Supporting information

Pseudo-capacitive Behavior Induced Dual-ion Hybrid Deionization

System Based on Ag@rGO||Na_{1.1}V₃O_{7.9}@rGO

Zhishuai Yue^a, Yulong Ma^b, Jiawei Zhang^c, Haibo Li^{a,b,*}

a. Ningxia Key Laboratory of Photovoltaic Materials, Ningxia University, Yinchuan, Ningxia, 750021, P. R. China

b. 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

c. School of Electrical Engineering, Northeast Electric Power University, Jilin, 132012, P. R. China * Corresponding author. Fax/Tel: +86 0951 2062414; E-mail: <u>lihaibo@nxu.edu.cn</u> (Haibo Li)

Experimental

Synthesis of graphene oxide (GO): Typically, 2 g graphite powder and 1 g sodium nitrate (NaNO₃) were added into a beaker with 50 mL vitriol (H₂SO₄) successively. After the beaker was continuously stirred under the ice bath for 15 minutes, 5 g potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) was slowly added and kept stirring under the ice bath for 2 hours. After the beaker rose to room temperature, it kept stirring under 40 °C for 2 hours. Then 100 mL DI was added into the beaker and continue the reaction for 30 minutes. Afterwards, 100 mL boiled DI was also added into the beaker and kept stirring for 10 minutes, following moderate hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) was added and stood for several hours. The precipitate was washed with DI by using centrifuge until the PH equals to 7. Finally, the precipitate was performed ultrasound and centrifuged for three times to obtain GO flakes.

Synthesis of reduced graphene oxide (rGO) and Ag@rGO: 0.0472 g silver nitrate (AgNO₃) was added into a beaker with 60 mL GO (~1 mg/L) and kept ultrasound for 1 hour. Afterwards, a beaker with 15 ml sodium hydroxide (NaOH, 4M) was kept stirring under 85 °C and accompanied by adding the solution above drop by drop. Finally, the beaker was kept stirring for 30 minutes. The black precipitate was washed with DI by using centrifuge until the PH equals to 7. For comparison, the rGO was synthesized via the same method without the addition of AgNO₃.

Contents

Table and Figures

Table S1 Pore texture of rGO and Ag@rGO.

Table S2 The comparison on salt removal rate of various CDI systems.

Fig. S1 SEM images of (a, b) NVO-250, (c, d) NVO-350, (e, f) NVO-450.

Fig. S2 TEM images of (a, b) rGO@NVO-250.

Fig. S3 SEM images of (a, b) rGO, (c, d) Ag@rGO, (e) elemental mapping of Ag@rGO with Ag and C.

Fig. S4 (a) XRD, (b) Raman spectrum of GO, rGO and Ag@rGO, (c) N₂ adsorption-desorption isotherm and (d) pore size distribution of rGO and Ag@rGO.

Fig. S5 (a) Specific capacitance with respect to scan rate of NVO-250, NVO-350, NVO-450 and NVO-250@rGO.

Fig. S6 (a) the conductivity transient of rGOlAg@rGO and rGOlrGO CDI in NaCl solution with an initial conductivity of 1000 μ S/cm at 1.2 V, (b) salt removal capacity

Fig. S7 (a, c) The conductivity transient of Ag@rGOINVO-250@rGO at different cell potential in NaCl solution with an initial conductivity of 100, 1000 μ S/cm, (c, d) salt removal capacity (mg/g) and charge efficiency (%) with respect to potential (V) for rGOINVO-250, rGOINVO-250@rGO and Ag@rGOINVO-250@rGO. (e) the concentration variation of Na⁺, K⁺ and Mg²⁺ before and after electrosorption, (f) the salt removal capacity (mg/g) and charge efficiency of Ag@rGOINVO-250@rGO. (250@rGO in the muti-ions solution with an initial conductivity of 1000 μ S/cm.

Fig. S8 (a) The conductivity transient of Ag@rGOINVO-250@rGO at different cell potential in NaCl solution with an initial conductivity of 4000 μ S/cm, (b) salt removal capacity (mg/g) and charge efficiency (%) with respect to potential (V) for Ag@rGOINVO-250@rGO.

Fig. S9 (a, b) SEM images of NVO-250@rGO after 30 cycles.

Table

Sample	$S_{BET} (m^2/g)$	V (cm ³ /g)	D _{avg} (nm)
rGO	29.290	0.113	15.401
Ag@rGO	67.102	0.130	7.743

Table S1 Pore texture of rGO and Ag@rGO.

Material	Initial concentration (mg/L)	Potential (V)	Salt removal rate (mg/g/min)
C@NTO [7]	250	1.4	1.13
NGCPs ^[10]	500	1.4	4.14
NMCs-800 ^[40]	584	1.2	~ 2.5
NHPC ^[41]	500	1.4	> 2
HPAC ^[42]	500	1.2	1.09
NP-3DHCA ^[43]	~ 500	1.2	0.9
3 DHGR ^[44]	500	1.2	~ 0.8
Ag@rGO[NVO- 250@rGO ^[This work]	250	1.4	3.84

 Table S2 The comparison on salt removal rate of some CDI systems.

Figures

Figure S1











Figure S4



Figure S5



Figure S6







Figure S8



Figure S9

