Supplementary Information

Photoelectrochemical battery for efficient energy recovery

Lei Han, Shaojun Guo, Miao Xu, and Shaojun Dong*

State Key Laboratory of Electroanalytical Chemistry, Changchun Institute of Applied Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Changchun, 130022, Jilin, PR China. University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, 100039, Beijing, PR China

Experiment section

Reagents: Titanium foil (purity > 99.7%) was bought from Aldrich. Hydrofluoric acid, nitric acid, acetone, absolute ethanol, ethylene glycol and sodium hydrate were of analytical grade from Beijing Chemical Reagent Company (China) without further purification. Ultrapure water from Water Purifier (Sichuan Water Purifier Co., Ltd., China) was used in all the experiments.

Preparation of TiO₂ nanotubes (TNTs) photoanode: Titanium foil was first chemically etched in a mixture of HF and HNO₃ (volume ratio of HF:HNO₃:H₂O in 1:4:5) for 40 s. Then the titanium foil was rinsed with acetone, absolute ethanol and water for 10 min, respectively. TNTs was prepared by a potentiostatic anodization in a two-electrode electrochemical cell, in which rinsed titanium foil was used as working electrode and platinum foil served as counter electrode. The TNTs was formed by anodizing titanium foil in 40 mL of 0.5 wt% HF solution at 20 V for 20 min. The obtained titanium foils were annealed at 500 °C for 3 h in air atmosphere, heating rates was kept at 1 °C min⁻¹. The obtained TNTs possess highly crystalline TiO₂ with a mixture of anatase and rutile phases, proved by X-ray diffraction (XRD) (Fig S1) and scanning electron microscope (SEM) (Fig. S2).

Preparation of Ag/Ag₂O cathode: Silver foil was used as the working electrode. Prior to anodization, silver foil was washed with 0.1 M HNO₃ in ultrasonic bath sequentially. Then Ag₂O/Ag electrode was prepared through the anodization of silver foil in 1 M NaOH under constant potential 0.2 V (Fig. S3). After 1 h electrochemical

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed. Fax: +86-0431-85689711. E-mail: dongsj@ciac.ac.cn.

oxidation, Ag_2O was formed, proved by its XRD result with typical (111) peak of Ag_2O (Fig. S4). The surface morphology of Ag_2O/Ag electrode examined by SEM presents irregular micro/nanoparticles with the size of 500 nm (shown in Fig. S5).

Apparatus: SEM images were taken with a XL30 field-emission scanning electron microscope at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV. XRD patterns were collected by a D8 ADVANCE (Germany) with Cu K α radiation (λ =1.54056 Å) in the range of 20-80° (2 θ). Photoelectrochemical (PEC) studies were performed in a conventional three electrode system with a platinum foil as the counter electrode and Ag/AgCl (saturated KCl) as the reference electrode. Photoelectrochemical battery (PEB) were carried out using a two electrode system with a TNTs photoanode and Ag/Ag2O cathode. All electrochemical measurements were recorded by a CHI 832C electrochemical workstation (Chenhua Co., Shanghai).

Figure



Fig. S1 The typical XRD pattern of the as-prepared TNTs.



Fig. S2 The typical SEM image of the as-prepared TNTs.



Fig. S3 The chronoamperometry curve of the as-prepared Ag_2O/Ag .



Fig. S4 The typical XRD pattern of the as-prepared Ag_2O/Ag through the anodization of silver foil in 1 M NaOH under constant potential 0.2 V.



Fig. S5 The typical SEM image of the as-prepared Ag₂O/Ag.



Fig. S6 (a) light-induced potential change collected from TNTs photoanode, (b) potential change of Ag_2O/Ag cathode collected from Ag_2O/Ag cathode, and (c) potential change of PEB in 1.0 M NaOH in the absence (blank) and presence of ethanol (0.85 M), respectively; (d) the effect of the concentration of ethanol on the photocurrent response of TNTs photoanode at a bias of -0.4 V vs Ag/AgCl.

