Ionic-to-electronic current amplification in hybrid perovskite solar cells
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Abstract

Mobile ions in hybrid perovskite semiconductors introduce a new degree of freedom to electronic devices suggesting applications beyond photovoltaics. An intuitive device model describing the interplay between ionic and electronic charge transfer is needed to unlock the full potential of the technology. We describe the perovskite-contact interfaces as transistors which couple ionic charge redistribution to energetic barriers controlling electronic injection and recombination. This reveals an amplification factor between the out of phase electronic current and the ionic current. The resulting simple equivalent circuit model, which we verified with time-dependent drift-diffusion simulations of impedance spectra, allows a general description and interpretation of perovskite solar cell behaviour. Our findings also suggest a strategy to design thin film electronic components with large, tuneable, capacitor-like and inductor-like characteristics.
Main Text
The realization that the internal energy barrier within a semiconductor can be varied asymmetrically by a voltage applied between its contacts to give exponential control of electrical current was a fundamental breakthrough in human history (Fig. 1a). It underpinned the success of the diode, and led to the development of transistors and optoelectronic devices such as light emitting diodes and solar cells. Representing solar cells as diodes in equivalent circuit models neatly encapsulates their behaviour and has helped facilitate their worldwide adoption. However, solar cells based on the rapidly developing technology of hybrid perovskite semiconductors do not generally display pure diode-like behaviour. Identifying an accurate equivalent circuit model describing their behaviour is a priority, both to unravel their unique history-dependent properties, and to enable development and application of new electronic devices utilising these properties. Mobile ionic defects in the perovskite semiconductor phase are thought to underlie the hysteresis often seen in their current-voltage characteristics but a physically meaningful equivalent circuit explaining the very large capacitive (> $10^{-3}$ F cm$^{-2}$) and inductive (> 1 H cm$^{-2}$) behaviour reported in perovskite devices is lacking. Ferroelectric effects, a photoinduced giant dielectric constant, and accumulation of ionic charge have all been discounted as explanations. Bisquert et al. have proposed that giant capacitances and inductances could arise from phase-shifted accumulation or release of electronic charge from within a degenerate layer induced by fluctuations in the surface polarisation due to ionic charge. However, interfacial degeneracy is unlikely to exist under normal operating conditions. More promisingly, Pockett et al. have highlighted the link between rate of recombination and varying ion distribution as an explanation for the low frequency behaviour of perovskite impedance spectra. Previous attempts to model the interaction between electronic and ionic charge have used capacitive elements which cannot describe the influence of one species on the energy barriers that control fluxes of another species. This intrinsically limits the applicability of equivalent circuit models of mixed conductors such as perovskites.

Here we show that the interfaces in perovskite solar cells behave like bipolar transistors in which the electronic energy barrier to injection and recombination is modulated by the accumulation/depletion of ionic charge at the interfaces (Fig. 1a). Specifically we find that: (i) an oscillating voltage applied to the solar cell naturally introduces an out of phase, capacitive ionic current; (ii) the associated changes in electrostatic potential across the perovskite modulate the rates of electronic recombination and injection across the interfaces. The resulting out of phase electronic current is related to the ionic current through a trans-carrier amplification factor with either a positive sign (for recombination) or a negative sign (for injection or specific recombination cases) and causes capacitor-like or inductor-like behaviour without accumulation of electronic charge. Modelling the amplification effect using bipolar transistor elements incorporated in a simple equivalent circuit (Fig. 1b) allows us to efficiently explain and physically interpret the many peculiar features observed in the general transient behaviour (including impedance) of perovskite devices. This avoids the need for far more complex drift-diffusion models. Our insights open the possibility of engineering a new class of mixed...
conducting electronic devices whose behaviour is controlled by the properties of mobile ions in the active layer.

**Measured and simulated impedance spectra characteristics**

To demonstrate ionic-to-electronic current amplification behaviour of interfaces we measured impedance spectra of perovskite solar cells. Impedance spectroscopy involves the application of a voltage $V$ which includes small periodic voltage perturbation, $v$, superimposed on a background voltage, $\bar{V}$, and measurement of the amplitude and phase shift of the induced current, $j$, superimposed on a background current $\bar{j}$. The complex impedance ($Z = Z' + iZ''$) is given by $Z = |v/j| \exp(i\theta)$ where $\theta$ is the phase shift of $v$ relative to $j$. This is evaluated at different angular frequencies ($\omega$) resulting in a spectrum $Z(\omega)$.

Fig. 1c and d show impedance data collected from a stable perovskite solar cell equilibrated at open circuit for different light intensities (see complete spectra in Extended Data Fig. 1 and the effects of stabilisation time in Extended Data Fig. 2a-d). The measurements indicate that there is a significant out of phase component in the induced current ($j''$) which, at low frequencies, results in a large apparent device capacitance, as defined by $\omega^{-1}\text{Im}(Z')$. This increases linearly with light intensity and thus exponentially with the bias voltage (Fig. 1c), consistent with previous observations.\(^8\)\(^{,}\)\(^{11}\)\(^{,}\)\(^{18}\) Similar behaviour was also seen at short circuit, or with different applied biases in the dark (Extended Data Fig. 2d, e, h, i) ruling out a significant contribution from photoinduced changes in ionic conductivity.\(^{22}\)\(^{,}\)\(^{23}\) (Extended Data Fig. 3).

![Figure 1](image-url)

**Figure 1** Transistor model of the measured and simulated impedance of a perovskite solar cell. \(a\), Schematic diode and transistor indicating the electron and hole quasi Fermi levels relative to an interfacial energy barrier. \(b\), Solar cell circuit model containing an ionically gated transistor used to fit the experimental and simulated data.
in c-f. c, Nyquist plot of the real ($Z'$) vs imaginary ($Z''$) impedance components, and (d) apparent capacitance, $\omega^{-1}\text{Im}(Z^{-1})$ vs frequency of a spiro-OMeTAD/Cs$_{0.05}$FA$_{0.81}$MA$_{0.14}$PbI$_{2.55}$Br$_{0.45}$/TiO$_2$ solar cell measured around the open circuit voltage, illuminated with constant bias light intensities (legends of e and f respectively). The devices were stabilised to avoid inductive loops in the Nyquist plot arising as artefacts due to incomplete stabilisation of the device during data collection (see Methods and Extended Data Fig. 2). e, f, Corresponding simulated impedance measurements determined from a drift-diffusion model of a p-type/intrinsic/n-type (p-i-n) device structure containing mobile ionic charge. The dashed lines indicate the simulated contribution to the capacitance from mobile ionic charge. Solid lines show a simultaneous 5 parameter global fit (Extended Data Table 1) to the measured and simulated data using the circuit model in b. The inset of d shows the out of phase electronic to ionic current ratio, $j''_{\text{rec}}/j''_{\text{on}}$ plotted against the recombination interface transconductance, $g_{\text{rec}}/2$, evaluated from the measurements (Methods).

To underpin these measurements with a physical interpretation we simulated impedance spectroscopy measurements using a time-dependent drift-diffusion semiconductor model (Driftfusion) which includes the effect of mobile ionic defects. Fig. 2a shows an example of the simulated steady state profiles of the conduction band, valence band, and quasi Fermi levels under 1 sun equivalent illumination with an applied d.c. voltage equal to the open circuit voltage. There is no electric field in the bulk of the perovskite layer since the mobile ionic charge has migrated to accumulate at the interfaces screening the built-in potential (Fig. 2a insets) consistent with previous observations and simulations explaining hysteresis.

The impedance, $Z(\omega)$, evaluated from these simulations (Fig. 1e and f) shows remarkably similar behaviour to the measurements. In the dark, with no bias voltage or light, the capacitance, $\omega^{-1}\text{Im}(Z^{-1})$, of the device at low frequencies is dominated by contributions from ionic movement (dashed lines). However, the exponential increase of $\omega^{-1}\text{Im}(Z^{-1})$ when the steady state voltage across the device was increased by light (or applied voltage in the dark, Extended Data Fig. 2f, g) does not arise directly from the ions, and is also not due to an accumulation of electronic charge (see Extended Data Fig. 2j-l and the magnitude of electronic accumulation current in Fig. 2e). Instead it arises from the out of phase modulation of electronic recombination at the interfaces.

The explanation for this is seen in Fig. 2b and c which show that ionic redistribution influences the potential profile dropping across the perovskite layer when the applied voltage perturbation (v) oscillates at sufficiently low frequencies for the ions to move. At low frequency, the screening effect of ionic redistribution occurs out of phase with v resulting in an out of phase modulation of interfacial recombination, and thus current through the device (Fig. 2e). At high frequencies the ionic redistribution is too slow for ions to compensate the rapid changes in applied potential so recombination only varies in phase with v; the out of phase current component arises solely from capacitive accumulation of electronic charge (Fig. 2d).
Simulated energy level diagram and ionic/electronic currents during impedance measurements. The drift-diffusion simulation solves for the evolution of free electron, hole, and mobile ionic defect concentration profiles, as well as the electrostatic potential in a p-i-n device with a time-varying voltage between the terminals as a boundary condition (Methods). (a) The steady state electrostatic energy level profile corresponding to the simulations in Fig. 1 at open circuit under 1 sun equivalent illumination, the insets show net accumulation of ionic charges (grey) at the perovskite/HTM (pink) and perovskite/ETM (blue) interfaces screening the internal electric field. The effect of an applied voltage perturbation with amplitude $v$ superimposed on $V = V_{OC}$ (b) at high frequency (1 MHz) and (c) at low frequency (0.1 Hz) on the conduction band energy profile (limits indicated by the black and grey lines). The amplitude (rescaled×25) of the electrostatic potential perturbations at each interface are indicated by $v_1$ and $v_2$. The corresponding simulated cell currents in response to (d) the high frequency and (e) the low frequency applied voltage oscillation ($V_{OC} + v$, red line) vs time.

### Ionoically gated interfacial transistor

We now develop simple expressions to describe the impedance of the interfaces in a semiconductor with mixed ionic and electronic conduction by considering how the current across each interface will vary with the externally applied voltage in the presence of inert mobile ions. In hybrid perovskite solar cells the interfacial electronic currents can be related to the processes of charge injection, collection, thermal generation and recombination between the active layer and the HTM or ETM layers. Under most circumstances one of these processes will dominate the impedance of the device, either for the free electron or free hole species (Supplementary Information). We assume resistance to free electron and hole transport in the perovskite is low relative to recombination/generation and injection/collection impedances, consistent with measurements showing long diffusion lengths observed in these materials$^{29,30}$. 
Initially we consider the impedance related to the recombination (and thermal generation) of electrons at the interface with p-type HTM (interface 1) assuming electron injection and collection is not limiting. Close to the interface, where most recombination is thought to occur\textsuperscript{31,32}, electrons in the perovskite phase with concentration $n_1$ may be considered a minority species relative to the holes in the neighbouring HTM. For simplicity we assume the electron recombination current density from the perovskite to HTM can be approximated by the first order process, $J_{\text{rec}} \propto n_1$. The system must obey the principle of detailed balance, so there will be a thermal generation current, $-J_{\text{gen}}$ of electrons from the HTM to the perovskite. The current densities $J_{\text{rec}}$ and $J_{\text{gen}}$ vary exponentially with the potential barrier between the electron quasi Fermi level ($V_n$ in the perovskite for $J_{\text{rec}}$, and $V$ for $J_{\text{gen}}$) and the conduction band of the perovskite at interface 1. At dark equilibrium the barrier for the two processes is the same and equals $\phi_0$ (see Fig. 3a) resulting in equal and opposite current densities with magnitude $J_{\text{rec}} = -J_{\text{gen}} = J_{s1}$. Here, $J_{s1}$ is the saturation current density of recombination for interface 1. We refer to the changes in potential barrier relative to the dark equilibrium case for the recombination and the generation current as $V_{\text{rec}}$ and $V_{\text{gen}}$ respectively, at dark equilibrium $V_{\text{rec}} = V_{\text{gen}} = 0$. The net electron recombination at this interface is then given by:

$$J_1 = J_{\text{rec}} - J_{\text{gen}} = J_{s1} e^{\frac{qV_{\text{rec}}}{k_B T}} - J_{s1} e^{\frac{qV_{\text{gen}}}{k_B T}}$$

where $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s constant, $T$ is temperature (see Fig. 3 and Extended Data Fig. 4). Without mobile ions in the system, a potential, $V$, applied across the cell would be fully experienced by the electrons in the perovskite at interface 1 so that $V_{\text{rec}} = V$ with no change in the barrier to thermal generation ($V_{\text{gen}} = 0$) so equation 1 would become the standard diode equation: $J_1 = J_{s1} (\exp[qV/k_B T] - 1)$.

