View Article Online

Journal of Materials Chemistry A

Materials for energy and sustainability

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: M. G. Mohamed, C. Lee, A. F. M. EL-Mahdy, J. Luder, M. Yu, Z. Li, Z. Zhu, C. Chueh and S. Kuo, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2020, DOI: 10.1039/D0TA02956D.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the Information for Authors.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the <u>Ethical guidelines</u> still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



rsc.li/materials-a

ARTICLE

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Exploitation of Two-Dimensional Conjugated Covalent Organic Frameworks Based on Tetraphenylethylene with Bicarbazole and Pyrene Units and Applications in Perovskite Solar Cells

Mohamed Gamal Mohamed,^{a+} Chia-Chen Lee,^{b,c+} Ahmed F. M. EL-Mahdy,^{a+} Johann Lüder,^d Ming-Hsuan Yu,^bZhen Li,^c Zonglong Zhu,^c Chu-Chen Chueh,^{b,e*} and Shiao-Wei Kuo^{a,f*}

In this work, two-dimensional conjugated covalent organic frameworks (2D-COF) based on a building block of tetraphenylethylene are successfully developed. Bicarbazole and pyrene moieties are respectively coupled with 4,4',4",4"'-(ethane-1,1,2,2-tetrayl)tetranilino (ETTA) via [4+4] solvothermal condensation conditions of 3,3',6,6'-tetraformyl-9,9'-bicarbazole (Car-4CHO) and 1,3,6,8-tetrakis(4-formylphenyl)pyrene (TFPPy) to afford Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs. According to thermogravimetric analysis (TGA), powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD), and N₂ adsorption and desorption measurements, both Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs exhibit excellent thermal stability, highly crystalline structure, and high specific surface area, respectively. These findings are supported by force field and ab initio calculations. Furthermore, successful applications of these COFs in perovskite solar cells (PVSCs) are demonstrated owing to their well-conjugated properties and π - π interactions. While serving as interlayers in the devices, these COFs could effectively promote the interfacial charge dynamic to further optimize the resulting performance. Besides, certain interaction between COFs and perovskite also leads to an improved morphology and crystallinity of the perovskite layer, presenting defect passivation capability. As a result, we show that the performance of the COF-modified PVSC could be improved from 17.40 to 19.80%.

Introduction

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Covalent organic frameworks (COFs) have been considered as a fascinating class of organic materials with high crystallinity and ordered conjugation.¹⁻⁶ According to their structural arrangement, this kind of high crystalline material can be divided into layered two-dimensional (2D) and threedimensional (3D) networks.7-10 In recent years, COFs have attracted significant research interest in both academic and industrial communities due to their well-defined porous properties, tailorable electronic and structural design, ordered skeletons, facile preparation through reversible covalent bond formation between organic linkers, and excellent chemical and thermal stability.11-17 Owing to these appealing properties, these materials have been widely applied in many technological fields and device prototypes, such as pseudocapacitors,18 gas separation,19 proton conduction,²⁰ semiconductors.²¹

+ These authors are equally contributed to this work.

heterogeneous catalysis,²² water splitting,²³ drug delivery,²⁴ solar cells,²⁵ and chemical sensors.²⁶

From the perspective of molecular design, to promote the charge transfer, the donor-acceptor (D-A) structure is the key feature in controlling the charge dynamic by providing a bicontinuous heterojunction structure and self-sorted D and A columnar arrays for charge separation and ambipolar pathways for charge collection.²⁷ 2D COFs, which usually consist of two different conjugated rigid organic molecular building blocks, present a 2D stacking pattern with D-A arrangement that permits charge migration along the framework and through π - π interactions.²⁸⁻³⁰ Besides, according to the D-A design principle, the bandgaps and energy levels are adjustable and the absorption range can even span over a broad visible and nearinfrared region up to 1100 nm.³¹ Credited with the crystalline and conjugated properties, COFs show a promising potential in photovoltaic applications and could provide an unprecedented strategy in charge dynamics within organic materials. The large contact area of COFs attributed to porous structure provides a perfect space that is large enough for prospective filler (i.e. fullerene derivatives, perovskite nanocrystals) to promote the charge collection between the two layers.^{28,33} Meanwhile, their high dimensional (2D and 3D) geometry might turn over a new page in the optoelectronic applications as compared to the 1D conjugated counterparts since they can better ameliorate the charge collect, phase separation, and the orientation issues of the devices.

Provided these significant properties, COFs have been utilized in organic solar cells as the photoactive materials.^{34,35}

^{a.} Department of Materials and Optoelectronic Science and Center of Crystal

Research, National Sun Yat-Sen University, Kaohsiung 80424, Taiwan ^{b.} Department of Chemical Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617,

Taiwan. ^c Department of Chemistry, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon 999077, Hong Kong.

^{d.} Department of Materials and Optoelectronic Science, National Sun Yat-Sen University, Kaohsiung 80424, Taiwan

e. Advanced Research Center for Green Materials Science and Technology, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan.

^{f.} Department of Medicinal and Applied Chemistry, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: [details of any supplementary information available should be included here]. See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

ARTICLE

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

However, only inferior power conversion efficiency (PCE) has been achieved so far owing to the narrow absorption and unsatisfactory charge collection with pure COF layer. Meanwhile, based on their porous characteristic, the COFs were further blended with phenyl-C₆₁-butyric acid methyl ester (PCBM) to enhance the charge dissociation and transporting capabilities.³³ Although some improvements were made, the overall PCEs were still below 1%. Instead of being used as the photoactive component, Chen et al. developed a two-in-one molecular design to successfully facilitate the growth of 2D-COFs on ITO and employed them as the interface modifier in perovskite solar cells (PVSCs).³² This pioneering exploration opens up the potential applications of 2D-COFs in the photovoltaic community. Meanwhile, Zhao et al. recently invented a series of spirobifluorene-based 3D-COFs and used them as additive in PVSCs to yield an improved PCE to 18.0%.²⁵ With suitable energy-level relationship, when the 3D-COFs is excited by light, electrons are generated at the LUMO-localized acceptor and transported to perovskite, while holes are produced at the HOMO-localized donor and accept electrons excited by nearby perovskite. Based on this phenomenon, the 3D-COF addition in the perovskite layer facilitates charge transfer and simultaneously reduce charge recombination within perovskite regions, resulting in a higher short-circuit current (Jsc) and fill factor (FF) of the derived device.²⁵ This result signifies a new direction of applying COFs in the photovoltaic devices; despite this, the applications of COFs in photovoltaics remain rare until now and their promising properties which can be relevant for many technological fields also need further explorations.

