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One-step synthesis of cobalt-doped MoS\textsubscript{2} nanosheets as bifunctional electrocatalysts for overall water splitting under both acidic and alkaline conditions
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Experimental section

Preparation of Co-doped MoS\textsubscript{2} nanosheets (Co-MoS\textsubscript{2}): All the chemicals were purchased from Sinopharm and used without further purification. For the synthesis of Co-MoS\textsubscript{2} samples, hexaammonium heptamolybdate tetrahydrate (1.0 mmol, (NH\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{6}Mo\textsubscript{7}O\textsubscript{24}·4H\textsubscript{2}O), thiourea (33 mmol, CS(NH\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}) and cobalt nitrate hexahydrate (0.05 mmol, 0.5 mmol, 1.0 mmol and 3.0 mmol Co(NO\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2}·6H\textsubscript{2}O, respectively) were dissolved in 30 mL of deionized water under vigorous stirring to form a homogeneous solution. Then, the solution was transferred into a 100 mL Teflon-lined stainless steel autoclave, maintained at 220 °C for 18 h, and allowed to cool to room temperature naturally. The final product was washed with water and absolute ethanol for several times and dried at 60 °C under
vacuum. The prepared MoS$_2$ with different Co contents was indicated as Co-MoS$_2$-$x$ ($x$ represents the addition amount of Co(NO$_3$)$_2$·6H$_2$O in reaction precursors, $x$=0.05, 0.5, 1.0 and 3.0, respectively).

**Preparation of pure MoS$_2$ nanosheets (MoS$_2$):** Typically, hexaammonium heptamolybdate tetrahydrate (1.0 mmol, (NH$_4$)$_6$Mo$_7$O$_{24}$·4H$_2$O) and thiourea (30 mmol, CS(NH$_2$)$_2$) were dissolved in 30 mL of deionized water under vigorous stirring to form a homogeneous solution. Then, the solution was transferred into a 100 mL Teflon-lined stainless steel autoclave and maintained at 220 °C for 18 h. The reaction system was allowed to cool to room temperature. The final product was washed with water and absolute ethanol for several times, and then dried at 60 °C under vacuum to collect for further use.

**Characterizations**

The crystalline structures of samples were identified by X-ray diffraction analysis (XRD, Philips X’pert PRO) using Nifiltered monochromatic CuKa radiation ($\lambda$K$\alpha_1$ = 1.5418 Å) at 40 kV and 40 mA. Raman spectra were carried out on a confocal microscope Raman system (LabRAMHR800, Horiba Jobin Yvon, Japan) using an Ar ion laser operating at 532 nm. The morphology and structure of samples were characterized by field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, Hitachi SU8020) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM, JEOL 2010) with an energy dispersive X-ray spectrometer (EDS Oxford, Link ISIS). X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) analysis was performed on an ESCALAB 250 X-ray photoelectron spectrometer (Thermo, America) equipped with Al K$\alpha_1$, 2
monochromatized radiation at 1486.6 eV X-ray source. The extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) spectra of samples were measured at the 1W1B beamline of Beijing Synchrotron Radiation Facility (BSRF). The Co and Mo contents in samples were determined using inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometer (ICP-AES, ICP-6300, Thermo Fisher Scientific).

**Electrochemical measurements**

Electrochemical measurements were performed on an electrochemical workstation (CHI 760D, CH Instruments, Inc., Shanghai, China). A standard three-electrode electrochemical cell equipped with gas flow system was employed during measurements. The Co-MoS$_2$ catalyst inks were prepared by dispersing catalyst powder (4.0 mg) into a mixture including 10 μL of Nafion solution (0.5 wt. %) and 490 μL of ethanol, followed by ultrasonic treatment for 10 min to form a homogeneous ink. After that, 250 μL of catalyst ink was dropped on carbon fiber paper (1.0×1.0 cm$^2$) surface and completely dried at room temperature. For comparison, commercial Pt/C, RuO$_2$ and pure MoS$_2$ catalyst inks were also made as the same procedure as Co-MoS$_2$ catalyst ink. Linear sweep voltammetry and chronoamperometry with a scan rate of 5.0 mV s$^{-1}$ were conducted in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ and 1.0 M KOH (purged with pure N$_2$) using Ag/AgCl (3 M KCl) and Hg/HgO as the reference electrode, respectively, carbon cloth as the counter electrode, and the carbon fiber paper with various catalysts as the working electrode. The electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) measurements were performed by applying an AC voltage with 5.0 mV amplitude in a frequency range from 10$^6$ to 0.1 Hz and recorded
at -0.3 V (vs. Ag/AgCl) in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ and -0.35 V (vs. Hg/HgO) in 1.0 M KOH. All the potentials were calibrated to a reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE) based on following equations:

\[
E \text{(vs. RHE)} = E \text{(vs. Ag/AgCl)} + 0.059 \times \text{pH} + 0.1976 \text{ V} \quad (1)
\]

\[
E \text{(vs. RHE)} = E \text{(vs. Hg/HgO)} + 0.059 \times \text{pH} + 0.0977 \text{ V} \quad (2)
\]