However, as observed in the simulations, the potential barriers at the interfaces in hybrid perovskites devices depend both on the applied potential and also on the effect of the redistribution of mobile ions. This modifies the potential barrier at the HTM perovskite interface and, consequently, the values of both $V_{\text{rec}}$ and $V_{\text{gen}}$ as shown in Table 1 and Figs 3b-e. Here, we refer to the changes in the electrostatic potential at the interfaces relative to the values at dark equilibrium as $V_1$ and $V_2$. 
Figure 3  Simplified energy level diagrams and circuit models using transistors to describe the ionic gating of electronic processes at interfaces. (a) The energy levels of the conduction and valence bands in the dark after equilibration of ionic charge. The current densities ($J_{\text{col}}$ and $J_{\text{inj}}$) across interface 2 with barrier height $\phi_0$ are equal and opposite as are the currents ($J_{\text{gen}}$ and $J_{\text{rec}}$) across interface 1. The corresponding energy level profiles after applying a voltage $V$, in the dark ($V_n = 0$), for a device whose impedance is limited by recombination (b) immediately after the voltage is applied ($\omega \to \infty$) and (c) after the redistribution of ionic charge has reached steady state ($\omega \to 0$). The diagrams indicate the changes barrier heights for the interfacial electronic processes at interface 1 ($V_{\text{gen}}$ and $V_{\text{rec}}$) and interface 2 ($V_{\text{col}}$ and $V_{\text{inj}}$) due to changes in $V$, $V_n$, $V_1$, and $V_2$. The relationship between these changes is given in Table 1. (d) The corresponding change in the electrostatic potential profile due to the change in ion redistribution following the application of a voltage ($V$) shown instantaneously ($\omega \to \infty$, dashed line) and at steady state ($\omega \to 0$, solid line). $V_1$ and $V_2$ indicate the change in electrostatic potential relative to dark equilibrium in the active layer close to each interface. (e) A general example for a device in the light ($V_n \neq 0$) where the impedance has contributions from both interfaces and the ions have not reached a steady state.
distribution. (f) The equivalent circuit model for the ionic impedance in response to high frequency voltage perturbation, \( v(\omega \to \infty) \), where ions are frozen, and low frequency, \( v(\omega < \infty) \) where ionic motion is described by \( C_{\text{ion}}R_{\text{ion}} \) series elements. (g) An equivalent circuit model for the device in which the impedance of interfaces to electrons are modelled as bipolar transistors with impedance \( Z_1 \) and \( Z_2 \), the base terminals are gated by the ionic potentials \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \). (h) General circuit model considering both electrons (n) and holes (p) with a (negative) photogeneration current \( J_{\text{pht}} \).

| Table 1 | Expressions for potentials driving electron transfer processes. The terms in the equations are illustrated in Fig. 3. |
| Change in electronic barrier potential relative to equilibrium (V) |
| Electron generation | \( V_{\text{gen}} = V_1 - V \) |
| Electron recombination | \( V_{\text{rec}} = V_1 - V_n \) |
| Electron collection | \( V_{\text{col}} = V_2 - V_n \) |
| Electron injection | \( V_{\text{inj}} = V_2 \) |
| Electrostatic potential from ionic circuit (V) |
| Interface 1 | \( V_1 = \frac{\bar{V}}{2} + \frac{\nu}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}/2} \right) \) |
| Interface 2 | \( V_2 = \frac{\bar{V}}{2} + \frac{\nu}{2} \left( 1 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}/2 \right) \) |
| Impedance of ionic circuit branch (\( \Omega \text{ cm}^2 \)) |
| \( Z_{\text{ion}} = \left[ i\omega C_g + i\omega \left( C_{\text{ion}}/2 - C_g \right) \right]^{-1} \) |

In the simple case of a symmetric device with ion blocking contacts, ion redistribution occurs with a time constant approximated by \( (R_{\text{ion}}C_{\text{ion}}/2) \) where \( R_{\text{ion}} \) is the specific resistance (\( \Omega \text{ cm}^2 \)) to ionic motion and \( C_{\text{ion}} \) is the specific capacitance for accumulation of ions at each interface (\( \text{F cm}^{-2} \)) (Fig. 3f). If the concentration of mobile ionic defects is large relative to the concentration of free electrons and holes in the active layer then the ionic distribution will determine the electrostatic potential profile in the perovskite layer and the values of \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) as shown in Table 1. This description also assumes that changes in potential at the interfaces due to ionic accumulation drop predominantly within each contact (consistent with Fig. 2a). We discuss the case where potential also drops in the perovskite in the Methods.

Based on these assumptions, equation 1 gives a general expression in terms of \( V, V_n \) and \( V_1 \) for the net electron recombination current across interface 1: \( J_1 = J_{s1} \exp[q(V_1 - V_n)/k_BT] - J_{s1} \exp[q(V_2 - V)/k_BT] \). This is analogous to the expression used to describe a bipolar npn
transistor where the voltage of the base corresponds to $V_1$ and is determined by the change in accumulation of ions at interface 1. Under dark forward bias conditions there is net flux of electrons from the perovskite (which acts as the emitter with potential $V_3$) to the HTM (which acts as the collector with potential $V$). The potential differences of the base-emitter and base-collector junctions are equivalent to $V_{\text{rec}}$ and $V_{\text{gen}}$ respectively. We have modified the conventional bipolar transistor symbol used to represent the interfaces (Fig. 3g) to emphasise that the net electronic current through the transistor may be in either direction according to the electrical and light bias conditions. If $V_{\text{rec}} < V_{\text{gen}}$ then the assignment of the terms 'emitter' and 'collector' to the two sides of the interface would be reversed. If there is no chemical reaction between ionic and electronic charge at the interface and no ionic penetration into the HTM, then the ionic-to-electronic current gain of the transistor ($\beta_{\text{ion-electron}}$) is infinite.

These observations naturally result in the simple equivalent circuit illustrated in Fig. 1b where an 'ionic circuit' is connected in parallel to an 'electronic circuit'. Strikingly, virtually all the features related to the electronic behaviour of a perovskite solar cell, under the conditions described above, can be summarised through the use of a single circuit element, i.e. a transistor. If $\beta_{\text{ion-electron}}$ is infinite, the complex impedance of the ionic branch of the circuit ($Z_{\text{ion}}$) behaves analogously to a lossy dielectric layer. At high frequency the impedance is dominated by the device’s geometric capacitance ($C_{\text{g}}$) but at lower frequencies the ionic motion through the $C_{\text{ion}}-R_{\text{ion}}-C_{\text{ion}}$ series dominates (Table 1 and Fig. 3f). This enables a straightforward evaluation of $V_1$ (and $V_2$) which control the electronic impedance, as shown in Table 1. We now consider the implications of a transistor-like interface for the behaviour of the device.

**Ionic-to-electronic current amplification**

Amplification is a key property shown by bipolar transistors\(^{21}\), where changes in electronic energy barriers induced by the gating terminal (base) amplify the flux of electrons or holes between the emitter and collector terminals. Here, at sufficiently low frequencies when $\omega \ll (R_{\text{ion}}C_{\text{ion}}/2)^{-1}$ the ionic current can be approximated by $j_{\text{ion}} \approx i\omega C_{\text{ion}}v/2$. It induces an out of phase change in potential at the interface of $v''_{\text{ion}} = j_{\text{ion}}R_{\text{ion}}/2$. This varies $v_{\text{rec}}$ and results in an out of phase component to the electronic current of $j''_{\text{rec}} = j_{\text{ion}}R_{\text{ion}}g_{\text{rec}}$ where $g_{\text{rec}}$ is the recombination transconductance which describes the change in interfacial current in response to changes in $V_{\text{rec}}$ given by $g_{\text{rec}} = dJ_{\text{rec}}/d(V_1 - V_n)$, in this example $V_n = 0$ V. Taking the ratio between the two currents gives an ionic-to-electronic transcarriber amplification factor:

$$\frac{j''_{\text{rec}}}{j_{\text{ion}}} = \frac{R_{\text{ion}}}{2} g_{\text{rec}} = \frac{R_{\text{ion}} qJ_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})}{k_B T}$$ 

analogous to the classic result for an amplification circuit using a bipolar transistor. The magnitude of $j''_{\text{rec}}$ across the interface is proportional to $R_{\text{ion}}$, independent of the value of $C_{\text{ion}}$, and will also increase exponentially with background bias voltage, $\bar{V}$. Interestingly, this result implies that $R_{\text{ion}}$ (and thus ionic conductivity) can be inferred from measurements of the apparent capacitance since, as $\omega \rightarrow 0$, $R_{\text{ion}} \approx 2j''_{\text{rec}}/(J_{\text{ion}}g_{\text{rec}}) = 4\alpha_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})/(C_{\text{ion}}g_{\text{rec}})$, where $C_{\text{ion}}$
and \(c_{\text{rec}}\) can easily be determined from the measurements of apparent capacitance in dark conditions with \(V = 0\) V (for \(C_{\text{ion}}\)) or with a bias voltage \(\vec{V}\) (for \(c_{\text{rec}}\)). The inset of Fig. 1d shows that this method predicts a value of \(R_{\text{ion}} \approx 60\) kΩ cm\(^2\) (ionic conductivity of about \(10^{-9}\) S cm\(^{-1}\)) for the cell under consideration.

**Capacitor-like and inductor-like behaviour**

The ionic gating effect at the interfaces results in out of phase electronic currents causing the device to display very large apparent capacitances or inductances at low frequencies. We now explore the implications of this. Under forward bias \((V > 0)\) conditions \(I_{\text{rec}} \gg I_{\text{gen}}\) so the second term of equation 1 can be neglected. Differentiating \(I_{\text{rec}}\) with respect to the applied voltage \(V\) gives an expression for the reciprocal of the recombination impedance, which in the small voltage perturbation \((\nu)\) limit can be written:

\[
\frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}} = \frac{dI_{\text{rec}}}{d\nu} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2(1+i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}/2)}\right) \frac{q}{k_B T} I_{\text{rec}}(\vec{V}) = \frac{1}{r_{\text{rec}}} + i\omega c_{\text{rec}}
\]

where the background recombination current across the interface with a potential difference \(\vec{V}\) at steady state \((\omega=0)\) is \(I_{\text{rec}}(\vec{V}) = I_{s1} \exp[q\vec{V}/(2k_B T)]\), \(r_{\text{rec}}\) is the small perturbation recombination resistance, and \(c_{\text{rec}}\) is the apparent capacitance of the interface. Several features of equation 3 are noteworthy (Supplementary Information). First, \(r_{\text{rec}}\) shows a dependence on frequency since the amplitude of the interfacial barrier \((\nu_1 - \nu_0)\) oscillations are frequency dependent so that \(r_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to 0) = 2r_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to \infty)\). Second, the interface behaves like a frequency dependent capacitor despite no accumulation of electronic charge being required; at low frequency \(c_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to 0) = R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}} g_{\text{rec}}/4 \) but at high frequency \(c_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to \infty) = 0\). Third, the magnitude of \(c_{\text{rec}}\) is proportional to \(I_{\text{rec}}(\vec{V})\) and so increases exponentially with the voltage (which may be photoinduced) across the interface allowing variable control of the capacitance. Although this capacitive behaviour could not be used for energy storage, the effect offers a route to achieve at least \(10^3\) times greater effective capacitance per unit area than the capacitance achieved by state-of-the-art hafnium oxide capacitors used in electronic circuitry \((\sim 2 \times 10^6\) F cm\(^{-2}\))\(^3\).  

Global fits to both experimental and drift-diffusion measurements are shown in Fig. 1 using the expression for \(Z_{\text{rec}}\) given by equation 3 incorporated in the circuit model shown in Fig. 1b. Only five free parameters are required to simultaneously fit all measurement conditions (Methods, Extended Data Table 1). Agreement is seen between the values of \(C_{\text{ion}}\) and \(R_{\text{ion}}\) determined from the equivalent circuit fit and the values derived from the inputs to the Driftfusion model, validating our interpretation of the system. The frequency dependence of \(Z_{\text{rec}}\) displayed in a Nyquist plot gives rise to a low frequency semicircle in agreement with the observations of Pockett et al.\(^1\). The details are illustrated in Extended Data Figs 4 and 5.

The expression we have derived for \(Z_{\text{rec}}\) (equation 3) explains the majority of unusual features observed in the impedance spectroscopy measurements of hybrid perovskite solar cells. Similar
arguments can be used to derive expressions for the impedance to recombination of holes at the perovskite/ETM interface which also yield capacitive behaviour (see Supplementary Information). However, in some perovskite devices, inductor-like behaviour is seen in their impedance spectra\textsuperscript{11,19} and is also apparent in the slow evolution of current towards a new steady state in response to step changes of voltage or light\textsuperscript{4}. The capacitor-like form of $Z_{\text{rec}}$ in equation 2 is unable to explain this inductive behaviour.

