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**Fig. S1** TEM images of HMZSs prepared without sol-gel protection method under calcination temperature of (A) 500 °C; (B) 600 °C; (C) 700 °C; and (D) 800 °C.
Fig. S2 (A) Schematic representation of synthetic procedure of HMZSs by sol-gel protection method; TEM images of (B) $s\text{SiO}_2$; (C) $s\text{SiO}_2@s\text{ZrO}_2$; (D) $s\text{SiO}_2@m\text{ZrO}_2@s\text{SiO}_2$; (E) $m\text{ZrO}_2$ (HMZSs).
Fig. S3 (A) Powder XRD pattern for HMZSs-d150; (B) N₂ adsorption-desorption isotherm and pore-size distribution of HMZSs-d150.

Table S1 Physicochemical properties of the HMZSs-d150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Specific surface area (m² g⁻¹)</th>
<th>Pore size (nm)</th>
<th>Pore volume (cm³ g⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMZSs-d150</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. S4 Zeta potential of HMZSs-d300 as function of solution pH.
It is necessary to investigate the relationship between zeta potential of HMZSs and solution pH before we begin to screen the appropriate corrosion inhibitor. Fig. S4 depicts zeta potential of HMZSs-d300 as function of solution pH. The isoelectric point is around pH 2.39. By analysis of EDS mapping of HMZSs-d300 in Fig. S5, there are still some remaining silica in the mesoporous zirconia shells after chemical etching and the occurrence of substantial silanol groups will cause the deviation of isoelectric point. As solution pH decreases from 7.0, the zeta potential of HMZSs-d300 pronounced increases, arising from the transition process of exterior SiO\textsuperscript{-} group to SiOH. In the other hand, when solution pH steps into the alkaline range, the pH effect on zeta potential becomes unobvious and the zeta potential keeps almost constant.
**Fig. S6** Equilibrium configurations performed for L-CAR and L-histidine on Fe(110) surface in aqueous solution obtained by molecular dynamic simulations.

**Fig. S7** (A) Optimized structure; (B) The highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) density; (C) The lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) density of L-CAR and L-histidine using DFT at the B3LYP/6-31+G (d,p) basis set level.

**Table S2** Calculated theoretical parameters for the compounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrosion inhibitor</th>
<th>$E_{\text{HOMO}}$ (eV)</th>
<th>$E_{\text{LUMO}}$ (eV)</th>
<th>$\Delta E$ ($E_{\text{LUMO}} - E_{\text{HOMO}}$, eV)</th>
<th>Molecular Volume (cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-histidine</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>159.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We first theoretically evaluate the qualification for L-CAR. The molecular dynamic simulations depicted in Fig. S6 demonstrate that L-CAR molecules adsorb on iron surface spontaneously through the multiple adsorption centers, such as hetero atoms (N and O) with unshared electron pairs, imidazole ring with π-electrons, and the calculated $E_{\text{binding}}$ (the binding energy between inhibitor molecule and iron surface) is 344.7 kJ mol$^{-1}$, even higher than that of L-histidine ($E_{\text{binding}}=312.4$ kJ mol$^{-1}$), evidencing its great application potential.

According to the Frontier Molecular Orbital Theory, the reactive ability of the corrosion inhibitor is considered to be closely related to their frontier molecular orbitals, HOMO and LUMO. Higher $E_{\text{HOMO}}$ of the molecule means a higher electron-donating ability to appropriate acceptor molecules with low-energy empty molecular orbital. The lower $E_{\text{LUMO}}$, the more probable it is that the molecule would accept electrons. The gap between LUMO-HOMO energy levels of inhibitor molecule is another important parameter to predict inhibition efficiency. Smaller the value of $\Delta E$ ($E_{\text{LUMO}}-E_{\text{HOMO}}$), higher is the inhibition efficiency of the inhibitor. Based on the results presented in Table S2, compared with L-histidine, the lower $E_{\text{LUMO}}$ and energy gap of L-CAR signify its application potential for corrosion inhibitor. The lower value of $E_{\text{LUMO}}$ calculated by quantum chemistry suggests that L-CAR molecules are more prone to accept the electrons from d-orbital of iron to form feedback bonds than L-histidine molecules, which will enhance the adhesion strength. In addition, the higher molecular volume of L-CAR guarantees the larger coverage area on metal surface.

| L-CAR | -0.224 | -0.080 | 0.144 | 85.128 |
Fig. S8 Tafel plots for carbon steel in 1.0 M NaCl solution containing different concentration of L-CAR at 25 °C.

Tafel plots for carbon steel in 1.0 M NaCl in the presence of different concentration of L-CAR at 25 °C are presented in Fig. S8. The corrosion parameters like corrosion potential ($E_{corr}$), corrosion current density ($I_{corr}$) calculated by extrapolation of Tafel straight line, cathodic Tafel slope ($\beta_c$), anodic Tafel slope ($\beta_a$) and percentage inhibition efficiency ($\eta_p$) are presented in Table S3. The $\eta_p$ was calculated from the following equation:

$$\eta_p = \left( \frac{I_{corr}^0 - I_{corr}}{I_{corr}^0} \right) \times 100$$

In the above equation, where $I_{corr}^0$ and $I_{corr}$ are corrosion current density in the absence and presence of inhibitor, respectively. It is found that $I_{corr}$ values decreased considerably in presence of L-CAR and decreased with increasing inhibitor concentration while $E_{corr}$ values remained almost unchanged ($\Delta E_{corr} < 85$ mV). These phenomena suggest that L-carnosine act as mixed type corrosion inhibitor for carbon steel in 1.0 M NaCl.\textsuperscript{1,2}
**Table S3** Polarization parameters and corresponding inhibition efficiency for the corrosion of carbon steel in 1.0 M NaCl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Inhibitor Concentration, L-CAR mg/L</th>
<th>$E_{corr}$ (mV/SCE)</th>
<th>$I_{corr}$ (μA cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_a$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_c$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\eta_p$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>-492</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 M NaCl</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-497</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>164.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>175.2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-482</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. S9** Tafel plots for carbon steel in 0.1 M H$_2$SO$_4$ solution containing different concentration of L-CAR at 25 °C.

