## Electronic Supplementary Information

## Experimental Section

Materials: $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{~F}$ and urea were bought from Beijing Chemical Works. $\mathrm{Ni}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{6} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ were purchased from Aladdin Ltd. (Shanghai, China). Pt/C ( $20 \mathrm{wt} \% \mathrm{Pt}$ ) was provided by Alfa Aesar (China) Chem. Co. Ltd. Nafion (5 wt\%) was bought from Sigma-Aldrich Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd. All reagents were used as received without further purification. Ti mesh was purchased from Phychemi Hong Kong Company Limited. Pure water was utilized to prepare all solutions.

Preparation of $\mathbf{N i}(\mathbf{O H})_{2} \mathbf{N S} / \mathbf{T i}$ : We chose Ti mesh as the substrate due to its excellent chemical and electrochemical stability, acceptable electronic conductivity, open structure and ease of fabrication into electrodes. ${ }^{1}$ Ti mesh was cleaned by sonication sequentially in concentrated HCl , ethanol and water for several times to remove the surface impurities. $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ was made as follows. In brief, 1.308 g $\mathrm{Ni}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 1.201 \mathrm{~g}$ urea, and $0.296 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{~F}$ were dissolved in 80 mL ultrapure water. Then the mixture solution and the pre-treated Ti mesh $(2 \mathrm{~cm} \times 3 \mathrm{~cm})$ were transferred into a 100 mL Teflon-lined stainless-steel autoclave and maintained at 373 K for 6 h . After the autoclave cooled down naturally, the resulting $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ was taken out and washed with ultrapure water. The loading of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ on Ti mesh is 1.49 $\mathrm{mg} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}$.

Preparation of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}: \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ was prepared as follows. $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{6} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{mg})$ was dissolved in 25 mL water under vigorous stirring for 5 min . $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{6} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ aqueous solution were all transferred into a 50 mL Teflon-lined stainless autoclave and maintained at 373 K for 4 h . After cooled down to room the temperature, the $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ was taken out and washed with ultrapure water thoroughly before vacuum dried. The loading of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ on Ti mesh is $1.48 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}$.

Preparation of $\mathrm{PtO}_{2} / \mathbf{T i}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{6} \cdot 6 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(70 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in ultrapure water $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$. Then this pale yellow solution was transferred into a 50 mL Teflon-lined stainless-steel autoclave, which was sealed and maintained at 453 K for 24 h . After the sample cooled down to ambient temperature, $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ was collected by centrifugation and washed with ultrapure water. To prepare $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ loaded electrode, 20 mg PtO 2 and $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ $5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ Nafion solution were dispersed in $1 \mathrm{~mL} 1: 1 \mathrm{v}$ water/ethanol solvent by $30-\mathrm{min}$ sonication to form an ink finally. Then $74 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ catalyst ink was loaded on Ti mesh with a catalyst loading of $1.48 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}$.

Characterizations: XRD data was performed using a LabX XRD-6100 X-ray diffractometer $\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation ( $40 \mathrm{kV}, 30 \mathrm{~mA}$ ) of wavelength 0.154 nm (SHIMADZU, Japan). SEM images were collected from the tungsten lamp-equipped SU3500 scanning electron microscope at an accelerating voltage of 20 kV (HITACHI, Japan). TEM images were collected on a Zeiss Libra 200FE transmission electron microscope operated at 200 kV . XPS measurements were performed using an ESCALABMK II Xray photoelectron spectrometer with the exciting source of Mg. The ICP-MS analysis was performed on ThermoScientific iCAP6300.

Electrochemical measurements: All electrochemical measurements were performed with a CHI 660E electrochemical analyzer (Chenhua, Shanghai) in a conventional three electrode system, using $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ as working electrode, a graphite rod as counter electrode and $\mathrm{Hg} / \mathrm{HgO}$ as reference electrode. Polarization curves were obtained using LSV with a scan rate of $5 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ and no activation was used before recording the polarization curves. Given that as-measured reaction currents do not directly reflect the intrinsic behavior of catalysts due to the effect of ohmic resistance, an $i R$ correction was applied to all LSV curves for further analysis, and all potentials were reported on a reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE) scale unless specifically stated. The potentials were calibrated to RHE, using the following equation: $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{RHE})=\mathrm{E}$ $(\mathrm{Hg} / \mathrm{HgO})+(0.098+0.059 \mathrm{pH}) \mathrm{V}$.