Fig. S6a depicts the light-induced potential change of TNTs photoanode in 1.0 M NaOH in the absence and presence of 0.85 M ethanol. Instant photoresponses at a photovoltage of about -0.74 V and -0.97 V vs Ag/AgCl are observed in the absence and presence of ethanol upon UV illumination, which are accordance with LSV results. As can be seen in Fig. S6c, an obvious constant potential of 1.10 V based on TNTs photoanode and Ag₂O/Ag cathode can be observed upon UV illumination. To maximize

the performance of PEB, the effect of ethanol concentration on the photocurrent response of TNTs photoanode was also investigated. As depicted in Fig. S6d, the photocurrent denstity in the presence of ethanol was higher than that without ethanol whereas the photocurrent denstity remains unchanged as the ethaol concentration increases upon the addition of ethanol. Herein we choose 0.85 M ethanol for PEB operation later.



Fig. S7 (a) LSVs and (b) the power density as a function of potential collected from PEFCs based on Pt cathode (black), Ag cathode (red) and Ag_2O/Ag cathode (blue) in 1.0 M NaOH containing 0.85 M ethanol.



Fig. S8 The effect of the electrochemical oxidation time for the preparation of Ag_2O/Ag on the performance of PEB: 0.5 h (a) and 1 h (b).

It can be found that the electrochemical oxidation time for Ag foil only affected the capacity of Ag_2O/Ag electrode (the working time of PEB) but had no effect on the performance of PEB (Fig. S8). Thus, by controlling the area of Ag electrode and electrochemical oxidation times, we can easily tune the working time of our PEFCs.

Photoanode	Cathode	Membrane	Open circuit voltage	Maximum power density
Zinc chlorin-e6 sensitized TiO ₂ nanoparticles ¹	Pt	No	0.415 V	$0.028 \ \mu W/cm^2$
Porphyrin-sensitized TiO_2 nanoparticles ²	Hg/ Hg ₂ SO ₄	Yes	1.10 V	$37 \ \mu W/cm^2$
Porphyrin-sensitized TiO_2 nanoparicles ³	Pt black	Yes	0.74 V	$33.94 \ \mu W/cm^2$
Porphyrin-sensitized SnO ₂ nanoparticles ⁴	Hg/ Hg ₂ SO ₄	Yes	0.75 V	$19 \ \mu W/cm^2$
TiO ₂ nanotube arrays ⁵	Pt	No	1.42 V	0.67 mW/cm ²
TiO ₂ nanotube arrays ⁶	Pt black	No	1.30 V	0.27 mW/cm ²
TiO_2 nanotube arrays ⁷	bilirubin oxidase	No	1.0 V	$47 \ \mu W/cm^2$
TiO ₂ nanotube arrays*	Ag ₂ O/ Ag	No	1.10 V	0.94 mW/cm ²

Table 1. The comparisons between our work and conventional PEFCs.

[*] Our present work.

Reference

1. Y. Amao, Y. Takeuchi, Int. J. Hydrogen Energy 2008, 33, 2845.

2. A. Brune, G. Jeong, P. A. Liddell, , T. Sotomura, T. A. Moore, A. L. Moore, D. Gust, *Langmuir* 2004, **20**, 8366.

3. K. Wang, J. Yang, L. Feng, Y. Zhang, L. Liang, W. Xing, C. Liu, *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 2012, 32, 177.

4. L. de la Garza, G. Jeong, P. A. Liddell, T. Sotomura, T. A. Moore, A. L. Moore, D. Gust, J. *Phys. Chem. B* 2003, **107**, 10252.

5. Y. Liu, J. Li, B. Zhou, X. Li, H. Chen, Q. Chen, Z. Wang, L. Li, J. Wang, W. Cai, *Water Res.* 2011, **45**, 3991.

6. Y. Liu, J. Li, B. Zhou, H. Chen, Z. Wang, W. Cai, Chem. Commun. 2011, 47, 10314.

7. L. Han, L. Bai, C. Zhu, Y. Wang, S. Dong, Chem. Commun. 2012, 48, 6103.