-vis absorption spectra of the control and SPHI treated perovskite films, (b) the corresponding bandgaps (1.52 eV).



Fig. S6. UPS spectra of control (a) and SPHI treated perovskite films (b), (c) the corresponding energy levels, respectively.



Fig. S7. Cross-sectional SEM images of (a) the control and (b) the SPHI-containing PSCs.



Fig. S8. PV parameters distribution of the devices with different SPHI concentrations (60 devices for each concentration).



Fig. S9. Hysteretic effect of the small area (0.09 cm²) devices based on the control (a) and SPHI treated perovskite films (b).



Fig. S10. The certification report of photovoltaic performance of the SPHI-treated RbCsFAMA quadruple cation perovskite solar cell (aperture area: 0.09 cm²) with forward and reverse scan from Chengdu Institute of Product Quality Inspection Co., Ltd.



Fig. S11. Stabilized output efficiency of the control device around the maximum output power point as a function of time under simulated 1 sun illumination.



Fig. S12. J-V curves of the FAMA-based PSCs with and without SPHI-treatment.



Fig. S13. The certification report of photovoltaic performance of the large area SPHI-treated RbCsFAMA quadruple cation perovskite solar cell (aperture area: 1 cm²) with forward and reverse scan from Chengdu Institute of Product Quality Inspection Co., Ltd.



Fig. S14. Hysteretic effect of the large area (1 cm²) devices based on the control (a) and SPHI treated perovskite films



Fig. S15. Dark current-voltage curves for the hole-only structured devices with control and SPHI treated perovskites (ITO/PEDOT:PSS/Perovskite/Spiro/Ag).



Fig. S16. J_{SC} vs. light intensity for the devices without and with SPHI treatment.

Table S1. Parameters of the TRPL spectroscopy based on different samples.

Samples	$\tau_{ave} \left(ns \right)$	τ_1 (ns)	τ_2 (ns)	A_1	A_2
Glass/Control perovskite	1117.1	5.07	1119.5	0.30	0.63
Glass/SPHI treated perovskite	1708.5	4.73	1715.2	0.47	0.33

 Table S2. Summary of PV parameters for the normal structured PSCs based on RbCsFAMA quadruple cation perovskites.

		1			DOD	
Devices	Scan direction	V _{oc}	J_{sc}	FF	PCE	Ref.
Configurations		[V]	[mA/cm ²]	[%]	[%]	
FTO/c-TiO ₂ /m-	Daviansa	1 1 2 0	22.80	81.00	21.0	
TiO ₂ /RbCsFAMA	Reverse	1.180	22.80	81.00	21.0	1
/spiro-				~~ ~~		1
OMeTAD/Au	Forward	1.173	22.80	80.00	21.3	
FTO/SnO ₂ /RbCsF	Reverse	1.098	24.11	80.77	21.38	
AMA/PFAI/spiro						2
-OMeTAD/Ag	Forward	1.084	24.09	79.40	20.73	
FTO/T1O ₂ /m-	Reverse	1.121	25.35	84.70	24.05	
TiO ₂ /RbCsFAMA						3
/spiro-	Forward	1 123	25.23	80.50	22.85	
OMeTAD/Au.	1 of wurd	1.125	23.23	00.50	22.05	
FTO/c-TiO ₂ /m-	n	1 1 (1	22.28	76.0	20.24	
TiO ₂ /RbCsFAMA	Reverse	1.161	22.28	/6.8	20.24	4
/Spiro-						4
OMeTAD/Au	Forward	1.161	22.27	75.9	20.03	
FTO/SnO2/RbCs	_					
FAMA/spiro-	Reverse	1.162	25.69	83.80	25.01	This
						T III5
	Forward	1.146	25.65	80.78	23.74	WOLK
/Ag						

Table S3. PV parameters of 60 control devices.

