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Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Morphologies of Cu-GFs fabricated by electroless plating copper on GFs (a) low and (b) high magnification.

Figure S2. XRD patterns of Cu-GFs.
Figure S3. Morphologies of Cu-BTC-GFs (a) low and (b) high magnification.

Figure S4. XRD patterns of Cu-BTC-GFs.
Figure S5. (a) Nitrogen adsorption/desorption isotherms of the Cu-BTC-GFs (b) pore-size distribution of the Cu-BTC-GFs.

Figure S6. Thermogravimetric Analysis curves of the Cu-BTC-GFs in nitrogen flow.
Figure S7. EDS diagram of CuO-C/MGFs.

Figure S8. XPS spectra of Cu\text{2p} spectra of Cu-C/MGFs.
Figure S9. The survey of XPS spectra (a) CuO-C/MGFs (b) Cu-C/MGFs.
Figure S10. Galvanostatic charge and discharge curve during Coulomb efficiency test of (a) CuO-C/MGFs (b) Cu-C/MGFs (c) enlarged image of Cu-C/MGFs.
Figure S11. Voltage profiles with different cycles of lithium plated/stripped on Cu-C/MGFs at a current density of 1 mA cm\(^{-2}\) with a capacity of 1 mAh cm\(^{-2}\).

Figure S12. Coulombic efficiency of lithium plated on CuO-C/MGFs and Cu-C/MGFs with a mount of 1 mAh cm\(^{-2}\) at 2 mA cm\(^{-2}\).
Figure S13. Coulombic efficiency of lithium plated on CuO-C/MGFs and Cu-C/MGFs with a mount of 1 mAh cm\(^{-2}\) at 5 mA cm\(^{-2}\).

Figure S14. Coulombic efficiency of lithium plated on CuO-C/MGFs and Cu-C/MGFs with a mount of 2 mAh cm\(^{-2}\) at 1 mA cm\(^{-2}\).
Figure S15. Voltage profiles of lithium plated on Cu-C/MGFs at different current densities with a capacity of 1mAh cm$^{-2}$.

Figure S16. The lithium deposition voltage hysteresis of CuO-C/MGFs and Cu-C/MGFs at different current densities.
Figure S17. CV curves of CuO-C/MGFs anode countering to a lithium metal plate. Test voltage range is from 2.0 V to -0.1 V and the sweep speed is 0.1 mV s$^{-1}$. 

Figure S18. CV curves of Cu-C/MGFs anode countering to a lithium metal plate. Test voltage range is from 2.0 V to -0.1 V and the sweep speed is 0.1 mV s$^{-1}$. 
Figure S19. Voltage–time curve of CuO-C/MGFs and Cu-C/MGFs at 0.05 mA cm$^{-2}$.

Figure S20. XRD patterns of CuO-C/MGFs anode after the first discharge.
Figure S21. The fitted lines of the impedance versus $\omega^{-1/2}$ for CuO-C/MGFs anode (red) and Cu-C/MGFs anode (black).

Figure S22. Morphologies of Cu-C/MGFs after deposited lithium in amount of 10 mAh cm$^{-2}$ at a current density of 1 mA cm$^{-2}$.
Figure S23. SEM images of the morphologies of lithium deposited on CuO-C/MGFs at a current density of 1 mA cm$^{-2}$ with the capacity of (a) 0.2 mAh cm$^{-2}$ (b) 0.5 mAh cm$^{-2}$ (c) 1 mAh cm$^{-2}$ (d) 2 mAh cm$^{-2}$ (e-f) lithium was totally stripped.
Figure S24. Voltage-time profiles of symmetric Li| Li/ CuO-C and Li| Li/ Cu-C batteries with a capacity of 1 mAh cm\(^{-2}\) Li at 2 mA cm\(^{-2}\).

Figure S25. Cycling stability comparison of the full cells with CuO-C/MGFs anode and Li anode.
Table 1. Coulombic efficiency of CuO-C/MGFs compared with various anode substrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>substrates</th>
<th>Current/ Capacity (mA cm(^{-2})/mAh cm(^{-2}))</th>
<th>CE (%)</th>
<th>cycle</th>
<th>Max current (mA cm(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDA@3D Cu</td>
<td>0.5/1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Energy Storage Materials, 2020, 29, 84-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D porous Cu current collector</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adv. Mater. 2016, 28, 6932-6939.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D PI-clad copper</td>
<td>0.5/1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nat. Commun. 2018, 9, 464.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D porous Cu</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adv. Energy Mater. 2018, 8, 1800266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Cu@Al@Li</td>
<td>0.5/2</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2019, 58, 1094-1099.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D copper nanowire-phosphide</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adv. Mater. 2019, 31, 1904991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>