The description of the electronic impedance so far assumed that the rate of injection and collection is sufficiently fast (also shown by $V_n \approx 0$) such that the electronic impedance is dominated by the recombination process (Fig. 3b and c). If this were not the case, the electron injection ($J_{\text{inj}}$) and collection ($J_{\text{col}}$) currents at interface 2 follow an analogous dependence on the injection and collection voltages $V_{\text{inj}}$ and $V_{\text{col}}$ which are controlled by the value of $V_2$ (Table 1, see Methods).

In the limiting case where charge injection dominates the impedance of the circuit, at low frequencies, the out of phase injection current is negatively amplified by the ionic current (Extended Data Fig. 4c). The trans-carrier amplification factor is $-R_{\text{ion}}/2 \cdot q[J_{\text{inj}}(V, \omega = 0)/k_B T]$ resulting in inductive behaviour (see Supplementary Information). The effect opens the possibility to design thin film devices with huge tuneable effective inductances per unit volume ($> 10^4 \text{ H cm}^{-3}$) without relying on the elements coupling to a magnetic flux.

Given the influence of the ionic circuit on the electronic impedance described here, we note that more complex interactions of ionic charge with electronic charge or contact materials would also modulate interfacial electronic processes. For example the phase of $j_{\text{rec}}$ can lag $v$ if ionic charge penetrates, or undergoes a reversible chemical reaction, at a dominant recombination interface. Fits from an equivalent circuit allowing ion penetration into an interface to experimental data are shown in Fig. 4a. Under these circumstances our model implies that the ionic gating of the electronic recombination process can result in both capacitive and inductive behaviour.

Our model provides a basis to include additional factors that may influence device behaviour such as: the fraction of ionic screening potential dropping within the contacts, asymmetric interfacial ionic capacitances, non-ideal recombination and injection, treatment of both electrons and holes (Fig. 3h), recombination in the perovskite bulk, and the effect of interface screening by electronic charge (see Methods and Supplementary Information). The latter factor is expected to be relevant in record efficiency solar cells and at large light or electrical bias conditions. In its simplest version, our ionically coupled transistor circuit model is already able to interpret the most important features of impedance spectra observed in the literature and, additionally, also allows simple calculation of large perturbation measurements such $J-V$ sweeps and voltage step measurements (Extended Data Fig. 6). In cases where impedance from both interfaces is comparable an analytical solution is no longer accessible due to the need to
numerically evaluate $V_n$ (and/or $V_p$), however the procedure to determine the device behaviour is qualitatively similar and straightforward (see Methods); an example of a fit to a simulated device with mixed capacitor and inductor-like behaviour is shown in Fig. 4b.

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4** Simulated and measured devices showing inductive behaviour. a, b, Nyquist plot of the real ($Z'$) vs imaginary ($Z''$) impedance components for (b) a spiro-OMeTAD/FA$_{0.85}$MA$_{0.15}$PbI$_3$/SnO$_2$ solar cell measured around the open circuit voltage, illuminated at different constant light intensities and (a) a simulated device with low majority carrier mobility in contacts and high interfacial recombination in the dark. The solid lines are global fits to the data using 8 and 6 free parameters respectively (Extended Data Table 1) in the circuit models shown (with all data) in Extended Data Fig. 7.

To conclude, our description of the interfaces as ionically gated transistors provides an intuitive framework to interpret the complicated current-voltage behaviour of perovskite devices as well as unlocking the potential of impedance spectroscopy as a means to identify the key bottlenecks of their performance. The interfacial transistor model also has a number of interesting broader implications. The trans-carrier amplification phenomenon described suggests a strategy to design devices displaying huge, tuneable, effective capacitances or inductances without the volume required for similar physical capacitances or inductances and with the option to be powered by light. Furthermore, the model will be generally applicable to other electrochemical redox processes supported by a high concentration of low mobility inert ions as well as to ionic motion signal sensing and amplification in biological systems requiring neural interfacing in a manner related to electrochemical transistors.
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Methods

Device Fabrication: spiro-OMeTAD/ Cs_{0.05}FA_{0.81}MA_{0.14}PbI_{2.55}Br_{0.45}/TiO_2 (Fig. 1)

Chemicals: Lead (II) Iodide (PbI_2, 99.99%), Lead Bromide (PbBr_2) were purchased from TCI UK Ltd. Formamidinium Iodide (FAI), Methylammonium Bromide (MABr), FK209 Co(III) TFSI and 30NTD TiO_2 paste were purchased from Greatcell Solar. Dimethylformamide (DMF anhydrous), Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO, anhydrous), Chlorobenzene (anhydrous), Acetonitrile (anhydrous), Titanium di-isopropoxide bis-acetylacetonate (TiPAcAc, 75 wt% in IPA), Butyl Alcohol (anhydrous), Bis(trifluoromethane)sulfonimide lithium salt (Li-TFSI), 4-tert-butyl pyridine (96%), Cesium Iodide (99.9%) were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Spiro-MeOTAD (Sublimed grade 98%) and Fluorine doped Tin Oxide (FTO, 8Ω/□) substrates were purchased from Ossila Ltd. UK. All chemicals were used without further purification.

FTO substrates were patterned to desired geometry using chemical etching with Zinc metal powder and Hydrochloric Acid (4M, Sigma Aldrich). Substrates were cleaned by sequential ultra-sonication in diluted Hellmanex (Sigma Aldrich), De-ionized water and Isopropyl-Alcohol. Compact-TiO_2 layer (~30 nm) was deposited on patterned FTOs using spray pyrolysis of TiPAcAc (0.5 M in butyl alcohol) at 450 °C and post-heated at 450 °C for 30 min. Mesoporous TiO_2 layer (~150 nm) was then deposited by spin coating 30NRD solution (1:6 wt:wt in butyl alcohol) at 5000 RPM for 30 s and heated at 150 °C for 10 min. Substrates were then heat-treated at 480 °C for 30 min to remove organic contents in the 30-NRD paste.

Triple cation (Cs_{0.05}FA_{0.81}MA_{0.14}PbI_{2.55}Br_{0.45}) perovskite solution was prepared using a reported protocol \(^{35}\). CsI, FAI, MABr, PbI_2 and PbBr_2 were mixed in appropriate ratio in mixed solvents DMF:DMSO (4:1 v:v) to get 1.2 M concentration of Pb^{2+} ions. This solution was filtered using 0.4 μm PTFE syringe filter before use. Perovskite films were deposited by anti-solvent quenching method in which 70 μL solution was spin coated initially at 2000 RPM for 10 s (ramped 200 RPM s\(^{-1}\)) and then at 6000 RPM for 20 s (ramp 2000 RPM s\(^{-1}\)) with 100 μL chlorobenzene dripped at 10 s before the end of second spin cycle. Spin coated perovskite films were crystalized by heating at 100 °C for 30 min. After cooling, hole-transport layer (HTL) of spiro-OMeTAD was spin coated at 4000 RPM for 30 s. HTL solution was prepared by dissolving 86 mg spiro-OMeTAD (Ossila Ltd. sublime grade) in 1 mL chlorobenzene, Li-TFSI (20 μL from 500 mg mL\(^{-1}\) stock solution in Acetonitrile), FK209 Co-TFSI (11 μL from 300 mg mL\(^{-1}\) stock solution in acetonitrile) and tert-butyl pyridine (34 μL). HTL coated perovskite cells were aged in dry air (RH < 20 %) for 12 hours before depositing Au (80 nm) top electrodes using thermal evaporation. Fabricated devices were then encapsulated first using 250 nm Al_2O_3 deposited by e-beam process and then using UV-Vis curable epoxy (Ossila Ltd.) with glass cover-slip. The thickness of the perovskite layer was 550 ±20 nm. The active area of the device was 0.12 cm\(^2\).

Device Fabrication: spiro-OMeTAD/ FA_{0.85}MA_{0.15}PbI_2 /SnO_2 (Fig. 4b)
For the fabrication of perovskite solar cell on an SnO$_x$ compact layer, patterned and cleaned FTO-glass (7Ω/sq, Hartfordglass Inc.) was covered with a 10 nm SnO$_x$ layer using an atomic layer deposition (ALD) process. Tetrakis(dimethylamino)tin(IV) (TDMSn, Strem, 99.99%) was used as a tin precursor and held at 75 °C during depositions. The deposition was conducted at 118 °C with a base pressure of 5 mbar in a Picosun R-200 Advanced ALD reactor. Ozone gas was produced by an ozone generator (INUSA AC2025). Nitrogen (99.999%, Air Liquide) was used as the carrier and purge gas with a flow rate of 50 sccm per precursor line. The growth rate was 0.69 Å per cycle. Double cation (FA$_{0.85}$MA$_{0.15}$PbI$_3$) perovskite solution was prepared by dissolving FAI (182.7 mg, 1.06 mmol), MAI (29.8 mg, 0.19 mmol) and PbI$_2$ (576.2 mg, 1.25 mmol) in a mixture of 800 µL DMF and 200 µL DMSO. The solution was filtered using a 0.45 µm PTFE syringe filter before use. FA$_{0.85}$MA$_{0.15}$PbI$_3$ perovskite films were prepared on the compact SnO$_x$ layer by spin-coating 75 µL solution at first 1000 rpm, then 5000 rpm for 10 s and 30 s, respectively. 500 µL chlorobenzene was dripped as an anti-solvent 15 s before the end of the second spin cycle. Spin-coated perovskite films were annealed at 100 °C for 10 min. For the hole transporter layer, 1 mL of a solution of spiro-OMeTAD (Borun Chemicals, 99.8%) in anhydrous chlorobenzene (75 mg mL$^{-1}$) was doped with 10 µL 4-tert-butylpyridine and 30 µL of a Li-TFSI solution in acetonitrile (170 mg mL$^{-1}$) and deposited by spin-coating at 1500 rpm for 40 s and then 2000 rpm for 5 s. After storing the samples overnight in air at 25% relative humidity, 40 nm Au was deposited through a patterned shadow mask by thermal evaporation. The devices were encapsulated using epoxy (Liqui Moly GmbH) and glass cover-slips. The active area was 0.158 cm$^2$ for the impedance measurements.

**Photovoltaic characterisation**

The current-voltage characteristics of the spiro-OMeTAD/Cs$_{0.05}$FA$_{0.81}$MA$_{0.14}$PbI$_{2.55}$Br$_{0.45}$/TiO$_2$ device was measured with forward and backward scans between -0.1 V to 1.2 V with scan rate of 400 mV s$^{-1}$ under a Newport 92251A-1000 AM 1.5 solar simulator calibrated against an NREL certified silicon reference cell. An aperture mask of 0.0261 cm$^2$ was used to define the active area, see Extended Data Fig. 8a. The performance of the spiro-OMeTAD/FA$_{0.85}$MA$_{0.15}$PbI$_3$/SnO$_x$ device is shown in Extended Data Fig. 8b. An identical spiro-OMeTAD/Cs$_{0.05}$FA$_{0.81}$MA$_{0.14}$PbI$_{2.55}$Br$_{0.45}$/TiO$_2$ device showed good stability when aged using an ATLAS Suntest CPS+ solar simulator with a 1500 W xenon lamp and internal reflector assembly to provide continuous illumination (~100 mW cm$^{-2}$) to the unmasked device for 40 hours. Current-voltage measurements were made every 10 minutes (reverse sweep 1.15 V to 0V) in lifetime tester, see Extended Data Figure 8c.

**Impedance measurements**

Impedance measurements were performed using an Ivium CompactStat potentiostat. The perovskite solar cell devices were masked using an aperture slightly bigger than the total active area defined by the overlap between the FTO layer and the top metal contact. All impedance measurements were run by applying a 20 mV sinusoidal voltage perturbation to the cell superimposed on a DC voltage. The potentiostat measures the resulting current, this is used to
calculate the impedance spectrum as described in the main text. The frequency of the perturbation was varied between 1 MHz to 0.1 Hz. The measurement was performed after a stabilization time of at least 100 seconds at the (light and voltage) bias condition used in the measurement, unless stated otherwise. When different stabilization protocols were used to investigate the effect of preconditioning on the impedance measurements, these are specified in the figure legends. Different bias light conditions were obtained using white LEDs and the sun equivalent light intensity was calibrated against a filtered silicon photodiode in turn calibrated by an AM1.5 solar simulator. Stabilization of the cell was performed as follows. Chronopotentiometry (for impedance measurements under light at open circuit) or chronoamperometry (for impedance measurements under light at short circuit or in the dark with an applied potential bias) measurements were run before the stabilization stage to monitor the cell behaviour while settling to the set measurement condition. For each measurement at open circuit under light, we ran a chronopotentiometry measurement and we used the open circuit voltage measured after at least 100 seconds as the DC voltage bias condition during the impedance measurement. This voltage was applied for an additional 100 seconds before the beginning of the impedance measurement. For measurements at short circuit under light or at an applied potential in the dark, a chronoamperometry measurement was run for 100 seconds to monitor the evolution of the current in the device at the applied voltage. The same voltage was then applied for additional 100 seconds before the start of the impedance measurement. In some cases we noticed that changes in cell potential or current still occurred after 100 second stabilization time. One could expect that these slow variations would not significantly vary the features probed for frequencies that range down to about 10 times the inverse of the stabilization time (in our case about 0.1 Hz). However, we found that this is not the case. In particular, some peculiar features (loops in the Nyquist plots) disappeared after sufficiently long stabilization (see Extended Data Fig. 2a-d). While these features might still be indicative of the state of the device at the time of the measurement, they represent a transient state rather than the equilibrated state. For measurements at quasi-equilibrium the influence of different stabilization times should be recorded to assess the influence on a feature of interest in an impedance spectrum to identify the minimum time needed for the spectra to reach acceptable convergence.

