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Table S1. Lattice parameters of calculated LDHs

|  | a | b | c | D=c/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{2.0} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ | 18.399 | 6.131 | 22.673 | 7.558 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{2.6} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ | 18.410 | 6.172 | 22.628 | 7.543 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{3.5} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ | 18.427 | 6.181 | 22.766 | 7.589 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{2.0} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{-}$ | 18.297 | 6.143 | 25.314 | 8.438 |
| $\mathrm{Zn}_{2.0} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ | 18.674 | 6.268 | 22.578 | 7.526 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{24} \mathrm{Al}_{9} \mathrm{Ti}_{3}-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$ | 18.535 | 6.178 | 22.503 | 7.501 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{24} \mathrm{Al}_{11} \mathrm{Ti}^{-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}}$ | 18.468 | 6.153 | 22.708 | 7.569 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}_{2.0} \mathrm{Cr}^{-\mathrm{Cl}^{-}}$ | 18.439 | 6.253 | 22.800 | 7.600 |



Figure S1. Conversion relation between absolute vacuum energy scale (V/AVS) and normal hydrogen electrode (V/NHE).
Fermi level ( eV ) is electrochemical potential of electron on electrode; $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{CB}}$ is conduction band edge; $E_{V B}$ is valence band edge; $E_{g}$ is band gap; $E_{F}$ is Fermi level; LUMO is lowest unoccupied molecular orbital; HOMO is highest occupied molecular orbital. ${ }^{1-7}$

The band gaps from KS-DFT+U were not directly related to any actual measurements. Such band gaps as "eigenvalue gaps", which were the difference between LUMO and HOMO in KS (Kohn-Sham) eigenvalues. Energy zero was set to the Fermi energy during calculation of DOS. The positions of $E_{V B}$ and $E_{C B}$ with respect to the normal hydrogen electrode (NHE) were computed according to Eq.1-4.
$E_{C B}=X-0.5 E_{g}+E_{0}$
Eq. 1
$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{VB}}=\mathrm{X}+0.5 \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}+\mathrm{E}_{0}$
Eq. 2
$X=\left(X_{B}^{b} \chi_{C}^{c}\right)^{1 /(b+c)}$
Eq. 3
$\chi=\frac{E_{1}+E_{A}}{2}$
Where $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}$ was the band gap energy; $\mathrm{E}_{0}=-4.5 \mathrm{eV}$ for normal hydrogen electrode; X was the electronegativity of solid material (such as $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{c}}$ compound), which was expressed as the geometric mean of absolute electronegativity of the constituent atoms. The absolute electronegativity of each atom was obtained from other literatures $;^{8,9} \chi_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $\chi_{C}$ were the absolute electronegativity of atoms $B$ and $C$. $E_{1}$ and $E_{A}$ were the ionization energy and electric affinity of atom.

Besides, electrostatic potential of $\mathrm{Zn}_{2} \mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{LDH}(001)$ surface was calculated by DFT+U. There was a $15 \AA$ A of vacuum region on the surface, where the electrostatic potential energy was set to zero to set the vacuum level. The position of valence-band as $\mathrm{E}_{\text {vi(vacuum) }}$ can be obtained using the Fermi level and the vacuum level. The difference of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{VB}}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{VB} \text { (vacuum) }}$ was around 0.3 eV . Therefore, above calculations were convincing.
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