To well unroll the typical properties of COFs, in this work, we synthesized two kinds of 2D COFs, Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA. We first investigate the structure-property relationship of these two COFs in both aspects of experiment and theoretical calculation. Further, we demonstrated their efficacy of serving as an interlayer in PVSCs to enhance PCE, which can be attributed to their eminent charge transporting ability as a result of well-conjugated property and $\pi\text{-}\pi$ interactions. It is also revealed that their porous characteristic can facilitate the nucleation and crystal growth of perovskite to possibly reduce the charge recombination at the interface arising from defective states.^{36, 37} Notably, we manifested that the different synthesized units can tailor the energy levels of the derived COFs to modulate the band alignment across associated interfaces that leads to different open-circuit voltage (V_{oc}). Combing all these advantages, these COF interlayers enable the PVSCs to deliver enhanced PCEs up to 19.80%, outperforming the performance (17.40%) of the control device without COF interlayers.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis and characterization

We first constructed and synthesized two new 2D iminelinked Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs and investigated their structure-property relationship in both aspects of experiment and simulations. Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs were both



Scheme 1. Synthesis of Car-ETTA COF and TFPPy-ETTA

synthesized by [4+4] solvothermal condensation condition of Car-4CHO and TFPPy both with ETTA in the presence of 1,4dioxane/mesitylene/acetic acid (6M) for Car-ETTA COF and nbutanol/1,2-dichlorobenzene/acetic acid (6M) for TFPPy-ETTA COF at 120 °C for 72 h, as displayed in Scheme 1. Both yellow powders of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs are not soluble in common organic solvents including DMF, NMP, acetone, and THF. The building monomers of Car-4CHO, TFPPy, and ETTA were prepared according to the previously reported methods (Scheme S1-S5) and all spectroscopic analyses were summarized in the experimental parts (Figures S1-S8).³⁸⁻⁴² As seen in the ¹H-NMR spectra, the ETTA shows characteristic signals at 4.82 and 6.26-6.58 ppm for the NH_2 group and aromatic protons (Figure S1) while Car-4CHO displays the proton signals at 10.20 ppm for the aldehydic group (Figure S7). Further, the ¹³C-NMR spectrum of ETTA displays five characteristic signals of carbon atoms (113.74-146.47 ppm) (Figure S2) while that of Car-4CHO exhibits the typical C=O at 192.21 ppm (Figure S8). All these results indicate the successful syntheses of ETTA and Car-4CHO monomers in high purity.

The chemical structures of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs were examined by using Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) and solid state ¹³C NMR spectroscopy. As the FTIR spectra presented in Figure S9, ETTA shows typical absorption bands at 3358 and 3420 cm⁻¹ for the amino NH group and Car-4CHO displays characteristic bands at 2842, 2752, and 1695 cm⁻¹ for the aldehydic (HC=O) group. The FTIR spectrum of TFPPy shows the typical signals at 2824, 2731, and 1700 cm⁻¹ due to C-H and C=O stretching of HC=O units (Figure S10). The FTIR spectra of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs are presented in Figure S9 and Figure S10, which clearly reveal the successful formation of the imine linkage with the feature absorption of C=N stretching band located at 1620 cm⁻¹ and the bands of aromatic (C=C) groups centered at 1595 and 1512 cm⁻¹. Figure S11 displays the solid state ¹³C NMR spectra of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs, wherein the carbon resonance signal of C=N is respectively appeared at 158.6 ppm for Car-ETTA COF and at 156.4 ppm for

Journal Name



Figure 1. (a) PXRD pattern of the Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs: experimental (black), Pawley refined (red), difference between the experimental and calculated (FF) data (green), calculated for the AA-stacking model (blue) and AB-stacking model (aqua). (b) and (c) Top and side view of the AA-stacking model of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs, respectively.

TFPPy-ETTA COF. Both the FTIR and solid state ¹³C NMR spectra confirm the successful syntheses of the targeted Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs.

Crystallinity analysis with force-field calculations

The thermal stability of both synthesized COFs is then examined by thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) measured under a N2 atmosphere. As seen in Figure S12, both COFs display excellent thermal stabilities. Car-ETTA COF possesses a high decomposition temperature (T_{d10}) of 467 °C with a char yield of 59 % while the T_{d10} of TFPPy-ETTA COF is 580 °C with a char yield 81% (Table S1). Next, we performed powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) and computational simulations (classical force field (FF) simulation⁴³ in combination with XRD simulation on the fitted unit cell; the results are compared to DFT, for details see section of Computational Details to elucidate the crystalline nature and unit cell parameters of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs. As depicted in Figure 1a, the experimental PXRD patterns display the characteristics PXRD signals at 6.98°, 10.37°, 13.15°, and 20.96° for Car-ETTA COF, corresponding to the (110), (210), (220), and (001) planes. While TFPPy-ETTA COF shows PXRD

signals at 5.87°, 8.88°, 11.83°, and 19.70°, corresponding to the (110), (210), (220), and (001) planes. The *d*-spacing between the (110) plane (d_{110}) and the π -stacking interlayer distance between 2D sheets of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs are then calculated by Bragg equation. The respectively obtained values are 1.26 nm and 4.23 Å for Car-ETTA COF and 1.50 nm and 4.50 Å for TFPPy-ETTA COF.

To better understand the structures of the studied COFs, their PXRD patterns are also simulated from the Pawley refinement (Figure 1a, red curve). As seen, the simulated PXRD patterns are very similar to the experimental PXRD pattern (Figure 1a, black curve), as evidenced by their difference pattern (Figure 1c, green curve). In addition, the XRD pattern derived from the AA-eclipsed stacking models of both Car-ETTA COF and TFPPy-ETTA COF (Figure 1a, blue curve, and Figure 1b-1c) also well matches with the experimental patterns; whereas, the pattern derived from their corresponding AB' staggered stacking model (Figure 1a, aqua curve, and Figures S13-S14) deviates largely from the experimental results. The refined unit cell of the Car-ETTA COF is calculated to be *a* = 19.30 Å, *b* = 17.00 Å, and c = 4.60 Å with $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 90^{\circ}$ (residuals $R_{wp} = 7.15\%$ and $R_p = 5.10\%$) (Table S2). While, the refined unit cell of the TFPPy-ETTA COF is a = 21.20 Å, b = 21.20 Å, and c = 4.50 Å with $\alpha = \beta =$ $\gamma = 90^{\circ}$ (residuals $R_{wp} = 4.40\%$ and $R_{p} = 3.24\%$) (**Table S3**).

To elucidate the permanent porosities properties of both COFs, their respective Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface areas are determined by nitrogen adsorption and desorption measurements at 77 K, as presented in **Figure 2a**. Both Car-ETTA COF and TFPPy-ETTA COF show type I isothermal behavior with a sharp uptake at low-pressure region, which is attributed to microporosity properties. We found that the S_{BET} = 829 m² g⁻¹ with a specific pore volume of 0.46 cm³ g⁻¹ for Car-ETTA COF and the S_{BET} = 1156 m² g⁻¹ with a specific pore volume of 0.72 cm³ g⁻¹ for TFPPy-ETTA COF. In addition, the pore sizes for Car-ETTA COF and TFPPy-ETTA COF were estimated by nonlocal density functional theory and the results were 1.29 and 2.23 nm as displayed in **Figure 2b**, respectively. From the BET results, TFPPy-ETTA COF had a higher surface area and larger pore sizes than Car-ETTA COF, which suggests a larger mesopore with



Figure 2. (a) N_2 gas adsorption and desorption isotherms and (b) pore size distribution curve of Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs. (c, e) FE-SEM and (d, f) TEM images of (c, d) Car-ETTA and (e, f) TFPPy-ETTA COFs, respectively.

microporous exists inside TFPPy-ETTA COF. Such discrepancy lies in the different structure of the bridging unit, wherein the more planar and the spacing between bridging units of TFPPy also increases the pore size. The morphology of both COFs is examined by field emission scanning and transmission electron microscopy (FE-SEM and TEM) as presented in Figures 2c-2d and Figures 2e-2f. The FE-SEM images showed that a uniform spherical shaped aggregation morphology is observed for Car-ETTA COF while entangled nanofibers are observed for TFPPy-ETTA COF. Their corresponding TEM images are shown in Figures 2d and 2f. Car-ETTA COF possesses spherical morphology while TFPPy-ETTA COF shows microtubular morphology.

Journal of Materials Chemistry A

After elucidating the structural properties of these studied COFs, we are interested in exploring their potential in recent rising photovoltaic technologies, PVSCs, motivated by their layered structure. Based on our previous work and related wellconjugated property and π - π interactions within the 2D works from other research groups, it was unveiled that introducing additional mesoporous scaffolds at the perovskite/CTL interface can promote the crystallinity of the perovskite film grown on top.^{36, 37} Thus, we herein envisage to explore the roles of both COFs as a surface modifier of charge-transporting layer (CTL) in PVSC devices.