**Drift-diffusion simulation of impedance measurements**

Driftfusion is a one-dimension drift-diffusion simulation for modelling perovskite solar cells which solves for the time-dependent profiles of free electron, free hole, mobile ion and electrostatic potential. The device physics of the model are based on established semi-classical transport and continuity equations, which are described in reference 1. The code uses MATLAB's built-in Partial Differential Equation solver for Parabolic and Elliptic equations (PDEPE) to solve the continuity equations and Poisson's equation for electron density \( n \), hole density \( p \), a positively charged mobile ionic charge density \( a \), and the electrostatic potential \( V \) as a function of position \( x \) and time \( t \). Positively charged mobile ions and a negatively charged static counter ions (simulating Shottky defects 36) are confined to the intrinsic region in order to simulate the
high density of mobile defects in the perovskites. High rates of recombination in the contact regions are used to simulate surface/interfacial recombination.

In order to deal with the high charge density and electrostatic potential gradients at the interfaces a piece-wise linear spatial mesh was used with a spacing of 2.54 nm outside of, and 0.55 nm within the approximate depletion regions of the device. The time mesh was evaluated with either linearly or logarithmically spaced points dependent on predicted gradients in the time dimension. A complete description of the model is given in the supporting information of reference 24. The code used for simulation can be downloaded from: https://github.com/barnesgroupICL/Driftfusion where usage examples specific to impedance spectroscopy are reported in the included documentation file.

For simplicity we used electron and hole transporting contacts with the same band-gap, but work functions that differ from the intrinsic perovskite, to create a built-in potential in the simulated perovskite layer. Illumination was described by a uniform rate of charge generation throughout the active layer also for simplicity.

The solution of the charge and electrostatic concentration profiles of the device under steady state operating conditions was determined to provide initial conditions for the simulated impedance spectroscopy. The impedance spectroscopy simulations were performed by applying an oscillating voltage, \( v \), with amplitude, \( v_{\text{max}} = 2 \text{ mV} \), superimposed on a bias voltage \( \bar{V} \) boundary condition:

\[
\bar{V} + v = \bar{V} + v_{\text{max}} \cdot \sin(\omega t)
\]

where \( \omega = 2\pi \times \text{frequency} \). For measurement of the device around its open circuit potential, \( \bar{V} \) was set to the equilibrated value of \( V_{\text{oc}} \) at steady state.

The electronic current was then estimated from the solution via the continuity equations. Usually a simulation of 20 voltage periods (evaluated with 40 time points per period) was enough for extracting the impedance information from the current profile.

The amplitude and phase of the oscillating electronic current density was obtained via demodulation, mimicking the working principle of a two-phase lock-in amplifier. The current density profile was point-by-point multiplied by the voltage profile or the \( \pi/2 \) rad shifted voltage profile normalised by \( v_{\text{max}} \) and integrated over time (typically 10 periods):

\[
X = \frac{\omega}{m\pi} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \frac{2m\pi}{\omega}} j(t) \cdot \sin(\omega t) dt
\]
\[
Y = \frac{\omega}{m\pi} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \frac{2m\pi}{\omega}} j(t) \cdot \cos(\omega t) dt
\]
where \( m \) is the number of periods, and \( t_0 \) is the start of the integration time. The amplitude and phase are then given via:

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{\text{max}} &= \sqrt{X^2 + Y^2} \\
\theta &= \arctan \left( \frac{Y}{X} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

allowing the impedance to be determined by \( Z = v_{\text{max}} / J_{\text{max}} \exp(-i\theta) \). The amplitude and phase obtained this way were confirmed by fitting \( j(t) \) with a sinusoidal function.

To analyse the output of the simulation, both the electronic accumulation current and the ionic displacement current were evaluated from the solutions for the time dependent concentration profiles of electrons, holes, and ions (see Fig. 2). The ionic displacement current, \( J_{\text{ion}} \), in the device was evaluated by determining the electric field profile due only to ions \( E_{\text{ion}} \) as a function of time:

\[
E_{\text{ion}}(x, t) = \frac{q}{\varepsilon_0 \epsilon_r} \int_{x_1}^{x_1 + x} a(x', t)dx'
\]

then finding its average value as a function of time:

\[
\langle E_{\text{ion}}(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{d_{\text{prv}}} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} E_{\text{ion}}(x, t)dx
\]

to calculate the corresponding displacement current:

\[
J_{\text{ion}} = -\varepsilon_0 \epsilon_r \frac{\partial \langle E_{\text{ion}}(t) \rangle}{\partial t}.
\]

Where \( a(x, t) \) is the ionic concentration profile, \( x \) is the position in the device, \( x_1 \) is the position of the HTL/perovskite interface, \( x_2 \) the position of the perovskite/ETM interface, \( q \) is the elementary charge, \( \varepsilon_0 \epsilon_r \) is the perovskite permittivity.

The electronic accumulation current, \( j_{\text{accumulation}} \), was determined by subtracting the total recombination (minus the generation) current and the ionic displacement current from the total cell current:

\[
j_{\text{accumulation}}(t) = j(t) - j_{\text{rec}}(t) + j_{\text{gen}}(t) - J_{\text{ion}}
\]

where \( j_{\text{rec}}(t) \) and \( j_{\text{gen}}(t) \) were evaluated from integrating the recombination/generation terms in the current continuity equations over the device thickness using electron and hole concentration profiles. The parameters used in the simulation are listed in Extended Data Table 2, unless stated otherwise.
**Equivalent circuit model**

We now outline the approach for fitting the equivalent circuit model, and the expressions that are needed to fit the data. We will initially focus on the fit the data in Fig. 1. If a single interfacial electron or hole transfer process is assumed to dominate the observed impedance of the device (see discussion the Supplementary Information) then $V_n$ or $V_p$ may be set 0 or $V$ and an equivalent circuit of the following form can be used to fit to the experimental data (this example is for electron recombination so we can set $V_n = 0$ V). The appropriate equivalent circuit arbitrarily only considering electrons is given in Fig. 1b. The impedance of the circuit is given by:

$$Z = \left( \frac{1}{Z_{ion}} + \frac{1}{Z_{rec}} \right)^{-1}$$

where $Z_{ion}$ is given by (Table 1):

$$Z_{ion} = \left[ i\omega C_g + \frac{i\omega (C_{ion}^2 - C_g)}{1 + i\omega R_{ion} C_{ion}^2} \right]^{-1}$$

Note that we have not included a series resistance in this model since its magnitude was negligible relative to the other elements under consideration under most measurement conditions, however we note that it is trivial to include (for example when fitting the data in Fig. 4b). $C_g$ is the geometric capacitance of the device at high frequency, and $C_{ion}$ is the capacitance of the interfacial layers (assumed here to be symmetric for both interfaces see Supplementary Information for asymmetric case) which results from the capacitance of the electronic and ionic space charge layers on either side of the interface in series. Both $C_{ion}$ and $C_g$ will show a dependence on the d.c. voltage $\bar{V}$ across the device which will change the width of the space charge layers according to the approximations:

$$C_{ion}(\bar{V}) \approx C_{ion}(\bar{V} = 0) \frac{V_{bi}}{\sqrt{V_{bi}^2 - \bar{V}^2}}$$

and

$$C_g(\bar{V}) \approx \left[ \frac{2}{C_{ion}(\bar{V} = 0)} \left( \frac{V_{bi} - V}{V_{bi}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{C_g(\bar{V} = 0)} \right]^{-1}$$

where $V_{bi}$ is the built-in potential of the device corresponding to the difference in work functions between the ETM and HTM contacts. If $V_{bi}$ is known, or can be roughly estimated, it can be used as a constant input in the model, otherwise it can be used as an optional free fitting parameter. The value of $V_{bi}$ has only a weak influence on the overall quality of the fit, and similar results will be achieved if $C_{ion}$ and $C_g$ are considered constant.
The expression for $Z_{\text{rec}}$ is determined from Extended Data Table 3 with $B_n = 0$ V:

$$Z_{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{f_c}{2 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}})} \frac{m_1 k_B T}{q f_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})}$$

where $m_1$ is the ideality factor for the recombination process at interface 1 and $f_c$ represents the fraction of ionic screening potential dropping within contact layer that controls the interfacial process. If recombination is localised to the interface then $f_c \approx 1 - C_{\text{ion}}/C_{\text{per}}$ where $C_{\text{per}}$ is the capacitance due to the accumulation or depletion of ionic charge at the interface. It parameterises the potential drop across the contact at which recombination dominates. The ideality factor for the recombination process can be estimated from the steady state ideality factor, $m_{\text{ss}}$ determined from the slope of $V_{\text{oc}}$ vs $\log(\text{light intensity})$ measurements using the following expression:

$$m_1 \approx m_{\text{ss}} \left(1 - \frac{f_c}{2}\right)$$

The steady state voltage driving recombination across interface 1 will be given by:

$$\bar{V}_{\text{rec}} = V_1 - V_n = \bar{V} \left(1 - \frac{f_c}{2}\right)$$

since $V_n = 0$. We can then evaluate the recombination current density across the interface at steady state (Extended Data Table 3) with the expression:

$$J_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V}) = J_{s1} \exp\left(\frac{q\bar{V}_{\text{rec}}}{m_1 k_B T}\right) = J_{s1} \exp\left(\frac{q\bar{V}}{m_{\text{ss}} k_B T}\right)$$

The complete expression for the impedance of the device becomes:

$$Z = \left\{i\omega C_{\text{g}}(\bar{V}) + \frac{i\omega |C_{\text{ion}}(\bar{V})/2 - C_{\text{g}}(\bar{V})|}{1 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}(\bar{V})/2} + \left[1 - \frac{f_c}{2 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}(\bar{V})}\right] J_{s1} \exp\left(\frac{q\bar{V}}{m_{\text{ss}} k_B T}\right)\right\}^{-1}$$

The cell bias voltage, $\bar{V}$ and the steady state ideality factor, $m_{\text{ss}}$ are known or determined independently from measurements. $C_{\text{ion}}(\bar{V})$ and $C_{\text{g}}(\bar{V})$ will approximately depend on $\bar{V}$ as described above using an estimation of $V_{\text{bi}}$. The unknown device parameters in this expression for $Z$ are which can be determined from a fit are: $R_s$, $R_{\text{ion}}$, $C_{\text{ion}}(\bar{V} = 0)$, $C_{\text{g}}(\bar{V} = 0)$, $J_{s1}$ and $f_c$. If $V_{\text{bi}}$ cannot be estimated, it can also be used as a fitting parameter. Since $R_s$ is typically trivial to determine from the impedance spectra this leaves only five significant parameters to describe key device physics.
A similar approach can be used to express the impedance of the device for the more general circuit for example if both recombination and injection of electrons limit impedance as described the section above:

$$Z = R_s + \left( \frac{1}{Z_{ion}} + \frac{1}{Z_n} \right)^{-1}$$

where $Z_n$ is the impedance of electronic current transfer through the device (Extended Data Table 3). More generally for transfer of both electrons and holes with impedance $Z_{np}$ (Supplementary Table 1) the device impedance becomes:

$$Z = R_s + \left( \frac{1}{Z_{ion}} + \frac{1}{Z_{np}} \right)^{-1}$$

We emphasise again that under most circumstances only one electronic process is likely to dominate the electronic branches of the device impedance so such a generalisation will not normally be required to describe a device. We also note that the impedance of the ionic branch of the circuit, $Z_{ion}$, might differ from the expression presented above in some devices, for example if ions penetrate or react at interfaces, or if ion transport is dispersive, or if more than one mobile ionic species is present. Additionally, diffusive transport of ions might occur within mesoporous regions of a device which could potentially be described by a Warburg element in series with $R_{ion}$.

