## Supporting information

## Transition Metal-Tetracyanoquinodimethane Monolayers as Single-Atom Catalysts for Electrocatalytic Nitrogen Reduction Reaction

Yiran Ying<sup>a</sup>, Ke Fan<sup>a</sup>, Xin Luo<sup>b\*</sup>, Jinli Qiao<sup>c</sup>, and Haitao Huang<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Applied Physics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, P.R. China

<sup>b</sup> School of Physics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong Province, P.R. China,

510275

<sup>c</sup> College of Environmental Science and Engineering, State Key Laboratory for Modification of Chemical Fibers and Polymer Materials, Donghua University, Shanghai 201620 (China)

## **Corresponding Author**

\*E-mail: luox77@mail.sysu.edu.cn; aphhuang@polyu.edu.hk

System	a (Å)	b (Å)	System	a (Å)	b (Å)
Sc-TCNQ	7.266	11.702	Zn-TCNQ	7.158	11.423
<b>Ti-TCNQ</b>	7.162	11.559	Mo-TCNQ	7.041	11.522
V-TCNQ	7.095	11.455	<b>Ru-TCNQ</b>	7.014	11.354
Cr-TCNQ	7.043	11.332	Rh-TCNQ	7.028	11.326
Mn-TCNQ	7.015	11.295	Pd-TCNQ	7.030	11.363
Fe-TCNQ	6.938	11.193	Ag-TCNQ	7.381	11.758
Co-TCNQ	6.886	11.161	<b>Pt-TCNQ</b>	7.022	11.368
Ni-TCNQ	6.974	11.208	Au-TCNQ	7.297	11.549
Cu-TCNQ	7.183	11.371			

**Table S1.** Optimized lattice constants *a* and *b* for TM-TCNQ (TM=Sc-Zn, Mo, Ru-Pd, Ag, Pt, Au).

**Table S2.** Adsorption energies  $E_{ad}$  (eV) of N<sub>2</sub> onto the TM-TCNQ (TM=Sc-Zn, Mo, Ru-Pd, Ag, Pt, Au) with both end-on and side-on configurations. Catalysts with favorable  $E_{ad}$  value for NRR are marked in red.

System	End-on	Side-on	System	End-on	Side-on
Sc-TCNQ	-0.63	-0.33	Zn-TCNQ	-0.11	-0.05
<b>Ti-TCNQ</b>	-0.97	-0.56	Mo-TCNQ	-0.06	-0.06
V-TCNQ	-1.16	-0.50	<b>Ru-TCNQ</b>	-0.03	-0.07
Cr-TCNQ	-1.20	-0.09	Rh-TCNQ	-0.03	-0.07
Mn-TCNQ	-0.96	-0.04	Pd-TCNQ	-0.05	-0.07
Fe-TCNQ	-0.45	-0.08	Ag-TCNQ	-0.01	-0.01
Co-TCNQ	0.08	0.04	Pt-TCNQ	-0.05	-0.07
Ni-TCNQ	0.05	0.02	Au-TCNQ	-0.27	-0.28
Cu-TCNQ	-0.05	-0.06			

Adsorbates	E <sub>DFT</sub> (eV)	E <sub>ZPE</sub> (eV)	TS (eV)
*	-162.539	0	0
*N-N	-179.776	0.177	0.141
*N-NH	-181.070	0.399	0.125
*N-N*	-179.468	0.161	0.145
*N-NH*	-182.793	0.484	0.163
*N-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-186.253	0.474	0.281
*NH-NH*	-186.306	0.719	0.146
*N	-167.512	0.042	0.116
*NH-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-191.059	1.119	0.152
*NH <sub>2</sub> -NH <sub>2</sub> *	-193.786	1.441	0.211
*NH	-173.978	0.325	0.114
*NH <sub>2</sub>	-179.883	0.641	0.139
*NH <sub>3</sub>	-183.323	1.014	0.174
*H	-166.185	0.145	0.027

**Table S3.** DFT-calculated total energy  $E_{DFT}$ , zero point energy  $E_{ZPE}$ , and entropic contribution term TS for NRR and HER intermediates on Sc-TCNQ.