Prior to the test in the device, we first characterize the bandgap and energy levels of Car-ETTA COF and TFPPy-ETTA COF. The bandgap of both COFs is determined through their corresponding Tauc plots (Figure S15a-b) and their work function is measured using a photoelectron spectrometer model, AC-2 (Figure S15c-d). The respective highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) level for Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA is estimated to be -5.49 and -5.54 eV and the respective lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) level is -3.39 and -3.54 eV. It thus can be concluded that both COFs are more suitable to serve the surface modifier of hole-transporting layer (HTL) in PVSCs, especially for the inverted structure (Figure 8a, more details will be discussed later), to better mediate the energylevel alignment at the HTL/perovskite interface.44-46

Ab initio calculations

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

To gain insights at the atomic scale, first principle calculations based on Density Functional Theory were performed on monomers, monolayers, and bulk phases for the two prepared COFs. The optimized structure of the Car-ETTA and the TFPPy-ETTA monomers with passivated ends are shown in Figure 3 together with the orbital shapes of HOMO and LUMO of the individual molecules. Both Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA monomers are non-flat, which can cause a non-flat structure in the 2D layer as confirmed by the FF calculations. The electronic levels are also indicated in Figure 3. The Car-ETTA monomer has eigenvalues of HOMO and LUMO at -5.88 and -0.59 eV resulting in a fundamental gap of 5.3 eV. The fundamental gap has a similar value (5.3 eV) in TFPPy-ETTA mainly due to a slightly deeper LUMO at -1.53 eV and a HOMO of ca. -6.82 eV. In agreement with the experimental values, TFPPy-ETTA has a lower HOMO than Car-ETTA, while the absolute value for TFPPy-ETTA is overestimated by the DFT calculation potentially due to

the monomer model. While the values of the HOMOs are in fair agreement with the reported experimental values, the larger differences observed in the LUMO values can be explained with the limitations of DFT (e.g. contracted band gap), size effect, and the missing bulk contributions. Compared to the Car-4CHO and ETTA molecules, the gap values of the monomers are decreased, while the TFPPy molecule has a similar value. Details are given in Figure S16. The frontier orbitals are delocalized in the molecules. The Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA monomers show a localization of the equivalent frontier states. The localization of the orbitals on different parts of the molecules and a small but non-vanishing overlap of the occupied and the unoccupied frontier states may suggest possible electron transfer paths in the 2D layers of the COF as indicated in the Figure 3 by green arrows. The transfer can happen between subunits as well as across the COF among different units. However, an accurate description of electron transfer process requires computational techniques that are beyond ground state based DFT calculations and are beyond the scope of this article.

Figure 4 shows the structures of monolayer and bulk phase structures for both COFs for comparison. For the bulk phases, the formation energies of the COFs in different stacking configurations are given in Table 1. Details of the different geometries of the bulk phases are given in the computational details. The formation energies of the bulk phase with respect to individual monolayers were calculated according to Eq. (1) (see below). Car-ETTA has a formation energy of -1.4 eV and TFPPy-ETTA of -1.7 eV (Table 1). For all cases, the energy difference between differently stacked geometries is small (in the order of 100 meV). Car-ETTA has a preferred AB1 eclipsed stacking, i.e. alternating layers are shifted by (0.5, 0.5) lateral unit vectors, but with the same relative orientation, although the energy difference of 50 meV to the simple unit cell with

Figure 3. Overview of computed structures and frontier orbitals of TFPPy-ETTA and Car-ETTA COFs. Possible electron transfer paths from HOMO to LUMO are indicated by green arrows. Here and below, the color code is as follows: carbon (gray), hydrogen (white), oxygen (red) and nitrogen (blue).

Journal Name

Page 4 of 13



4 | J. Name., 2012, 00, 1-3

Materials Chemistry A Accepted Manus





Figure 4. Structure of DFT optimized Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA in monolayer and bulk phases. Black lines indicate the unit cell boundaries.

vertically eclipsed stacking (AA, e.g., similar to the FF simulation above) is minimal. TFPPy-ETTA has an energy difference of 90 meV between the vertically stacked configuration (AA) (**Table 1**) and the most stable configuration being an eclipsed AB stacking (i.e. AB3), in which the B layer is rotated and shifted.

For the most stable configurations, that are the shifted Car-ETTA (AB1) and the shifted and rotated TFPPy-ETTA (AB3), the computed lattice constants (angles) are 19.6, 16.4 and 9.73 Å (86.9°, 110.0° and 90.0°) and 21.9, 21.9 and 9.21 Å (87.3°, 87.7° and 90.1°) for Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA, respectively. These values agree with the results of the experimental and FF calculations above. Only the c vector is about twice because current model includes two layers in one-unit cell. Compared to the monolayer with lateral unit vectors of 19.4 and 16.3 Å and (89.4°, 89.0°) for Car-ETTA and 22.9 and 20.5 Å (88.5°, 89.9°) for TFPPy-ETTA, the bulk phases exhibit little difference in those vectors indicating weak interactions between COF layers. Furthermore, the calculations indicate that van der Waals forces dominate the interaction between COF layers resulting in minimal distances of ca 3 Å and an average height of 4.6 to 5 Å between neighboured COF planes.

In general, each COF layer is not flat but shows slight out-ofplane displacements resulting in a total height (out of molecular plane) difference within a COF layer of ca. 3 Å. These displacements are caused by dihedral rotations of molecular subunits. Details of the dihedral angles are given in **Table S4**. In

Table	1.	Formation	energies	$E_{f_{\square}}$	of	eclipsed cle COF				
configurations. Most stable configurations are highlighted in										
bold fo	nt. V	alues are give	en in eV.							

	E_f (Car-ETTA)	E _f (TFPPy-ETTA)
Vertical stacking (AA)	-1.33	-1.62
Shifted by (0.5,0.5) (AB1)	-1.38	-0.89
Rotated (AB2)	-0.95	-1.44
Shifted by (0.5,0.5) and rotated (AB3)	-1.14	-1.71

Car-ETTA, two dihedral rotations between diphenylmethylene and Carbazol-9-ide subunits can cause the out-of-plane displacements. In the single-molecule calculations, the dihedral angle was close to 90° between the Carbazol-9-ide-like subunits in Car-4CHO and 57.3° in ETTA. In the Car-ETTA monolayer as well as the bulk phase calculations, this dihedral angle drastically reduces to a value of ca. 52.3 and 46.3°, respectively, in Carbazol-9-ide. The dihedral angle in diphenylmethylene subunit is also decreased when compared to the single molecule calculation. The values reach ~ 12-18° in the monolayer and bulk phase. Smaller values are prevented by the steric hindrance. Similar trends can be seen in TFPPy-ETTA, in which these dihedral angles also change to small values of less than 10°. However, the dihedral angles in TFPPy subunits remain almost unchanged (ca. 53°) in monolayer and bulk formation. Moreover, it is noticeable that the bulk phase has generally smaller dihedral angles than the monolayer phases and the chemical surrounding has only a slight influence on the structure of each layer. For the most stable configurations, we estimate pore areas from the computed atomic structure (neglecting H atoms) and an area is spanned to frame the void regions. The computed pore sizes in Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA COFs are 123.7 Å² and 158.8 Å², respectively, shown in Figure a and **5b**, qualitatively confirming the experimental pore volume given above.

The electronic structure, especially the HOMO-LUMO gap, can drastically change when going from monomer to the bulk phase. The energy difference between valence band maximum and conduction band minimum reduces to ca. 1.7 eV for Car-ETTA and ca 2.0 eV for TFPPY-ETTA. For the monolayers, these



Figure 5. Estimates of pore areas in (a) Car-ETTA (AB1) and (b) TFPPy-ETTA (AB3) for the most stable configurations. Black frames indicate the unit cell. Color code: C (brown), N (blue), H (white). The black box indicates the unit cell. Color code is carbon (brown), nitrogen (blue) and hydrogen (white).