**Fitting the impedance spectra to an equivalent circuit model**

Global fits of the impedance circuit model to the experimental and simulated impedance spectra at all measured conditions presented in Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 were performed using a non-linear least squares fitting routine. We aimed to use the fewest parameters possible to give a reasonable representation of the data. For Fig. 1 the free parameters were $R_s$, $R_{ion}$, $C_{ion}(\bar{V} = 0)$, $C_g(\bar{V} = 0)$, $J_{s1}$ and $f_c$. The bias voltage, $\bar{V}$, and measured ideality factor for each measurement were used as inputs. Relatively little co-variance was observed between the parameters for the overall shape of the resulting device impedance spectra, so the fits were performed in a stepwise fashion in which the range of frequencies over which each parameter was fit was limited to the regions of the spectra which responded to that particular parameter. $C_g(\bar{V} = 0)$ was determined from the fit to the high frequency region of the dark, 0 V bias, spectrum. $C_{ion}(\bar{V} = 0)$ was initially determined from the fit to the low frequency region of the dark, 0 V bias, spectrum. $R_{ion}, J_{s1}$, and $f_c$ (the fraction of screening potential dropping within the contacts) were determined from the fit to all the spectra from low frequency to medium frequency. The fit parameters the Fig. 1 data are given in Extended Data Table 1.

To estimate $R_{ion}$ directly from the measured impedance data we can use the relationship outlined in equation 2:
\[ \frac{j''_{\text{rec}}}{j_{\text{ion}}} = \frac{R_{\text{ion}}}{2} \frac{1}{f_c g_{\text{rec}}} = \frac{R_{\text{ion}}}{2} \frac{q J_{\text{rec}}(V)}{m_1 \kappa g_{\text{rec}}} \]

where \( j''_{\text{rec}}/j_{\text{ion}} \) at low frequency \((\omega \to 0)\) is given by:

\[ \frac{j''_{\text{rec}}}{j_{\text{ion}}} = \frac{2e_{\text{rec}}}{C_{\text{ion}}} = \frac{c(V,\omega \to 0) - c(V=0,\omega \to 0)}{c(V=0,\omega \to 0)} \frac{V_{\text{bi}}}{\sqrt{V_{\text{bi}}}} \]

The \( c \) terms are given by the measured apparent capacitance, \( c = \omega^{-1} \text{Im}(Z^{-1}) \) at the different frequency limits and voltage biases indicated. If the measurement is made in the dark and recombination is assumed to be dominant then \( J \approx J_{\text{rec}} \), the cell current. If the measurement is made at open circuit then \( J_{\text{rec}} \approx J_{\text{ph}} \), which may be estimated from the short circuit current or the absorbed photon flux.

**Circuit model resulting in inductive behaviour due to recombination with penetration, or chemical reaction, of ions at interfaces**

If ionic defects penetrate or chemically react reversibly with an interface, this will result in an additional perturbation of the ionic distribution which may have a different time constant to \( R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}/2 \) which could lead to inductive behaviour. For example, iodide ions might reversibly react with oxygen vacancies in an SnO\(_2\) contact. An equivalent circuit giving an approximate description of ion penetration or a reversible reaction is shown in Extended Data Fig. 8d:

\[ Z_{\text{ion}} = \frac{1}{i \omega C_{\text{ion}}} + R_{\text{ion}} + \left( i \omega C_{\text{ion}} + \frac{1}{R_{\text{ion}} + i \omega C_{\text{con}}} \right)^{-1} \]

Ignoring \( R_S \), at steady state the potentials at \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) where \( \omega \to 0 \) will be given by:

\[ \bar{V}_1 = \bar{V}_2 = \frac{C_{\text{ion}}}{2 C_{\text{ion}} + C_{\text{con}}} \bar{V} \]

This allows the transconductance for hole recombination to be calculated given the voltage driving recombination is \( \bar{V} - \bar{V}_2 \) (Supplementary Table 1):
\[
g_{\text{rec}}^p = \frac{q}{k_B T} J_{\text{2e}} e^{rac{q(V - V_2)}{k_BT}} = \frac{q}{k_B T} J_{\text{2e}} e^{rac{q}{k_BT} \left(1 - \frac{c_{\text{ion}}}{Z_{\text{ion}} c_{\text{con}}}\right)} = \frac{q}{k_B T} J_{\text{rec}}^p
\]

The small perturbation potentials \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) in response to \( v \) are then given by:

\[
v_1 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{i \omega C_{\text{ion}} Z_{\text{ion}}} \right) v
\]

\[
v_2 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{i \omega C_{\text{ion}} Z_{\text{ion}} - R_{\text{ion}} Z_{\text{ion}}} \right) v
\]

When a small perturbation \( v \) is applied across the interface the voltage driving recombination \( v - v_2 \) can be found using the above expression. This enables the impedance to hole current recombining across the interface to be found by dividing \( j_{\text{rec}}^p = (v - v_2) g_{\text{rec}}^p \) by \( v \):

\[
\frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}^p} = \frac{j}{v} = \frac{1}{i \omega C_{g} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{ion}}} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}^p}} \frac{q}{k_B T}
\]

This can then be incorporated within the complete equivalent circuit to give the impedance of the device including series resistance \( R_s \):

\[
Z = R_s + \left( i \omega C_g + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{ion}}} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}^p}\right)^{-1}
\]


Extended data Figure 1  Complete measured and simulated impedance spectra corresponding to Fig. 1 with equivalent circuit model fits. The solid lines show the global fit to the measured and simulated data sets using the parameters listed in Extended Data Table 1. a-c, The circuit model and measured impedance for the spiro-OMeTAD/ Cs0.05FA0.81MA0.14PbI2.55Br0.45/TiO2 solar cell in Fig. 1 c and d and 5 free parameter global fit. At low frequencies it is apparent that the contribution from the transport of ionic defects is somewhat dispersive (ion movement with a range of time constants) whereas the circuit model and simulations assume non-dispersive transport. Some of the dispersive behaviour may be related to the presence of a thin (150 nm) mesoporous TiO2 layer in this device which is not accounted for in the simulation or circuit model. Fine tuning the details of the ionic conduction model in the device and simulation would enable more precise characterisation of measured devices. The deviation of the fits at higher light intensities is likely to be related to either electronic screening of the interfaces by photogenerated charge (Supplementary Information).
and/or an increasing contribution from injection/collection impedance to the measured impedance. **d-f**, Circuit model and 6 free parameter global fit to the experimental data in **b** and **c** including photogeneration and an injection/collection transistor element. **g-i**, Circuit model and 5 free parameter global fit to the simulated measurements in Fig. 1e and f. Global fit parameters are given in Extended Data Table 1.
Extended Data Figure 2  The effect of stabilisation time, light, and bias voltage in dark on impedance measurements, and the contributions to the apparent capacitance. Measurements performed on the spiro-OMeTAD/\text{Cs_{0.05}FA_{0.81}MA_{0.14}PbI_{2.55}Br_{0.45}/TiO}_2 solar cell and the simulated device in Fig. 1. a, Measured \( V_{OC} \) vs time for 0.1 sun illumination following preconditioning at 0 V in the dark. b, Measured Nyquist plot of the imaginary vs real parts of the impedance over a frequency range 0.1 Hz to 1 MHz, showing effects of different stabilisation protocols prior to measurement at open circuit. c, Measured Nyquist plots showing effects of stabilisation protocol for measurements at short circuit. The individual impedance measurements were collected in order of decreasing frequency (opposite direction to arrow). d - i, Measured and simulated Nyquist plots and apparent capacitances, \( \omega^{-1} \text{Im}(Z^{-1}) \), against frequency. (d, e) The effects of bias voltage in the dark for the measured device, and (f, g) the simulated
device. A loop is seen in the measured Nyquist plot (highlighted by the red circles) if the cell was only left to stabilise for 100 s prior to measurement at each voltage, but this loop disappeared if a longer stabilisation period of 1000 s was used prior to measurement. (h, i) The impedance spectra of the device measured at short circuit with the light intensities indicated in Fig. 1 show qualitatively similar behaviour as at open circuit, though with higher impedances. j - l, The different contributions to the apparent capacitance for the device simulated in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. (j) Simulated under dark conditions with zero bias voltage, (k) dark with an applied voltage, and (l) with 1 sun equivalent conditions at open circuit conditions. Comparison between the electronic accumulation capacitance with an applied voltage or under light at open circuit and the total capacitance evaluated at 0 V in the dark illustrates the effect of the electronic charge in the perovskite on the geometric capacitance (visible experimentally at high frequency in Fig. 1a).
**Extended Data Figure 3**  Possible consequences of photoinduced changes in ionic resistance for impedance spectra of a simplified hybrid perovskite solar cell calculated using an equivalent circuit model assuming $C_{\text{ion}}$ is constant. **a, b,** Measured impedance in the light and the dark at the same bias voltage for the device shown in Fig. 1. The results indicate there is modest difference between the (a) magnitude of the impedance of the two states which may partly be explained by the consequences of optical heating or drift in cell behaviour (see Extended Data Fig. 1), although could also be related to a photoinduced change in ionic conductivity$^{22,23}$. There is also a small change in the apparent capacitance (b). **c,** In this equivalent circuit model, the interfacial transistor element seen in Fig. 1b has been replaced with a diode element representing a conventional recombination process. Three light intensities are shown corresponding to potentials $V$ across the device of 0.1 V (blue), 0.2 V (red), and 0.3 V (green) and respective ionic resistances of $R_{\text{ion}} = 2 \times 10^6$, $4 \times 10^4$, $1 \times 10^3 \, \Omega \, \text{cm}^2$. The other elements are $C_{\text{ion}} = 1 \times 10^{-8} \, \text{F cm}^{-2}$, $C_g = 1 \times 10^{-8} \, \text{F cm}^{-2}$ and $J_{\text{ss}} = 1 \times 10^{-11} \, \text{A cm}^{-2}$. **d** and (e) show the resulting modelled impedance and capacitance. It is apparent that although the capacitance of the device shows a shift in its frequency dependence, there is no change in the magnitude of the device capacitance at low frequencies This is in contrast to observation where the apparent capacitance increases at low frequency but there is no shift in the frequency of this feature (Fig. 1a and b and Extended Data Fig. 1). We note that if there were also photoinduced changes in $C_{\text{ion}}$ then it is possible that $C_{\text{ion}}$ and $R_{\text{ion}}$ could co-vary such that the time constant of the ionic response remained unchanged. However, since $C_{\text{ion}}$ will be predominantly controlled by the width of the
interfacial space charge regions, which have contributions from both the accumulation/depletion of mobile ions in the perovskite as well as a contribution from depletion of electrons or holes in the contacts. Any change in $C_{\text{ion}}$ is likely to be dominated by changes in the electronic depletion layer which to a first approximation scales with $(V_{\text{bi}}/(V_{\text{bi}} - V))^{1/2}$. Thus perfect co-variance of $C_{\text{ion}}$ and $R_{\text{ion}}$ is unlikely.
**Extended Data Figure 4**  Simplified energy level diagrams and equivalent circuit models. The conduction and valence bands of the perovskite layer are sandwiched by the hole transporting material (HTM, pink) and the electron transporting material (ETM, light blue), the vertical axis represents electrochemical potential energy which points down. The ionic accumulation layers are assumed negligibly thin. The height of the energy barrier for electron injection/collection and recombination/generation in the dark is given by \( \phi_0 \) and ionic charge is represented by the light grey squares. The
electron and hole quasi Fermi levels are indicated by the dashed blue and red lines, the other symbols are defined in the main text. The equivalent circuit diagrams are colour coded blue, red and grey to indicate the paths for electrons, holes and ions. a, The energy levels of the conduction and valence bands in the dark before and after ionic equilibration. The ideal Schottky-Mott limit electronic energy barriers are indicated, these change with applied potential and ionic redistribution. Energy levels after application of a voltage ($V$) shown instantaneously ($\omega \to \infty$) and at steady state ($\omega \to 0$) and corresponding circuit models for devices in the: (b) recombination limited regime where $J_{s1} \ll J_{s2}$, (c) the injection limited regime where $J_{s1} \gg J_{s2}$ and (d) the mixed limit regime. Example model Nyquist plots are also shown for each regime, the mixed limit plot corresponds to a special case where $R_{\text{ion}}$ is comparable to the real parts of $Z_{\text{rec}}$ and $Z_{\text{inj}}$. 
Extended Data Figure 5  Interpretation of recombination limited impedance spectra.