Adsorbates	E <sub>DFT</sub> (eV)	E <sub>ZPE</sub> (eV)	TS (eV)
*	-162.820	0	0
*N-N	-180.394	0.217	0.089
*N-NH	-182.135	0.404	0.060
*N-N*	-179.972	0.204	0.096
*N-NH*	-183.212	0.481	0.114
*N-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-187.236	0.826	0.104
*NH-NH*	-186.476	0.711	0.147
*N	-170.319	0.070	0.078
*NH-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-191.484	1.123	0.213
*NH <sub>2</sub> -NH <sub>2</sub> *	-194.089	1.459	0.221
*NH	-176.090	0.348	0.090
*NH <sub>2</sub>	-180.398	0.659	0.115
*NH <sub>3</sub>	-183.731	1.021	0.167
*H	-166.752	0.162	0.021

**Table S4.** DFT-calculated total energy  $E_{DFT}$ , zero point energy  $E_{ZPE}$ , and entropic contribution term TS for NRR and HER intermediates on Ti-TCNQ.

Adsorbates	E <sub>DFT</sub> (eV)	E <sub>ZPE</sub> (eV)	TS (eV)
*	-162.840	0	0
*N-N	-180.601	0.216	0.133
*N-NH	-182.660	0.424	0.104
*N-N*	-179.932	0.177	0.117
*N-NH*	-182.884	0.477	0.107
*N-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-187.238	0.825	0.097
*NH-NH*	-186.794	0.770	0.110
*N	-171.575	0.075	0.028
*NH-NH <sub>2</sub> *	-191.076	1.115	0.157
*NH <sub>2</sub> -NH <sub>2</sub> *	-193.974	1.531	0.103
*NH	-176.181	0.341	0.051
*NH <sub>2</sub>	-180.154	0.677	0.095
*NH <sub>3</sub>	-183.779	1.030	0.150
*H	-166.756	0.173	0.021

**Table S5.** DFT-calculated total energy  $E_{DFT}$ , zero point energy  $E_{ZPE}$ , and entropic contribution term TS for NRR and HER intermediates on V-TCNQ.

**Table S6.** Zero point energy  $E_{ZPE}$  and entropic contribution term TS for  $H_2$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $NH_3$  in their gas phases. Values of TS for gases under T=298.15 K are extracted from NIST database (https://doi.org/10.18434/T4D303).

Gas	E <sub>ZPE</sub> (eV)	TS (eV)
H <sub>2</sub>	0.269	0.404
$N_2$	0.151	0.592
NH <sub>3</sub>	0.939	0.596



**Fig. S1** Side and top view of the schematic geometric structures of  $N_2$  adsorbed on Sc-TCNQ with (a) side-on configuration and (b) end-on configuration. Sc, C, N, H are represented in purple, brown, cyan, and pale pink, respectively. Sc-N bond length values are also marked in the figure.



**Fig. S2** Schematic illustration of distal, alternating, and their mixed mechanisms for NRR on TM-TCNQ. TM denotes transition metal atom (active site) in the figures.



**Fig. S3** DFT-optimized structures of  $N_2$  adsorbed on (a) V-TCNQ with side-on configuration, (b) Fe-TCNQ with end-on configuration, and on Au-TCNQ with (c) side-on and (d) end-on configuration. The V-N and Fe-N bond length values in (a)(b) as well as the smallest distance between Au and N atoms in (c)(d) are marked.



Fig. S4 Minimum energy path for the transformation from end-on to side-on  $N_2$  adsorption on (a) Sc- and (b) Ti-TCNQ calculated by CI-NEB method.



**Fig. S5** DFT-optimized structures for all intermediates in the NRR along the most favorable pathway for (a) Sc-TCNQ and (b) Ti-TCNQ except for \*N≡N\* on Sc-TCNQ (already shown in Fig. S1a). C, N, H, Sc, and Ti are represented in brown, cyan, pale pink, purple, and blue, respectively.