Calculation details: Spin-polarized density functional theory calculations were performed using the Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP). ${ }^{2-4}$ We used the PBE functional for the exchange-correlation energy ${ }^{5}$ and projector augmented wave (PAW)
potentials. ${ }^{6,7}$ The kinetic energy cutoff was set to 450 eV . The ionic relaxation was performed until the force on each atom is less than $0.02 \mathrm{eV} / \AA$. The k-points meshes were $6 \times 6 \times 1$ with Monkhorst-Pack method. ${ }^{8}$ The simulations were performed based on a $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}(111)$ slab model, a $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}(001)$ slab model and $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} / \mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ interface with one $\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ unit on the $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ substrate. To minimize the undesired interactions between images, a vacuum of at least $10 \AA$ was considered along the z axis. The climbing image nudged elastic band $(\mathrm{CNEB})^{9}$ method was used to examine the energy profiles along selected pathways for $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ dissociation.

The $\Delta \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{H}^{*}}$ was calculated as follows, which is proposed by Norskov and coworkers ${ }^{10}$ :

$$
\Delta \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{H}^{*}}=\mathrm{E}_{\text {total }}-\mathrm{E}_{\text {sur }}-\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{H}^{2} / 2+\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{ZPE}}-\mathrm{T} \Delta \mathrm{~S}}
$$

where $\mathrm{E}_{\text {total }}$ is the total energy for the adsorption state, $\mathrm{E}_{\text {sur }}$ is the energy of pure surface, $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{H}}{ }^{2}$ is the energy of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in gas phase, $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {ZPE }}$ is the zero-point energy change and $\Delta \mathrm{S}$ is the entropy change.


Fig. S1. SEM image of bare Ti mesh.


Fig. S2. Cross-section SEM image of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$.


Fig. S3. SEM and EDX elemental mapping images of $\mathrm{Pt}, \mathrm{Ni}$ and O for $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ NS/Ti.


Fig. S4. LSV curves for bare Ti mesh, $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}, \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}, \mathrm{PtO}_{2} / \mathrm{Ti}$, and $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ on Ti mesh with a scan rate of $5 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ for the HER in 1.0 M KOH .

Table S1. Comparison of HER performance for $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ with other Ptbased electrocatalysts in alkaline media.

| Catalyst | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{j} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \eta \\ (\mathrm{mV}) \end{gathered}$ | Pt content (wt\%) | Electrolyte | Ref. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ | 4 | 31.4 | 5.1 | 0.1 M KOH | This work |
|  |  | 44.8 |  | 1.0 M KOH |  |
| Pt NWs/SL-$\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ | 4 | 57 | 38 | 0.1 M KOH | 11 |
|  |  | 85 |  | 1.0 M KOH |  |
| $\mathrm{Pt}(110) / \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ | 4 | 110 | Pt electrode | 0.1 M KOH | 12 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pt}_{3} \mathrm{Ni} \\ \text { frames } / \mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} / \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | 4 | 59 | 20 | 0.1 M KOH | 13 |
| $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{C}$ | 4 | 40 | 25 | 0.1 M KOH | 14 |
| PtCuNi/CNF@CF | 4 | 145 | 1.8 | 1.0 M KOH | 15 |
| $\mathrm{Ni}_{3} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{Pt}$ | 4 | 37 | 15 | 1.0 M KOH | 16 |
| hcp-Pt-Ni | 4 | 45 | 39.6 | 0.1 M KOH | 17 |
| $\mathrm{Pt}_{3} \mathrm{Ni}_{2}$ NWs-S/C | 4 | 60 | 81.6 | 0.1 M KOH | 18 |
| $\mathrm{Pt}(111)-\mathrm{Co}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ | 3 | 196 | Pt electrode | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{KOH} / \mathrm{LiOH} \end{gathered}$ | 19 |
| Pt@2D-Ni(OH) ${ }_{2}$ | 4 | 87 | 43 | 0.1 M KOH | 20 |
| $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2} / \mathrm{Pt}$ | 5 | 75 | Pt electrode | 0.1 KOH | 21 |



Fig. S5. SEM images of $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ after HER electrolysis in 0.1 M KOH .

