## **Supporting Information**

## MOF-derived C@NiO@Ni electrocatalyst for N<sub>2</sub> conversion to NH<sub>3</sub> in alkaline electrolytes

Shijian Luo, Xiaoman Li\*, Wanguo Gao, Haiqiang Zhang and

Min Luo\*

State Key Laboratory of High-efficiency Utilization of Coal and Green Chemical Engineering, School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Ningxia University, Yinchuan, Ningxia, 750021, P.R.China

> \*Corresponding author: Min Luo martinluomin@163.com, Xiaoman Li lixm2017@nxu.edu.cn

## Content

| TG curves and XRD pattern of Ni-MOF                           | Fig. S1  |
|---|----------|
| XPS spectra of C@NiO@Ni etching 10 nm                         | Fig. S2  |
| XPS spectra of C@NiO@Ni                                       |          |
| XPS spectra of C@NiO  | Fig. S4  |
| SEM image of Ni-MOF   | Fig. S5  |
| SEM, TEM, HRTEM images of C@Ni                                | Fig. S6  |
| SEM, TEM, HRTEM images of C@NiO                               | Fig. S7  |
| EDX data  | Fig. S8  |
| UV-Vis absorption spectra and Calibration curve               | Fig. S9  |
| UV-Vis absorption spectra of catalyst at different potentials | Fig. S10 |
| Chronoamperometry results                                     | Fig. S11 |
| XRD and Raman pattern of carbon                               | Fig. S12 |
| NRR performance in different electrolytes                     | Fig. S13 |
| Controlling experiments in Ar                                 | Fig.     |
| S14   |          |
| NRR performance using different feeding gases                 | Fig. S15 |
| UV-Vis absorption spectra and Calibration curve               | Fig. S16 |
| N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub> detection                       | Fig. S17 |
| NRR performance of Ni-MOF and carbon paper                    | Fig. S18 |
| XRD and SEM of C@NiO@Ni after 24 h NRR                        | Fig. S19 |
| Arrhenius plot and NRR performance in air                     | Fig. S20 |
| EIS plots   | Fig. S21 |
| Comparison of NRR performance under ambient conditions        | Table S1 |



Fig. S1. (a) Thermogravimetric curve of Ni-MOF (Ni-BTC) in Air and  $N_2$ . (b) XRD pattern of Ni-MOF (Ni-BTC).



Fig. S2. The Ni  $2p_{3/2}$  XPS pattern using Ar particles to etch C@NiO@Ni for 10 nm.



Fig. S3. XPS C 1s spectra for the C@NiO@Ni.



Fig. S4. XPS Ni  $2p_{3/2}$  (a) and O 1s (b) spectra for the C@NiO.



Fig. S5. SEM image of Ni-MOF (Ni-BTC) precursor.



Fig. S6. (a) SEM image, (b) TEM image and (c) HRTEM image of C@Ni microtubes.



Fig. S7. (a) SEM image, (b) TEM image and (c) HRTEM image of C@NiO microtubes.



Fig. S8. (a) EDX of C@Ni. (b) EDX of C@NiO@Ni. (c) EDX of C@NiO.



Fig. S9. (a) UV-Vis absorption curves of Nessler's reagent assays kept with different concentrations of  $NH_4^+$  ions. (b) A calibration curve used to estimate the concentrations of  $NH_4^+$  ions.



Fig. S10. UV-Vis absorption curves of the electrolyte after tests of C@NiO@Ni at different potentials.



Fig. S11. Chronoamperometry results of C@NiO@Ni at the corresponding potentials.



**Fig. S12**. (a) XRD pattern of carbon (etching NiO and Ni of C@NiO@Ni by HNO<sub>3</sub>). (b) Raman pattern of carbon (etching NiO and Ni of C@NiO@Ni by HNO<sub>3</sub>).



Fig. S13. NRR performance of C@NiO@Ni in different electrolytes at -0.7 V.