**Fig. S6** Comparison between Gibbs free energy change of potential-limiting step (PLS) for NRR (marked in orange in Fig. 5) and NH<sub>3</sub> desorption free energy for Sc-, Ti-, and V-TCNQ.



Fig. S7 Comparison between adsorption Gibbs free energy for  $N_2$  and H for Sc-, Ti-, and V-TCNQ. The adsorption Gibbs free energy for species M was defined as  $\Delta G(M)=G(*M)-G(*)-G(M)$ , where \* denotes the active site.

**Supplementary Notes 1.** Justification of 4-coordinated TM-TCNQ structures in the calculations The geometric structure of 4-coordinated transition metal atom to nitrogen in TM-TCNQ network was confirmed by pioneer experimental observations (e.g. scanning tunneling microscopy, STM) in *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2013, **110**, 027202; *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2011, **115**, 10211; *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2010, **114**, 17197, indicating that the structure is indeed stable under lab conditions. The 4coordinated TM-TCNQ structure was used in our calculations and other theoretical work (*Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 5173; *J. Catal.*, 2019, **370**, 378; *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 3805-3814). Other configurations might be possible, but the 4-coordinated TM-TCNQ has already been experimentally fabricated, which provides our results with validity and importance.

Supplementary Notes 2. N<sub>2</sub> adsorption energy and adsorption free energy

There is still controversy in whether N<sub>2</sub> adsorption energy  $E_{ad}$  or adsorption Gibbs free energy  $\Delta G(N_2)$  should be used for screening NRR catalysts. Several studies on computational NRR in recent years used the N<sub>2</sub> adsorption energy instead of  $\Delta G(N_2)$  as an indicator (*J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2018, **140**, 14161; *Small Methods*, 2019, **3**, 1800376; *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2019, **10**, 6984; *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2020, **142**, 308; *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2020, **142**, 5709). Specifically, Ling *et al.* used  $E_{ad}$ <-0.5 eV as a criterion for screening NRR single-atom catalysts in a benchmark study (*Small Methods*, 2019, **3**, 1800376), and the criterion was also applied in our work. Nevertheless, to ensure the completeness of our discussion, it is necessary to check whether  $\Delta G(N_2)$  can also favor the spontaneous N<sub>2</sub> adsorption. Fig. S7 shows the  $\Delta G(N_2)$  values for side-on configuration on Sc-, Ti-, and V-TCNQ, and the negative  $\Delta G(N_2)$  indicates that adsorption Gibbs free energy can also fulfill the spontaneous N<sub>2</sub> adsorption.

## Supplementary Notes 3. Explanation of the 'mixed' pathway

In the main text, we mention that the energetically favorable pathway for Sc- and Ti-TCNQ is the enzymatic-consecutive mixed pathway. The conclusion is made by comparing the Gibbs free energy changes for different intermediates in NRR. Since both catalyst favors \*N-NH<sub>2</sub>\* to \*NH-NH\* in the second hydrogenation step (Fig. 5), they follow step C1-C3 in the consecutive pathway (Fig. 2); however, for the third step, for Sc- and Ti-TCNQ, \*NH-NH<sub>2</sub>\* is more favorable than \*N+NH<sub>3</sub>, so C4' step instead of C4 is chosen which lead to \*NH-NH<sub>2</sub>\* intermediate in the enzymatic pathway, followed by E5' step (getting back to \*NH in the consecutive pathway) due to smaller  $\Delta$ G for \*NH+NH<sub>3</sub> than \*NH<sub>2</sub>-NH<sub>2</sub>\*. To sum up, because two reaction steps (C4' and E5') for Sc- and Ti-TCNQ include a transformation between conventional consecutive and enzymatic pathways, we define that Sc and Ti-TCNQ go through the enzymatic-consecutive mixed pathway.