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Journal Name

ARTICLE

energy gaps are 1.7 and 1.4 eV for Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA, respectively. In the bulk phase, the values of the fundamental energy gaps are much closer to the experimental values for the HOMO-LUMO gap of ca. 2 eV for both COFs. Here, the theoretical values are contracted, which is typical for the mean-field approach.

Besides these calculated results, experimental XRD measurements in combination with simulated XRD signals provide a reliable way to confirm the atomic structure of COFs, especially in cases where the energy difference between computed structure is relatively small as seen for different COF configurations. Figure 6. Comparison of measured and computed XRD signals for (a) Car-ETTA (AB1) and (b) TFPPy-ETTA (AB3), the inserts give the comparison of different configurations as given in Table 1.Figure a and 6b compare the measured and computed XRD signals for Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA, respectively. For all computed configurations good to very good agreement with the experimental main peak positions at 7° and 5.9° for Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA were obtained. Car-ETTA shows excellent agreement for the shifted and rotated AB stacking (AB3). However, the shifted configuration (AB1) is by more than 200 meV more stable and has good agreement with the experimental XRD measurement. The apparent double peak in AB1 is very narrow which can still



b) TFPPy-ETTA



Figure 6. Comparison of measured and computed XRD signals for (a) Car-ETTA (AB1) and (b) TFPPy-ETTA (AB3), the inserts give the comparison of different configurations as given in Table 1. The dashed line indicates the computed diffraction plane and the dotted line in the inserts is for comparison with the measurement.

result in good agreement with the measured XRD, signal ni lp contrast, the single-layer unit cell (vertical stacking AA) 485 % both COFs a relatively wide separation of a double peak. This indicates in combination with the computed formation energies that the COF has a preferred AB1 stacking, i.e., there are two layers in the unit cell.

For TFPPy-ETTA, all configurations but the single-layer have excellent agreement with the experiment. The main deviation in the simulated XRD signal is seen in the AA case, where a relatively wide double peak is formed. The here simulated double peak is too narrow to be revealed by the experiment that has a more substantial broadening of the peaks. In comparison to the peak width of Car-ETTA, it can be expected that a wide separation of the double peak would result in a broader experimental peak for TFPPy-ETTA, and therefore the AA configuration appears unlikely. Among the remaining AB stackings, the energy separation is at least 270 meV between the most stable AB stacking configuration and similar cases. Hence, AB3 is confirmed as experimental structure for TFPPy-ETTA, also indicates that two layers are in the unit cell.

COF application in perovskite solar cells

With these insightful understanding at the atomic scale of the synthesized COFs, we next study their applications in PVSCs. As discussed earlier, both COFs are more suitable to serve the surface modifier of HTL in inverted PVSCs to better mediate the energy-level alignment at the HTL/perovskite interface (**Figure 8a**).⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ Besides, it is important noting that a hydrophobic surface has been proven to effectively promote the vertical grain growth of perovskite film owing to the reinforced vertical diffusion of precursor solution.⁴⁻⁶ To clarify the advantage of the hydrophobic property of both COFs, we then investigate the crystallinity of the perovskite film grown on top of their modified HTLs.

We first examine the morphology of the perovskite films grown on the COF-modified hydrophilic NiO_x HTL, which is



Figure 7. (a) The SEM images of the perovskite film deposited on a pristine NiO_x layer and on the COF-modified NiO_x layers. The comparison of PL spectra (b) between the pristine perovskite film and film grown on Car-ETTA COF-modified PTAA and (c) between the pristine perovskite film and film grown on TFPPy-ETTA COF-modified PTAA. The comparison of Pb-4f XPS spectra (d) between the pristine perovskite film and film grown on both COFs.

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Journal Name

commonly used in the inverted PVSCs.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ Figure 7a presents the surface morphology of these films taken by the fieldemission gun scanning electron microscope (FE-SEM). As can be clearly seen, the grain size of the perovskite film becomes larger when depositing on the COF-modified hydrophilic NiO_x HTL. Being similar to the cases reported in the literature, introducing these hydrophobic mesoporous scaffolds at the perovskite/NiOx interface seems to effectively promote the crystallinity of the perovskite film.36, 37 The improved crystallinity of the perovskite film is also confirmed by its corresponding X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns, as displayed in Figure S17. The full width at half maximum (FWHM) value of the film deposited on Car-ETTA- and TFPPy-ETTA-modified NiOx HTL is 0.274° and 0.287°, respectively, which is smaller than the value (0.296°) of the pristine film. Thus, this result indicates that introducing COF-based mesoporous scaffolds at the perovskite/NiO_x interface effectively promote the crystallinity of the perovskite film, being like the previous cases of MOFbased mesoporous materials reported in the literature.^{36, 37}

However, in order to fabricate high-performance PVSCs, we herein would like to fabricate the PVSCs by using poly[bis(4-phenyl)(2,4,6-trimethylphenyl)amine (PTAA) as the HTL. Different to NiO_x HTL, PTAA is much more hydrophobic; therefore, the increase of the grain size in the perovskite film grown on top of PTAA is not that obvious (**Figure S18**). Regardless, these COFs still present certain surface modification effects. As shown in the photoluminescence (PL) spectra in **Figure 7b-7c**, the PL peak of the perovskite films deposited on

the COF-modified PTAA HTL is blue-shifted. Generally, the spontaneous radiative recombination leads to 39 Pative 9 and shifted PL peak whereas the passivation of surface defects results in the blue-shifted PL peak.⁵⁰ The observed blue-shift in PL peak thus suggests that introducing COF at the perovskite/PTAA interface can passivate the interfacial defects and promote the film crystallinity to a certain degree by providing an additional nucleation scaffold.^{36, 37} Based on these findings, we next ascertain the interactions between these COFs and perovskite by using X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS), and the whole XPS survey of the studied perovskite films are presented Figure S19a. As seen in Figure 7d, the binding energy of Pb-4f peak of the film deposited on Car-ETTA COF is negatively shifted compared to the pristine and TFPPy-ETTAmodified films. This large shift can be attributed to the more lone pairs on Car-ETTA, which provides more intense interactions with the perovskite through the Lewis acid-base interactions.⁵¹ Besides, the N-1s spectra shown in Figure S19b also exhibits clear shifts, indicating certain interactions between the studied COFs and the perovskite.

To examine the real efficacy of these COFs as an interlayer in PVSCs, we herein fabricate inverted p-i-n PVSCs with a device configuration of indium tin oxide (ITO)/PTAA/COFs/(FAPbI₃)_{0.83}(MAPbBr₃)_{0.17}(CsPbI₃)_{0.05}/PCBM/B CP/Ag. **Figure 8a** display the energy-level diagram of the studied device and its schematic illustration of COFs in the device. We first access the charge transfer efficiency across the perovskite/PTAA interface and perovskite/COF interface using



ARTICLE

ARTICLE

time-resolved photoluminescence (TRPL). The results are presented in Figure 8b, where the lifetimes (τ) are fitted with the double-exponential model, and the detailed parameters are summarized in **Table S4**. Generally, τ_1 is regarded as time from excitation to recombination at the surface while τ_2 is associated with a similar process but the recombination happens in the bulk perovskite film. As shown, the average τ (τ_{avg}) of the pristine perovskite film is 1475.8 ns and this value will respectively reduce to 969.0 and 535.7 ns when the perovskite film respectively deposits on TFPPy-ETTA COF and Car-ETTA COF, revealing certain hole extraction capability of both COFs. Note that Car-ETTA COF seems to have a better hole extraction ability than TFPPy-ETTA COF. This can be attributed to the higher-lying HOMO level of Car-ETTA COF relative to that of perovskite, which provides a larger thermodynamic driving force for charge transfer. Owing to the better film formation and hole transport capability, the τ_{avg} of the perovskite film deposited on PTAA can be largely reduced to 172.0 ns. However, the τ_{avg} of the perovskite film can be further reduced to 147.0 ns and 123.1 ns when it respectively deposits on the TFPPy-ETTA-/Car-TTTA-modified PTAA layer. This result clearly manifests the advantageous role of COFs in improving the charge transfer efficiency across the perovskite/PTAA interface, which benefits from their wellconjugated property and π - π interactions within the 2D layered structure.