Fig. S6. XPS spectra in the (a) Ni 2 p , (b) Pt 4 f and (c) O 1 s regions for $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2}$ after HER electrolysis in 0.1 M KOH .


Fig. S7. The amount of gas theoretically calculated and experimentally measured vs. time for $\mathrm{Ni}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}-\mathrm{PtO}_{2} \mathrm{NS} / \mathrm{Ti}$ in 0.1 M KOH .

## References

7 P. E. Blochl, Phys. Rev. B, 1994, 50, 17953-17979.
H. Cheng and K. Scott, J. Appl. Electrochem., 2006, 36, 1361-1366.
G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, Comp. Mater. Sci., 1996, 6, 15-50.
G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, Phys. Rev. B, 1996, 54, 11169-11186.
G. Kresse and J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B, 1994, 49, 14251-14269.
J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett., 1996, 77, 38653868.
G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B, 1999, 59, 1758-1775.
H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B, 1976, 13, 5188-5192.
G. Henkelman, B. P. Uberuaga and H. J. Jónsson, Chem. Phys. 2000, 113, 9901-9904.
J. K. Nøskov, T. Bligaard, A. Logadottir, I. R. Kitchin, J. G. Chen, S. Pandelov and U. Stimming, J. Electrochem. Soc., 2005, 152, J23-J26.
H. Yin, S. Zhao, K. Zhao, A. Muqsit, H. Tang, L. Chang, H. Zhao, Y. Gao and Z. Tang, Nat. Commun., 2015, 6, 6430.
R. Subbaraman, D. Tripkovic, D. Strmenik, K. C. Chang, M. Uchimura, A. P. Paulikas, V. Stamenkovic and N. M. Markovic, Science, 2017, 8, 1256-1260.
C. Chen, Y. Kang, Z. Huo, Z. Zhu, W. Huang, H. L. Xin, J. D. Snyder, D. Li, J. A. Herron, M. Mavrikakis, M. Chi. K. L. More, Y. Li, N. M. Markovic, G. A. Somorjai, P. Yang and V. R. Stamekovic, Science, 2014, 343, 1339-1343.
R. Kavian, S. I. Choi, J. Park, T. Liu, H. C. Peng, N. Lu, J. Wang, M. J. Kim, Y. Xia and S. W. Lee, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2016, 4, 12392-12397.
Y. Shen, A. C. Lua, J. Xi and X. Qiu, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2016, 8, 3464-3472.
Y. Wang, L. Chen, X. Yu, Y. Wang, and G. Zheng, Adv. Energy Mater., 2017, 7, 1601390.
Z. Cao, Q. Chen, J. Zhang, H. Li, Y. Jiang, S. Shen, G. Fu, B. Lu, Z. Xie and L. Zheng, Nat. Commun., 2017, 8, 15131.
P. Wang, X. Zhang, J. Zhang, S. Wan, S. Guo, G. Lu, J. Yao and X. Huang, Nat. Commun., 2017, 8, 14580.
R. Subbaraman, D. Tripkovic, K.-C. Chang, D. Strmenik, A. P. Paulikas, P. Hirunsit, M. Chan, J. P. Greeley, V. R. Stamenkovic and N. M. Markovic, Nat. Mater., 2012, 11, 550-557.
L. Wang, Y. Zhu, Z. Zeng, C. Lin, M. Giroux, L. Jiang, Y. Han, J. Greeley, C. Wang and J. Jin, Nano Energy, 2017, 31, 456-461.
N. Danilovic, R. Subbaraman, D. Strmenik, K. C. Chang, A. P. Paulikas, V. R. Stamenkovic and N. M. Markovic, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2012, 51, 1249512498.