Fig. S14.  $NH_3$  yields and FEs of C@NiO@Ni with alternating 1 h cycles between Ar atmosphere and  $N_2$  atmosphere, for a total of 4 hours.



**Fig. S15**. Comparison of the Faradaic efficiency and NH<sub>3</sub> yield of C@NiO@Ni using different feeding gases for the NRR at -0.7 V.



Fig. S16. (a) UV-Vis curves of various concentrations of  $N_2H_4$  stained with p-C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>11</sub>NO indicator. (b) A calibration curve used to estimate the concentrations of  $N_2H_4$ .



**Fig. S17**. UV-Vis absorption spectra of the electrolytes stained with  $p-C_9H_{11}NO$  indicator after NRR electrolysis at different time.



**Fig. S18**. Ammonia concentration and FE of C@NiO@Ni/CP, Ni-MOF/CP and CP after 1 h electrolysis at a potential of -0.7 V under ambient conditions.



Fig. S19. (a) XRD pattern, (b) SEM image of C@NiO@Ni after 24 h NRR.



**Fig. S20**. (a) Arrhenius plot of the NRR rate over C@NiO@Ni catalyst at the temperature from 273 to 353 K. (b) NH<sub>3</sub> yields and FE for C@NiO@Ni at different potentials in Air.



Fig. S21. EIS plots of C@Ni, C@NiO@Ni, C@Ni and commercial Ni in 0.1 M KOH.

| Catalyst   | Electrolyte                           | NH <sub>3</sub> yield  | FE (%) | Ref       |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------|-----------|
| C@NiO@Ni   | 0.1 M KOH                             | 43.15 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 10.9   | This work |
| Cr-doped CeO <sub>2</sub>  | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 16.82µg h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup>                       | 3.84   | 1         |
| Bi <sub>2</sub> MoO <sub>6</sub>                                 | 0.1 M HCl                             | $20.46 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ m g^{-1}{}_{cat.}$                   | 8.17   | 2         |
| Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> @NC                               | 0.05M H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>  | 42.58 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 8.49   | 3         |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -CNT                              | KHCO <sub>3</sub>                     | $0.22 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$                              | 0.15   | 4         |
| TA-reduced<br>Au/TiO <sub>2</sub>                                | 0.1 M HCl                             | 21.4 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub>  | 8.11   | 5         |
| Au nanorods  | 0.1 M KOH                             | $1.6 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$                               | 3.88   | 6         |
| α-Au/CeO <sub>x</sub> -RGO                                       | 0.1 M HCl                             | 8.31 $\mu g h^{-1} m g^{-1}{}_{cat.}$                          | 10.1   | 7         |
| Rh nanosheet nanoassemblies                                      | 0.1 M KOH                             | 23.88 $\mu g h^{-1} m g^{-1}_{cat.}$                           | 0.22   | 8         |
| Pd/C   | 0.1 M PBS                             | 4.5 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> cat.              | 8.2    | 9         |
| Ru/C   | 2 М КОН                               | $0.21 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$                              | 0.28   | 10        |
| AuHNCs   | 0.5 M LiClO <sub>4</sub>              | $3.90 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$                              | 30.2   | 11        |
| γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub><br>nanoparticles                | 0.1 M KOH                             | $0.212 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ m g^{-1}{}_{cat.}$                   | 1.9    | 12        |
| Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /Ti                               | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | $5.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ mol s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$       | 2.6    | 13        |
| N-doped porous<br>carbon   | 0.05 M H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 23.8 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub>  | 1.42   | 14        |
| PCN-NV4  | 0.1 M HCl                             | $8.09 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ mg^{-1}_{cat.}$                       | 11.59  | 15        |
| N-doped carbon<br>nanospikes                                     | 0.25 M<br>LiClO <sub>4</sub>          | 97.18 μg h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup>                      | 11.56  | 16        |
| Bi <sub>4</sub> V <sub>2</sub> O <sub>11</sub> /CeO <sub>2</sub> | 0.1 M HCl                             | 23.21 $\mu g h^{-1} m g^{-1} cat.$                             | 10.16  | 17        |