The photovoltaic performance of the fabricated devices is measured under AM 1.5 G solar irradiance (100 mWcm⁻²). Figure 8c compare their current density-voltage (J-V) characteristics and the relevant photovoltaic parameters are summarized in Table 2. The performance of the fabricated PVSC is clearly enhanced after inserting the COFs into the perovskite/PTAA interface. The TFPPy-ETTA-/Car-TTTAmodified PVSCs can deliver a respective PCE of 19.72 and 19.79% (measured under forward scan), outperforming the PCE (17.40%) of the control device. Both COF-modified devices yield higher J_{sc} than the control device, which can result from the improved quality of the perovskite films and facilitated charge transfer as discussed earlier. Besides, both COF-modified devices also give a slightly higher V_{oc} than that of the control device. This enhancement can be attributed to the reduced charge recombination at the perovskite/PTTA interface and the deeper-lying HOMO levels of COFs. Notably, the Voc of TFPPy-ETTA-modified PVSC is larger than that of Car-TTTA-modified PVSC owing to the deeper-lying HOMO level of the former (Figure 8a).

Figure 8d shows the external quantum efficiency (EQE) spectrum of each top-performing device, wherein all of them possess similar photo-response profiles suggesting the well light absorption of the perovskite layer in these devices. The photocurrent integrated from the EQE spectrum is in a well congruence with the value obtained in the J-V measurement, validating the accuracy of the performance. Figure 8e presents the dark current of the fabricated device. The dark current of a device has been known to correlate with the charge recombination at associated interface. As seen, both TFPPy-ETTA-/Car-TTTA-modified PTAA layers can inhibit the dark Page 8 of 13

Table 2. Photovoltaic parameters of the fabricated 397565 with 60 or without using a COF interlayer.

Device	Scan	Voc (V)	J _{sc} (mA/cm²)	FF (%)	PCE (%)
Control	Forward	1.092	20.25	78.71	17.40
Control	Reverse	1.087	20.10	75.13	16.41
	Forward	1.119	22.50	78.34	19.72
with TFPPy-ETTA	Reverse	1.102	22.41	77.59	19.15
With Con ETTA	Forward	1.097	23.18	77.84	19.79
with Car-ETTA	Reverse	1.090	22.80	75.00	18.65

current of the derived devices, which is almost one order less than that of the control device. This result unveils that the reticulating porous structure of a COF scaffold indeed modified the charge transfer at the interface where charge loss is considered to be the main constituent limiting device performance.

To further probe the charge dynamic in these devices, the maximum exciton generation rate (G_{max}) and charge collection probability (P) are investigated by plotting the photocurrent density (J_{ph}) -effective voltage (V_{eff}) curves. The J_{ph} is defined as $J_{ph} = J_L - J_D$, where J_L and J_D is the photocurrent measured under 1 sun AM 1.5G spectrum and dark current measured in a totally dark condition, respectively. The V_{eff} is defined as $V_{eff} = V_0 - V_{bias}$, which V_0 is the voltage while $J_L = J_D$ and V_{bias} is the applied voltage bias. Generally, J_{sat} can be defined as the current when all the generated excitons are dissociated into free carriers. And G_{max} can be calculated by the equation of $J_{sat} = eG_{max}L$, where e is the elementary charge and L is the thickness of the perovskite film (500 nm). The greater G_{max} principally represents the higher utilized efficiency of incident photons of the device. From the results shown in Figure S20, the G_{max} of the control, TFPPy-ETTA-modified, and Car-ETTA-modified devices is calculated to be 2.38×10^{27} , 2.62×10^{27} , and 2.61×10^{27} s⁻¹ m⁻³, respectively. This result shows that the COF-modified devices possess higher utilized efficiency of incident photons compared to the control PVSC device, confirming their higher $J_{sc}s$. Besides, P can be calculated by the ratio of J_{ph}/J_{sat} , which can be referred as the charge collection capability of CTLs in the device. Taking V_{eff} = 0.2 V for instance, the obtained P value for TFPPy-ETTA- and Car-ETTA-modified devices is 90.6 and 90.3%, respectively, largely exceeding the value (74.9%) of the control device. It again indicates the enhanced charge collection capability after inserting the COF scaffolds. All the above results not only clearly demonstrate the potential of COFs to serve as the interface modifier in PVSCs but also highlight the importance of their structural design in affecting the resultant photovoltaic parameters.

Conclusions

In summary, two kinds of highly crystalline 2D COFs, Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA, were successfully synthesized through [4+4] imine solvothermal condensations of Car-4CHO and TFPPy with the core building unit, ETTA. Both Car-ETTA and TFPPy-ETTA

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Journal Name

COFs possess highly crystalline structure and well thermal stability with a respective high degradation temperature ($T_{d10\%}$) of 467 and 580 °C. Besides, they have a high surface area of 829 and 1156 m² g⁻¹, respectively. Furthermore, these two COFs, as the 2D porous conjugated materials, are unveiled to benefit the crystal growth of the perovskite film grown on top and to facilitate the charge transfer across the associated interface. As a result, we manifest the performance of the COF-modified PVSC could be improved from 17.40 to ~19.80%. In addition, we show that the energy levels of the derived COFs can be tailored by the constituent units, which highlights the importance of the structural design in affecting the resultant photovoltaic parameters.

Experimental Section

Materials: Carbazole (98%), pyrene (98%), 4,4'diaminobenzophenone (98%), 4-formybenzeneboronic acid (98%), tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) [Pd(pph₃)₄], dichloromethane, anhydrous magnesium sulfate (MgSO₄), bromine solution (Br₂), and N-bromosuccinimide were purchased from Acros. Potassium permanganate (KMnO₄), potassium carbonate (K₂CO₃), N-formylpiperidine (99%), and mesitylene (99%) were obtained from Sigma. Tin (Sn), acetic acid (99.8%), hydrochloric acid (37%), n-butanol, 1,2dichlorobenzene, acetone, n-butyl lithium 2.5 M in hexane, and ordered from Alfa 1,4-dioxane were Aesar. 1,3,6,8tetrabromopyrene [Pyrene-4Br], and 1,3,6,8-Tetra(4formylphenyl)pyrene (TFPPy) were synthesized according to the literature previously reported method.^{39, 40} PbI₂ powder (> 99.99%) and Nickel(II) 2,4-pentanedionate (95%) were purchased from Alfa Aesar. PC₆₁BM (99.5%), and BCP (>99.5%) were obtained from UniRegion. PbBr₂ (99.9%) was purchase from TCI. HC(NH₂)₂I (FAI) were purchase from Greatsolar. CH₃NH₃Br (MABr) and CsI were purchase from Xi'an Polymer Light Technology Corporation. The detailed synthetic procedures and characterization of studied COFs are described in the supporting information.