Example of equivalent circuit model Nyquist plots and impedance spectra (magnitude $|Z(\omega)|$, phase $\theta$, and apparent capacitance $\text{Re}[1/(i\omega Z)]$) for a recombination limited circuit showing the characteristic time constants at 0 V and 0.8 V. The time constants ($\omega^{-1}$) of various spectral features are indicated.
Extended Data Figure 6  Circuit model cyclic voltammograms based on parameters from fit to experimental impedance data in Fig. 1. The circuit model is shown above the plots, corresponding to the central column in Fig. S1 with impedance spectroscopy fitting parameters in Extended Data Table 1. $J_{\text{ph}} = 22$ mA cm$^{-2}$ (solid lines) and $J_{\text{ph}} = 0$ (dashed lines) with a scan rates of $s = 0.04, 0.4,$ and $40$ V s$^{-1}$ from 1.2 to 0 V reverse scan (purple) followed by reverse (light blue). Applied voltage $V$, ionic interface potentials $V_1$ and $V_2$ and electron potential $V_n$ vs time are also shown for the illuminated $J_{\text{ph}} = 22$ mA cm$^{-2}$ cases. The $s = 0.4$ V s$^{-1}$ case is close to the measured current voltage curve seen in Extended Data Fig. 8.
Extended Figure 7  Circuit models and complete impedance spectra corresponding to Fig. 4a (left-hand column) and Fig. 4b (right-hand column). The solid lines show the global all the data using the parameters listed in Extended Data Table 1. The drift diffusion model parameters used to create the simulated impedance measurements in the left-hand column (Fig. 4a) are identical to those listed in Extended Data Table 2 except that the recombination lifetimes of the contacts were reduced by 10,000 times so that $\tau_n = \tau_p = 5 \times 10^{-14}$ s, and the mobility of the majority carrier species in the contacts were reduced by 100 times so that $\mu_h = 0.2$ cm$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ in the p-type contact and $\mu_e = 0.2$ cm$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ in the n-type contact. The right-hand column shows a global fit to the impedance measurements of the spiro-OMeTAD/ FA$_{0.85}$MA$_{0.15}$PbI$_3$/SnO$_x$ in Fig. 4b assuming a model in which ions may penetrate or reversibly react at the recombination interface.
Extended Data Figure 8  Solar cell data and circuit models described in the Methods and Supplementary Information. a, Current-voltage sweeps of the spiro-OMeTAD/ Cs\(_{0.05}\)FA\(_{0.81}\)MA\(_{0.14}\)Pbl\(_{2.55}\)Br\(_{0.45}\)/TiO\(_2\) solar cell in Fig. 1c,d measured under AM1.5 illumination with a sweep rate of 0.4 V s\(^{-1}\). b, Current-voltage sweeps of the spiro-OMeTAD/ FA\(_{0.85}\)MA\(_{0.15}\)Pbl\(_{3}\)/SnO\(_2\) solar cell in Fig. 4b measured under AM1.5 illumination with a sweep rate of 0.2 V s\(^{-1}\). c, Normalised power conversion efficiency (PCE), \(V_{OC}\), short circuit current (\(J_{SC}\)), and fill factor (FF) as a function of illumination time of a device prepared using the same procedure as that measured in a. d, Equivalent circuit model including the effects of screening by electrons in the perovskite on the interfacial capacitances (\(C_n\)). e, Normalised Nyquist plot, calculated from the circuit model shown in d, indicating the effect of increasing \(C_n\) on the shape of the spectrum. The example is calculated with the same parameters as those shown in Extended Data Fig. 5 where \(J_{s1} \ll J_{s2}\) with an applied voltage of 0.5 V, and varying \(C_n\) from \(10^{-12} – 10^{-7}\) F cm\(^{-2}\). f, A general solar cell circuit model including, free electrons and holes, photogeneration, and the effects of bulk recombination.
Extended Data Table 1. Global fit parameters for the measured and simulated impedance data presented in the study. The applied voltages used as inputs for the circuit model (Fig. 1b) of the experimental data in Fig. 1c and d (also Extended Data Fig. 1b and c) were: 1.107 V (1 sun), 1.066 V (0.32 sun), 1.016 V (0.1 sun), 0.955 V (0.032 sun), 0.894 V (0.01 sun), 0.846 V (0.0032 sun), 0.795 V (0.001 sun) with a steady state ideality factor of $m_{ss} = 1.79$. The applied voltages for the simulated measurements in Fig. 1e and f were: 0.931 V (1 sun), 0.876 V (0.32 sun), 0.822 V (0.1 sun), 0.766 V (0.032 sun), 0.711 V (0.01 sun), 0.656 V (0.0032 sun), 0.600 V (0.001 sun) with a steady state ideality factor of $m_{ss} = 1.84$, $V_{bi} = 1.3$ V. * The value inferred from the simulation input parameters is $R_{ion} = d_{intrinsic}/(q\mu_aN_{ion}) = 3.1 \times 10^5 \Omega$ cm$^2$, close to the value extracted from the fit to the simulated impedance measurements using the expression $R_{ion} = c_{rec}(\bar{V})4m_{ss}(1 - f_c/2)k_B T/(q f_c C_{ion} J_{rec}(\bar{V})) = 3.8 \times 10^5 \Omega$ cm$^2$ (see main text and for the experimental data the inset in Fig. 1c). The deviation between the simulation input value and the fit value of $R_{ion}$ in the table below arises due to factors not accounted for by the circuit model which the fit attempts to compensate for, particularly the capacitive screening of interfaces by the electronic charge at the higher light intensities. The applied voltages used as inputs for the circuit model (Fig. 3g) of the simulated impedance measurements in Fig. 4a were: 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, and 0.8 V, with a steady state ideality factor of $m_{ss} = 1.93$. The applied voltages used as inputs to the circuit model (Extended Data Fig. 7) for the experimental data in Fig. 4b were: 1.061 V (1 sun), 1.012 V (0.32 sun), 0.948 V (0.1 sun), 0.865 V (0.032 sun), 0.777 V (0.01 sun), 0.713 V (0.0032 sun), 0.638 V (0.001 sun), with a steady state ideality factor of $m_{ss} = 2.43$. The ideality factor for charge injection/collection was assumed to be unity. Fit uncertainties approximately correspond to the number of decimal places shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Experimental data (Fig. 1c,d)</th>
<th>Simulated data (Fig. 1e,f)</th>
<th>Experimental data (ED Fig. 1d-f)</th>
<th>Simulated data (Fig. 4a)</th>
<th>Experimental data (Fig. 4b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$ (\Omega cm$^2$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_g$ (F cm$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>$4.4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$4.4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{ss}$ (\Omega cm$^2$)</td>
<td>$6.7 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$3.8 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$6.7 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$3.8 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$2.2 \times 10^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{int}$ (\Omega cm$^2$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4.1 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{ion}$ (F cm$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>$7.2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$2.6 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$7.2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$2.6 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>$8.6 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{con}$ (F cm$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7.8 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{s1}$ (A cm$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>$6.1 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$7.1 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>$1.19 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{s2}$ (A cm$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3.1 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>$1.50 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_c$</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extended Data Table 2  Drift-diffusion simulation parameters. These parameters were used for all the simulated data, except where explicitly stated. The $V_{OC}$ resulting from this parameters set is 0.931 V, the resulting $J_{SC}$ is 20.3 mA/cm$^2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter name</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>p-type</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>n-type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer thickness</td>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band gap</td>
<td>$E_g$</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built in voltage</td>
<td>$V_{bi}$</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative dielectric constant</td>
<td>$\varepsilon_s$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile ionic defect density</td>
<td>$N_{ion}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10$^{19}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion mobility</td>
<td>$\mu_a$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10$^{-10}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cm$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron mobility</td>
<td>$\mu_e$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>cm$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole mobility</td>
<td>$\mu_h$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>cm$^2$V$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor doping density</td>
<td>$N_A$</td>
<td>3.0 \times 10$^{17}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptor doping density</td>
<td>$N_D$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0 \times 10$^{17}$</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective density of states</td>
<td>$N_0$</td>
<td>10$^{20}$</td>
<td>10$^{20}$</td>
<td>10$^{20}$</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band-to-band recombination rate coefficient</td>
<td>$k_{betb}$</td>
<td>10$^{-12}$</td>
<td>10$^{-12}$</td>
<td>10$^{-12}$</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH trap energy</td>
<td>$E_t$</td>
<td>$E_{CB}$-0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$E_{CB}$-0.8</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH time constants</td>
<td>$\tau_n, \tau_p$</td>
<td>5 $\times$ 10$^{-10}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 $\times$ 10$^{-10}$</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation rate</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5 $\times$ 10$^{21}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>cm$^{-3}$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extended Data Table 3. Changes in interfacial barrier potentials and small perturbation impedances due to ionic redistribution considering only free electrons. The terms in the equations are described in the main text, Supplementary Information and illustrated in Fig. 3 and Extended Data Figure 4. In the small perturbation regime an oscillating voltage \( v \) is superimposed on the steady state cell bias potential \( \bar{V} \). Complete expressions considering holes are given in the in Supplementary Information, considering asymmetric interfacial capacitances, and screening within the perovskite. The symbols covered by a bar (e.g. \( \bar{V} \)) indicate the steady state value of the at quantity when \( \omega \to 0 \). *Assumes that mobile ionic charge does not penetrate or react at interfaces and the \( C_{\text{ion}} \) is the same at each interface.

### Change in barrier potential for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Type</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron generation</td>
<td>( V_{\text{gen}} = V_1 - V = -\bar{V}A - vA )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron recombination</td>
<td>( V_{\text{rec}} = V_1 - V_n = \bar{V}(1 - A - B_n) + v(1 - A - B_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron collection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{col}} = V_2 - V_n = \bar{V}(A - B_n) + v(A - B_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron injection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{inj}} = V_2 = \bar{V}A + vA )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Small voltage perturbation parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Description</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of ionic screening potential within contact layer</td>
<td>( f_c = 1 - \frac{C_{\text{ion}}}{C_{\text{per}}} = 1 - \frac{\text{total interface capacitance}}{\text{perovskite space charge capacitance}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of voltage change at interface due to ionic redistribution*</td>
<td>( A = \frac{v_C}{v} = \frac{f_c}{2 + i\omega R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential due to ions at interface 1 (V)</td>
<td>( v_1 = v(1 - A) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential due to ions at interface 2 (V)</td>
<td>( v_2 = vA )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional change in voltage of electron quasi Fermi level†</td>
<td>( B_n = \frac{v_n}{v} = \frac{I_{\text{rec}} + A(I_{\text{gen}} - I_{\text{rec}} + I_{\text{col}} - I_{\text{inj}})}{I_{\text{rec}} + I_{\text{col}}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interfacial currents (A cm\(^{-2}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Type</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron generation</td>
<td>( J_{\text{gen}} = \frac{q^2}{J_{s1} e^2 m_{1} k_B T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron recombination</td>
<td>( J_{\text{rec}} = \frac{q^2}{J_{s1} e^2 m_{1} k_B T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron collection</td>
<td>( J_{\text{col}} = \frac{q^2}{J_{s2} e^2 m_{2} k_B T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron injection</td>
<td>( J_{\text{inj}} = \frac{q^2}{J_{s2} e^2 m_{2} k_B T} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interfacial impedances (\( \Omega \) cm\(^{-2}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impedance Type</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron generation impedance</td>
<td>( Z_{\text{gen}} = \frac{(1 - B_n) m_1 k_B T}{A q^2 J_{\text{gen}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron recombination impedance</td>
<td>( Z_{\text{rec}} = \frac{(1 - B_n) m_1 k_B T}{(1 - A - B_n) q^2 J_{\text{rec}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 1 electron impedance</td>
<td>$Z_1 = \left(\frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{gen}}}\right)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron collection impedance</td>
<td>$Z_{\text{col}} = \frac{B_n}{(B_n - A)} \frac{m_2 k_B T}{q f_{\text{col}}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron injection impedance</td>
<td>$Z_{\text{inj}} = \frac{B_n m_2 k_B T}{A q f_{\text{inj}}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 2 electron impedance</td>
<td>$Z_2 = \left(\frac{1}{Z_{\text{inj}}} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{col}}}\right)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplementary Information

Evaluation of $r_{\text{rec}}$ and $c_{\text{rec}}$.

The real part of $Z_{\text{rec}}$ (derived from equation 3) gives the small perturbation resistance of the interface:

$$r_{\text{rec}}(\omega) = Z'_{\text{rec}} = \frac{2 + \omega^2 R_{\text{ion}}^2 c_{\text{ion}}^2}{\left(1 + \omega^2 R_{\text{ion}}^2 c_{\text{ion}}^2\right)} \frac{k_B T}{q J_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})}$$

Since $J_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})$ varies exponentially with $\bar{V}$ (when $V_n = 0$) we see that $r_{\text{rec}}$ is proportional to $\exp\left[-q\bar{V}/(k_B T)\right]$ analogous to the resistance expected from a diode. Additionally, $r_{\text{rec}}$ is frequency dependent since the variation in interfacial energy barrier ($v_1 - v_n$) induced by ion motion is also frequency dependent. It is apparent that $r_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to 0) = 2r_{\text{rec}}(\omega \to \infty)$ as stated in the main text.

