Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Dalton Transactions. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019

Extremely Sensitive and Accurate H₂S Sensor at Room Temperature Fabricated with Indoped Co₃O₄ Porous Nanosheets

Jie Wu, Ying Yang*, Chengxin Zhang, Hui Yu*, Licheng Huang, Xiangting Dong*, Jinxian Wang, Xinlu Wang

Key Laboratory of Applied Chemistry and Nanotechnology at Universities of Jilin Province,

Changchun University of Science and Technology, Changchun 130022, China

Fax: 86-0431-85383815; Tel: 86-0431-85582574; E-mail: yangying0807@126.com;

yh2001101@163.com; dongxiangting888@163.com



Fig. S1 The interdigitated electrode and gas sensing schematic diagram.



Fig S2. XRD patterns (a) and the corresponding partial enlargement of (221) peaks (b) of undoped Co_3O_4 precursors and In-doped Co_3O_4 precursors



Fig. S3 SEM images of undoped Co_3O_4 (**a**, **b**), 0.5 at% In-doped Co_3O_4 (**c**, **d**) and 1.5 at% In-doped Co_3O_4 (**e**, **f**)



Fig. S4. XPS spectra of the four samples: (a) full-range survey spectra; (b) Co 2p spectra.



Fig. S5 The relation between the concentrations of H_2S and recovery time.



Fig. S6 The long term stability testing curves of the 1.0 at% In-doped Co_3O_4 sensor to 50 ppm H₂S at room temperature for 30 days

| Precursors | Lattic | Lattice constant | | <i>d</i> ₂₂₁ | Microstrain | |
|---|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|--|
| | a | b | С | (Å) | E (%) | |
| undoped Co ₃ O ₄ precursors | 8.8109 | 10.1596 | 4.4350 | 2.6620 | 0 | |
| 0.5 at% In-doped precursors | 8.8116 | 10.1606 | 4.4361 | 2.6624 | 0.015 | |
| 1.0 at% In-doped precursors | 8.8122 | 10.1613 | 4.3579 | 2.6629 | 0.034 | |
| 1.5 at% In-doped precursors | 8.8131 | 10.1622 | 4.4399 | 2.6635 | 0.056 | |

Table S1. The lattice constants and microstrains of the four precursors.

Table. S2 The results of the response of four samples to different concentrations of H_2S at room temperature.

| Samples | 50 ppm | 30 ppm | 10 ppm | 5 ppm | 3 ppm | 1 ppm |
|---|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| undoped Co ₃ O ₄ | 2.34 | 1.64 | 1.44 | 1.21 | 1.11 | \ |
| 0.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 5.15 | 4.72 | 2.76 | 1.77 | 1.35 | 1.14 |
| 1.0 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 6.81 | 5.92 | 4.95 | 3.66 | 2.46 | 1.40 |
| 1.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 2.87 | 1.87 | 1.44 | 1.11 | 1.04 | / |

Table. S3 The results of the gas response time of four different samples to different concentrations of

| H ₂ S at room | temperature. |
|--------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------|--------------|

| Samples | 50 ppm | 30 ppm | 10 ppm | 5 ppm | 3 ppm | 1 ppm |
|---|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| undoped Co ₃ O ₄ | 16 s | 22 s | 35 s | 38 s | 55 s | \ |
| 0.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 13 s | 15 s | 20 s | 17 s | 35 s | 28 s |
| 1.0 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 9 s | 13 s | 12 s | 21 s | 23 s | 24 s |
| 1.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 13 s | 10 s | 12 s | 24 s | 54 s | \ |

Table. S4 The results of the gas recovery time of four different samples to different concentrations of

H₂S at room temperature.

| Samples | 50 ppm | 30 ppm | 10 ppm | 5 ppm | 3 ppm | 1 ppm |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| undoped Co ₃ O ₄ | 47.3 min | 31.7 min | 12.3 min | 22.4 min | 5.9 min | \ |
| 0.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 38.8 min | 38.5 min | 45.8 min | 21.3 min | 6.1 min | 4.6 min |
| 1.0 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 62.3 min | 47.8 min | 30.6 min | 18.5 min | 13.8 min | 7.3 min |
| 1.5 at% In-doped Co ₃ O ₄ | 40.7 min | 27.4 min | 21.4 min | 8.3 min | 2.8 min | \ |

|--|

| Gas name | H_2S | NH ₃ | NO | CHCl ₃ | НСНО | C ₂ H ₅ OH | SO_2 |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------|
| Broken bond | H-SH | $\mathbf{H}\text{-}\mathbf{NH}_2$ | N=O | H-CCl ₃ | H-CHO | $H-OC_2H_5$ | S=O |
| Bond energy (kJ/mol) | 381 | 450.2 | 630.6 | 413.8 | 368.40 | 438.1 | 521.3 |

The gas sensing reaction involves breaking chemical bonds, which would consume a great deal

of energy. And the good selectivity to H_2S may be due to the smaller bond energy of H-SH compared with other target molecules (as shown in **Table S4**).^{1,2} H_2S can be decomposed at lower temperature to participate in reaction with sensing material^{3, 4}. Although the bond energy of HCHO is small to H_2S , interaction strength between the sensing layer and target gas is an effective factor on the sensor response. Co_3O_4 has higher affinity to H_2S as a strong reducing gas compared to other tested gases. This is explained with adsorption of H_2S by Co_3O_4 surface and its decomposition to HS and then to S through the following reaction^{3, 4}:

 $Co_3O_4 + H_2S \rightarrow 3CoO + S + H_2O$

 $\mathrm{CoO} + \mathrm{H_2S} \rightarrow \mathrm{CoS} + \mathrm{H_2O}$

This reaction is a spontaneous exothermic process, however, the reactions between Co_3O_4 and other target gases cannot do it spontaneously². The exothermic reaction will provide some energy for gas sensing possess, which might be conductive to enhance the response to H₂S.

- 1. Y.-R. Luo, Handbook of Bond Dissociation Energies in Organic Compounds, 2002.
- Z. S. Hosseini, A. I. zad and A. Mortezaali, Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical, 2015, 207, 865-871.
- 3. J. Wang, C. Yang, Y.-R. Zhao, H.-L. Fan, Z.-D. Wang, J. Shangguan and J. Mi, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2017, **56**, 12621-12629.
- 4. Q. Yang, H. Choi, S. R. Al-Abed and D. D. Dionysiou, *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 2009, **88**, 462-469.