**Table S1**. Comparison of the electrocatalytic activity of C@NiO@Ni to produce NH<sub>3</sub> through NRR with respect to the performances of other previously reported NRR electrocatalysts.

| Mo nanofilm   | 0.01 M H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | $1.89 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$                              | 0.72 | 18 |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|------|----|
| MoS <sub>2</sub> /CC                                  | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 4.94 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup>                  | 1.17 | 19 |
| MoO <sub>3</sub>                                      | 0.1 M HCl                             | $29.43 \mu g h^{-1} m g^{-1}{}_{cat.}$                         | 1.9  | 20 |
| Mo <sub>2</sub> N                                     | 0.1 M HCl                             | 78.4 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub>  | 4.5  | 21 |
| MoN   | 0.1 M HCl                             | $3.01 \times 10^{-10} \text{ mol s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$      | 1.15 | 22 |
| Nb <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub><br>nanofiber           | 0.1 M HCl                             | 43. 5 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 9.26 | 23 |
| hollow Cr <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub><br>microspheres | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 25. 3 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 6.78 | 24 |
| Mn <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>                        | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 11. 6 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 3.0  | 25 |
| MoS <sub>2</sub><br>Nanoflower                        | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 29. 3 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 8.34 | 26 |
| SnO <sub>2</sub> /CC                                  | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | $1.47 \times 10^{-10}$   | 2.17 | 27 |
|   |                                       | mol s <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup>                           |      |    |
| b-FeOOH<br>nanorods                                   | 0.5 M LiClO <sub>4</sub>              | 23. 3 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 6.7  | 28 |
| TiO <sub>2</sub> –rGO                                 | 0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> | 15. 1 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 3.3  | 29 |
| B <sub>4</sub> C                                      | 0.1 M HCl                             | 26. 6 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> <sub>cat.</sub> | 16.0 | 30 |