**Theoretical calculations**

All density functional theory (DFT) computations were performed using the Vienna \textit{ab initio} simulation package (VASP) based on the projector augmented wave (PAW) method.\textsuperscript{1,2} Electron-ion interactions were described using standard PAW potentials, with valence configurations of 4s$^2$4p$^6$5s$^2$4d$^4$ for Mo (Mo$_{sv}$GW), 3s$^2$3p$^4$ for S (S$_{GW}$), and 2s$^2$2p$^4$ for O (O$_{GW}$new), and 1s$^1$ for H (H$_{new}$) and 2s$^2$2p$^2$ for C (C$_{GW}$new). A plane-wave basis set was employed to expand the smooth part of wave functions with a cut-off kinetic energy of 520 eV. For the electron-electron exchange and correlation interactions, the functional parameterized by Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE),\textsuperscript{3} a form of the general gradient approximation (GGA), was used throughout. 2H-MoS$_2$ crystal was modelled with the primary unit cell including 2 Mo atoms and 4 S atoms. Before the analysis of electronic properties, the geometry was optimized. All the atoms were allowed to relax until the Hellmann-Feynman forces were smaller than 0.01eV/Å. The convergence criterion for the electronic self-consistent loop was set to $1 \times 10^{-5}$ eV. The Co-doped MoS$_2$ slab was modelled using a (3×3) surface using one Co atom to replace one Mo atom. As such, the molar ratio of Co to Mo here is 1:8. The Gibbs free energy ($\Delta G_{\text{H}^+}$) was calculated by the formula:
\[ \Delta G_{H^*} = \Delta E_{H^*} + \Delta ZPE - T\Delta S \]

where \( \Delta E_{H^*} \), \( \Delta ZPE \) and \( \Delta S \) are the binding energy, zero point energy change and entropy change of H adsorption, respectively. Herein, the \( T\Delta S \) and \( \Delta ZPE \) are obtained by following the scheme proposed by Nørskov et al.\(^4\)

**Fig. S1** The calculated density of states (DOS) of the pristine MoS\(_2\) and Co covalently doped MoS\(_2\).
**Fig. S2** SEM images of (a) MoS$_2$, (b) Co-MoS$_2$-0.05, (c) Co-MoS$_2$-1.0 and (d) Co-MoS$_2$-3.0 samples.

**Fig. S3** (a) XPS survey spectra, (b) High resolution Mo 3$d$ XPS spectrum, (c) High resolution S 2$p$ XPS spectrum and (d) Raman spectra of MoS$_2$, Co-MoS$_2$-0.05, Co-MoS$_2$-0.5, Co-MoS$_2$-1.0 and Co-MoS$_2$-3.0 samples.
Fig. S4 (a) Tafel plots in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ solution. (b) Tafel plots in 1.0 M KOH solution. The samples of Pt/C, MoS$_2$, Co-MoS$_2$-0.05, Co-MoS$_2$-0.5, Co-MoS$_2$-1.0 and Co-MoS$_2$-3.0 for HER. (c) Tafel plots in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ solution. (d) Tafel plots in 1.0 M KOH solution. The samples of RuO$_2$, MoS$_2$, Co-MoS$_2$-0.05, Co-MoS$_2$-0.5, Co-MoS$_2$-1.0 and Co-MoS$_2$-3.0 for OER.
Fig. S5 (a) LSV curves of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after 3000 CV cycles at 10 mV s$^{-1}$ and (b) Durability test of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 at an overpotential of 60 mV for HER in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ solution. (c) LSV curves of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after 3000 CV cycles at 10 mV s$^{-1}$ and (d) Durability test of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 at an overpotential of 90 mV for HER in 1.0 M KOH solution.
Fig. S6 (a) LSV curves of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after 3000 CV cycles at 10 mV s$^{-1}$ and (b) Durability test of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 at an overpotential of 570 mV for OER in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ solution. (c) LSV curves of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after 3000 CV cycles at 10 mV s$^{-1}$ and (d) Durability test of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 at an overpotential of 190 mV for OER in 1.0 M KOH solution.
**Fig. S7** The electrochemical impedance spectra (EIS) of MoS$_2$, Co-MoS$_2$-0.05, Co-MoS$_2$-0.5, Co-MoS$_2$-1.0 and Co-MoS$_2$-3.0 samples in (a) 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ and (b) 1.0 M KOH solution.

**Fig. S8** The side view (a) and top view (b) of the optimized H adsorption configuration of Co-doped MoS$_2$. Green balls: Mo; yellow balls: S; blue balls: Co; pink balls: H.
Fig. S9 (a) The Co K-edge $k^2$-weighted EXAFS spectra of Co$_3$O$_4$ for comparison and Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after OER measurements in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ and 1.0 M KOH. (b) The Mo K-edge $k^2$-weighted EXAFS spectra of Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 before and after OER measurements in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$ and 1.0 M KOH.

Fig. S10 Durability test of the overall water splitting in a two electrode system with Co-MoS$_2$-0.5 catalyst as cathode and anode.
Table S1 The Co and Mo contents and molar ratio of Mo to Co in samples obtained by ICP analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mo (at.%)</th>
<th>Co (at.%)</th>
<th>Mo/Co</th>
<th>Co(NO$_3$)$_2$/(NH$_4$)$_6$Mo$<em>7$O$</em>{24}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoS$_2$</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-0.05</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>135.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-0.5</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-1.0</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-3.0</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2 The element content (at.%) and Mo/S ratio of various electrocatalysts obtained by XPS analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Mo/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoS$_2$</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-0.05</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-0.5</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-1.0</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoS$_2$-3.0</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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