The apparent capacitance due to the recombination current out of phase with $v$ can also be found from equation 3:

$$c_{\text{rec}}(\omega) = \text{Im}\left(\frac{1}{\omega Z_{\text{rec}}}\right) = \frac{R_{\text{ion}} c_{\text{ion}}}{4 + \omega^2 R_{\text{ion}}^2 c_{\text{ion}}^2} \frac{q J_{\text{rec}}(\bar{V})}{k_B T}$$

Evaluation of inductive behaviour due to injection and negative ionic-to-electronic current transcarrier amplification

We now demonstrate that the circuit model can result in inductive behaviour due to interfacial charge injection processes coupled to ionic redistribution. Charge injection of a carrier (free electron or hole) will occur in series with the corresponding recombination process described above. Considering the electronic current across the ETM interface 2, the net current density is given by the difference between the injection and collection currents, $J_{\text{inj}}$ and $J_{\text{col}}$:

$$J_2 = J_{\text{inj}} - J_{\text{col}} = J_{s2} e^{q V_{\text{inj}} / k_B T} - J_{s2} e^{q V_{\text{col}} / k_B T}$$

where $J_{s2}$ is the electron saturation current density of the interface at equilibrium in the dark and the changes in barrier potentials $V_{\text{inj}}$ and $V_{\text{col}}$ in relation to ionic redistribution are given in Table 1, Fig. 3 and Extended Data Fig. 4c.

If $V_n \approx V$ (which would occur under forward bias in the dark where $J_{s2} > J_{s1}$) then the electron collection current is negligible and the impedance of interface 2 is controlled by injection (Table 1):

$$\frac{1}{Z_{\text{inj}}} = \frac{d J_{\text{inj}}}{d \bar{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + i \omega R_{\text{ion}} c_{\text{ion}} / 2}\right) \frac{q J_{\text{inj}}(\bar{V})}{k_B T}$$
Comparing this with equation 3 shows that ionic motion causes \( Z_{\text{inj}} \) to vary with an imaginary component \( \pi \) rad out of phase with \( Z_{\text{rec}} \) so that the interface will behave like an inductor despite no release of accumulated electronic charge. The real part of this \( Z_{\text{inj}} \) is given by:

\[
r_{\text{inj}} = Z'_{\text{inj}} = \frac{2k_BT}{qJ_{\text{inj}}(V)}
\]

The corresponding negative value of the imaginary part of \( Z_{\text{inj}} \) divided by the angular frequency gives an expression which is analogous to an apparent inductance to injection \( l_{\text{inj}} \) of charge carriers across the interface:

\[
l_{\text{inj}} = -\frac{Z''_{\text{inj}}}{\omega} = \frac{k_BT R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}}}{qJ_{\text{inj}}(V)}
\]

This has the potential to lead to loops in Nyquist plots (Extended Data Fig. 4c). As discussed in the main text, this result also implies the presence of a transcarrier amplification factor based on the following argument. At low frequency when \( \omega \ll (R_{\text{ion}} C_{\text{ion}})^{-1} \) the ionic current will be out of phase with \( v \) is given by \( J_{\text{ion}} \approx i\omega C_{\text{ion}} v/2 \) so that the out of phase component of the voltage perturbation at interface 2 is \( v''_2 = -J_{\text{ion}} R_{\text{ion}}/2 \) due to the electrostatic drop in potential across the perovskite. This results in an out of phase electronic current of \( j''_{\text{inj}} = -J_{\text{ion}} R_{\text{ion}} g_{\text{inj}} \) where \( g_{\text{inj}} \) is the injection transconductance of the interface given by \( dq_{\text{inj}}/dV_2 = qJ_{\text{inj}}(\bar{V})/(k_BT) \).

Taking the ratio of these currents gives the ionic-to-electronic transcarrier amplification of the ionic current as mentioned in the main text:

\[
\frac{j''_{\text{inj}}}{J_{\text{ion}}} = -R_{\text{ion}} g_{\text{inj}} = -R_{\text{ion}} \frac{qJ_{\text{inj}}(V,\omega=0)}{k_BT}
\]

**Calculating the impedance of both interfaces considering only electrons**

In cases where the impedance of both interface 1 and interface 2 are comparable, the value of \( V_n \) will no longer be \( V_n \approx 0 \) (for a recombination dominated impedance) or \( V_n \approx V \) (for injection dominated impedance) so it must be determined in order to quantify \( Z_1 \) and \( Z_2 \). The inclusion of both \( Z_{\text{rec}}(V_{fph},\omega) \) (capacitor-like) and \( Z_{\text{inj}}(V_{fph},\omega) \) (inductor like) elements within an equivalent circuit model can result in loops within Nyquist plots under some circumstances (see Extended Data Fig. 4d). Extended Data Table 3 (which is a more complete extension of Table 1) summarises the changes in potential barriers, electrostatic interface potentials, and small perturbation impedances considering electrons only. The value of \( V_n \) is evaluated by substituting the expressions for the interfacial currents at steady state (i.e. \( \omega = 0 \)) in Extended Data Table 3 into the following current continuity equation using the steady state values of \( \bar{V}_1 \) and \( \bar{V}_2 \) where \( \bar{V}_1 = \bar{V}_2 = \bar{V}/2 \) (if \( f_z = 1 \)):
\[ J_n = J_{\text{rec}} - J_{\text{gen}} + J_{\text{ph}} = J_{\text{inj}} - J_{\text{col}} \]

and solving numerically for \( V_n \). In the small perturbation regime current continuity must also be obeyed so that:

\[ J_n = J_{\text{rec}} - J_{\text{gen}} = J_{\text{inj}} - J_{\text{col}} \]

where the photogeneration current need not be considered as it is not perturbed. The above expression can be rewritten as in terms of the product of the voltage perturbation driving each process (Table S3) with the transconductance for each process

\[ j_n = v(1 - A - B_n) \frac{J_{\text{rec}}}{k_BT} + vA \frac{J_{\text{gen}}}{k_BT} = vA \frac{J_{\text{inj}}}{k_BT} - v(B_n - A) \frac{J_{\text{col}}}{k_BT} \]

where \( B_n = v_n/v \). Since \( A \) is known, this can be solved for \( B_n \) to give:

\[ B_n = \frac{J_{\text{rec}} + A(J_{\text{gen}} - J_{\text{rec}} + J_{\text{col}} - J_{\text{inj}})}{J_{\text{rec}} + J_{\text{col}}} \]

The small perturbation impedance (for electrons) of the two interfaces in series can then be found by dividing \( v \) by \( j_n \) to give:

\[ Z_n = Z_1 + Z_2 = \left( 1 - A - B_n \right) \frac{J_{\text{rec}}}{k_BT} + A \frac{J_{\text{gen}}}{k_BT} \]

The impedances of each interface and individual process are separately are listed in Extended Data Table 3 (which also includes the process ideality factors) should they need to be evaluated separately. Almost identical arguments can be used if only hole processes dominate the impedance of the device. Bulk recombination can also be easily included by adding the appropriate expression to the current continuity equation as described for the general case in the Supplementary Information.

**Accounting for accumulating electronic charge in the perovskite layer**

The model we have proposed assumes that the concentration of electronic charge in the active layer is negligible relative to the background concentration of mobile ionic defects. Particularly at higher bias voltages the concentration of electronic charge may become comparable to the ionic charge. Since the electronic charge is highly mobile relative to the ionic defects it will rapidly move to screen changes in the ionic charge distribution. This will have the consequence of screening any modulation in the values of \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) and thus modulation out of phase components of interfacial charge transfer. To approximately describe this screening behaviour...
for a simplified model considering just electrons and ions we can modify the equivalent circuit as shown in Extended Data Fig. 8e.

As the value of the screening capacitance, \(C_n\) the amplitude of the modulation electrostatic potential by the ions at \(V_1\) and \(V_2\) is reduced, removing the amplification behaviour from the out of phase currents across the interfaces resulting so that the Nyquist plot returns to a single semicircle (see Extended Data Fig. 8f).

**Calculating large perturbation current-voltage sweep behaviour**

The time varying potential in the perovskite layer close to each interface can be evaluated for large perturbations. For example, the current response of the device in response to a linear voltage sweep can be found by considering the ionic branch of the circuit and its coupling to the electron branch for the circuit shown in Fig. 3g.

A linear voltage sweep with scan rate \(s\) is applied across the device terminals results in charge \(Q_{ion}\) that accumulates at the interfacial capacitances \(C_{ion}\) with time, this can be found by solving the differential equation:

\[
\frac{dQ_{ion}}{dt} = \frac{V_{initial} + st}{R_{ion}} - \frac{2Q_{ion}}{R_{ion}C_{ion}}
\]

with the initial condition that \(Q_{ion}(t = 0) = Q_0\) and \(V(t = 0) = V_{initial}\) is the initial potential. When the scan starts \(Q_0\) need not be in equilibrium with \(V_{initial}\) this is particularly relevant to cases where the cell is preconditioned with a forward bias prior to measurement.

\[
Q_{ion}(t) = s \frac{C_{ion}}{2} t - sR_{ion} \left( \frac{C_{ion}}{2} \right)^2 + \left( sR_{ion} \left( \frac{C_{ion}}{2} \right)^2 + Q_0 - V_{initial} \frac{C_{ion}}{2} \right) e^{-\frac{2t}{R_{ion}C_{ion}}} - Q_0 + V_{initial} \frac{C_{ion}}{2}
\]

\(Q_0\) is the initial charge on \(C_{ion}\) relative to equilibrium in the dark (in which case we define \(Q_0 = 0\)). The electrostatic potentials at \(V_1\) and \(V_2\) are given by:

\[
V_1(t) = V(t) - \frac{Q_{ion}(t)}{C_{ion}}
\]

\[
V_2(t) = \frac{Q_{ion}(t)}{C_{ion}}
\]

This allows the current through the interfaces to be calculated by numerically solving the following expression to give \(V_n\) and thus \(J_n\) by substituting in the expressions for interfacial currents and potentials given in Table S3 (assuming \(V_n\) it is not set to 0 for cases where injection is not limiting):

\[
J_n(t) = J_{rec}(t) - J_{gen}(t) + J_{ph} = J_{inj}(t) - J_{col}(t)
\]
If only one process limits the interfacial currents then the interfacial electron current, $J_n$, can be found more simply, for example if electron recombination limits the current through the interfaces ($V_n = 0$ V) and:

$$J_n(t) = \frac{J_{s1}}{k_B T} \frac{Q_{ion}(t)}{q} e^{\frac{q V_n}{k_B T}}$$

The device current, $J$, can then be found from the sum of the ionic current, $J_{ion}$, the geometric charging current $J_g$ and the interfacial electronic current $J$:

$$J(t) = J_n(t) + J_{ion}(t) + J_g(t)$$

For a linear voltage sweep with rate $s$ these currents are:

$$J_g(t) \approx s C_g$$

$$J_{ion}(t) = \frac{s C_{ion}}{2} - \frac{2sR (C_{ion})^2 + Q_0}{R_{ion}C_{ion}} e^{-\frac{2s}{R_{ion}C_{ion}}}$$

An example of the modelled $J_{device}$ using this approach is shown in Extended Data Fig. 6 for a cyclic voltammogram, it shows the resulting hysteresis in the current-voltage behaviour.

**Calculating large perturbation current-voltage step behaviour**

The response of the circuit to a voltage step may also be calculated by considering the response of the ions to a step change in cell potential from $V_{initial}$ to $V_{final}$. The differential equation for the evolution of ionic charge is given by:

$$V_{final} - V_{initial} = R_{ion} \frac{dQ}{dt} + \frac{2(Q - C_{ion}V_{initial})}{C_{ion}}$$

With the initial condition $Q(t = 0) = C_{ion}V_{initial}/2$, which has the solution:

$$Q_{ion}(t) = \frac{C_{ion}}{2} \left[ V_{final} - (V_{final} - V_{initial})e^{-\frac{2t}{R_{ion}C_{ion}}} \right]$$

The electrostatic potentials at $V_1$ and $V_2$ are given by:

$$V_1(t) = V_{final} - \frac{Q_{ion}(t)}{C_{ion}}$$

$$V_2(t) = \frac{Q_{ion}(t)}{C_{ion}}$$
Again, this allows the current through the interfaces to be calculated by numerically solving the following expression to give $V_n$ and thus $J$ (as described above for the linear sweep voltammetry case) by substituting in the expressions for interfacial currents and potentials given in Extended Data Table 3:

$$J(t) = J_{\text{rec}}(t) - J_{\text{gen}}(t) + j_{\text{ph}} = J_{\text{inj}}(t) - J_{\text{col}}(t)$$

The currents in the other branches of the device circuit, $J_{\text{ion}}$ and $J_g$ are given by:

$$J_{\text{ion}}(t) = \frac{2(V_{\text{final}} - V_{\text{initial}})}{R_{\text{ion}}} e^{-\frac{2t}{R_{\text{ion}}C_{\text{ion}}}}$$

$$J_g = \frac{2(V_{\text{final}} - V_{\text{initial}})}{R_s} e^{-\frac{2t}{R_sC_g}}$$

Assuming that $R_s \ll R_{\text{ion}}$ giving $J_{\text{device}}(t) = J(t) + J_{\text{ion}}(t) + J_g(t)$. The resulting current (or photocurrent transients) may display apparently capacitive or inductive behaviour.

