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Electromagnetic shielding performance measurement

The electromagnetic interference (EMI) shielding performance of the hybrid membranes was characterized by an Agilent Model N5230A vector network analyzer in X-band (8.2-12.4 GHz). The as-prepared membranes were cut into circular plates with a diameter of 15 mm, and an electromagnetic wave was guided into the samples by using the coaxial line technique. The measured scattering parameters (S11 and S21) were employed to calculate the EMI SE according to the following formula:

\[ R = |S11|^2 \]
\[ T = |S21|^2 \]

\[ R + A + T = 1 \]

\[ SE(dB) = -10 \log T \]
\[
\text{SER(dB)} = -10\log(1-R)
\]

\[
\text{SEA(dB)} = \text{SET} - \text{SER} - \text{SEM}
= -10\log(T/1-R)
\]

The total shielding (SE\(_T\)) is mainly caused by the sum of the contribution of absorption (SE\(_A\)), reflection (SE\(_R\)) and multiple reflection (SE\(_M\)), where SE\(_M\) can be ignored when SE\(_T\) \(\geq 15\) dB.

**Thermal conductivity testing**

The thermal conductivity of the CNF hybrid membrane was tested by a laser flash technique (LFA 457 MicroFlash, Netzsch) and calculated according to the following formula:

\[
K = \rho C_p \sigma
\]

where \(\rho\) is the density of the CNF hybrid membrane, \(C_p\) is the specific heat which is measured through a method of sapphire with differential scanning calorimetry (DCS 8500), and \(\sigma\) is thermal diffusivity.

**Photothermal performance of the CNF hybrid membrane**

The photothermal conversion efficiency (\(\eta\)) of the CNF hybrid membrane was determined from the following equation\(^1\).

\[
\eta = \frac{hA\Delta T_{\text{max}}}{I(1 - 10^{-A_{808}})}
\]

Where \(h\) represents the heat transfer coefficient, \(A\) represents the surface area of the system, \(\Delta T_{\text{max}}\) (80.9 °C) represents the maximum temperature change, \(I\) represents the laser power (0.2 W) and \(A_{808}\) is the absorbance of the samples at the wavelength of 808 nm (0.95). In order to obtain the value of \(hA\), \(\theta\) is introduced as follows:

\[
\theta = \frac{T - T_{\text{surr}}}{T_{\text{max}} - T_{\text{surr}}}
\]
where $T$ is the temperature of the CNF hybrid membrane, $T_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum system temperature, and $T_{\text{surr}}$ is the initial temperature. The $\theta$ and $t$ are introduced to establish a functional relationship:

$$t = - \frac{\sum m_i c_{p,i}}{hA} \ln \theta$$

Where $m$ (1.4 mg) and $c_p$ (2.049 J (g °C)$^{-1}$) are the weight and specific heat of system components (CNF hybrid membrane), respectively. Therefore, $hA$ can be acquired from the time of cooling period vs $\theta$. The photothermal conversion efficiency ($\eta$) of CNF hybrid membrane can be calculated.

![Fig. S1 SEM images of the carbon nanofibers and the statistical diameter distributions.](image)
(a-b) CNF. (c-d) CNF-Ni1. (e-f) CNF-Ni2.

**Fig. S2** The XPS spectrum of CNF-Ni2 and the content ratio of corresponding atoms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Atomic %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cls</td>
<td>84.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1s</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1s</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni 2p</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. S3** The XPS spectrum of CNF-Ni2-F: (a) N 1s peak fitting; (b) O 1s peak fitting; (c) F 1s peak fitting; (d) Ni 2p peak fitting.
Fig. S4 The CAs of the composite membranes after immersion into acid (pH=3), alkaline (pH=14) and salt conditions for 3 h.

Fig. S5 CAs on the superhydrophobic membrane surface as a function of the temperature.
Fig. S6 (a) Electrical conductivity and (b) magnetic hysteresis loops of the CNF, CNF-Ni1 and CNF-Ni2 membrane. (c) Variation in shielding effectiveness with frequency (8.2-12.4 GHz) for CNF and its hybrid membranes. (d) EMI shielding effectiveness of the CNF-Ni2 in the X band with different thickness. (e and f) Comparison of the EMI SE of the CNF-Ni2 samples (with a thickness of about 0.6 mm) before and after fluorination.
Fig. S7 A linear fitting correlation between time (t) and lnθ from the cooling period.

Fig. S8 Photograph of the CNF-Ni2 membrane wetted by water after.
Table S1 Comparison of EMI shielding performance of various carbon nanomaterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Thickness (mm)</th>
<th>Density (g/cm³)</th>
<th>EMI SE (dB)</th>
<th>SSE (dB cm³ g⁻¹)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP/MWCNT coated PET fabrics</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.2236</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activated Carbon Web</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>75.44</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWCNT-Dip-Coated Cotton Fabrics</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF/PC/Ni film</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT/carbon fiber/pyrolytic carbon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMBs/MWCNTs/Fe₃O₄</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>183.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2. Comparison of the photothermal efficiency (η) among various carbon nanomaterials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Laser power (W)</th>
<th>η (%)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxidized mesoporous carbon Nanoparticles glucose-derived</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbonaceous nanospheres MoS₂@C nanocomposite</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphitic carbon nanocubes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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