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Figure S1. Capacity comparison between 3rd and 50th cycle under 1.2-4.2 V for salts dissolved in EC:DEC:DMC=2:1:1.  a) 1M NaDFOB  b) 1M NaPF₆  c) 1M NaClO₄
Figure S2. Capacity comparison between 10\textsuperscript{th} and 50\textsuperscript{th} cycle under 1.2-4.2 V for the same salt dissolved in different solvents a) EC:DEC:DMC=2:1:1 b) EC:DEC=1:1 c) EC:DMC=1:1
Figure S3. a) discharge capacity for 1M NaDFOB under different voltage ranges b) discharge capacity for 1M NaClO₄ under different voltage ranges
Figure S4. CV diagram of NaDFOB cell under the voltage range of 1.5-3.7 V.
Figure S5. Charge/discharge curve for cells under 1.2-4.2v at 2nd, 3rd and 50th cycle using 1M NaClO₄.
Figure S6. SEM of FeF$_3$/CNFs using carbonization temperature at a) 500 °C, b) 700 °C.
Figure S7. Capacity comparison of cathode materials made from different temperature.
Figure S8. Long-term testing at 100 mA g$^{-1}$ for NaDFOB cells under the voltage range of 1.2-4.2 V.
Figure S9. Rate capacity testing for NaDFOB cells under the voltage range of 1.2-4.2 V.
Figure S10. XPS for bare FeF$_3$