Solution preparation: The precursor solution of NiO_x was prepared by dissolving nickel(II) 2,4-pentanedionate in ethanol with a concentration of 25.7 mg/ml and with the addition of 10 μ l HCl. The poly(bis(4-phenyl)(2,4,6-trimethylphenyl)amine) (PTAA) HTL was prepared by dissolving in toluene with a concentration of 2 mg/ml. The precursor solutions for processing the COF interlayers were prepared by dispersing COFs in DMF with a concentration of 0.5 mg/ml. (FAPbI₃)_{0.83}(MAPbBr₃)_{0.17}(CsPbI₃)_{0.05} was prepared by mixing FAI (1.25 M), PbI₂ (1.5 M), MABr (1.25 M), PbBr₂ (1.35 M), CsPbI₃ (1M) in a mixed solvent of DMF:DMSO = 5:1 (v/v). PC₆₁BM was dissolved in chlorobenzene (CB) with a concentration of 20 mg/ml.

Device fabrication: ITO-glasses were cleaned by DI water, acetone, and isopropanol (IPA), followed by the plasma treatment for 10 minutes. For NiO_x bottom layer, they were spin-coated onto the ITO-glasses at 5000 rpm for 10 s and then annealed at 325 °C for 40 min in air. Additionally, the PTAA HTLs were spin-coated onto the ITO-glasses at 6000 rpm for 30 s and

then annealed at 100 °C for 10 minutes in glove-box. Then, the COF interlayers were spin-coated onto $NO_x^{10}r^{10}F^{10}AATayers Gat$ 4000 rpm. Afterwards, (FAPbl₃)_{0.83}(MAPbBr₃)_{0.17}(CsPbl₃)_{0.05} films were spin-coated onto the HTL or COF-modified HTL at 5000 rpm for 30 s. During the spin-coating process, 150 µL of chlorobenzene used as anti-solvent was dropped onto the center of film before the end of spin-coating, followed by annealing at 100 °C for 30 min. The PC₆₁BM ETLs were spin-coated onto the perovskite films at 1000 rpm for 30 s. Finally, the BCP layer (6 nm) and Ag electrode (820 nm) was evaporated under high vacuum (< 4 × 10⁻⁶ Torr). The effective illumination area was defined as 0.13 cm².

Characterization: Proton and carbon nuclear magnetic resonance (¹H and ¹³C NMR) spectra were recorded using an INOVA 500 instrument with DMSO-d₆ and CDCl₃ as solvents and tetramethylsilane (TMS) as the external standard. Chemical shifts are provided in parts per million (ppm). FTIR spectra were recorded using a Bruker Tensor 27 FTIR spectrophotometer and the conventional KBr plate method; 32 scans were collected at a resolution of 4 cm⁻¹. Solid state nuclear magnetic resonance (SSNMR) spectra were recorded using a Bruker Avance 400 NMR spectrometer and a Bruker magic angle spinning (MAS) probe, running 32,000 scans. Cross-polarization with MAS (CPMAS) was used to acquire ¹³C NMR spectral data at 75.5 MHz. The CP contact time was 2 ms; 1H decoupling was applied during data acquisition. The decoupling frequency corresponded to 32 kHz. The MAS sample spinning rate was 10 kHz. Elemental analysis (EA) was performed using an Elementar vario EL III apparatus. Powder Xray diffraction (PXRD) was carried out with a Siemens D5000 using monochromated Cu/Ka $(\lambda = 0.1542 \text{ nm})$. The sample was spread in a thin layer on the square recess of an XRD sample holder. Field emission scanning electron microscopy (FE-SEM) was conducted using a JEOL JSM-7610F scanning electron microscope. Samples were treated via Pt sputtering for 100 s prior to observation. BET surface area and porosimetry measurements of the prepared samples (ca. 20–100 mg) were performed using a Micromeritics ASAP 2020 Surface Area and Porosity analyzer. Nitrogen isotherms were generated through incremental exposure to ultrahigh-purity N₂ (up to ca. 1 atm) in a liquid nitrogen (77 K) bath. TGA was performed using a TA Q-50 analyzer under a flow of N2 atmosphere. The samples were sealed in a Pt cell and heated from 40 to 800 °C at a heating rate of 20 °C min⁻¹ under a flow of N₂ atmosphere at a flow rate of 50 mL min⁻¹. Molecular modeling was performed using Reflex, a software package for crystal determination from XRD patterns, implemented in MS modeling (v. 4.4, Accelrys). Unit cell dimensions were first manually determined from the observed XRD peak positions using the coordinates. The UV-vis spectrum was recorded using a Hitachi U-4100 UV-visible spectrophotometer. The staticphotoluminescence (PL) emission spectrum was measured by FLS980 spectrofluorometer (Edinburgh) system and the timeresolved PL was measured by time-correlated single photo counting (TCSPC), fitting with the function of $R(t) = B_1 \exp(-t/\tau_1)$ + $B_2 \exp(-t/\tau_2)$. J-V curves were measured under AM1.5G (100 mW cm⁻²) illumination by a SS-F5-3A simulator, Enlitech, recorded with a computer-controlled Keithley 2400 source. The

Chemistry A Accepted Manu

Waterials

Journal Name

EQE spectrum was performed with QE-R, Enlitech Co., Ltd, AM1.5G reference spectrum and corrected by a single crystal Si photovoltaic cell. The x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) were measured with ULVAC-PHI PHI 5000 Versaprobe II. The FE-SEM images were taken by NOVA NANO SEM 450 and Philips XL30 FEG. The energy levels were measured with photoelectron spectroscopy by a photoelectron spectrometer model AC-2 (Riken Keiki) And the XRD spectrum was measured by the X'PERT X-ray diffractometer.

Computational Details

ARTICLE

Classical FF simulations of COF bulk phases were performed in the Materials Studio 7.0 suite.⁴³ One initial guess for each of the crystalline COFs was constructed by hand. The setups contained one COF layer in a unit cell. Atomic positions, and unit cell shapes and sizes were motivated by the results of the single molecules, i.e. Car-4CHO, ETTA, and TFPPy. These are the starting points for the FF optimizations employing the Forcite module optimizing atomic positions and the unit cells via energy minimization. The cell optimizations were conducted via a volume relaxation, *i.e.* the unit cell shape is maintained. Interatomic forces were obtained with a universal force field.⁵² Moreover, atom-based van der Waals forces, which are important for layered structures, and electrostatic contributions were assigned by the Ewald method with a threshold of 0.0001 kcal mol⁻¹. Energy and force convergence thresholds were set to 0.0001 kcal mol⁻¹ and 0.005 kcal mol⁻¹ ${\rm \AA}^-$ ¹, respectively. Convergence was achieved within 500 iterations. It should be noted the optimizations were split into three stages to achieve convergence. A Quasi-Newton algorithm was used initial and intermediate optimizations with loser for convergence parameters and the final structures were obtained with a conjugate gradient algorithm and the convergence thresholds mentioned above.

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations including single point and structure optimizations of single molecules were performed with the Gaussian package.53 The exchangecorrelation effects were described by the CAM-B3LYP functional,⁵⁴ a range-separated modification of the B3LYP functional, and the electronic states were represented by the 6-31G(d,p) basis set on all atoms. Calculations for COFs in monolayer and bulk phase configurations were performed with the Quantum Espresso code.^{55,56} The PBE functional⁵⁷ and the PAW method⁵⁸ were used to describe the exchange-correlation effects and electronic states, respectively, and an additional correction for the missing van der Waals interaction was included by the Grimme D3 method.⁵⁹ The cutoff of the kinetic energy was 600 eV, and Monkhorst-Pack k-point meshes of 2x2xn and 2x3xn were used for TFPPy-ETTA and Car-ETTA calculations, respectively, to sample the Brillouin zone (where n is in stacking direction and n=1 for a monolayer, n=10 for a bulk phase unit cell with one layer and n=5 for a bulk phase unit cell containing two COF layers).