Entry	$V_{\rm OC}$ (V)	$J_{\rm SC}~({ m mA~cm^{-2}})$	FF (%)	PCE (%)
1	1.105	25.75	79.06	22.50
2	1.114	25.26	79.97	22.49
3	1.107	25.27	80.18	22.44
4	1.098	25.75	79.39	22.44

5	1.092	25.40	80.81	22.41
6	1.095	25.40	80.54	22.40
7	1.116	25.32	79.09	22.36
8	1.103	25.30	80.01	22.33
9	1.105	25.57	79.02	22.33
10	1.104	25.71	78.61	22.32
11	1.102	25.49	79.46	22.32
12	1.102	25.72	78.70	22.32
13	1.106	25.40	79.43	22.31
14	1.098	25.68	79.06	22.30
15	1.105	25.58	78.86	22.29
16	1.084	25.31	81.20	22.29
17	1.106	25.42	79.05	22.24
18	1.112	25.36	78.80	22.22
19	1.108	25.71	77.97	22.22
20	1.090	25.17	80.94	22.20
21	1.090	25.72	79.20	22.20
22	1.114	25.63	77.63	22.18
23	1.098	25.79	78.33	22.17
24	1.087	25.53	79.89	22.17
25	1.104	25.28	79.34	22.15
26	1.102	25.69	78.26	22.15
27	1.070	25.56	80.95	22.15
28	1.109	25.58	78.05	22.14
29	1.104	25.75	77.89	22.14
30	1.103	25.62	78.30	22.13
31	1.119	25.21	78.44	22.12
32	1.095	25.34	79.66	22.11
33	1.105	25.59	78.12	22.09
34	1.107	25.53	78.09	22.07
35	1.085	25.56	79.54	22.06
36	1.099	25.88	77.54	22.05
37	1.070	25.69	80.07	22.02
38	1.100	25.09	79.66	21.99
39	1.068	25.48	80.83	21.98
40	1.087	25.12	80.47	21.98
41	1.098	25.82	77.47	21.97
42	1.094	25.56	78.52	21.96

Average	$\boldsymbol{1.099 \pm 0.012}$	$\textbf{25.44} \pm \textbf{0.23}$	$\textbf{79.07} \pm \textbf{1.05}$	$\textbf{22.10} \pm \textbf{0.21}$
60	1.069	25.19	80.56	21.69
59	1.104	25.39	77.58	21.74
58	1.110	25.16	77.94	21.76
57	1.090	25.30	79.02	21.79
56	1.107	25.06	78.63	21.82
55	1.097	25.23	78.93	21.85
54	1.102	25.42	78.00	21.85
53	1.110	24.96	78.88	21.86
52	1.095	25.26	79.03	21.87
51	1.078	25.14	80.70	21.87
50	1.114	25.68	76.49	21.87
49	1.088	25.17	79.92	21.88
48	1.107	25.27	78.22	21.89
47	1.109	25.32	77.93	21.89
46	1.095	25.03	79.95	21.91
45	1.104	25.28	78.55	21.91
44	1.105	25.45	78.00	21.94
43	1.087	25.45	79.35	21.95

 Table S4. PV parameters of 60 SPHI treated devices.

Entry	$V_{\rm OC}$ (V)	$J_{\rm SC}~({ m mA~cm^{-2}})$	FF (%)	PCE (%)
1	1.162	25.69	83.80	25.01
2	1.159	25.76	83.30	24.86
3	1.156	25.63	83.52	24.73
4	1.161	25.52	83.32	24.67
5	1.150	25.62	83.68	24.66
6	1.164	25.46	83.20	24.66
7	1.164	25.37	83.40	24.63
8	1.159	25.87	82.09	24.62
9	1.153	25.41	83.94	24.60
10	1.153	25.31	84.31	24.59
11	1.154	25.59	83.24	24.59
12	1.163	25.21	83.69	24.54
13	1.146	25.47	84.06	24.54
14	1.158	25.66	82.57	24.54