**General description of interfaces considering electrons, holes, bulk recombination, interface idealities, asymmetric ionic capacitance, partial ionic screening within the perovskite layer.**

In the main text we assumed that under most circumstances a single electron or hole interfacial transfer process would dominate the observed impedance behaviour. If the contributions to the impedance from the processes at all interfaces are considered then the total impedance of the combined interfaces will be given by:

$$Z_{np} = \left(\frac{1}{Z_1^{\text{n}} + Z_2^{\text{n}}} + \frac{1}{Z_1^{\text{p}} + Z_2^{\text{p}}}\right)^{-1}$$

where $Z_1^{\text{n}}$ and $Z_2^{\text{n}}$ are the electron transfer impedances of interfaces 1 and 2, and $Z_1^{\text{p}}$ and $Z_2^{\text{p}}$ are the corresponding hole transfer impedances (see Supplementary Table 1). Note that in the these expressions and those that follow the superscripts 'n' and 'p' are used to distinguish processes related electrons or holes, they do not refer to exponents. The value of $Z_{np}$ will be dominated by the process with the highest impedance within the branch showing the lowest impedance.

Under some circumstances more than one process may contribute to the observed impedance in which case a complete expression for $Z_{np}$ may be evaluated. In the main text, and in the expression for $Z_{np}$ above we also assumed that recombination only occurred at interfaces. We now describe the method to evaluate a more general version of the interface model, containing electrons, holes and bulk recombination (represented by a diode which describes recombination processes that depend only on the quasi Fermi level splitting such as band-to-band bimolecular recombination), see circuit diagram in Extended Data Fig. 8f.
To find the impedance, the background steady state currents of each interfacial process must be established, this requires the values of $V_n$, $V_p$ and $J_{np}$ to be determined where $J_{np}$ is the steady state electronic current due to both electrons and holes. We define the photogeneration current, $J_{ph}$, to be negative. These quantities can be found by numerically solving a system of three simultaneous equations arising from Kirchhoff’s laws:

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{np} &= J_{rec}^n - J_{gen}^n + J_{inj}^p - J_{col}^p \\
J_{np} &= J_{rec}^p - J_{gen}^p + J_{inj}^n - J_{col}^n \\
J_{rec}^n - J_{gen}^n + J_{bulk} = J_{inj}^n - J_{col}^n
\end{align*}
\]

with the appropriate expressions substituted into the terms which are given in Supplementary Table 1. $V_n$, $V_p$ and $J_{np}$ allow the steady state interfacial currents to be evaluated and used to calculate the transconductances described below. Similar equations govern the current continuity in the small perturbation regime, without the need to include photocurrent (we note that the model could also be applied to describe intensity modulate photocurrent and photovoltage measurements (IMPS and IMVS) by including a small perturbation photocurrent):

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{np} &= J_{rec}^n - J_{gen}^n + J_{inj}^p - J_{col}^p \\
J_{np} &= J_{rec}^p - J_{gen}^p + J_{inj}^n - J_{col}^n \\
J_{rec}^n - J_{gen}^n + J_{bulk} = J_{inj}^n - J_{col}^n
\end{align*}
\]

These can be rewritten in terms of the voltage perturbation driving each process and the corresponding transconductances:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{Z_{np}} &= \frac{J_{np}}{V} = (1 - A_1 - B_n) \frac{qJ_{rec}^n}{m_1k_BT} + A_1 \frac{qJ_{gen}^n}{m_1k_BT} + A_1 \frac{qJ_{inj}^p}{m_1k_BT} - (B_p + A_1 - 1) \frac{qJ_{col}^p}{m_1k_BT} \\
\frac{1}{Z_{np}} &= \frac{J_{np}}{V} = (B_p - A_2) \frac{qJ_{rec}^p}{m_2k_BT} + A_2 \frac{qJ_{gen}^p}{m_2k_BT} + A_2 \frac{qJ_{inj}^n}{m_2k_BT} - (A_2 - B_n) \frac{qJ_{col}^n}{m_2k_BT} \\
(1 - A_1 - B_n) \frac{qJ_{rec}^n}{m_1k_BT} + A_1 \frac{qJ_{gen}^n}{m_1k_BT} + (B_p - B_n) \frac{qJ_{bulk}}{k_BT} &= A_2 \frac{qJ_{inj}^n}{m_2k_BT} - (A_2 - B_n) \frac{qJ_{col}^n}{m_2k_BT}
\end{align*}
\]

given that $A_1$ and $A_2$ are known (see Table S4) this system of equations can be solved analytically to give $Z$, $B_n$ and $B_p$ where $B_n = \nu_n/v$ and $B_p = \nu_p/v$. Here, $Z_{np}$ is the impedance of the two interfaces in series for electrons and holes. The resulting analytical solutions are rather long and thus not reproduced here, however they are straightforward to evaluate using analytical mathematics software. The impedances of the individual processes and interfaces are listed in Supplementary Table 1.

**Supplementary Table 1.** Changes in interfacial barrier potentials and small perturbation impedances due to ionic redistribution considering both free...
electrons and holes, and including bulk recombination. The superscripts n and p are
used to processes involving free electrons or holes respectively, they are not exponents.
The terms in the equations are described in the main text and illustrated in Fig. 3. In the
small perturbation regime an oscillating voltage \( \nu \) is superimposed on the cell potential
\( V \). The electron and hole quasi Fermi levels, \( V_n \) and \( V_p \) have corresponding small
perturbation oscillations \( \nu_n \) and \( \nu_p \). The ideality factors of interface 1 and 2 are given by
\( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) respectively. \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) arise because the capacitances of each interface are
different, \( C_{\text{ion1}} \) and \( C_{\text{ion2}} \). The symbols covered by a bar (e.g. \( \bar{V} \)) indicate the steady state
value of the quantity when \( \omega \rightarrow 0 \). *Assumes that mobile ionic charge does not
penetrate or chemically react at interfaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in barrier potential for:</th>
<th>Response to small voltage perturbation, ( \nu ) (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron generation</td>
<td>( V_{\text{gen}}^n = V_1 - V = -\bar{V}A_1 - vA_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron recombination</td>
<td>( V_{\text{rec}}^n = V_1 - V_n = \bar{V}(1 - \bar{A}_1 - \bar{B}_n) + v(1 - A_1 - B_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron collection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{col}}^n = V_2 - V_n = \bar{V}(\bar{A}_2 - \bar{B}_n) + v(A_2 - B_n) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron injection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{ijn}}^n = V_2 = \bar{V}A_2 + vA_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole generation</td>
<td>( V_{\text{gen}}^p = -V_2 = -\bar{V}A_2 - vA_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole recombination</td>
<td>( V_{\text{rec}}^p = V_p - V_2 = \bar{V}(\bar{B}_p - \bar{A}_2) + v(B_p - A_2) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole collection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{col}}^p = V_p - V_1 = \bar{V}(\bar{B}_p + \bar{A}_1 - 1) + v(B_p + A_1 - 1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole injection</td>
<td>( V_{\text{ijn}}^p = V - V_1 = \bar{V}A_1 + vA_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk recombination</td>
<td>( V_{\text{bulk}} = V_p - V_n = \bar{V}(\bar{B}_p - \bar{B}_n) + v(B_p - B_n) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small voltage perturbation parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction of ionic screening potential within contact layers</th>
<th>( f_c = 1 - \frac{C_{\text{ion}}}{C_{\text{per}}} = \frac{1}{\text{total interface capacitance perov. space charge capacitance}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraction voltage change at interface 1 due ion redistribution*</td>
<td>( A_1 = \frac{v_{\text{ion1}}}{\nu} = \frac{f_c}{1 + C_{\text{ion1}}/C_{\text{ion2}} + i\omega R_{\text{ion}}C_{\text{ion1}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction voltage change at interface 2 due ion redistribution*</td>
<td>( A_2 = \frac{v_{\text{ion2}}}{\nu} = \frac{f_c}{1 + C_{\text{ion2}}/C_{\text{ion1}} + i\omega R_{\text{ion}}C_{\text{ion2}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential due to ions at interface 1 (V)</td>
<td>( v_1 = v(1 - A_1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential due to ions at interface 2 (V)</td>
<td>( v_2 = vA_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional change in voltage of electron quasi Fermi level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional change in voltage of electron quasi Fermi level</td>
<td>Lengthy analytical expression, solved using Kirchhoff’s laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interfacial currents (A cm\(^{-2}\))

| Ideality factor of interface 1 | \( m_1 \) |
| Ideality factor of interface 2 | \( m_2 \) |
Electron generation \( J_{\text{gen}}^n = \frac{qV_{\text{gen}}^n}{E_1m_1k_BT} \)

Electron recombination \( J_{\text{rec}}^n = \frac{qV_{\text{rec}}^n}{E_1m_2k_BT} \)

Electron collection \( J_{\text{col}}^n = \frac{qV_{\text{col}}^n}{E_2m_1k_BT} \)

Electron injection \( J_{\text{inj}}^n = \frac{qV_{\text{inj}}^n}{E_2m_2k_BT} \)

Hole generation \( J_{\text{gen}}^p = \frac{qV_{\text{gen}}^p}{E_1m_2k_BT} \)

Hole recombination \( J_{\text{rec}}^p = \frac{qV_{\text{rec}}^p}{E_1m_1k_BT} \)

Hole collection \( J_{\text{col}}^p = \frac{qV_{\text{col}}^p}{E_2m_2k_BT} \)

Hole injection \( J_{\text{inj}}^p = \frac{qV_{\text{inj}}^p}{E_2m_1k_BT} \)

Bulk recombination \( J_{\text{bulk}} = I = J_0 \left( \frac{qV_{\text{bulk}}}{e k_BT} - 1 \right) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interfacial impedances</strong></th>
<th>((\Omega \text{ cm}^2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron generation impedance ( Z_{\text{gen}}^n )</td>
<td>( \frac{(1 - B_{n}) m_1k_BT}{A_1 q_{\text{gen}}^n} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron recombination impedance ( Z_{\text{rec}}^n )</td>
<td>( \frac{(1 - A_1 - B_{n}) m_1k_BT}{q_{\text{rec}}^n} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 1 electron impedance ( Z_1^n )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}^n} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{gen}}^n} \right)^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron collection impedance ( Z_{\text{col}}^n )</td>
<td>( \frac{B_n m_2k_BT}{(B_n - A_2) q_{\text{col}}^n} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron injection impedance ( Z_{\text{inj}}^n )</td>
<td>( \frac{B_n m_2k_BT}{A_2 q_{\text{inj}}^n} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 2 electron impedance ( Z_2^n )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{Z_{\text{inj}}^n} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{col}}^n} \right)^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole generation impedance ( Z_{\text{gen}}^p )</td>
<td>( \frac{B_p m_2k_BT}{A_2 q_{\text{gen}}^p} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole recombination impedance ( Z_{\text{rec}}^p )</td>
<td>( \frac{B_p m_2k_BT}{(B_p - A_2) q_{\text{rec}}^p} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 2 hole impedance ( Z_2^p )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{Z_{\text{rec}}^p} + \frac{1}{Z_{\text{gen}}^p} \right)^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole collection impedance ( Z_{\text{col}}^p )</td>
<td>( \frac{(1 - B_p) m_1k_BT}{(1 - A_1 - B_p) q_{\text{col}}^p} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole injection impedance ( Z_{\text{inj}}^p )</td>
<td>( \frac{(1 - B_p) m_1k_BT}{A_1 q_{\text{inj}}^p} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface 1 hole impedance</td>
<td>$Z_1^p = \left( \frac{1}{Z_{inj}^p} + \frac{1}{Z_{col}^p} \right)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk recombination impedance</td>
<td>$Z_{bulk} = \frac{k_B T}{q J_{bulk}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impedance of hole circuit branch</td>
<td>$Z_p = Z_1^p + Z_2^p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impedance of electron circuit branch</td>
<td>$Z_n = Z_1^n + Z_2^n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total impedance of active layer interfaces</td>
<td>$Z_{np} = \left( \frac{1}{Z_n} + \frac{1}{Z_p} \right)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>