**Table S4** Polarization parameters and inhibition efficiency of L-CAR for the corrosion of carbon steel in 0.1 M H$_2$SO$_4$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Inhibitor Concentration, L-CAR mg/L</th>
<th>$E_{corr}$ (mV/SCE)</th>
<th>$I_{corr}$ (mA cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_a$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_c$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\eta_p$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>-457</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 M H$_2$SO$_4$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-472</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-473</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. S10 Tafel plots for carbon steel in 0.1 M NaOH solution containing different concentration of L-CAR at 25 °C.

Table S5 Polarization parameters and inhibition efficiency of L-CAR for the corrosion of carbon steel in 0.1 M NaOH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Inhibitor Concentration, L-CAR mg/L</th>
<th>$E_{corr}$ (mV/SCE)</th>
<th>$I_{corr}$ (μA cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_a$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\beta_c$ (mV dec$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\eta_p$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>-305</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 M NaOH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-301</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-305</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Fig. S9 (Table S4) and S10 (Table S5), after addition of L-CAR, the corrosion current density decreased remarkably with increasing the concentration and the $E_{corr}$ did not change obviously either in acidic or in alkaline solution. It can be inferred that L-CAR will show excellent corrosion inhibition performances for carbon
steel no matter in corrosive micro-anodic or micro-cathodic zones.

**Fig. S11** Schematically representation of dissociation equation of L-CAR.
**HMZSs-d300**---inner diameter (D_1): 300 nm; external diameter (D_2): 330 nm

**HMZSs-d150**---inner diameter (D_1): 150 nm; external diameter (D_2): 210 nm

We assume the density of the mesoporous shells are the same, and denoted as $\rho$, then the volume of mesoporous shells are as following:

\[
\text{HMZSs-d300: } \frac{\pi D_1^3}{6} - \frac{\pi D_2^3}{6} = \frac{\pi}{6} (330^3 - 300^3) = 1489500 \pi
\]

\[
\text{HMZSs-d150: } \frac{\pi D_1^3}{6} - \frac{\pi D_2^3}{6} = \frac{\pi}{6} (210^3 - 150^3) = 981000 \pi
\]

The numbers of HMZSs-d300 and HMZSs-d150 included in unit mass are as following:

\[
\text{HMZSs-d300: } \frac{1}{1489500 \times \pi \times \rho}
\]

\[
\text{HMZSs-d150: } \frac{1}{981000 \times \pi \times \rho}
\]

The hollow volumes of HMZSs-d300 and HMZSs-d150 per nanospheres are as following:

\[
\text{HMZSs-d300: } \frac{\pi}{6} \times 300^3 = 4500000 \pi
\]

\[
\text{HMZSs-d150: } \frac{\pi}{6} \times 150^3 = 562500 \pi
\]

Therefore, the total hollow volumes of HMZSs-d300 and HMZSs-d150 in unit mass are as following:

\[
\text{HMZSs-d300: } \frac{1}{1489500 \times \pi \times \rho} \times 4500000 \pi = \frac{3.021}{\rho}
\]

\[
\text{HMZSs-d150: } \frac{1}{981000 \times \pi \times \rho} \times 562500 \pi = \frac{0.573}{\rho}
\]

If we ignore the small proportion of adsorbed L-CAR in mesoporous shells, the ratio of hollow cavity volume between HMZSs-d300 and HMZSs-d150 is about 5.27.

**Scheme S1.** Theoretical calculation processes of ideal adsorption capacity for HZMSs-d300 and HZMSs-d150.
**Theoretical Assessment of Inhibition Performances of L-CAR:**

Quantum chemical calculations were conducted with Gaussian 03 program. The molecular structures of corrosion inhibitors were geometrically optimized by the density functional theory (DFT)/B3LYP method with the basis set 6-31G+ (d, p). The molecular dynamics simulations (MD) were performed using the Materials Studio software from Accelrys Inc. Fe (110) surface was chosen for the simulation study due to its stable property. The MD simulation was carried out in a simulation box (29 Å×29 Å×67 Å) with periodic boundary conditions in order to model a representative part of an interface devoid of any arbitrary bound effects. The MD simulation was performed under 298 K, NVT ensemble, with a time step of 0.1 fs and simulation time of 50 ps using DISCOVERY module and COMPASS force field. During the process of simulations, all the atoms in Fe (110) surface were kept “frozen”, and the one L-CAR molecule and 600 water molecules were allowed to interact with the iron surface freely. The interaction energy between the inhibitor molecule and the Fe (110) surface was calculated as following:

\[ E_{\text{Fe-inhibitor}} = E_{\text{total}} - (E_{\text{surface}} + E_{\text{inhibitor}}) \]

In above equation, \( E_{\text{inhibitor}} \), \( E_{\text{surface}} \) and \( E_{\text{total}} \) represent the energies of an inhibitor molecule, the metal surface without inhibitor adsorption, and the total system containing an inhibitor molecule and metal surface, respectively. The binding energy between the inhibitor molecule and Fe (110) surface is the negative value of the
interaction energy, $E_{\text{binding}} = -E_{\text{Fe-inhibitor}}$.
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