## **Supporting Information**

# Oxidative chemical vapor deposition of graphene oxide carbocatalyst on 3D nickel foam as a collaborative electrocatalyst towards hydrogen evolution reaction in acidic electrolyte

Sangchai Sarawutanukul,<sup>a</sup> Nutthaphon Phattharasupakun,<sup>a</sup> Juthaporn Wutthiprom,<sup>a</sup> and Montree Sawangphruk\*<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, School of Energy Science and Engineering, Vidyasirimedhi Institute of Science, and Technology, Rayong 21210, Thailand.



#### 1. Raman spectroscopy

Fig. S1 Deconvoluted 2D Raman spectra of samples G to G-6 as shown in (a) - (f), respectively.





Fig. S2 C1s XPS survey spectra of the samples G to G-6 as shown in (a) - (f), respectively

#### 3. Evaluation of band gap energy



**Fig. S3.** Tauc plot analysis for the direct allowed transition from UV-Vis diffuse reflectance for the samples G to G-6 indicating a direct band gap transition from 1.37 eV up to 1.52 eV.

#### 4. FESEM images of G-4 electrode and digital photograph of electrolyte after stability test



Fig. S4. FE-SEM images of the as-prepared G-4 sample after stability test.



Fig. S5. Digital photograph of electrolyte after stability test of Ni foam (left) and G-4@Ni foam (Right).

<b>Table S1.</b> The comparison of HER performance between the oxidative graphene@Ni electrode with
other electrodes in 0.5 M H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> .

Electrodes	OverpotentialTafel slope(mV, 10 mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )(mV dec <sup>-1</sup> )		Ref
Full-activation Ni foam	210	100.6	1
MoS <sub>x</sub> grown on graphene-protected 3D Ni foam	151	42	2
Mo <sub>2</sub> C nanoparticle on RGO hybrid	130	57.3	3
WS <sub>2</sub> nanolayer heteroatom-doped graphene film	125	-	4
CoSe <sub>2</sub> nanoparticles grown on carbon fiber paper	137	-	5
Oxidative graphene on nickel foam	137.0	54.4	This work

**Table S2.** The weight of the electrode before and after hydrogen evolution tested.

Weight(mg)	NiF	G	G-1	G-2	G-3	G-4	G-5	G-6
Before	59.92	69.19	63.03	69.16	72.74	70.49	67.23	69.37
After	16.19	62.61	61.61	67.87	71.50	69.62	65.97	68.22
	-43.73	-1.13	-1.42	-1.29	-1.24	-0.87	-1.26	-1.55

### References

- 1. J. Lu, T. Xiong, W. Zhou, L. Yang, Z. Tang and S. Chen, *ACS App. Mater. Interfaces*, 2016, **8**, 5065-5069.
- 2. Y.-H. Chang, C.-T. Lin, T.-Y. Chen, C.-L. Hsu, Y.-H. Lee, W. Zhang, K.-H. Wei and L.-J. Li, *Adv. Mater.*, 2013, **25**, 756-760.
- 3. L. F. Pan, Y. H. Li, S. Yang, P. F. Liu, M. Q. Yu and H. G. Yang, *Chem. Commun.*, 2014, **50**, 13135-13137.

- 4. J. Duan, S. Chen, B. A. Chambers, G. G. Andersson and S. Z. Qiao, *Adv. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 4234-4241.
- 5. D. Kong, H. Wang, Z. Lu and Y. Cui, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2014, **136**, 4897-4900.