Besides a monolayer configuration in which the vertical distance between layers was more than 20 Å to avoid cross-talk between unit cells in vertical c direction, four layered configurations were investigated following the results of the EE calculations. These configurations include Vertical A/A and three different AB stackings with eclipsed geometries, which are structures that have overlapping void regions along the c unit cell vector leading to the formation of void channels. Here, eclipsed structures are considered because their simulated XRD patterns show good agreement with the experimental XRD spectrum, while those of other tested structures did not. Besides a simple vertical stacking (AA), the other configurations were generated by shifting layers with respect to each other by (0.5,0.5,1.0) unit cell vectors (AB1), a rotation of one layer by 90° around a rotation axis parallel to the c vector (i.e. parallel to the stacking direction) (AB2), and combinations of both structure modifications (AB3). In should be noted that the resulting AB stackings are eclipsed in contrast to the staggered AB' stacking investigated by FF calculations and that the shifting by (0.5,0.5,1.0) unit cell vectors causes the Car and ETTA subunits to be vertically stacked along c direction in alternating layers for Car-ETTA, and TFPPy and ETTA subunits in TFPPy-ETTA. The bulk formation energies with respect to a free-standing monolayer are computed as the total energy difference between an isolated COF layer and their bulk phase normalized by the number of layers in the unit cell, i.e.

$$E_f = \frac{E_{m \ layer} - m \ E_{monolayer}}{m} \tag{1}$$

where E_f is the formation energy, $E_{m \ layer}$ is the total energy obtained from DFT calculations of the unit cell with *m* layers, and $E_{monolayer}$ is the total energy of the single layer. Negative values indicate a release of energy.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the financial support from the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan (MOST 108-2638-E-002-003-MY2, 108-2218-E-110-013-MY3, and 108-2221-E-002-026-MY3). C.-C. C also thank the financial supports from the Featured Area Research Center Program within the framework of the Higher Education Sprout Project by the Ministry of Education (108L9006) and the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan (MOST 108-3017-F-002-002) and Top University Project from National Taiwan University (109L7846). J. L. acknowledges financial support from MOST 108-2112-M-110-001-MY2 and is grateful to the National Center for Highperformance computing for computer time and facilities.

Notes and references

- S. Lin, C. S. Diercks, Y. B. Zhang, N. Kornienko, E. M. Nichols, Y. 1 Zhao, A. R. Paris, D. Kim, P. Yang, O. M. Yaghi and C. J. Chang, Science 2015, 349, 1208-1213.
- 2 N. Huang, X. Chen, R. Krishna and D. Jiang, Angew. Chem., Int.

10 | J. Name., 2012, 00, 1-3

Journal Name

37

2

nemistry A Accepted

Waterials

l r D a

Ed. 2015, 54, 2986-2990.

- 3 Y. Zheng, R. Zou and Y. Zhao, Adv. Mater., 2016, 28, 2855-2873. 31
- 4 A. F. M. EL-Mahdy, Y. H. Hung, T. H. Mansoure, H. H. Yu, Y. S. Hsu, K. C. W. Wu and S. W. Kuo, J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Engrs. 2019, **103**, 199-208.
- 5 A. F. M. El-Mahdy, C. Young, J. Kim, J. You, Y. Yamauchi and S. W. Kuo, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2019, 11, 9343-9354.
- 6 H. L. Li, X. L. Feng, X. H. Cui, Y. X. Ma, S. Y. Ding and W. Wang, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2017, 139, 6042-6045.
- 7 Q. Gao, X. Li, G. H. Ning, H. S. Xu, C. Liu, B. Tian, W. Tang and K. P. Loh, Chem. Mater. 2018, 30, 1762-1768.
- 8 H. R. Abuzeid, A. F. M. EL-Mahdy, M. M. M. Ahmed and S. W. Kuo, Polym. Chem., 2019, 10, 6010-6020
- 9 P. Côté, I. Benin, N. W. Ockwig, M. Keefe, A. J. Matzger and O. M. Yaghi, Science 2005, 310, 1166-1170.
- 10 Q. Jiang, Y. Li, X. Zhao, P. Xiong, X. Yu, Y. Xu and L. Chen, J. Mater. Chem. A 2018, 6, 17977-17981.
- 11 H. Ding, J. Li, G. Xie, R. Chen, Z. Peng, C. Yang, B. Wang, J. Sun and C. Wang, Nat. Chem. 2018, 9, 5234-5241.
- S. Y. Ding and W. Wang, Chem. Soc. Rev. 2013, 42, 2013, 548-12 568.
- 13 S. Das, P. Heasman, T. Ben and S. Qiu, Chem. Rev. 2017, 117, 1515-1563.
- 14 A. F. M. EL-Mahdy, C. H. Kuo, A. Alshehri, C. Young, Y. Yamauchi, J. Kim and S. W. Kuo, J. Mater. Chem. A 2018, 6, 19532-19541.
- 15 W. Cai, C. C. Chu, G. Liu and Y. X. J. Wáng, Small 2015, 11, 4806-4822.
- 16 H. Lyu, C. S. Diercks, C. Zhu and O. M. Yaghi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2019, 141, 6848-6852.
- 17 Y. Liu, C. S. Diercks, Y. Ma, H. Lyu, C. Zhu, S. A. Alshmimri, S. Alshihri and O. M. Yaghi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2019, 141, 677-683.
- D. P. Cao; J. H. Lan; W. C. Wang and B. Smit Angew. Chem., Int. 18 Ed. 2009, 48, 4730-4733.
- H. S. Yang; Y. Du; S. Wan, G. D. Trahan, Y. H. Jin and W. Zhang, 19 Chem. Sci. 2015, 6, 4049-4053.
- 20 H. Xu; S. Tao; Jiang and D Jiang, Nat. Mater. 2016, 15, 722-726.
- 21 M. Dogru, M. Handloser, F. Auras, T. Kunz, D. Medina, A. Hartschuh, P. Knochel and T. Bein, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, **52**, 2920-2924.
- H. Xu, J. Gao and D. Jiang, Nat. Chem. 2015, 7, 905-912. 22
- 23 P. P. Pachfule, A. Acharjya, J. Roeser, T. Langenhahn, M. Schwarze, R. Schomacker, A. Thomas and J. Schmidt, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 1423-1427.
- 24 L. Bai, S. Z. F. Phua, W. Q. Lim, A. Jana, Z. Luo, H. P. Tham, L. Zhao, Q. Gao and Y. Zhao, Chem. Commun., 2016, 52, 4128-4131.
- 25 C. Wu, Y. Liu, H. Liu, C. Duan, Q. Pan, J. Zhu, F. Hu, X. Ma, T. Jiu, Z. Li and Y. Zhao, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 10016-10024.
- 26 Q. Gao, X. Li, G. H. Ning, K. Leng, B. Tian, C. Liu, W. Tang, H. S. Xu and H. K. P. Loh, Chem. Commun. 2018, 54, 2349-2352.
- 27 H. T. Turan, O. Kucur, B. Kahraman, S. Salman and V. Aviyente, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 2018, 20, 3581-3591.
- H. Bildirir, V. G. Gregoriou, A. Avgeropoulos, U. Scherf and C. 28 L. Chochos, Mater. Horiz. 2017, 4, 546-556.
- 29 S. Jin, X. Ding, X. Feng, M. Supur, K. Furukawa, S. Takahashi, M. Addicoat, M. E. El-Khouly, T. Nakamura, S. Irle, S. Fukuzumi, A. Nagai and D. Jiang, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 2017-2021.
- 30 S. Park, M. S. Kim, W. Jang, J. K. Park and D. H. Wang,

Nanoscale 2018, 10, 4708-4717.

