## Journal of Materials Chemistry A

**RSCPublishing** 

ARTICLE

## **Supporting Information**

## Improving TiO<sub>2</sub> Electron Transport Layer in Perovskite Solar Cell by Acetylacetonate-based Additives

Hsin-Hua Wan<sup>+</sup>,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Qi Chen<sup>+</sup>,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Huanping Zhou,<sup>\**a,b*</sup> Luo Song,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Zac St Louis,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Nicholas De Marco, Yihao Fang,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Pengyu Sun,<sup>*a*</sup> Tze-Bin Song,<sup>*a,b*</sup> Huajun Chen, and Yang Yang<sup>\**a,b*</sup>

Author Contributions +H. Wang and Q. Chen contributed equally to this work. Corresponding author: happyzhou@ucla.edu and yangy@ucla.edu



Figure S1 Absorption spectra of the perovskite absorber layer on modified TiO<sub>2</sub> ETLs by various additives.



**Figure S2** Photoemission cutoff obtained via UPS for  $TiO_2$  with and without additives, and the obtained Fermi level for ETL materials are:  $TiO_2$  (4.0 eV), to Zn- $TiO_2$  (3.85 eV), Y- $TiO_2$  (3.9 eV), Zr- $TiO_2$  (4.18 eV) and Mo- $TiO_2$  (4.1 eV) respectively.



**Figure S3** XPS analysis for  $TiO_2$  with and without additives, a) the survey spectra of all the electron transport materials; b) a detailed scan of Zn 2p for Zn-TiO<sub>2</sub> film; c) a detailed scan of Mo 3d for Mo-TiO<sub>2</sub> film; d) a detailed scan of Y 3d for Y-TiO<sub>2</sub> film; e) a detailed scan of Zr 3d for Zr-TiO<sub>2</sub> film. The absence of the signal from the additives indicates a low incorporation concentration.



**Figure S4** SEM images of  $TiO_2$  with and without additives, a)  $TiO_2$  film; b) Zn- $TiO_2$  film; c) Y- $TiO_2$  film; d) Zr- $TiO_2$  film; and e) Mo- $TiO_2$  film. Different electron transport materials exhibit similar morphology in terms of the film conformity and grain size.



**Figure S5** UV-Vis absorption of  $TiO_2$  with and without additives. All the electron transport materials exhibit similar bandgaps around 3.6 eV.

ARTICLE

Sample	Voc (V)	Jsc (mA/cm <sup>2</sup> )	PCE (%)	FF (%)
Reference	1.047	20.30	16.39	77.15
Standard	1.048	20.54	16.59	77.06
Standard (rev)	1.027	20.51	15.46	73.38
Y-TiO <sub>2</sub>	1.017	20.29	15.46	74.91
Y-TiO <sub>2</sub> (rev)	1.007	19.52	14.66	74.59
Mo-TiO <sub>2</sub>	0.995	20.12	15.21	76.01
Mo-TiO <sub>2</sub> (rev)	0.955	20.30	13.85	71.41
Zr-TiO <sub>2</sub>	1.041	19.83	15.69	76.03
Zr-TiO <sub>2</sub> (rev)	1.024	19.66	14.78	73.40
Zn-TiO <sub>2</sub>	1.046	19.84	15.91	76.67
Zn-TiO <sub>2</sub> (rev)	1.027	19.40	14.86	74.58

Table S1: The hysteresis study of the devices based on TiO<sub>2</sub> electron transport materials with and without additives.



**Figure S6** Stability study of devices based on  $TiO_2$  with and without additives. The stability of perovskite solar cells shows a random trend, where the devices based on Mo-TiO<sub>2</sub> exhibit improved stability, while others show a decreased stability when compared to standard devices. Further studies on underlying degradation mechanisms is under investigation.