Electronic Supporting Information

Preparation of TiO_xN_y/TiN Composite for Photocatalytic

Hydrogen Evolution under Visible Light

Tao Yang,^a Qun Li,^a Xiwang Chang,^a Kuo-Chih Chou,^a and Xinmei Hou*^a

^a State Key Laboratory of Advanced Metallurgy, University of Science and Technology Beijing, Beijing 100083, China Email: houxinmei@ustb.edu.cn

^b School of Material Science and Engineering, University of Science and Technology Beijing, Beijing 100083, China

Task: Geometry optimization			Energy		
Functional	GGA ^{1,2} PW91 ³		LDA CA-PZ	<u>,</u> 4,5	
Minimizer	Fine quality		-		
	Energy:	1.0e-5 eV/atom	-		
	Max force:	0.03 eV/	-		
	Max stress:	0.05 GPa	-		
	Max displacement:	0.001 Å	-		
Algorithm	BFGS ⁶ use line search		-		
Stress	0 for all		-		
Energy cutoff	700 eV		700 eV		
SCF tolerance	1.0*10 ⁻⁶ eV/atom		1.0*10 ⁻⁶ eV/atom		
Pseudopotentials	Ultrasoft ⁷		Norm-conserving 8		
FFT grid density	Fine quality		Standard		
Finite basis correction	Smart		Smart		
Electronic minimizer	Density Mixing ⁹		Density Mixing ⁹		
Orbital occupancy	Fixed		Fixed		
<i>k</i> point quality	Fine quality		Fine quality		
Band structure	Unchecked		Chaskad	Fine quality k point	
			Checked	set	
Density of states	Unchecked		Chaolead	Medium quality k	
Density of states			Uneckeu	point set	

 $\label{eq:table_stable} Table \, S1 \ \mbox{Calculation conditions for geometry optimization and energy task}$



Fig. S1. Structures of calculation models

Table S2 The lattice parameter and grain size of the nitridation products at
different temperature with 3 h

Temperature						JCPDS
(°C)	800	850	900	950	1000	card 38-
(C)						1420
a (nm)	0.4216	0.4228	0.4237	0.4241	0.4241	0.4241
Grain size	25 5 1 5	26.1+1.0	27.0+1.6	27.0+1.7	29.5+2.4	
(nm)	33.3±1.3	30.1±1.9	37.0±1.0	37.9±1.7	38.3±2.4	

Table S3 The lattice parameter and grain size of the nitridation products withdifferent time at 900 °C

Time(h)	2	2	4	5	JCPDS card
	2	5	4	5	38-1420
a (nm)	0.4233	0.4236	0.4238	0.4241	0.4241
Grain size	25 2+1 2	26 8+2 2	27 2+1 4	28 2+0 7	
(nm)	55.2±1.5	50.8±2.2	<i>37.2</i> ±1.4	58.3±0.7	



Fig. S2. (a) UV-vis diffuse reflection spectra of yolk–shell TiO_xN_y/TiN , (b) The plots of $(\alpha h\nu)^{1/2}$ versus hv. The bandgap of yolk–shell TiO_xN_y/TiN .

■REFERENCES

- (1) D. C. Langreth and M. J. Mehl, Phys. Rev. B, 1983, 28, 1809-1834.
- (2) A. D. Becke, Phys. Rev. A, 1988, 38, 3098-3100.
- (3) Y. Wang and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B, 1991, 44, 13298-13307.
- (4). D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett., 1980, 45, 566-569.
- (5). J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B, 1981, 23, 5048-5079.
- (6) T. H. Fischer and J. Almlof, J. Phys. Chem., 1992, 96, 9768-9774.
- (7). D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B, 1990, 41, 7892-7895.
- (8). D. R. Hamann, M. Schlüter and C. Chiang, Phys. Rev. Lett., 1979, 43, 1494-1497.
- (9) G.; Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B, 1996, 54, 11169-11186.