### **Supporting Information**

# Interface engineering of Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> nanowire arrays with ultrafine NiO nanowires

## for high-performance rechargeable alkaline battery

Ke Zhang<sup>a</sup>, Xiao Ye<sup>a</sup>, Yuenian Shen<sup>b</sup>, Ze Cen<sup>a</sup>, Kaibing Xu<sup>b</sup>, and Fang Yang<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> College of Mechanical and Automotive Engineering, Shanghai University of Engineering Science, Shanghai, 201620, China.

<sup>b</sup> State Key Laboratory for Modification of Chemical Fibers and Polymer Materials,

Research Center for Analysis and Measurement & College of Materials Science and Engineering, Donghua University, Shanghai, 201620, China.

E-mail: yfang@sues.edu.cn.

## **Part I: Calculation**

For the RAB and three-electrode system, we calculated the electrode's areal capacitance (mAh/cm<sup>2</sup>) based on this equation:

$$C = \frac{I \bigtriangleup t}{S}$$

Where, C is the specific capacitance (mAh/cm<sup>2</sup>), I is the applied current (mA), S is the geometrical area of the electrode (cm<sup>2</sup>) and  $\Delta t$  is discharge time (h).<sup>1</sup>

The energy density (E) and power density (P) of the two electrodes in the RAB device are calculated based on the following equations:

$$E = C \bigtriangleup V$$
$$P = \frac{E}{\bigtriangleup t}$$

Where C is the specific capacity,  $\Delta V$  is the potential change during the discharge process and  $\Delta t$  is the discharge time.<sup>2</sup>

In order to maintain the charge balance of  $q^+ = q^-$  between the cathode and anode, the optimal mass ratio should follow the following formula:

$$\frac{m^+}{m^-} = \frac{C^- \Delta V^-}{C^+ \Delta V^+}$$

In which  $m^+$ ,  $V^+$ , and  $C^+$  denote the mass, potential window and specific capacity of the positive electrode, respectively, and  $m^-$ ,  $V^-$ , and  $C^-$  are the corresponding negative one, respectively.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the calculated mass ration between the Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@NiO electrode and AC electrode is about 1:5.



Part II: Figures

Fig. S1. XRD pattern of Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> materials on Ni foam.



**Fig. S2.** (a, c, e) CV curves at different scanning rates, (b, d, f) CD curves at different current densities of Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@NiCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@MnO<sub>2</sub>, respectively.



Fig. S3. (a) The relationship between log (i) and log (v) plots of  $Co_3O_4$ @NiO

electrode.



Fig. S4. (a) CV curves and (b) CD curves of AC electrode.



Fig. S6. High-resolution XPS spectra of (a) Ni 2p, (b) Co 2p, (c) O 1s and (d) Mn 2p

for the Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@NiCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> and Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@MnO<sub>2</sub> Composites

The XPS spectra of Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@NiCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> and Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>@MnO<sub>2</sub> are shown in Fig. S6.

The binding energy of Ni 2p is 874.2, 861.7 eV peak corresponds to Ni<sup>3+</sup>, 872.9, 854.9 eV peak corresponds to Ni<sup>2+</sup> (Fig. S6a).<sup>3-5</sup> The strong satellite peak indicates that Ni<sup>2+</sup> is the dominant element in the lattice. In the Co 2p spectra, binding energy at 796.0 and 780.9 eV corresponds to Co<sup>2+</sup>, 795.3 and 780.0 eV corresponds to Co<sup>3+</sup> (Fig. S6b).<sup>1, 3, 6</sup> In Fig. S6c, the peak at binding energy 531.6 eV indicates the hydroxylation of the surface of the material and the peak at 529.9 eV is a typical metal-oxygen bonding peak.<sup>6-8</sup> For Mn 2p XPS spectra (Fig. S6d), the peaks at binding energies of 654.3 and 642.5 eV correspond to Mn  $2p_{1/2}$  and Mn  $2p_{3/2}$ , respectively.<sup>2, 9, 10</sup>

#### References

- 1. Y. Ouyang, R. Huang, X. Xia, H. Ye, X. Jiao, L. Wang, W. Lei and Q. Hao, *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2019, **355**, 416-427.
- 2. F. Zhu, Y. Liu, M. Yan and W. Shi, *J Colloid Interface Sci*, 2018, **512**, 419-427.
- 3. Y. Wang, M. Zhang, Y. Li, T. Ma, H. Liu, D. Pan, X. Wang and A. Wang, *Electrochimica Acta*, 2018, **290**, 12-20.
- 4. L. Shen, Q. Che, H. Li and X. Zhang, *Advanced Functional Materials*, 2014, **24**, 2630-2637.
- 5. X. Wu, Z. Han, X. Zheng, S. Yao, X. Yang and T. Zhai, *Nano Energy*, 2017, **31**, 410-417.
- X. Feng, Y. Huang, C. Li, Y. Xiao, X. Chen, X. Gao and C. Chen, *Electrochimica Acta*, 2019, **308**, 142-149.
- 7. Y. Gao, Q. Yu, Y. Du, M. Yang, L. Gao, S. Rao, Z. Yang, Q. Lan and Z. Yang, *Journal Of Electroanalytical Chemistry*, 2019, **838**, 41-47.
- 8. L. Ni, L. Jia, G. Chen, F. Wang, X. Liu and R. Ma, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, 2018, **122**, 261-267.
- 9. H. Du, C. Wang and J. Lv, *Solid State Communications*, 2018, **277**, 19-24.
- 10. K. Wang, Z. Shi, Y. Wang, Z. Ye, H. Xia, G. Liu and G. Qiao, *Journal of Alloys and Compounds*, 2015, **624**, 85-93.