View Article Online D. Bessinger, L. Ascherl, F. Auras and D.Bein 10AmD Chem Soc. 2017, 139, 12035-12042.

- 32 Y. Li, Q. Chen, T. Xu, Z. Xie, J. Liu, X. Yu, S. Ma, T. Qin and L. Chen, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2019, 141, 13822-13828.
- 33 M. Dogru, M. Handloser, F. Auras, T. Kunz, D. Medina, A. Hartschuh, P. Knochel and T. Bein, T. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2013. 52. 2920-2924.
- 34 M. Calik, F. Auras, L. M. Salonen, K. Bader, I. Grill, M. Handloser, D. D. Medina, M. Dogru, F. Lobermann, D. Trauner, A. Hartschuh and T. Bein, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 17802-17807.
- 35 J. Guo, Y. Xu, S. Jin, L. Chen, T. Kaji, Y. Honsho, M. A. Addicoat, J. Kim, A. Saeki, H. Ihee, S. Seki, S. Irle, M. Hiramoto, J. Gao and D. Jiang, Nat Commun. 2013, 4, 2736-2744.
- 36 C. C. Lee, C. I. Chen, Y. T. Liao, K. C. Wu and C. C. Chueh, Adv. Sci. 2019, 6, 1801715-1801724.
 - D. Shen, A. Pang, Y. Li, J. Dou and M. Wei, Chem. Commun. 2018, 54, 1253-1256.
- 38 S. Feng, H. Xu, C. Zhang, Y. Chen, J. Zeng, D. Jiang and J. X. Jiang, Chem. Commun. 2017, 53, 11334-11337.
- 39 P. J. Waller, Y. S. AlFaraj, C. S. Diercks, N. N. Jarenwattananon and O. M. Yaghi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 9099-9103.
- 40 A. F. M. EL-Mahdy, M. G. Mohamed, T. H. Mansoure, H. H. Yu, T. Chen and S. W. Kuo, Chem. Commun., 2019, 55, 14890-14893.
- 41 S. Xu, X. Bai, J. Ma, M. Xu, G. Hu, D. T. James and L. Wang, Anal. Chem. 2016, 88, 157853-7857.
- 42 F. Xu, S. Yang, X. Chen, Q. Liu, H. Li, H. Wang, B. Wei and D. Jiang, Chem. Sci. 2019, 10, 6001-6006.
- 43 BIOVIA Materials Studio 7.0, Dassault Systemes Biovia, Cambridge, UK, 2015
- 44 S. Wang, T. Sakurai, W. Wen and Y. Qi, Adv. Mater. Interfaces 2018, 5, 1800260.
- 45 I. Gelmetti, N. F. Montcada, A. Pérez-Rodríguez, E. Barrena, C. Ocal, I. García-Benito, A. Molina-Ontoria, N. Martín, A. Vidal-Ferran and E. Palomares, Energy Environ. Sci. 2019, 12, 1309-1316.
- 46 C. C. Chueh, C. Z. Li and A. K. Y. Jen, Energy Environ. Sci. 2015, 8, 1160-1189.
- 47 C. H. Tsai, N. Li, C. C. Lee, H. C. Wu, Z. Zhu, L. Wang, W. C, Chen, H. Yan and C. C. Chueh, J. Mater. Chem. A 2018, 6, 12999-13004.
- C. Bi, Q. Wang, Y. Shao, Y. Yuan, Z. Xiao and J. Huang, Nat 48 Commun 2015, 6, 7747.
- 49 C. C. Lee, C. I. Chen, C. T. Fang, P. Y. Huang, Y. T. Wu and C. C. Chueh, Adv. Funct. Mater. 2019, 29, 1808625.
- Y. Shao, Z. Xiao, C. Bi, Y. Yuan and J. Huang, Nat Commun. 2014, 50 5, 5784-5791.
- 51 J. W. Lee, H. S. Kim and N. G. Park, Acc. Chem. Res 2016, 49, 311-319.
- A. K. Rappe, C. J. CasewitK. S. Colwell, W. A. Goddard III and 52 W. M. Skiff, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1992, 114, 10024-10035.
- 53 Gaussian 09, Revision A.02, M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, X. Li, M. Caricato, A. Marenich, J. Bloino, B. G. Janesko, R. Gomperts, B. Mennucci, H. P. Hratchian, J. V. Ortiz, A. F. Izmaylov, J. L. Sonnenberg, D. Williams-Young, F. Ding, F. Lipparini, F. Egidi, J. Goings, B. Peng, A. Petrone, T. Henderson, D. Ranasinghe, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. Gao, N. Rega, G. Zheng, W. Liang, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T.

Journal of Materials Chemistry A Accepted Manuscript

Journal Name

View Article Online DOI: 10.1039/D0TA02956D

ARTICLE

Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, K. Throssell, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, T. Keith, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, C. Adamo, R. Cammi, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K.

Morokuma, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, and D. J. Fox, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, **2016**. T. Yanai, D. P. Tew and N. C. Handy, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2004.

- 54 T. Yanai, D. P. Tew and N. C. Handy, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2004, **393**, 51.
- 55 P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococcioni, I. Dabo, A. Dal Corso, S. de Gironcoli, S. Fabris, G. Fratesi, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, C. Gougoussis, A. Kokalj, M. Lazzeri, L. Martin-Samos, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, R. Mazzarello, S. Paolini, A. Pasquarello, L. Paulatto, C. Sbraccia, S. Scandolo, G. Sclauzero, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, P. Umari, and R. M. Wentzcovitch, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 2009, **21**, 395502.
- P. Giannozzi, O. Andreussi, T. Brumme, O. Bunau, M. Buongiorno Nardelli, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, M. Cococcioni, N. Colonna, I. Carnimeo, A. Dal Corso, S. de Gironcoli, P. Delugas, R. A. DiStasio, A. Ferretti, A. Floris, G. Fratesi, G. Fugallo, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, F. Giustino, T. Gorni, J. Jia, M. Kawamura, H.-Y. Ko, A. Kokalj, E. Küçükbenli, M. Lazzeri, M. Marsili, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, N. L. Nguyen, H.-V. Nguyen, A. Otero-de-la-Roza, L. Paulatto, S. Poncé, D. Rocca, R. Sabatini, B. Santra, M. Schlipf, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, I. Timrov, T. Thonhauser, P. Umari, N. Vast, X. Wu and S. Baroni, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* 2017, **29**, 465901.
- 57 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1996, **77**, 3865.
- 58 P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B. 1994, 50, 17953.
- S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich and H. Krieg, J. Chem. Phys. 2010, 132, 154104.

Published on 25 May 2020. Downloaded by Goteborgs Universitet on 5/25/2020 5:14:35 PM

Exploitation of Two-Dimensional Conjugated Covalent Organic Frameworks, Base (700 A02956D) Tetraphenylethylene with Bicarbazole and Pyrene Units and Applications in Perovskite Solar Cells

Mohamed Gamal Mohamed,^{a+} Chia-Chen Lee,^{b,c+} Ahmed F. M. EL-Mahdy,^{a+} Johann Lüder,^{a,d} Ming-Hsuan Yu,^b Zhen Li,^c Zonglong Zhu,^c Chu-Chen Chueh,^{b,e^*} and Shiao-Wei Kuo^{a,f^*}

Keywords: Covalent organic frameworks; perovskite solar cells; interfacial materials



Two conjugated covalent organic frameworks (COFs) are successfully synthesized in this work, presenting decent thermal stability, high crystallinity, and conjugated properties, which is supported by classical force field and ab initio calculations. They are further introduced as the interface modifier in perovskite solar cells (PVSCs) and are demonstrated to promote the perovskite morphology and associated charge transfer to effectively enhance the resultant photovoltaic performance of the derived PVSCs.