## References

- 1 H. Xie, H. Wang, Q. Geng, Z. Xing, W. Wang, J. Chen, L. Ji, L. Chang, Z. Wang and J. Mao, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2019, **58**, 5423-5427.
- 2 Z. Xing, W. Kong, T. Wu, H. Xie, T. Wang, Y. Luo, X. Shi, A. M. Asiri, Y. Zhang and X. Sun, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.*, 2019, DOI: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b03141.
- 3 S. Luo, X. Li, B. Zhang, Z. Luo and M. Luo, ACS Appl. Mater. Inter., 2019, 11, 26891-26897.
- 4 S. Chen, S. Perathoner, C. Ampelli, C. Mebrahtu, D. Su and G. Centi, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2017, **129**, 2743-2747.
- 5 M. M. Shi, D. Bao, B. R. Wulan, Y. H. Li, Y. F. Zhang, J. M. Yan and Q. Jiang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1606500.
- 6 D. Bao, Q. Zhang, F.-L. Meng, H.-X. Zhong, M.-M. Shi, Y. Zhang, J.-M. Yan, Q. Jiang and X.-B. Zhang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1604799.
- 7 S.-J. Li, D. Bao, M.-M. Shi, B.-R. Wulan, J.-M. Yan and Q. Jiang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1700001.
- 8 X. Y. Cui, C. Tang, X. M. Liu, C. Wang, W. J. Ma and Q. Zhang, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2018, **24**, 18494-18501.
- 9 J. Wang, L. Yu, L. Hu, G. Chen, H. Xin and X. Feng, Nat. Commun., 2018, 9, 1795.
- 10 V. Kordali, G. Kyriacou and C. Lambrou, Chem. Commun., 2000, 17, 1673-1674.
- 11 M. Nazemi, S. R. Panikkanvalappil and M. A. El-Sayed, Nano Energy, 2018, 49, 316-323.
- 12 J. Kong, A. Lim, C. Yoon, J. H. Jang, H. C. Ham, J. Han, S. Nam, D. Kim, Y.-E. Sung, J. Choi and H. S. Park, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.*, 2017, **5**, 10986-10995.
- 13 Q. Liu, X. Zhang, B. Zhang, Y. Luo, G. Cui, F. Xie and X. Sun, *Nanoscale*, 2018, **10**, 14386-14389.
- 14 Y. Liu, Y. Su, X. Quan, X. Fan, S. Chen, H. Yu, H. Zhao, Y. Zhang and J. Zhao, *ACS Catal.*, 2018, **8**, 1186-1191.
- 15 C. Lv, Y. Qian, C. Yan, Y. Ding, Y. Liu, G. Chen and G. Yu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2018, 57, 10246-10250.
- Y. Song, D. Johnson, R. Peng, D. K. Hensley, P. V. Bonnesen, L. Liang, J. Huang, F. Yang,
  F. Zhang, R. Qiao, A. P. Baddorf, T. J. Tschaplinski, N. L. Engle, M. C. Hatzell, Z. Wu, D. A.
  Cullen, H. M. Meyer, B. G. Sumpter and A. J. Rondinone, *Sci. Adv.*, 2018, 4, e1700336.
- 17 C. Lv, C. Yan, G. Chen, Y. Ding, J. Sun, Y. Zhou and G. Yu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2018, **57**, 6073-6076.
- 18 D. Yang, T. Chen and Z. Wang, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2017, 5, 18967-18971.
- 19 L. Zhang, X. Ji, X. Ren, Y. Ma, X. Shi, Z. Tian, A. M. Asiri, L. Chen, B. Tang and X. Sun, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1800191.
- 20 J. Han, X. Ji, X. Ren, G. Cui, L. Li, F. Xie, H. Wang, B. Li and X. Sun, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, **6**, 12974-12977.
- 21 X. Ren, G. Cui, L. Chen, F. Xie, Q. Wei, Z. Tian and X. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, 54, 8474-8477.

22 L. Zhang, X. Ji, X. Ren, Y. Luo, X. Shi, A. M. Asiri, B. Zheng and X. Sun, *ACS Sustain*. *Chem. Eng.*, 2018, **6**, 9550-9554.

23 J. Han, Z. Liu, Y. Ma, G. Cui, F. Xie, F. Wang, Y. Wu, S. Gao, Y. Xu and X. Sun, *Nano Energy*, 2018, **52**, 264-270.

24 Y. Zhang, W. Qiu, Y. Ma, Y. Luo, Z. Tian, G. Cui, F. Xie, L. Chen, T. Li and X. Sun, *ACS Catal.*, 2018, **8**, 8540-8544.

25 X. Wu, L. Xia, Y. Wang, W. Lu, Q. Liu, X. Shi and X. Sun, Small, 2018, 14, e1803111.

26 X. Li, T. Li, Y. Ma, Q. Wei, W. Qiu, H. Guo, X. Shi, P. Zhang, A. M. Asiri, L. Chen, B. Tang and X. Sun, *Adv. Energy. Mater.*, 2018, **8**, 1801357.

27 L. Zhang, X. Ren, Y. Luo, X. Shi, A. M. Asiri, T. Li and X. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, **54**, 12966-12969.

28 X. Zhu, Z. Liu, Q. Liu, Y. Luo, X. Shi, A. M. Asiri, Y. Wu and X. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2018, **54**, 11332-11335.

29 X. Zhang, Q. Liu, X. Shi, A. M. Asiri, Y. Luo, X. Sun and T. Li, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, **6**, 17303-17306.

30 W. Qiu, X. Y. Xie, J. Qiu, W. H. Fang, R. Liang, X. Ren, X. Ji, G. Cui, A. M. Asiri, G. Cui, B. Tang and X. Sun, *Nat. Commun.*, 2018, **9**, 3485.