15	1.159	25.57	82.67	24.50
16	1.144	25.75	83.17	24.49
17	1.156	25.59	82.80	24.49
18	1.141	25.57	83.93	24.49
19	1.154	25.40	83.47	24.46
20	1.153	25.28	83.91	24.46
21	1.159	25.11	83.92	24.43
22	1.152	25.80	82.16	24.42
23	1.156	25.22	83.47	24.33
24	1.139	25.23	84.62	24.32
25	1.147	25.44	83.32	24.31
26	1.165	25.43	82.04	24.31
27	1.147	25.69	82.47	24.30
28	1.149	25.26	83.62	24.27
29	1.150	25.47	82.85	24.27
30	1.154	25.21	83.43	24.27
31	1.161	25.21	82.89	24.26
32	1.144	25.47	83.25	24.26
33	1.149	25.35	83.26	24.26
34	1.146	25.47	83.05	24.24
35	1.143	25.62	82.74	24.23
36	1.142	25.60	82.77	24.20
37	1.155	25.35	82.69	24.20
38	1.154	25.32	82.78	24.19
39	1.160	25.67	81.20	24.19
40	1.153	25.14	83.41	24.18
41	1.141	25.40	83.37	24.16
42	1.153	25.50	82.13	24.15
43	1.156	25.13	83.12	24.14
44	1.143	25.63	82.33	24.13
45	1.141	25.62	82.43	24.11
46	1.167	25.40	81.28	24.11
47	1.152	25.17	83.10	24.10
48	1.152	25.18	83.03	24.09
49	1.148	25.12	83.54	24.08
50	1.159	25.17	82.56	24.08
51	1.141	25.37	83.11	24.05
52	1.145	25.56	82.14	24.05

Average	1.152 ± 0.007	25.44 ± 0.21	$\textbf{82.98} \pm \textbf{0.74}$	24.31 ± 0.24
60	1.149	25.21	82.78	23.99
59	1.143	25.78	81.39	23.99
58	1.160	25.34	81.64	23.99
57	1.140	25.75	81.72	24.00
56	1.155	25.00	83.14	24.00
55	1.139	25.56	82.48	24.02
54	1.152	25.41	82.06	24.02
53	1.149	25.13	83.25	24.04

Table S5. EIS parameters of the devices based on the control and SPHI treated perovskite films.

Devices	$R_{\rm tr}$ (ohm)	CPE1 (F)	$R_{\rm rec}$ (ohm)	CPE2 (F)
Control	10247	11.01E-9	3.12E4	5.39E-7
SPHI	8357	10.15E-9	3.95E4	5.68E-7

Time (h) $V_{\rm OC}$ (V) $J_{\rm SC}$ (mA cm⁻²) FF (%) PCE (%) Devices 0 79.11 1.093 25.63 22.17 480 1.094 25.83 75.45 21.31 840 1.087 25.75 75.15 21.04 75.91 Control 960 1.089 25.57 21.14 1704 1.090 25.22 73.18 20.12 1896 1.088 25.33 69.00 19.01 2064 1.077 25.22 65.55 17.81 0 1.150 25.64 81.94 24.16 480 1.142 25.75 81.10 23.84 25.68 80.84 SPHI 840 1.125 23.35 treated 960 25.84 79.56 1.125 23.13 perovskite 1704 1.113 25.84 78.48 22.56 1896 1.110 25.47 77.67 21.95

76.93

21.66

25.60

1.100

2064

Table S6. Time evolution of the PV parameters for PSCs without and with SPHI treatment.

- M. Saliba, T. Matsui, K. Domanski, J.-Y. Seo, A. Ummadisingu, S. M. Zakeeruddin, J.-P. Correa-Baena, W. R. Tress, A. Abate, A. Hagfeldt and M. Grätzel, *Science*, 2016, **354**, 206-209.
- 2. L. Yangi, Y. Li, Y. Pei, J. Wang, H. Lin and X. Li, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2020, 8, 7808-7818.
- Y. Ding, B. Ding, H. Kanda, O. J. Usiobo, T. Gallet, Z. Yang, Y. Liu, H. Huang, J. Sheng, C. Liu, Y. Yang, V. I. E. Queloz, X. Zhang, J.-N. Audinot, A. Redinger, W. Dang, E. Mosconic, W. Luo, F. De Angelis, M. Wang, P. Dörflinger, M. Armer, V. Schmid, R. Wang, K. G. Brooks, J. Wu, V. Dyakonov, G. Yang, S. Dai, P. J. Dyson and M. K. Nazeeruddin, *Nat. Nanotech.*, 2022, 17, 598-605.
- L. Merten, A. Hinderhofer, T. Baumeler, N. Arora, J. Hagenlocher, S. M. Zakeeruddin, M. I. Dar, M. Grätzel and F. Schreiber, *Chem. Mater.*, 2021, 33, 2769-2776.